

Key to Abbreviations

MI: misinformation
UI: unauthorised information
TD: tournament director
LA: logical alternative

Other bridgetalk forums

Polling Booth
 The Bridge Table
 Bridge Issues
 Ask an Expert
 Information

[Click here for Code Guide](#)
[Click here for Emoticon Key](#)

**[Thread Index](#) :: [FAQ's](#) :: [Main Menu](#) :: [Posting Hints](#) :: [Emoticon Key](#) :: [Search](#)
[David's Lawspace](#) :: [EBU](#) :: [ACBL](#) :: [WBF](#)**

bridgetalk.com forums :: Laws & Rulings

International Bridge Laws Forum

If you need help with the Laws or rulings from
 any country in the world, this is the place!

Hosted by David Stevenson
 Senior Consultant Director
 English Bridge Union

**To ask a question, click [HERE](#) and type in your message.
 Please specify your **country** in your query where indicated.
 Right click your mouse button for help on abbreviations.**

Welcome, [Register](#) :: [Log in](#)

Pages: [[1](#) [2](#) [3](#) [4](#) [5](#) **[6](#)** [7](#) [8](#) [9](#) [10](#) [11](#) [12](#) [13](#)]

[Mark Forum Read](#)

[[New Discussion](#)]

	Subject	Replies	Views	Last Post T U
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bid out of turn	2	128	bluejak 23:17:35 Tue Apr 8 2003

<input type="checkbox"/>	redealng	4	163	bluejak 19:35:34 Mon Apr 7 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	average minus	2	116	JimO 21:54:17 Sun Apr 6 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	penalty card in each opp's hand	5	112	JimO 16:44:21 Sat Apr 5 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Alerts required?	9	145	bluejak 00:15:43 Thu Apr 3 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	dummy	3	147	mycroft 17:14:53 Wed Apr 2 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	inadvertant call	1	94	bluejak 17:10:23 Mon Mar 31 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Alerting (or not)	4	120	RichM 20:39:25 Fri Mar 28 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Slow Play	8	198	Ed 16:35:04 Thu Mar 27 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	1NT continuation	8	161	bluejak 10:52:27 Wed Mar 26 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scoring wrong traveller	4	146	bluejak 12:02:57 Mon Mar 24 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Insufficient bid	3	135	bluejak 11:49:49 Mon Mar 24 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	law 25	2	103	bluejak 01:24:55 Sun Mar 23 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Incomplete disclosure or psyche?	6	137	Ed 21:36:30 Fri Mar 21 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Transfers	4	115	bluejak 23:04:51 Thu Mar 20 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Multi 2D	3	215	Ed 07:16:17 Wed Mar 19 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	What I should have done	14	351	HenryS 18:22:48 Sat Mar 15 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	what would you rule?	5	187	bluejak 02:43:46 Fri Mar 14 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Howell movements	5	248	Ed 04:19:50 Thu Mar 13 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	2NT forcing	8	223	HenryS 17:27:45 Tue Mar 11 2003

[New Discussion](#)

<p>Guest</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Bid out of turn (16:09:23 TueApr 8 2003)</p> <hr/> <p>North opens 2s,East bids 3d, south bids 3s and before West makes a bid North bids 4s. the bidding reverts back to West who now bids 5d. The question, is North allowed to double? Pat</p> <p>{subject changed by moderator}</p>
<p>mycroft</p> <hr/> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 67 posts bridgetalk member <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Bid out of turn (18:44:35 TueApr 8 2003)</p> <hr/> <p>This one is probably going to be moved to the Laws forum, but...</p> <p style="text-align: center;">N E S W 2S-3D-3S- 4S</p> <p>TD called, 4S not accepted by E, W bids 5D.</p> <p>Let's go through this in order, in detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● L29B directs us to pick the appropriate Law, which in this case is L31. ● L31A2 says "offender can make any legal call" - so double is allowed. However: ● L31A2b says that South must pass throughout after the double, directs you to L26 for possible lead penalties (North bid spades naturally and legally earlier, so no lead penalties), and as in all penalty-paying pass situations, brings up the L23 spectre. ● L23 says that if North could have known that barring south by bidding out of rotation would be likely to damage E-W, the TD considers awarding an adjusted score. <p>Exercising L23 is a judgement ruling, so the TD goes back and consults. It would strongly depend on the nature of both North and South, the match situation, scoring and vulnerability, and the meaning of 2S.</p> <p>I can see (if 2S was strong or Acol, for instance) North fearing the auction would go 2S-3D-3S-4D; 4S-5D-5S and not getting a chance to double or 2S-3D-3S-5D; X-P and partner pulling it with the wrong hand (did North open 2S on a seriously unexpected hand? Maybe a weak 2 with a</p>

club void and spade and diamond aces? Perhaps a "strong" 2S based more on distribution than honour tricks, or three expected top losers?).

This is pretty shaky, and North is likely to get away with what was probably just a stupid lack of concentration - it's not as if doubling 5D would be takeout, after all (the most common uses of L23 is to nail people who convert T/O doubles to penalty by berring partner, and getting out in xNT which normally would be Blackwood, or continuation); but the players should be warned about this, and the TD should consider it.

This is not the same as an insufficient bid - say 2S-3D-3S-5D; 4S - where L27B3 denies you the ability to double. It's a complicated ruling, and not a terribly common one (especially compared to insufficient bids), so I can see at least one of the five people at the table having doubts. Of course, that's why the TD reads it out of the Law Book - as he always does, right?

I guess this is also time to remind everybody not to play bridge on an 'assumption' basis - you don't bid before RHO, even when you "know" he's going to pass; you don't pick up the bidding cards when you "know" there will be no more bidding, but LHO still gets to act; you don't bid 3NT (or 2H, or) and turn your CC over and start writing in the contract; you don't play a card from dummy before it's called, even if it's the only possible choice; you don't call a card from dummy before LHO plays to your trick; you don't automatically correct an insufficient bid to "lowest sufficient in that denomination", and all the rest. 90+ % of the time it will be safe, but this is all illegal, and when it does get you into trouble, it's really ugly trouble.

Michael.

{ subject changed by moderator }

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Bid out of turn (23:17:35 TueApr 8 2003)

The answer to your question is that, assuming the next player does not accept the 4 ☐ out of rotation, and then the correct player bids 5 ☐, this player may double. This will silence partner and cause lead penalties.

It is an easy ruling which the TD will read from the book: Laws 29A and 31A.

{ subject changed by moderator }

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)] [[Print](#)] [[Send](#)] [[Watch](#)] [[<](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]

2 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 2 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: [FrancesHinden](#).

[Register](#) :: [Log in](#)

The time is now 14:47:18 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

top ☐

**[Thread Index](#) :: [FAQ's](#) :: [Main Menu](#) :: [Posting Hints](#) :: [Emoticon Key](#) :: [Search](#)
[David's Lawspage](#) :: [EBU](#) :: [ACBL](#) :: [WBF](#)**

Legend :: ☐ Read Topic :: ☐ Unread Topic

Radoslav Radev

Reply

redealing (14:46:55 TueApr 1 2003)

Country: Bulgaria

Dear Sirs,
Please advise in what conditions Director may rule already played board to be redealt (supposed hand dealing, teams match)

Thanks in advance

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: redealing (00:54:43 WedApr 2 2003)

That is remarkably difficult to answer! No doubt there are cases, though not very many. For example, the TD may not order the board redealt because there is a difficult ruling to make [though I have known it to happen!].

If the wrong pair played a board it would seem reasonable to redeal it with the right pair.

Of course redealing is a common solution if the hand has not been played: if a board is dealt, and it is found to have 14 cards in one hand, 12 in another, the board is cancelled and redealt. Law 13A3 covers this.

Actually, consider this: if the hand is played like that Law 13 requires that the result be cancelled. While an artificial score could be given [the first paragraph of Law 13 says it should be] in paractical terms a redeal would seem sensible.

OK, let me summarise: if there is a ruling which leads to the result being cancelled for any reason, then a redeal [if there is time] seems a sensible alternative to an artificial score. But if there is a result which is not being cancelled then it should stand, or be adjusted by an assigned score.

It si a very wide field, and I would prefer to answer specific cases. Was there some problem that led to this question, and if so perhaps you could let us know what it was.

Later this year the English Bridge Union intends to bring out its new "White Book" which contains lots of strange regulations, and advice for TDs. This problem will be addressed there, and it will be available on the EBU web site. I shall be posting the URL here on IBLF since it is of use to TDs throughout the world. Did I mention that I am the editor?



David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

JimO



175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: redealing (21:48:56 SunApr 6 2003)

Country: USA

I can think of only three situations where I have ordered a board redealt after it had already been played.

- 1) It was previously played with more than 13 cards in one hand, and fewer in another hand.
- 2) It was played with 13 cards in each hand, but two or more hands now have more/fewer than 13 cards, and it is impossible to reconstruct the hand.
(This one happened two days ago - not sure if it was 1) or 2);
fortunately this was noticed in round 2)
- 3) It was played in a previous round/session, and never reshuffled.
(This one happened yesterday - I was not directing, but was consulted by phone; unfortunately it was not noticed until the 3rd time the board had been played).

See Laws 13A3 and 6D2

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

**Frances
Hinden**

Re: redealing (18:19:18 MonApr 7 2003)

Country: UK

Slightly pedantic addition:

In a head-to-head teams of 4 match, if it was played the wrong way round in one of the rooms.

This is second hand, so I may have the details wrong: there was some confusion in a private (NICKO) match last year, when an entire set of 8 boards were played the same way round in both rooms. It apparently was not clear from the regulations if all 8 boards should be redealt, or if the set should be cancelled. The temporary ruling was to redeal & replay the 8 and see what happened. Of course, a different team won depending what the rules were...

bluejak




434 posts
Forum Host

Re: redealing (19:35:34 MonApr 7 2003)

Quite an important addition I would say, Frances!

There have been several situations where an entire stanza has been redealt and replayed - including, I seem to remember, the semi-final of a Spingold.

The problem in the case you mention was that half the stanza was played in the wrong direction, ie four boards [Nicko? probably six boards, not four].

It is also true that a hole was found in the regs, though I thought the ruling clear enough myself. Anyway, that is the way to build regs: plug the holes! 

Yes, if a board is fouled in a k/o match then it is redealt and replayed unless:

[1] The result of the match is known before the board is replayed
AND there is only one fouled board, OR
[2] One side is responsible for fouling a board, and they have
already acquired a bad score on it.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)] [[Print](#)] [[Send](#)] [[Watch](#)] [[<](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]

2 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 2 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: [FrancesHinden](#).

[Register](#) :: [Log in](#)

The time is now 14:47:53 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

top ☐

**[Thread Index](#) :: [FAQ's](#) :: [Main Menu](#) :: [Posting Hints](#) :: [Emoticon Key](#) :: [Search](#)
[David's Lawspage](#) :: [EBU](#) :: [ACBL](#) :: [WBF](#)**

Legend :: ☐ Read Topic :: ☐ Unread Topic

☐ **Email**

Help | **Full Format:** **ON** :: **OFF** | **Text:** **ON** :: **OFF** | **Email Status**

richard brewer

average minus (23:16:59 WedApr 2 2003)

Reply

Country: australia

If a pair is given average minus (40%) at matchpoints and their final percentage is less than 40% is their matchpoint total adjusted down like average plus is adjusted up.

Law 88 only mentions 60% but I seem to remember seeing in some forum that it also applied to 40%.

Thanks in anticipation

bluejak

Re: average minus (00:42:56 ThuApr 3 2003)



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

You are correct: a pair given Average Minus in a duplicate pairs receives 40% of a top, or their session average, whichever is the smaller.

The authority for this is the WBF Laws Commission minutes dated 1998-08-30, #1.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>

Liverpool, England, UK

http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

JimO

Re: average minus (21:54:17 SunApr 6 2003)



175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Law 12C1 does say "at most 40% of the available matchpoints". But something like "a maximum of 40% of the matchpoints available, or the percentage of matchpoints earned on boards actually played, whichever is smaller" should be added to Law 88.

Hopefully omissions like this will be rectified when the Laws are next revised.

-Jim O'Neil

Oak Park, IL

dan neill

Reply

penalty card in each opp's hand (04:22:50 SatApr 5 2003)

Hi,

I was wondering, at our club, South declaring, East had a penalty card, and West gained the lead. Before director was called, West led to the next trick. This card was then a penalty card and play stopped there.

Now, is West's obligation to play the penalty card (the one he was going to lead anyways), or does declarer get his options vis a vis East's penalty card instead?

Who's fault is it that the director was not immediately called? Is West most at fault? What is the warning given?

Thanks
Dan

JimO



175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: penalty card in each opp's hand (06:11:38 SatApr 5 2003)

1) The Director should have explained all the options when he ruled East's card a penalty card. (Laws 9-11).

2) If the Director ruled East's card a minor penalty card, West is not subject to lead restrictions. (Law 50C)

If the Director ruled East's card a major penalty card, West is not to lead before declarer exercises his options - require of forbid the lead of that suit, in which case the penalty card is picked up, or allow West to lead whatever he likes, and the card remains a penalty card (Law 50D2). If the West leads before declarer has exercised his options, the premature lead becomes a major penalty card (Law 49). Declarer may accept the lead, but may still exercise one of his options, in which case East's card is picked up and West's card remains a major penalty card.

3) If West was not informed of lead penalties by the Director, Law 82C (or perhaps Law 11A) may apply.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: penalty card in each opp's hand (12:27:21
SatApr 5 2003)

While Jim is right about the basic Laws let us dig a little deeper into this.

Quote: Dan Neill

Before director was called, ...

Why did the TD need to be called?

