

Key to Abbreviations

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

Other bridgetalk forums

Polling Booth
 The Bridge Table
 Bridge Issues
 Ask an Expert
 Information

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

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

bridgetalk.com forums :: Laws & Rulings

International Bridge Laws Forum

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

Hosted by David Stevenson
 Senior Consultant Director
 English Bridge Union


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

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

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

[Mark Forum Read](#)

[[New Discussion](#)]

	Subject	Replies	Views	Last Post T U
	Director asking wrong couple to "hurry up"	6	212	F D Sturdy 14:53:08 Tue Dec 3 2002

	Psyching Conventional Opening Lead	1	160	bluejak 04:55:33 Mon Nov 25 2002
	force majeure / act of god (case of arriving late)	6	539	[Jon] 03:37:06 Fri Nov 22 2002
	Change of call	10	252	bluejak 21:08:37 Thu Nov 21 2002
	Alerting psychics?	2	186	Al Kimel 13:37:20 Wed Nov 20 2002
	Alerting (in England)	2	163	[James Vickers] 16:43:46 Thu Nov 14 2002
	Use of Stayman	1	145	bluejak 11:41:34 Wed Nov 13 2002
	Pausing before passing when on lead	3	181	bluejak 14:27:02 Tue Nov 12 2002
	responder's 1nt over competetion.	5	147	bluejak 14:46:24 Mon Nov 11 2002
	Mixed board	1	105	Ed 23:38:58 Tue Nov 5 2002
	Jacoby 2NT	6	321	Arciel 02:49:01 Tue Nov 5 2002
	Claim, Suit Didn't Run	1	108	bluejak 15:24:22 Sun Nov 3 2002
	Howell movement 4 tables	1	228	JimO 15:24:22 Sat Nov 2 2002
	Duplicate bridge	1	124	JimO 14:21:30 Thu Oct 31 2002
	Faced opening lead	2	104	bluejak 00:52:03 Wed Oct 30 2002
	Calculate a three table duplicate	3	162	[] 07:35:31 Tue Oct 29 2002
	Unintentional hesitation with a singleton	4	172	Håkan Strä ä f 07:01:44 Mon Oct 28 2002
	dummy,s rights	4	155	bluejak 12:59:46 Sat Oct 26 2002
	Escape from 1 NT-dbl	13	274	bluejak 12:15:11 Sat Oct 26 2002
	Hesitation	3	105	bluejak 01:51:07 Wed Oct 23 2002

F D Sturdy

Reply

Director asking wrong couple to "hurry up" (
10:50:31 WedNov 27 2002)

:Is it correct for a Director to a) request the "wrong person" to hurry up, then continue to send messages via other people to tell the "wrong person" to hurry up ? My new to the club partner got a bit cross, informed the Director it was not us, then a few words took place. Now, this morning, my partner has received rather a nasty letter from Sec of Bridge Club, which I think is totally out of order. I would appreciate a word from you, and thank you in anticipation. PS I think the Director may not be a totally qualified person, but I am not sure on this one. The word "Volunteer" appears in the letter.

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Director asking wrong couple to "hurry up"
(14:53:07 WedNov 27 2002)

I imagine I would get a different version of events from the Director. Without knowing exactly what happened, or what your partner said and how he/she said it, I can't say for sure if the Director was out of line, but your partner should not "get a bit cross", but simply make an effort to get caught up.

At the clubs I direct, I learn very quickly who the slow players are. They are the same pairs who are continually late week after week. A simple "Please try to get caught up" usually works, without ruffling any feathers, though both pairs will usually tell me "It's not our fault".

Most lateness is not caused by slow bidding or play, but by lengthy post-mortems between hands, and pairs who have to study the traveling scoreslips as if there was going to be a quiz later.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Director asking wrong couple to "hurry up"

(20:09:23 WedNov 27 2002)

Another way people love slowing a game down is by writing the contract on their personal score-sheet before the lead: this is very rude, with three people sitting waiting! 🤔

If you get behind then you should speed up in an attempt to catch up. Now that applies whether it was your fault or not. So if your partner was annoyed just because he felt your opponents were at fault, and he did not see why he should try to catch up, then he was out of line. 🤔

Of course, we do not know in detail what happened. If you were following a slow pair, and continually being delayed, then the Director should be chivvying them and not you.

None of this condones rudeness to the Director. If your partner's heated words included rudeness then even if the Director was wrong your partner was also wrong.

In a club it is important that players catch up when they get behind. So long as your partner realises that applies to him even if he was not the cause of getting behind, and so long as he was not rude to the Director in any way, then you probably have a legitimate grievance.

One other point: I do not like the idea of a Director chivvying via a third party: that was wrong.

I hope some of this helps. If you like to give further details of the incident, I am sure Jim, Ed or I can offer further advice. 🌈

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

James Vickers

Reply

Re: Director asking wrong couple to "hurry up"

(16:02:04 ThuNov 28 2002)

Quote: bluejak at 20:09:23 Wed Nov 27 2002

Another way people love slowing a game down is by writing the contract on their personal score-sheet before the lead: this is very rude, with three people sitting waiting!

It is also a good way of ensuring your opening leads are in tempo. If you lead a card after the auction: 1NT - 3NT the instant the final pass hits the table, both your partner and declarer can deduce you had an obvious lead (probably a good 5+ card suit rather than a choice between two mediocre 4-carders). If you always think (or make a pretence of thinking) for a few seconds before making your lead you don't slow the game down noticeably, and you do reduce the transmission of unauthorized information. You might as well fill in your score card during this time.

James

Edited to correct quote code.

[Edited By bridgeaddict at 00:07:37 Fri Nov 29 2002]

James Vickers

Reply

Re: Director asking wrong couple to "hurry up"

(17:48:10 ThuNov 28 2002)

Sorry, only the first paragraph of the previous message was a quote from David, the rest was supposed to be my reply!

James

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Director asking wrong couple to "hurry up"

(05:49:15 SunDec 1 2002)

This is ok for you, James, but it is not what happens with 99% of players.

For the normal person on lead, she puts her cards face down on the table, finds her pen in her bag, finds her spectacles in her bag, searches for her score-card [which is under the bag 🎨], checks the board number [twice], writes the contract down, puts her pen away in her bag, puts her spectacles away in her bag, hangs her bag on the back of the chair, puts her score-card face-down on the table, picks her hand up, says "Is it my lead?", and when told yes

..... she then takes five minutes wondering which of her four-card suits to lead.

No, James, for the average person, it is just not the correct method.



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

F D Sturdy

Reply

Re: Director asking wrong couple to "hurry up"

(14:53:08 TueDec 3 2002)

Thank you all for your replies. Trouble was it was the table before us causing the delay. Yes words were said after the Director was told we were "still waiting for a board" - she said "it will be the first time then" and my partner got cross. And no, Directors should not send messages via other people! My friend will not go to that evening again - after the nasty letter from Sec of Club. I dont blame her.

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

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

[[Print](#)]

[[Send](#)]

[[Watch](#)]

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

[Josef Harsanyi]

Psyching Conventional Opening Lead (21:42:27 SunNov 24 2002)

Reply

The opening lead against 3NT is the 10 of hearts. The cc of opps defines it:
 AJ10x.
 A109x.
 KB10x.
 K109x.
 Q109x.
 Dummy's AK2 and declarers J3 in the suit of the opening lead can result three tricks, if the J wins.

A second control of opps cc shows: the 109x. suitcombination will be opened with the 9.

The declarer had also an other alternative to collect his 9th trick (a finesse in an other suit), but he did want to cash the trick with the hearth Jack, presented by the opening lead from the Q109x.

You know, the Queen of RHO won the first trick, and everybody at the pair tournament used the working finesse to make the contract.

What is TD-s decision, if the SO has no hint for psyching?

bluejak

Re: Psyching Conventional Opening Lead (04:55:32 MonNov 25 2002)

offline

435 posts
 Forum Host

Reply

False cards are common in bridge, far more common than any psyches during the bidding.

Of course the TD should make sure that this is how they play it, but so long as there is no misinformation the result stands.

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

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

Joerg Fritsche

force majeure / act of god (case of arriving late) (21:32:45 ThuJul 18 2002)

Reply

Hello Forum,

I am from Germany and member of our national appeals committee. We have to decide in a case of arriving late at a team match in the league and I would like to know, whether you have clear regulations in your NBO's rules for dealing with arriving late at a tourney, if it is a case of force majeure (act of god, higher force or whatever term you use for it).

In German NBO our rules say:

If your team is not complete at the start of the match (and can not be completed with a substitute) you receive a warning for the 1st 5 minutes, after that you are subtracted 0.2 VPs for every minute. If you are more than 30 minutes late, appeals committee has to decide. If you are more than 45 minutes late, match is lost with 0 VPs for your team.

All this unless it is a case of force majeure. This means according to our comments that 'due to circumstances, which prevented a player despite sufficient care to appear in time'

We don't have any examples or comments in our regulations, and we didn't have a similar case like that we have to decide now in the past.

Do you have any suggestions of your NBO's regulations or similar cases to support me ?

