

O. K. plenty of grey areas with this one and lots of questions to be asked before a definitive answer can be given.

Where there are no grey areas is in the first question and that this is a foul. The cue ball has jumped a ball without striking another ball first and in landing on the far side of any such object ball, whether striking that ball or not on the way, constitutes a jumped ball and a foul. This is the case if the cue ball should pass over any part, even the finest edge, of the ball jumped.

For the second question the first and obvious thing to consider is, could there be another escape path that would not bring the cue ball close enough to a ball not on so that it could be jumped?

If so, and in my opinion, the stroke described would not constitute a genuine attempt at first contacting a ball on and would justify a call of miss regardless of the fact that the first ball contacted was a ball on.

If there is not such a path, are the cushions on this table ones that tend to throw the ball off the bed, or do they have 'dead' rubbers that calls upon the striker to play with excessive force so as to reach the desired position?

If either of these is the case then an assessment of the stroke would need to be taken by the referee at the time as to whether the attempt was good enough and then make his decision if a miss should or should not be called, having also considered that the poor state of the table could have contributed to the foul.

If there is no other escape path, did the striker in the referees opinion deliberately try to cause the cue ball to jump the ball not on, or is the opinion that the desire was to pass close to the ball not on in trying to avoid it and so go on to strike the ball on?

If it is the former that is the opinion of the referee he is then obligated by the rules to call a miss and further to consider warning the player that such conduct will not be tolerated. If the latter, then as above he must make the assessment.

If the cue ball were to have been played so that it did not leave the table and the same path were chosen to escape, would it then have struck the ball that was jumped and would the referee be within his rights to call a miss in that case?

Well within his rights and in most cases, required by the rules to do so.

Another thing that might also need consideration is the impossible snooker situation. The rule only tells us that as long as the cue ball is played with enough pace and in the direct or indirect path to a ball on then only a foul should be called and not a miss and as with a previous poser where there were options of which foul the striker could make to escape, but having no choice on whether to foul or not, then he was at liberty to choose which of those fouls he would make.

The third part of this poser also asks for an assessment by the referee. After the stroke has been played he must make a decision on whether a good enough attempt at an escape had been made in his opinion, by the striker according to his skill.