First possibility: he was a non-playing TD, had been called for the penalty cards originally, and had not stayed at the table. In this case it is pure TD error, and we use Law 82C to let the play finish with the card led but assign a score for the other side that assumes the alternative choice was made by declarer: in other words, both sides get a good score.

When a TD gives a ruling about a penalty card, **he then stays at the table until all penalties are carried out, ie until the penalty card has been played**, and thus is at the table to warn players against leading before declarer names an option.

Just occasionally this does not apply if he has another call he has to take, but he should still return as quickly as possible.

Second possibility: he was a playing TD. Now he may feel he has to go away. Even so, he will often find he can stay for a trick or two, and should try to as far as possible.

Third possibility: the players have not called the TD but assumed they were penalty cards. Now my sympathy for declarer disappears. The TD {b}must be called [the Law says so], and I would now designate the exposed cards as not being penalty cards [see the first paragraph of Law 50]. Too often this sort of situation comes about from the ignorance of defenders who do not know their rights and could have avoided some of the penalties if they had been warned.

I might not follow this line if I feel the defenders were rather more experienced than declarer.

Whatever, I would indicate to **all four** players that I am not happy at not being called when a card was exposed. This applies even if I was a playing TD.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

dan_neill

Re: penalty card in each opp's hand (14:25:36
SatApr 5 2003)

Reply

Country: USA

Thanks both of you. To confirm the details, I was the non-playing director. East's penalty card was major (revoke caught immediately). The director was not called ever until West led without declarer designating an option related to East's penalty card.

Our club is very small, rural, non-proprietary. I am trying to learn all I can about the laws by investigating situations as they come up, and perusing the lawbook often. Duplicate Decisions is a nice supplement, as well as the NABC casebooks, and various newsgroup/forums. But our club is kind of a microcosm of the ACBL in general I think. The emphasis is on having any game at all, rather than necessarily the correctly-run game, in these years of declining bridge interest in the US. There are welcome exceptions, especially at proprietary clubs.

When I became a director a year ago, the test was open-book (so I could have ANY references handy) and not too challenging. Even then, I barely achieved the 75% score or whatever needed to pass. So knowing the laws in the ACBL is not a major requirement to be a director. In practice, directing is 99% hospitality, where adhering consistently to 'some' set of accepted rules is valued to the customer over whether the rules are correct. Our club's accepted rules are different from the ACBL, and the members are loath to change.

For this reason, despite my personal values, I'll swallow my pride and go with the flow until I become a guru of the rulebook (like Jim

and David), and then apply it with vigor.

Dan

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: penalty card in each opp's hand (15:28:55
SatApr 5 2003)

I do not object to "going with the flow" so long as you are sure what it is. But remember that in some ACBL clubs players are not dealt with when they behave badly because it might upset them: please remember that this upsets their opponents!!!

As to calling the TD for a penalty card: just insist, firmly but politely, that it happens. In the quoted case I would have said:

I am very sorry, but I have been told that I am not allowed to treat them as penalty cards unless I was called at the time. I would like to help you, declarer, but the rules will not allow me.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

JimO



175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: penalty card in each opp's hand (16:44:21
SatApr 5 2003)

Country: USA

Quote: Guest (Unregistered) at 14:25:36 Sat Apr 5 2003

Thanks both of you. To confirm the details, I was the non-playing director. East's penalty card was major (revoke caught immediately). The director was not called ever until West led without declarer designating an option related to East's penalty card.
Dan

This is what I suspected. It happens too frequently. Actually, once is too frequently.

Players will make their own - incorrect or incomplete - rulings and then I am called later to sort things out.

In this case I would likely have ruled no lead penalties against West, and given a warning to all four players for violating proper procedure: "The Director must be summoned at once when attention is drawn to an irregularity" - Law 9B1(a).

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)] [[Print](#)] [[Send](#)] [[Watch](#)] [[<](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]

2 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 2 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: [FrancesHinden](#).

[Register](#) :: [Log in](#)

The time is now 14:48:29 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

top ☐

**[Thread Index](#) :: [FAQ's](#) :: [Main Menu](#) :: [Posting Hints](#) :: [Emoticon Key](#) :: [Search](#)
[David's Lawspage](#) :: [EBU](#) :: [ACBL](#) :: [WBF](#)**

Legend :: ☐ **Read Topic** :: ☐ **Unread Topic**

☐ **Email**

Help | **Full Format:** **ON** :: **OFF** | **Text:** **ON** :: **OFF** | **Email Status**

AlanW

Reply

Alerts required? (11:24:10 WedApr 2 2003)

A previous thread has highlighted some of the difficulties of interpreting the alerting requirements even when the law-makers have tried to be as precise as possible. In England one category of alertable bids is one which 'is natural, but its meaning is affected by other agreements which your opponents are unlikely to expect'. (The other categories of 'not natural', and natural but agreed to be F or NF in a way the opponents are unlikely to expect seem much less likely to cause confusion.)

So, does this mean an ELC double is alertable in England? My interpretation of the above quotation would be that it should be alerted, but I have never come across anyone who has alerted one against me (I don't play them myself).

On the other hand, my interpretation of the above would be that the example James quoted earlier of 1x 1y; 1N (12-16) 2C (enquiry); 2N showing 15-16 should not be alerted. The bid is certainly natural, and it's difficult to see why there are any surprises for oppo arising from other agreements. But clearly others have interpreted the rules differently in this respect.

James gives some other good examples of bids which might or might not require alerts. To take just one more of them, should 1x - 1H; 1N be alerted if you have a specific agreement about whether it can or cannot conceal a 4-card spade suit?

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Alerts required? (11:51:20 WedApr 2 2003)

I am surprised at your logic re the reply to Crowhurst. When you use an artificial enquiry, and have a response showing point-count it seems very strange that you consider that response "natural". I believe the 2NT response is alertable because it is not natural. It is not an attempt to play there: it shows partner what he has asked in the same way as a response to Blackwood.

As to your other points, it is true that the third reason for alerting is difficult to interpret. The two cases you cite are borderline ones in my view: do you really think that ELC doubles are likely to come as a shock to the opponents? The same for rebids bypassing a four-card major? If so, and only if so, you should alert them.

To answer one point from a different thread, few players, except the least ethical, approach alerting with any view of gaining from it. For the majority of players, especially ones like me who played before alerting, it adds considerable fairness to bridge, and that is what we want. Players who like to gain by their opponents ignorance of their methods are not those we wish to encourage.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

RMB




19 posts
bridgetalk member






Reply






Re: Alerts required? (12:01:55 WedApr 2 2003)

I don't have a definitive answer by any means. (I am sure someone thinks they have. )

It is true that no one alerts ELC doubles, but no one alerts doubles that show (close to) opening values and no shape suitability and no idea what to do if partner bids their short suit; and those doubles are far more of menace [end rant].

We should look closely at the wording of the EBU regulation: 'is natural, but its meaning is affected by other agreements which your opponents are unlikely to expect'. There must be **other** agreements.

So in the check-back sequence: 1X-1Y, 1NT-2, 2NT = maximum. The meaning of 2NT is affected by the meaning of 2 = minimum, no major to show. But opponents might expect 2 to be natural, and 2NT to be the same values as 1NT with nothing to show.

However, in the sequence 1m-1, 1NT. The fact that 1NT may or may not deny four spades is not affected by the meaning of 1, if 1 simply shows spades. But if 1 shows spades and five cards in the minor (or spades and an unbalanced hand) and 1NT is compulsory on balanced hands with spades, then perhaps 1NT and 1 require an alert.

[1 edits; Last edit by RMB at 12:03:21 Wed Apr 2 2003]

James Vickers



10 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Alerts required? (13:04:28 WedApr 2 2003)

Country: UK

First of all, thank you Alan for asking the original question.

Quote: David

I believe the 2NT response is alertable because it is not natural. It is not an attempt to play there: it shows partner what he has asked in the same way as a response to Blackwood.

It perhaps doesn't conform to the EBU Orange Book definition of "natural for alerting purposes" (5.3.1(b), a dubious definition of "natural" per se) but only because it is forcing. It is still showing a balanced hand and a willingness to play in that denomination, and you can't get much more natural than that.

Quote: David

do you really think that ELC doubles are likely to come as a shock ot the opponents? The same for rebids bypassing a four-card major? If so, and only if so, you should alert them.

I thought it was a matter of what the regulations say are alertable, rather than what I think should be alerted, which is "extremely unhelpful".

James

AlanW

Re: Alerts required? (13:47:31 WedApr 2 2003)

Reply

Quote: bluejak

I am surprised at your logic re the reply to Crowhurst. When you use an artificial enquiry, and have a response showing point-count it seems very strange that you consider that response "natural". I believe the 2NT response is alertable because it is not natural. It is not an attempt to play there: it shows partner what he has asked in the same way as a response to Blackwood.

Perhaps I did not define the system of responses I had in mind precisely enough. I believe it is normal to play 2N as 15-16 with a more balanced hand than shown so far, while 3-level bids show 15-16 with extra distribution. I described 2N as natural because I thought it fitted the definition of a natural 2N bid in 5.3.1(b), but I take James' point that it could be regarded as forcing and therefore violate the definition. (I don't actually think it has to be F, though. It's difficult to see how partner can have a hand that justifies bidding 2C and then want to pass when you bid 2N, but that's up to him.)

I'm not sure the analogy with Blackwood, helps me understand this, either - if I open 1N and partner bids 2C Stayman, my rebid of 2H simply tells him what he asked, but I don't think that makes it alertable in the same way that a 2D response in answer to the same question would be.

I hope my argumentativeness here is not misunderstood. I'm not really trying to argue that it's wrong to say 2N should be alerted here, and I'm happy to do so if that's the received wisdom, if I ever play this system. I'm more interested in where the limits to alerting might lie, because the meaning of almost every bid I make with my regular partners will be affected by our agreements over what other bids in the same situation would show. I'm more than happy to explain all these inferences to the opponents, and it's easy to do so after the auction if we are declaring, but somehow I've got to judge during the auction which inferences are likely to be unexpected, and I think it would be equally unhelpful to alert everything as to alert

nothing.

(Although I realise this board is not really the right place for the suggestion (sorry, David), perhaps there should be two types of alert!!! A real alert for artificial bids, and a semi-alert for natural bids affected by other agreements.)

HenryS

Re: Alerts required? (15:18:30 WedApr 2 2003)

Reply

Country: USA

Quote: RMB at 12:01:55 Wed Apr 2 2003

It is true that no one alerts ELC doubles, but no one alerts doubles that show (close to) opening values and no shape suitability and no idea what to do if partner bids their short suit; and those doubles are far more of menace [end rant].

We should look closely at the wording of the EBU regulation: 'is natural, but its meaning is affected by other agreements which your opponents are unlikely to expect'. There must be **other** agreements.

This is, and I expect will continue to be, a fascinating thread.

I wish to add a point about "other agreements." When asked to play ELC (against my better judgment), I always clarify with my partner how I should handle competitive hands with clubs and short diamonds. My standard hand for this question is, eg, Kxx; xxxx; x; QTxxx. After the auction (1h) dbl (2h), is this hand good enough for a 3c advance in competition? It certainly should be if partner's hand is going to be something like Axxx; x; KJxx; Kxxx, even with wasted diamonds. It certainly isn't if partner is liable to be Axxx; x; AQxxxx; xx and will be forced to convert to 3d without showing extra values. And if partner does have a big hand with diamonds, eg AQx; x; AQJxxx; Axx and is forced to rebid 4d because 3d would be ELC, then my aggressive 3c advance will certainly create major problems for us.

My point is that players using ELC are virtually forced to have other agreements in order to know when, when not, and how to advance a potentially ELC double. From that point of view, other agreements DO exist, and hence that would satisfy the criterion quoted above for requiring an alert.

RichM



285 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Alerts required? (16:47:28 WedApr 2 2003)

AlanW wrote

< <

I'm not sure the analogy with Blackwood, helps me understand this, either - if I open 1N and partner bids 2C Stayman, my rebid of 2H simply tells him what he asked, but I don't think that makes it alertable in the same way that a 2D response in answer to the same question would be.

> >

OK, try this analogy.

You are playing original Blue Team Club. Your opening 1NT bid shows 15-17 HCP balanced or 12-14 HCP and 3=3=2=5 distribution.

Your partner responds 2 Clubs. This is non-forcing Stayman.

You rebid 2 Diamonds. This shows 12-14 HCP and 3=3=2=5. That's alertable.

You rebid 2 Hearts. This shows 4 Hearts and 15-17 HCP. That's alertable too even though it is "natural" showing Hearts.

Any rebid, natural or not, that shows a subset of the original range of an opening bid should be alerted.

Second analogy.

You are playing 2/1 game force in the style of Max Hardy. You open 1 Club and your partner responds 1 Spade. You rebid 1 NT showing 12-14(15-) HCP and balanced shape.

Your partner rebids 2 Diamonds which is "new minor forcing". You rebid 2 Hearts.

In the Hardy style your rebid of 2 Hearts is artificial, showing a minimum within 12-14 and saying nothing about Hearts. That is

alertable.

If you instead rebid 2NT, that shows a maximum within 12-14 and does not specify any additional distributional information. That's alertable too even though it is more-or-less natural.

RichM

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Alerts required? (17:03:09 WedApr 2 2003)

Quote: James Vickers

It perhaps doesn't conform to the EBU Orange Book definition of "natural for alerting purposes" (5.3.1(b), a dubious definition of "natural" per se) but only because it is forcing. It is still showing a balanced hand and a willingness to play in that denomination, and you can't get much more natural than that.

Why is it a "dubious" definition?