Thanks in advance,

Joerg Fritsche

<div>Ed</div> <div><div>offline</div></div> <div>173 posts Forum Host</div> <div>Reply</div>	<div>Re: force majeure / act of god (case of arriving late) (17:16:44 FriJul 19 2002)</div> <div>ACBL Conditions of Contest are online at http://www.acbl.org/details.asp?id=1829&PID=9918</div> <div>The ACBL regs for Swiss Teams, at least, are similar to the German regulations posted. They don't speak to "acts of God" per se, but do say that a TD can ignore or modify the penalty/disqualification provisions "if compelling reasons exist".</div> <div>I don't know of any case law involving this question.</div>
<div>Grattan Endicott</div> <div>Reply</div>	<div>Re: force majeure / act of god (case of arriving late) (17:34:11 FriJul 19 2002)</div> <div>Provided the understanding of 'force majeure' is applied sympathetically, I would think the regulation sensible.</div>
<div>Ed</div> <div><div>offline</div></div> <div>173 posts Forum Host</div> <div>Reply</div>	<div>Re: force majeure / act of god (case of arriving late) (23:35:29 SatJul 20 2002)</div> <div>Hi, Grattan, and welcome!</div>
<div>[Josef Harsanyi]</div> <div>Reply</div>	<div>Re: force majeure / act of god (case of arriving late) (21:53:28 WedNov 20 2002)</div> <div>The TD is not sure after arrival of a team, if the law-option force majeure to apply or not, the AC should decide. He let play the team, 29 Boards of the prescribed 32 will be played. Both teams agree with the decision of TD.</div> <div>The result, achieved by this way in a sporty competition, can be erased by the AC, if they judge, the delay was not totally act of god?</div>

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: force majeure / act of god (case of arriving late) (08:12:37 ThuNov 21 2002)

Certainly if the regulations say so.

But I do not like leaving it to the AC. That means it will definitely be decided later, which is not desirable. It should be a TD decision, whihc may be appealed.

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

[Jon]

Reply

Re: force majeure / act of god (case of arriving late) (03:37:06 FriNov 22 2002)

Perhaps the following Rule of Golf and Decision of Golf would be a helpful guide:

RULE:

6-3. Time of Starting and Groups

a. Time of Starting

The player shall start at the time laid down by the Committee. . . . PENALTY FOR BREACH OF RULE 6-3: Disqualification.

DECISION:

Q. A Committee may in exceptional circumstances waive the penalty of disqualification under Rule 6-3a for failure to start on time (Rule 33-7). With reference to the following examples, what circumstances are considered exceptional such that the Committee would be justified in waiving the penalty if the player failed to start at the time laid down:

1. The player gets lost on the way to the course.
2. Heavy traffic results in the journey to the course taking longer than expected.
3. A major accident results in the journey to the course taking longer than expected.
4. The player's car breaks down on the way to the course.
5. The player was present at the scene of an accident

and provided medical assistance or was required to give a statement as a witness and otherwise would not have failed to start on time.

A. There is no hard-and-fast Rule. The proper action depends on the circumstances in each case and must be left to the judgment of the Committee.

Generally, only example (5) constitutes exceptional circumstances which might justify waiving the disqualification penalty under Rule 6-3a.

It is the player's responsibility to ensure that he allows enough time to reach the course and he must make allowances for possible delays.

Jon

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 08:21:52 Mon Sep 1 2003

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

[top](#) ↑

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

[Legend](#) ::  [Read Topic](#) ::  [Unread Topic](#)

<p>[cill]</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Change of call (21:27:34 FriNov 15 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>My pd opened 2 D (multi). While I explained to my LHO its meaning, my pd noticed he by mistake took a wrong bidding ticket from the bidding box (he intended to bid 3 D). What should be the ruling? TIA.</p> <p>[Edited solely to include Subject] [Edited By bluejak at 23:05:39 Sun Nov 17 2002]</p>
<p>Ed</p> <hr/> <p>offline 173 posts Forum Host</p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Change of Call (00:49:50 SatNov 16 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>Law 25A allows a player to change his inadvertent call, if he does so "without pause for thought". I don't think this law applies to this case. Law 25B says "Until LHO calls, a call may be substituted when Section A does not apply". If LHO has not called, which seems to be the case, then LHO (your partner's LHO, your RHO) may accept 3D, in which case the auction proceeds without penalty. If LHO does not accept 3D, then your partner must either (a) Let 2D stand, in which case you must pass at your next turn to bid (and Law 23 will apply if the pass damages the opponents), or (b) make any other legal call (including, but not limited to, 3D), in which case the auction proceeds normally, you have UI on which you must not base your calls, and your side can only achieve average minus on this board. In either case you are subject to lead penalties if your side defends.</p>
<p>Ed</p> <hr/> <p>offline 173 posts Forum Host</p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Change of Call (00:52:54 SatNov 16 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>Hm. I just noticed you said you explained to your LHO the meaning of partner's bid. If the bidding has gone round to him, which it should have if he is asking questions, then your partner's call cannot be changed. You still have UI.</p>

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Change of Call (23:15:40 SunNov 17 2002)

Ed is certainly right if the bidding has gone round to LHO. It is too late to change the 2♦ bid, and the partner of the 2♦ bid has unauthorised information that he must avoid using as far as possible: he must continue to treat it as a 2♦ Multi opening.

However, if the original query means that the player was explaining it before he has made his call, then I do not agree with Ed's answer. While he is right that Law 25A only allows a mechanical error to be changed if the change is made or attempted without pause for thought, that pause for thought applies from the realisation of the mistake.

So if opener immediately says he made the wrong call once he realises it may change it to 3♦. Of course the Director must be called, and he will tell you whether it may be changed.

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

Ed

offline

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Change of Call (16:20:50 TueNov 19 2002)

Quote: bluejak at 23:15:40 Sun Nov 17 2002

Ed is certainly right if the bidding has gone round to LHO. It is too late to change the 2♦ bid, and the partner of the 2♦ bid has unauthorised information that he must avoid using as far as possible: he must continue to treat it as a 2♦ Multi opening.

However, if the original query means that the player was explaining it before he has made his call, then I do not agree with Ed's answer. While he is right that Law 25A only allows a mechanical error to be changed if the change is made or attempted

without pause for thought, that pause for thought applies from the realisation of the mistake.

So if opener immediately says he made the wrong call once he realises it may change it to 3♦. Of course the Director must be called, and he will tell you whether it may be changed.

Hm. It occurred to me at the time I first read the original post that the 2D bidder may have been "awakened" by his partner's explanation. Surely that makes a difference?

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Change of Call (01:02:00 WedNov 20 2002)

I thought that at one time, but discussion amongst EBU Panel TDs convinced us that this approach was wrong.

The player intended to bid 3♦ otherwise this Law never applies. It does not matter how he finds out he has pulled the wrong card ["mispulled"]: he is allowed to correct it.

Nothing in the wording of Law 25A suggests otherwise.

[AlanW]

Reply

Re: Change of Call (09:42:22 WedNov 20 2002)

Quote: Bluejak

The player intended to bid 3 otherwise this Law never applies. It does not matter how he finds out he has pulled the wrong card ["mispulled"]: he is allowed to correct it.

Would you always take a player's word at face value if he said he intended to bid 3D or would you want to look at his hand as well? Isn't it possible he wanted to open a weak 2D but when he realised

he was playing 2D multi he immediately wanted to 'correct' the bid to 3D? (In my experience people more often pull out the card next to the one they want rather than 5 bids away.)

[James Vickers]

Reply

Re: Change of Call (14:21:17 WedNov 20 2002)

This is something I always have difficulty with. I think it is generally accepted that looking at offender's hand and trying to divine what their intentions were is not the way to proceed, but I have problems taking offender's word at face value.

When the TD at our local club is called to deal with an insufficient bid he always asks: "Is that what you intended to bid, or did you pull the wrong card out?" Players at our club are now wise to this one, and the incidence of "genuine" insufficient bids has declined to zero. The last time I made an insufficient bid and called the director my opponent leaned over to me while we were waiting for him to arrive and said in a conspiratorial whisper: "Tell him you mispulled - he'll let you take it back!"

I was discussing this with a fellow TD at a tournament recently. He invokes L25A only if the offender has taken the neighbouring card out of the box by mistake. (Bear in mind it is just as easy to be out by one column as it is to be out by one row, i.e. it is as easy to pull out 3D instead of 2D as it is to pull out 3C for 3D.)

I think this approach is also too restrictive. I consider (within generous limits) any card pulled from the same section of the bidding box to be a possible mispull, I don't look at their hand, but I always check with the opponents that there was no apparent pause for thought. I am still in two minds about whether I should prompt them to say whether it was a "mechanical error" or not.

I would be interested to hear if other directors have any advice on this subject.

James

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Change of Call (08:09:14 ThuNov 21 2002)

First of all, let me be clear on one thing: a Director **NEVER, NEVER, NEVER** looks at the player's hand.

