

## 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
	Dummy says, "having none?"	<a href="#">2</a>	116	John_M,UK 13:47:19 Wed Feb 19 2003

	Canapé Overcalls	1	122	<b>bluejak</b> 13:30:30 Wed Feb 19 2003
	No Agreement	1	100	<b>bluejak</b> 14:23:46 Sat Feb 15 2003
	a paradox	14	205	<b>bluejak</b> 16:06:14 Fri Feb 14 2003
	alerting unusual leads	2	118	<b>JimO</b> 00:02:46 Wed Feb 12 2003
	Is it psyching?	1	121	<b>bluejak</b> 13:03:59 Tue Feb 11 2003
	Declarers inadvertant play	2	115	<b>bluejak</b> 11:28:55 Sun Feb 9 2003
	1 hand, 2 decks of cards	1	79	<b>bluejak</b> 19:52:46 Sat Feb 8 2003
	Handicaps	3	107	<b>bluejak</b> 23:11:53 Thu Feb 6 2003
	claiming	2	91	<b>JimO</b> 00:23:06 Thu Feb 6 2003
	Swiss teams	6	173	<b>bluejak</b> 00:02:30 Thu Feb 6 2003
	Misled by explanation	13	238	<b>bluejak</b> 23:46:05 Wed Feb 5 2003
	fifth card played to a trick	1	96	<b>JimO</b> 15:33:48 Mon Feb 3 2003
	convention	2	111	<b>JimO</b> 21:21:53 Sun Feb 2 2003
	Alerts	2	101	<b>bluejak</b> 14:50:46 Sat Feb 1 2003
	on-purpose facing of card/cards on table before bidding??? ruling please?	2	171	<b>bluejak</b> 03:53:31 Fri Jan 31 2003
	Unplayed board in Swiss	1	97	<b>bluejak</b> 11:54:44 Thu Jan 30 2003
	Alerting	5	157	<b>bluejak</b> 23:31:21 Mon Jan 27 2003
	High Level Decision	2	122	<b>JimO</b> 16:20:57 Mon Jan 27 2003
	1NT overcall	1	117	<b>bluejak</b> 13:17:06 Wed Jan 22 2003

**John\_M,UK**

---

**Reply**

**Dummy says, "having none?"** ( 12:31:06 WedFeb 19 2003 )

---

**Country:** England

Hi,  
In duplicate bridge;

I wonder if you could answer a question about dummy highlighting that declarer has not followed suit.

Does this observation establish the revoke if indeed declarer has discarded in error, even if the the opposition has not yet followed to this card?

Thanks,

John.

**bluejak**

---

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: Dummy says, "having none?"** ( 13:40:41 WedFeb 19 2003 )

---

Dummy is permitted to say "Having none?". If declarer has, in fact, revoked, he may change it without penalty. If the next defender has already played he may change that card without penalty.

Defenders are not allowed to ask each other in England, but dummy has a perfect right to ask.

Incidentally defenders may ask each other in North America and Australasia.

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

**John\_M,UK**

**Re: Dummy says, "having none?"** ( 13:47:19  
WedFeb 19 2003 )

**Reply**

Thanks for the quick response.

Kind regards,

John.

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

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

9 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 1 incognito and 8 guest(s).  
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **399**, Newest Member: [texian13](#).

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

The time is now 07:44:10 Mon Sep 1 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**



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

**kvetcher**

offline

1 posts  
bridgetalk member



**Reply**


**Canapé Overcalls** ( 15:39:49 SunFeb 16 2003 )

**Country:** Spain

Hi David,

I am very interested in playing Canapé Overcalls as I believe they represent a genuine technical advantage over "standard overcalls"

This summer I will be playing in the Pairs Tournaments at the International Bridge Festivals at Biarritz and Deauville. Are these Overcalls legal at such tournaments?

Bocchi/Duboin - perhaps the most famous exponents of Canapé Overcalls - play Biarritz fairly frequently and so far they haven't been hauled out! 

As certain defences to Strong (Artificial) Openings involve the use of Canapé'-type bids Ex (1C- Precision) -1S (3+S with a 5+ card suit somewhere) and are legally acceptable why is there a problem with their general use?

Thanks for your help

Kvetcher

**bluejak**

offline

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: Canapé Overcalls** ( 13:30:30 WedFeb 19 2003 )

I have asked my correspondents in France - so far I have only got one answer! 


He says that you may play canape overcalls in French tournaments if

(a) The suit bid shows at least four cards, or

(b) The second suit is known, thus for example 1♣ 1♠ shows 3+ spades, but the longer suit is always hearts.

He says these are French regulations, but he believes that French regulations also apply in the International tournaments.

Incidentally, I do not understand your reference to a strong 1♣. Most authorities allow you to play anything over a strong 1♣, but

so what? It does not affect what you may play in a totally unrelated area. 

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

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

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

9 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 1 incognito and 8 guest(s).  
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **399**, Newest Member: [texian13](#).

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

The time is now 07:44:44 Mon Sep 1 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**



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

**bergid**

offline

35 posts

bridgetalk member



Reply

## No Agreement ( 21:06:04 FriFeb 14 2003 )

Here is a hypothetical sequence - my RHO has opened 1♣ and I have overcalled 1♥; the bidding has proceeded:

1♣ : 1♥ : Dbl : Rdbl

I am playing with a partner with whom I have never (a) discussed this sequence or (b) experienced this sequence.

I am asked the meaning of the redouble. Up until now, I would have replied "We have not discussed this particular sequence" or "We have no special agreement about that bid".

I don't believe it's right to suggest a possible meaning for the bid, based on my experience with other partners. So I should not say "We haven't discussed it, but with some partners, I would treat it as SOS". That might appear to be an attempt at being helpful (and I'm all in favor of that), but really it could be quite misleading, if my partner did not intend it as SOS, but something else. Far better for me to say nothing than to speculate, perhaps wrongly.

### Quote:

When explaining the significance ... a player should disclose all special information conveyed to him through partnership agreement or partnership experience; **but he need not disclose inferences drawn from his general bridge knowledge and experience.**

I believe that this situation fall into the above category. 🌈

**bluejak**

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: No Agreement** ( 14:23:46 SatFeb 15 2003 )

Given the actual situation you quote no doubt you are right. 🌈

Now consider this. There are a group of good players in my area. One of them, Ralph Churney, I cannot ever remember playing with. Since I have known him as a good local player for nearly thirty years I probably have played with him but not in the last eight years or more.

Let's say I play with him next Tuesday - that's not impossible, since I am due to play in a competition, my partner is unavailable, and I am allowed to bring along a substitute. We will have very little time for discussion.

Suppose on the second board the bidding goes 1♣ 1♥ dbl redbl - what do I do if the double is penalties?

The answer is that I would alert it, and say "I have no particular agreement with this partner, but it is normal to play this as SOS". Then I will take it out - and I bet you I will be right!.

We have an implicit agreement not from partnership experience nor from discussion but from knowledge of what people play locally.

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

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

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

[ [Print](#) ]

[ [Send](#) ]

[ [Watch](#) ]

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

8 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 1 incognito and 7 guest(s).  
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)



**Adriano Voscilla**

**Reply**

**a paradox** ( 11:57:15 ThuFeb 13 2003 )

Firstly, I would like to thank you for the exhaustive answer to my previous question (by the way, I am from Croatia) about psyching which is not psyching. It is going to help me for sure.

Now, I have another problem, hopefully more interesting from the point of view of laws application.

It was a team match, with neither side vulnerable. LHO opened 1 club, partner overcalled 1 heart, and RHO doubled (not negative, just showing 10+ HCP). Holding a singleton in partner's suit, and 4 cards in each other suit, with just one Ace, I decided that an S.O.S redouble would be in place here. There followed two Passes, and RHO began to ponder. He asked my partner for the meaning of my redouble, and got the answer that it was a support redouble (we indeed play this convention, and my tired partner, on the last board after a 4 hours match, probably didn't realize that it was not me who opened the bidding). RHO finally decided to bid (after all, he held a balanced hand with 3 small hearts). The opponents bid and made 3NT, but probably could have set us for two tricks (LHO heart holding was AKJx).

Now, my first question is:

**Would the director** (if called; yes, again our opponents complained without calling the director) **have corrected the score?** It seems to me that our opponents has not been damaged by the misinformation, since, had RHO got the right explanation, he would have found himself in a pretty similar situation: instead of figuring hearts to split 5-3 between my partner and me, he would have imagined them to be 6 or 7 with my partner and 0 or 1 with me. (Surely RHO, while being entitled to know the meaning of my bid, is not as well entitled to know weather my partner has understood it correctly, isn't it so?). Here we come to the issue that really interests me. It appears that my partner could not logically have given the correct information **AND** that the auction be as it really has been (namely that he passed with his actual hand, which included five hearts to the Q and 4 spades to the Ace). Since there was no alternative to the situation that occurred, why should we be penalized?

**AlanW**

**Re: a paradox** ( 12:43:13 ThuFeb 13 2003 )

**Reply**

I shall be interested in how the experts sort this one out. There seem to me to be several issues.