Anyway, let us see. If you respond 5 \heartsuit to Blackwood does it become a natural bid because you are known to have diamonds, and partner might want to play there? Of course not. The fact that partner might want to play there is irrelevant: it is not a natural bid for alerting purposes because it shows one ace, not that you want to play in 5 \heartsuit .

Now if partner bids Crowhurst, he is in control. 2NT does not say "I have a suitable hand for playing in no-trumps" which is the natural meaning: it says "I have 15 or 16 points". The way some people play it it also tells something about the distribution. But it is not a question of whether no-trumps is a suitable spot to play: that is for partner. Opener is not saying "Let's play no-trumps": he is saying "This is my hand: now you decide".

Thus a 2NT response to Crowhurst is not natural for alerting purposes.

Quote: Alan W

I'm not sure the analogy with Blackwood, helps me understand this, either - if I open 1N and partner bids 2C Stayman, my rebid of 2H simply tells him what he asked, but I don't think that makes it alertable in the same way that a 2D response in answer to the same question would be.

2[□] is natural: it shows hearts.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

HenryS

Re: Alerts required? (18:20:59 WedApr 2 2003)

Reply

Country: USA

Quote: Guest [Unregistered]

at 13:47:31 Wed Apr 2 2003]I'm not sure the analogy with Blackwood, helps me understand this, either - if I open 1N and partner bids 2C Stayman, my rebid of 2H simply tells him what he asked, but I don't think that makes it alertable in the same way that a 2D response in answer to the same question would be.

Perhaps a different scenario can raise a different question.

In the US, it is VERY common to play that the sequence 1nt-2c; 2s DENIES 4 hearts because, if opener is 4-4 majors, he rebids 2h first.

I think it is entirely appropriate to alert 2s as denying 4 hearts and probably appropriate to alert 2h as 'could be 4-4 majors' even though both are natural calls showing the suit bid.

But if the partnership is playing some form of Precision in which a 1nt opener DENIES 4-4 majors, should not the 1nt opening bid be alerted (responder might not use Stayman, after all)? If the 1nt opening bid is deemed to require an alert, then would it not be redundant to re-alert 1nt-2c-2M as denying 4 in the other major?

Oh for the days when everyone played Goren and we didn't need alerts (rofl...)

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Alerts required? (00:15:43 ThuApr 3 2003)

The problem with analogies from different countries is that the basis for alerting is very different. In England/Wales, you alert:

- Any call that is not natural, and natural is defined by regulation.
- Any call that is forcing unexpectedly, or non-forcing unexpectedly.
- Any natural call that has a meaning that might be described as 'very strange', so much so that opponents will not expect it without the alert.

Now a response of 2 \square to Stayman, that says something about the other major {denying it, perhaps} is not alertable since it is natural, and opponents would not find it 'very strange' that the partnership has a particular rule as to which major to bid with both majors.

So in the scenario you give neither 2 \square nor 2 \square is alertable in England/Wales.

If an opening 1NT shows some sort of limitation, eg denies 4-4 majors, then that is not alertable. not only because it is not strange enough, but also because some situations have been discussed and interpretations published: this is one of them. Such limitation needs to be on the convention card but does not require an alert.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)] [[Print](#)] [[Send](#)] [[Watch](#)] [[<](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]

2 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 2 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: [FrancesHinden](#).

[Register](#) :: [Log in](#)

The time is now 14:48:55 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

top ☐

**[Thread Index](#) :: [FAQ's](#) :: [Main Menu](#) :: [Posting Hints](#) :: [Emoticon Key](#) :: [Search](#)
[David's Lawspage](#) :: [EBU](#) :: [ACBL](#) :: [WBF](#)**

Legend :: ☐ **Read Topic** :: ☐ **Unread Topic**

☐ **Email**

Help | **Full Format: ON :: OFF** | **Text: ON :: OFF** | **Email Status**

tigerboy



47 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

dummy (06:33:18 MonMar 31 2003)

Country: new zealand

There is a widely held belief that all players are responsible for dummy being properly displayed, but there does not seem to be a law saying as much. Moreover if there is an error in dummy display there is, as far as I can see no penalty prescribed for any such irregularity. Could you kindly comment on this please. J.S.

RMB



19 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: dummy (17:03:27 MonMar 31 2003)

Country: England

Dummy is responsible for dummy being displayed (Law41D). It is usual that when opponents are damaged by dummy not being properly displayed (cards not visible, cards in wrong suit) they will get redress (usually involves Law12A1).

Robin

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: dummy (17:03:41 MonMar 31 2003)

The defenders are not responsible for dummy in any way.

The player holding dummy's cards is responsible for putting dummy down face up, sorted into suits, in columns towards declarer, and with each suit sorted by rank. This is a requiremnet [Law 41D]. Failure to do so is thus subject to penalty, and a TD could give a Procedural Penalty.

In practice, the only time a TD would do so is if the player makes a habit of this despite warnings: then a TD will have to resort to Procedural Penalties to make sure the Law is followed.

Occasionally, failure to put dummy's hand down properly will cause the defenders to go wrong. Since there is a requirement to put it down right, an adjustment would be given by the TD, using Law 12A1 since there is no other relevant Law.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

mycroft



67 posts
bridgetalk member




Reply

Re: dummy (17:14:52 WedApr 2 2003)

I think what "widely held belief" has itself thinking is Law 50B3:

Quote:

The penalty for an established revoke does not apply:...if the revoke was made in failing to play any card faced on the table or belonging to a hand faced on the table, including a card from dummy's hand.

Which is certainly true, and saved me from 3 -2 when +150 was obvious (the hidden card was a trump...pulling the "outstanding trump" cost me the overtricks). However, that does not make anything any of the other posters said invalid! L50C goes on to say (my emphasis):

Quote:

When, after any established revoke, **including those not subject to penalty**, the Director deems that the non-offending side is insufficiently compensated by this Law for the damage caused, he shall assign an adjusted score.

So, if dummy doesn't put the hand correctly, and this causes a problem to the opponents, the score will be adjusted. It's only when dummy revokes because of misalignment, and either nobody was hurt or the only side hurt is dummy's, is there no additional penalty.

Michael (who had to give an established revoke penalty last night...for 2NT-6).
Calgary AB Canada

alohana



5 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

inadvertant call (14:21:41 MonMar 31 2003)

Country: france

Hi all

Usually, when there are two or more conditions needed for the use of law , the law book specifies "and" , like in law 70C

In law 25, the paragraph relative to the inadvertant call says :an inadvertant call may be changed if

- partner has not yet declared
- it is changed without pause for thought

Does that means that we need the two conditions for the change being possible, or is it possible to change in each case ?

Many thanks in advance

Kind regards

AL. Ohana

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host


Reply

Re: inadvertant call (17:10:23 MonMar 31 2003)

The English Law book is quite clear: you need both requirements. Perhaps the French translation has become slightly skewed: I shall have a look and comment further.

You cannot change a call under Law 25A once partner has called.

You cannot change a call under law 25A if you have paused for thought, but TDs are instructed to be generous in their application of this.

And, of course, you may not change a call under this Law unless the original call was inadvertent. 

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>

Liverpool, England, UK

http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

Michael Levy

Reply

Alerting (or not) (18:31:06 FriMar 28 2003)

Country: UK

Playing at a local club a partnership picks up the following:

A K Q x x x

A

A Q 9 8 x x

x x x

x x x

K J x x

K x x

The bidding (including opponents) went 2s, p, 3s, p, 4d, x (no alert given), p, p, 4s (the final contract). The doubler was short in diamonds and claimed it was lead directing. Declarer claimed the thought of the diamonds being offside stopped even a small slam being bid and that the (artificial) double should have been alerted. The doubler's partner claimed he was unsure of the meaning of the double. Both defenders are very strong players.

Should the double have been alerted and, if so, what should the penalty be?

Please reply to antrimplc@aol.com

Many thanks

HenryS

Reply

Re: Alerting (or not) (19:31:30 FriMar 28 2003)

Country: US

In the US, such a double would never be alerted to the best of my knowledge.

My question would be, why did responder pass over the double instead of (a) redoubling or (b) bidding 5d to confirm control? Surely with kjxx of diamonds, responder could at least have chanced a 5d rebid over opener's signoff.

Or, why not have the auction 2s-3s; 6d (monster 2 suiter in spades and diamond)-7d; 7s?

From where I sit, NS got confused, and confusion often leads to a bad board (shrug), but I can't see where EW has done anything wrong or improper.

Val

☐ 17 posts
bridgetalk member

☐
Reply

Re: Alerting (or not) (20:00:23 FriMar 28 2003)

This bid is not alerted here in Canada for the most part either. Most declarers would know that it was "lead - directing". If the doubler's partner did not know what the bid meant - probably a new partnership or beginners! If the spade bidder is going to be playing spades or diamonds the double is silly as the doubler will be leading. It appears (and far be it from me to say anything untoward about the players) that the doubler was trying to throw a monkey wrench into the auction and succeeded royally as the two bidders did not trust and cherish each other.

bluejak

☐ 434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Alerting (or not) (20:19:16 FriMar 28 2003)

While it is usually unhelpful to discuss the wrong alerting rules, in this case it does not matter: an unalerted double is lead-directing in both England and Wales, and in North America, so if it means something else then it requires an alert in both jurisdictions.

[Note: the original poster said he was from the UK. Scottish and Irish alerting regs are different. Since he did not specify I am assuming England or Wales.]

I think that Henry's post is somewhat unsympathetic to the side who might have been damaged. As South I am sure at the table that it sounds as though North is void in diamonds, and to proceed to the five-level with his load of junk, most of which seems to be waste paper, would be very optimistic.

Furthermore, his suggested redouble is normally played as first round control, so KJxx does not seem the right holding to redouble! Given the apparent lead-directing double of 5 ☐ I believe a lot of pairs would now go wrong.

Perhaps a better approach, rather than criticising N/S's bidding, is

to consider first whether there is MI and second whether there is damage.

If the double was lead-directing then it does not require an alert. It is difficult from here to know whether it was lead-directing. True, the player does not seem to have had the correct hand for the call, but that proves nothing.

The TD had to decide whether East-West had an agreement that the double was something other than lead-directing. To be honest the evidence given here suggests to me that they did not have such an agreement. If that is so then there was no MI, and thus no redress would be offered.

Let us suppose that they did have such an agreement, perhaps that a double of 4 shows the other two suits or something. Now South's hand improves dramatically, and I would adjust, perhaps to

.. 15% of 7 =
 + 70% of 6 + 1
 + 15% of 4 + 3

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
 Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

RichM



285 posts
 bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Alerting (or not) (20:39:25 FriMar 28 2003)

Hmmm... was the doubler telling himself what to lead ?

Perhaps we should reconsider the claim that "the defenders were strong players".

RichM

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

**richard
morgan**

Reply

Slow Play (18:08:58 MonMar 24 2003)

Country: USA

What is consdiered slow play- by declarer or deferder? Number of seconds? Can the Director be called? What are the consequences? Thanks rmorgan7@nc.rr.com

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Slow Play (03:11:41 TueMar 25 2003)

This is an enormous and very complicated subject so I shall just give a very simplistic answer, and then you can ask further questions if you wish.

Bridge is a timed sport, and roughly speaking there is a general allowance to play a round in, and each player has the right to roughly one-quarter of that time. Of course it never works as easily as that!

If a player takes a full three minutes to make a call or play that is excessive, but if he and his partner play pretty fast the rest of the time so they have only used their allotted time between them then there is no problem.

The real problems come from people who are persistently slow. The only solution is to call the TD and let him deal with it. This is often very difficult, partly because people who are slow rarely realise that they are.

There is no absolute time limit for an individual call or play, just for the overall time to play a round.

Does this help?

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

mycroft



67 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Slow Play (18:56:16 TueMar 25 2003)

A couple of points, although David, as is his wont, has given an excellent response:

- If you are consistently slower than the rest of the room, and it's not because you're following a very slow pair, you should really look at ways to quicken your game up. This might be as little as ensuring that your opening lead is on the table, or your dummy is spread, before marking the contract in your personal score. It may, however, mean that you have to learn to play faster, as well!

If the director is coming to you frequently and telling you to pick up the pace, listen to her. You **don't** want her to get fed up and start issuing real slow play penalties (frankly, neither does she!)

- If you start a round late, even if you are not in the least responsible for the late start, it is **your responsibility** to catch up, and directors will penalize you if you do not make an effort to do so.

Most of the frustration of "following a zombie pair all night" comes from the fact that one pays to play bridge, not to stand and wait...again. But some, maybe a lot, comes from the fact that one doesn't get the time allotted to other pairs to play the boards, and therefore won't score as well. This is another reason why we directors are so forceful about keeping the game moving, and getting on the perennially slow players.

- It is perfectly appropriate for you to make your case to the TD. If it was totally your opponents that slowed you up, and the TD comes to the table about it, explain this to them. Don't accuse, don't "defend yourself", just explain what happened. Oh, and when it's your fault, explain that as well.

This doesn't absolve you of the above responsibility to get caught up! It may, however, help you not getting "perpetually slow pair" status (unless, of course, you are).

A very good (if ACBL-oriented) article on how to speed up your game without cutting into your bridge time is on David's web site:

Hurry Up and Think!, by Bruce McIntyre.

As a TD, I have had more ugly situations due to slow play(ers) than due to all other rulings I have had to give combined - including the dreaded "disputed hesitation", "blatant use of UI", and "bad claims". As a player (my regular partners tend to be quick) I have had many TDs come over in private and thank us for catching the room up. We're happy to do so, but are still right irked about needing to.

Michael.

mycroft



67 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Slow Play (19:34:58 TueMar 25 2003)

Hmm. About seconds:

You are allowed to think when it's the opponents' turn to call or play. If everybody realized this, slow play would be cut in half, at least! Note that there are situations where someone is **required to take time**; where playing quickly is actually both detrimental to quick play and improper.

