



# **CHANGES TO THE LAWS OF CRICKET**

**(With effect from 1st April 2019)**

**OFFICIAL**

**Marylebone Cricket Club**

---

## Changes to the Laws of Cricket – with effect from 1 April 2019

In 2017, MCC published a new Code of Laws, which incorporated the most wide-ranging and ambitious alterations to the Laws of Cricket for almost two decades. The Code has been well-received, and had a positive impact on cricket the world over. However, over the last two years, some issues have emerged, and so MCC has produced a second edition, which will come into force on 1st April 2019.

The majority of these changes are simply minor corrections or clarifications, and will not make a material difference to the vast majority of cricket played around the world. One change removes a whole clause (the previous Law 41.19), but this is simply because, after changes to Law 41.2, the clause was duplication.

However, there are a few significant changes. First, the decision was taken to rework Law 41.7, which relates to full-pitch deliveries over waist height (known colloquially as ‘beamers’). MCC listened to significant feedback and has handed more control to umpires to determine whether a delivery is dangerous. Also relevant to that Law, and at the behest of umpires, MCC has for the first time put into the Laws a definition of the waist – something that has long-since been a point of contention, particularly in the recreational game.

There is also a slight change to Law 41.16, which should further confirm the principle, established in the 2017 Code, that it is the non-striker’s duty to remain in his/her ground until the bowler has released the ball. The other most notable alterations come in Laws 34 and 37, where the scenarios of hitting the ball twice, and obstructing a catch, after a delivery has been called a No ball, have been addressed.

The other changes (there are 22 in total) are not as significant, but are listed, in order, in this document to give a full run-down of the second edition.

---

### Preamble – The Spirit of Cricket

#### Explanation

The Preamble makes no reference to scorers, who are a vital part of the game of Cricket. It does, however, mention coaches and parents, who have no official role.

#### Change

The word ‘umpires’ has been changed to ‘match officials’ in the opening part of the Preamble (it later refers specifically to umpires and the authority of the umpires).

#### New wording

Cricket owes much of its appeal and enjoyment to the fact that it should be played not only according to the Laws, but also within the Spirit of Cricket. The major responsibility for ensuring fair play rests with the captains, but extends to all players, match officials and, especially in junior cricket, teachers, coaches and parents.

---

### Law 11.2.2

#### Explanation

It had been noted that there was a slight error in the cross-references in Law 11. Law 11.2.2 currently makes reference to Laws 11.4, 11.6 and 11.7. It should be 11.3, 11.5 and 11.6.

#### Change

This error has been fixed.

#### New wording

11.2.2 An interval between innings shall be 10 minutes, commencing from the close of an innings until the call of Play for the start of the next innings. See, however, 11.3, 11.5 and 11.6.

---

**Law 15****Explanation**

Under Law 15.2, a forfeited innings is specifically described as a completed innings. This is also true of a declared innings (importantly for Law 16), but the Law does not currently state it.

**Change**

The sentence 'A declared innings shall be considered to be a completed innings' has been added in Law 15.1.

**New wording****15.1 Time of declaration**

The captain of the side batting may declare an innings closed, when the ball is dead, at any time during the innings. A declared innings shall be considered to be a completed innings.

---

**Law 16.3.3****Explanation**

In the writing of Law 42.1.5, some minor amendments were made to the procedure for adding time on. As this Law had borrowed from Law 16.3.3, it was felt that these amendments should be made in both Laws.

**Change**

The reference to Law 11.4 was changed so that it covered the whole of Law 11, while the reference to suspensions in play was also altered to make things clearer.

**New wording**

- 16.3.3** if action as in 16.3.2 takes place after play has started and does not constitute a refusal to play,
- Playing time shall be counted as lost from the call of Time to the call of Play, excluding intervals (Law 11) and suspensions of play (Law 2.8).
  - the time for close of play on that day shall be extended by this length of time.
  - if applicable, no overs shall be deducted during the last hour of the match solely on account of this time.