Suppose that a player bids 1♠ but then says he intended to bid 1♣. You look at his hand and see five cards in each suit - now what are you going to say? Looking in a player's hand leads to Directors giving unauthorised information, and it is the worst form of such information - that given by a Director through not doing his job correctly.

Players do take silly cards out of the bidding box. If you are not prepared to allow that you are not ruling right. A player who takes out 2♦ when he means 3♦ has a **right** to change it, and no Director should ever refuse that right because he only allows changes to the next door card.

Cheating must be stamped out of this game, and lying to a Director is one of the worst types, fortunately very rare. The Director should wait until the time he is sure he is being lied to, issue a full board penalty, and then tell everyone in the club that this form of cheating is not to be tolerated. Trust me, it will stop immediately.

Since you know that insufficient bids are very rarely mispulls treat such statements with a reasonable lack of sympathy, ruling against often. But do not get into the situation where you will not rule when someone really does mispull.

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

**[James
Vickers]**

Reply

Re: Change of Call (18:19:25 ThuNov 21 2002)

David, I agree with what you say about looking at offender's hand, that mispulls are not always the adjacent card, and that insufficient bids are seldom mispulls.

Just to set the record straight, though, in all the bidding boxes I have ever used 3D IS next to 2D and so is quite a likely candidate for a mispull. As I said, unlike other directors of my acquaintance I am fairly generous in my interpretation of mispulls, but if anyone claimed to have pulled out, say, 2D instead of 6NT I would be sceptical.

I know we have disagreed on this before, but I think that lying to the director is much more common than you think, but I don't consider it such a heinous crime because I think it is rarely perpetrated with malicious intent.

Imagine the scene: A player sees partner open 2NT, looks at their long heart suit and decides to transfer. They pull out their usual transfer call of 2D, without thinking it should be a level higher than usual. This will be claimed as a mispull by many players at my club, even though it is nothing of the sort. When this kind of thing happens at my club the director is rarely called (unless I am at the table). When the irregularity is pointed out, offender just says: "Sorry, I meant to bid 3D", corrects the bid and the auction continues.

Since this is what normally happens, on the rare occasions when the director is called, offender thinks to themselves: "This is monstrously unfair. No-one ever calls the director in this situation, now I'm going to be penalised and get a poor score. I don't see why I should suffer just because that idiot Vickers is at the table." They will then often (in my experience) lie through their teeth in order to avoid what they consider an injustice.

I don't agree with this behaviour, and would never perpetrate such action myself, but I would not try to hound such players out of the club. You might say this is deplorable, but it is (arguably) human nature.

Now to the important question I want answered: in the case of an insufficient bid, do you prompt offender to say whether the bid was a mispull (always, sometimes, never?), and if so, how?

Anyone?

James

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Change of Call (21:08:37 ThuNov 21 2002)

Quote: James Vickers

Just to set the record straight, though, in all the bidding boxes I have ever used 3D IS next to 2D and so is quite a likely candidate for a mispull. As I said, unlike other directors of my acquaintance I am fairly generous in my interpretation of mispulls, but if anyone claimed to have pulled out, say, 2D instead of 6NT I would be sceptical.

OK, But I do not think people usually pick the wrong card out when it is 3♦ and 2♦ because of its position, rather their brain tells them something wrong in the instant they are reaching for the box. Anyway, all I am suggesting is to ask them without a pre-conceived view of how you are to rule - and the same applies to 2♦ instead of 6NT. See what they say. Some answers may be credible.

Quote: James Vickers

I don't agree with this behaviour, and would never perpetrate such action myself, but I would not try to hound such players out of the club. You might say this is deplorable, but it is (arguably) human nature.

I am not trying to hound them out of the club! I am just trying to stop this happening, and the heavy approach will only be needed once.

Quote: James Vickers

Now to the important question I want answered: in the case of an insufficient bid, do you prompt offender to say whether the bid was a mispull (always, sometimes, never?), and if so, how?

No, I don't.

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

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

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

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

The time is now 08:22:11 Mon Sep 1 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

[top](#) ↑

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

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



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

Al Kimel

Reply

Alerting psychics? (17:24:43 SatNov 16 2002)

In the November issue of the ACBL Bulletin, Richard Colker states that one is actually disallowed to "alert" partner's propensity to psyche in certain situations. He writes:

"Can't the psychers simply Alert the opponents to those situations in which a psychic is likely so that both sides have 'equal access' to the tendency? Surprisingly, no. For one thing, on a practical level the psychers can never impart to their opponents the same level of awareness that they themselves possess.

"For another, once the pair achieves the ability to anticipate their psychs, they have an illegal agreement (ACBL regulations make illegal any call which makes allowance for a psychic, called a psychic control). Thus, if a call is intended to fool the opponents by grossly misstating the hand's honor strength or suit length, it must fool partner as well. But as soon as partner develops the ability to recognize and allow for a possible psychic, we have an infraction." (p. 102)

Is Colker's interpretation of the Laws and ACBL regulations correct? Is this view peculiar to the ACBL or does it also represent other jurisdictions?

TIA.

Al Kimel

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Alerting psychics? (00:50:59 TueNov 19 2002)

This is a complex question. hiowever to deal with one detail first, when Rich says

Quote: Richard Colker

For one thing, on a practical level the psychers can never impart to their opponents the same level of awareness that they themselves possess.

that is silly. The same could be true of every agreement a partnership has and is no reason not to alert psyches.

Certainly, the Law accepts that when a pair has an agreement over a psyche it is legal so long as their opponents are fully informed. So it comes down to ACBL regulations, which apparently disallow psyches.

Yet this generally held view is probably wrong in certain situations. For example, a 2NT response to a weak two was originally played as a game try or better, and an enquiry. Players have realised that it is quite a good move on a weak hand to the extent that it is quite common and expected. This is legal if disclosed. You could call this a legal psyche, or you could just say that it is a legal way of playing it.

The real answer seems to be that if a player is likely to make a specific call in a specific situation to an extent where partner is aware of this the opponents need to be advised. Now it just depends on whether you are allowed to play that specific agreement in that particular place.

In areas of the world which allow a much greater degree of system, such as the European Bridge League [though not all their member countries: certainly not Great Britain] and Australia, various psyches are probably perfectly legal if disclosed adequately.

A final example: the comic no-trump was in vogue many years ago, by which a 1NT overcall was either strong balanced, or was a psyche on a weak hand with a long suit. If a pair was to use it frequently in England then presumably they need to disclose it. Interestingly that is fine in the top tournaments where it is legal [called the Gardener no-trump in England] but not in lower tournaments.

Note: I notice you also posted this query to RGB: feel free to copy this reply there if you wish.

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

Al Kimel

Re: Alerting psychics? (13:37:20 WedNov 20 2002)

Reply

A follow-up question, David: Colker appears to suggest that one may not "alert" to partner's psyching tendencies in specific situations because "as soon as partner develops the ability to recognize and allow for a possible psychic, we have an infraction." But isn't there a difference between recognizing the possibility of a psychic bid in a specific situation and actually taking this tendency into account in one's bidding? For example, I know that in the past my partner has on a few times opened 1H in first position with two or three small and a very weak hand. Perhaps I even announce this fact to my opponents. But I still respond on the assumption that he has a normal opener and bid accordingly, at least until the psyche is exposed.

Colker's reasoning here, with the assertion that partner must be as "surprised" as the opponents, seems deeply flawed. I wonder if Rosenberg is "surprised" by Zia's psyches ...

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 08:22:35 Mon Sep 1 2003

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

[top](#) ↑

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

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

[AlanW]

Alerting (in England) (12:21:32 MonNov 11 2002)

Reply

A discussion has uncovered a difference of opinion with a friend over applying the English alerting procedures where calls are natural but their meaning is affected by other calls available.

Example 1: Partner opens 1H, RHO overcalls 1S, you bid 3H preemptively and would bid 2S with a limit raise in hearts. Is 3H alertable?

Example 2: You open 1H, LHO overcalls 1S, partner responds 2D, RHO bids 2S. Now you play a 'good-bad' 2NT, with 2N asking partner to bid 3C and a rebid from you of 3D or 3H being purely competitive. So should you alert a direct 3D or 3H as showing more than going via 2NT?

Example 3: You open 1H, partner responds 1S, RHO overcalls 2C. You play a double as showing exactly 3 spades, so should you alert a raise to 2S as guaranteeing 4-card support?

bluejak

Re: Alerting (in England) (15:03:46 MonNov 11 2002)

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

The regulation in question is

Quote: EBU Orange book 1998

5.2 Basic Rules

5.2.1 You must alert a call if

- (a) it is not 'natural' (see 5.3).
- (b) it is natural, but you have an agreement by which it is forcing or non-forcing in a way that your opponents are unlikely to expect.
- (c) it is natural, but its meaning is affected by other agreements which your opponents are unlikely to expect.

The wording of (c) which is what you are querying was designed to suggest that a fairly normal treatment does not need an alert.

Let us look at your examples.

Example 1 seems to be easy since it is quoted in the Orange book - see 5.4.3(f). It is not alertable.

However! 🤔

Several people have been extremely rude about that item, and it has probably got more bad press than anything else in alerting. I suggest alerting it would be a good idea: too many people think the Committee got that one wrong.