First, what did the double mean? You say not negative, just 10+ points, but I'm not sure what this really means. Is it for take-out or penalties? I wish people would use these descriptions when they are appropriate, rather than the ghastly term 'negative' which really means take out and indeed is positive as far as values are concerned, even if it's negative as far as penalties are concerned. (That's not intended to be a criticism of your use of the term, of course, since it's in widespread use, just a general moan.)

Second, has partner given a correct explanation of your system and you have mis-bid, or vice versa? If the double is normally expected to be taken out by opener, then I'm not sure redouble would normally be played as rescue, but what matters is your system. My understanding is that in doubtful cases, the normal approach is to assume mis-explanation rather than mis-bid, and I guess that is appropriate here.

Third, have opponents been damaged by the misinformation? The only information your opponents are entitled to is what the bid means, not what your partner thought it meant, so the question is would your RHO have made a different decision if he had known it was for rescue and your partner still passed it? Here your point about expecting hearts to be 6/7 opposite 1/0 rather than 5-3 seems right. It's certainly arguable that RHO would have been in much the same position as before. But it's also quite possible he would have reached a different decision on the grounds that his partner could have 1/2 more hearts under the first scenario than the second. I think directors will be sympathetic to the view that he might have acted differently given that he is the non-offending side.

Fourth, you raise a point suggesting the auction couldn't have been as it was if partner's explanation was correct. I don't really follow this given the point above about partner having, say, 7 hearts. But if you are simply saying that given his hand partner acted on the explanation he gave rather than the correct one, I don't think there's any argument about that, and it doesn't really affect the decision. (If he knowingly gave the wrong explanation that would be a very different matter since that is cheating rather than just a mistake, but I think it is virtually unheard of.)

**Adriano Voscilla**

Reply

**Re: a paradox** ( 14:27:34 ThuFeb 13 2003 )

When I qualified their double as "not negative, just 10+ HCP", I meant they were not playing what is called "negative double" in this position, showing the unbid suits but guaranteeing spades. I have supposed that such "negative doubles" are normally played by most players today, but I have learned bidding mainly through american books, so I don't really know if this convention is equally common outside U.S. In our club everybody doubles with **any** hand stronger than 10 HCP, without regard to distribution.

As to the systemic meaning of my bid (redouble), we haven't till now discussed this precise sequence, but my partner has mistakenly taken as showing 3-card support (he even wanted to show them our convention card, where it is apparent that we play a convention called "support redouble" - but, of course, not in the actual sequence).

I want also to clarify why I see a logical contraddiction in trying to hypothesize what would happen if my partner had given a correct explanation. Namely, **if my partner had given a correct explanation, he would have had a different hand, which is not the case..** With the actual hand he had and taken the actual bid he made, he had really no choice but to give the explanation he gave. I think there is a difference between this case and the situation where someone get a wrong information from an opponent who has not yet bid, because in this last case we can indeed analyse and compare two possible continuations.

**JimO**

offline

175 posts  
Forum Host

Reply

**Re: a paradox** ( 14:32:23 ThuFeb 13 2003 )

**Country:** USA

First, the opponents are entitled to a correct explanation of your actual agreement - and it seems they were given misinformation.

See Law 21, 40C, and the footnote to Law 75.

Specficaly:

Law 40C.

If the Director decides that a side has been damaged through the full meaning of a call or play, he may award an adjusted score.

If it was at all likely that RHO would have passed rather than bid,

then adjusting to 1Hxx-2 could be appropriate.  
In order to give a ruling at the table, I might need to know what your opponents' agreements are - specifically, what did RHO's double promise in terms of heart length, and what did LHO's pass over the redouble promise.

---

-Jim O'Neil  
Oak Park, IL

**bluejak**

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: A paradox** ( 16:37:10 ThuFeb 13 2003 )

**Quote: Adriano Voscilla**

Would the director (if called; yes, again our opponents complained without calling the director) have corrected the score? It seems to me that our opponents has not been damaged by the misinformation, since, had RHO got the right explanation, he would have found himself in a pretty similar situation: instead of figuring hearts to split 5-3 between my partner and me, he would have imagined them to be 6 or 7 with my partner and 0 or 1 with me.

Perhaps you are right and RHO might not pass. However, what would LHO's pass of your SOS redouble mean? Many people play that as saying "Let us defend", and then RHO might easily pass.

I am not saying I would necessarily adjust the score to 1H redoubled, especially since I have not seen the hand. But I would ask some questions and consider it.

Also, we are talking about what might have happened. The Director would give the benefit of any doubt to the non-offending side, ie your opponents. Your arguments tend to give the benefit of doubt to your side.

**Quote: Adriano Voscilla**

(Surely RHO, while being entitled to know the meaning of my bid, is not as well entitled to know whether my partner has understood it correctly, isn't it so?).

That is correct.

**Quote: Adriano Voscilla**

It appears that my partner could not logically have given the correct information AND that the auction be as it really has been (namely that he passed with his actual hand, which included five hearts to the Q and 4 spades to the Ace). Since there was no alternative to the situation that occurred, why should we be penalized?

Because your side has done something wrong. Opponents have **a right** to know your system and agreements, and they have been misinformed.

Suppose we consider "perfect bridge" where players cannot see each other, and where each player has a complete list of his opponents' agreements. It should be possible with computers! Your opponents would know their system, but your partner would not since he had forgotten it.

It would not be right for your side to escape a penalty in this situation. Bridge is a game played with perfect information between the two sides [in theory] so when the information is imperfect the Laws give redress.

**Quote: AlanW**

First, what did the double mean? You say not negative, just 10+ points, but I'm not sure what this really means. Is it for take-out or penalties? I wish people would use these descriptions when they are appropriate, rather than the ghastly term 'negative' which really means take out and indeed is positive as far as values are concerned, even if it's negative as far as penalties are concerned. (That's not intended to be a criticism of your use of the term, of course, since it's in widespread use, just a general moan.)

There is no reason why other players should play the way you think best. If a pair wish to play double as 10+ HCP, rather than takeout, penalty, negative or whatever, why should they not? I do not want to play it: you do not: but this pair does.

'Negative' is a bad name, true, just meaning takeout in a specific position, and I see no reason why the equivalent name 'Sputnik' is not used, which means the same. Unfortunately bridge is becoming less flamboyant and less led by people with an interesting approach, and names are getting poorer as well. Take systems - they used to have names like 'Acol', 'Vienna' and 'Romex': now it is 'Standard American' or '2/1'.

But in the current case they are not playing takeout, negative or penalties, so why should they not just describe it as they play it?

**Quote: AlanW**

Second, has partner given a correct explanation of your system and you have mis-bid, or vice versa? If the double is normally expected to be taken out by opener, then I'm not sure redouble would normally be played as rescue, but what matters is your system. My understanding is that in doubtful cases, the normal approach is to assume mis-explanation rather than mis-bid, and I guess that is appropriate here.

If you read the original post, not only do they have an agreement over the system, but it is quite clear the overcaller forgot the position. There was no doubt as to their arrangements.

**Quote: Adriano Voscilla**

As to the systemic meaning of my bid (redouble), we haven't till now discussed this precise sequence, but my partner has mistakenly taken as showing 3-card support (he even wanted to show them our convention card, where it is apparent that we play a convention called "support redouble" - but, of course, not in the actual sequence).

Oh! 😞

Well, the original post suggested there was no doubt as to the actual meaning!!!

Still, when in doubt the Laws require TDs to assume misinformation rather than a misbid so I have no doubt any ruling here will be based on the assumption that the explanation was wrong.

**Quote: Adriano Voscilla**



I think there is a difference between this case and the situation where someone get a wrong information from an opponent who has not yet bid, because in this last case we can indeed analyse and compare two possible continuations.

As explained above, this is not the case. If there is misinformation, and the opponents' actions could have been more successful without the misinformation then there will be an adjustment.

---

David Stevenson <bridge2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/brg\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/brg_menu.htm)

**AlanW**

**Re: a paradox** ( 16:38:02 ThuFeb 13 2003 )

Reply

**Quote: Adriano Voscilla**

if my partner had given a correct explanation, he would have had a different hand

Sorry, you've lost me there. With the hand that he actually did hold, he could (and presumably would) have given a correct explanation of your bid if he had known what it meant.

**Quote: Adriano Voscilla**

I think there is a difference between this case and the situation where someone get a wrong information from an opponent who has not yet bid

Sorry to disagree again, but I don't think there is any real difference here, and I don't think the law would view it any differently. What matters is that when it is an opponent's turn to bid he has a correct



explanation of your systemic agreements. Maybe he can sometimes deduce something about those agreements from your side's subsequent bidding (ie your partner's pass in this case), but this is unlikely to tell him everything he is entitled to know and there is still an obligation on your partner to provide the correct explanation. I don't see how he can ever be expected to deduce he has been given a wrong explanation from the bidding of the person giving the explanation.

**bergid**

offline

35 posts

bridgetalk member



**Reply**

**Re: a paradox** ( 20:47:27 ThuFeb 13 2003 )

Although this doesn't materially affect the ruling that a misexplanation occurred here, I think it's worth mentioning that players who quiz their opponents in situations where it's more a case of "bridge judgement" than an agreement, do the game a disservice. This particular sequence, if you analyse it, comes into that category, though of course you have to navigate through a minefield of complicating factors to reach that conclusion.