- After a jump bid, **any jump bid, whether prefaced by the STOP card or not**, players are expected to pause around 10 seconds (anywhere between 7 and 12 is probably right; you don't want to be excessively regular; note that 10 seconds can seem like an awfully long time - try timing it!), either thinking about their call or attempting to look like they are.

Frequently, they need this time. If you take it consistently, then when you **do** need the time, you won't tell your partner you needed it, and you won't put her under (the pretty drastic) UI restrictions. Similarly, when you have nothing to think about, pausing will not pass that information to partner, thus putting her under the same UI restrictions.

Equally frequently, jump-bidder's partner needs the time, and will get a chance to make his bid in tempo, as well. In fact, he is also entitled to the 10 seconds you should take. I do not see in the ACBL skip bid regulations about it, but you would have a hard time convincing me that LHO passed UI to her partner if she called in about 12 seconds after partner, no matter how much of that time was after your call.

Of course, there are those (and their name is legion) who will stare at you for the entire length of time you are pausing, with a "hurry up, idiot" look on their face, and then when you do pass in tempo, **only then start to figure out what to do with their hand**. I have no patience for these.

- At trick 1, declarer should pause for about 30 seconds before playing from dummy. If he takes this time to work out what he is going to do during the hand, strangely enough, the hand will usually take less time to play than if he hadn't. Also, declarer's RHO is entitled to that same time to work out what to do during the hand, and will not be penalized (in the ACBL, at least) for "passing UI" by slow play to trick 1 if declarer does not sufficiently pause before playing from dummy. Again, thinking at trick 1, formulating a plan of what to do now, and later, and when declarer pulls trumps, and...will speed up the play of the entire hand.

When I'm in a speedball, "10 seconds" becomes about 7, so "30 seconds" becomes about 20. But I still pause, and I don't remember the last time I was late in a speedball, never mind being warned about it!

Michael.

HenryS

Re: Slow Play (20:57:44 TueMar 25 2003)

Reply

Country: US

About pausing after jump bids:

On an auction, let's say, that goes 1h (p) 2nt* (p), 3c (p), 4nt* (p) 5d* (p), 6h (p) p (p), there are three bids that are jumps that technically require a pause. Taking those three bids together, about 30 seconds of time, or roughly 3.3% of a round's 15 minute time limit, is being wasted with no good or productive end.

I mention this because Kaplan cited this sort of auction as a consideration AGAINST the mandatory pause after all jump bids by opponents philosophy.

I must admit that I have always been one of those who always hesitated after a jump bid, even though such a practice often was greeted with 'hurry up dumbo' looks from the opponents who didn't want their time wasted.

So I don't pretend to suggest an answer to Kaplan's situation.

And let us not forget that slow play problems in team games are qualitatively different from pair games. Oddly enough, what was demonstrably the most effective deterrent - suspension of a slow pair after suitable warning for the next session (or more) during an early 1980s Bermuda Bowl - has been replaced by the less effective deterrent of imp penalties.

JimO



175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Slow Play (22:02:32 TueMar 25 2003)

The problem with slow players is usually not slow play, nor bidding. Most slow pairs are those who take an inordinate amount of time between hands, usually:

- 1) studying the traveling scoreslip as if there was going to be a quiz on it later - then passing it around to each of the other players, so they can study it as well.
- 2) lengthy post-mortems, and arguments with partner and/or opponents
- 3) arriving at the table late - especially the smokers and nibblers

The slow pairs in my clubs may not think of them as slow. But I know who the slow pairs are, and that's what matters.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Slow Play (01:25:02 WedMar 26 2003)

Quote: Henry S

I must admit that I have always been one of those who always hesitated after a jump bid, even though such a practice often was greeted with 'hurry up dumbo' looks from the opponents who didn't want their time wasted.

In England, where in tournaments people tend to follow the Stop regs without comment, it is clear that the "waste" of time over pausing when there seems no obvious reason to do so causes no trouble whatever. Perhaps if people applied the rules on manners more forcefully, and dealt with the rude people and their "hurry up, dumbo" looks the game would be more pleasant for everyone.

Players should always make the mandatory pause over skip bids whatever the situation.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

robin

Re: Slow Play (14:34:43 ThuMar 27 2003)

Reply

Country: UK

Smoking seems to be a good way of -speeding- up your game- since many events are non-smoking, most smokers have a definite incentive to finish the round early! An unexpected fringe benefit of banning smoking at the table?

Ed

Re: Slow Play (16:35:04 ThuMar 27 2003)



173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Quote: Guest [Unregistered]

at 20:57:44 Tue Mar 25 2003]About pausing after jump bids:

On an auction, let's say, that goes 1h (p) 2nt* (p), 3c (p), 4nt* (p) 5d* (p), 6h (p) p (p), there are three bids that are jumps that technically require a pause. Taking those three bids together, about 30 seconds of time, or roughly 3.3% of a round's 15 minute time limit, is being wasted with no good or productive end.

I mention this because Kaplan cited

this sort of auction as a consideration AGAINST the mandatory pause after all jump bids by opponents philosophy.

I disagree. The purpose of the pause is to avoid potential UI problems. Since you never know when such problems may crop up, the procedure can hardly be characterized as having "no good or productive end".

As for Kaplan, he was a wise man, but he wasn't always right.

[:smile:](#)

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)] [[Print](#)] [[Send](#)] [[Watch](#)] [[<](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]

2 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 2 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: [FrancesHinden](#).

[Register](#) :: [Log in](#)

The time is now 14:50:29 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)













[top](#) ☐

[Thread Index](#) :: [FAQ's](#) :: [Main Menu](#) :: [Posting Hints](#) :: [Emoticon Key](#) :: [Search](#)
[David's Lawspage](#) :: [EBU](#) :: [ACBL](#) :: [WBF](#)

Legend :: ☐ Read Topic :: ☐ Unread Topic

[Email](#)

[Help](#) | **Full Format:** **ON** :: **OFF** | **Text:** **ON** :: **OFF** | **Email Status**

<p>terry</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>1NT continuation (11:11:43 TueMar 25 2003)</p> <hr/> <p>Country: england</p> <p>I have always thought 1NT-2d-2h-3d playing transfers but then just showing diamonds to be illegal, but where does it say so in the orange book or elsewhere?</p>
<p>bluebird</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: 1NT continuation (11:41:51 TueMar 25 2003)</p> <hr/> <p>Country: Spain</p> <p>I think this is not a convention problem but illegal use of the convention (two meanings for the same bid) or UI (when the opener do not alert or alert the 2D bid is when the responder know that he has missbid).</p>
<p>bluejak</p> <hr/> <p> 434 posts Forum Host</p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: 1NT continuation (12:21:23 TueMar 25 2003)</p> <hr/> <p>To play 1NT - 2 - 2 - 3 as diamonds is perfectly legal at Level 2 or higher. All responses to 1NT are permitted. There are, however, two snags.</p> <p>First, you may not call the 2 bid a transfer. If 2 is a transfer then it shows hearts unambiguously. If you play it as either hearts, or weak with diamonds, that is how you must describe it, both on your convention card and in answer to questions.</p> <p>Second. some people confuse this with a defensive sequence, where 2 is an overcall. Suppose you agree to play Asptro, where 2 shows spades and another: you may not use the sequence (1NT) 2 - 2 - 3 to just show diamonds at Level 2 or Level 3.</p> <p>Furthermore, if you want to play (1NT) 2 as either spades and another suit, or just diamonds, at Level 4 where it is legal (since any defence to 1NT is permitted at Level 4) then you may not call it Asptro: you must describe it on your convention card and in answer to questions as either spades and another suit, or just diamonds.</p>

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
 Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

AlanW

Re: 1NT continuation (12:38:04 TueMar 25 2003)

Reply

My reading of the Orange Book (section 12.5.3) is that any system of responses to 1N is allowed.

If so, the only issue is whether the circumstances you are envisaging might give rise to UI. If the convention card stated that 2D asked opener to bid 2H and showed either D (if followed by 3D) or H then I cannot see a problem, and similarly if 2D was alerted and explained as such. If 2D was simply stated as transfer and the convention card did not help, then it may be that the explanation was simply inadequate or it may be that the agreement really was than 2D showed hearts, in which case opener must presumably bid on assuming responder has H+D.

AlanW

Re: 1NT continuation (12:42:30 TueMar 25 2003)

Reply

Sorry - I see David has provided a much more definitive reply than mine. I was interrupted in writing my response and didn't see he had answered by the time I finished!

RMB

Re: 1NT continuation (12:51:17 TueMar 25 2003)

☐
 19 posts
 bridgetalk member

☐
Reply

If the auction goes

W	N	E	S
1NT	Pass	2 <input type="checkbox"/> (A)	Pass
2 <input type="checkbox"/> (A)	Pass	3 <input type="checkbox"/> (A)	End

At her first turn, South asks and is told "transfer to hearts" and asks at her second turn and is told "NF, just diamonds", and the EW convention card says "red suit transfers", is this ruled as a concealed partnership understanding (law 40B) or just misinformation?

bluejak <hr/> <div><input type="checkbox"/></div> 434 posts Forum Host Reply	Re: 1NT continuation (01:02:46 WedMar 26 2003) <hr/> Does it really matter? It is misinformation both ways. --- David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com> Liverpool, England, UK http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm
RMB <hr/> <div><input type="checkbox"/></div> 19 posts bridgetalk member <div><input type="checkbox"/></div> Reply	Re: 1NT continuation (10:24:06 WedMar 26 2003) <hr/> bluejak asks "Does it really matter?" I thought we (EBU) fined players for having CPUs. Isn't that the basis for our treatment of psyches?
bluejak <hr/> <div><input type="checkbox"/></div> 434 posts Forum Host Reply	Re: 1NT continuation (10:52:27 WedMar 26 2003) <hr/> It is part of our treatment of psyches, that is true, but I was not aware that an effect of that is to treat different situations similarly. --- David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com> Liverpool, England, UK http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)] [[Print](#)] [[Send](#)] [[Watch](#)] [[<](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]

1 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 1 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Peter

Reply

Scoring wrong traveller (15:24:35 MonFeb 10 2003)

Country: Hong Kong

Would appreciate an early reply to this question. At one table they had just played board No.3. North took out the traveller to enter the score but unfortunately took out the traveller for board 4 that had not yet been played. North looked at the results on the board before discovering the mistake. The board obviously could not be played but what is the penalty? (Duplicate Pairs Club Bridge)

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Scoring wrong traveller (17:04:45 MonFeb 10 2003)

For board four North-South get average minus, East-West get average-plus [A-/A+].

While this is not a penalty it is sufficiently annoying to North-South that they will be more careful in future.

I assume that your computer can score A-/A+ [or your scorer if you do it by hand]. If you need to put it in manually it normally comes to 40% of a top for North-South, 60% for East-West.

Technically [and good software will do this] A+ actually means 60% or their session score, whichever is greater, similarly A- actually means 40% or their session score, whichever is less.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

Robert Johnson

Reply

Re: Scoring wrong traveller (02:52:16 MonMar 24 2003)

Country: USA

David, there is an even more irritating variation of this problem. Occasionally, boards arrive at a new table with the travelers switched and the error is not discovered before a board has been played.....

Now there is a problem.

Is the current North to be charged an A- for not verifying that each board arrived with the correct traveler?

Is the table where the switch occurred given a penalty for creating the problem? If so, is the penalty applied to one of the boards played, or is it a penalty deducted from the offending N/S total score.

Regards,
Bob

Ed



173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Scoring wrong traveller (08:14:59 MonMar 24 2003)

If North or South pulls out a traveller and looks at it, and it is for a board not yet played, then L12A2 comes into play, and NS get Avg- (and EW Avg+, L88).

If the travellers were placed in the wrong boards by N/S at another table, then a Procedural Penalty might be assessed against that pair, because their error caused a score adjustment at another table (L90B7). The penalty (normally 1/10 of a board, I think) would be deducted from their overall score.

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Scoring wrong traveller (12:02:56 MonMar 24 2003)

If the travellers were put in the wrong boards by the North player at an earlier table, I would issue a Procedural Penalty of 10% of a top **always**. This is against my normal policy in clubs which is never to give more than a warning except for repeat offences, but this is so unforgiveable. There is never any reason to have two travellers out of the board at the same time. If North-South can convince me that East-West took the travellers out then I issue a Procedural Penalty to them **as well**. North-South do not escape since the travellers are their responsibility.

But I do not expect the players receiving the boards to know the travellers are wrong, so they got A+ /A+ on any unplayable board.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)] [[Print](#)] [[Send](#)] [[Watch](#)] [[<](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]

1 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 1 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: [FrancesHinden](#).