---

**Law 16.7****Explanation**

Law 16.7 makes reference to a side 'losing all wickets'. This is just one way an innings can be completed, and thus suggests that, if a side has players suspended/retired, they cannot win by Penalty runs.

**Change**

The second paragraph of this Law has been changed to mention the side batting last's innings being completed, rather than it losing all wickets.

**New wording**

If, without having scored a total of runs in excess of the total scored by the opposing side, the innings of the side batting last has been completed, but as the result of an award of 5 Penalty runs its total of runs is then sufficient to win, the result shall be stated as a win to that side by Penalty runs.

---

**Law 18.6****Explanation**

Law 18.6 makes reference to four occasions when an umpire must disallow runs. However, there are actually eight such occasions.

**Change**

All eight are now be included in this Law, and they have been re-ordered to be in Laws order.

---

**Law 18.6 (Continued)****New wording****18.6 Runs awarded for penalties**

Runs shall be awarded for penalties under 18.5, and Laws 21 (*No ball*), 22 (*Wide ball*), 24.4 (*Player returning without permission*), 26.4 (*Penalties for contravention*), 28.2 (*Fielding the ball*), 28.3 (*Protective helmets belonging to the fielding side*), 41 (*Unfair play*) and 42 (*Players' conduct*).

Note, however, the restrictions on the award of Penalty runs in Laws 18.5, 23.3 (*Leg byes not to be awarded*), 25.6.5 (*Dismissal and conduct of a batsman and his/her runner*), 25.7 (*Restriction on the striker's runner*), 28.3 (*Protective helmets belonging to the fielding side*), 34 (*Hit the ball twice*), 41.14 (*Batsman damaging the pitch*) and 41.15 (*Striker in protected area*).

---

**Law 21.6****Explanation**

The change to Law 41.16 (see below), which allows for an accidental run-out of the non-striker by the bowler, required a similar change to Law 21.6

**Change**

The concept of 'attempting' to run out the non-striker has been removed from the Law.

**New wording****21.6 Bowler breaking wicket in delivering ball**

If the ball is delivered and if the non-striker is not dismissed under Law 41.16 (Non-striker leaving his/her ground early), either umpire shall call and signal No ball if the bowler breaks the wicket at any time after the ball comes into play and before completion of the stride after the delivery stride. This shall include any clothing or other object that falls from his/her person and breaks the wicket. See Appendix A.12. Laws 20.4.2.8, 20.4.2.9 (Umpire calling and signalling Dead ball) and 21.12 will apply.

---

**Law 21.12****Explanation**

The 2017 Code stated that if there is an instance of a deliberate attempt to distract under either of Laws 41.4 (Deliberate attempt to distract striker) or 41.5 (Deliberate distraction, deception or obstruction of batsman), a call of No ball should be revoked. It was felt that this was unfair and that the batting side should still get the run for the No ball.

**Change**

Clause 20.4.2.7 has been removed from the list in Law 21.12.

**New wording****21.12 Revoking a call of No ball**

An umpire shall revoke the call of No ball if Dead ball is called under any of Laws 20.4.2.4, 20.4.2.5, 20.4.2.6, 20.4.2.8 or 20.4.2.9 (Umpire calling and signalling Dead ball).

---

**Law 29.1****Explanation**

Law 29.1.6 in its previous form was slightly unclear, as it referred to Law 29.1.5 by saying 'in the same manner', when all of the above clauses are about how the wicket is put down.

**Change**

A slight amendment has been made to make clear that Law 29.1.6 refers back only to Law 29.1.5.

---

---

**Law 29.1 (Continued)****New wording**

- 29.1.1.5 by a fielder with his/her hand or arm, providing that the ball is held in the hand or hands so used, or in the hand of the arm so used.
- 29.1.1.6 The wicket is also put down if a fielder strikes or pulls a stump out of the ground as in 29.1.1.5.
- 

**Law 30.1****Explanation**

The previous Law contained a duplication of wording, which stemmed from an amendment to this Law in the 2017 changes. The requirement at the end of the current Law, stating “provided that the batsman has continued movement in the same direction” was not felt to be necessary given the requirement to be “running or diving towards his/her ground and beyond”.

