

# An Overthrow, a Boundaries Count & a (Batting) Mug's Game



Indrajit Hazra

*Robert de la Chesnaye: Cornelle! Put an end to this farce!*  
*Cornelle: Which one, your lordship?*  
—La Règle du Jeu (The Rules of the Game), 1939, Jean Renoir

Just in case no one had noticed how farcically the rules of the game of cricket are biased towards batsmen, we saw not one, but two billboard-sized examples of that hardwired predisposition in Sunday's remarkable World Cup final.

First, the 'Boundary count' in the 'Super Over' to decide the winner is an unmitigated boulder. The procedure for the One Over Per Side Eliminator (Opse)—introduced by the International Cricket Council (ICC) during the 2011 Cricket World Cup knock-out stage without needing to be used, after it was first used in a December 26, 2008 Twenty20 match between New Zealand and West Indies that the latter won—in its Rule No. 13 states, 'In the event of the teams having the same score after the one over per side eliminator has been completed, the team that hit more boundary strokes during its innings in the main match (ignoring the one over per side eliminator) shall be the winner.'

On Sunday with New Zealand and England both scoring two overboundaries (a six each from Martin Guptill and Tom Latham, and both England sixes coming from Ben Stokes) during their innings in the main match, one would have thought that the wise men of ICC would then seek a bowling count-back procedure to decide matters.

But no. Rule No 14 of the aptly named Opse procedure states, 'If the number of boundary strokes hit by both teams is equal, the team whose batsmen scored more boundaries during its innings in the main match (ignoring the one over per side eliminator) shall be the winner.' England had hit 22 boundaries, while New Zealand 14 in the stipulated 50 overs, and so huzzah!

For this World Cup (semifinal and final), ICC 'simplified' matters in Clause 13 of Appendix H of Cricket World Cup 2019 Playing Conditions: '...the team whose batsmen hit the most number of boundaries combined from its two innings in both the main match and the Super Over shall be the winner.'

Then Clause 14 goes on to state, 'If the number of boundaries hit by both teams is equal, the side scoring more boundaries in the main match (not during the Super Over) shall be winners. Nothing about any option at any



stage of number of wickets taken being a criterion. Once again, this wasn't about the rules being bent in favour of England and against New Zealand, as some post-colonial studies bobbies may aver: It's about the batsmen being fed ICC grapes while being flamed by scantly-clad Victor 'Puff!' Trumper rules.

But what to me was the bigger conker in Sunday's game took place in the last over of the regulation England innings. Bowling the final over, Trent Boult bowled his fourth delivery to Stokes with 9 runs needed off 3 balls. A full toss, Stokes hit it to deep mid-wicket from where Guptill threw in the ball while Stokes and Adil Rashid were taking a second run. The projectile from Guptill hit Stokes' stretched-out bat, attached to his stretched-out prone body, and ricocheted off down to third-man yonder as if finding sanctuary from a giant, mutant, angry, flightless, brown bird.

MCC rules (Marylebone Cricket Club 2017), which form the basis for the ICC's 42 Commandments that make up the current Mosaic Laws of Cricket Do's and Don'ts, is rather Muggles about such an 'overthrow'. ICC Law No. 19.8, which one would think umpire Kumar Dharmasena would have referred to after the 'Bat of god' incident, states, 'If the boundary results from an overthrow or from the wilful act of a fielder, the runs scored shall be one for penalties awarded to either side and the allowance for the boundary and the runs completed by the batsmen, together with the run in progress

if they had already crossed at the instant of the throw or act.'

Now, even if one does choose to bring out one's inner Soli Sorabjee, what catches the eye is this run-on bit: '...together with the run in progress if they had already crossed at the instant of the throw or act.'

Stokes and Rashid had not crossed for their second run before Guptill's throw was blocked, unintentionally, by the bat of adiving Stokes. So even while one, going by ICC Law No. 19.8, accepts the overthrow boundary fetched England 4 runs, along with the first run taken, the umpire should have signaled 5, not 6 runs.

