

Last year's statement was not clear in the case where the ball being out of bounds and the touching of a player were simultaneous (a player who was out of bounds touched or caught the ball). The new wording is definite.

Play: A1 tries and the try is not successful. A1 continues over the end line and is out of bounds when B1 recovers the rebound and bats or passes the ball against A1 who is still out of bounds. **Ruling:** The ball should be awarded to B1. Under such circumstances, it is theoretically possible for B to take advantage of the rule. In actual practice, it is doubtful whether such action will occur.

Play: A1 has the ball out of bounds at the side. He attempts to throw it in and B1 bats the pass back against A1 who is still legitimately out of bounds. **Ruling:** Ball should be awarded to B1. This is another case where it is theoretically possible for B1 to take advantage of the rule. However, A1 has the whole court into which to throw the ball and he also has plenty of chance to avoid being hit by the batted ball if he is alert.

11-1-Note. The first paragraph of this note is new. Since any player may request a time-out, it is not uncommon for poorly informed players to ask at a time when they may not legally make such a request. Under ordinary circumstances, the Official will ignore such request but if he erroneously grants it, it is a technical foul as well as a charged time-out and the ball should immediately be taken to the free throw line. It is assumed that it is not essential that the full one-minute time-out be allowed, since there is a considerable period of rest during the free throw for technical foul.

Play: While A1 is dribbling, B1 asks for a time-out and the Official blows his whistle. B has already taken their last legal time-out. **Ruling:** This is a technical foul for delay of game and also an excess time-out. Two free throws should be awarded to Team A.

Comment: It might be argued that this is a double penalty for the same act. However, if such a penalty were not provided, it would result in lack of any penalty for taking the time-out at the wrong time. Illustration: Suppose B1 asks for an excess time-out while his team is in possession. The penalty is a free throw for an excess time-out. Extend this situation to the one where the excess time-out is illegally requested while A1 is in control. If only one free throw were awarded, the illegal request would go unpunished. Theoretically there are two infractions. The first for taking too many time-outs and the second for breaking up a play by the opponent. This is the basis on which the two free throws are awarded.

11-2. In the last question there are two slight changes. An omission in the answer makes it clear that a thirty second substitution will cancel a charged time-out even if the time-out was taken in the interval following a field goal. Also in the question the phrase "after the watch is stopped" has been added.

In past years there was considerable laxity in connection with the method of counting the thirty seconds. In some groups, a substitute was allowed thirty seconds from the time he reported to the Scorer. In other groups, he was allowed thirty seconds from the time he entered the court. It seems obvious that if a time-out is to be cancelled by a substitution, the thirty seconds should be counted from the time the Timer stops his watch. In actual practice, this will make it almost impossible for a team to cancel a time-out unless the time-out is actually taken for the purpose of making a substitution and unless substitution slips are being used to reduce the amount of waste time.

Comment: It might be claimed that teams may take advantage of this privilege. Here are some illustrations:

1. Following a field goal, A1 asks for a time-out in order to prevent a fast break by the opponent. The coach rushes in a substitute who reports to the Official within thirty seconds and thus cancels the charged time-out.
2. After the ball has been placed at the disposal of free thrower, A1, A2 notices that B1 is in a sleeper position without any guard in his vicinity. A substitute is rushed in in time to cancel the charged time-out.

3. Near the end of a game, A1 holds the ball for eight seconds in his back court and then asks for a time-out. Play is resumed by awarding the ball to A1 out of bounds and he is permitted ten more seconds to advance the ball to the front court. This action is repeated several times. In order to prevent excess time-outs a substitute is rushed in on each occasion.

These possible abuses of the rule are largely theoretical, especially since the thirty seconds is to start when the watch is stopped. In the last illustration, there would always be the possibility of a held ball before the request for a time-out could be transmitted, especially if the defensive team is alert. If they are merely holding a zone defense under such circumstances, they probably ought to lose.

11-5. There are two slight changes in this section. In the next to the last line, the phrase "or awarded" has been added to take care of the situation where a goal might be awarded on the last play of a period. In the last paragraph, the word "practice" replaces "practice shooting". Some teams interpreted the old rule to mean that they might practice passing (probably to annoy the opponent).

13-7. This section has been reworded to cover situations which were only ambiguously covered by questions and answers. If there is a foul by one team and between the time of that foul and the time the watch is next started, there is a foul by the other team. Since the fouls are not simultaneous, this is not a double foul. However, as far as resumption of play after the last free throw is concerned, the administration is the same as for a double foul. The reason these can not be classed as a double foul

Player
can control
ball in back
court for
19 seconds
and no penalty