**Change**

The final sentence of the Law has been removed.

**New wording**

- 30.1.2 However, a batsman shall not be considered to be out of his/her ground if, in running or diving towards his/her ground and beyond, and having grounded some part of his/her person or bat beyond the popping crease, there is subsequent loss of contact between the ground and any part of his/her person or bat, or between the bat and person.
- 

**Law 33.4****Explanation**

There was an incorrect cross-reference in Law 33.4, which referred back to Law 18.11 rather than 18.12

**Change**

This has been fixed.

**New wording**

- 33.4 No runs to be scored
- If the striker is dismissed Caught, runs from that delivery completed by the batsmen before the completion of the catch shall not be scored but any runs for penalties awarded to either side shall stand. Law 18.12 (Batsman returning to wicket he/she has left) shall apply from the instant of the completion of the catch.
- 

**Law 34.3****Explanation**

A striker is permitted to defend his/her wicket with a lawful second strike. However, if the delivery is a No ball, the striker could not be out bowled and some people had questioned whether such a second strike should be allowed when it is largely irrelevant.

**Change**

As the call of No ball may not have been heard by the striker (or indeed may not even have been made by the umpire), and as the defence may well be instinctive, it was felt that the striker should still be permitted to defend his/her wicket. A sentence has thus been added to the Law.

**New wording**

The striker may, solely in order to guard his/her wicket and before the ball has been touched by a fielder, lawfully strike the ball a second or subsequent time with the bat, or with any part of his/her person other than a hand not holding the bat.

---

---

**Law 34.3 (Continued)**

The striker may guard his/her wicket even if the delivery is a No ball.  
However, the striker may not prevent the ball from being caught by striking the ball more than once in defence of his/her wicket. See Law 37.3 (Obstructing a ball from being caught).

---

**Law 37.3****Explanation**

If a fielder is obstructed from taking a catch by either batsman, it is the striker who is out, regardless of which batsman caused the obstruction. Similar to Law 34.3, the question was raised over a catch obstructed from a No ball when a Caught dismissal would not be possible.

**Change**

As the striker cannot be out Caught off a No ball, it should not be the striker who is necessarily out in this scenario. As in 34.3, where the reaction to defend the wicket was instinctive, whether the batsmen knew it was a No ball is not deemed to be relevant for this Law. The obstruction of a catch off a No ball should thus be treated as a normal case of Obstructing the field, meaning that whoever commits the obstruction will be out. The Law has been rewritten to reflect this.

**New wording****37.3 Obstructing a ball from being caught**

- 37.3.1** If the delivery is not a No ball, the striker is out Obstructing the field if wilful obstruction or distraction by either batsman prevents the striker being out Caught.
- 37.3.2** 37.3.1 shall apply even if an obstruction is caused by the striker in lawfully guarding his/her wicket under the provision of Law 34.3 (Ball lawfully struck more than once).
- 37.3.3** If an obstruction or distraction takes place from a No ball then the batsman who caused the obstruction or distraction will be out Obstructing the field.
- 37.3.4** 37.3.3 shall not apply if the striker obstructs while instinctively defending his/her wicket with a lawful second strike.
- 

**Law 39.3.1****Explanation**

*Law 39.3.1 previously stated:*

The striker will not be out Stumped if he/she has left his/her ground in order to avoid injury.

The Law did not clarify that such avoidance of injury could only be a defence if it happened after receiving the delivery and not as a result of it. Since only the wicket-keeper can be involved, it will be extremely rare for the ball to come from a direction where the striker might be injured, but it can happen.

**Change**

This Law should not protect a batsman who has left his/her ground to avoid injury from the original delivery (i.e. has fallen out of his/her ground when ducking to avoid a bouncer). The words 'after having received the delivery' have thus been inserted.

**New wording**

The striker will not be out Stumped if, after having received the delivery, he/she has left his/her ground in order to avoid injury.

---

---

**Law 39.3.2****Explanation**

Law 39.3.2 incorrectly included a reference to Law 25.6.5. Law 25.6.5 is not an exception to this Law, it is covered by it, and therefore does not need to be mentioned.