Examples 2 and 3 are borderline. Quite frankly there is a case for alerting in each case, probably more so in Example 3 than Example 2, because in Example 2 other bids show strong hands with or without the good-bad approach. Even in Example 3 you could ask "Do they really not expect this?"

To be honest, I think all three examples are fairly borderline! 😬

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

[James Vickers]

Re: Alerting (in England) (16:43:46 ThuNov 14 2002)

Reply

Further to example 2: The Orange Book does specifically require an alert for a natural suit response to a take-out double where this guarantees certain values. Many players use a version of Lebensohl in this situation:

(2S) - X - (p) - ?

2NT shows a weak hand, 3 of a suit natural with ~7-11 pts. All are alertable.

Your example 2 is so similar to this situation (the "good / bad 2NT" is really just a variant of Lebensohl) I think it requires an alert.

To example 3, I was recently asked whether responses to Crowhurst (or Checkback Stayman) are alertable if they deny certain holdings in the major suits. E.g.:

1D - 1S

1NT - 2C*

?

1NT shows 12-16, 2C is an asking bid. Opener is expected to bid 2/3S with 3-card support and min/max, 2/3H with four hearts and min/max, otherwise 2D/2NT with min/max.

I think that with the possible exception of 2D none of these meanings will come as a surprise to the opponents and so should not be alerted. I was told by a senior EBU TD at the Brighton Congress that 2NT should definately be alerted. I remain unconvinced. It may deny four hearts, but then so does 1D - 1NT, and no-one makes a fuss about alerting that bid.

James

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 08:22:55 Mon Sep 1 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

[top](#) ↑

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

[Legend](#) ::  [Read Topic](#) ::  [Unread Topic](#)



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

linda14808

offline

1 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Use of Stayman (08:01:49 WedNov 13 2002)

Is it considered to be part of standard Acol to bid Stayman with a long weak club suit with the intention of re-bidding clubs over partner's response? (This is taught in the "Bridge for All" "Really Easy Bidding Book".) If so, if a partnership play simple system Acol and do not have a convention card (and therefore cannot state, unless asked, that they play Stayman without a 4 card major) can opposing partnerships claim that they have been damaged by their bidding methods?

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Use of Stayman (11:41:34 WedNov 13 2002)

Stayman is a bid that asks a question, but does not show anything. A player cannot be damaged if he makes assumptions about what a player holds from the statement that he plays Stayman.

A player who when he bids 2C either has a four-card major or a weak hand with long clubs is playing Stayman. A player who always guarantees a four-card major when he bids 2C is playing Stayman. A player who has more complex rebids so when he bids Stayman may have a variety of types of hand, some with a four-card major, some without, is playing Stayman.

If a player wishes to know what hands a player who uses Stayman holds then it is easy for him to ask but he should not assume.

One of the sadnesses of this game is that there are so many different ways to play, but beginners do not get told this, so many of them get upset when they find things are not played their way in the real world. 😞

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

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

[AlanW]

Pausing before passing when on lead (12:30:12
MonNov 11 2002)

[Reply](#)

Suppose you are about to make the final pass in an auction after which you will be on lead. It has been a competitive auction and it is possible you may have a bidding decision to take before passing. In fact you have no difficulty in passing but need to spend some time thinking before leading. If you pause before passing in order to do some thinking about the lead this is presumably in danger of misleading declarer as to what your problem was. If you pass in tempo then pause before leading you convey potentially helpful (authorised) info to declarer and possible unauthorised info to partner. Is it acceptable to pause and then lead without putting a final pass card on the table so that no-one knows whether your problem was in the bidding or in the lead, or is declarer definitely entitled to this information?

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

Re: Pausing before passing when on lead (
15:07:06 MonNov 11 2002)

You are not permitted to mislead declarer through an action. So, this is not permitted. It is just tough luck that declarer will know you have a problem with your lead.

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

Wotan

offline

69 posts
bridgetalk member



[Reply](#)

Re: Pausing before passing when on lead (
07:34:15 TueNov 12 2002)

Quote: bluejak at 15:07:06 Mon Nov 11 2002

You are not permitted to mislead declarer through an action. So, this is not permitted. It is just tough luck that declarer will know you have a problem with your lead.

Just a second David. You are not misleading declarer; you are

thinking about the lead. Is this not an equivalent situation to taking your time playing to trick 1 when declarer hurriedly calls for a card from dummy?

Ron Lel

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Pausing before passing when on lead (
14:27:02 TueNov 12 2002)

Quote: Ron Lel

You are not misleading declarer; you
are thinking about the lead.

You make it sound as those these are exclusive, but they are not. You are thinking about your lead **and** misleading declarer. However, misleading declarer is not permissible.

It is accepted that players have a right to think at trick one. Thus a declarer who deduces that RHO has a problem because he paused gets no redress: a pause at such time does **not** show a problem on that trick.

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

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

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

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

The time is now 08:23:32 Mon Sep 1 2003

[Cheekylady]

responder's 1nt over competetion. (00:48:06

FriNov 8 2002)

Reply



if bidding goes 1c, 1spade lho, and 1nt by responder and the responder DOES NOT PROMISE a spade stopper is that alertable?

my director says it is and when it occurred at another club without an alert that director said it was not alertable

thanks

[]

Re: responder's 1nt over competetion. (01:00:03

FriNov 8 2002)

Reply

no one out there who can help?

Ed

Re: responder's 1nt over competetion. (21:40:58

FriNov 8 2002)

offline

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Sorry I wasn't around last night, but I was playing bridge.

You don't say where you are, and that could affect the answer, as Alert regs vary geographically. In the ACBL, I don't believe this 1NT response is alertable. If you are in some other jurisdiction, let us know where and we'll try to find an answer for you.

You might ask the TD to show you the part of the Alert Regulation that says this call is alertable.

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: responder's 1nt over competetion. (22:46:51
FriNov 8 2002)

I believe this call should be alerted in the "admittedly fuzzy" ACBL. To bid 1NT without a stopper in the opponents suit is certainly "highly unusual and unexpected". Even if not within the letter of the law, alerting is certainly within the spirit of the alert procedure. You know something about the meaning of your partner's call that the opponents most likely do not - and they are entitled to know - so it is up to you to inform them.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

Wotan

offline

69 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: responder's 1nt over competetion. (00:51:05
SatNov 9 2002)

Quote: JimO at 22:46:51 Fri Nov 8 2002

I believe this call should be alerted in the "admittedly fuzzy" ACBL. To bid 1NT without a stopper in the opponents suit is certainly "highly unusual and unexpected".

Just as a matter of interest Jim, what if responder held Jxx or maybe Txxx or Qx of S. Not a stopper but.....

I don't know whether these would need to be alerted here in Australia.

Cheers
Ron

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: responder's 1nt over competetion. (14:46:23
MonNov 11 2002)

It is helpful if people asking question say where they are. Alerting differs in different places. 🤔

This case is interesting insofar as I would not be completely sure whether it is alertable in England either. 😞

If the player will really respond 1NT with

♠ 54
♥ Q74
♦ J873
♣ KJ96

after 1♠ over 1♣ then it is probably unusual enough to be alerted in England. My guess is that despite the plethora of alerting regulations that this treatment is unusual enough to need an alert nearly everywhere. 🤖

Small aside: there are some of us, notably Jim, Ed and I, who check here regularly and will always answer to the best of our ability. But it will sometimes take a few days for us to look so sometimes answers will not



be immediate - sorry.

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

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

Katarina

offline

1 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Mixed board (08:31:14 TueNov 5 2002)

Hello again,

Last night me and my pard sitted NS and defeated opponents, contract 3 NT for 1 down. When we opened the score sheet we noticed that at the other tables it was NS that played 3 NT and all of them succesfully. It was found out that precedent players put cards wrongly into the board. What score should be written down at our table?

Ed

offline

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Mixed board (23:38:58 TueNov 5 2002)

The simple answer is that you write down the result as it happened at your table: 3NT-1, declarer E (or W), NS + 50 (or + 100 if EW were vulnerable). For the TD, it's a little more complicated than that. 🏠

This is a fouled board. It has to be matchpointed in two groups: the first, those who played the board before it was fouled, and the second, those who played it afterwards. If there is only one table in the latter group (you played the board in the last round) then **both** pairs at that table get average plus (60% of the matchpoints or the pair's average on all the other boards, whichever is greater). See laws 86, 88, and 12. In addition, the pair or pairs responsible for fouling the board (at the table which played it before you) might receive a procedural penalty.

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 08:24:15 Mon Sep 1 2003

JoAnneM

Reply

Jacoby 2NT (05:05:28 FriSep 27 2002)

I maintain that J2NT and all of it's ensuing bids are alertable. For instance 1s-2nt-4d which shows a five card diamond suit should be alerted. Is this not right?

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Jacoby 2NT (12:14:27 FriSep 27 2002)

While I am happy to help with alerting questions, it is important that you say where you are if you are asking such questions. Alerting differs from country to country.

In the ACBL, ie in North America, for example, calls after the first round above 3NT are not alertable, so 4♦ is not alertable in North America.

