

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 Lawspage](#) :: [EBU](#) :: [ACBL](#) :: [WBF](#)**

bridgetalk.com forums :: Laws & Rulings

International Bridge Laws Forum

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

Hosted by David Stevenson
 Senior Consultant Director
 English Bridge Union

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

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

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

[Mark Forum Read](#)

[[New Discussion](#)]

	Subject	Replies	Views	Last Post T U
<input type="checkbox"/>	Revoke - twice	2	100	JimO 13:56:06 Tue Mar 11 2003

<input type="checkbox"/>	Alerting a 1NT response	4	133	JimO 23:59:41 Sun Mar 9 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	UI case [1 2]	20	331	JimO 17:20:12 Fri Mar 7 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	the curse of scotland tells the story [1 2]	19	297	James Vickers 13:53:08 Fri Mar 7 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ethics	4	206	Guest 11:07:51 Fri Mar 7 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Card played...or not	7	151	John_M,UK 07:58:18 Fri Mar 7 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	"Legitimising" a bid or a play	2	88	Guest 22:54:59 Thu Mar 6 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Alertable?	9	146	James Vickers 17:28:13 Thu Mar 6 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Directors' refresher	1	89	bluejak 17:48:11 Mon Mar 3 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Pair leave during the game	10	246	bluejak 17:19:39 Mon Mar 3 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Resurrecting a Hand	4	135	John_M,UK 17:02:25 Mon Mar 3 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Incomplete disclosure	4	172	Robert Johnson 01:51:50 Sun Mar 2 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Score Correction Period	7	126	John_M,UK 14:47:18 Thu Feb 27 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	KQxx, KJxx hesitation	14	210	bergid 20:08:55 Tue Feb 25 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Acol 2 Club bid	3	128	Ed 06:40:15 Mon Feb 24 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Revoke	2	93	bluejak 15:16:59 Sat Feb 22 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Response of PASS to a double following a Weak 2	7	147	bridgeaddict 18:50:25 Fri Feb 21 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Running suit in dummy	2	109	bluejak 16:50:28 Fri Feb 21 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Dummy play(?)	1	81	JimO 14:13:53 Fri Feb 21 2003
<input type="checkbox"/>	Dummy says, "having none?"	2	115	John_M,UK 13:47:19 Wed Feb 19 2003

[New Discussion](#)

Get Email Advice of New Discussions in This Forum

George

Reply

Revoke - twice (11:42:48 TueMar 11 2003)

Hi there.

I was called to a table by declarer who was playing 4S, where a defender has revoked twice.

First revoke: diamond led, defender ruffs in and wins trick.

Second revoke: heart led, defender ruffs in and wins trick.

Result: declarer goes two off.

NB. Defender DID win other tricks between the two revokes, but did not win any tricks subsequent to the second revoke.

The first part of the ruling was simple: one trick transferred for winning revoke trick, another for winning a subsequent trick. Then I may have got it wrong.

My overall ruling was to transfer two tricks to declarer, but having given it some more thought, I think I may have misunderstood law 64 B2. :dunno:

At the time, I assumed that since she had ruffed on both occasions (ie. played the same suit on both revokes) then law 64 B2 meant there was no penalty for the second revoke.

The wording of 64 B2 seems a bit ambiguous but the definition of a revoke as "the play of a card of another suit..." makes me think that it is referring to the suit led.

So in the above scenario, should I have transferred 3 tricks to the non-offending side?

And had the offending side won a further trick, subsequent to her second revoke, would this have merited transferring 4 tricks?

Many thanks

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Revoke - twice (13:20:24 TueMar 11 2003)

Yes, you have misunderstood Law 64B2, as you suspected. 

When it refers to a revoke "**in**" a suit it means revoking "in" the suit led.

So you should have given three tricks, or four tricks, dependent on how many tricks were available.

In effect the Law says that if a player revokes on a heart lead, and does so again [and perhaps again!] which does happen when a player has a little heart stuck behind another card, then that is one revoke.

But it is different when two different suits are led. After all, it is no longer possible that the second revoke was because the same single card was invisible. 

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

JimO



175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Revoke - twice (13:56:06 TueMar 11 2003)

Country: USA

I believe it should a three trick penalty - 2 tricks for the first revoke (offender won the revoke trick; offending side won subsequent tricks) and 1 trick for the second revoke (offender won revoke trick, but offending side did not win any tricks subsequent to revoke trick).

And, had the offending side won a trick subsequent to the second revoke, that would mea a 4-trick penalty.

Also, I am assuming the second revoke occured prior to trick 12. Revokes on trick 12 are not subject to trick penalty, but are corrected.

Of course, if 3 tricks does not restore equity to the non-offenders, then the penaty could be more.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 15:14:04 Sat Aug 30 2003

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

[top](#) ☐

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

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

☐ **Email**

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

**carol a.
Heinrich**

[Reply](#)

Alerting a 1NT response (15:21:34 SatMar 8 2003)

if my partner opens 1club and there is an interveni bid and I respond 1 no trump.How many points am I showinh?????

JimO

☐
175 posts
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

Re: bridge (17:07:39 SatMar 8 2003)


Your question probably belongs in the "Ask an Expert" or "The Bridge Table" forums.

This forum is intended to be a discussion of the Laws and rulings, though other questions of a directoral nature, i.e., movements, scoring, etc., are generally welcome as well.

Assuming there is a ruling-related reason for your question:
After 1C-1x, the 1NT bid should show about 7-10 points and a stopper in the opponents suit. Some play it weaker (e.g. 6-9, some a little stronger (e.g., 8-11).
If the bid is not in this range, and/or does not promise a stopper, it should be alerted.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

bridgeaddict

Unavailable
510 posts

Administrator



[Reply](#)

Re: bridge (20:37:23 SatMar 8 2003)

A copy of this thread is now in the **"Ask an Expert"** forum. Please post any future replies there.

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: bridge (23:37:27 SunMar 9 2003)

Jim is usually very punctilious in his replies, but he has slipped slightly here! 

Whne he says that if the range is other than the standard it should be alerted he should have added **in the ACBL**.

Alerting is different in different countries, which is one reason we always ask people to quote their country with queries, and in many countries 1NT would not be alertable just because the range is unusual.

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

JimO



175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: bridge (23:59:41 SunMar 9 2003)

Country: USA

Yes, of course.
I apologize.

Different countries have not only different alert procedures, but also different procedures regarding allowable conventions, skip bid procedures, bid-box procedures, etc. Furthermore, the Laws themsevles vary among sponsoring organizations (Laws 12C3 and 61B, for example).

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

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

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

[[Print](#)]

[[Send](#)]

[[Watch](#)]

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

Ben Cowling

UI case (12:14:14 MonMar 3 2003)

Reply

hi

I recently played in a big tournament, and this board came up:

☐ T2
☐ AQ82
☐ AKJ43
☐ K6

☐ 7
☐ KJ4
☐ 976
☐ AJT942

☐ KJ
☐ 97653
☐ Q82
☐ 873

☐ AQ986543
☐ T
☐ T5
☐ Q5

Auction:

West	North	East	South
-	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	No	4 <input type="checkbox"/> (1)
No	4NT (2)	No	5 <input type="checkbox"/> (3)
No	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	No	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
End			

(1) alerted; West asked for explanation and was told it was a splinter, with a good hand, diamond support, and spade shortage.

(2) RKCB

(3) 0 or 3 key cards (after a very long hesitation)

At the end of the auction, we called the director to ask him to

record the auction (we weren't really sure what we should do, but we thought we might have been damaged). Anyway, he told us he didn't understand why we had called him, and asked us to call him back at the end of the board, if we felt we had been damaged in any way.

Result: 5S+1 for NS +480 after the ☐A was led.

At the time, NS were very upset with us for calling the director - South showed me his hand, and said that I had no case against them. In any case, on the travelling scoresheet, some NS pairs had reached the making spade slam, so our score was slightly better than average. So I didn't call the director back.

Looking at the hand now, it seems to me that South has the UI that his partner thinks 4S wasn't natural (the alert is UI to him) - and therefore after his partner's subsequent 5D bid, i think he has two logical alternatives - Pass, or bid 5S. I think that Pass is a logical alternative, because South does have ruffing values, and an ace (albeit he has denied it). If his partner, knowing that all he has is a long string of spades, still wants to play in 5D, it must be a LA for this hand to pass.

Is my thought pattern correct -- I am not that familiar with the finer points of the law. If i had called the director back, would he have adjusted the score in my favour?

thanks
Ben Cowling

bluejak

☐
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: UI case (17:29:39 MonMar 3 2003)

if you are not quite sure what you should be doing then **always** call the Director and ask! I would certainly have called the Director back at the end.

As for North-South, either they were very inexperienced or they were unethical. After UI is given to partner as here calling the Director is quite routine.

Would I have adjusted on the actual hand? I doubt it. If you do not use UI and are totally ethical you will probably bid 6☐ over 5☐ because it seems to ask for the ☐Q. Since that makes your side would get a poorer score.

Passing 5 ☐ is not really a credible alternative. First, 4NT probably agrees spades, and second, even if it doesn't, players with eight card spade suits do not become dummy! ☐:smile:

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

Guest

Re: UI case (17:46:14 MonMar 3 2003)

Reply

Thanks for your reply - yes I see why no adjustment is necessary.

I have noticed one further point - why is South lying about his aces, in RKCB? This seems completely unethical to me - it seems he has only lied because he knows the wheels have come off! Interestingly, if he answers correctly, they will reach the making slam!

N.B. the pair are very experienced, being at least EBU Regional Masters.

bluejak

Re: UI case (17:53:34 MonMar 3 2003)



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Yes, interesting. It could be a player being unethical deliberately, but there are other interpretations. ☐:sad:

With due respect to yourself and my wife, I do not really think Regional Masters are necessarily what I would call very experienced! ☐:smile:

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

James Vickers

Re: UI case (18:27:39 MonMar 3 2003)

Reply

Country: UK

I agree that South's 5C response is an infraction, as it could have been suggested over and above 5D (the correct reply) by the UI. Whether this would have made any difference to the final result or not is not easy to determine, but South should certainly get his wrist slapped.

What would have happened if screens had been in use (no-one knows about partner's alerts)?

1D - 4S

N: "Partner has diamond support, spade shortage and slam interest"

S: "Let's play in 4S"

4NT (I'm assuming North intended this as RKCB)

N: "Let's see how many key cards South has"

S: "Partner has spade support and slam interest and wants to know how many key cards I have"

South has no reason not to bid 5D.

N: "Partner has one key card, so I'll do whatever it was I planned to do on hearing this response when I bid RKCB in the first place. (Darn, what was it now?)"

North might bid 6D, putting partner with the club A and a spade singleton. Now:

N: "Partner likes the sound of my hand and is making a grand slam try, showing a diamond feature (presumably the king). Shall I accept (7S), decline (6S) or make another try (6H)?"

Well, what would North do? If NS play the sort of methods I am suggesting, the failure of North to cue bid a club feature might point to a second round loser in the suit and persuade South to sign off in 6S. On the other hand, might North not have a likely parking place for this club loser (DQ or HK)? If NS are playing different methods (e.g. rolling king ask), should not North respond to 5D on this basis?

I leave you to decide. This may be rather speculative, but it's not too far fetched, and it does illustrate what kind of mess you can

land yourself in after a bidding misunderstanding. I think you should explore the possibility of NS landing in a grand slam.

James

Shuffler

Re: UI case (00:28:01 TueMar 4 2003)

Reply

Country: USA

A question about the splinter bid over a minor...isn't a bid of 3S Splinter? If so, the 4S is a preemptive spade bid?

Shuffler

Henry's

Re: UI case (01:53:40 TueMar 4 2003)

Reply

Quote: Guest [Unregistered]

at 18:27:39 Mon Mar 3 2003]N:
"Partner likes the sound of my hand
and is making a grand slam try,
showing a diamond feature
(presumably the king). Shall I accept
(7S), decline (6S) or make another
try (6H)?"

I leave you to decide. This may be
rather speculative, but it's not too far
fetched, and it does illustrate what
kind of mess you can land yourself in
after a bidding misunderstanding. I
think you should explore the
possibility of NS landing in a grand
slam.

James has a good point. As the thread appears to agree that there is no reason for south NOT to bid 5d= 1/4 key cards, the question would seem to be, 'what would 6d mean after the 5d response'? If I remember it right from one of Eddie Kantar's books, that should be looking for 3rd round diamond control with all key cards known to be held plus the qs. If north needed to know about the sq, he could

ask with 5h; if north were interested in locating kings, he could bid 5nt.

IF this would, indeed, be the system agreement, then I think it is absolutely clear for south to bid 7s. North must have at least Kxx spades and be inferring a 10 card spade fit (AJTxxxx or the like) and know that south cannot hold a side king for his preemptive response. Since I know of no way (at least, no common way) for North to ask for side singletons, South's doubleton must be deemed sufficient. Even if north has something like Kxx; AK; Axxxxx; Ax you might be able to pitch the losing diamond on a heart and ruff diamonds good.

So if I were a director, I'd award the adjusted score of 7s down 1. Were I a committee, I'd uphold the director.