**Change**

This has been amended.

**New wording**

If the striker is not out Stumped he/she may, except in the circumstances of Law 38.2.2.2 (Batsman not out Run out), be out Run out if the conditions of Law 38.1 (Out Run out) apply.

---

**Law 41.2/41.19****Explanation**

Laws 41.2 and 41.19 were extremely similar – merely slightly different wordings of the same principle. It was decided that Law 41.2 should be re-written to incorporate the whole of 41.19, to avoid this duplication.

**Change**

Law 41.19 has been removed from the Laws. It was also decided to remove the final sentence of Law 41.2 (stating that umpires should not intervene when the Laws do not direct them to) which was determined to be more umpire guidance than Laws.

**New wording****41.2 Unfair actions**

**41.2.1** The umpires shall be the sole judges of fair and unfair play. If an umpire considers that any action by a player, not covered in the Laws, is unfair, he/she shall call and signal Dead ball, if appropriate, as soon as it becomes clear that the call will not disadvantage the non-offending side, and report the matter to the other umpire.

**41.2.1.1** If this is a first offence by that side, the bowler's end umpire shall then

- summon the offending player's captain and issue a first and final warning which shall apply to all members of the team for the remainder of the match.
- warn the offending player's captain that any further such offence by any member of his/her team shall result in the award of 5 Penalty runs to the opposing team.

**41.2.1.2** If this is a second or subsequent offence by that side, the bowler's end umpire shall then

- summon the offending player's captain and inform him/her that there has been a further such offence.
- award 5 Penalty runs to the opposing side

**41.2.1.3** The umpires together shall report the incident as soon as possible after the match to the Executive of the offending side and to any Governing Body responsible for the match, who shall take such action as is considered appropriate against the captain, any other individuals concerned and, if appropriate, the team.

---

**Law 41.7****Explanation**

In the first edition of the 2017 Code, Law 41.7 (Bowling of dangerous and unfair non-pitching deliveries) imposed stricter penalties on a bowler who bowls a full toss over the batsman's waist than existed under the previous Code of Laws.

---

The tightened areas were as follows:

A ball of any speed over waist high was deemed to be a No ball and dangerous. Under the 2000 Code, slow deliveries could be up to shoulder height.

Two warnings used to be given to the bowler, with a third infringement seeing him/her removed from the attack. In the 2017 Code, only one warning is given, so a bowler will be suspended for 2 full tosses over waist height at any speed.

The feedback from around the world to this change was, almost universally, negative, feeling that it was overly harsh, particularly on younger bowlers. Several Governing Bodies wrote Playing Conditions to work around it, and those matches which did use it reported problems throughout the year.

MCC has listened to that feedback, and changed the Law to what we trust will be a better and fairer Law, while still maintaining the core aim of improving player safety and enjoyment.

### **Change**

As is already the case with short-pitched bowling, the umpire will now decide whether a full-pitched delivery is dangerous, based on various factors such as the ball's speed, direction, repetition, and the ability of the batsman.

There is no longer a 'catch-all', but umpires are required to use their best judgement to determine whether it is dangerous. If it is dangerous, it will lead to a first and final warning. If not, it will still be a No ball, but there will be no warning.

### **New wording**

#### **41.7 Bowling of dangerous and unfair non-pitching deliveries**

**41.7.1** Any delivery, which passes or would have passed, without pitching, above waist height of the striker standing upright at the popping crease, is unfair. Whenever such a delivery is bowled, the umpire shall call and signal No ball.

**41.7.2** The bowling of a delivery as defined in 41.7.1 is also dangerous if the bowler's end umpire considers that there is a risk of injury to the striker. In making that judgement the umpire shall:

- disregard any protective equipment worn by the striker
- be mindful of:
  - the speed, height and direction of the delivery
  - the skill of the striker
  - the repeated nature of such deliveries.

