

We don't see that very often

By Missy Jones • @missyjonjones

June 14, 2014



It was really pretty cool that Matt Kuchar played a second ball under Rule 3-3 yesterday. His ball moved on the 16th green and the question became whether he had addressed it or not. All the actions following revolved on the answer to that question. The use of 3-3 is rarely seen at a professional level event and it's rather newsworthy to us rules aficionados that it was invoked here. The rules allow a player who doesn't know his rights

or the correct procedure to play two balls, select which one he wants to count and then report it to the Committee at scoring so they can help him determine his score. It's rarely used at this level because players generally get an official to give them a ruling on the spot and it's not needed. Because this was going to require looking at video and some thought, it helped the pace of play to proceed this way and it was also a good insurance policy to ensure that he would only get one stroke depending on how the facts became known.

There were two ways he could've gotten a two stroke penalty for playing from a wrong place:

1. He decides on his own that he had not addressed it yet, plays from the new place and then Committee decides he had addressed it.
2. He decides he had addressed it, replaces it and then Committee decides he hadn't and should have played from the new place.

Rule 3-3 was an excellent way to keep play moving and give the Committee time to help him figure it out. In scoring, with the help of fellow competitor, Lee Westwood, it was determined that he had not addressed the ball yet and the ball he chose to count played from the new spot was the proper ball. He got no penalty but his use of 3-3 ensured he would not have gotten more than one stroke.