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host


Reply

Re: UI case (02:15:43 TueMar 4 2003)

Quote: Shuffler

A question about the splinter bid over a minor...isn't a bid of 3S Splinter? If so, the 4S is a preemptive spade bid?

Certainly, and I expect this is the agreement this pair had.

But people make mistakes, and most rulings in bridge start with someone making a mistake! 

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

John_M,UK

Reply

Re: UI case (09:20:15 TueMar 4 2003)

Country: England

Hi,

If I might just make an observation about the hand and bidding.

North Opens, East passes (no overcall, but maybe values), South Jumps to 4S.

At this point things get a little difficult and West doesn't help matters.

The explanation is a little bit off, admittedly, and all the glaring is a little bit suspect and the subsequent whinging is down right rude.

But West asked a question during the auction, Why?

It would be interesting to know if E/W were vulnerable, obviously N/S weren't.

If West is considering a bid the only one he can possibly be considering is 5C. On West's holding and with a pass from partner a double of 4S is suicide. But after a pass from partner there is unlikely to be game going values between the hands ~ anything West does at this point is guess work.

Unless, of course, the question is for East's benefit to highlight values in West's hand ie. if they go too high double (UI).

Now I am not saying that N/W were ethical in their bidding or behaviour ~ that would be for others to judge. What I am suggesting is that at that point in the auction West should have kept quiet ~ from the look of West's hand (ignoring East's hand) he hasn't got a bid so an explanation at that point of the auction could open West up to a counter accusation of Unethical play.

Perhaps my view is too simplistic, I would be interested in people's thoughts on my scenario.

Kind regards,

John.

Ben Cowling

Reply

Re: UI case (09:51:20 TueMar 4 2003)

The vulnerability was Love All

Yes - I wish my partner hadn't asked what the bid meant. In fact, when the director came, my partner launched into an argument that she might have wanted to bid, if she had been given the correct argument. This is obviously a bit dubious, and confused the director about why I had called him. He said that if she wanted to bid over 4S natural, why would she not want to bid over 4S as a splinter?

I had called the director because I was suspicious about their actions (but i didn't know why), and wanted to record the auction.

Btw asking in itself isn't necessarily bad is it? - some pairs have the agreement that they will **always** ask about every alert - in that case you would only transmit UI by **not asking** (thus showing a very poor hand).

John_M,UK

Reply

Re: UI case (10:17:45 TueMar 4 2003)

Country: England

Thanks for the update Ben.

No there is nothing wrong with asking questions but, unfortunately, there are times when you are going to help the opposition out ~ Sometimes the opposition may have a choice of responses and can argue the toss that there decision wasn't based on UI ~ I've seen it done numerous times.

I believe that partnerships that have an agreement to ask about every alert would need to make such an agreement known at the start of the match so that they don't fall foul of any accusations of "partnership" agreements.

My understanding is that if something falls outside the "norm" and into a partnership agreement, then the opposition must be made aware of it before play begins.

One question about etiquette remains. What can a TD do about rude players. I have come across all sorts of players where repeatedly calling the TD would only compound a bad situation. Then there is also the fear that those players are going to make

"false" accusations about your attitude.

For example, in a fairly recent game, declarer had 5 cards left on table and said discard anything. Dummy discarded the 2 of clubs. when I said please discard the Jack of clubs ~ dummy went "ballistic". "dummy" didn't get their own way and that put them in a bad mood ~ I fail to see what a TD could have done to "make things better".

All the best.

James Vickers

Re: UI case (14:11:48 TueMar 4 2003)

Reply

Country: UK

Quote: John_M, UK

No there is nothing wrong with asking questions but, unfortunately, there are times when you are going to help the opposition out ~ Sometimes the opposition may have a choice of responses and can argue the toss that there decision wasn't based on UI ~ I've seen it done numerous times.

I believe that partnerships that have an agreement to ask about every alert would need to make such an agreement known at the start of the match so that they don't fall foul of any accusations of "partnership" agreements.

The problem is that West has a legal right to ask at her turn to call. Most players understand this. What they don't understand and seemingly cannot grasp is that asking demonstrates a need to know at this point and conveys unauthorized information. I think the way this is handled varies according to zone, but my understanding is that in England partner may not take action which could have been suggested over a logical alternative by the interest shown in the auction.

This means that if East had made a questionable double and defeated the contract (on a different layout) the double should be cancelled if it could have been suggested over a pass.

I would do this regardless of whether West belonged to the category of player who "always ask" (I know so many of them). I really think it is beyond the means of directors to garner intimate knowledge of every player's mannerisms. In the same way I throw the book at players who disregard the "stop" procedure. If they bid too quickly after a stop bid, the argument that they never pause anyway cuts no ice with me. Conversely if I know they never (rarely) stop and think for a while on one occasion, that's UI as well.

James

AlanW

Re: UI case (16:02:29 TueMar 4 2003)

Reply

Quote: James Vickers

I throw the book at players who disregard the "stop" procedure. If they bid too quickly after a stop bid, the argument that they never pause anyway cuts no ice with me. Conversely if I know they never (rarely) stop and think for a while on one occasion, that's UI as well.

This is something that seems to be impossible to get observed properly - even on our 'county' nights when only the better players in the county are expected to be playing, the majority of players simply will not pause after a stop bid. Of course, we all know auctions where the immediate pass doesn't really convey information, such as 1N (pass) stop 3N, for example. But most players do not pause even over pre-empts, although the director has repeatedly made a general point about how stop bids are supposed to work. It's not that these people don't know what they are supposed to do, they simply don't see why they should be bothered.

My only, slightly forlorn, reaction is to look carefully at their partner's hand each time to see whether they might have a case for

bidding on, or a unilateral overcall, or whatever, without the UI and therefore to be able to suggest to the director that they should be conceding 800 or 1100 or whatever. I've never known the score to be adjusted for somebody not bidding in these circumstances, though, even though it's just as logical as adjusting when they do bid after partner's slow pass has given UI.

Ed



173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: UI case (17:02:45 TueMar 4 2003)

Quote: Guest [Unregistered]

at 10:17:45 Tue Mar 4 2003]

No there is nothing wrong with asking questions but, unfortunately, there are times when you are going to help the opposition out ~ Sometimes the opposition may have a choice of responses and can argue the toss that there decision wasn't based on UI ~ I've seen it done numerous times.

If UI is present (and asking a question about a specific call **always** gives UI) and a player who has it may have taken advantage of it and damage results, the score should be adjusted. Offender's arguments are relevant, but not conclusive.


Quote: Guest [Unregistered]

at 10:17:45 Tue Mar 4 2003]

I believe that partnerships that have an agreement to ask about every alert would need to make such an agreement known at the start of the match so that they don't fall foul of any accusations of "partnership" agreements.

My understanding is that if something falls outside the "norm" and into a partnership agreement, then the opposition must be made aware of it before play begins.

Interesting view. 

If a partnership make an agreement to always ask, then, yes, they have an agreement. But it's not an agreement about the meaning of a call or play, so I'm not so sure it falls under the disclosure rules. However, practically speaking, I don't suppose there's anything **wrong** with disclosing it at the start of a match, and it might forestall ill feeling, if nothing else. So yeah, disclose it. But I don't think **not** disclosing it is wrong. I may be wrong about that, in which case I'm sure David will tell us. 

Quote: Guest [Unregistered]

at 10:17:45 Tue Mar 4 2003]

One question about etiquette remains. What can a TD do about rude players. I have come across all sorts of players where repeatedly calling the TD would only compound a bad situation. Then there is also the fear that those players are going to make "false" accusations about your attitude.

For example, in a fairly recent game, declarer had 5 cards left on table and said discard anything. Dummy discarded the 2 of clubs. when I said please discard the Jack of clubs ~ dummy went "ballistic". "dummy" didn't get their own way and that put them in a bad mood ~ I fail to see what a TD could have done to "make things better".

This one's easy. 

In the specific case, TD rules iaw Law 46B5:

Quote: Law 46B5

If declarer indicates a play without designating either a suit or rank (as by saying, "`play anything", or words of like import), either defender may designate the play from dummy.

I would also caution dummy, if his displeasure has been made manifest, that he may run afoul of the general case: rudeness is a violation of Law 74. That law says that a player "should" be courteous, which means that an occasional offense would probably not be penalized (except in the ACBL, which has a "Zero Tolerance" policy). Nonetheless, repeated or egregious violations may subject the offender(s) to penalty.

You can't **make** people be polite - but if TD calmly and clearly explains the law and the possible consequences, most folks will comply, IMO. Sometimes, I admit, drastic action is needed. We had one player locally who had acquired a reputation for rudeness. One day he was rude to the TD. She banned him from the club for 30 days. He's been a paragon of virtue since. :smile:

On alerting and asking in the EBU

Ref: EBU Orange Book, sections 3.4 and 5

Quote: EBU OB

The right to ask questions is not a licence to do so without consequence: if you ask about an unalerted call and then pass, you have shown an interest which may influence your partner. Asking about an alerted call and then bidding reduces this possibility, but in either case if your partner acts in a way that suggests he has taken advantage of your question, then unauthorised information may be deemed to have been given. Similarly, if you ask a question and then pass, thus ending the auction, your partner's choice of lead, from the logical alternatives available,

must not be one that could have been suggested by your question.
(Law 16A, 73F1)

Note: If, at your turn to call, you do not need to have a call explained, it is in your interest to defer all questions until either you are about to make the opening lead or your partner's lead is face-down on the table.

This doesn't specifically address the question of an agreement to always ask, but it does seem to discourage it.

I would add that asking about an unalerted call, except in search of further information after an explanation of the **entire auction**, is a violation of Law 20.

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: UI case (23:38:12 TueMar 4 2003)

Quote: Ed

I would add that asking about an unalerted call, except in search of further information after an explanation of the entire auction, is a violation of Law 20.

This view is not universal, and is certainly not the English view. It is normal to ask about a single call - bridge would become unmanageable otherwise. The Law concerned can be read in more than one way and we see no reason to go for the reading that ruins the game.

Quote: Ed

If a partnership make an agreement to always ask, then, yes, they have an agreement.

I just do not believe that pairs have such an agreement and stick to

it.

Quote: Alan W

I've never known the score to be adjusted for somebody not bidding in these circumstances, though, even though it's just as logical as adjusting when they do bid after partner's slow pass has given UI.

There was a case at Brighton where the bidding went Stop 3 ☐ very fast pass 4 ☐ passed out. We adjusted to 4 ☐ three off because we considered 4 ☐ over 4 ☐ was a logical alternative so we disallowed the pass. But I agree it is rare.

Quote: John M

One question about etiquette remains. What can a TD do about rude players. I have come across all sorts of players where repeatedly calling the TD would only compound a bad situation. Then there is also the fear that those players are going to make "false" accusations about your attitude.

If you do not report this to the TD it will never improve - give him a chance to do his job. Discourtesy is against the Laws.

Quote: John M

For example, in a fairly recent game, declarer had 5 cards left on table and said discard anything. Dummy discarded the 2 of clubs. when I said please discard the Jack of clubs ~ dummy went "ballistic". "dummy" didn't get their own way and that put them in a bad mood ~ I fail to see what a TD could have done to "make things better".

If the TD tells them their attitude is intolerable, and they will get thrown out of the game if they are so discourteous again they will not get into a better mood now, certainly. But it will improve the game for everyone in future.

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

View Thread Page(s): [**1** **2**]

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

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

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

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

The time is now 15:15:06 Sat Aug 30 2003

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

top ☐

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

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

☐ **Email**

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

ne_trepide

Reply

the curse of scotland tells the story (08:28:14

TueMar 4 2003)

another interesting problem arose at the local bridge club - please give me a ruling or at least an opinion.
opponents had bid diamonds during the auction - and win the auction in 4s.
my partner leads the 9d - dummy goes down showing 5 diamonds - i hold 4 diamonds.
it is obvious to me my partner has a singleton diamond.
we move on -
my partner wins a trick and in trying to find an entry to my hand leads a heart - i hold the king and the ace lies on the table.
declarer mumbles something, dummy plays small, i rise with the king and declarer plays small.
i lead a diamond (the setting trick) and declarer says, "i called for the ace".
my partner says i didn't hear what you said, i concur and declarer's partner (dummy) says i thought you said "small".
the director is called and hasn't got a clue what to rule so eventually - with the whole room looking at us - i say, "well let's take an average."
would you believe we came second on the day losing by 0.24%.
it was only a club game and i'm sure the declarer was not lying (not that this is relevant) and like most clubs we are short of quality directors but....
how should it have been ruled?

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: the curse of scotland tells the story (

23:58:31 TueMar 4 2003)

Directors make judgement decisions - they have to. So your Director has to decide for what declarer called. If he decides declarer called for a small card the play stands. If not then Law 45D applies, and the cards get corrected.

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

ne_trepide



14 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: the curse of scotland tells the story (

00:59:28 WedMar 5 2003)

do you think should apply even after declarer has played to the trick?

additionally the first card to the next trick is played.

would you not think this dis-advantages the defenders who are totally blameless; surely the play should stand since the declarer has played to the trick.

i would agree if declarer had not played.

is not the original fault (and therefore subject to penalty) the fact that all parties did not hear what declarer claims to have called and surely in following the declarer accepted the small heart from dummy?