This seems to be a clear case of a "Kock-Werner" redouble, whether a player is familiar with that name or not. A simple answer of "We haven't discussed this particular sequence" (if that is the case) would seem to be appropriate, but players are often accused, I believe unjustly, of failing in their duty to give "full disclosure" if they dare to say this. Consequently, they sometimes (often?) end up virtually giving a description of their hand, rather than their agreement. "Oh, we must have an agreement, let's try and work out what it might be". A player can get into hot water with this mind set, if his "guess" happens to be incorrect. The opponents are then quick to pounce!

As an aside, experience has taught me that letting opponents "hang themselves" is sometimes the best approach, rather than quizzing them too much about a given sequence. So often, it only serves to alert them and prevent the "wheel falling off".

Moving on, the question of damage in this hand could arise if declarer played the hand on the assumption of hearts being split a certain way (as implied by the explanation) and going down as a result. This doesn't appear to have happened in this case, but again it brings up another point. The idea that if there has been an infraction of law, players are automatically entitled to redress, appears to be gaining ground and again, this is detrimental to the game. In addition, it has been known for players to take a "double

shot" after a perceived infraction, by allowing the hand to be played out and saying nothing if they got a good result, but calling the director if they did not. Such players would be greatly offended by any criticism of this behavior.

David, could you clarify this point, as I don't believe it has been mentioned: once the auction is over and knowing that partner has given a mis-explanation of the redouble, would it not be appropriate (or even mandatory) for the player in question to explain the true situation? If so, how should he/she phrase it? "My partner has mistakenly given you our agreement as it applies to a different situation - it doesn't apply here" comes to mind. What should be his/her response to further questioning by the opponent(s), should they choose to enquire further?

**JimO**

**offline**

175 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: a paradox** ( 23:05:03 ThuFeb 13 2003 )

**Country:** USA

The defending side may not correct a mis-explanation until after the play is over.  
See Law 75D2.

---

-Jim O'Neil  
Oak Park, IL

**bergid**

**offline**

35 posts  
bridgetalk member



**Reply**

**Re: a paradox** ( 00:18:24 FriFeb 14 2003 )

Ah, thanks Jim. 🌈

I see the wording of this particular section (Error Noticed by Explainer's Partner) has changed: it used to say (in relation to a defender):

**Quote:**

He is under no legal or moral obligation at any later time to inform the opponents that the explanation was erroneous.

In relation to the declaring side:

**Quote:**

If he then becomes declarer or dummy, he may then volunteer a correction of the explanation.

It now states:

**Quote:**

A player whose partner has given a mistaken explanation may not correct the error before the final pass, nor may he indicate in any manner that a mistake has been made; a defender may not correct the error until play ends. After calling the Director at the earliest legal opportunity (after the final pass, if he is to be declarer or dummy; after play ends, if he is to be a defender), the player must inform the opponents that, in his opinion, his partner's explanation was erroneous.

I understand why the change was made in relation to a defender, as discussion at the table might well lead to UI and thus possibly influence the defenders' play. I'm guessing that long and involved appeals in instances of this nature, may have prompted the change. (?)

However it does seem a shame that a defender has no way to put matters right, unless perhaps he can call the director, arrange to have a private word with him away from the table and then have the new information relayed to the declarer by similar means. I've seen this happen quite often, not in relation to this particular scenario perhaps (I don't recall any specific cases) but there may a precedent for it. 🌈

**bluejak**

offline

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: a paradox** ( 01:10:36 FriFeb 14 2003 )

**Quote: bergid**

Although this doesn't materially affect the ruling that a misexplanation occurred here, I think it's worth mentioning that players who quiz their opponents in situations where it's more a case of "bridge judgement" than an agreement, do the game a disservice. This particular sequence, if you analyse it, comes into that category, though of course you have to navigate through a minefield of complicating factors to reach that conclusion.

While I do not disagree with the sentiment, this particular sequence is certainly not one of bridge judgement. A pair would expect to know whether they play an SOS redouble after an overcall is doubled, and this is a pure case of an agreement.

**Quote: bergid**

This seems to be a clear case of a "Kock-Werner" redouble, whether a player is familiar with that name or not. A simple answer of "We haven't discussed this particular sequence" (if that is the case) would seem to be appropriate, but players are often accused, I believe unjustly, of failing in their duty to give "full disclosure" if they dare to say this.

They are required to tell their opponents implicit as well as explicit agreements. If either they have agreed to play SOS or Kock-Werner redoubles, or one has turned up before, and as a result they know whether they play them after an overcall is doubled then they do have an agreement, and they are required to inform their opponents accordingly.

"We haven't discussed this particular sequence" is not an acceptable answer if they have discussed similar related sequences or if they have partnership experience telling them what their methods are in this sequence. For example, if they have had an SOS redouble after 1♠ is doubled, they cannot say "We haven't discussed this particular sequence" because it is 1♥ that is doubled on a later occasion.

The posts that led to this are inconsistent. The first makes it clear that they had an agreement that it was SOS, but partner forgot the position. The second post cast more doubt. However, it is clear that they had some agreements impinging on this sequence, and the opponents should be made aware of any such agreements.

"We have no agreement" is ok if it is true, but players should not hide behind it when the partnership has more information than their opponents.

**Quote: bergid**

In addition, it has been known for players to take a "double shot" after a perceived infraction, by allowing the hand to be played out and saying nothing if they got a good result, but calling the director if they did not. Such players would be greatly offended by any criticism of this behavior.

I have never understood why this is not acceptable. It is normal and acceptable in the majority of types of sports and games around the world, for example all forms of football. Still, it is not legal in bridge for some curious reason to take strange action to attempt to gain, and rely on the ruling to give you back what you lost if the strange action does not succeed. But the Director knows that, and if there is a double shot attempt he will adjust for the offending side only.

Of course, if a player merely plays on to see whether he is damaged, that is normal and there is no reason to consider anything wrong with that behaviour.

**Quote: bergid**

David, could you clarify this point, as I don't believe it has been mentioned: once the auction is over and knowing that partner has given a mis-explanation of the redouble, would it not be appropriate (or even mandatory) for the player in question to explain the true situation?

It is mandatory for declarer or dummy to do so. However defenders must wait until the end of the hand.

**Quote: bergid**

If so, how should he/she phrase it?  
"My partner has mistakenly given you our agreement as it applies to a different situation - it doesn't apply here" comes to mind. What should be his/her response to further questioning by the opponent(s), should they choose to enquire further?

First, the player calls the Director. Then he says that his partner has given an explanation which is incorrect in his opinion. Since this will always be declarer or dummy he can explain it fully without a problem of unauthorised information. Defenders similarly explain in full but only when the hand is over.

**Quote: bergid**

However it does seem a shame that a defender has no way to put matters right, unless perhaps he can call the director, arrange to have a private word with him away from the table and then have the new information relayed to the declarer by similar means. I've seen this happen quite often, not in relation to this particular scenario perhaps (I don't recall any specific cases) but there may a precedent for it.

That method is illegal, and correctly so. After giving an explanation, it would take a partner with a brain roughly at the level of a starfish to not realise when his partner looks surprised and suddenly departs to talk to the Director.

Discussions with Directors away from the table usually give as much unauthorised information as those at the table since partner knows exactly what they mean. Just follow the Laws, and if defending tell the opponents at the end and let the Director sort it out.

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

**bergid**

offline

35 posts

bridgetalk member



**Reply**

**Re: a paradox** ( 04:09:34 FriFeb 14 2003 )

**Quote: bluejak**

A pair would expect to know whether they play an SOS redouble after an overcall is doubled, and this is a pure case of an agreement.

Certainly, if they have such an agreement. However, many situations go "by default", as you can't discuss everything. Even with established partnerships, some sequences only come up occasionally and furthermore the ones that do come up are usually

the ones you haven't discussed. Sod's Law. 🙄

Just in passing, since Messrs Kock and Werner were both born in 1901, it's possible that their brainchild came into being before sputnik was launched. 🇺🇸

**Quote: bluejak**

They are required to tell their opponents implicit as well as explicit agreements. If either they have agreed to play SOS or Kock-Werner redoubles, or one has turned up before, and as a result they know whether they play them after an overcall is doubled then they do have an agreement, and they are required to inform their opponents accordingly.

Yes, I did not imply otherwise. When I said "no agreement", I was of course including implicit ones.

If a pair has *\*not\** discussed this particular sequence (even though they might both be aware of it and play it with others), then I believe it becomes a matter of bridge judgement. In this particular sequence, the double wasn't even a "standard" negative double and it has been suggested that the meaning of redouble might alter as a result. Perhaps one should say "We haven't discussed it, but with some partners I would treat it as an SOS"? I'd say that was a little dangerous, as (a) it might give UI and (b) it might be totally wrong!

**Quote: bluejak**

The first makes it clear that they had an agreement that it was SOS, but partner forgot the position.

I believe the overcaller said that **support** redoubles were being played, when asked:

**Quote: Adriano**



He asked my partner for the meaning of my redouble, and got the answer that it was a support redouble (we indeed play this convention, and my tired partner, on the last board after a 4 hours match, probably didn't realize that it was not me who opened the bidding).

I'm sure that Adriano had no idea, this thread was going to develop into such a complex discussion!