In England and Wales, natural bids are not alertable, so 4♦ is not alertable in England and Wales.

In South Africa, it depends what 4♦ is usually after Jacoby. If it is normally a void, for example, then natural is unusual, and that would make it alertable in South Africa.

But I would say that 4♦ is not alertable in most jurisdictions.

You say all ensuing bids are alertable: I do not believe that to be true anywhere! After all, some bids are just natural and not unexpected: how about 3♣ just as natural?

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

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Jacoby 2NT (12:32:04 FriSep 27 2002)

Actually, in North America: most conventional calls above 3NT, beginning with opener's second rebid, require a delayed alert. (Except that alertable passes, doubles and redoubles require an immediate alert).

Since the 4D bid is natural, it is my opinion that it does not require a (post) alert.

However, since the ACBL Alert Procedure states "to insure full disclosure, however, at the end of the auction and before the opening lead declarers are encouraged to volunteer to explain the auction (including available inferences)", I would explain the 4D bid. (e.g., 5+ -card suit, X of the top X honors)

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

kjun

Reply

Re: Jacoby 2NT (13:44:45 FriSep 27 2002)

this came up recently in one of my games... *all* replies to J2NT are conventional (with us at least), and we alert them as a matter of course... J2NT requires opener to bid a stiff at the 3 level or void at the 4 level and point count responses if no s/v is held...

while it's true that bids above 3NT require a delayed alert, we alert them immediately... but then we alert even mundane bids such as 1S:2S* as showing "exactly 3 card support"... we've even been (probably rightly so) snickered at for alerting the pass in 1D-(P)-1S-2C-P* here as denying 3 card spade support... it probably isn't necessary, but it seems right

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Jacoby 2NT (20:11:05 FriSep 27 2002)

If you are alerting immediately bids which require a delayed alert, then you are in violation of procedure, and may be subject to penalty.

There is a reason that these bids are to be alerted after, rather than during, the auction.

BTW, defenders are also required to post-alert:

E.g.,

1H - p - 1S - p

4C* - x - p - 5C

x - all pass

* = splinter

The defenders are required to post alert before declarer plays from dummy.

(Best is for partner of the person who made the alertable bid - in this case, opening leaders partner - to alert after the opening lead is selected, but before it is faced).

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

Wotan

offline

69 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Jacoby 2NT (01:08:03 SatSep 28 2002)

I don't know what the situation in other countries is, but here in Oz if you alert a bid that is not alertable you are in breach of the regulations and may be subject to a penalty. We are required to alert all bids where partner is privy to information which the opponents do not have eg

1C (P) 1H (1S)

2H showing 4 card support if you play support Xs is alertable.

Bids of opponent's suits and Xs are regarded as "self alerting" and bids over 3NT are not to be alerted. We don't have "post auction alerts" but it is increasingly common for players to volunteer an explanation of bids the opps may not understand.

Ron Lel

[Edited By Wotan at 01:09:03 Sat Sep 28 2002]

Arciel

Re: Jacoby 2NT (alerting a non-alertable bid) (
02:49:01 TueNov 5 2002)

Reply

From Wotan:

> I don't know what the situation in other countries is,
> but here in Oz if you alert a bid that is not alertable
> you are in breach of the regulations and may be
> subject to a penalty.

From the ACBL Alert Chart --

"Many previously Alertable calls no longer require an Alert. However, when in doubt Alert (there is no penalty for Alerting unnecessarily but there may be one for failing to Alert when one is required)."

I cited this the other day when an opponent objected to my alerting a 3-of-a-suit bid after my partner's Jacoby 2NT. I can't find any clear direction as to whether or not to alert this, so I did.

Arciel (from the D.C. area, USA, since bluejak says we should say where we're operating from)

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 08:24:41 Mon Sep 1 2003

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

top ↑

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

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

Shuffler

offline

7 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Claim, Suit Didn't Run (02:47:18 SatNov 2 2002)

Contract 6S by W

dummy: ♠ Q1064 ♥ A752 ♦ none ♣ AQJ87

declarer: ♠ AK983 ♥ K6 ♦ Q864 ♣ K6

North led ♦ A, trumped in dummy. ♠ AK pulled opponents trumps, 2/2. Declarer claimed with the following statement:
The rest are mine. I have ♥ AK, ♣ K then over to dummy's clubs pitching three diamonds on the clubs.

RHO has ♣ 96532. Because of the statement, "pitching the three diamonds on dummy's clubs," must declarer pitch the last diamond on RHO's ♣ 9 instead of ruffing? The last diamond could then be ruffed in dummy to score 6S+1.

Thank you so much for your help.
Shuffler

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Claim, Suit Didn't Run (15:24:21 SunNov 3 2002)

People will argue about these type of claims for ever! 😞

Fortunately, this one is easy. When the last club is led from dummy, declarer would see it is a loser because RHO covers it and it would be irrational not to overruff. Then he would find he could ruff his last diamond in the dummy. So the claim is allowed. 🌈

More interesting, and more contentious, would be if LHO had the five clubs. Now the question is whether declarer would automatically realise the last club in dummy is not good. Some people would argue either way, but in my view anyone who is casual enough to assume Kx opposite AQJ8x is running is also casual enough not necessarily to realise that it is not. So if LHO had the fifth club I would not allow the claim. 😞

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

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

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

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

The time is now 08:25:03 Mon Sep 1 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

[top](#) ↑

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

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



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

[]bridgetoddess

Howell movement 4 tables (03:41:38 SatNov 2 2002)

[Reply](#)

please help me with the movement for 4 table howell my name is Lauretta Zellner bridge teacher

JimO

Re: Howell movement 4 tables (15:24:21 SatNov 2 2002)

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

Here is the standard 4-table, 6-round (3 boards/round) Howell:

Table 1 - - Table 2 - - Table 3 - - Table 4

NS EW Bds NS EW Bds NS EW Bds NS EW Bds

8-1 1-3 | | 7-5 1-3 | | 3-4 4-6 | | 6-2 7-9

8-2 4-6 | | 7-6 4-6 | | 4-5 7-9 | | 1-3 10-12

8-3 7-9 | | 7-1 7-9 | | 5-6 10-12 | | 2-4 13-15

8-4 10-12 | 2-7 10-12 | 6-1 13-15 | 3-5 16-18

8-5 13-15 | 3-7 13-15 | 1-2 16-18 | 4-6 1-3

8-6 16-18 | 4-7 16-18 | 2-3 1-3 | | 5-1 4-6

Tables 1 and 2 relay (share) boards each round.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 08:25:26 Mon Sep 1 2003

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

**[]Lina
Mosmann**

Duplicate bridge (12:20:42 ThuOct 31 2002)

Reply

I would like to know how to set up a two table duplicate bridge individual players please.
Thanks,
LINA

JimO

Re: Duplicate bridge (14:21:30 ThuOct 31 2002)

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

See the thread "How to set up a two table duplicate bridge club" in the "Ask an Expert" Forum.

[Edited By JimO at 14:22:17 Thu Oct 31 2002]

Reply

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 08:25:50 Mon Sep 1 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

top ↑

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

<p>[]Peter</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Faced opening lead (03:17:39 TueOct 29 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>South is declarer. E makes a faced opening lead out of turn(2H). Then W makes a lead of the KD. The TD is called. S is informed of the various options. He decides to accept the lead of the 2H and become dummy. His partner will then play the hand. Does the KD become a penalty card?</p>
<p>[Robin]</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Faced opening lead (11:13:32 TueOct 29 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>Yes, if declarer accepts H2 lead then he has not accepted the DK lead so DK is MPC under L56.</p> <p>More interesting perhaps, is when declarer does not accept the H2 lead and imposes lead penalties on LHO.</p> <p>Does this forum have a style guide: I prefer "H2" for the "two of hearts" card to distinguish from the 2H bid.</p>
<p>bluejak</p> <hr/> <p>offline 435 posts Forum Host</p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Faced opening lead (00:52:03 WedOct 30 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>We do not have a style guide but I agree. To me 2H is a bid, H2 is a card. Of course you can use the codes [see Posting Hints] and then 2♥ is a bid, ♥2 is a card.</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](#)] [[>](#)]

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

[Nélida Lugo]

Calculate a three table duplicate (19:03:41 MonOct 21 2002)

[Reply](#)

I want to know how to calculate the resultate of three table duplicate

[Edited By bluejak at 21:59:18 Mon Oct 21 2002]

bluejak

Re: Calculate a three table duplicate (22:32:09 MonOct 21 2002)

[offline](#)

435 posts
Forum
Host

[Reply](#)

In any duplicate each pair gets two match points for each pair they beat on each board, and one match point for every pair they tie with. For example, suppose you have a score-sheet that reads like this:

N/S pair no	E/W pair no	N/S score	E/W score
3	1	+170	
4	2	+420	
6	5		+50

Now pair 4 get four matchpoints because their +420 beats the other two scores. Similarly pair 3 gets 2 matchpoints and pair 6 get no matchpoints.