Ed




173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: the curse of scotland tells the story (

06:05:49 WedMar 5 2003)

The Law to which David referred, 45D, says "If dummy places in the played position a card that declarer did not name, the card must be withdrawn if attention is drawn to it before each side has played to the next trick, and a defender may withdraw (without penalty) a card played after the error but before attention was drawn to it; if declarer's RHO changes his play, declarer may withdraw a card he had subsequently played to that trick (see Law 16C2)."

Since declarer has not played to the **next** trick from either his hand or dummy, the low card on the previous trick is withdrawn, and the ace substituted. You may now withdraw your king, and substitute a different heart. If you do so, declarer may withdraw *his* card. The reference to Law 16C2 is to say that the fact that you have the K and another diamond is UI to declarer; he may not base a subsequent play on that knowledge if he has an LA. (That your partner now knows you have those cards is AI to him.)

John_M,UK

Reply

Re: the curse of scotland tells the story (

07:15:57 WedMar 5 2003)

Isn't the moral of the story to ask for clarification when declarer calls for a card and you didn't hear/understand what card/play was called for? Don't assume dummy got it right.

Wouldn't the position of the QH impact on the TD's decision. If it is in declarers hand then there is no reason to believe that he wasn't trying to run to the QH? If declarer hasn't got the QH then it was a mistake (probably)?

Kind regards,

John.

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: the curse of scotland tells the story (

10:13:06 WedMar 5 2003)

How would the Director know it was in declarer's hand? Competent directors **never** look in the hand during the play because they would be scattering unauthorised information around themselves.

Directors just have to make a judgement based on what people say.

Furthermore, people make silly mistakes. Directors learn early that because a play is illogical that does not mean a player will not do it! Perhaps a player was thinking of the next trick or something.

:smile:

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

John_M,UK

Reply

Re: the curse of scotland tells the story (

10:50:30 WedMar 5 2003)

Country: England

:embarrassed: My Mistake.

So, if the view is that the director wouldn't look at the hand/s during play and the problem is that declarer's mistake might lead to the contract going off, wouldn't it be reasonable for the director to say something like, Play the Ace and I will return at the end of the hand ~ that way the director would be able to "fully access" the logicity of the claim that the Ace was called for and that the player was NOT resorting to unethical play, by chancing that the lead was away from the KH, with a "get out of jail card" in his deck as well?

Obviously the KH was revealed and that impacts on declarers decision making; he now knows that the ace isn't going to catch the king so the Ace can be played "without regret".

In this circumstance as a defender I would have said "play the Ace and we will call the director at the end." If declarer then called the director I would suggest that the hand be played out with "declarers correction" so that the "damage and legitimacy of the correction" could be established.

Would I be within my rights to ask for that? Would it be reasonable for the TD and declarer to comply?

Thanks,

John.

John_M,UK

Reply

Re: the curse of scotland tells the story (
11:20:04 WedMar 5 2003)

Country: England

As an after thought.

Am I right in thinking that Law 46A puts the onus on Declarer to call for the correct card clearly.

As declarer was the only person out of the 4 to assert he called for the Ace, doesn't the spirit of that law mean that any rulings would be inclined to be more favourable to the defenders? And as such the TD has an "obligation" to base a decision on the fullest amount of information possible ~ after the hand has been played?

Thanks again,

John.

John_M,UK

Reply

Re: the curse of scotland tells the story (
11:30:13 WedMar 5 2003)

Country: England

Second and final afterthought;

If the spirit of Law 46A favours the defence and the director deems that an Average should be taken would it be defensible to state this law and give defenders "Average +" and declarer "Average -".

Kind regards,

John.

ne_trepide



14 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: the curse of scotland tells the story (

13:01:23 WedMar 5 2003)

i do believe the laws of bridge do leave me amazed at times.
surely it is the responsibility of the declarer to ensure dummy plays the nominated card - and do so immediately, or at least before playing to the trick themselves - not 6 played cards later.
one responder to this problem said that perhaps declarer was thinking of the next trick and missed dummy's play.
that is declarer's problem and it should not be that the defenders pay for the declarer's inattention or distraction.
if the declarer mumbles (or whispers) so softly that the 3 others at the table did not apparently hear correctly - don't forget dummy believed "small" was called for; then surely the fault- in every instance - is with declarer.
incidentally the heart queen was in the hand of declarer but this fact is really irrelevant since such a play towards the queen opens up the opportunity for the diamond ruff.
that is if one assumes declarer realised the 9D was indeed a singleton and not shall we say a doubleton.

John_M,UK

Re: the curse of scotland tells the story (

13:28:42 WedMar 5 2003)

Reply

Country: England

Hi ne_trepide,

Sorry for Hi-jacking your thread.

The picture I am trying to paint is that declarer Knew the next round of diamonds was going to be ruffed by your partner .

So when the heart is led with Ace on table and queen in hand declarer has a decision to make - is the lead away from KH looking for a speculative QH ~ declarer decides that he can afford to lose the KH but can't afford the ruff or to lose the QH.

By the KH now being revealed Declarer cries "foul" to avoid the ruff with the reassurance that the KH can't catch his Queen so declarer can now draw trumps instead of the "risky" play of allowing the ruff and finding that it was the bare KH, lol.

I'm with you ~ declarer fluffed it whichever way you look at it and the best result that declarer should have got was "Average minus"

say 60/40.

I am very interested to know what the experts think.

Thanks,

John.

All the best.

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: the curse of scotland tells the story (

00:41:52 ThuMar 6 2003)

Quote: John M

So, if the view is that the director wouldn't look at the hand/s during play and the problem is that declarer's mistake might lead to the contract going off, wouldn't it be reasonable for the director to say something like, Play the Ace and I will return at the end of the hand ~ that way the director would be able to "fully access" the logicity of the claim that the Ace was called for and that the player was NOT resorting to unethical play, by chancing that the lead was away from the KH, with a "get out of jail card" in his deck as well?

When you call the Director because of an irregularity he rules as the Laws require. In this case he decides what card was called for from dummy and then bases his ruling on this decision.

Why are you suggesting he does something different? TDs are not allowed to ignore the Laws, and it will cause unimaginable trouble if they do. What for, anyway?

Quote: John M

Obviously the KH was revealed and that impacts on declarers decision making; he now knows that the ace isn't going to catch the king so the Ace can be played "without regret".

The ☐K is unauthorised information to declarer so if he chooses amongst logical alternatives one suggested by the sight of the ☐K the TD will adjust.

Quote: John M

In this circumstance as a defender I would have said "play the Ace and we will call the director at the end." If declarer then called the director I would suggest that the hand be played out with "declarers correction" so that the "damage and legitimacy of the correction" could be established."

You are not allowed to give rulings at your table, especially wrong rulings.

Quote: John M

Would I be within my rights to ask for that? Would it be reasonable for the TD and declarer to comply?

No. Stick to rulings given by the TD from the law book. ☐:smile:

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

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: the curse of scotland tells the story (

00:49:39 ThuMar 6 2003)

Quote: John M

Am I right in thinking that Law 46A puts the onus on Declarer to call for the correct card clearly.

As declarer was the only person out of the 4 to assert he called for the Ace, doesn't the spirit of that law mean that any rulings would be inclined to be more favourable to the defenders? And as such the TD has an "obligation" to base a decision on the fullest amount of information possible ~ after the hand has been played?

Either declarer called for the ace, or he did not. 

The TD has to rule. He cannot ignore the Law: he must make a decision. Of course he will notice that three people say one thing and one another - like everything else he is told he will use that in making his determination.

But he cannot wait until the end of the hand to tell them how to proceed now.

Quote: John M

If the spirit of Law 46A favours the defence and the director deems that an Average should be taken would it be defensible to state this law and give defenders "Average +" and declarer "Average -".

He is not giving an average. He is either ruling the ace was played, and giving a ruling under Law 46D, or he is ruling it was not, and letting play continue.

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


John_M,UK

Re: the curse of scotland tells the story (
08:09:54 ThuMar 6 2003)

Reply

Country: England

Thanks bluejak for the insight.

As ne_trepide said, "i do believe the laws of bridge do leave me amazed at times." 

So if the TD is to decide if the Ace was called for or not based on what people say how should he rule?;

1 person says he called for the Ace

1 person says he called for "small"

2 people didn't hear what he called for.


True you say that either declarer called for the Ace or he didn't ~ so what is the point of Law 46A?


Law 46: Incomplete or Erroneous call of card from dummy;

A. Proper Form for Designating Dummy's Card

When calling a card to be played from dummy, declarer should clearly state both the suit and the rank of the desired card.

So how is the TD supposed to deal with the UI and indeed how are the defenders and declarer supposed to deal with it if they are "not

allowed to make rulings at table especially wrong rulings"  ~ this implies that should the TD rule that the Ace was called that he should remain at table to "adjust". Yet how is the TD going to be able to fathom "what's what" and how are the defenders going to know exactly what UI declarer is in possession of until the hand is played out.

From my "neutral"  perspective, once the TD rules the ACE was called for then declarer is in possession of the following UI;

1. The KH is held by his RHO;

1.1 The Ace cannot catch the King.

1.2 The King cannot catch the Queen.

2. RHO holds another diamond;

2.1 The diamond lead was probably a singleton*

3. The RHO holds at least 1 other heart;

3.1 Therefore if a diamond ruff is taken there is no chance of RHO getting back in with a heart ruff.

All that info is known* to declarer ~ would it influence the contract? Well it certainly doesn't damage declarer knowing it.

*(this is probably helped by RHO's quick return of a diamond once the heart is lead with AH on table, I don't know for certain but I think it is a "reasonable" assumption).

However, if those are the rules then so be it ~ but should the TD remain to adjust for use of UI ~ remember the TD has no idea of "supplementary" UI held by declarer because he has not seen declarers hand?

I would say that declarer "at best" wasn't watching what the RHO was doing when he played the KH ~ so he "assumed" the Ace would hold and not be ruffed.

This is one part of "Bridge Laws" that I cannot fathom, the apportioning of blame in this case declarer has not observed;

Law 46A

Law 74B1

There are other laws I could point to but no doubt it is down to my



strict interpretation of them

How can the "game" hold legitimacy when 1 side clearly made an error "declarers" and yet they have the chance to put it right to the detriment of defenders.

If declarer calls for a card from dummy and doesn't watch (74B1) what is played and then misses the KH being played and still doesn't notice the Ace was not played (74B1) declarer should lose the right to appeal the played card ~ but the opposition should have a right to correct a card call from declarer that dummy doesn't follow.

Still, in my humble opinion, defenders should have asked declarer



to "say again" what card he called for

Thanks again bluejak I appreciate your input. I hope you don't mind

me putting forward a "players perspective" on the decisions made


But I would add, come "play time" I NEVER question a TD over a decision. This has cost me in the past with bad decisions being made against me ~ but my firm belief is a TD never gives a bad decision on purpose and I will not be the first to cast the proverbial stone (unless the opposition make a meal out of a situation 😊).



All the best,

John.

ne_trepide



14 posts
 bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: the curse of scotland tells the story (

22:33:23 ThuMar 6 2003)

john i cannot believe you are serious when you suggest the defender should ask the declarer to clarify which card was called for.

it should be sufficient to accept that dummy has heard correctly and played accordingly or if dummy is in doubt then dummy should ask for clarification.

for the defender to ask for a clarification is a clear signal to the declarer that the king of hearts (in this particular example) is held by the RH defender.

it is also a clear signal to the defender's partner that the KH is held. akin to cheating i would think.

think of the implications of such enquiries - not to mention how the game would be slowed, and don't suggest one should only ask when one has not heard clearly. how do anyone else know why the enquiry is being raised?

View Thread Page(s): [**1** **2**]

[**Get Email Advice of Replies**]

[**Print**]

[**Send**]

[**Watch**]

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

Ben Cowling

Reply

Ethics (12:32:53 MonMar 3 2003)

Hi

I have just posted a hand where there seems to be UI. I think that the information I gave should be sufficient, but I was upset by other things relating to the same round:

Firstly, in the board I described, North opened 1 \square , and alerted her partner's jump to 4 \square . Now, while alerting that bid, North was looking directly at her partner's face, the whole time. Anyway, noticing her stare, I looked at South (the 4 \square bidder), and his body language was definitely saying that she shouldn't have been alerting. He sat back, with a confused look on his face.

To me this action, of watching your partner's face while you alert, seems completely unethical, although I won't mention the "c" word - i suppose in her defence, she could argue that she wants to get as much UI as possible, so as to be as ethical as possible about not taking advantage of it. However, even if this kind of thing is unethical, i can't see what can be done about it. It was my word against their word when i mentioned it to the director, and he believed them.

After this board, we still had to play three more boards against the same pair, and they were pretty rude to us from then on. It seemed they were annoyed that I had called the director, and thought I was accusing them of cheating. North, in particular, wouldn't stop glaring at me, which I found very off-putting. Again, even if this kind of thing is unethical, i can't see what can be done about it (although is this related to "Zero Tolerance" in the ACBL?)