**Quote: bluejak**

Of course, if a player merely plays on to see whether he is damaged, that is normal and there is no reason to consider anything wrong with that behaviour.

Certainly, but if he *\*knows\** for certain that there was an infringement, shouldn't he call the director there and then?

**Quote: bluejak**

Discussions with Directors away from the table usually give as much unauthorised information as those at the table since partner knows exactly what they mean.

I can't argue with you there - I wonder how much brain power this sheep has ...



**Adriano**

**Reply**

**Re: a paradox** ( 08:40:58 FriFeb 14 2003 )

I see that I did not manage to explain clearly the situation on the table (my english is probably a little convoluted). Anyhow, Bergid got it well: my partner only taught we had an agreement, having misjudged the context of the auction.

I think I understand now what the Law in general is aiming at. As Bluejak said:

**Quote: Bluejak**

Suppose we consider "perfect bridge" where players cannot see each other, and where each player has a complete list of his opponents' agreements. It should be possible with computers! Your opponents would know their system, but your partner would not since he had forgotten it.

The game can become "less than perfect" when agreements are explained wrongly, but it can also become "more than perfect", e.g. when an "online" player, explaining his own bid, sometimes exceeds the boundaries of partnership agreements, thus giving his opponents **more** information than his partner has. Anyway, to me what is truly important is that the Law achieves what to my mind it was originally designed for: **to provide the players with a complex enough environment, thus enabling them to exercise reasoning and draw inferences.**

**bluejak**

offline

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: a paradox** ( 13:47:46 FriFeb 14 2003 )

**Quote: bergid**

Just in passing, since Messrs Kock and Werner were both born in 1901, it's possible that their brainchild came into being before sputnik was launched.

Certainly, and many players, myself included, only play Kock-Werner if it is a penalty double. But I expect to know what a redouble means over Sputnik too.

**Quote: bergid**

If a pair has *\*not\** discussed this particular sequence (even though they might both be aware of it and play it with others), then I believe it becomes a matter of bridge judgement. In this particular sequence, the double wasn't even a "standard" negative double and it has been suggested that the meaning of redouble might alter as a result. Perhaps one should say "We haven't discussed it, but with some partners I would treat it as an SOS"? I'd say that was a little dangerous, as (a) it might give UI and (b) it might be totally wrong!

It was a standard double where it was being played. Furthermore, giving UI to partner is not an offence: giving misinformation to opponents is.

If you have reason to suppose you have an implicit agreement then you should tell the opponents and let partner worry about UI.

**Quote: bergid**

I believe the overcaller said that support redoubles were being played, when asked.

Exactly what I said: his partner knew it was a misexplanation because it was not a support redouble situation.

If nothing else he should correct this. He could say "We do not play support redoubles in this situation."

**Quote: bergid**

Certainly, but if he *\*knows\** for certain that there was an infringement, shouldn't he call the director there and then?

No law says he should. People often do not.

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

**Guest**

**Re: a paradox** ( 14:13:35 FriFeb 14 2003 )

**Reply**

**Quote: Bluejak**

If nothing else he should correct this.  
He could say "We do not play support redoubles in this situation."

Really should I have corrected the explanation? Is it not forbidden by the Law:

**Quote: Jim0**

The defending side may not correct a mis-explanation until after the play is over.  
See Law 75D2.

**bluejak**

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: a paradox** ( 16:06:14 FriFeb 14 2003 )

Everything I have written depends on everything else I have



written!!!

First we discussed when it could be corrected. If declarer or dummy, before the opening lead is faced. If a defender at the end of the hand.

Then we discussed what should be corrected. I am saying that the description of support doubles should be corrected - you will see that another poster is referring to this as merely bridge judgement. But it should only be corrected [since you became a defender] at the end of the hand.

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

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

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

[ [Print](#) ]

[ [Send](#) ]

[ [Watch](#) ]

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

7 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 1 incognito and 6 guest(s).  
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

**okaydokay**

offline

1 posts  
bridgetalk member



[Reply](#)

**alerting unusual leads** ( 22:30:13 TueFeb 11 2003 )

**Country:** ireland

which laws govern alerting of unusual leads (e.g. 3rd/5th, journalist, etc.)?

**bluejak**

offline

435 posts  
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

**Re: alerting unusual leads** ( 23:17:46 TueFeb 11 2003 )

The actual Law is Law 40 which controls all partnership understandings. However, alerting is always subject to regulation by the sponsoring organisation, which in most countries is either the national body or, for lesser events, follows the regulations of the national body.

Actually I do not know of anywhere that requires the alerting of unusual leads, except that in North America small leads from a doubleton must be pre-alerted. I shall ask about Irish alerting and get back to you.

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

**JimO**

offline

175 posts  
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

**Re: alerting unusual leads** ( 00:02:46 WedFeb 12 2003 )

**Country:** USA

Just to clarify:  
In the ACBL, leading low from a doubleton requires a "Pre-Alert", that is, the opponents must be notified prior to the beginning of each round.

---

-Jim O'Neil  
Oak Park, IL

**Adriano Voscilla**

**Reply**

**Is it psyching?** ( 12:25:37 TueFeb 11 2003 )

I opened, non-vulnerable, 4 hearts with the following hand:

S: x

H: AQJ98xx

D: x

C: J9xx

When asked by my RHO, my partner explained as 8 or more hearts, below opening strength. RHO ended playing the hand in 4 spades doubled. He didn't make his contract, but afterwards complained that I have psyched (no 8th heart!), which is not allowed in 1st or 2nd seat. This happened at our local duplicate, so there was no director call, but since similar complaints are becoming more and more frequent, I would like to learn what the bridge laws would say about it.

Could somebody explain, please?

**bluejak**

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: Is it psyching?** ( 13:03:59 TueFeb 11 2003 )

You have not told us your country, and the rule you refer to is a strange rule, not known in most countries [and probably illegal!!!!]. I think perhaps you are in Italy or Austria.

A psyche is a deliberate call that is different from your system in a major way. If you open 1♠ showing five cards when you have only got two spades that is a psyche. But if you decide to treat ♠ AKQJ as a five card suit that is not a psyche: that is just application of judgement.

In the case you cite it is not a psyche. Either it is a small deviation because you have decided a 7-4-1-1 hand is as good a hand as one containing an eight-card suit, or perhaps your partner has just told them wrong.

Whatever happens your opponent was wrong. No doubt he was annoyed because he did not make his contract. However, you have not psyched, and he was just trying to be nasty. Take no notice.

You say there was no director call because this was in a club. That is not right. Players should either call the Director or shut up. It is **far more unfriendly** to complain and not call the Director. Even in a club it is important to call the Director. The next time someone accuses you of psyching when you have not call the Director yourself and tell him that this opponent is upsetting you wiht

unjustified complaints. You may not get satisfaction that time but it will help what seems to be a growing problem. 🤖

And, of course, why not agree with your partner that a 4♥ opening only need have seven cards in future?! Personally I would never describe any of my partner's pre-empts so definitely. 🌈

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

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

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

6 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 1 incognito and 5 guest(s).  
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **399**, Newest Member: [texian13](#).

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

The time is now 07:46:20 Mon Sep 1 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**



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



**John**

**Declarers inadvertant play** ( 04:17:18 SunFeb 9 2003 )

**Reply**

A diamond is led to a NT contract. Declarer wins the first trick and then plays the Ace , King & queen of hearts plays what he thinks is the fourth round of the suit and while waiting for LHO to decide what to discard looks down at the table to discover a small diamond there , calls the director and away from the table states that he did not intend playing the spade and cant understand how it got there . LHO has not yet played to the trick .

Law 45 C4 b states that a player may change an inadvertant designation without penalty. There is no mention as to whether it refers to changes of cards to be played from dummy or from declarer's hand .How should the director rule in the above situation . It seems clear as to what declarers intention was .  
John

**JimO**

**Re: Declarers inadvertant play** ( 05:12:50 SunFeb 9 2003 )

**offline**

175 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

Law 45C4(b) applies to a named or designated card. It generally refers to the call of a card from Dummy, though any of the other 3 players are bound by 45C4(a). The applicable Law is 45C2:

Law 45C. Compulsory play of Card  
2. Declarer's Card

Declarer must play a card from his hand held face up, touvhing or nearly touching the table, or maintained in such a position as to indicate that it has been played.

The card need not be played if it was dropped accidentally (Law 48A), and may be retracted only in certain cases (See Law 47). As neither of these appear to be the case, the card (whether it was a diamond or spade) must be played.

**bluejak**

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: Declarers inadvertant play** ( 11:28:54 SunFeb 9 2003 )

First of all, the Director should take him back to the table. Private conversations with the Director are not encouraged, and here there is no partner to worry about.

Second, while Jim has got the Law right, the Director should find out what declarer means by

**Quote:**

that he ... cant understand how it got there

Jim assumes, and I think you meant, that declarer played a card but cannot understand how it came out to be that particular card. If so, tough. Tell declarer to be more careful in future.

But **if** declarer never played a card at all, and that card dropped out of his hand, then it is not played and may be changed.

The bottom line is that a designated card may sometimes be changed: a dropped card also: a played card stands and may not be changed.