[Register](#) :: [Log in](#)

The time is now 14:51:16 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

top

**[Thread Index](#) :: [FAQ's](#) :: [Main Menu](#) :: [Posting Hints](#) :: [Emoticon Key](#) :: [Search](#)
[David's Lawspace](#) :: [EBU](#) :: [ACBL](#) :: [WBF](#)**

Legend :: Read Topic :: Unread Topic

<p>Guest</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Insufficient bid (19:21:49 SunMar 9 2003)</p> <hr/> <p>Country: USA</p> <p>What is the proper way to handle an insufficient bid by an opponent?</p>
<p>JimO</p> <hr/> <div data-bbox="53 541 100 588" data-label="Image"></div> <p>175 posts Forum Host</p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Insufficient bid (20:45:32 SunMar 9 2003)</p> <hr/> <p>Country: USA</p> <p>The first thing you should do is call the Director. Law 9B1(a) The Director must be summoned at once when attention is drawn to an irregularity. Law 9B1(c) Summoning the Director does not cause a player to forfeit any rights to which he might otherwise have been entitled.</p> <p>The Director will explain all the options as spelled out in Law 27.</p> <p>The Director may find that the call was inadvertent, and rule that Law 25A applies.</p> <p>Otherwise: First, the LHO of the insufficient bidder will have the option of accepting the insufficient bid, and making any legal call. Now the auction will proceed as if there had been no irregularity. ***The insufficient bidder does not have the option of changing his call until his LHO has exercised his option to accept/refuse to accept the insufficient bid, even if the Director has been called.</p> <p>Then, if the bid is not accepted, the insufficient bid is cancelled. The insufficient bidder must correct his call to a sufficient bid or pass (double or redouble are not allowed). If the substituted bid is the lowest sufficient bid in the same denomination as the insufficient bid, and neither the insufficient bid nor the substituted bid are conventional, there is no further penalty. If the bid is corrected to a pass, a sufficient bid other than the lowest in the same denomination, or either bid is conventional, then the offender's partner must pass for the remainder of the auction, and there may be lead penalties.</p>

Robert Johnson

Reply

Re: Insufficient bid (02:18:59 MonMar 24 2003)

Country: USA

Excellent answer, but i would add that there is one additional bid offender can make should LHO not accept the INSF bid.

Offender can,"make any other sufficient bid."

Should he do so, partner is barred, Rule 23, damage by enforced pass is in effect, and lead penalty for illegally identified suits apply.

Regards,
Bob

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Insufficient bid (11:49:36 MonMar 24 2003)

Quote: Jim O

The Director may find that the call was inadvertent, and rule that Law 25A applies.

This worries me slightly, and it seems to me from reports form Noth America that TDs in the ACBL may be going wrong in this area.

For a change under Law 25A

- a call must be inadvertent
- it must be changed [or an attempted change] without pause for thought
- it must be changed [or an attempted change] before partner calls

When a player makes an insufficient bid, and makes no attempt to change it, and the TD is called, the TD has no reason to consider Law 25A, and that Law does not apply since there was no change or attempted change.

When a TD is called to the table he gets the facts. if those facts do not include any attempt to change the call then there is no reason for him to discover whether the call is inadvertent: it does not matter.

One other way that TDs sometimes go wrong everywhere: they must not offer the next player the chance to accept the insufficient bid before they have explained all the options.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)] [[Print](#)] [[Send](#)] [[Watch](#)] [[<](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]

1 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 1 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: [FrancesHinden](#).

[Register](#) :: [Log in](#)

The time is now 14:51:43 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

top ☐

**[Thread Index](#) :: [FAQ's](#) :: [Main Menu](#) :: [Posting Hints](#) :: [Emoticon Key](#) :: [Search](#)
[David's Lawspage](#) :: [EBU](#) :: [ACBL](#) :: [WBF](#)**

Legend :: ☐ **Read Topic** :: ☐ **Unread Topic**

☐ **Email**

Help | **Full Format:** **ON** :: **OFF** | **Text:** **ON** :: **OFF** | **Email Status**

al.ohana

Reply

law 25 (16:28:51 SatMar 22 2003)

Country: France

Hi David

This is not a real case but a question about law 25 B
 Suppose it is teams and in the open room S bids 4C and changes immediately by 5C
 W refuses the second declaration, but S maintains it. Now N-S lose 3 IMPS on the board
 Suppose that in the closed room S bids and makes 6C. The difference is 13 IMPS . Do we add these 13 IMPS to the 3 lost in the open room ; or is thze board limited to 3 IMPS (in which case the irregularity of the player is beneficial for him) ?
 Thanks a lot

I will be in Menton next June, and will enjoy to meet you and have a dinner together
 Kind regar
 Al. Ohana

JimO



175 posts
 Forum Host

Reply

Re: law 25 (23:49:12 SatMar 22 2003)

Quote: Guest [Unregistered]

at 16:28:51 Sat Mar 22 2003] Do we add these 13 IMPS to the 3 lost in the open room ; or is thze board limited to 3 IMPS (in which case the irregularity of the player is beneficial for him) ?

Neither.
 The offending side loses 13 IMPs.
 From Law 25B2(b)(2):
 "The offending side may receive no score greater than average-minus."

If the actual score is worse than "average-minus" - (minus 3 IMPs in Team play - see Law 86), they get that actual score.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: law 25 (01:24:55 SunMar 23 2003)

Quote: Al Ohana

I will be in Menton next June, and
will enjoy to meet you and have a
dinner together

Sadly, the EBL has decided one English Director apart from Max
Bavin is enough, and we have three international Directors, and I
am not the one!

They also have no need of me otherwise either!

I had a partner but he could not wait for the EBL to make up its
mind and has someone else!

It looks as though I shall not be in Menton.

By the way, I agree with Jim.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)]

[[Print](#)]

[[Send](#)]

[[Watch](#)]

[[<](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]

James Vickers



10 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Incomplete disclosure or psyche? (14:26:51

WedMar 19 2003)

Country: UK

This board caused recriminations in the bar afterwards. Pairs, EW vul, dealer North:

J 9 x x x

x x

Q x x

x x x

K x x x

x A K Q J x x

K J 10 x x x x x

A K Q x x x x

A Q 10 x

10 x x x

A x

J x x

N E S W

P P(1) 1S 2D

4S P(2) P X

P P P

(1) Long hesitation. East decided this was too good for 2H, not good enough for 1H.

(2) East asked South if 4S was natural. A puzzled South said yes. East said that he had asked because some players play Truscott in this situation. He again took a long time before passing.

At the end of the auction South reserved his rights because of the long pauses by East, which no-one disputed. When dummy went down East reserved his rights, arguing that South should have told him that North could be this weak for his bid.

After AK of clubs lead and a heart switch, East took two top hearts and switched back to a club. West found himself endplayed and eventually returned the thirteenth club, which South ruffed high in dummy, discarding his diamond loser for three down.

This was a good score for NS against a row of -650s, so they did not persue their case. If they had lost 800 against best defence, would you allow West's double to stand?

EW were not finished. East claimed that South had misinformed him about the strength of North's hand by intimating that they do not

play "Truscott" in this situation. Had he been correctly informed he would have bid 5H.

East agreed with South afterwards that he should have asked for an explanation of the 4S call, rather than asking whether it was natural, but nonetheless felt misinformed. NS play pre-emptive raises of major suits in competitive auctions, although South did not know this as "Truscott". South is well aware of the need for full disclosure of agreements, but was a little confused by the way East phrased his question. (East seems to think that "natural" precludes "pre-emptive".) He felt it was a matter of general bridge knowledge that a raise to 4M by a passed hand is a pre-emptive bid, and didn't really see what else he could have disclosed.

East's parting shot was to say that South either had an agreement that North could bid this way on three points, in which case it should have been disclosed, or that it was a psyche in which case he wanted it recorded as such.

Both parties are still on speaking terms, but can anyone say anything to calm the troubled waters?

James

AlanW

Re: Incomplete disclosure or psyche? (15:46:32
WedMar 19 2003)

Reply

There are two completely separate issues here - incomplete disclosure and unauthorised information (UI).

First, did South explain North's 4S bid correctly? In my view this depends on what alternatives were available. If north has other ways of showing a raise with more high-card strength, eg via 2N or a cue-bid, then I think East is entitled to know this, however obscure his question (like South, I have never heard of such arrangements being described as Truscott, although I have played them myself for many years). If N's bid is simply two-way and can be bid either to make or as an advance sacrifice then I don't think East really needs any more explanation than he got.

If NS did have other ways to raise here and one rules that this implies incomplete disclosure, it is also vital to consider whether EW have been damaged by it. I will leave others to try to judge that at this stage, since I cannot work out the EW hands from the original posting. However, it's not immediately obvious that knowing N was pre-emptive rather than simply that the call might be based on

either a big fit or high cards (surely the normal expectation of 'natural') would make that much difference to the decision East faced, whatever his hand.

On the issue of UI, it's clear West had this from the hesitations and the questions. So it's simply a question of whether West had logical alternatives to his double (and his 2D overcall) that he might have selected if he had not had UI, instead of the calls he did make. I won't try to suggest whether or not this might be the case without seeing the exact hand!

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host


Reply

Re: Incomplete disclosure or psyche? (16:11:27
WedMar 19 2003)

I have always liked puzzles! 

J 9 x x x
x x
Q x x
x x x
K x x x
x A K Q J x x
K J 10 x x x x x
A K Q x x x x
A Q 10 x
10 x x x
A x
J x x

Let me presume that the first four lines are the North hand and the last four the South hand. So the middle four are the West/East hands. Look at the hearts: x A K Q J x x

Presumably that is x for West and AKQJxx for East. But East did not open [goodness knows why not ], so all the other honours must be West. Also we know West's longest suit was diamonds since he overcalled in it. So now we know that the hands were [guessing how many small cards were where]:

J9xxx
xx
Qxx
xxx

Kx

xx

x	AKQJxx
KJTxxx	xx
AKQx	xxx
	AQTx
	Txxx
	Ax
	Jxx

May I remind all our readers that the software in this forum strips spaces? Please use dots, or the Pre formatting code, and it is best to preview your post.

Now let's get down to the query. East asked whether 4 \square was natural. Since it was natural, South answered "Yes". East having got the correct answer duly passed.

Ignoring the fact that despite 38 years on the tournament circuit I have never heard of a convention called Truscott in this position I presume that East is moaning because he wanted to know whether 4 \square was weak, which is of course the standard meaning of the bid in England. So why did he not ask that?

As for West's double, I would disallow that routinely. He has unauthorised information, pass is a logical alternative, so a ruling 4 \square -3, no double, seems fair.

South's comments were 100% right. 4 \square was natural, natural does include pre-emptive, that is the normal way to play it.

When we come to East's "parting shot" I might get a little stronger as a TD. His comments are unnecessary and almost offensive. He has got a bad board through his own efforts by bad bidding, failure to understand simple English and presumptions that his opponents are playing something strange despite evidence they are not. To blame someone else is not acceptable.

As for calming the troubled waters, I would not bother. someone should teach East not to blame others when he makes a mistake.

\square :smile:

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
 Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

RMB



19 posts
 bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Incomplete disclosure or psyche? (16:19:00
 WedMar 19 2003)

From the posting, I can't tell what the hand was. I guess?

```

      J 9 x x x
      x x
      Q x x
      x x x

K x x
x
K J 10 x x
A K Q x

      A Q 10 x
      10 x x x
      A x
      J x x

N      E      S      W
P      P(1) 1S    2D
4S      P(2) P      X
P      P      P
    
```

(1) Long hesitation. East decided this was too good for 2H, not good enough for 1H.

(2) East asked South if 4S was natural. A puzzled South said yes. East said that he had asked because some players play Truscott in this situation. He again took a long time before passing.

James asks: Both parties are still on speaking terms, but can anyone say anything to calm the troubled waters?

East should be encouraged to ask what bids mean, not ask "is it natural" when he means "does that a high card raise", and not to use names of conventions in questions.

South should be encouraged to fully describe bids, even when asked closed questions; but its hard not to say yes to "is it natural" and no to "do you play Truscott in this situation".

Damaged parties should call the director at the time - then they can whine about it in the bar as well. :biggrin:

Why should East-West think 4S is a psyche, as far as I can tell North-South never said that 4S could a 3 count with 5 spades.

James Vickers



10 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Incomplete disclosure or psyche? (19:15:01
WedMar 19 2003)

Country: UK

Quote: David

May I remind all our readers that the software in this forum strips spaces? Please use dots, or the Pre formatting code, and it is best to preview your post.

Sorry, I tried the formatting code last time and it didn't work. Perhaps I'll try the dots next time. You were spot on with the hands.

Quote: David

...despite 38 years on the tournament circuit I have never heard of a convention called Truscott in this position...

I know Truscott as a conventional defence to strong club openers, and Crowhurst as a conventional 2C enquiry to a 1NT rebid. However I used to play in Germany, where Truscott is indeed used to describe a system of pre-emptive raises of 1M, and Crowhurst as a defence to 1NT (similar to what we call Capalletti or Pottage, and definately not invented or championed by Eric C). This was a source of much confusion until I cottoned on to this.

Quote: AlanW

If north has other ways of showing a raise with more high-card strength, eg via 2N or a cue-bid, then I think East is entitled to know this...If N's bid is simply two-way and can be bid either to make or as an advance sacrifice then I don't think East really needs any more explanation than he got.

NS use 2NT as a good raise to 3M, but not after 3rd hand openers. South was not sure whether he would expect North's sort of hand for the bid - it happened to work out well because of the misdefence, but could have led to -800 and a bottom. However, it isn't far out and could easily have had a little more shape and a little less strength, e.g.:

10 9 x x x x / x x / x / x x x x

which I think would be everyone's idea of a raise to 4S, so I don't think East should complain that he was misinformed as to high card strength.

I am reassured that no-one is calling for the psyche book to be dusted off.

James

**Bridge Center
on Sheridan**



3 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Incomplete disclosure or psyche? (19:55:51
WedMar 19 2003)

Country: USA

Was there unauthorized information?

Yes. West has UI from E's hesitation at his first turn, and his question at his second turn.

Does West have a logical alternative?

Double is reasonable, but, IMO, pass is certainly a LA to double.

Does the UI suggest one call over another?

Yes. The UI suggests East has something, hence double is more likely to be successful.

I would adjust to 4S - 3 (undoubled).

And East's "I would have bid 5H" is ridiculous.
He could have opened 1H or 2H or 3H, but chose to pass.
Now he's going to bid 5H opposite a partner who has done nothing more than make a 2D overcall? I doubt it.