In any case, I shrugged it off and carried on with the session - but was horrified, and very disappointed, when it transpired that this pair were the winners over the 90 board tournament!

I wasn't going to mention the names of the pair in question. I will just comment that I am a Regional Master, and was playing in a national tournament in Coventry, UK, this past weekend.

Ben Cowling


bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Ethics (17:41:06 MonMar 3 2003)

The players have no right to treat you discourteously. If it happens again, just call the TD again - and if necessary again. Just because the TD could not do anything the first time does not mean he will not do something when there is a second happening. 

As a general comment it is notable in England that top players are ethical and courteous in general, and such bad behaviour as exists is generally amongst above-average players that below the top. All I mean by this is that as you move up the ranks you will probably find the behaviour improves in the Ranked masters weekend.



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

**Frances
Hinden**

Reply

Re: Ethics (13:49:38 ThuMar 6 2003)

Country: UK

I STRONGLY object to your posting. You are very rude about a pair in a forum where they may not be able to defend themselves, then say all self-righteously 'I'm not going to give their names' before telling us exactly what the event was, and where that pair came in the event. It's not exactly rocket science to work out who they are.

It's one thing to discuss rulings, and to ask for guidance on standards of behaviour. It's another to complain about the behaviour of identifiable people who may not read this forum.

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Ethics (00:09:10 FriMar 7 2003)

I agree with you in one way, Frances, and I ask that in future people do not post complaints about anyone in a way that is identifiable.

But it is a pity you pointed it out, because that made it more obvious, which is why I did not!

I understand someone identified them further which is not acceptable.

Please, everyone, take note: Complaining about other people is part of bridge, so feel free to do so. Please do not make such people identifiable in htis forum.

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

Guest

Reply

Re: Ethics (11:07:51 FriMar 7 2003)

Hello.

I was just pasing yesterday and saw this post. It amused me.

I clicked on the link and the scores were revealed.

"Them" at the top and Ben in the basement.

it looked like that age old problem. If you are in with a chance of winning, each mistake of partners is a twist in your gut and you can't help it showing.

I don't think letting on who they were did any harm to the winners ~ good luck to them. You don't play 90 boards of bridge and win by squiggling and squirming



Well done winners!

<p>WVLaker</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Card played...or not (17:30:12 WedMar 5 2003)</p> <hr/> <p>Country: USA</p> <p>At a local club in USA, declarer trumped her own winner. Realizing what she had done, she wanted to change the card. Declarer was last to play to the trick and was still holding her card, but it was clearly faced.</p> <p>Should she be allowed to change it?</p>
<p>RMB</p> <hr/> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 19 posts bridgetalk member</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Reply</p>	<p>Re: Card played...or not (18:25:48 WedMar 5 2003)</p> <hr/> <p>Law 45.C.2. Declarer's Card</p> <p>Declarer must play a card from his hand held face up, touching or nearly touching the table, or maintained in such a position as to indicate that it has been played.</p> <p>"but it was clearly faced" sound like is was played according to Law 45, and so can not be changed.</p>
<p>WVLaker</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Card played...or not (18:36:37 WedMar 5 2003)</p> <hr/> <p>Country: USA</p> <p>The ops didn't deny that the card was played, but said that they should be able to change it, because nobody had played subsequent to that.</p> <p>My partner said that they couldn't change it, and they continued play without further argument.</p> <p>Later, my partner asked the director's husband (who comes around and collects the scoresheets) if that was correct. He said that declarer could change the card in that situation, but that defenders could not. That seemed strange to me.</p>

ne_trepide



14 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Card played...or not (20:52:18 WedMar 5 2003)

i'm afraid declarer's card was not played.
this may seem strange but the laws give declarer certain liberties that are not available to the defenders.
look at it on the basis that a withdrawn card by declarer does not transmit unauthorized information to another player whereas a withdrawn card by a defender does.

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Card played...or not (02:42:24 ThuMar 6 2003)

Quote: WVLaker

The ops didn't deny that the card was played, but said that they should be able to change it, because nobody had played subsequent to that.

Whether the card is played is a matter for the Director based on the law as quoted by RMB, and not a matter for the opponents.

Once a card is played it may not be changed.

I notice that ne_trepide thinks it is not played. Well, that is a determination for the Director, and we have only got the original wording of WVLaker on which to make a judgement. It sounds to me as though declarer took the card out, put it on the table [still holding it] and then said "Oops". If so that is played - see RMB's quote of the Law - and thus may not be changed.

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

ne_trepide



14 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Card played...or not (00:59:00 FriMar 7 2003)

david the wording "clearly faced" is ambiguous and i read it as still firmly in the possession of the declarer, some distance from the table but clearly visible to the defender(s).
on this basis the card may be withdrawn and another substituted (by the declarer only.)
were the person involved a defender - and the identical circumstances applicable - then if this card were held in a position that the defender's partner MIGHT see it then the card is considered played.
the definition is loose but this is why we have directors to make such determinations.
do you not agree?

JimO



175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Card played...or not (02:26:30 FriMar 7 2003)

Country: USA

This one is always fun.

In most sports, the referee/umpire/linesman is on the scene, watching the action. Not in bridge.

Imagine a football (soccer) referee nowhere near the action - in the locker room perhaps - being called to determine if a play was offside. Or a baseball umpire in the dugout, called to the plate to determine wheher the pitch was a ball or a strike.

This is what happens in bridge.

I have been called to a table countless times.

Defender: "He played it like this!" (Holding a card face up on the table, almost level with the table.)

Declarer: "No it was more like this!" (Holding the card foot above the table, almost perpendicular to the table.)

Defender: "Well, it was more like this!" (Three inches above the table, at a 20 degree angle.)

Declarer: "Well, maybe it was like this (Eight inches off the table, at a 60 degree angle.)

Etc, etc.

The law (45C2) has been quoted. If it was played, it may not be changed, except as allowed by Law 47.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

John_M,UK

Re: Card played...or not (07:58:18 FriMar 7 2003)

Reply

Country: England

Hi JimO,

I will highlight a more "appropriate" game/sport (?) 😊

Chess.

In chess if you touch the piece, you move the piece ~ it's a piece of etiquette that the game is founded on.

Here the card whether it was faced or not was removed from the hand and "should" (I know the difference between what the law is and not what I want it to be, bluejak 😊) be played ~ that'll teach delclarer to pay attention 😊

Equally, when a player breaks etiquette and draws a card from their hand before their turn to play the TD should be called immediately and if the card cannot be played legally then a revoke should be established 😊 or if that offends your sensibilities the draw card should be immediately faced as a major penalty card, 😊

All the best,

John.

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

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

[[Print](#)]

[[Send](#)]

[[Watch](#)]

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

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

John_M,UK

"Legitimising" a bid or a play (12:48:24 ThuMar 6 2003)

Reply

Country: England

On a more general note.

The principle of "legitimising" a bid or a play features prominently in bridge where there is perhaps a "clear cut" answer. For example leading out of turn, or insufficient bid.

These are 2 examples where an error can be accepted and legitimised even though a subsequent appeal could establish "beyond a doubt" that an error had occurred.

Why then, do we have such situations as this where declarer makes an error but is allowed to "redeem" himself.

I believe in fair play. If I make a mistake I should pay for it ~ particularly if the mistake is due to my lack of attention ~ who would argue otherwise?

If the opposition make a mistake ~ due to lack of attention ~ I would expect them to have to pay for it as well.

It is my belief that were declarer or any player is able to avoid the consequences of their mistakes, then the game of Bridge is undermined. To not accept that mistakes are part of the game of bridge is to ignore the failings in man.

To be called to rule on ambiguous situations when clear-cut situations of mistakes are not rectified because the call or card was "legitimised" seems to be a mammoth contradiction in the application of the laws.

And therein lies my dilemma about the "fairness" of bridge and why I took an interest in this thread.

If my comments are out of place please tell me bluejak. And if you know that this/these issues have been covered perhaps you could relate the outcome of such discussions to me or point me in the direction where I can find my answers.

All the best,

John.

Post split from thread and new subject added by bluejak

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: "Legitimising" a bid or a play (20:56:25
ThuMar 6 2003)

The reasoning behind why the Laws are why they are is very complex and comes from much arguing. You see the position of not noticing partner has put the wrong card out as similar to a call out of turn - I don't, and judging by what the law-makers have done, nor do they.

As to the suitability of this forum for this type of post I do not mind it, but please put posts about what the Laws should be in a separate thread [which is why I have split your post off]. Most people come to this forum to find out what the Laws are, not what they should be.

In fact, while we shall not stop anyone starting such a thread, it probably is not the best place for it. I would advise that if you want to discuss why the Laws are as they are you should pick a newsgroup, typically rec.games.bridge, or the bridge-laws mailing list. Details of how to find these and other newsgroups are at

Bridge newsgroups and mailing lists

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

Guest

Reply

Re: "Legitimising" a bid or a play (22:54:58 ThuMar
6 2003)

Quote: bluejak at 20:56:25 Thu Mar 6 2003

You see the position of not noticing
partner has put the wrong card out
as similar to a call out of turn - I
don't

Ah, not quite. **:frown:**

I see "not noticing partner has put the wrong card out" as declarers failure to observe what has been played (and clouded with uncertainty, see previous example).

I see "a call out of turn" as a procedural error (with no uncertainty).

Your over-simplification of my post does not do you or me any justice.

Kind regards,

John.

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 15:18:40 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

[top](#) ☐

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

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

☐ **Email**

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

James Vickers

Reply

Alertable? (14:08:50 WedMar 5 2003)

Country: UK

Can anyone help me with the EBU alert regulations? The Orange Book requires an alert if a call is "forcing in a way that the opponents are unlikely to expect" (or words to that effect). It then goes on to list examples and exceptions the understanding of which depends on the experience of the players involved.

E.g. 1C (X) 2S

Not alertable if non-forcing. I expect experienced players to take this in their stride, but less experienced players to expect another bid from opener.

So much for the preamble - in which of the following auctions is the last call alertable and why (opponents silent)?

1S - 2C if 2C is:

- (1) forcing partner to bid
- (2) forcing to 2S
- (3) forcing to 2NT
- (4) forcing to game

1S - 2C

2NT if 2NT is:

- (1) 15-16 pts non-forcing
- (2) 15-16 pts forcing for one round
- (3) 15-16 pts forcing to game
- (4) 15+ forcing to game

Thanks,

James

AlanW

Re: Alertable? (14:32:47 WedMar 5 2003)

Reply

A layman's view -

Quote:

1S - 2C if 2C is:

- (1) forcing partner to bid
- (2) forcing to 2S
- (3) forcing to 2NT
- (4) forcing to game

None of these looks alertable to me provided there is no understanding that because of its particular forcing nature it may regularly be bid with a 3-card suit.

Quote:

1S - 2C

2NT if 2NT is:

- (1) 15-16 pts non-forcing
- (2) 15-16 pts forcing for one round
- (3) 15-16 pts forcing to game
- (4) 15+ forcing to game

All except (1) look alertable here since this does not sound like a forcing sequence without an agreement to play it that way. Clearly if 2/1 is GF than 2N has to be F anyway, but unless 2C had already been explained as GF I would expect to alert 2N here.

Others may have different views (and usually do!). And, of course, it may be hard to argue there is any damage through failure to alert in any of these sequences, anyway. As a defender I would always expect to clarify whether 2N was F or not before leading or before partner's lead was faced, regardless of whether or not it was alerted.

RMB



19 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Alertable? (18:36:31 WedMar 5 2003)

Country: England

Quote: James

1S - 2C if 2C is:

- (1) forcing partner to bid
- (2) forcing to 2S
- (3) forcing to 2NT
- (4) forcing to game

David tells me that (4) is alertable, I guess that means (2) and (3) are alertable. [Under OB 5.2.1(c)]

Quote: James

1S - 2C

2NT if 2NT is:

- (1) 15-16 pts non-forcing
- (2) 15-16 pts forcing for one round
- (3) 15-16 pts forcing to game
- (4) 15+ forcing to game

(2), (3) and (4) are alertable because they are unexpectedly forcing, for some value of "unexpectedly". [Under OB 5.2.1(b)]

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Alertable? (01:02:26 ThuMar 6 2003)

The normal interpretation is that 1 ☐ - 2 ☐ natural is only alertable if it is (a) non-forcing or (b) game forcing.

1 ☐ - 2 ☐ - 2NT natural is alertable if it is forcing.

1 ☐ Dbl 2 ☐ was always non-forcing in old-fashioned Acol, and the majority of people play it as non-forcing [trust me: your inexperienced players have no agreement on the bid at all!] so the default might be considered non-forcing.

Of course, a lot of people play it as artificial, but they are not relevant, because then it is alertable under a different section.

But is there an authority to say it is not alertable if it is non-forcing?

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

James Vickers



10 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Alertable? (12:45:04 ThuMar 6 2003)

Country: UK

Quote: David

1 Dbl 2 was always non-forcing in old-fashioned Acol, and the majority of people play it as non-forcing [trust me: your inexperienced players have no agreement on the bid at all!] so the default might be considered non-forcing.

The majority of non-expert players of my acquaintance play this as forcing. When I learned the game I was told in such circumstances to ignore the double.