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

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

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

6 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 1 incognito and 5 guest(s).  
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

**JoAnneM**

**1 hand, 2 decks of cards** ( 05:38:45 SatFeb 8 2003 )

**Reply**

This is actually kind of funny but I want to know if I handled it correctly.

The bidding proceeded normally, east winning the bid. When west laid down dummy, South announced "I have some of those cards in my hand!" I was called to the table. South had taken her hand from the next board under the one being played.

I had them return the cards to both boards (correctly) gave avg- to n/s and avg+ to e/w for both boards, and they played neither board.

They were upset that I didn't let them play the 2nd board but one hand had already been "exposed" by the bidding on the previous hand.

I looked through several books and couldn't find anything written up on this irregularity.

**bluejak**

**Re: 1 hand, 2 decks of cards** ( 19:52:46 SatFeb 8 2003 )

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

You handled it correctly. Players like South worry me: they do something wrong and then complain rather than just say sorry! 🤔

**Reply**

The justification for your actions can be found in the law book.

**Quote: Law 17D**

If a player who has inadvertently picked up the cards from a wrong board makes a call, that call is cancelled. If offender's LHO has called over the cancelled call, the Director shall assign artificial adjusted scores (see Law 90 for penalty) when offender's substituted call differs in any significant way from his cancelled call . If offender subsequently repeats the cancelled call on the board from which he mistakenly drew his cards, the

Director may allow that board to be played normally, but the Director shall assign artificial adjusted scores (see Law 90) when offender's call differs in any way from his original cancelled call.

While sometimes a hand can be continued after a call or two it is normal to cancel it once dummy has appeared. As for the second hand:

**Quote: Law 12 B**

When a player accidentally receives unauthorised information about a board he is playing or has yet to play, as by looking at the wrong hand; by overhearing calls, results or remarks; by seeing cards at another table; or by seeing a card belonging to another player at his own table before the auction begins: the Director should be notified forthwith, preferably by the recipient of the information. If the Director considers that the information could interfere with normal play, he may:

1. Adjust Positions  
if the type of contest and scoring permit, adjust the players' positions at the table, so that the player with information about one hand will hold that hand; or,
2. Appoint Substitute  
with the concurrence of all four players, appoint a temporary substitute to replace the player who received the unauthorised information; or,
3. Award an Adjusted Score  
forthwith award an artificial adjusted score.

Since #1 and #2 are impractical [everyone having seen the hand]

#3 is the only recourse, and the hand must be cancelled.

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

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

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

6 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 1 incognito and 5 guest(s).  
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **399**, Newest Member: [texian13](#).

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

The time is now 07:46:55 Mon Sep 1 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**



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

**Patrick  
Concannon**

**Reply**

**Handicaps** ( 16:06:03 ThuFeb 6 2003 )

**Country:** U.K

I would like to know if there is any system of handicapping that could be used in a small club where bridge is played once a week: frown:

Hawk.

**JimO**

**offline**

175 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: Handicaps** ( 17:09:58 ThuFeb 6 2003 )

**Country:** USA

There are a couple of ways that are popular over here:

Matchpoint pairs-

1) A player's handicap is based on his/her masterpoint total, according to a chart.

For example, at one club I run, I use a chart where a player with 0-5MPs gets 25%, 5-20 gets 22.5%, etc., up until 5000+, which gets 0 handicap:

\*\*\*Note that this is an ACBL club; these are ACBL Masterpoint Totals, and surely not applicable elsewhere.

Even in an ACBL club, you might want to use a different chart, depending on the MP levels of your players\*\*\*

Now, add the handicaps of the 2 players, divide by 2. That is that pair's handicap.

2) A player's handicap is based on previous performance

Take the player's average % game for the last N games (6, or 10, or whatever). Subtract this number from 65%. (arbitrary).

You can multiply this result by a some factor (90% is common over here). That is that player's handicap. Again, add the handicaps of both players, divide by 2.

The second method is more accurate - previous performance is a better indication of skill than MP total. But it requires a lot more calculation. Fortunately for me, the ACBLscore program will do all the math in an instant. I don't know if anyone has written a program to do all this.

IMP teams-

I usually use a chart that converts MP total to handicap in IMPs. I

have posted the chart at [acblinfo.forumexperts.com/bforum.php](http://acblinfo.forumexperts.com/bforum.php)  
(Club Director Information Forum > Handicap Team Games)  
\*\*\*Again, note that these are ACBL MP totals\*\*\*  
It would be better to use previous performance; there is currently  
no way to do this with ACBLScore, though.

---

-Jim O'Neil  
Oak Park, IL

**patrick  
Concannon**

**Re: Handicaps** ( 20:23:07 ThuFeb 6 2003 )

**Country:** United Kindom

Reply

Thanks Jim,  
I very much appreciate the trouble you went to. Your answer is of  
great help.

Patrick

**bluejak**

**Re: Handicaps** ( 23:11:53 ThuFeb 6 2003 )

offline

435 posts  
Forum Host

Reply

One of the clubs at which I play uses handicaps. I have no idea how  
they do it, but if you send an email to me at the eddress below I  
shall forward on to one of the Directors at the club who will be able  
to help you.

---

David Stevenson <[laws2@blakjak.com](mailto:laws2@blakjak.com)>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

View Thread Page(s): [ 1 ]

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

[ [Print](#) ]

[ [Send](#) ]

[ [Watch](#) ]

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

**samandar2002**

**Reply**

**claiming** ( 21:25:32 WedFeb 5 2003 )

**Country:** America



the other day my friend who was in dummy claimed, gave no explanation. as they threw the cards in I said but u can go down if u use a club to go to hand to draw the outstanding trump with me but now that I have drawn ur attention to it u use an alternate method , he obviously did not have the trumps count, ruling please !?

**bluejak**

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: claiming** ( 00:11:00 ThuFeb 6 2003 )

First, dummy must never claim.

Second, was this duplicate or rubber? If it was duplicate then the Director should be called, and he would give a trick to the defence, because doubtful points are decided in their favour.

If it was rubber then the defence can insist that declarer plays it out, but without giving him the benefit fo the doubt in cases where there are alternatives. This means in effect that the result is the same - the defence gets a trick. But it is always more difficult to get agreement in rubber bridge games [unless there is a Club Host, who will do the same sort of job as a Director in duplicate bridge].

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)



**JimO**

**offline**

175 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: claiming** ( 00:23:06 ThuFeb 6 2003 )

**Country:** USA

I'm not sure I understand who was who in all of this. Your friend was Declarer, and the lead was in Dummy? Were you Dummy? A Defender? A Kibitzer?

Did both defenders throw their cards in?

Law 70 deals with contested claims. Specifically, Law 70C seems to deal with this specific situation:

When a trump remains in one of the opponents' hands, the Director shall award a trick or tricks to the opponents if:

1. claimed made no statement about that trump, and
2. it is at all likely that claimer at the time of his claim was unaware that a trump remained in an opponents' hand, and
3. a trick could be lost to that trump by any normal\* play

\*normal includes play that would be careless or inferior for the class of player involved, but not irrational.

So from what you have said, it sounds like the defenders should be awarded an additional trick. I would need to see the entire hand (at least the remaining cards) to say for sure.

---

-Jim O'Neil  
Oak Park, IL

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

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

6 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 1 incognito and 5 guest(s).  
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **399**, Newest Member: **texian13**.

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

The time is now 07:47:31 Mon Sep 1 2003

**jwilson21**

offline

2 posts  
bridgetalk member



[Reply](#)

**Swiss teams** ( 14:50:13 TueFeb 4 2003 )

**Country:** Andorra

Our national bridge association is very small totalling less than 100 members. We have been playing pairs three times per week and are now starting a monthly team game, probably five or six teams. Are there any Laws covering permissible scoring methods? If not, what would you advise. Thank you, Jim Wilson

**JimO**

offline

175 posts  
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

**Re: Swiss teams** ( 22:45:28 TueFeb 4 2003 )

The three most popular forms of team-of-4 scoring are:

1) Swiss or Round-Robin Teams, generally IMP scoring.

Each team plays short matches against several other teams during a session. The score difference on each board is converted to IMPs. The scale is shown in Law 78B. The match results may be win-loss, but are often converted to "Victory Points" - The IMP difference between the winning and losing teams is converted to VPs

according to one of many scales - a 1 IMP win may result in 11 VPs for the winners and 9 for the losers, while a 40-IMP win will result in 20 for the winners and 0 for the losers. (The 20-point scale is most common in North America; Different areas use different scales).

In a "Swiss" event, teams are paired based on how well they are doing; a team near the top will be paired against another team that is doing well; a team near the bottom will be paired against another team doing poorly. Teams play each other no more than once.

In a Round Robin, each team plays every other team. With a small number of teams - 5 or 6 - this would be my choice.

2) Board-a-Match Teams, almost always matchpoint scoring.

Each team plays a few boards against many other teams.

You get 1 point for winning the board (a net + score), 1/2 point for a tie, or 0 for losing the board. High score wins.

3) Knockout Teams, invariably IMP scoring. Each team plays a long match against one other team. Scores are converted to IMPs.

Winners advance to the next round; losers find another event to play in.

(If the # of teams is not an exact power of 2, there may be "3-way" matches required in the earlier rounds. Usually 2 of the 3 teams advance, the 3rd is eliminated.)