Pair 5 get four matchpoints because they beat pairs 1 and 2 in their direction, and so on. In fact you could write the matchpoints down like this:

N/S pr no	E/W pr no	N/S sc	E/W sc	N/S mps	E/W mps
3	1	+170		2	2
4	2	+420		4	0
6	5		+50	0	4

Another example:

N/S pr no	E/W pr no	N/S sc	E/W sc	N/S mps	E/W mps
1	4		+420	1	3
5	3		+420	1	3
6	2		0	4	0

Several things to note. A passed out board scores zero, beating all the minus scores, but losing to the plus scores. See also the effect of the tied scores. The N/S and E/W matchpoints on each line always total four, so

once you have worked out the N/S one you can just subtract from four for E/W. And finally, all the matchpoints on a single board total 12 - always!

So, work out each score-sheet like this. Transfer the matchpoints to a sheet of paper with individual scores for pair one, pair two and so on, and add up the scores for pair one, pair two and so on. As a final check you should total everybody's score, and the grand total if you have made no mistakes comes to twelve times the number of boards played.

Now the pairs with the highest score wins, and so on down.

Is this clear? If not, feel free to ask further questions. 🌈

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

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Calculate a three table duplicate (22:37:46
WedOct 23 2002)

What David said is correct for Europe and man other parts of the world.

In North America, a pair gets one matchpoint for every pair whose score they beat on a given board, and one-half point for every pair whose score they tie (rather than 2 and 1).

So in the first example, pairs 4,3 and 6 would get 2,1 and 0 matchpoints (rather than 4,2, and 0) In the second example, pairs 1,5 and 6 would get 1/2, 1/2 and 2 matchpoints (rather than 1,1, and 4).

It works out the same.

Of course, this is for matchpoint pairs. Occasionally, a pair game will be scored using IMP scoring - there are different ways of doing this.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

[]

Re: Calculate a three table duplicate (07:35:31

TueOct 29 2002)

Reply

I have written a beginners Guide to Matchpointing with a 15 table example for anyone wanting to know more. It is based on two points matchpointing. the site is

<http://www.teawamutu.net/bridge/matchpointing.html>

Bruce Owen

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

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

[[Print](#)]

[[Send](#)]

[[Watch](#)]

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

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

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

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

The time is now 08:26:38 Mon Sep 1 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

top ↑

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

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



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

**Håkan
Strä ä f**

Reply

Unintentional hesitation with a singleton (

21:17:21 FriOct 25 2002)

Hi,

I'm a bit confused on how rule in the following situation. Perhaps someone can help me straighten it out.

Well into the play of the hand, one defender unintentionally hesitates before playing his only remaining card in the suit played, thus giving the declarer the impression that he has at least one more card in the suit.

Question 1: Is the declarer allowed to draw any conclusions from this or does law 73.D.1 apply, ie any inferences may be drawn at declarer's own risk?

Question 2: If declarer is allowed make the inference that the defender in question has at least one more card in the suit, and plans his play accordingly, must his chosen line of play be good or perfect in order to get compensated in accordance with law 73.F.2 (or some other paragraph, or is he allowed to play badly but not completely mad?

Thanks in advance!

/Håkan

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Unintentional hesitation with a singleton (

12:42:39 SatOct 26 2002)

Quote: Hakan

Well into the play of the hand, one defender unintentionally hesitates before playing his only remaining card in the suit played, thus giving the declarer the impression that he has at least one more card in the suit.

The first question might be "What should the defender do now that he has hesitated?"

He should say something like "Sorry, I have nothing to think about". Yes, this is unauthorised information to partner. which may cause partner trouble, but the only other solution is not to hesitate in the first place.

Quote: Hakan

Question 1: Is the declarer allowed to draw any conclusions from this or does law 73.D.1 apply, ie any inferences may be drawn at declarer's own risk?

Declarer has a perfect right to draw conclusions from this. The law that says inferences are drawn at declarer's risk means that if the defender has a perfectly good reason but declarer misguesses what the reason is then declarer has no recourse.

Suppose there seems an obvious club switch, and declarer wonders why a defender did not find it. If the defender suddenly grimaces and appears to find a card stuck behind another then declarer might play him for a singleton club. However, if it turns out that the defender had found the heart king and that is why he grimaced declarer has no recourse: the defender has a perfectly good bridge reason for his action: it just was not what the declarer guessed it to be. 😞

Quote:

Question 2: If declarer is allowed make the inference that the defender in question has at least one more card in the suit, and plans his play accordingly, must his chosen line of play be good or perfect in order to get compensated in accordance with law 73.F.2 (or some other paragraph, or is he allowed to play badly but not completely mad?

His play certainly does not need to be perfect to get redress! It would be very unfair if only perfect declarers got redress from opponents' sins! 🏠

However, bridge has a dislike of the "double shot", legal in many sports. If he tries a totally mad action, relying on getting redress if it fails, he will usually be denied redress. The standard for this is different in different parts of the world.

To be denied redress in the ACBL declarer must have failed to "play bridge", or committed an "egregious error". In England or Wales declarer must have committed "wild or gambling action", with at least a suspicion of the double shot. In most other places declarer must have committed "irrational, wild or gambling action" to be denied redress.

Even if you deny declarer redress you should still adjust for his opponents to make sure they do not benefit, so you should give different scores to each side, a "split" score.



If you are ruling in a club you might just as well ignore all this business of split scores and denying redress. Teach the players to say "Sorry" when they accidentally think with a singleton, and adjust if they do not.

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

**Håkan
Strä ä f**

Re: Unintentional hesitation with a singleton (
22:58:05 SatOct 26 2002)

Reply

Hi and thanks for your answers!

Now I'd like to relate to the actual case. The board was played in a match in the second division of the Swedish league. All players at the table are the Swedish equivalent of Life Masters. The board in question looked like this

Board 23
Dealer: South
Vuln.: All

S K84
H 54
D KT632
C QJT

S QT732
H -
D AQJ
C A8654

S A65
H QJT9632
D 87
C 7

S J9
H AK87
D 954
C k932

The bidding was short:

N	E	S	W
		P	2S
P	4S	P	P
P			

2S showed at least 5 spades, at least 4 clubs, 11-16 hcp and 4-5.5 losers.

North lead the three of diamonds (fourth highest) to South's nine and declarer's queen. Declarer (my partner) played the ace of clubs and ruffed a club in dummy. A low heart was ruffed and another club was ruffed in dummy. After giving the situation considerable thought, declarer ruffed another heart and North hesitated for a short moment and tugged at another card before he played his remaining heart. The remaining cards are

S K84
H -
D KT62
C -

S QT7
H -
D AJ
C 86

S A
H QJT96
D 8
C -

S J9

H AK

D 54

C K

Safe in the knowledge that North holds at least one of the remaining hearts, declarer cashed the ace of diamond, ruffed a club with the ace of trumps, and tried to ruff a heart with the spade seven, but North overruffed. Declarer could only get one more trick and was one down.

Declarer stated immediately after the board that he would not have cashed the ace of diamonds if North had followed to the second heart trick in tempo. He would have ruffed the club and tried to ruff a heart with the spade seven. North can still overruff but is endplayed and declarer will eventually emerge with ten tricks.

Both the TD and the AC claimed that declarer made the inference about the heart suit at his own risk.

Both the TD and the AC have also focussed on the play of the ace of diamonds and considered it a bad line of play. Declarer decided to cash the ace of diamonds to get the trick before the rats got at it. He was afraid that if one defender held three clubs and two diamonds, that defender might discard his last diamond on the fourth round of clubs. Declarer didn't analyze all variations of the play, and agrees that it is hard to find a layout consistent with the play where it is necessary to cash the ace of diamonds. It is almost as hard to find layout where it might cost a trick. In most layouts the play of the ace of diamonds does not affect the outcome of the play.

The TD's ruling was that the result should stand, and the AC's decision was a split score, 4S+4 in 25% of the cases and 4S-1 in 75% of the cases.

We, on the other hand, claim that declarer was allowed to draw the conclusion that North held at least one more heart, and was damaged by the hesitation.

We also claim that declarer's play wasn't "irrational, wild or gambling" and that he therefore is entitled to full redress.

Comments, please!

/Håkan

PS. Just to make things perfectly clear. All players at the table

KNOWS that North would never hesitate on purpose in this situation. He was just caught napping when declarer finally decided to play the second round of hearts from table. He just wasn't awake.

Edited solely to make hand diagrams readable - see Posting Hints
[Edited By bluejak at 00:56:38 Sun Oct 27 2002]

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Unintentional hesitation with a singleton (
01:02:31 SunOct 27 2002)

In my view the TD and AC should have adjusted fully, and they have both misunderstood the Law. Your partner's line is reasonable, and he has a right to depend on the opponent's mannerism.

Feel free to quote me!

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

**Håkan
Strä ä f**

Reply

Re: Unintentional hesitation with a singleton (
07:01:44 MonOct 28 2002)

Thanks!

A correct ruling would have meant 3 extra VPs to us, and since we were only one VP behind the winner, the ruling cost us a place in the highest division. Sometimes life isn't fair.