Quote: David

But is there an authority to say it is not alertable if it is non-forcing?

How about: OB5.4.2(a)(ii) ?

I posted the question originally because I had an argument on Tuesday as to whether a 2NT rebid after a 2/1 response counts as "unexpectedly forcing". If the rebid shows at least 15 pts, passing 2NT is trying to land on a pinhead. The trend in ever higher 2/1 responses (was it Eric Crowhurst who compared them with ladies' hemlines?) which were 8+ pts when my parents learned to play, 9+ when I learned the game, and now almost universally played as 10+ means that 2NT in this sequence will be passed about as often as:

1S - 2C
2D

so I also wanted to know if this counted as "unexpectedly forcing".

James

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Alertable? (13:22:42 ThuMar 6 2003)

Ok 1 ☐ Dbl 2 ☐ requires an alert if it is non-forcing. It is not a sequence where it makes a lot of difference, and looks to me like one that has slipped through the net.

You must not let geographical considerations be ignored when you are considering normal. For example, I play in three clubs and two leagues locally. In those 1 ☐ - 2 ☐ - 2NT is played as non-forcing by over 90% of players, as is 1 ☐ - 2 ☐ - 2 ☐. I know that some areas have developed more than others, but really old-fashioned Acol is still very common in a lot of clubs country-wide.

1 ☐ - 2 ☐ is not played universally as 10+: I play it as 8+, as do my partners, and many of my local opponents.

Another point is that the EBU does not like to change alerting rules too often. The current ones have not been changed in fifteen years, and it took ten of those years before people stopped saying "Why does the EBU change alerting so often? Every year it is different."

However, a major review has now started, and opinions as to how to change them have been sought.

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

**Frances
Hinden**

Reply

Re: Alertable? (13:43:57 ThuMar 6 2003)

Country: UK

From a practical point of view, if you play 1S - 2C as game forcing subsequent auctions are much easier if you alert the 2C bid. Once I've done that, I really feel I don't have to alert subsequent bids in the auction solely because they are still game forcing.

I think it is important to alert the 2C bid for another reason: playing it as game forcing, they will be playing a forcing pass after an overcall. Playing 2C as forcing for a round only, there may well not be a forcing pass. This can directly influence the next hand's choice of whether and how high to overcall.

James Vickers



10 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Alertable? (17:13:43 ThuMar 6 2003)

Country: UK

Quote: David

Ok 1C Dbl 2H requires an alert if it is non-forcing. It is not a sequence where it makes a lot of difference, and looks to me like one that has slipped through the net.

But according to the section of the Orange Book I quoted (5.4.2(a)(ii)):

"Because you have an agreement by which it is forcing or non-

forcing in a way that your opponents are unlikely to expect, you must alert:

- (a) a non-forcing new suit response to an opening bid, unless:
 - (i) responder has previously passed, or
 - (ii) the opening bid was doubled, or
 - (iii)etc"

So 1C (X) 2H is not alertable if non-forcing (nor is it alertable if it is forcing either).

I think this is important. I was involved in an AC where the director had ruled damage because fourth player had passed a non-alerted 2H in this sequence, assuming he was going to get another chance to bid. We overturned the decision and ruled no damage since the call does not require an alert under EBU regulations whether it is forcing or non-forcing, provided it is natural.

I think this is a far cry from

1S - 2C
2D

and

1S - 2C
2NT

which are passed so rarely they might as well be forcing, and are unlikely to cause damage if this is not disclosed.

Still, if the general view is that these calls require an alert if forcing, I shall alert them in future.

James

James Vickers



10 posts
bridgetalk member



[Reply](#)

Re: Alertable? (17:20:20 ThuMar 6 2003)

Country: UK

Quote: Alan W

None of these looks alertable to me provided there is no understanding that because of its particular forcing nature it may regularly be bid with a 3-card suit.

Bear in mind that a 2C response to 1S is "considered natural" on a 3=4=3=3 distribution according to the Orange Book (5.3.1(a)).

Another common source of confusion!

James

James Vickers



10 posts
bridgetalk member



[Reply](#)

Re: Alertable? (17:28:13 ThuMar 6 2003)

Country: UK

Quote: Frances

From a practical point of view, if you play 1S - 2C as game forcing subsequent auctions are much easier if you alert the 2C bid. Once I've done that, I really feel I don't have to alert subsequent bids in the auction solely because they are still game forcing.

I think it is important to alert the 2C bid for another reason: playing it as game forcing, they will be playing a forcing pass after an overcall. Playing 2C as forcing for a round only, there may well not be a forcing pass. This can directly influence the next hand's choice of whether and how high to

overall.

I agree with this, provided the regulation means that it is the _forcing manner_ of the agreement that is unexpected (i.e. whether to game or for only one round) rather than just whether it is forcing as opposed to non-forcing.

If anyone understands that last paragraph, could you tell me whether that is what it means?

James

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 15:20:05 Sat Aug 30 2003

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

[top](#) ☐

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

Legend :: ☐ Read Topic :: ☐ Unread Topic

☐ [Email](#)

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

<p>RCB</p> <hr/> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1 posts bridgetalk member</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Directors' refresher (13:45:08 MonMar 3 2003)</p> <hr/> <p>Country: England</p> <p>Our County are holding a Directors' refresher/standardisation afternoon shortly for all standards/qualifications. Does anyone have a couple of constructive bullet points or pet hates they would bring up at a similar event?</p>
<p>bluejak</p> <hr/> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>434 posts Forum Host</p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Directors' refresher (17:48:10 MonMar 3 2003)</p> <hr/> <p>Give at least one example on each of the main headings: Misinformation, Unauthorised Information, Claims are the judgement cases. Calls out of turn, Leads out of turn, Revokes, mis-scores are the main other cases.</p> <p>---</p> <p>David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com> Liverpool, England, UK http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm</p>

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 15:20:38 Sat Aug 30 2003

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

[top](#) ☐

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

Guest

Pair leave during the game (08:03:43 WedFeb 19 2003)

Reply

Country: Hong Kong

Duplicate Club Game Hong Kong 16 table Mitchell Movement
Halfway through the evening one EW pair had to leave because one of the players was taken ill. When scoring the session I gave the EW pair an average for the remaining tables and I also give an average to the NS pairs who did not play them. Should the NS pairs have been awarded an average plus ?



bluejak

Re: Pair leave during the game (13:36:33 WedFeb 19 2003)



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

In theory every sponsoring organisation (including your club) should have a regulation to cover this!  In practice, practically none of them ever do! 

Normal is to give the pair that was ill average minus and their opponents average plus. You do not want a pair to win playing fewer boards [unless they have done fantastically well on the boards they actually played] even when they have a very acceptable reason, such as being ill. However, a pair running at 65% will feel justifiably cheated by getting two or three averages when they get no opponents.

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

James Vickers

[Reply](#)

Re: Pair leave during the game (17:44:17 FriFeb 21 2003)

Country: UK

According to L12C1 any pair who are unable to play a board through no fault of their own are entitled to an Av+. Sponsoring Organisations have no right to deviate from the laws, although many of them try to in instances where several boards have to be scrapped. I agree it is unfair to give a pair several Av+ scores, but that is the law.

I believe common practice is to award 60% for the first two such boards, then reduce the percentage to 55 if three or four are to be averaged, and reduce further for more boards. Something like that, anyway.

James

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

Re: Pair leave during the game (17:55:43 FriFeb 21 2003)

I cannot imagine why a pair should need several Ave+ results, and have never heard of this strange 55% after a few. Better is to follow the Laws.

The pair who is ill, of course, have caused the failure to play, so **of course** they get Ave- under the Laws.

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

James Vickers

Re: Pair leave during the game (18:12:24 MonFeb 24 2003)

Reply

Country: UK

If a pair is taken ill early in a competition you will be scattering several artificial 60% scores around the room, sometimes several to the same pair (depending on how many boards per round you are playing). In a club event where I was playing (but not directing) a sit out pair decided to look at the boards they were due to play during the sit out round (illegal, I know, but they decided to do it). The problem was they looked at the wrong set of boards by mistake, and we were playing four-board rounds.

Now I have no problem giving them 4 X Av-, I think that may even be too generous. But do you give their opponents who should have played these boards against them 4 x Av+?

If you "follow the law" you certainly should.

There is a precedent for this "strange 55%". If a board is played once and then fouled and played at all other tables (say a card or hand is switched between slots) do you not give the lone table 60-40 and Neuberg the rest? And if it is played twice before fouling, don't you score the first two tables something like 60-55-45-40 and Neuberg the rest?

Maybe I've remembered it wrong, but I thought there was something in the White Book about this.

James

bluejak

Re: Pair leave during the game (22:12:48 MonFeb 24 2003)



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

If a board is fouled then it is correct to follow Law 87 and use Neuberg on the two separate subfields. That is true, though nothing to do with the case under point. Note the figures you quote for small numbers were abandoned about fifteen years ago and Neuberg is now used for any number in the UK.

I really think we should assume the Law-makers know what they are doing and not refuse to follow them. That way madness lies!

:sad:

If a pair manages to screw up four boards by looking at the score-

sheets then they get four Average Minuses, and the pair that does not play them get four Average Plusses. Anytrhing else is illegal - see Laws 12C1 and 12B

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

JimO



175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Pair leave during the game (00:39:16 TueFeb 25 2003)

Country: USA

The ACBL still uses artificial numbers for a fouled board played a small number of times, though not the numbers James Bickers quoted.

For a board played four or more times, or three times when it is the larger group, the Neuberg formula is used.

For a board played once in one form - each side receives 60%

For a board played twice - the better score receives 65%, the worse score receives 55%.

For a board played three times when it is the smaller group, the scores are 70%/60%/50%.

This is the only reference to an artifical 55% that I have been able to find anywhere.

And it only applies to the worse of two scores for a fouled board.

And only in the ACBL, as far as I know. I don't know if any other SO's use this, and I wish the ACBL would scrap it in favor of the Neuberg throughout. (A pair recently went for 1100 on a partscore deal, and got 55%!)

The best solution to the original problem, is of course, to find a sustitute. Fortunately, for several of the clubs around here, I have a list of players who may be able to come over on short notice. (Or if possible I fill in myself).

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

James Vickers

Re: Pair leave during the game (17:24:43 TueFeb
25 2003)

Reply

Country: UK

I was not advocating any deviation from the laws of the game (quite the opposite), but I was under the impression that it was common practice not to give a pair too many 60% scores when they are unable to play several boards in a session through no fault of their own.

When I talked about giving varied Av+ scores for boards where only two or three comparisons are possible I really had in mind the sort of figures Ed mentioned. I had no idea this was no longer standard practice in the UK - I learn a lot from this forum!

I'm beginning to think I misunderstood the whole point of this question. If the law is so clear and so obviously applies to this situation, what need is there for sponsoring organisations to have a regulation about this? Don't they just apply the relevant law?

James

bluejak

Re: Pair leave during the game (03:03:47 WedFeb
26 2003)



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Ah, but there are two quite separate things being discussed in this thread! :grin:

First, if a board cannot be played, then Law 12C1 instructs the Director what to rule - and he has no option. If that means there are a number of 60% scores, so be it.

Second, if a board is fouled then Law 87B tells the Director to divide the field into two sub-fields, but it then leaves it up to the sponsoring organisation to actually score it in those two sub-fields. This is the Neuberg formula, or the artificial one for small numbers abandoned by the EBU some years ago, but still used by the ACBL.

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

**Robert
Johnson**

Re: Pair leave during the game (16:46:56 SunMar 2
2003)

Reply

Country: USA

Perhaps I am not following the thread correctly, but the ACBL SCORE program handles boards not played as follows:

You enter "N" for the board not played, and the scoring program gives each pair a Match Point score equal to the average the pair has achieved on all (other) boards.

So if this happens when a 65% pair is meeting a 50% pair, the first would receive 2/3rds of points available on this board, and the other pair would receive 1/2, thereby neither rewarding or penalizing either, but maintaining their overall average.

bob johnson

bluejak

Re: Pair leave during the game (17:19:39 MonMar 3
2003)



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Yes, but you have **chosen** to enter "N" for an unplayed board, and this is not your only choice. You can also enter Average Plusses and Minusses using ACBLScore.

If a board is not played which would not normally be played by a pair then it is correct and normal for them to get no score on a board. However, when they should be playing the board it becomes somewhat different.

If a pair would normally be playing a board but cannot do so because their opponents have messed it up in some way to enter an "N" is wrong. It is illegal and very unfair on the pairs who should be getting A+, and benefits unfairly the pair who should be getting A-.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 15:21:08 Sat Aug 30 2003

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

top ☐

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

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

☐ **Email**

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

John_M,UK

Reply

Resurrecting a Hand (15:32:49 FriFeb 28 2003)

Country: England

I have spoken to several members of my County association and the EBU and none of the have given me a satisfactory answer to my "straightforward questions, lol.

What I want to know is under what laws do you justify resurrecting a hand after a match (please assume that it falls within the correction period) that was not subject to any appeal or ruling during the match?

I keep being pointed towards laws that ultimately refer to corrections of "computation and tabulation", which in my days of going to school meant adding things up and writing things down.