My suggestion:

Round Robin Teams, IMP scoring, converted to Victory Points.

---

-Jim O'Neil  
Oak Park, IL

**jwilson21**

**offline**

2 posts  
bridgetalk member



**Reply**

**Re: Swiss teams** ( 07:52:03 WedFeb 5 2003 )

Thanks JimO. Your advice coincides with what I had suggested (having played some Bridge in Florida). Unfortunately I'm having trouble persuading some members that it is not correct to add each teams gross IMP's and that the conversion to VP's is necessary. Thanks for your help, Jim Wilson

**bluejak**

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: Swiss teams** ( 15:41:33 WedFeb 5 2003 )

The answer is simple: the conversion to VPs is not necessary. If the players do not like it, no problem: just play total imps. It will not make much difference.

More interestingly, I also posted an answer [agreeing with much of what Jim said] but where has it gone? 🤔

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

**bluejak**

offline

435 posts  
Forum Host

Reply

**Re: Swiss teams** ( 17:02:46 WedFeb 5 2003 )

Since my earlier posting has got mislaid somewhere, I shall try to reconstruct it from memory. 🤖

In principle I agree with Jim. Players tend to like Swiss Teams better than Round Robin, but five or six teams is not really enough. 🤖

You should, however, ignore the possibility of Board-a-Match teams. They are unknown in Europe, and you will tend to confuse your members if ever they play in France or Spain. 🌈

As for knockout, that is not suitable for a regular evening. I suggest you have an Annual Andorran Knockout championship, making a draw and then letting teams play 32 board matches [or 48] by agreement, merely giving them a closing date for each round. 😄

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

**bridgeaddict**

Unavailable

510 posts



Administrator



Reply

**Re: Swiss teams** ( 19:03:54 WedFeb 5 2003 )

David, I have examined the log and there is no record of any earlier reply by you, nor has any post been deleted from this thread.

I can send you the log entries by email, if you are interested in going into this further.



**bluejak**

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: Swiss teams** ( 00:02:30 ThuFeb 6 2003 )

No, I have reposted it, so it is history. 🌈

I am having fun with new anti-spam software, that freezes more often than Word 97, so that's probably the cause. 😞

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

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

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

6 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 1 incognito and 5 guest(s).  
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **399**, Newest Member: [texian13](#).

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

The time is now 07:48:00 Mon Sep 1 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**



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

**James Vickers**

[Reply](#)

**Misled by explanation** ( 19:16:11 MonFeb 3 2003 )

Original reposted below on behalf of James Vickers.

**bridgeaddict**

Unavailable

510 posts




Administrator



[Reply](#)

**Re: Misled by explanation** ( 20:43:39 TueFeb 4 2003 )

County pairs competition.

		<b>North</b>	
<b>Dir: N</b>		♠ K 10 8 2	
<b>Vul: EW</b>		♥ A Q J	
<b>Scr: MP</b>		♦ A 9	
		♣ K 10 7 5	
<b>West</b>			<b>East</b>
♠ A 6 5			♠ 7 3
♥ 10 8 7 5			♥ K 9 6 3 2
♦ 10 8 6 4 2			♦ K 7 5
♣ 8			♣ A 9 2
		<b>South</b>	
		♠ Q J 9 4	
		♥ 4	
		♦ Q J 3	
		♣ Q J 6 4 3	

© bridgetalk.com

West	North	East	South
	1♣	P	1♠
P	3♠	P	4♣*
P	4♦*	P	4♠
P	P	P	

\* = alerted and explained as "cue bid".

West led 8♣ and East, taking the explanation at face value and assuming South to be void, ducked. South now made 4♠+1 (details of play not available). At the end of play EW complained that they had been misled by the explanation, and had they been given a correct explanation or a timely correction by South before the opening lead, they would have taken their club ruff and perhaps defeated the contract. When asked about their agreements, North

said "Well, I took it as a cue bid", South seemed to think this was a reasonable interpretation, and that they hadn't really discussed this sort of sequence.

How should the Director rule?

James

**bluejak**

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: Misled by explanation** ( 23:05:03 MonFeb 3 2003 )

It would appear there was misinformation. South believes that the sequence is undiscussed, and thus the explanation of "cue-bid" is wrong. South was required to correct this before the opening lead, and failed to do so.

It also appears that North did not believe they had an agreement that it was a "cue-bid" either since he said "I took it as ..." so both South and North were remiss. They should both have the Laws explained to them.

As for an adjustment, if East takes the ♣A, gives his partner a ruff, and his partner returns ... what? East will not be sure what to ask for with both red kings. Even if West returns a diamond there is unlikely to be a second ruff since declarer will probably play the ace and go one off. It makes on a heart return.

How about

.. 40% of 4♠ making  
+ 60% of 4♠ -1

That's what North-South get. For East-West it is more interesting. The play at trick one is so dreadfully poor - assuming partner has led the 8 from ♣ Q J 8 6 4 3 is amazing - that I am tempted to deny East-West any redress. East certainly was not playing bridge when he ducked.

Still, in England the standard for denying redress is "wild or gambling action, with at least the hint of a double shot". East's play at trick one is certainly wild, but is there any suspicion of the double shot? Not really! I would give East-West the same adjustment, but it is a very close run thing - I do not believe they deserve it! 😞

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

**James Vickers**

**Re: Misled by explanation** ( 11:16:25 TueFeb 4 2003 )

**Reply**

**Country:** UK

What actually happened was as follows:

My fellow director made the ruling and discussed the case with me. I initially misunderstood the problem and assumed that West had failed to lead a club because of the misinformation, and made ready to adjust to something like what you suggested - some percentage of 4S= and some percentage of 4S-1 to both sides. When I realised that the problem was East's duck of the club lead, I lost sympathy with EW, since even if the explanation is correct it seems most likely that South has cue-bid a singleton (honour) in which case ducking looks very dangerous. We let the score stand, the Appeals Committee adjusted to 4S= to both sides.

I agree that there was misinformation, and that NS need to be more careful of what they pass off as agreements to the opposition, but changing the score from 4S+1 to 4S= / 4S-1 largely on the basis of EW's poor play seems a rather harsh lesson for NS.

Thanks for your reply.

James

PS I tried to use your template for the hand layout and auction, and you can obviously read it, but to me it just looks like a lot of indecipherable code. Any idea as to whether this is my mistake, some formatting problem my end, or what?



**bluejak**

offline

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: Misled by explanation** ( 12:42:58 TueFeb 4 2003 )

North-South gained an advantage through breaking the Law. Why on earth should they not have that advantage taken away from them? You allowed a pair to gain by breaking the law!!!! That cannot be right. 😞

Your Appeals Committee has also allowed the pair to gain by breaking the law, though not to gain so much. Do you think North-South will take the trouble to explain fully next time? 🤔

If someone does something wrong, do not let them gain from it.



Of course, I agree with the lack of sympathy for East-West. If you like, split the score, and give them a poor score as well. As I explained I think this is probably a little too harsh for England [though would be correct in other jurisdictions which have a more exacting standard]. But it is close.

As for your comment about formatting, I read your diagram easily but it went strange when I looked at my reply. However, when just looking at the thread, it seems fine. But it is not mine! The Bridgetalk people look after this forum for me, and I shall ask them to look at your comment and reply to it.

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

**James Vickers**

Reply

**Re: Misled by explanation** ( 14:41:55 TueFeb 4 2003 )

**Country:** UK

Perhaps I am out of line with normal practice here and need to review my approach to such rulings, but the reason I let the score stand was that the peculiar action taken by East was the cause of the damage, not the misexplanation. When I apply the usual algorithm in such cases:

was there MI? (yes)

was the non-offending side damaged as a consequence? (no)

I take the matter no further. Saying that NS should not gain from breaking the law is pretty close to saying that we should adjust the score \_because\_ NS broke the law. Score adjustments should make recompense for damage and not be used as punishments.

I would make it clear to NS that they escaped by the skin of their teeth only because EW screwed up, and that they should be more careful in future. Perhaps that will serve as sufficient warning.

But then again, perhaps this approach is too hard on EW, who were misled after all. The more I think of this, the more I like the idea of a split score.

James

**bluejak**

offline

435 posts  
Forum Host

Reply

**Re: Misled by explanation** ( 16:59:19 TueFeb 4 2003 )

Consider the offenders only.

Was there MI? Yes.

Might they have received a poorer score wihtout the MI? Yes.

Then you are required to adjust for the offenders.

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

## bridgeaddict

Unavailable

510 posts



Administrator



Reply

### Re: Misled by explanation ( 21:12:01 TueFeb 4 2003 )

#### Template Explanation:

Currently the template can be used only by the admin (me) and the moderators (bluejak, Ed and JimO). The reason is that the template uses HTML code (which is how web pages are written) and its use is restricted.

Initially, I edited James' post, inserting the necessary code to enable the correct display of the hand. Because I was able to see it, I assumed it would be visible to everyone.

It was only when James mentioned that it still looked a mess of code, that I realised something was amiss. What he (and everyone else except the moderators) was seeing was the "raw" HTML code.

I've edited out James' initial post and reposted the hand exactly as he set it out originally, so now everyone can enjoy it!