**41.7.3** If the umpire considers a non-pitching delivery, or a series of non-pitching deliveries, to be dangerous under 41.7.2, when the ball is dead, the umpire shall repeat the No ball signal to the scorers and then caution the bowler, indicating that this is a first and final warning. The umpire shall also inform the other umpire, the captain of the fielding side and the batsmen of what has occurred. This caution shall apply to that bowler throughout the innings.

**41.7.4** Should there be any further dangerous such delivery by the same bowler in that innings, the umpire shall

- call and signal No ball
- when the ball is dead, direct the captain of the fielding side to suspend the bowler immediately from bowling
- inform the other umpire for the reason for this action.

The bowler thus suspended shall not be allowed to bowl again in that innings.

If applicable, the over shall be completed by another bowler, who shall neither have bowled any part of the previous over, nor be allowed to bowl any part of the next over.



Additionally, the umpire shall

- report the occurrence to the batsmen and, as soon as practicable, to the captain of the batting side.

The umpires together shall report the occurrence as soon as possible after the match to the Executive of the offending side and to any Governing Body responsible for the match, who shall take such action as is considered appropriate against the captain, any other individuals concerned and, if appropriate, the team.

**41.7.5** The warning and action sequences in 41.7.3 and 41.7.4 are independent of those in 41.6.

**41.7.6** If the umpire considers that a bowler deliberately bowled a non-pitching delivery, deemed to be unfair as defined in 41.7.1, then the caution and warning in 41.7.3 shall be dispensed with. The umpire shall

- immediately call and signal No ball.
- when the ball is dead, direct the captain of the fielding side to suspend the bowler immediately from bowling and inform the other umpire for the reason for this action.

The bowler thus suspended shall not be allowed to bowl again in that innings.

If applicable, the over shall be completed by another bowler, who shall neither have bowled any part of the previous over, nor be allowed to bowl any part of the next over.

- report the occurrence to the batsmen and, as soon as practicable, to the captain of the batting side.

The umpires together shall report the occurrence as soon as possible after the match to the Executive of the offending side and to any Governing Body responsible for the match, who shall take such action as is considered appropriate against the captain, any other individuals concerned and, if appropriate, the team.

### **Interpretation of the new Law**

This is the most significant of the Law changes and so, in order to help players and umpires understand and enact this new Law, MCC has provided the following, detailed, guidance on it:

Every beamer is still to be considered unfair – non-pitching deliveries above waist height are not a part of the game and should always be called a No ball. Assuming a non-pitching delivery is accidental, the umpire has two matters to take into consideration:

First, the umpire must consider the height at which the ball would have passed the striker standing upright at the crease. The ball that is difficult to judge for height is one that is dropping as it reaches the striker. If the striker tries to play it well in front of the body, or has perhaps stepped down the pitch, it will be difficult to know how far it would have dropped by the time it reached the popping crease. An enquiring look from the bowler's end umpire to his/her colleague, answered by a pre-agreed signal from the striker's end umpire, can be extremely helpful. However, it should be noted that it is still for the bowler's end umpire to make the decision.

If the decision is taken that the delivery was above waist height, then it is a beamer and unfair. The umpire will call and signal No ball, whatever else he/she decides.

Then, the umpire must make his/her second decision, on whether the delivery is dangerous. This is not as straightforward as simply judging the pace and direction of the ball. Of course, faster deliveries are more likely to be dangerous, but there are many other considerations, not least the context of the delivery. For example, against a fast bowler, the batsman, anticipating

---

**Law 41.7 (Continued)**

quick, possibly short-pitched deliveries, will be expecting the ball to rise up off the pitch. An attempted slower-ball that loops out of the bowler's hand and hits the batsman on the head might be extremely dangerous, despite being slow, because it is so unexpected that the batsman does not 'pick it up' out of the hand. That same looping delivery, bowled by a spinner who is constantly flighting the ball, comes without the element of surprise and might not be dangerous.