In the hand that I queried the score was agreed at table, the correct score was written down, no appeal or ruling on that hand was claimed or made during the match ~ what laws do you use to appeal a hand such as this after the match?

I was always under the impression that once a result was agreed upon and the correct score for that result was recorded, that the game moved on. And that if a hand was subject to an appeal and/or a ruling then the scores etc. could be revisited by a further appeal. Have I been wrong in this assumption and if so which laws apply (that don't ultimately rely on a correction of an error in "computation or tabulation".

Thanks in advance,

John.

Ed



173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Resurrecting a Hand (02:53:59 SatMar 1 2003)

Country: USA

I'm not at all sure what you mean by "resurrecting a hand". The laws in general allow for a TD ruling on questions of irregularity, and Law 81C6 requires the TD "to rectify an error or irregularity of which he becomes aware in any manner, within the correction period established in accordance with Law 79C". Law 92 establishes a contestant's right to appeal, and specifies that he may do so until 30 minutes after the official score has been made available, unless the Sponsoring Organization specifies a different interval. This is the same correction period specified in Law 79C. Law 93C specifies that a final appeal may be made to the National Authority (in England, the EBU, if I'm not mistaken).

Does this answer your question?

John_M,UK

Reply

Re: Resurrecting a Hand (10:04:22 SatMar 1 2003)

Country: England

Hi Ed,
Thanks for the reply.

Regards.

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Resurrecting a Hand (15:19:49 MonMar 3 2003)

Let us look a little more carefully at Ed's answer.

Quote: Law 92B

The right to request or appeal a Director's ruling expires 30 minutes after the official score has been made available for inspection, unless the sponsoring organisation has specified a different time period.

Note that this includes the words "right to request ... a Director's

ruling".

So the Correction periods are in effect four.

One. Scoring, computation, tabulation and so on is covered by Law 79C.

Two. Scoring an event is covered by Law 81C6 and thus Law 79C.

Three. Asking for a ruling is covered by Law 92B.

Four. Appealing a ruling is covered by Law 92B.

All of these default to 30 minutes after the scores are published and made available unless the sponsoring organisation says otherwise.

So, if:

- You agree on 2S + 1 but put + 110 on the score sheet
- The EBU scorer enters the score on the wrong side
- You decide to ask for a ruling at the end of the session when you realise what declarer really had!
- You got a ruling, discuss it with friends at the end who advise you to appeal, so you do

then you are in time to do so within 30 minutes of the scores being published, or whatever time the sponsoring organisation says.

Note that a sponsoring organisation can decide to make the various Correction Periods different lengths. For example, the Merseyside Bridge League says that for rulings the Correction period is 24 hours, but for appeals it is 48 hours. For leagues played privately this seems sensible to me.

Unfortunately most sponsoring organisations do not ever look at what Correction periods should be but then they default to 30 minutes after the scores are published.

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

John_M,UK

Re: Resurrecting a Hand (17:02:25 MonMar 3 2003)

Reply

Country: England

Thanks bluejak for the clarification.

On reflection the crux of my questioning revolves around the "ethical application" of some laws.

I have today submitted an e-mail to Nick Doe and await his response. Maybe you'll get to hear about it,lol (it's full of mistakes)!

Kind regards,

John.

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 15:21:35 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

top ☐

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

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

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

AlanW

Reply

Incomplete disclosure (14:33:58 WedFeb 19 2003)

An incident at a recent club night left me wondering how directors/appeals committees would react. My partner was playing the hand and an oppo discarded. Partner asked the other defender what discards they played and was told distributional. Fortunately, partner followed up with a supplementary question to check whether this was the usual way round (ie high-low to show an even number) and was told they played reverse distribution. However, on an ordinary club night 95% of pairs playing distributional discards would play 'normal' distribution, and 90% of declarers would not feel the need to ask a supplementary question to confirm this since in the absence of a more specific reply they would feel entitled to assume this.

Leaving aside my no doubt unfounded suspicion that the incomplete answer given was a deliberate attempt to gain an unfair advantage, how would a director rule if my partner had gone wrong by relying on the answer he thought he had been given? I presume 'distributional' would not be regarded as adequate disclosure on the normal grounds that names are not enough, but is the onus on the defender to give an adequate answer or on the declarer to ask for one? Anyone got any ideas on how to tactfully suggest to the defender in question that a fuller answer would be fairer to all concerned, particularly when it happened to be the director?

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Incomplete disclosure (16:07:39 WedFeb 19 2003)

The onus is on the defender to describe the methods adequately and correctly, and an adjustment in case of damage would be routine.

I am not sure I would even be tactful. The player concerned should be told that the answer "Distributional" is highly misleading, and illegal.

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

James Vickers

Reply

Re: Incomplete disclosure (17:33:05 FriFeb 21 2003)

Country: UK

I agree that incomplete disclosure is deplorable and should be discouraged, but to adjust routinely can leave the door open to double shot actions.

E.g. 1H - (2NT*). If I ask and get the answer: "Ghestem" or "Schroeder" (two suited overcalls) I am free to act as if it is showing two particular suits of my choice and then call the director for an adjusted score if it turns out I have chosen the wrong ones. I can't lose.

I must admit I would be inclined to say the enquirer should have made certain their assumption was correct by asking a supplementary question, so I would let the score stand and fine the player who gave insufficient information.

I can guess what David is going to say in response to this.

James

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Incomplete disclosure (17:51:12 FriFeb 21 2003)

Players break the rules.

Why should their opponents suffer?

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

**Robert
Johnson**

Re: Incomplete disclosure (01:51:50 SunMar 2 2003)

Reply

I try to encourage players to describe their partners bid in plain ole English, and leave convention names out of it. This reduces the incomplete factor.

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

[**Get Email Advice of Replies**] [**Print**] [**Send**] [**Watch**] [**<**] [**Add a Reply**] [**>**]

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

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: **FrancesHinden**.

Register :: **Log in**

The time is now 15:22:01 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 **BbBoy.net**

top ☐

Thread Index :: **FAQ's** :: **Main Menu** :: **Posting Hints** :: **Emoticon Key** :: **Search**
David's Lawspage :: **EBU** :: **ACBL** :: **WBF**

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

☐ **Email**

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

John_M,UK

Score Correction Period (14:06:17 WedFeb 26 2003)

Reply

Country: England

Hi,

I am looking for an objective opinion about "Score Correction Periods".

I play in a lowly division of a winter bridge league ~ we play 7 matches per year but of course the opponents can be anywhere in the county making travel anywhere upwards of a four hour round trip.

The league I play in has/(had?) no rules governing the correction of scores. The scoring procedure for as long as I have played in the league has always been that scores are agreed at the end of each round and the final score agreed at the end of the match and the team captains sign the league score sheet to attest to that ~ Any problems are sent away for adjudication.

Recently a team I played against appealed a score after we had gone home ~ it was their club they had the "benefit" of having the time to carry out a "post-mortem". The score was adjusted and we appealed.

The appeals committee agreed that the league rules on score corrections was very confusing (in fact they had none) and that the management committee should look at the issue, but in the meantime the appeals committee resorted to "other" laws that refer to 30 minute correction periods.

My questions then;

Is it reasonable to "introduce" a 30 minute "score correction period" without proving that the lack of one wasn't an intentional feature of the league?

Is it reasonable to expect that teams wait around for 30 minutes after a match to ensure that "all is well" and that everyone has equal opportunity to sort out scores (having already "been there and done that")?

Please bear in mind that the offending score correction was based on a "slam that couldn't have gone down without a revoke". And that 3 other pairs (1 of theirs 2 of ours) had made the same slam and all 8 pairs had played those boards ~ so presumably these people had every opportunity to question the score at the end of

the round (of 8 boards) or before the final score which showed that they had narrowly lost.

Kind regards,

John.

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Score Correction Period (17:47:28 WedFeb 26 2003)

I am afraid the decision is correct, and is the fault of your league.

:sad:

The correction period is defined in the Laws as 30 minutes unless the sponsoring organisation decrees otherwise. Your league clearly have not decreed otherwise thus the thirty minute period is correct, even though it favours the home team. **:embarrassed:**

All I can suggest is that your league should learn from this incident for the future. The Merseyside Bridge League defines the Correction period for agreement of scores and for rulings as 24 hours from the end of the match, and for appeals as 48 hours from the end of the match. I commend these arrangements to **all** leagues **everywhere**.

:smile:

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


John_M,UK

Reply

Re: Score Correction Period (09:07:50 ThuFeb 27 2003)

Country: England

Thanks for the reply bluejak.

From my (novice) reading of the laws, the correction period of 30 minutes is for the correction of errors in "computation & tabulation" of scores. I would take this to mean the incorrect scoring of a hand eg. 3NT vulnerable being recorded as 400. I wouldn't take it to mean correcting a hand that had already been agreed on and scored correctly, eg 6NT going 1 off being corrected to 6NT making after the opposition had gone home ~ or am I missing some nuance? 

Kind regards,

John.

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Score Correction Period (12:11:22 ThuFeb 27 2003)

There are four possible Correction periods really, but they all default to 30 minutes if the sponsoring organisation does not specify otherwise.

They are

[1] The score being computed and recorded at the table under Law 79C.

[2] The score being calculated by the Directors to find the winners of the competition under Law 79C.

[3] Rulings given under Law 92B.

[4] Appeals held under Law 92B.

If there is a question over whether someone has revoked that is a ruling under Law 92B.

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

John_M,UK

Re: Score Correction Period (13:00:55 ThuFeb 27
2003)

Reply

Thanks again bluejak for the response.

If I may impose one last time on this topic for your time and patience.

The "revoke" in the slam was not noted during the hand or the course of the round or at the scoring of the round or at the end of the match.

It was "noticed" after the teams had gone home. The opposition got hold of one of our players and "ran through" the hand over the phone with them, and got him to agree that he or his partner must have revoked.

I personally feel a little bit aggrieved at this situation as the chap in question wouldn't say "boo to a goose". Also, to expect someone to mentally recall a hand literally hours after it was played is ridiculous. ~ I know 1 person that could do that with any accuracy without special attention having been drawn to it at the time. Plus, the situation totally ignores the possibility of bad play from their players. As I said we are in a low division, lol.

This phone call had to have taken place after the 30 minute time limit had elapsed as our team were on our way home when it elapsed ~ so presumably it was for the adjudicator to intercede as an unbiased third-party and take statements rather than rely on the "word" of one team?

Another point of contention is the 30 minute period. We have no record of when the score was signed, we have no recollection of the time the score sheet was signed, we have no indication from anybody of the time that their appeal was lodged or the time that they assert the score sheet was signed.

When we appealed against the score adjustment the appeals committee found as facts that i) The revoke had taken place. ii) The appeal was made within 30 minutes of the end of the match.

From the laws you mention I cannot find one that refers to resurrecting a hand that had been played during a match ~ that was NOT subject to an appeal or adjudication during any part of the match, and the results and scores were agreed on and correctly recorded.

I would be grateful of your opinion on this situation and I promise that I won't add another question. :smile:

Kind regards,

John.

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Score Correction Period (14:16:57 ThuFeb 27 2003)

The only people who should really deal with rulings are Tournament Directors. You are in England so it is easy for you: even if your league does not provide phone numbers of Directors [which I believe they should] the EBU provides such phone numbers and they are published in the EBU Year book and in the EBU diary. Within a few months I expect them to appear on the EBU website. If nothing else, anyone can always phone me for a ruling [whether they are in England or elsewhere] by ringing me on 0151 677 7412 from Great Britain, or on +44 151 677 7412 from anywhere else.

It is legitimate to have a ruling decided between two captains, though if there is the slightest doubt I would suggest that captains should refer matters to a TD.

In the case you cite, who decided it? It does not sound as though it was decided. One player of your team making unfortunate concessions over the phone is not a legitimate decision, unless he was the captain.

It does not sound to me as though any ruling was given here, in which case the **original** agreed score stands.

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


bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Score Correction Period (14:21:20 ThuFeb 27 2003)

Looking back over my answers I realise I have said both that the decision was right and that it was wrong! 

Your first question concerned time. The 30 minute period stands, as I expalined, unless your league has decreed other wise [and they should]. The question was first raised within 30 minutes apparently.

However, the way the ruling was given [or more properly, not given] was incorrect.

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

John_M,UK

Reply

Re: Score Correction Period (14:47:17 ThuFeb 27 2003)

Country: England

Thanks bluejak,
I appreciate the time and effort you gave to answering this question.

All the best,

John.

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

daponte



5 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

KQxx, KJxx hesitation (22:54:25 SatFeb 22 2003)

Dear forum

I have two questions regarding two cases of hesitation before play during a board.

1. Declarer (or defender, anyone with concealed cards) holds KQx in a suit and w3hen in turn after obviously break in tempo he plays the K. We can make the case more complex if we give declarer AKJx in a suit and after thinking when in turn he plays the A. (of course defence takes the other TOUCHING honor as placed in partners hand and plays accordingly and as happening in that cases the only one who could (if possibly) benefit from such an action is the player who performed it. Another option in defence would of course lead to a better result for the defenders. I hope we all agry to the unethical point of the situation (if not please state) but when it comes to the result will this be changed for the favor of the defenders who could have been mislead of the hesitation and the play?