/Håkan

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

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

[[Print](#)]

[[Send](#)]

[[Watch](#)]

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

**[]Barbara
Kranjc**

Reply

dummy,s rights (09:34:32 SunOct 6 2002)

Hi

I have been irritating by the following question:
Does the dummy,s right to warn a declarer if he
genuinly believes he is about to lead from the wrong hand
expires when declarer has called wrongly for a card from
the dummy or in case when the wrongly played card from the
decalrer,s hand has been seen.

I appreciate yr reply very much, thanks.

My very best Barbara

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: dummy,s rights (15:19:21 SunOct 6 2002)

Once Declarer leads from the wrong hand, either Defender may
(without consulting partner) accept the lead, or require Declarer to
lead from the proper hand, regardless of what Dummy does.
So Dummy's pointing out that Declarer has led from the wrong
hand can only help the Defenders.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: dummy,s rights (23:49:10 SunOct 6 2002)

Jim is right! 🌈

However, a little more detail might be helpful. Dummy has the right
to try and stop partner leading from the wrong hand, and this
cannot be done once the lead is made. Now, when he calls for a
card from dummy, that card is played so a warning is now too late.



However, it is a little more complex when the declarer plays from
hand. His card is not played when it is visible, but when it is placed
on the table, or held stationary near or touching hte table. So, until
that moment, dummy is in time to warn him.

In effect this means that if declarer produces a card from hand
when he should be leading from dummy a last despairing cry by

dummy might still be in time even if the card has been seen! 🌈

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

[]

Re: dummy,s rights (14:58:55 FriOct 25 2002)

Reply

(Happened to be looking at an old thread and this started me thinking.)

Quote: JimO

Once Declarer leads from the wrong hand, either Defender may (without consulting partner) accept the lead, or require Declarer to lead from the proper hand, regardless of what Dummy does.

How is this supposed to work in practice? I had always assumed it was for the next defender to play to decide whether or not he accepted the lead (I caused quite a lot of surprise at my local club recently by following suit 2nd in hand even after everyone had realised the lead was from the wrong hand). But does the rule that either defender may accept or refuse the lead out of turn mean my partner could have pre-empted this by saying he wasn't going to accept the lead?

And what does the director do if called to the table at the right time when the lead out of turn has been made? He presumably cannot ask each defender in turn whether he wants to accept the lead since whoever he asks first has pre-empted his partner. Does he simply say 'either defender may ...' and wait for something to happen?

Alan

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Dummy's rights (12:59:46 SatOct 26 2002)

If declarer or dummy leads out of turn either partner has the right to accept or refuse the lead. He who speaks first speaks for the partnership, and no conferring is allowed.

If the next to play plays a card that is the end of it: it has been accepted.

If either player says that he accepts the lead, or that he refuses, then that is the end of it: it has been accepted or refused.

If the TD is called then he will make the same offer: he should say something like:

"Either partner has the right to accept or refuse the lead. He who speaks first speaks for the partnership, and you may not confer. If neither partner speaks then the lead is refused."

The TD then waits, and if no-one says anything he should tell declarer the lead is refused and he should lead from the correct hand.

If the two players speak simultaneously the TD should decide which player spoke first - if necessary he might decide the next to play spoke first if he really cannot decide otherwise.

Oh - one last trap. If a defender says "You led from the wrong hand" this does **NOT** mean he has refused the lead: it just means that he is drawing attention to an irregularity, and the TD must be called, who will give both partners their choice, as above.

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

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

[Katarina]

Escape from 1 NT-dbl (22:09:16 MonOct 21 2002)

Reply

LHO PD RHO

1 NT dbl 2 C

(12-14) (penalty) (alerted by LHO)

On my inquiry what the bid of 2 c means,

LHO responded: starting to escape

Me: Has RHO monocolor or 2 suiter including clubs?

LHO: He can have any hand: monocolor or twosuit

Me: So you must bid if I pass

LHO: No I will pass whatever you bid, including pass.

Me: And if you have only 2 clubs, will you also pass?

LHO: Yes.

Me: You will pass knowing that RHO may have zero clubs?

LHO: Yes.

I felt frustrated. Afterwards I was not sure if at club tournament it is permissible to use such an ambiguous convention which needs prepared defence.

Am I right?

[James Vickers]

Re: Escape from 1 NT-dbl (14:01:20 TueOct 22 2002)

Reply

It sounds to me as if your opponents are not giving you the full explanation you are entitled to by law. There is a convention known as Koch-Werner, in which a player could either have length or shortage in the suit bid after 1NT - X. Partner is expected to pass, but if the rescuer redoubles this tells them to choose one of the other suits. There could be something like this going on, in which case they should be telling you.

Two weeks ago my partner doubled 1NT, RHO redoubled (alerted), and I asked what this meant. I was told it requested partner to bid 2C. I asked what sort of hand it could be based on, and was told "anything at all". They were a regular partnership, and I cannot believe this was all they knew. If the redoubler subsequently changes the suit, how does opener know what to do if it could be either a single-suiter or a "scramble" to the side's best fit?

Both these situations are open to abuse by unethical players who may (wittingly or unwittingly) use partner's mannerisms to decide what to do. If the explanations really are complete and correct, I

think they are introducing a random element into the game which is also illegal.

I would be interested to hear other opinions on the matter.

Ed

offline

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Escape from 1 NT-dbl (18:50:57 TueOct 22 2002)

Interesting problem. 

A couple of comments:


Players are entitled to full and complete explanation of all "special information" relating to an opponent's call or play (Law 75C). Failure to provide it is an infraction (misinformation) which may lead to redress if the non-offending side is damaged.

If a player feels his (or her) opponent's explanation is inadequate, the best thing to do is call the director. Asking repeated questions could constitute an infraction in itself (see Law 74).

In the original post, the question was whether the methods in use by opponents might be illegal at the club tournament where the incident occurred. The only way to know that is to consult the club's conditions of contest, or to call the director. At the table, only the latter method is really available (and you can't consult the club's coc if they aren't published, which is the case with all the clubs around here I know about).

The question whether players are entitled to know the meaning of calls not yet made by opponents, but which might be made in future is a thorny one. IMHO, there is no such entitlement, but these examples show that may present a problem occasionally.

James suggests that a player may unwittingly use partner's mannerisms to decide what to do, and that this is unethical. It is not. It is illegal, certainly, but that's another story. To do so knowingly **is** unethical, of course, as well as illegal. James also suggests that "introducing a random element into the game" is

illegal. I don't know on what he bases that. 

If I were called to the table at the point where James or Katarina was dissatisfied with opponents' explanation, I would ask the opponents if they feel they have given full and complete disclosure. If they say yes, or even if they give further information, I would ask

that play continue, and that I be recalled at the end of the hand if the side that called me originally felt they were damaged by a lack of information in the explanation given. If they can show that they were damaged, I will adjust the score (Law 40, Law 12C2).

[]

Re: Escape from 1 NT-dbl (22:01:49 TueOct 22 2002)

Reply

Some more information:

LHO assured that he gave the full explanation and repeated it was a classic escape (i.e. any hand, monosuit, twosuit, clubs or no clubs) which he was going to pass whatever I bidded.

Not knowing what our bids meant afterwards, we ended in a bad contract of 3 C (I tried lebensohl), whereas all other pairs reached 3 NT.

bluejak

Re: Escape from 1 NT-dbl (02:24:43 WedOct 23 2002)

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

I do not believe the explanation was full. What a lot of people play is that 2♣ is effectively natural, so partner will pass, but it could be made on a number of hands because responder might take further action. For example, responder might redouble to ask partner to try somewhere else: he might do this with a club shortage.

While this is quite normal in clubs in England, that does not mean it is understood everywhere, and the players must explain it better. To say

Quote:

He can have any hand: monosuit or twosuit

is not good enough - surely it does not show an eight-card spade suit, for example.

Law 75A makes it quite clear that the full meaning of calls must be fully and freely available to opponents. This means that any inferences from further calls must be made clear.

As Ed notes the pair is not unethical if they fail to do this [unless they do it deliberately knowing it to be wrong] but they should have

the requirements of Full Disclosure explained to them.

Incidentally, on a side note, this is not Kock-Werner: they invented the SOS redouble, but only as a response to an overcall. SOS redoubles are now played in a large variety of cases.

Are their methods legal? Without knowing where you play I cannot be sure, but if they play it as I suggested, basically natural, but responder in control, these are normal methods, and probably legal everywhere.

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

**[James
Vickers]**

Re: Escape from 1 NT-dbl (10:24:24 WedOct 23 2002
)

Reply

Ed,

just to clarify a couple of points: if responder redoubles 1NT to request partner to bid 2C with the agreement that this could be based on any hand under the sun, then bids, say, 2H over 2C how is the opener supposed to know what action to take? If responder has a single-suiter, pass would be correct. If they have both majors, a correction to 2S may be correct. If both players' actions are reduced to pure guesswork, one tends to be suspicious if their guessing turns out to be particularly good. Could there be incomplete disclosure here (most favourable interpretation), secret signalling going on (least favourable)?