Similarly, deliveries directed at the batsman are more likely to be dangerous than those which are wide of him/her, but this is not a hard and fast rule in determining danger. An umpire may very well consider that a fast bowler who bowls one ball fast, high and well wide of the batsman on the off side, followed by one that is fast, high and well wide of the batsman on the leg side, is becoming dangerous. The third such ball may be straight, and could be seriously dangerous to the batsman, and the bowler is clearly out of control. The second such ball might, therefore, be considered dangerous in the eyes of the umpire even if the first, in isolation, was not.

Another factor to be considered is repetition. As with short-pitched bowling, even a very skilful player might be worn down by a barrage of beamers. A batsman who is constantly swatting such deliveries for six should not be 'punished' with the removal of the wayward bowler, but once it is clear that, due to their repetition, the deliveries have become dangerous, the umpire should begin the warning process.

The first time that an umpire identifies any delivery as dangerous, a warning must be given. Once a bowler has been warned, the process continues against any batsman. If that bowler bowls a second dangerous beamer at any batsman, that is enough for them to be suspended from bowling for the rest of the innings.

Finally, if the umpire considers that a beamer was not an accident, but deliberately bowled, there is no warning. The captain must immediately remove the bowler from the attack, for the rest of the innings, at the direction of the umpire. This is a very serious offence and the umpires must decide if the bowling of such a delivery is a deliberate act. Context should also be helpful in determining that the delivery was deliberate. Such offences are thankfully very rare and unlikely to happen without some indication of trouble beforehand. If the umpires realise there is bad feeling in the match they should both watch and listen carefully for any signs of trouble and involve the captain of the relevant teams to prevent escalation to this level if at all possible.

Reporting of a bowler and the captain for any suspension will of course follow.

---

**Law 41.16****Explanation**

It has long been the position of MCC that, if a non-striker leaves his/her ground early, he/she is liable to be Run out. An extension of this has come to light principally on the back of TV replays, meaning that, if a bowler accidentally puts down the wicket with the ball held in his/her hand during the bowling action, and the non-striker is out of his/her ground, the non-striker would be dismissed if there is an appeal.

The previous wording referred to an 'attempt' to run out the non-striker, which some people do not feel allows for such accidental run-outs. This new change clarifies MCC's interpretation of the Law.

**Change**

Although there are some valid arguments for not allowing dismissals of this sort, MCC felt that it would be wrong to carve out an exception in these

---

## Law 41.16 (Continued)

circumstances for a fundamental principle that a batsman can be Run out if the wicket is put down when he/she is out of his/her ground. Furthermore, the Law emphasises the importance of the non-striker remaining in his/her ground until the ball is released, which is felt to be important. With TV now potentially ruling that a batsman has made his/her ground by millimetres, it seems wrong to allow them a head-start of sometimes several feet in setting off. So, the policy in the Law has not been changed but rather the outcome is being more strongly emphasised to avoid confusion.

It is worth stressing that giving a warning for such dismissals has often been seen as a convention but has never been part of the Laws. The fielding side has the option not to appeal, or to withdraw the appeal if they do not want to dismiss the batsman in this way.

### **New wording**

#### **41.16 Non-striker leaving his/her ground early**

**41.16.1** If the non-striker is out of his/her ground at any time from the moment the ball comes into play until the instant when the bowler would normally have been expected to release the ball, the non-striker is liable to be Run out. In these circumstances, the non-striker will be out Run out if he/she is out of his/her ground when his/her wicket is put down by the bowler throwing the ball at the stumps or by the bowler's hand holding the ball, whether or not the ball is subsequently delivered.

**41.16.2** If the ball is not delivered and there is an appeal,

- the umpire shall make his/her decision on the Run out. If it is not out, he/she shall call and signal Dead ball as soon as possible.
- the ball shall not count as one in the over.

**41.16.3** If the ball is delivered and there is an appeal,

- the umpire shall make his/her decision on the Run out.
- if the non-striker is not dismissed, the ball remains in play and Law 21.6 (Bowler breaking wicket in delivering ball) shall apply.
- if the non-striker is dismissed, the ball shall not count as one in the over.

---

## Law 42.1

### **Explanation**

As originally written, Law 42.1 did not allow for time to be added on if it was lost due to umpires intervening to deal with player behaviour. This meant that, potentially, a side could risk committing an offence under Law 42, knowing that the time taken out of the game to deal with it would work in their favour. It was felt that this was unfair, and should be rewritten.