To state it as defender you hold QJx in a suit, declarer makes the first finesse in this suit you hesitate with this kind of holding (QJx) and finally you play the Q. Declarer of course finesses now again assuming your partner has the J and voila here comes the J from the "thinker". Are there any obseptions for adjusting the score or for giving the declarer the position of the J? And according to the law "if the purpose is to misleading the opponents" the case should be obvious. WHAT OTHER purpose could there be for such a move after hesitation?

Now to the 2nd question.

2. As defnder you hold KJx in a suit playing eg 3nt and declarer makes a finesse of the 10 (x from dummy, x from partner, 10 from declarer and now your turn). You think (obviously break in tempo to consider the situation) and you assume the only way to set the contract is the one of making the declarer believe partner has the J and to declare in a kind of avoidance from your partner taking the lead and so you play the K. Of course the K is not equal as the J (referring to the law that states (i think) from equal plays the locical should have been made). Trully things happen as you imagined declarer finesses partner for the J (maybe he would have done it either for the K if you played the J in first trick but does it make any difference?), you win and set the contract. You creatyed a losing option and maybe declare could try other plans (playing a suit hoping for a favorable break 3-3 but being "sure" for the position of the J he refinessed.

Now what? Do we adjust?

I am in the direction that after hesitation from two (or more) EQUAL cards you have to play (ethics if not law) the logical one, the

smallest IF you decide to play one of them. Is that really so according to the laws? Is that situation "covered" by the laws? And in the 2nd case i think defender must be awarded rather than punished for his play because KJ are NOT equal cards and he performed a 'gambit" which could easily not work for his favor or anyway he has the "demonstrated bridge reason" to think and when it comes to play the 2 cards are not equal.
Please clarify the situation if possible
Thank you in advanced
Peter

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: KQxx, KJxx hesitation (01:30:41 SunFeb 23 2003)

If a player thinks for a time, holding KQx, and then plays an honour, this is no rule or Law or anything else that says he should play one honour rather than the other. The choice of a card at any time is a legitimate way of deceiving people.

What is not permitted is to think for a time when he has no decision to make. So long as he has a legitimate bridge reason, he may think for a time, and then play any card he feels is suitable. If an opponent misreads what he was hesitating about then that is unfortunate for that opponent: the Law says he takes inferences "at his own risk" and that refers to inferences where the person taking them has misguessed what the hesitator's problem was.

Similarly, if he holds KJx, and thinks for a time before deciding to play the king, it is difficult to see anything wrong with that. He had a valid reason for thinking presumably - deciding whether to play a deliberately high card is a valid reason.

However, that does not mean he may always think without opponents getting any redress. If with KQx he is only considering whether to play the K or the Q that is not a valid bridge reason, and an opponent could get redress if he concluded something else from this think. But it would not make any difference whether he played the K or the Q after his spurious think.

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

daponte



5 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: KQxx, KJxx hesitation (08:39:55 SunFeb 23 2003)

I think the case of KJx is clear.

But regarding KQx, or even worse QJx how can we get into one peoples mind? And what else rather than misleading could be to play the Q after some hesitation? Of course we could argue that the defender could hold up and in this case losing his trick but that could not be the case because with his hesitation he already has to have a reason for that (that means a honor, he "is not allowed" to hesitate with xxx) and with the play of the Q he is rather trying to mislead on purpose regarding the position of the J. Isnt then the play of the Q a violation? This (I think) is the obvious case.

But there are lot of other positions too.

Say as declarer you could hold up playing last on the lead with KQx in order to cut communications but isn't the play of the K after not ducking and hesitating highly misleading?

Isnt there a law (seventysomething I think) in which it quotes that after a hesitation the player should do the logical alternative between two? Is Q or K equal regarding "logical"?

Thank you for the answer

Peter

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: KQxx, KJxx hesitation (00:51:37 MonFeb 24 2003)

You seem to have some rule in mind that does not exist.

If I hold KQx in what way is it misleading to play the king slowly rather than the queen slowly? it is difficult to see a difference.

To play a card slowly is a violation if you have no decision to make. To play a particular card rather than another card slowly is not a violation.

If you are declarer and you consider before playing from KQx I cannot see why you think there is a rule that you must play one

rather than the other. Furthermore I can assure you there is no such rule.

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

bergid



35 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: KQxx, KJxx hesitation (02:00:22 MonFeb 24 2003)

Whilst I understand that it's completely irrelevant which card you play in this situation, I cannot understand how, if redress is to be given, you can prove damage, if you are only allowed to take inferences "at your own risk"?

The question remains if undue hesitation is made and there is no legitimate bridge reason for it, what should the player do? If the player in question does not have a legitimate bridge reason, why is he hesitating? I can certainly sympathise with daponte's conclusion that the reason for the hesitation is to "introduce confusion".

Good players try not to hesitate and should be prepared **in advance** if for example, dummy has AJ9x and they are sitting under it with KQx. Playing an honor after a long hesitation is bound to make declarer wonder. If he changes his line of play based on the possible "inference" that defender has a doubleton honor, how does he prove damage, if he subsequently goes down?

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: KQxx, KJxx hesitation (03:56:12 MonFeb 24 2003)

First of all, players are not required to **prove** anything. As with every other judgement decision a player explains the problem to the TD [or Appeals Committee] and he decides whether he believes a player has been damaged. **:rolleyes:**

I am not disagreeing with the principle that a hesitation may sow confusion. Of course, and then it gets ruled back. **:smile:** All I disagreed with is whether it makes a difference what card is played after a hesitation. **:embarrassed:**

In the example you give he explains the situation to the Director and lets him consult, consider, decide and rule. :biggrin:

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

daponte



5 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: KQxx, KJxx hesitation (12:24:37 MonFeb 24 2003)

Country: greece

well i ve done some homework, because i thought for all this time that at least from "ethics" side I could be right and now that I read "bluejacks" answer I am in doubt again. I ve found an appeal from the 42nd Generali Europ Championships and after the appeal and the ruling the committee states: (which I think is not the direction of bluejack who as I understand frees the defender (or declarer) from any obligation and we come to the very hard to tell "prove" situation which is always hard to tell (we cannot be into someone elses mind and we could argue a lot). The link where to find the appeal and the decision is

<http://home.worldcom.ch/~fsb/appeals/ebc95.html>

appeal 11

and for those who dont want to follow the link the case is about KQx sitting after AJxx, 108xx in dummy and declarer goes for the double fin and KQx after agreed hesitation puts the K and declarer misjudges the position of the Q.

"The committee: The committee established, that since East had at least two main possibilities in his defense (he could play one of the honors or the 9), he would also have every right to think for as long as he pleased. However, when he decided to play an honor, he should have known that by choosing the "abnormal" alternative, he would (inadvertently) violate the ethic code, as this play was bound to mislead South. In situations of this kind, East should always play the "natural" card, the Queen, which gives the declarer a real choice instead of an imaginative misleading one"

"Committee's note: The committee was confident that it was not East's intention to coffee-house South. The EBL wants the highest

possible standard of ethical conduct to be followed in these championships. Therefore, after a hesitation, players are advised to do the "normal" thing rather than the "abnormal", whenever there is a choice between the two. "

The law I am referring is 73F2
73F2

"Player Injured by Illegal Deception

if the Director determines that an innocent player has drawn a false inference from a remark, manner, tempo, or the like, of an opponent who has no demonstrable bridge reason for the action, and who could have known, at the time of the action, that the action could work to his benefit, the Director shall award an adjusted score."

This "could have known" is the hard to tell thing but in my mind what other purpose than "work for his benefit" does the Higher from Equal honors help? And the committee's advice does stand? Or it depends anytime from the committee, the side who appeals and so on?

Shouldn't we at least advise the players to follow the committee's direction in order to avoid getting to the "could have known" situation?

Or should we tell the declarers or defenders that any inference is drawn at own risk and so be it, we can never proof what's in a player's mind...

Thank you for the answers
and waiting for others too

:dunno:

Peter Daponte

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: KQxx, KJxx hesitation (13:41:04 MonFeb 24 2003)

Just because one Committee makes one very doubtful decision at one time does not mean that anyone else is bound by that decision. Personally, I think the decision just wrong.

If you read a high-level bridge book it will tell you that with KQx you should win the trick randomly. This Committee tells us there is a natural card to play - all other authorities say there is not. Which should we believe?

At the time the player thought he had no decision because he was not going to duck holding KQx. Therefore his hesitation was misleading to declarer and it was right to adjust.

But it would have been just as right to adjust if he had won with the queen after the hesitation!

The hesitation was misleading, not the choice of card.

I cannot believe that we should recommend that we follow one doubtful decision and ignore the instructions from many authorities over the years.

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

bergid



35 posts
bridgetalk member
♥♥♥♥♥

Reply

Re: KQxx, KJxx hesitation (22:53:20 MonFeb 24 2003)

daponte has chosen this hand to support his case, but I don't believe it does:

AQ95
 2
 AQJ8
 AJ73

103
 A1096

J742
 J873

☐ K9652

☐ 43

☐ 65

☐ KQ9

☐ K86

☐ KQ54

☐ 107

☐ 10842

The contract was 3NT by South and West led a small diamond. South took this in hand with the ten and played another diamond to dummy's Jack. He then played the club 3 **off the board** and this was when the hesitation took place. East eventually played the club King.

South later ran the club 10 losing to East's queen and ended up down three. The TD ruled damage owing to the hesitation and adjusted to down one. The Appeals Committee upheld his decision.

I agree with bluejak that this was not right, but for a slightly different reason. Given declarer's unusual play, East was taken off guard and did have something to think about. Playing the Queen would have disclosed the location of the King. It perhaps took East a few seconds to work this out.

The committee however referred to this play as the "abnormal alternative" and that he should have played the queen. I don't believe this is the same situation as the one where declarer plays clubs the "normal" way by leading from his own hand. This is quite different as then the play of the Queen or King is irrelevant (as bluejak states). In this case, declarer could well take the view that a hesitation followed by the play of the King indicated that the defender was considering whether to take the trick now or hold up. The natural inference would be that the Queen was in the other hand. Without the hesitation however, no such inference would present itself, whichever card was played.

In conclusion, I wonder whether, if hesitation and possible damage occurs, the choice of card played from equals depends on whether you play towards or away from the critical holding.

daponte



5 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: KQxx, KJxx hesitation (23:30:20 MonFeb 24 2003)

Country: greece

dear forum

I found this hand as one that had to do with "expert" rulings from an "expert" tournament. The critical point is the Hesitation.

I obviously agree that from KQx expert books say that you should win the trick randomly as to mislead (without break in tempo) the declarer / defender whatever. I hardly believe there is a book that states that AFTER hesitation KQx should take the trick randomly. HESITATION is the point. And after that please someone tell me what other purpose other than misleading the opponents could be to play the top of EQUAL honors. Any OTHER reason?

According to bluejak hesitate or not, you could choose anything from both. (except proven otherwise).

Shouldnt the Hesitation (the agreed hesitation), if only from 'ethical' point of view, "advise" you not to mislead the opps? I mean you take an advantage over the opps and this is just only because of your hesitation, if there wouldnt exist one you would not get such an advantage.

Anyway that doesnt seem "fair" to me if not covered by the "ethical" if not the "written" laws.

I think bluejak made his point clear. Any other opinions?

Thank you

PS please bergid could you pls tell me how to greate such a perfect diagramm?

bergid



35 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: KQxx, KJxx hesitation (23:56:45 MonFeb 24 2003)

If you click on the link at the top of the page that says "Posting Hints", it explains there how to use the "pre" tag to set out hands.

:smile:

bergid



35 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: KQxx, KJxx hesitation (01:04:26 TueFeb 25 2003)

Quote: daponte

And after that please someone tell me what other purpose other than misleading the opponents could be to play the top of EQUAL honors. Any OTHER reason?

Yes, I agree with you this is ethically wrong. All I was suggesting in my last post, was that the example you chose didn't quite illustrate your point. It would have done so if declarer had initiated clubs from his own hand instead of dummy and the play had gone the same way. In that case, I believe there would be a strong case for supposing the defender was intending to deliberately mislead declarer.

I think what you are trying to say (and I am right with you here) is that having hesitated for whatever reason (possibly unrelated to the hand), one should do the "honorable thing" and play the lower of touching honors, so as not to attract the suspicion of unethical play. If this happened to me, I would say "Sorry, wasn't thinking about this trick" or words to that effect (if I had actually been distracted).

:smile:

daponte



5 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: KQxx, KJxx hesitation (09:49:35 TueFeb 25 2003)

Country: greece

I agree with you bergid that in the chosen example the play (off the table) isnt the best position / situation for the defender and he could easily become surprised and hesitate but was the one I found regarding appeals, committees and so on and even in this situation I welcomed the decision of the committee and i agree totally with the guideline the committee states.

In every day bridge "worse" things happen, as is QJx after the fin position, hesitating and then the Q. Demonstarble bridge reason for the defender as arguing to duck and create an impression that his honors are still protected in order to refinisse. For me the only reason was confusing in an "unethical" way.