In any case, Stokes' Oliver Twist-like 'It's not my fault, Guv!' notwithstanding, the Lords of ICC should clearly call a ball dead once a fielders' throw 'or act' is (unintentionally) obstructed or deflected by one of the two batsmen. After all, if Guptill's throw had lodged inside one of Stokes' pads (or Dharmasena's man-purse), according to ICC Law 20.1.1.5, a ball is declared dead when 'whether played or not, it lodges in the clothing or equipment of a batsman or the clothing of an umpire'.

England had as much of a good game as New Zealand did on Sunday. But if cricket doesn't address its batsman-lurving rules at the expense of the fielding side, expect the possibility of pinch-hitting robot arms and pressure-sensitive points across a field for noching up points giant pinball-bagatelle-style.

## OVERTHROW CONTROVERSY

'It's a clear mistake... It's an error of judgment. They (England) should have been awarded five runs, not six. The judgment error was the timing of when the fielder threw the ball. The act of the overthrow starts when the fielder releases the ball. That's the act. It becomes an overthrow from the instant of the throw.'

Simon Taufel, former international umpire currently part of the MCC's laws sub-committee that makes the rules governing cricket, The Age and Sydney Morning Herald

## What's the Law?

**LAW 19.8**, pertaining to 'Overthrow or wilful act of fielder', says: 'If the boundary results from an overthrow or from the wilful act of a fielder, the runs scored shall be one for penalties awarded to either side, and the allowance for the boundary, and the runs completed by the batsmen, together with the run in progress if they had already crossed at the instant of the throw or act.'

A review of the incident clearly shows that, at the moment the ball was released by the New Zealand fielder, Martin Guptill, Ben Stokes and his partner, Adil Rashid, had not yet crossed for their second run.

## What's Super Over?

► It's a tie-breaking method used in limited-overs cricket matches.  
► The two teams bat six balls each.  
► The bowling team nominates one bowler, and the batting team nominates three batsmen from the playing XI.  
► Same fielding restrictions apply as were used for the last over in the main match.  
► The Decision Review System (DRS) rules apply as well, with each team allowed one unsuccessful review.

► The team that batted second in the main innings gets to bat first in the Super Over.  
► If a team loses two wickets in the Super Over, the innings ends.  
► It was first used in the tied Twenty20 match between the West Indies and New Zealand on 26 December 2008.

► It was formally introduced by the ICC during 2011 Cricket World Cup knockout stage but it was never used as there were no tied matches.

## Also, Ends Should've Been Switched...

Taufel also said that Stokes and Rashid should have switched ends once the run was found to be incomplete—which meant Rashid would have played the fifth ball with three runs required to win.

They did not cross on their second run, at the instant of the throw. So given that scenario, five runs should have been the correct allocation of runs, and Ben Stokes should have been at the non-striker's end for the next delivery —TAUFEL

## WHAT IS BEING SAID

If you could give an alternative I'd be able to, like compare the both. But I can't think of an alternative at the moment. The rules are obviously set out a long time ago and we have no control over them

EOIN MORGAN, England captain

It is what it is, really. The rules are there at the start. No one probably thought they would have to sort of result to some of that stuff. A great game of cricket and all you guys probably enjoyed it

KANE WILLIAMSON, New Zealand captain

Some rules in cricket definitely needs [sic] a serious look in

ROHIT SHARMA, India opener

Don't understand how the game of such proportions, the #CWC19Final, is finally decided on who scored the most boundaries. A ridiculous rule @ICC. Should have been a tie. I want to congratulate both @BLACKCAPS & @englandcricket on playing out a nail biting Final

GAUTAM GAMBHIR, former India opener

I don't agree with that rule! But rules are rules congratulations to England on finally winning the World Cup, my heart goes out for the kiwis they fought till the end. Great game an epic final!!! #CWC19Final

YUVRAJ SINGH, former India allrounder

## What If the Super Over Is also tied?

The team that scored the most boundaries (fours and sixes), including in the Super Over, shall be declared the winner. In this case, England aggregated 26 boundaries (24 + 2 in the Super Over), but New Zealand managed only 17 (16 + 1).

If the number of boundaries hit by both teams is equal, the team whose batsmen scored more boundaries during its innings in the main match (ignoring the Super Over) shall be the winner.