I have never heard this 4S called "Truscott".

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

Ed



173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Incomplete disclosure or psyche? (21:36:30
FriMar 21 2003)

I'm afraid I have no sympathy for East. And I agree completely with David and Jim - adjust to 4S - 3, undoubled.

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)] [[Print](#)] [[Send](#)] [[Watch](#)] [[<](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]

1 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 1 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: [FrancesHinden](#).

[Register](#) :: [Log in](#)

The time is now 14:52:37 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

[top](#)

[Thread Index](#) :: [FAQ's](#) :: [Main Menu](#) :: [Posting Hints](#) :: [Emoticon Key](#) :: [Search](#)
[David's Lawspage](#) :: [EBU](#) :: [ACBL](#) :: [WBF](#)

Legend :: Read Topic :: Unread Topic

[Email](#)

Help | **Full Format: ON :: OFF** | **Text: ON :: OFF** | **Email Status**

Val



17 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Transfers (13:01:03 ThuMar 20 2003)

The bidding goes 1NT - Pass - 2 - (Announced as transfer) - Pass - 2NT - Pass - ??? What can the 2 bidder legally do?

RMB



19 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Transfers (13:19:00 ThuMar 20 2003)

As far as I can see, the 2D bidder (the responder) is under no legal constraint and can make any call they like.

I guess the responder does not have an agreement about 2NT. It might be appropriate to alert 2NT and, if asked, say "our agreement is that partner would bid 2H, we have no agreement about 2NT in this sequence".

JimO



175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Transfers (14:23:05 ThuMar 20 2003)

Country: USA

What did the 2D bidder intend 2D as?

If he intended it as a transfer, then the 1NT opener is superaccepting, showing a maximum 1NT with hearts.

If he intended it as a diamond signoff, then he must assume that opener is superaccepting, showing a maximum with diamonds.

If he intended it as forcing stayman, he must assume nothing other than opener has no 4-cad major of 5-card minor.

In any case, the 2D bidder must not base his bidding on opener's announcement.

Read the footnote to Law 75.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

Val



17 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Transfers (20:50:32 ThuMar 20 2003)

Thanks for your replies. responder meant 2 Diamonds as transfer and that is what partner announced.

The opener held:



K J x



K x



K J x x



A J x x x

Super accept is not part of their game.

Responder held:



x x x



Q x x x x



x x x



x x

Responder did not feel like bidding 3 - Was told that he could not and as I thought he could if he wanted to; so decided to ask.

[1 edits; Last edit by Val at 20:51:35 Thu Mar 20 2003]

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Transfers (23:04:51 ThuMar 20 2003)

2

was announced as a transfer and was meant as a transfer.

Therefore responder has no difficulty: there is no problem from UI, for example.

Opener now rebids 2NT which is not part of their system. Since there is no UI, no other problem, responder can bid anything he likes. Why ever not? :rolleyes:

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>

Liverpool, England, UK

http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Multi 2D (01:01:50 ThuJan 30 2003)

This post was copied from the former IBLF site on Bravenet.

Here is my question on Multi 2D

Background

I live in Spain and play mainly in Europe (France & Spain but not in the UK)

Is it permitted to play the Multi 2D with the following 2 elements:

1) Weak 2 in either Major 5 or 6 cards. If only 5 cards will be accompanied by a 5 card minor suit 5/10 hcp

2) Balanced hand 21/23 hcp

If this is not permitted is it possible to play the Multi 2D in a format which varies with the vuln.? Ex:

Non Vul

1) Weak 2 in either Major - 6 card suit 5/10 hcp

2) Bal 21/23

Vul

1) Weak 2 in either Major - 5 Card suit with 5 card Minor 5/10

2) Bal 21/23

Thanks for your help

Paul Fenn

Ed **Re: Multi 2[d]** (04:51:07 ThuFeb 6 2003)


173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

this depends on the convention regs where you play (France and Spain, you said), and I'm afraid I don't know what those are. I'll have a look on the web, but it may take a day or two.

nnnnne_trepide **Re: Multi 2[d]** (11:22:25 ThuMar 13 2003)

Reply

when the basic legal requirements essential to an opening hand were established it was found that the multi 2D did not meet this criteria but it's use was so widespread that an exception was made.

to include additional configurations it is necessary that these meet the permitted criteria.

for example a 4-4-4-1 shape with 17 high card points may be used within the 2D framework as it meets the legal requirements of a total of 25 "opening points".

this point range is required because in the given example no anchor suit is given.

this is not the case with a 5/5 in a major (which major?) and minor suit simply because it's opening point structure has a maximum of only 20 ops with no anchor suit identified - "anchor" being an identifiable suit.

such a bid would be legal if the bidder held 15 hcps.

it is legal to bid 2h with 5h and a 5 card minor and 5 hps as the heart suit is identified therefore the op range reduces to 15.

the definition of opening points is-

the sum of the number of cards held in your 2 longest suits and your high card points.

a 1 level bid requires 18 ops.

2 level 15 ops.

3 level 15 ops or 12 ops if the hand contains a 7 card suit

you may deviate from this occasionally but must not have an agreement to do so.

in each of the above it is mandatory that an anchor suit be identified.

it is not necessary to identify a suit if your opening points add to 25, for example a game force bid of 2C should show these 25 ops.

in the case of no trumps a balanced 1nt bid should show the 18 ops mentioned but may be unbalanced if holding the 25 ops mentioned.

an opening 1nt bid is illegal if the shape is 4-3-3-3 with only 10 hcps.

confused?

Ed <hr/> <div><input type="checkbox"/></div> 173 posts Forum Host Reply	Re: Multi 2[d] (07:16:17 WedMar 19 2003) <hr/> Yes. Is this applicable in Spain, or in France, or in both?

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)] [[Print](#)] [[Send](#)] [[Watch](#)] [[<](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]

1 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 1 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: [FrancesHinden](#).

[Register](#) :: [Log in](#)

The time is now 14:53:47 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

top ☐

**[Thread Index](#) :: [FAQ's](#) :: [Main Menu](#) :: [Posting Hints](#) :: [Emoticon Key](#) :: [Search](#)
[David's Lawspage](#) :: [EBU](#) :: [ACBL](#) :: [WBF](#)**

Legend :: ☐ **Read Topic ::** ☐ **Unread Topic**

Email

Help | **Full Format:** **ON** :: **OFF** | **Text:** **ON** :: **OFF** | **Email Status**

Hiroko Plant

Reply

What I should have done (16:26:05 TueJan 28 2003)

In a club game, in EBU-land, in fourth seat after the auction P-P-1 , I forget that I and my regular partner are now playing Michaels cue-bids and bid 2 on:

AJx

AQ

Kx

AQxxxx

Partner obediently alerts this, explains it as Michaels for the majors, and promptly bids 4

Clearly his alert and explanation are UI, so I try to work out what he can hold on a no-UI auction, and what I should, ethically, do.

He ought to have at least 7 , to set the suit this unequivocally opposite what might be a big 1 or 2 suiter.

He might have a truly awful hand (but why 4 and not 2 ?) or 8-10 ish (but why didn't he bid on the first round? We have a number of long major suit bids of varying strength)

Nothing quite makes sense, but I don't think I'm allowed unequivocally to conclude that I've stuffed up; both options are the kind of hand where partner might muck around.

Opposite the first hand, the only sane option is a pass; opposite the second (and some varieties of the first), 6 or 6NT might well be

on, so I could bid one or other directly, or invite with 5 or a 5

cue-bid. Rule out passing 4 ex hypothesi as the thing I'd like to do, given the UI, and I'm left with bidding one of two slams or inviting slam in spades. In the end, I bid 6NT, pretty much at random (and partly because I don't want to give partner a problem opposite the longest hesitation ever by making an invitational bid...)

Question is, what should I have done, ethically? I think it's a problem worth submitting to this forum; as a player with no directing training or experience, I find it hard to work out the correct action in these situations and an example might help.

Robin Barker

Reply

Re: What I should have done (12:11:59 WedJan 29 2003)

Your logical alternatives are probably Pass, and almost any bid from 4NT to 6NT. Partner could be KQxxxxx Kxxx x x, which he might not preempt in second seat; we may not have two diamond losers, even if partner is declarer.

Any bid from 4NT to 6S partner will probably taken as agreeing spades, while Pass and 6NT are attempts to recover from a wheel coming off. Because the UI tells you a wheel has come off, the UI suggests Pass and 6NT over the others and so (IMHO) you can not Pass or bid 6NT (sorry). If this were a genuine sequence, I guess you would bid 5C or 5S, both of which sound like you want a diamond control, and you would probably play in 5S.


bluejak




434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: What I should have done (12:45:28 WedJan 29 2003)

While I agree with Robin that your 6NT has probably misjudged it slightly you have done the most important thing: you have done your best not to take advantage of the UI. As a player if you always do your best in that direction then your ethics are pure despite the occasional time when the TD or Appeals Committee adjust your score. 

On the actual hand he might have short spades, which you know because of the UI, so you must take no action that tries to get you out of spades. 

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

Hiroko Plant

Re: What I should have done (17:10:15 WedJan 29 2003)

Reply

Hadn't pictured him with short spades, even on the basis of the UI (I think I thought bidding 4 \square as a passed hand opposite a Michaels bid meant he must think we had a huge fit on, so 43 at worst in the actual case). So thank you for making that point.

The actual outcome was 6 NT 4 off NV on a misdefence (pd had Qxx in \square and 5 Spades to the K but both black suits broke horribly. 4 \square 2 off was the normal contract, and any of the actions except a pass would have produced the same well-deserved bottom in practice.

ne_trepide

Re: What I should have done (08:19:09 TueFeb 11 2003)

Reply

the whole purpose of a pre-empive bid as you describe is in fact a declaration as to "this is the location at which this contract should be played."

i feel sorry for your confusion holding 20 points but you must trust your partner's judgement, even if it is based upon flawed information, especially in view of the fact that the original, and prime error, was yours.

you are now in uncharted territory and should try to get out for a plus score.

you have no choice but to grit your teeth and pass and then apologise for your slip.

partner will understand and the relationship will be stronger for your trust.

bluejak




434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: What I should have done (12:47:11 TueFeb 11 2003)

You have UI [unauthorised information] from partner's explanation [and alert]. No, you do not pass as the best way out of this mess - that is illegal. You must make every effort not to gain from knowledge of the UI.

You know his bid is pre-emptive **because** of the UI, so you should not treat it as pre-emptive.

It is important when in receipt of UI that you make every effort to take no advantage. If everyone did this it would be a far pleasanter game. 

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

ne_trepide

Reply

Re: What I should have done (10:34:39 ThuMar 13 2003)

david a pass here by the michael's cue bidder is not taking advantage of UI but merely suffering the penalty that ineviatably follows a systemic bidding error.
the poster of this thread went on to state (after my response) that 4s was the common contract and that is where they ended.
what do you suggest?
he now bid on to a higher level contract?
he would not have needed his partner's explanation to realise his bidding error - the jump to 4s would have revealed the situation quite clearly.
and as i say - what contract do you suggest they play in - pray tell!

mycroft



67 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: What I should have done (16:57:27 ThuMar 13 2003)

I'm not David, but I hope I'm allowed to grab some of his flak...

Quote: Guest at 10:34:39 Thu Mar 13 2003

david a pass here by the michael's cue bidder is not taking advantage of UI but merely suffering the penalty that ineviatably follows a systemic bidding error.

First a side complaint - not pointed solely at you, I see this **all the time**, and it bugs me. The guy's name is Mike Michaels. It's a Michaels cuebid. Nobody plays Berge'n raises, nobody should make a Michael's cuebid. (Yes, of course my name is Michael, why do you ask?) Having said that...

Let's look at this. P-P-1D-2D; P-4S-P-. You have AJx AQ Kx AQxxxx, a 20-count. Opener has 12 or so plus, partner has 7 spades; unless you're really unlucky, it'll include the SK or SQ. Yeah, it's preemptive, but if he has **anything** else to go with his 7 spades, you have a good shot at slam - you really going to tell me that finesses are going to be off?

Quote:

the poster of this thread went on to state (after my response) that 4s was the common contract and that is where they ended.
what do you suggest?

Irrelevant. At the other tables, it probably went P-P-1D-X; P-1S-P-2C; P-something-P-4S. If you get to 4S legally, pass is perfectly legal; unfortunately, here, you don't have that luxury. You've misbid, your partner has woken you to your misbid, you must bid on as if you still don't know you've misbid.

What I suggest? Especially if you play RKC, 4NT. And when I get one keycard, 6S. If you get none, ok, 5S - I can't reasonably force you to bid slam off two keys, especially when I'm planning on using the SK as one of my finesse entries.

Quote:

he would not have needed his partner's explanation to realise his bidding error - the jump to 4s would have revealed the situation quite clearly.

That's what they **always** say. Wouldn't you bid 4S opposite a strong takeout with KTxxxxx x Qxx xx? or K8xxxxx Kx xx xx? Or KTxxxxx xxxx -- xx, even? "Partner, I don't really care what you have, I can only play in spades, but game's on."

You say earlier:

Quote:

you are now in uncharted territory and should try to get out for a plus score.

No, you are not in uncharted territory. You must work out what 4S would be opposite a strong takeout - I think my hands above are reasonable - and bid accordingly.

You are not allowed to "try to get out with a plus score"; you must "carefully avoid taking **any advantage** that might accrue to his side" (Law 73C, my emphasis). If you can prove that nobody knows what a jump to game opposite a strong takeout is, fine. But you'll have to prove that nobody knows what P-P-1D-X; P-1S-P-2C; P-4S is, either (that's how the moderns would bid the "same" hand). Good luck!

Quote:

and as i say - what contract do you suggest they play in - pray tell!