But I just wanted to know if we could / should extend this to other obviously misleading plays and regard them as only causing confusion and advise players not to do them.
 eg as the ultimate position
 as declarer holding AKJx, playing last on lead and after agreed long hesitation as fourth to play you take with the A, in order to create the impression of being weak in the suit and getting a return to this suit from the safe hand (left hand opp). Such an advanced good declarer play (as seen in the books) in tempo, should maybe after hesitation become unavailable?
 (the same exists even playing in second position, as happened to me in real life in a 1NT contract and misjudged the whole position of the K which of course costed some overtricks and a bad pairs score. Director adjusted "quite" but as that happens from time to time i started a survey to see the point of views in general)
 Thank you for the answers till now
 could use some more 🤔

PS. Thank you bergid for the card layout advice

AlanW

Reply

Re: KQxx, KJxx hesitation (10:32:17 TueFeb 25 2003)

It seems to me that we can all agree that if declarer leads towards AJ10x in dummy and you are sitting over dummy, you should win the trick without hesitating with whichever card you feel like. If you hesitate, it does not matter in the slightest which card you play since you have misled declarer either way.

I also think if declarer leads way from AJxx on the table and you have KQxx you may need to think whether to go in with an honour or not. If you decide you do want to, I think it still doesn't matter which you play since you are not misleading declarer - you had a legitimate bridge reason to think, and declarer takes a view on what that reason was at his own peril. Incidentally, though it may be more relevant when declarer leads towards AJ in his own hand, different people seem to have different standard practices about whether they play the lower or higher of touching honours in second seat, anyway.

bergid



35 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: KQxx, KJxx hesitation (20:08:54 TueFeb 25 2003)

Quote: daponte

as declarer holding AKJx, playing last on lead and after agreed long hesitation as fourth to play you take with the A, in order to create the impression of being weak in the suit and getting a return to this suit from the safe hand (left hand opp)

Agreed, this is a blatant example, though a good player might not be taken in by it. It seems to me that there are situations in bridge, which while not strictly unethical as defined by the Laws, are "grey areas" and we have to live with them and just be wary of players who appear to be indulging in those practices.

Personally, I don't like to call the director over situations involving hesitations in the play - it's time consuming and can sometimes be somewhat confrontational - it's never much fun!

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 15:22:55 Sat Aug 30 2003

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

top

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

jediman2002



7 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Acol 2 Club bid (16:25:41 SatFeb 22 2003)

Country: UK

Most of the players in our 'group' play Benjaminised Acol, so when an opening 2C bid is made, it is alerted, because its meaning is different from 'standard' Acol.

However, a visiting pair came along and opened 2C as a standard Acol opening bid, forcing to game. The bid was not alerted.

I believe there is no need to alert this bid (although it should be 'stopped') since it is part of the basic Acol system. Other players disagree.

Could we have a ruling please?

Jon

Ed



173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Acol 2 Club bid (18:35:17 SatFeb 22 2003)

The Acol 2  opening is artificial, and is therefore alertable. EBU Orange Book 5.2.1(a).

jediman2002



7 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Acol 2 Club bid (20:13:20 SunFeb 23 2003)

Thank you very much for responding - I am very grateful

Jon

Ed




173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Acol 2 Club bid (06:40:15 MonFeb 24 2003)

You're welcome. 

<p>Gail</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Revoke (04:32:06 SatFeb 22 2003)</p> <hr/> <p>What is the penalty for a revoke discovered after 2 subsequent tricks have been played? In the deal, the declarer went down one trick and thought the rule was that she should have been given 2 penalty tricks which would have meant she made her contract. She felt she would have played the hand in a different manner if the revoke had not happened.</p>
<p>JimO</p> <hr/> <p> 175 posts Forum Host</p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Revoke (06:20:18 SatFeb 22 2003)</p> <hr/> <p>Country: USA</p> <p>The penalty for an established revoke: If the revoking PLAYER won the revoke trick, and the revoking side won at least one more trick after the revoke, it is a two trick penalty. If the revoking player won the revoke trick, but the revoking side did not win any tricks after the revoke, it is a one-trick penalty. Tricks won before the revoke trick are not transferred.</p> <p>If the revoking player did not win the revoke trick, but later won a trick with a card he could legally have played to the revoke trick, it is a two-trick penalty - if the revoking side won at least 2 tricks including and after the revoke trick. Otherwise it is only a one trick penalty. If the revoking player did not win the revoke trick, nor a trick with a card he could have legally played to the revoke trick, it is a one-trick penalty - if the revoking side won the revoke trick or a subsequent trick.</p> <p>In any case, the revoking side will never gain by revoking. For example, if the revoking side gains three tricks by revoking, the the director will transfer 3 tricks to the other side to restore equity.</p> <p>Also, there is no automatic trick penalty for a revoke on trick 12, or for failing to play a faced card (dummy, or a penalty card), but in these cases, equity is restored.</p>

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Revoke (15:16:58 SatFeb 22 2003)

Jim has told you what the penalty is. Unless the revoking side take no tricks from the revoke trick onwards, including the revoke tricsk, then at least one trick is transferred.

The old rule about two tricks being transferred was changed about fifteen to twenty years ago.

But if declarer went one down and there was a revoke, presumably she did make it, since one trick would be transferred? **:ohwell:**

Perhaps you mean she went one down after being given one trick for the revoke, in which case tell her sorry - the Law's changed!

:sad:

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

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

[**Get Email Advice of Replies**] [**Print**] [**Send**] [**Watch**] [**<**] [**Add a Reply**] [**>**]

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

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: **FrancesHinden**.

Register :: **Log in**

The time is now 15:24:13 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

**Pierrette
Fuoco**

Reply

**Response of PASS to a double following a Weak
2 (15:50:53 ThuFeb 20 2003)**

Country: Canada

We had an argument at the local club and I said I would get an official ruling to settle it. The bidding was this:
NORTH EAST SOUTH WEST
2 H Double Pass
Pass Pass

South told us that the bidding was illegal and wanted us to rebid. He stated that his double was forcing and that his partner had no right to pass..... HIS PARTNER JUST COULD NOT PASS.
Therefore, we had to rebid the hand. Or more accurately, his partner, North, had to rebid a suit or NT and then, the bidding would continue. My partner and I insisted that the bidding remain as is and that we play the hand. The opps were not happy. South still insisted that he was right at the end of the day.

Ruling, please. Thanks

James Vickers

Reply

**Re: Response of PASS to a double following a
Weak 2 (17:03:33 ThuFeb 20 2003)**

Country: UK

South was right that the auction should have been reopened, but not in the way he wanted. He has no right to dictate what action he would like his partner to take. His partner's pass was irregular, but not illegal.

North has passed out of rotation, but East has accepted this pass by continuing the auction from that point. This irregular auction is treated as legal following such acceptance.

However, all is not yet over. According to L34, if a pass out of rotation means that a player has been deprived of the right to call,

the irregular pass and all subsequent calls are cancelled and the auction reverts to the player who missed their turn - in this case, West. So roll back the auction to 2H - X - p - and it is West's call.

There's more. South's outburst at his partner's pass of a take out double is unauthorized information for North, so North must go out of his way to avoid making use of this information. If West passes, it would be difficult to imagine allowing North to do anything but pass again. If he choses an action inconsistent with his original pass of the double the TD should investigate thoroughly and consider awarding an adjusted score.

I would have to be there, see the hands and quiz the players, but I hope my answer helps.

James

James Vickers

Re: Response of PASS to a double following a Weak 2 (17:17:33 ThuFeb 20 2003)

Reply

Country: UK

Sorry, correction to the previous mail, I think I misread the original posting. If there was no pass out of rotation, South is emphatically, incontrovertibly, unassailably WRONG to insist his parter cannot pass a take out double. There is nothing illegal in this; moreover, it is an essential part of the game, and something I do every week.

Play should proceed, what I said earlier about South's comments being unauthorized to North apply throughout the play period, so once again an adjusted score may be necessary. In addition, a fine should be considered for South, unless he is a novice, in which case a lecture should suffice.

James

Ed

Re: Response of PASS to a double following a Weak 2 (22:14:37 ThuFeb 20 2003)



173 posts
Forum Host

I agree with James' second post. 😊

Reply

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

Reply


Re: Response of PASS to a double following a Weak 2 (00:59:42 FriFeb 21 2003)

When giving a hand or a bidding sequence it is always advisable to use the "pre" formatting code, otherwise all the spaces disappear! I am sure the original post meant to say

The bidding was this:

NORTH	EAST	SOUTH	WEST
	2 H	Double	Pass
Pass	Pass		

which is why James got confused! 

Sadly, even with the "pre" formatting it is difficult to get it to show the spaces as one wants them. Perhaps bridgeaddict will oblige us with a little code box we can fill in for bidding sequences [pretty please]? 

As to the ruling the later posts are correct. But let me stress them.

When a player does not like his partner's action he must keep quiet and say nothing until the end of the hand. To do otherwise is a gross breach of Etiquette, and that means a breach of the Laws of bridge.

Furthermore, apart from the breach of Etiquette, it is also a breach of commonsense. Any double, even a takeout one, may be passed by partner on the correct hand. South cannot tell that North has not got a suitable hand for passing.

Furthermore, even if there is an illegal bid, the auction is not "rebid". There are Laws in the Law book about what to do if a call is made when it is not the player's turn, or a bid is made that is insufficient.

South should learn that his partner will often do things he does not like in the future. That is normal bridge. To comment before the hand is finished is unethical, and South must learn to accept it.

bridgeaddict

Unavailable

510 posts



Administrator



Reply

Re: Response of PASS to a double following a Weak 2 (01:15:13 FriFeb 21 2003)

Quote: bluejak

Perhaps bridgeaddict will oblige us with a little code box we can fill in for bidding sequences.

I would like nothing better, but sadly, it can't be done - at least at present. The hand templates will be available before long to registered members (on application), but as far as guests are concerned, the "pre" tag is the best we can do for now. Actually, I thought the way you laid it out was fine, though I do agree boxes would be better. :smile:

bluejak



434 posts

Forum Host

Reply

Re: Response of PASS to a double following a Weak 2 (16:47:52 FriFeb 21 2003)

I know hte way I laid it out is fine, but it does not lay out like that just from using the "pre" tag. I had to fiddle with it, looking at what I got four or five times, adding and deleting spaces. If the "pre" tag worked to get the spacing right automatically then that would do, but it doesn't. :sad:

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

bridgeaddict

Unavailable

510 posts



Administrator



Reply

Re: Response of PASS to a double following a Weak 2 (18:50:25 FriFeb 21 2003)

Once you've typed West, North, East and South, and then lined up the first row of bids with those headings (most bridge books seem to have the bidding aligned with the left most character of the heading, rather than centered) the remainder can be done more easily. All the "pre" tag does is to allocate equal weight to all characters and spaces as it uses a "fixed" font, as opposed to a proportional one. Unfortunately you still have to actually count the required spaces! :ohwell:

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

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

[[Print](#)]

[[Send](#)]

[[Watch](#)]

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

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

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

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

The time is now 15:24:42 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

top ☐

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

Legend :: ☐ Read Topic :: ☐ Unread Topic

☐ **Email**

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

David Calcutt

[Reply](#)

Running suit in dummy (10:12:11 FriFeb 21 2003)

Country: England

In England, if declarer states to dummy "run the diamonds from the top" and then after 2 rounds, realises for argument sake that he will squeeze himself, so now wishes to change his mind and change tack, is he permitted to do so ? If not, which law governs declarers statement of play (but not a claim) ?

David

JimO



175 posts
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

Re: Running suit in dummy (14:07:04 FriFeb 21 2003)

Country: USA

The play of the hand occurs one card at a time, one trick at a time. Laws 44 & 45 cover the sequence and rotation of play, and what constitutes a played card.

Declarer can stop running the diamonds at any time he wishes.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

bluejak



434 posts
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

Re: Running suit in dummy (16:50:28 FriFeb 21 2003)

Jim is certainly correct, and the English L&EC and the WBF's Laws Commission have confirmed this.

However, I fancy an adjustment would certainly be given under Law 73 if the opposition had been misled by this.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 15:25:15 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

top ☐

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

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

☐ **Email**

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

Guest <hr/> Reply	Dummy play(?) (10:30:57 FriFeb 21 2003) <hr/> Country: South Africa Hi I placed dummy on the table showing only 12 cards (with a singleton in clubs) Dummy's RHO had led a club which was won by dummy's LHO This made a difference to the play by dummy's LHO as they exited with a diamond and not a club which did not give a ruff&sluff Who is responsible and what is the penalty Thanks for the assist Regards Anthony
JimO <hr/> <input type="checkbox"/> 175 posts Forum Host Reply	Re: Dummy play(?) (14:13:52 FriFeb 21 2003) <hr/> Country: USA Dummy is responsible for facing his 13 cards in an orderly manner. See Law 41D. If the opponents were subsequently damaged, the director may adjust to restore equity. --- -Jim O'Neil Oak Park, IL

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 15:25:45 Sat Aug 30 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



434 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

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](#)] [[>](#)]

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

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

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

The time is now 15:26:10 Sat Aug 30 2003

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

top ☐

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

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

☐ **Email**

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