### **Change**

As this interruption was the result of actions taken by players, it is now dealt with in the same way as under Law 16.3.3 (action which does not constitute a refusal to play). The actions in 16.3.3 were therefore added to the end of Law 42.1.

### **New wording**

**42.1.5** For each Level 1 to 4,

- Playing time shall be counted as lost from the call of Time to the call of Play, excluding intervals (Law 11) and suspensions of play (Law 2.8).
- the time for close of play on that day shall be extended by this length of time.
- if applicable, no overs shall be deducted during the last hour of the match solely on account of this time.

---

### Law 42.4.2.3.2

#### Explanation

There was a lack of clarity over the suspension of a player for 10 overs in a match limited by time, as the clause explaining that this should not include any part-overs was only in the subsequent Law about limited-overs matches.

#### Change

It was noted that this should have applied to both Laws, and thus the final sentence of law 42.4.2.3.2 was inserted into Law 42.4.2.3.1

#### New wording

- 42.4.2.3.1 In a match where the innings are not limited to a number of overs, the player shall be suspended from the field of play for 10 overs. Any balls remaining in the over in progress at the time of suspension shall not count towards the overs for which the player is suspended.
- 42.4.2.3.2 In a match where the innings are limited to a number of overs, the player shall be suspended for one fifth of the number of overs allocated to the current innings at its commencement. If, in calculating the length of the suspension, a part-over results, it shall be considered as a whole over. Any balls remaining in the over in progress at the time of suspension shall not count towards the overs for which the player is suspended.

---

### Law 42.7

#### Explanation

If a batsman's runner is removed from the game under Level 4 of Law 42, the batsman for whom he/she is running was also, under the previous wording, removed for the rest of the game. The batting side are thus two players down because of the actions of one player (the runner, necessarily, being a second nominated player).

#### Change

It was decided that this was unfair, and that while both the batsman and runner would be removed from the ongoing innings, the batsman would be allowed to continue playing in any subsequent innings.

However, this will not be the case for a substitute, who is not a nominated player and is thus the embodiment of the player he/she is replacing when he/she is on the field.

#### New wording

##### 42.7 Additional points relating to Level 3 and Level 4 offences

- 42.7.1 If a player, while acting as wicket-keeper, commits a Level 3 or Level 4 offence, Law 24.1.2 (Substitute fielders) shall not apply, meaning that only a nominated player may act as wicket-keeper, even if another fielder becomes injured or ill and is replaced by a substitute.
- 42.7.2 A nominated player who has a substitute or has a runner will suffer a penalty for any Level 3 or Level 4 offence committed by that substitute or by that runner.
- 42.7.2.1 When the offence is committed by a substitute, the nominated player and substitute will each suffer the penalty defined in 42.4.2.3 or in 42.5.2.3 as appropriate. Only the substitute will be reported as in 42.4.2.5 or 42.5.2.5.
- 42.7.2.2 When the offence is committed by a runner, the batsman who has the runner and the runner will each suffer the penalty defined in 42.4.2.3 or in 42.5.2.3 as appropriate. The penalty for a Level 4 offence (42.5.2.3) will apply to the runner for the remainder of the match, but in only the current innings to the batsman for whom the runner acted.

---

## Appendix A

### **Explanation**

The definition of the waist (for judging beamers) has long been a point of contention with umpires. The professional game has long-since adapted 'trouser height' as their definition, but the medical definition remains the area between the top of the hip and the bottom rib. MCC has often been asked to provide a definition.

### **Change**

It was decided that MCC should provide a definition in the Laws, and this should be in the Appendix. MCC debated various definitions (including rib, waistband) but settled on the top of the trousers, conventionally worn.

### **New wording:**

**A6.7** For the purposes of these Laws, waist height is defined as the point at which the top of the batsman's trousers would conventionally be when he/she is standing upright at the popping crease.

---

## **MCC Laws Department**

December 2018