With my partners (though I haven't played cuebid=strong T/O my entire life, except the two or three times my partner and I have decided to be silly and play "1950's Goren") 5S or 6S, depending on the response to 4NT. Yeah, partner could have xxxxxxxx x xx xxx, but even in the real world I'm not giving up on slam because of the

few times 5S will go down! And when I'm restricted to not passing unless (GB)it's a 70% action/(ACBL)few to none of my peers would do anything else - it's automatic.

It's going to get me a bottom? Well, I should really know my system when I walk in, no?

Michael.

ne_trepide



14 posts

bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: What I should have done (01:48:18 FriMar 14 2003)

i could not disagree more with your comments (should i say i could not be more disagreeable?).

the jump to 4s is certainly pre-emptive and the very nature of a pre-emptive jump to game is a signal to partner that this is where the contract should rest.

as to your statement that partner has realised your 2d bid is not Michaels i cannot fathom why you say this - is it not feasible that the response indicates long spades and no points opposite 5 spades and good points?

obviously responder thinks game is on but it is a judgement call by the Michaels cue bidder as to whether or not to proceed further.

this call has nothing whatsoever to do with UI from any source.

they reached the common contract by erroneous bidding and should learn from that experience but the jump to 4s is more likely to signal a weak (points) hand than a strong one.

pass is the only sensible (and honest) rebid and hope that partner has the weaker option (as his bid indicates) than the stronger one that might suggest a slam is on.

their penalty, which luckily for them does not exist, is that they stood the chance - by pre-empting and then passing - of missing a higher contract.

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: What I should have done (02:38:48 FriMar 14 2003)

Mycroft seems to have explained it quite well - perhaps better than Sherlock would have.

You bid 2 thinking it was strong, and you have unauthorised information that says your partner has taken it as Michaels. Despite various arguments of how to get away with this, you **must** avoid taking advantage - I say "must" both because the Laws require it, and because you will never get real pleasure from a game where you get an illegal advantage.

The best reason for passing 4 is because you know **from the unauthorised information** that partner might not have length in spades. Since that is the information you must not use therefore you must not pass 4 .

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

HenryS

Reply

Re: What I should have done (03:29:25 FriMar 14 2003)

Quote: bluejak at 02:38:48 Fri Mar 14 2003

Mycroft seems to have explained it quite well - perhaps better than Sherlock would have.

You bid 2 thinking it was strong, and you have unauthorised information that says your partner has taken it as Michaels. Despite various arguments of how to get away with this, you **must** avoid taking advantage - I say "must" both because the Laws require it, and because you will never get real pleasure from a game where you get

an illegal advantage.

The best reason for passing 4[□] is because you know **from the unauthorised information** that partner might not have length in spades. Since that is the information you must not use therefore you must not pass 4[□].

I find it interesting that Mycroft and David, taking the same position regarding the UI from the alert, suggest different rebids by the QBidder. Mycroft argues that pass is no longer an option because bidding on is a logical alternative and hence suggests that qbidder bid 4nt=rkc if that is available. David suggests, unless I misread him, that the safest action is to pass 4s.

Taken together, this apparent difference of opinion is the strongest argument against the attempt some US experts are making to replace the appeals committee system with a system in which the director is the final judge of damage and adjustment. Personally, I think that Mycroft's argument is more compelling than David's, and so I would rule in favor of bidding on.

But it must be better for a committee consensus to develop instead of the opinion of one person.

One additional point: in the US, qbids are NOT alertable, being considered instead to be 'self-alerting.' Of course, if an opponent asks what the qbid means, qbidder is in the same position vis-a-vis UI.

mycroft



67 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: What I should have done (18:03:52 FriMar 14 2003)

Quote: ne_trepide

the jump to 4s is certainly pre-emptive and the very nature of a pre-emptive jump to game is a signal to partner that this is where the contract should rest.

So you always obey your partner's signoffs with an unlimited hand? You must miss a lot of good games and slams. Remember, I said **unlimited**.

Please go back and tell me that you would not bid 4 \square with the hands I presented, opposite a strong takeout of 1 \square .

I was playing EHAA one day and held Qxxxx Kxxxxx x x. Partner opened 1 \square (13+, 4+ hearts, absolutely unlimited). I, like everyone else here would have, responded 4 \square , preemptive, signoff. Guess what? Partner bid 6 \square . If I had been xxxx Kxxxxx xx x, he would have made it. He had a beautiful 29-count, but couldn't pitch enough spades from dummy to avoid a loser.

Back to this hand, though. **You can make slam** opposite many hands partner would bid 4 \square on (if he knew you had a strong takeout, rather than bidding as if it were Michaels). Your hand is that good, and it improves that much by the knowledge that partner is one-suiter spades. I've got no problem with you passing 4 \square **with no unauthorized information** - if your system really was cuebid=strong takeout, and it was explained as such (or, in the ACBL, not asked about) - but I think it's losing bridge.

But you probably can't make slam opposite most hands partner would bid 4 \square on opposite a Michaels cuebid (for the key reason that you don't have a 10-card spade fit, and those other two cards of partner's are probably red). So, the Laws put you in the following situation:

- You may not be "woken up" by partner's explanations - it's Unauthorized Information to you. Even if you worked it out on your own, case history is that partner's explanation has pooched you,

because you can't prove it wasn't the UI that brought the misbid to your attention.

- When in possession of UI, you "must carefully avoid taking any advantage that might accrue to his side" (L73C), and this means you "may not choose from among logical alternative actions one that could demonstrably have been suggested over another by the extraneous information" (L16A). Therefore,

- Whether you would have passed 4 \square or not, with no UI, looking for slam **is** a definite option, and since pass is the logical alternative suggested by the UI, you can't pass. As Robin Barker said very early in this thread, the same thing goes for a direct 6NT, as well.

Frankly, if I as TD let you pass 4 \square , it's because you have convinced me you are such a novice that you literally cannot see how most hands with the \square K to 7 and almost any outside honour won't give you at least a 50% slam. And therefore, looking for slam is not something "some of your peers would consider, and at least one of them would actually have done."

And even that may not save you outside the ACBL, where the definition of logical alternative is different!

Quote:

as to your statement that partner has realised your 2d bid is not Michaels I cannot fathom why you say this - is it not feasible that the response indicates long spades and no points opposite 5 spades and good points?

That's **exactly** what it says. Or opposite 5 spades and few points, if I'm playing :-).

But you are not allowed to know that!

Sorry to shout, but this is the key point. You have information that partner thought you has 5-5 in the majors. This information was acquired through something other than his calls and plays, specifically, by his Alert and explanation of the 2 \square bid. Therefore, **you can't use it** - you must continue to bid as if your agreement is what you thought it was when you bid 2 \square , that partner knows it, and that partner bid 4 \square opposite an unlimited hand too strong to either double or overcall.

If you still don't understand that, and I realize I don't always explain well, especially in a written medium, get a local TD to sit down with you and explain it until you do understand. If you can't understand your obligations under L73C, even after a TD has patiently explained it and shown you the Laws - please stop playing bridge.

Quote:

obviously responder thinks game is on but it is a judgement call by the Michaels cue bidder as to whether or not to proceed further.

What Michaels cuebidder? I see no Michaels cuebidder here. I see someone who made a strong takeout of diamonds, and whose partner bid 4 \square in response. Ok, so partner explained it as a Michaels cuebid, and the system agreement is that it **is** a Michaels cuebid, but I've forgotten this when I bid 2 \square - and I am required, by the most stringent wording the Laws permit of, to avoid any action that is based on partner thinking I have a Michaels cuebid.

Quote:

[the 4S call] has nothing whatsoever to do with UI from any source.

That is certainly true. **Partner** has no UI whatsoever (unless you groaned or grimaced when the explanation hit the table). Partner is allowed to do whatever he wants. But you aren't.

Quote:

they reached the common contract by erroneous bidding and should learn from that experience but the jump to 4s is more likely to signal a weak (points) hand than a strong one.

I showed you three hands, ranging from 3 to 6 HCP, that make slam odds-on. They certainly can make slam opposite a "weak (points) hand". Give him KTxxxxx xx -- Kxxx and I'd lay good odds on partner making *7*. (yeah, this hand is not likely, opps would have bid something with 11 diamonds. But still).

They have reached the common contract, by erroneous bidding. However, because of UI transmitted to the strong hand, they just can't stop there. Sorry.

Michael.

mycroft



67 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: What I should have done (18:19:16 FriMar 14 2003)

Quote: Guest

Quote: bluejak

Mycroft
seems to
have
explained it
quite well -
perhaps
better than
Sherlock
would have.
:)

Why thanks :-)

Quote: Guest

Quote: bluejak

You bid 2 ☐
thinking it
was strong,
and you
have
unauthorised
information
that says
your partner
has taken it
as Michaels.
Despite
various
arguments
of how to
get away
with this,
you **must**
avoid taking
advantage -
I say "must"
both
because the
Laws
require it,
and because
you will
never get
real
pleasure
from a
game where
you get an
illegal
advantage.



The best
reason for
passing 4 ☐
is because
you know
**from the
unauthorised
information**


that partner
might not
have length
in spades.
Since that is
the
information
you must
not use
therefore
you must
not pass 4



I find it interesting that Mycroft and David, taking the same position regarding the UI from the alert, suggest different rebids by the QBidder. Mycroft argues that pass is no longer an option because bidding on is a logical alternative and hence suggests that qbidder bid 4nt=rkc if that is available. David suggests, unless I misread him, that the safest action is to pass 4s.

Well, yes, but no :-)

We all agree that the safest action is to pass 4 . In fact, we all - even David and I - **want** to pass 4 . But we don't do it for the same reason we don't break into 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and sleep in the Lincoln Bedroom - because we aren't legally allowed to.

Read David's last paragraph again - it tells you why you can't pass 4 . David, here, doesn't say what you should do instead; just that you can't pass.

I don't know what David would do - I'm sure he'd tell you, and he has a few more years of high-level bridge experience than I, so he's more likely to be right. Of course, if he would bid RKC too, then of course he's right :-)

Quote:

Taken together, this apparent difference of opinion is the strongest argument against the attempt some US experts are making to replace the appeals committee system with a system in which the director is the final judge of damage and adjustment.

Well, no :-). I don't know what to say about Director panels - I disagreed with them when they came in, but looking at the casebooks since then, I think they do at least as good a job as the Appeals committees - in key, because they always check with expert players or appellants' peers (whatever is appropriate, often both) before making a **bridge judgement** - and sometimes Appeals committees don't check well enough with the TDs before making a **laws judgement**.

I definately do not agree with abolishing/ignoring L92 :-)

Michael.

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply


Re: What I should have done (23:30:58 FriMar 14 2003)

Quote: Henry S

I find it interesting that Mycroft and David, taking the same position regarding the UI from the alert, suggest different rebids by the QBidder. Mycroft argues that pass is no longer an option because bidding on is a logical alternative and hence suggests that qbidder bid 4nt=rkc if that is available. David suggests, unless I misread him, that the safest action is to pass 4

Sure I did, but re-read the bit you quoted of what I said:

Quote: bluejak

Since that is the information you must not use therefore you must not pass 4 .

Mycroft and I are in complete agreement. .

Quote: Henry S

Taken together, this apparent difference of opinion is the strongest argument against the attempt some US experts are making to replace the appeals committee system with a system in which the director is the final judge of damage and adjustment. Personally, I think that Mycroft's argument is more compelling than David's, and so I would rule in favor of bidding on.

But it must be better for a committee consensus to develop instead of the opinion of one person.

Ignoring the fact that there was no difference of opinion, there may be a case for Appeals Committees with incompetent Directors. But assuming competent ones, what you say is wrong: judgement rulings are **never** decided by one person. It is routine to consult one more person as a minimum. In North American tournaments it is normal to discuss amongst a larger number of Directors.

Furthermore, there is a growing view that at least one top player should be consulted as well.

If Appeals Committees were dispensed with I am sure that regulating authorities would tighten up the rules for making sure that Director's rulings include adequate consensus.

Appeals Committees take up a lot of time. Apart from anything else, do players want to wait around for an hour or so after the end of a session? My view is that Director's judgement rulings in major events are probably 70% correct, and Appeals Committees decisions are 80% to 85% correct. Is it really worth all that trouble

and time for the 10% to 15% increase?

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

HenryS

Re: What I should have done (18:22:47 SatMar 15 2003)

Reply

Mycroft/David:

You are both completely correct. I read David's post too quickly and misread him. I apologize for the error.

It has been an interesting conversation about the value/benefit of abolishing appeals committees. Personally, I happen to like Rubens's view that it wouldn't be wise, but then again I must state that, as far as I know, Rubens is not a currently active director (or even tournament participant), and if that is the case, he opens himself to the criticism of being an ivory tower observer.

Partly, though, my disinclination to abolish appeals committees has to do with the fact that your best directors would presumably be national level directors, and at the highest national championship level one might want the 'error factor' reduced as much as possible. Thus, as someone who will likely never experience the thrill of winning a national (US) championship, I could be persuaded to accept a compromise that for open/national championships there must be an appeals committee procedure in place, whereas at the restricted/national championship level and lower, directors can be empowered to make the final decision.

As to whether this sort of compromise could ever be countenanced by the laws, I am completely uninformed.