# When God Was on Holiday

There can be no other explanation for the manner in which luck deserted New Zealand



Anand Vasu London

ment 50-over cricket team in the world.

Taking nothing away from England, who marched triumphantly to their maiden World Cup win, New Zealand's captain, Kane Williamson the incomparable, would have been sitting on a throne rather than an airplane seat on the longest journey back home, if only one of many things had gone his way.

First ball of the 34th over, Ross Taylor wears one on the pads from Mark Wood. It looks like the batsman has been hit too high on the pad, but the finger goes up, the review has already been wasted and this makes a potential dent of 15-20 runs in the target New Zealand are able to set.

First ball of the second innings, Trent Boult curls one into Jason Roy, the destroyer who set up England's campaign and got them roaring back into it, and the umpire goes with not out, the review suggesting that the leg stump would have been triggered, but the decision staying with the original on-field call.

Fourth ball of the 50th over of the chase, Martin Guptill lines the stumps up to fire the kind of throw that got rid of Mahendra Singh Dhoni and pesky India in the semifinal, but the ball, tracing a unique arc, ricochets off the bat of a diving Ben Stokes, and runs down to the one part of the field New Zealand had no reason to station a fielder in. Pure chance, four extra runs, and 'match gone' turned into 'match on' as what would have been seven from two balls—or even eight from two with Stokes run out—becomes three from two.

On the day after it became apparent that this was only partly luck, but also human error, for the batsmen should have been awarded one run (completed before the ball hit bat) plus four over throws, which would have meant that Stokes would have been off strike.

These are only the most obvious moments of luck not favouring the brave. The number of times Matt Henry beat the outside edge or caught the inside edge without the ball going back onto the stumps, is not worth chronicling. The skied balls that ballooned over infield but did not get near the catching fielder, will go uncounted. The heart of Lockie Ferguson, bowling as if New Zealand's life depended on him, or the nous of Colin de Grandhomme, taking the pace off the ball like it was a ticking time bomb, went unrewarded.

Williamson, who will go down in history as both bearded sweetheart and sorted braveheart of the game, was so humble, so self aware and so righteous that he ended up being bigger than the game on a day when the game could not be bigger.

Williamson was reeling from "thin margins"; Williamson accepted it was just "One of those days"; Williamson thought the overthrow four off the bat was "Just one of those things"; Williamson conceded "It's a fickle game, pars where as hard as you try, cards don't fall your way"

Williamson is wrong. In a match that England pulled all stops for, with all the possible assistance in the world, they only managed up to New Zealand. With Ben Stokes (84 not out) playing the innings of his life, England only managed to draw level. Twice.

When pressed on why he was going on and on about controllables and uncontrollables, Williamson allowed himself a hint of a smile when he said: "I guess uncontrollables. I suppose (it) means that you can't control them, can you? So it is up to someone else, I don't know."

That someone else, the cricketing god, she was on holiday.



When Morgan, the Irish glue that holds this very inclusive English team together, asked Adil Rashid, the Pakistan-origin Bradford-born leg spinner, how things were going, the skipper was re-assured. "Allah is definitely with us," Rashid told his skipper. "I said we had the rub of the green," said Morgan, referring to the luck of the Irishman. "It actually epitomises our team. Quite diverse backgrounds and cultures and guys grow up in different countries and to actually find humour in the situation we were in at times was pretty cool."

That a cricket match—with its complete insignificance in the larger scheme of things—was turning all those at Lord's on Sunday to thoughts of God, was perhaps the most incredible takeaway from a day that had to be seen and experienced to be believed.

It was perhaps fitting, for the day began with the two national anthems, New Zealand's being a poem that was set to music in 1876. The poem, begins the lines: "God of Nations at Thy feet In the bonds of love we meet ..."

And ends with: "Working out Thy glorious plan, God defend New Zealand."

For New Zealand, the World Cup final began and ended with a higher power on the mind. If only the game did not have to remind them so cruelly of their mortality in-between.