The HTML restriction will be lifted at some time in the reasonably near future, enabling the use of the template by registered members.

In the meantime, I would recommend using the "pre" tag, as described in [Posting Hints](#).

## Guest

Reply

### Re: Misled by explanation ( 22:17:31 TueFeb 4 2003 )

#### Quote: bluejak at 23:05:03 Mon Feb 3 2003

As for an adjustment, if East takes the ♣A, gives his partner a ruff, and his partner returns ... what? East will not be sure what to ask for with both red kings. Even if West returns a diamond there is unlikely to be a second ruff since declarer will probably play the ace and go one off. It makes on a heart return.

from a technical point of view, east should request a diamond return because there are fewer diamonds held between the north-east hands than hearts. consequently, there is a greater likelihood

that south has at least 2 diamonds.

also, i don't understand how the game ever makes on a diamond return. let's say ace of clubs, club ruff, diamond to dummy's ace. how is south to dispose of his two losing diamonds before giving up the lead? even if he plays ah, qh (covered) and establishes the jack of hearts for a discard, he cannot get to dummy fast enough.

consequently, it would appear that with normal defense 4s should always go down 1.

whether this east is capable of normal defense after the duck of the ace of clubs is a legitimate questions, and on that basis some sort of split ruling such as david suggests could well be appropriate.

**bluejak**

offline

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: Misled by explanation** ( 23:18:29 TueFeb 4 2003 )

My weighting was based on 4♣ - 1 on a diamond return, 4♠= on a heart return, and I gave the non-offenders the benefit of the doubt so they got the 60%.

Incidentally, the term "split ruling" refers to where the different sides get different scores [which was discussed], and the term "weighted score" to where both sides get the same score, but it is a percentage of various things. In fact, if you disallow redress for East-West as suggested in the thread, this ruling is both split and weighted!!!!

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

**James Vickers**

**Reply**

**Re: Misled by explanation** ( 15:31:11 WedFeb 5 2003 )

**Country:** UK

If I remember correctly the scores on the traveller were a roughly even mix of 4S= and 4S-1, with only one other 4S+1.

I believe I was told at my last TD training session that the assignment of weighted split scores, while legal, is not to be encouraged. Yet if one agrees that EW deserve to keep their score, this is the only reasonable solution, otherwise the TD would have to decide between giving NS the full benefit of 4S=, or hit them with the full weight of 4S-1.

James

**bluejak**

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: Misled by explanation** ( 15:48:17 WedFeb 5 2003 )

It depends what you mean by "weighted split scores". If you mean "split scores" where the two sides get different scores, we do discourage it. It is very rare, and if you look back on the thread I would not have used a split score in this case.

If you mean "weighted scores" where people get a percentage of various scores, then you have been misinformed. We encourage it, and in a case like this it shows: if we do not use Law 12C3 then the score of 4♠-1 is automatic - there is no case whatever for an adjustment of 4♠ making only.

As for the score-sheet, we do not look at it when deciding rulings.

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

**James Vickers**

**Re: Misled by explanation** ( 19:11:09 WedFeb 5 2003 )

**Reply**

**Quote: David Stevenson**

It depends what you mean by "weighted split scores". If you mean "split scores" where the two sides get different scores, we do discourage it. It is very rare, and if you look back on the thread I would not have used a split score in this case.

I mean a score which is both weighted and split, i.e. a mixture of 4S= and 4S-1 to one side (weighted) and 4S+1 to the other (split). You may not have chosen this option, but you mentioned it as a possibility.

**Quote: David Stevenson**

As for the score-sheet, we do not look at it when deciding rulings.

Quite so.

James

**bluejak**

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: Misled by explanation** ( 23:46:05 WedFeb 5 2003 )

It is true that a "weighted split score" is very rare, and probably discouraged - but that is nothing really to do with the weighted part of it. We discourage all split scores. The benchmark for split scores is quite strong in England and Wales, and as a result all split scores are very rare.

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

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

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

5 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 1 incognito and 4 guest(s).  
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **399**, Newest Member: [texian13](#).

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

The time is now 07:48:22 Mon Sep 1 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**



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

**Mariamea**

offline

1 posts  
bridgetalk member



[Reply](#)

**fifth card played to a trick** ( 13:08:58 MonFeb 3 2003 )

A player has a minor penalty card on the table and then follows suit when declarer leads the same suit i.e. has not played the penalty card. Is this a fifth card played to a trick or a lead out of turn?

**JimO**

offline

175 posts  
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

**Re: fifth card played to a trick** ( 15:33:48 MonFeb 3 2003 )

It is neither a fifth card, nor a premature lead.

The player is allowed to follow suit with an honor - A, K, Q, J, or T - rather than play the minor penalty card, without penalty. (See Law 50C).

Assuming the defender followed suit with a different spot card (2 thru 9), Law 52 applies.

Declarer has the following options:

1) he may accept the play of the second card (and must do so if he subsequently plays from his own hand or dummy).

The original card remains a minor penalty card.

2) He may require the defender to play the original minor penalty card. The second card now becomes a MAJOR penalty card.

---

-Jim O'Neil  
Oak Park, IL

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

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

5 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 1 incognito and 4 guest(s).  
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **399**, Newest Member: [texian13](#).

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

The time is now 07:48:54 Mon Sep 1 2003



**dhiru**

offline

1 posts  
bridgetalk member



Reply

**convention** ( 19:53:37 SunFeb 2 2003 )

I have just started playing bridge in United Kingdom. I do not know much about convention and cards involved. Where can I get more info. I also would like to know if some one states that he opens 1 nt (12-14 pts) and later opens with 17 pts is this allowed thanks dhiru

**bluejak**

offline

435 posts  
Forum Host

Reply

**Re: convention** ( 21:17:06 SunFeb 2 2003 )

We can always answer specific questions here, but for a general approach you should generally talk to some of the more experienced players in your local club. 🤖

If a pair says they open 12-14 1NT, and on one occasion a player decides to mislead his partner and open something else that is legal. So long as he has not got a private arrangement with partner it is permitted. In many occasions it is a mistake rather than deliberate anyway. 🌈

Only if the opponents know what they are doing but are not telling you is it illegal. 🤖

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

**JimO**

offline

175 posts  
Forum Host

Reply

**Re: convention** ( 21:21:53 SunFeb 2 2003 )

You might try the EBU website:

[www.ebu.co.uk](http://www.ebu.co.uk)

There are plenty of links to the information you're looking for. You can download blank convention cards, or a completed Standard ACOL or modern ACOL card. And there is a link to the "Orange Book", a handbook of EBU directives and permitted conventions.

(You didn't say where in the UK;  
the Scottish Bridge Union - [www.sbu.dircon.co.uk](http://www.sbu.dircon.co.uk)  
the Welsh Bridge Union - [www.wbu.org.uk](http://www.wbu.org.uk)  
I don't have a link for Northern Ireland, if there is one.)

As far as opening a 12-14 1NT with 17 hcp - I would have to determine whether or not it was deliberate (a psych) or not (a misbid). In either case, it is legal - though if it happens often, there may be repercussions - You can check out the Orange Book (Sec. 6.2)

---

-Jim O'Neil  
Oak Park, IL

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

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

5 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 1 incognito and 4 guest(s).  
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **399**, Newest Member: [texian13](#).

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

The time is now 07:49:17 Mon Sep 1 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**



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

**bldfarrar**

[Reply](#)

**Alerts** ( 02:26:32 SatFeb 1 2003 )

Is the bid Two over One alertable?

**JimO**

[offline](#)

175 posts  
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

**Re: Alerts** ( 05:50:36 SatFeb 1 2003 )

I assume what you are asking is, "Is a nonjump 2-level suit response to a 1-level suit opening alertable if it promises game values?"

Different organizations have different alert procedures. In the ACBL, such a 2/1 bid is no longer alertable. In some versions of "2/1", a partnership may stop below game on certain auctions, such as:

1S-2D

2S-3D

pass

or

1S-2D

2S-2NT

3D-pass

or even:

1S-2H

3H-pass

or

1D-2C

2NT-pass

None of the "2/1" bids are alertable any more.

My interpretation of the Orange book suggests it is not alertable in England either, but I will defer to Mr. Stevenson on that one.

---

-Jim O'Neil  
Oak Park, IL

**bluejak**

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: Alerts** ( 14:50:46 SatFeb 1 2003 )

As Jim puts it, if you are playing 2/1 as a game force then it is alertable in England and Wales, though [to be fair to Jim] I think it is not particularly clear in the Orange book. I shall take a note for the next Orange book which I am currently preparing.

If you want to know the answer in another country I may be able to answer you, or someone else may, but please tell us which country.

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

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

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

5 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 1 incognito and 4 guest(s).  
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **399**, Newest Member: [texian13](#).

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

The time is now 07:49:58 Mon Sep 1 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**



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

**p\_scammell**

**Reply**

**on-purpose facing of card/cards on table before bidding??? ruling please?** ( 19:37:00 ThuJan 30 2003 )

My question is what should the ruling be in this situation?

The situation is : At local club duplicate bridge game, a established partnership has been doing this.