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)]

[[Print](#)]

[[Send](#)]

[[Watch](#)]

[[<](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]

Guest

what would you rule? (14:09:32 TueFeb 25 2003)

Reply

Country: England

North opens 1NT, 12-14

East doubles with spade KJTxxx, H A, D AKT, C JTxx

South bids 2D, not alerted, with five hearts and a 4 count

West bids 3D, having six diamonds and a nine count

North passes

East bids 3S

South passes

West bids 3NT

North passes

East bids 4S, End

Result 4S-1

NS dispute agreement as to whether they are playing exit transfers, convention card very poor. EW want adjustment.


bluejak

Re: what would you rule? (17:01:24 TueFeb 25 2003)



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

If the Director cannot determine what the system is then he is instructed to rule misinformation. So there appears to be misinformation here, whether 2  was alerted or not.

But where is the damage? East-West seem to have reached game with a fair amount of distribution, an excellent suit, and 25 points. What would be different if they had been informed otherwise?

I cannot see any reason to adjust.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

JimO



175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: what would you rule? (22:59:50 TueFeb 25 2003)

Country: USA

I completely agree with David.

The footnote to Law 75 states:

"...the Director is to presume Mistaken Explanation, rather than Mistaken Bid, in the absence of evidence to the contrary..."

However, misinformation is not in itself enough to warrant an adjustment. There must be damage, and the damage must have been caused, at least in part, by the misinformation.

What would E-W have done differently if the 2D bid had been properly alerted?

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

Guest

Reply

Re: what would you rule? (09:19:58 WedFeb 26 2003)

Thankyou David/Jim for your prompt replies, which confirm my telephone ruling for a recent match played privately. A great facility for which I intend to register and participate in future.

ne_trepide



14 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: what would you rule? (02:00:05 FriMar 14 2003)

surely west was aware that the 2d bid by south was a transfer despite the lack of an alert.

if he was not aware surely he would have enquired as to the meaning of the bid - this may create a problem however as to enquire then bid the suit might open the door for some to claim UI, though i feel he has the right to enquire.

the diamond bid by west regardless of and enquiry must show a suit.

i'm more inclined to believe the contract was lost by misplay than by the lack of an alert since declarer knew wher all the hcps were.

no adjustment but a lecture to north to smarten up his act and learn his responses with interference after a no trump opening.

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: what would you rule? (02:43:46 FriMar 14 2003)

Why should the TD being giving the players lectures? If the TD were to lecture every pair that forgets his system in an event then he would be giving at least ten lectures for every thirteen table section. It hardly seems the TD's job.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)] [[Print](#)] [[Send](#)] [[Watch](#)] [[<](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]

1 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 1 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: [FrancesHinden](#).

[Register](#) :: [Log in](#)

The time is now 14:55:05 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

top

**[Thread Index](#) :: [FAQ's](#) :: [Main Menu](#) :: [Posting Hints](#) :: [Emoticon Key](#) :: [Search](#)
[David's Lawspage](#) :: [EBU](#) :: [ACBL](#) :: [WBF](#)**

Legend :: **Read Topic** :: **Unread Topic**

[Email](#)

Help | **Full Format: ON :: OFF** | **Text: ON :: OFF** | **Email Status**

jediman2002



7 posts
bridgetalk member



[Reply](#)

Howell movements (11:25:11 TueFeb 4 2003)

I wonder if anyone can help me please?

I want to be able to compose Howell movements from scratch, but I cannot find a formula or instruction about doing this. I know I can look up various publications to find movements already created, or I can look in my club's movements folder for ready-made movements. Somebody, somewhere, must have the answer about making them up instantly!

Jon

JimO



175 posts
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

Re: Howell movements (02:15:43 ThuFeb 6 2003)

I've compsed a few Howell movements in the past, but certainly not instantly!

The ACBL score has a large number of various movements.

Tell me what movement you're looking for, and maybe I can find it for you.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

Ed



173 posts
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

Re: Howell movements (04:30:26 ThuFeb 6 2003)

I think one of my books may have some information on this. I'll have to do a little research and get back to you.

jediman2002



7 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Howell movements (12:48:47 ThuFeb 6 2003)

Country: UK

I would surely appreciate it if you were able to find such information!

Jon

Ted Muller

Reply

Re: Howell movements (22:56:15 ThuMar 6 2003)

Country: USA

I have been constructing movements as a hobby for nearly forty years. I used some alternative movements at my own bridge clubs, and several are in use in Sacramento today. I could answer any questions regarding methods for devising Howells.

ted@winfirst.com

Ed



173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Howell movements (04:19:50 ThuMar 13 2003)

Country: USA

Ted,

What I think the original poster was looking for, and what I haven't found in my library yet, is a simple description of the basics of constructing a Howell movement, so that one could construct such a movement, for any number of tables, from first principles. If you could do that, it would be much appreciated. **:biggrin:**

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[**Get Email Advice of Replies**]

[**Print**]

[**Send**]

[**Watch**]

[**<**] [**Add a Reply**] [**>**]

al.ohana

2NT forcing (07:36:31 SatMar 1 2003)

Reply

Country: France

Hi all

I would like to have your opinion concerning a situation which is differently appreciated among Directors

N opens 2H weak, E pass, S bids 2NT alerted "forcing", W pass, N bids 3H, E pass, S thinks a little and pass, followed by W
Now S has nearly nothing apart Hearts, and E-W can make 3NT or 4S

When asked why he acts as if he has points, S says his partner never said he was strong, and he hesitates to decide stopping in 3H or continuing the preempt to 4H (NV against Vul)

What say the laws about that ? Ethically speaking, is it fair ?

Kind regards

Al. Ohana

henrys

Re: 2NT forcing (19:53:14 SatMar 1 2003)

Reply

Let me preface this by stating that I am neither a Director nor a common committee member.

I seem to recall a lengthy discussion in the Bridge World in which an individual took exactly the same action as your south, holding something akin to xxx; kxx; xx; xxxxx or the like. If my memory is correct, there were 3 possible solutions: (1) south had forgotten that they were playing weak2s and had given a negative response. If there is hard evidence that this is so - a prior board in the session was the bridge world's example - then the ruling would normally be bad luck, no adjustment. (2) south had a normal bridge problem that any reasonable person might take a moment or two to solve. Same ruling - bad luck, no adjustment. Clearly not the case here or in the BW's discussion. (3) south did not have a normal bridge problem. Ruling = damage plus adjustment.

However, the BW added a caveat: the damage would only have occurred at the hesitation over the 3h rebid. Would it be reasonable to assume that West would balance over this auction without hesitation with, say, xx; kjx; aqxx; kjxx once he decided that he could not take a call over the 2nt response WHICH WAS NOT AN INFRACTION BECAUSE NOT OUT OF TEMPO? If it is not reasonable to assume that a balancing call would be made, THEN most of the

damage to EW came as a consequence of the 2nt call, not the hesitation over the 3h rebid. Any adjustment would have to determine what damage resulted from the hesitation, and ignore what might of happened had west taken a call directly over 2nt.

Possibly someone more knowledgeable than I can cite chapter and verse from the BW issue in question.

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: 2NT forcing (17:09:12 MonMar 3 2003)

There are two possible infractions here so let us treat each one separately.

First is misinformation. There are a lot of players, especially in North America where this is a known problem that is not being dealt with satisfactorily, who know that a 2NT response is often made on a weak hand with a fit, but they do not tell the opponents this. That is misinformation.

In some cases they tell the opponents that 2NT is an enquiry but they do not mention whether it is strong or not. Good, experienced opponents realise it may be weak and pre-emptive: poor, inexperienced opponents expect it to be strong and so are misled.

It is important that players who play a 2NT response to a weak two as an enquiry make it clear to opponents whether it shows values or may be used as a pre-emptive manoeuvre.

So, in the current case, the first question is whether there was misinformation? Did the pair make it clear that 2NT might be weak? Of course, if they play it as showing values, and this was a psyche that is legitimate this time. However, if they often use it on a weak hand then the opponents should have had this information available.

If there was misinformation we consider damage. Would the next player have bid after 2 - 2NT? if so, we adjust.

Second, there is the question of the hesitation after 2 - 2NT - 3 - ?. The player said he was wondering whether to go on to 4 as a further pre-empt, which is complete codswallop. Before he bid 2NT he knew what he was doing on this hand, and to hesitate after the 3 rebid is clearly illegal. In tempo sensitive positions the Law requires the player not to act out of tempo if this misleads, and the

player certainly has done so.

So, if we believe that the next player might have protected then we adjust under Law 73F.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

Henrys

Re: 2NT forcing (16:38:37 TueMar 4 2003)

Reply

Quote: bluejak at 17:09:12 Mon Mar 3 2003

First is misinformation. There are a lot of players, especially in North America where this is a known problem that is not being dealt with satisfactorily, who know that a 2NT response is often made on a weak hand with a fit, but they do not tell the opponents this. That is misinformation.

In some cases they tell the opponents that 2NT is an enquiry but they do not mention whether it is strong or not. Good, experienced opponents realise it may be weak and pre-emptive: poor, inexperienced opponents expect it to be strong and so are misled.

It is important that players who play a 2NT response to a weak two as an enquiry make it clear to opponents whether it shows values or may be used as a pre-emptive manoeuvre.

David, a query:

Recent discussions in the bridge world editorial have raised a

question as to whether the act of asking a question can provide UI to the askers partner.

As a north american bridge player, would I be subject to giving UI were I always to ask, after the auction weak2-p-2nt "Can this bid be made on a weak hand with support"?

You are absolutely right in stating that this agreement, almost never explicit but a frequently suggested tactic in american bridge literature, is virtually NEVER made known to the opponents.

I suppose the argument could be made that because it is a frequently suggested tactic, experienced players should be aware of the possibility, but I don't know how that might affect the legal situation of asking my question.

Thanks in advance for the response.

Ed



173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: 2NT forcing (17:19:55 TueMar 4 2003)

Quote: Guest [Unregistered]

at 16:38:37 Tue Mar 4 2003]David,
a query:

Recent discussions in the bridge world editorial have raised a question as to whether the act of asking a question can provide UI to the askers partner.

As a north american bridge player, would I be subject to giving UI were I always to ask, after the auction weak2-p-2nt "Can this bid be made on a weak hand with support"?

You are absolutely right in stating that this agreement, almost never explicit but a frequently suggested tactic in american bridge literature, is virtually NEVER made known to the opponents.

I suppose the argument could be made that because it is a frequently

suggested tactic, experienced players should be aware of the possibility, but I don't know how that might affect the legal situation of asking my question.

ACBL regulations specify a couple of things wrt asking questions: (1) the proper way to ask is "Please explain". (2) **any** question from opponents should result in a full dump of partnership agreement and partnership experience, including inferences therefrom. So if in this situation you ask "Please explain", and they say "forcing" you say "is that the entirety of your partnership agreement and experience?" and if they aren't forthcoming, call the director. Who should not, btw, as some directors have done to me, ask you "what do you want to know?"

Partnership agreements **must** be disclosed [Law 75A]. Failure to do so should result, every time, in a procedural penalty, in addition to any score adjustment the law requires. [David may disagree with me here, but that is, according to my reading, what the law requires.]

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: 2NT forcing (23:48:37 TueMar 4 2003)

Quote: Ed

Partnership agreements must be disclosed [Law 75A]. Failure to do so should result, every time, in a procedural penalty, in addition to any score adjustment the law requires. [David may disagree with me here, but that is, according to my reading, what the law requires.]

I do disagree! There is no Law that requires a PP every time. Some sponsoring organisations have regs that do.

Furthermore, failure to disclose partnership agreements is a good example of why TDs get discretion. Sometimes it is a very minor error, not mattering very much: this particular example is a well-known problem that should be stamped out, and PPs is the way to do that.

Quote: Henrys

As a north american bridge player,
would I be subject to giving UI were
I always to ask, after the auction
weak2-p-2nt "Can this bid be made
on a weak hand with support"?

Not if you **always** do it. But opponents could be misled. Perhaps
your partner should point out that you **always** ask, but I fear the
always ask solution has not been sorted out satisfactorily yet.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

Ed



173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: 2NT forcing (06:24:57 WedMar 5 2003)

Quote: David Stevenson

I do disagree! There is no Law that
requires a PP every time. Some
sponsoring organisations have regs
that do.

Um. Law 75A says "Special partnership agreements, whether
explicit or implicit, must be fully and freely available to the
opponents." The preface to the Laws (NA edition, it may be in the
scope in the UK edition) says that where the word "must" is used,
the violation is "serious indeed". In the next lower category of
seriousness, says the preface, an offense should be penalized "more
often than not". So no, it doesn't say **every** time. I do think,
though, that a TD should have a very good reason **not** to issue a
penalty in such a case, rather than make not issuing one the default
action. I don't want to belabor the point, David, this is not the place
for it. But am I wrong?

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: 2NT forcing (10:03:59 WedMar 5 2003)

Yes, Ed, you are wrong. Tournament Direction is taught to people: they are not given a Law book and told to get on with it.

It is the shared opinion of the regulating authorities throughout the world that frequent Procedural Penalties is not a good solution to running the game of bridge. Therefore we do not do it. The opinion of the people that run the game is more important than personal opinions of the effect of the Scope of the Laws.

It is my view, and the view of everyone I know who is really involved in running the game, that continuous penalisation is counter-productive. So it is not done.

Note that the Laws do not require a Procedural Penalty: it is merely the interpretation of the Scope. OK, authorities interpret the Scope more leniently than you [or the bridge-laws mailing list] and it is good for the game that they do.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

HenryS

Reply

Re: 2NT forcing (17:27:45 TueMar 11 2003)

By a stroke of good fortune, I have found the BRidge World reference adduced in a previous post. It is the editorial of the November 1977 issue in which responder held xxx; xx; kxx; xxxxx. Interestingly enough, Kaplan did not broach the question of possible misinformation by the 2nt bidder, discussing instead only the question of possible damage created by the 2nt bidder's huddle then pass of 3h.

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)]

[[Print](#)]

[[Send](#)]

[[Watch](#)]

[[<](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]