## EASTERN RAILWAY

**e-Tender Notice No. : OP/SDAH/OT/19-003**, dated : 11.07.2019. E-tenders are invited by Senior Divisional Electrical Engineer/OP/Sealdah, 1st Floor, Control Building, Eastern Railway, Kolkata-700014 for the following work : **Tender No. : OP/SDAH/OT/19-003**. **Name of the work** : Provision of cooking, serving of meals to the running staff that is Guard and Driver availing LKPR R/Room (ration to be provided by the running staff), cleaning of utensils, serving to running staff, preparation of beds, working as a call man/Running Room Bearer and monitoring the entire work by engaging sufficient number of man power at LKPR Running Room for a period of two years. **Tender Value** : ₹ 19,85,504.80; **Earnest Money** : ₹ 39,700; **Date of Closing** : 19.08.2019 at 15.00 hrs. Details of tender notice and corrigendum issued from time to time are available at website : [www.ireps.gov.in](http://www.ireps.gov.in) (SDAH-96/2019-20)

Tender Notices are also available at Eastern Railway's website : [www.ez.indianrailways.gov.in/ireps.gov.in](http://www.ez.indianrailways.gov.in/ireps.gov.in)

## JHARKHAND STATE ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

### RECRUITMENT CANCELLATION NOTICE

Advertisement published on 03.12.2017 & 04.12.2017 in newspapers for recruitment to the posts of Director, Assistant Director (Engineering/Tariff/Finance/Administration & Law) & Finance / Accounts Officer in Jharkhand State Electricity Regulatory Commission (JSERC) stands cancelled due to unavoidable reasons.

Sd/-  
(A. K. Mehta)  
Secretary

Form G  
INVITATION FOR EXPRESSION OF INTEREST  
(Under Regulation 36A(1) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy (Insolvency Resolution Process for Corporate Persons) Regulations, 2016)