In order to "teach" her partner a lesson, (the lesson being to instill that partner counts the numbers of cards in his hand face down on table, instead of his habit of looking at cards and counting them while sorting his cards in his hand, counting cards and hand point count all at once.) she has started to, on purpose , either expose her entire hand face up on the table before any bidding has started, or just facing one random card up on the table, then saying partner u didn't count your cards!!!!.

Since either of the partnership is often also our playing director, no one is saying a word about these actions, but accepting "her ruling" , I quote, "oh that is a penalty card, inless I am dummy or declarer."

This seems a childish, unfair practise, and it also does give the partner (and O's) a glimpse of her card/cards.

Just curious as to your opinion on this matter.

Thank you

**JimO**

**offline**

175 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: on-purpose facing of card/cards on table before bidding??? ruling please?** ( 20:48:28 ThuJan 30 2003 )

Law 7B1:

Each player counts his cards face down to make sure he has exactly thirteen; after that and before making a call, he must inspect the face of his cards.

Failing to do so is a violation of procedure, but I would consider it a minor violation, and would not penalize the player, unless perhaps he actually had more or fewer than 13 cards.

His partner's actions are far more serious.

Law 72B2:

A player must not infringe a law intentionally, even if there is a prescribed penalty he is willing to pay.

You can read Law 24 for the procedure when a card is exposed

duing the auction.

But this is more serious. The first time this happened, I would impose a hefty procedural penalty, along with a strng warning. The second time, I would bar this player from the club. This behavior should be reported to the appropriate authorities - in the ACBL, that would mean the unit recorder.

---

-Jim O'Neil  
Oak Park, IL

**bluejak**

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: on-purpose facing of card/cards on table  
before bidding??? ruling please?** ( 03:53:30 FriJan  
31 2003 )

I agree with Jim over the relative importance of the two player's actions. The player who is not counting his cards face down is committing a minor violation that many players forget. If anyone really wants to convince him to do so then a Procedural Penalty **every hand** until he gets it right seems suitable - 10% of a top will suffice.

But his partner is spoiling the game for others, and that means one major warning, and then expulsion. I do not care that she is often a playing director, she is demeaning the game. 🙄

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

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

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

5 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 1 incognito and 4 guest(s).  
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

**LitaHop**

[Reply](#)

**Unplayed board in Swiss** ( 08:04:49 ThuJan 30 2003 )

In a Swiss Team game of 6 boards/round, during one round, our NS pair was not allowed to play its sixth board because of extremely slow play by our opponents. Our EW pair had made a score of +450 on that board.

What is the proper scoring procedure in such a situation?

**bluejak**

[offline](#)

435 posts  
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

**Re: Unplayed board in Swiss** ( 11:54:20 ThuJan 30 2003 )

If the Director agrees that it was because your opponents were slow and not you then a normal score would be to give you Average Plus and them Average Minus. Thsi means you gain three imps on the board, and they lose three imps.

I am afraid that if he does not agree that it was their fault [and often both sides blame each other 🤔 ] then both sides get a flat board.

If he agrees it was their fault then there are two further [but very rare] possibilities. First, if they are often doing this, he can give them a procedural penalty, taking a further 3 imps or half a Victory point from them. Sadly you do not get the benefit of this! 🤔

Second, if he felt that your score in the other room was a very good one and he believes it was their fault then he just might give you an "assigned score" so you do not lose your good result. 🤔

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

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

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

[ [Print](#) ]

[ [Send](#) ]

[ [Watch](#) ]

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

**Richard J**

**Alerting** ( 23:24:37 SatJan 25 2003 )

[Reply](#)

Should an Acol strong 2 club bid be alerted ?  
Also should the 2 diamond negative be alerted ?

**bluejak**

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

**Re: Alerting** ( 01:20:39 MonJan 27 2003 )

Unfortunately we cannot answer your query without further information. 🤔

Where do you play? The regulations for alerting are different from country to country, and are also different for online bridge. If you tell us where you play then we can help.

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

**Richard J**

**Re: Alerting** ( 11:20:20 MonJan 27 2003 )

[Reply](#)

Re Alerting of Acol strong 2 club bids.  
We play in England - West Sussex to be exact.

**bluejak**

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

**Re: Alerting** ( 12:37:25 MonJan 27 2003 )

In England all calls that are not natural require an alert. As a result, an Acol 2♣ opening and an artificial 2♦ response thereto are alertable.

However, it is difficult to see how the opponents are going to be damaged if someone forgets. 🤔

Note that discussions are underway for the next Orange book, and there is a feeling that after fifteen years of unchanged alerting, the time may have come for sweeping changes because the game has changed so much. 🌈



---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

**Ed**

**Re: Alerting** ( 22:01:04 MonJan 27 2003 )

**offline**

173 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Quote: bluejak at 12:37:25 Mon Jan 27 2003**

Note that discussions are underway for the next Orange book, and there is a feeling that after fifteen years of unchanged alerting, the time may have come for sweeping changes because the game has changed so much. 🌈

Oooh. That's gonna result in complaints that you change the alert regs way too often! 🌈

**bluejak**

**Re: Alerting** ( 23:31:21 MonJan 27 2003 )

**offline**

435 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

It took us about nine years of unchanged regulations for people last time to stop saying that we changed them every year! 🙄

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

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

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

[ [Print](#) ]

[ [Send](#) ]

[ [Watch](#) ]

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

## Wotan

offline

69 posts

bridgetalk member



Reply

## High Level Decision ( 04:05:05 MonJan 27 2003 )

All Green IMPs

x

xx

AKQxxxxx

KQ

AKxxx

Ax

J

Jxxxx

(1D) P (1S) 2H

(3D) 4H (X) (P)

(5D) (P) (6D)

The 5D bid was made after a long hesitation by Nth. South then bid 6D. The

director was called and allowed the result to stand.

His comment was, "A slow 5D bid by Nth is less likely to induce a 6D bid

than a fast 5D".

What do you think of this ruling? If it were appealed, would you regard the appeal as frivolous?

Ron Lel

## bluejak

offline

435 posts

Forum Host

Reply

## Re: High Level Decision ( 12:31:54 MonJan 27 2003 )

In many [possibly most] UI situations, the UI hows something fairly obvious. Partner makes a slow penalty double, and it is clear he would be happy to hear it removed with an unsuitable hand - and the reverse is that a quick, happy double is one that partner would like you to leave in whatever.

In this case, the first question is: What does a slow 5♦ show?

It could be that he was considering defending 4♥, perhaps taking it out because of fear that it might make. Alternatively it could be that he is wondering whether 5♦ is enough, considering a more encouraging bid.

The problem as far as deciding what to rule is that these two views work in different ways. If he was considering passing, then this suggests that 6♦ now is wrong: if he was considering doing more, then this suggests that 6♦ is right.

So I agree with the TD. South is on a guess, and the hesitation from partner does not really help [apart from the fact that he is not allowed to use it].

Suppose South had passed rather than bid 6♦, and North had a hand that was borderline whether to defend 4♥, so 6♦ does not make. Now the defence would be asking for an adjustment to 6♦ - 1.

While I think this ruling fairly clear, others might disagree on the bridge judgement. For that reason, an appeal is not frivolous.

---

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>  
Liverpool, England, UK  
[http://blakjak.com/lws\\_menu.htm](http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm)

**JimO**

**offline**

175 posts  
Forum Host

**Reply**

**Re: High Level Decision** ( 16:20:57 MonJan 27 2003 )

Law 16A states, in part:

"After a player makes available to his partner extraneous information that may suggest a call or play...the partner may not choose from among logical alternative actions one that could have demonstrably be suggested over another by the extraneous information".

I think Pass is a logical alternative to 6D.

But, what does the slow 5D suggest? That North was considering a different action, surely, but which action?

6D? 4S or 5C? Probably he was considering passing - in which case 6D is less likely to be successful.

I think I'd let the result stand. But I would not find an appeal of this ruling to be frivolous.

---

-Jim O'Neil  
Oak Park, IL

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

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

5 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 1 incognito and 4 guest(s).  
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **399**, Newest Member: [texian13](#).

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

The time is now 07:52:08 Mon Sep 1 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**



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

<p><b>Guest</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Reply</b></p>	<p><b>1NT overcall</b> ( 06:02:35 WedJan 22 2003 )</p> <hr/> <p>If your left hand opponent bids 1C and your partner overcalls 1NT. Right hand opponent no bids. Can you use the transfer bids that are used when your partner opens 1NT?</p>
<p><b>bluejak</b></p> <hr/> <p> 435 posts Forum Host</p> <p><b>Reply</b></p>	<p><b>Re: 1NT overcall</b> ( 13:17:06 WedJan 22 2003 )</p> <hr/> <p>Certainly you can if you want to. You should make sure you and your partner know whether you do.</p> <p>If you want to know whether this is the best way to play then I think you are asking on the wrong forum! ☹</p> <p>Try transferring to "Ask an Expert". They answer questions on what is best to play.</p> <p>---</p> <p>David Stevenson &lt;laws2@blakjak.com&gt; Liverpool, England, UK <a href="http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm">http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm</a></p>

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

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

5 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 1 incognito and 4 guest(s).  
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **399**, Newest Member: [texian13](#).

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

The time is now 07:52:35 Mon Sep 1 2003

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

[top](#) ↑