RELEVANT PARTICULARS	
1. Name of the Corporate Debtor	Indu Projects Limited
2. Date of Incorporation of Corporate Debtor	7th December, 2001
3. Authority under which Corporate Debtor is incorporated/registered	Registrar of Companies(ROC), Hyderabad
4. Corporate identity number/limited liability identification number of Corporate Debtor	U45200TG2001PLC038175
5. Address of the registered office and principal office (if any) of the Corporate Debtor	1009, Indu Fortune Fields, 13th Phase, KPHB Colony, Kakatipally, Hyderabad - 500072, Telangana
6. Insolvency commencement date of the Corporate Debtor	05.03.2019 (although the Corporate Debtor was admitted into CIRP vide Order no. 3727/HDB/2018 dated 25.02.2019. However the IRP was appointed vide order no. 3727/HDB/2018 dated 05.03.2019)
7. Date of invitation of Expression of Interest	16.07.2019
8. Eligibility for resolution applicants under section 25(2)(h) of the Code is available at:	The detailed term sheet for invitation of Expression of Interest specifying eligibility criteria is available at the official website of Indu Projects Limited i.e. <a href="http://www.induprojects.com/">http://www.induprojects.com/</a> and the correspondence address mentioned against Serial No. 21
9. Norms of ineligibility applicable under section 29A are available at:	The official website of Indu Projects Limited i.e. <a href="http://www.induprojects.com/">http://www.induprojects.com/</a> and the correspondence address mentioned against Serial No. 21
10. Last date for receipt of expression of interest	The interested parties/Prospective Resolution Applicants shall submit the EOI in a sealed envelope by 17.00 Hours on or before 31.07.2019 through speed registered post or by hand delivery at above mentioned address: C/o Sumedha Management Solutions Pvt. Ltd. Ideal Plaza, 11/1, Sarat Bose Road, 4th Floor, South Block, Room No. 405, Kolkata - 700020, West Bengal, India. E-mail: <a href="mailto:ip.induprojects@gmail.com">ip.induprojects@gmail.com</a> The envelope should be super scribed as "EOI for Indu Projects Limited" in the name of "Anup Kumar Singh, Resolution Professional".
11. Date of issue of provisional list of prospective Resolution Applicants	10-08-2019
12. Last date for submission of objections to provisional list	15-08-2019
13. Date of issue of final list of prospective resolution applicants	25-08-2019
14. Date of issue of information memorandum, evaluation matrix and request for resolution plans to prospective resolution applicants	15-08-2019
15. Manner of obtaining request for resolution plan, evaluation matrix, information memorandum and further information	Post receipt of EOI, access to Virtual Data Room containing request for resolution plan, evaluation matrix, information memorandum and further information will be submitted in a sealed cover to the shortlisted applicant after receipt of confidentiality undertaking duly executed as per Section 29(2) of the IBC at the sole discretion of Resolution Professional/CoC. Further Resolution Applicant may contact the Resolution Professional at the correspondence details mentioned against Serial No. 21 for obtaining the same.
16. Last date for submission of resolution plans	15-09-2019 subject to extension of Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process period which shall be as per the provisions of the Insolvency Act, 2016 and as per the Resolution Professional's orders.
17. Manner of submitting resolution plans to resolution professional	The Resolution Plan along with all the supporting documents shall be submitted in a sealed cover to duplicate along with a password-protected pen drive containing the said Resolution Plan along with all the correspondence details mentioned against Serial No. 21 for obtaining the same. C/o Sumedha Management Solutions Pvt. Ltd. Ideal Plaza, 11/1, Sarat Bose Road, 4th Floor, South Block, Room No. 405, Kolkata - 700020, West Bengal, India. E-mail: <a href="mailto:ip.induprojects@gmail.com">ip.induprojects@gmail.com</a> The envelope should be super scribed as "EOI for Indu Projects Limited" in the name of "Anup Kumar Singh, Resolution Professional".
18. Estimated date for submission of resolution plan to the Adjudicating Authority for approval	As soon as approved by the CoC
19. Name and registration number of the resolution professional	Name: Mr. Anup Kumar Singh Reg. No. IBBI/IPA-01/IP/P0153/2017-18/10322
20. Name, Address and e-mail of the resolution professional, as registered with the Board	Name: Mr. Anup Kumar Singh Address: 162/D/702 Lake Gardens, Kolkata-700045, West Bengal E-mail: <a href="mailto:anup_singh@sumedhamanagement.com">anup_singh@sumedhamanagement.com</a>
21. Address and email to be used for correspondence with the resolution professional	Address: Sumedha Management Solutions Pvt. Ltd. Ideal Plaza, 11/1, Sarat Bose Road, 4th Floor, South Block, Room No. 405, Kolkata - 700020, West Bengal, India. Email ID: <a href="mailto:ip.induprojects@gmail.com">ip.induprojects@gmail.com</a>
22. Further details are available at or with	Anup Kumar Singh Sumedha Management Solutions Pvt. Ltd. Ideal Plaza, 11/1, Sarat Bose Road, 4th Floor, South Block, Room No. 405, Kolkata - 700020, West Bengal, India. Email ID: <a href="mailto:ip.induprojects@gmail.com">ip.induprojects@gmail.com</a>
23. Date of publication of Form G	16.07.2019

**Notes:**  
1. The interested parties shall refer to the format for submission of the EOI and detailed terms and conditions uploaded on the official website of the Corporate Debtor i.e. <http://www.induprojects.com/>  
2. All the EOIs received will be reviewed by the RP as well as the CoC and thereafter further information/documents related to the process will be provided to the shortlisted parties. The RP/CoC shall have discretion to change the criteria for the EOI at any point of time.  
3. RP/CoC reserves the right to cancel or modify the process/application without assigning any reason for the same.  
4. The CIRP period shall expire on 31.08.2019. However the Committee of Creditors has approved the extension of 69 days from the CIRP period and application for the same shall be accordingly filed with the NCLT, Hyderabad Bench. Order towards the same shall be shared with the Prospective Resolution Applicants.

Sd/-  
Anup Kumar Singh  
Resolution Professional of Indu Projects Limited  
Reg. No. IBBI/IPA-01/IP/P0153/2017-18/10322  
Registered Address: 162/D/702 Lake Gardens, Kolkata - 700045, West Bengal  
anup\_singh@sumedhamanagement.com  
Correspondence Address: Sumedha Management Solutions Private Limited Ideal Plaza, 11/1, Sarat Bose Road, 4th Floor, South Block, Room No. 405, Kolkata - 700020, West Bengal, India. [ip.induprojects@gmail.com](mailto:ip.induprojects@gmail.com)  
Date: 16.07.2019  
Place: Kolkata