What would you do if your partner opened 1NT, next hand overcalled 2S (alerted) and this was explained as "could be absolutely anything, we just guess from now on". (Regulations allow "any defence to 1NT").

I cannot quote you chapter and verse concerning the illegality of making random calls, but I believe the EBU has made pronouncements on this in the past. This may constitute an illegal convention, or fall foul of the law about "losing interest in the game" (Law seventy-something, I think).

James

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Escape from 1 NT-dbl (12:45:53 WedOct 23 2002)

First, whether a pair is allowed to have an agreement to play random bids is a matter for regulation by the sponsoring organisation. The EBU does not permit them, see Orange book 9.1.5, but many authorities have no such rule. 😞

Second, to play 1NT x xx as random is fairly incredible. It would depend on the follow-ups, and despite what Ed suggests, you have a complete right under Law 75A and the principle of Full Disclosure to know the effects of such follow-ups. 😞

Of course, the original post did not quite suggest they were random, just one-suited or two suited. This is not so impossible, but still unlikely. I think the pair knew more than they suggested, and should therefore be explaining to their opponents more fully. 😞

If 1NT was overcalled with a random 2♠ bid then either
[1] It really is random. In that case, it depends whether it is legal. It is not in the EBU because the over-riding condition [no random bids] supersedes all other rules. However, many places will allow it. In that case you will just have to assume that people who play such things lose more than they gain - but possibly not **this** hand. 😊
[2] It is not really random, which is far more likely. The Director will probably ask what 2♥ means, and so on. If 2♥ shows [for example] hearts and clubs, then does 2♠ deny hearts and clubs? It is really unlikely that anyone is playing pure random bids - not explaining fully is far more likely - and that brings us full circle to the original problem. 😞

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

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Escape from 1 NT-dbl (14:08:07 WedOct 23 2002)

I agree with what Ed and David have said.

I would like to add:

Law 20F allows players, at the appropriate time to "ask about calls actually made or about relevant calls available but not made".

The ACBL does not use the term "ranndom", but disallows "destuctive" conventions. I don't think 1NT-x-xx (could be anythiHg) would be destructive; 1NT-2S(could be anything) might be; 1C (strong, artificial, forcing)-1S(could be anything) definitely would be.

In the original example, as an opponent at the table I would ask, what would pass mean here? 2C? 2D? 2H? 2S? etc. If the answers were not satisfactory, I would call the director.

As Director, I would ask the same things.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

Ed

offline

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Escape from 1 NT-dbl (03:25:16 ThuOct 24 2002)

Quote: Guest [Unregistered]

at 10:24:24 Wed Oct 23 2002]Ed,

just to clarify a couple of points: if responder redoubles 1NT to request partner to bid 2C with the agreement that this could be based on any hand under the sun, then bids, say, 2H over 2C how is the opener supposed to know what action to take?
[snip]

What would you do if your partner opened 1NT, next hand overcalled 2S (alerted) and this was explained as "could be absolutely anything, we just guess from now on".
(Regulations allow "any defence to

1NT").

I cannot quote you chapter and verse concerning the illegality of making random calls, but I believe the EBU has made pronouncements on this in the past. This may constitute an illegal convention, or fall foul of the law about "losing interest in the game" (Law seventy-something, I think).

As to your first question, I don't know. 🤔 Most of the people I play with aren't willing to discuss even defenses to the usual (around here) strong nt, much less what to do about weak nos, run outs, and such, so I haven't given it much thought.

Re "absolutely anything", I would ask if there is no hand on which they would do something other than bid 2S. If I don't get a satisfactory explanation (ie, one I can understand and which is helpful) I call the director.

I don't think having an **agreement** to make a "random" call* is "losing interest in the game". As to whether it is legal or not, I'd leave that up to the TD - who should, IMO, be able to show some law or regulation which **says** it's illegal.

* IMO, what is usually meant by "random calls" is calls which could have many widely different meanings, most (or all) of which are unspecified. If a pair has some agreement as to what kinds of hands would make such a call, and what kinds would not, then they are obliged to explain that agreement. If they can't, or won't, then the score is subject to adjustment, at least.

As a general rule, I would tend to expect ignorance of the rules long before I would suspect deliberate cheating.

Ed

offline

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Escape from 1 NT-dbl (03:34:55 ThuOct 24 2002)

Jim adds "Law 20F allows players, at the appropriate time to "ask about calls actually made or about relevant calls available but not made". "

Agreed, although this cannot refer to follow up calls to the call in question (as it's not LHO's turn to call yet, those calls are not available).

David is correct when he says the side asking the questions has a right to know what follow ups would mean - although I had to reread Law 75 several times to arrive at that conclusion, 😊 and I think it's Law 75C, not 75A, that holds the key ("a player shall disclose all special information conveyed to him through partnership agreement or partnership experience").

[James Vickers]

Reply

Re: Escape from 1 NT-dbl (11:35:22 ThuOct 24 2002)

Hi again, Ed.

I would like to stress at the outset that I suspect there is inadequate disclosure here and I do not suspect anyone of cheating or unethical behaviour. However, if the explanation they have supplied really is complete, I would like the TD to keep an eye on them to check there is no evidence that they don't know more than they are letting on.

It is indeed rare that I come across anyone playing random bids (since they are illegal where I usually play), but I have come across players claiming to play random carding methods at congresses. I am always suspicious in such cases, not of deliberate cheating, but of inadequate disclosure or unconscious (subconscious) agreement. It is very difficult (and demands much concentration which would be better expended elsewhere) to check that what they are saying is in fact the truth even over an eight board round, after all, we all false card now and again.

I had assumed that random bids were considered illegal under L74, which I believe is the law brought to bear on players who indulge in "random" (purposeless) psyching which just serves to scatter random results around the room and undo the efforts of other players who are trying to play bridge. If, as David says, this is not

the case and it is solely a matter of regulation, I am prepared to be corrected.

As to players who have not discussed their methods, they rarely cause this kind of problem. Their answer to your question is "no agreement" rather than "random". This is not the same thing at all.

Finally I certainly agree with you that further questions should be asked. In the case I cited I asked several supplementary questions and received the same reply: "Could be anything". After a while you have to accept this at face value and persue the matter later if you think you have been damaged. (I would have called the director if I had had any confidence that he would have known what to do.)

James

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Escape from 1 NT-dbl (22:27:06 ThuOct 24 2002)

You seem to be equating random with purposeless, but that can be far from the case. If you decide that the Precision Club is a very effective weapon then there is a case for **always** overcalling 1♠ against it whatever your hand. That's a random bid, done with the intention of improving your side's score, and thus perfectly legal under Law 74.

As for the TD not knowing what to do, that was the reason given in Buenos Aires in 1956 for not telling the TDs there that there was suspicion about Reese and Shapiro. It caused a lot of trouble then too! 🤖 I really think you should call the TD and give him a chance. Perhaps he would get it right!

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

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Escape from 1 NT-dbl (23:23:01 ThuOct 24 2002)

Quote: bluejak at 22:27:06 Thu Oct 24 2002

You seem to be equating random with purposeless, but that can be far from the case. If you decide that the Precision Club is a very effective weapon then there is a case for **always** overcalling 1♠ against it whatever your hand. That's a random bid, done with the intention of improving your side's score, and thus perfectly legal under Law 74.

However, Law 40D allows the sponsoring organization to regulate conventions. This can include "random" bids. While I don't know where the original poster was from, the ACBL has disallowed, on the General, Mid, and Super Charts, "conventions and/or agreements whose primary purpose is to destroy the opponents' methods". The ACBL interprets this to include a 1S overcall of a strong club with "almost anything". (I'll look for the exact source of this).

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Escape from 1 NT-dbl (12:15:11 SatOct 26 2002)

Random bids are disallowed by the EBU [and WBU]. Purely destructive bids are disallowed by the ACBL. Random bids are always purely destructive, so random bids are disallowed by the ACBL. However, many, many destructive bids are not random, so many bids disallowed by the ACBL as destructive are permitted in other jurisdictions.

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

11 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 11 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

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

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

The time is now 08:28:28 Mon Sep 1 2003

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

[top](#) ↑



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

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



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

<p>Peter</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Hesitation (23:23:17 MonOct 21 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>E bids 4S. S, who had been bidding diamonds throughout the auction, hesitated for a long time then passed. N bids 5D. E bids 5S and goes down one. The TD was called about the hesitation before the hand was played. The board was played 9 times. 5D had been bid 5 times (55.5%) during the auctions. The spade contract had made 10 tricks on 4 occasions and 11 tricks on three occasions. Do I give an adjusted score of 4S made?</p>
<p>[James Vickers]</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Hesitation (13:45:47 TueOct 22 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>You are supplying insufficient information. What you need to do is look at North's hand, determine what reasonable choices were available on the basis of the legal information (i.e. the calls made) at the point where they bid 5D, and try to determine whether the call actually chosen could have been suggested (the laws say "demonstrably suggested") over and above another by the hesitation. Exactly what the information the hesitation is conveying can be difficult to judge, but it may be likely that South was considering passing or doubling. If you think the knowledge that South could have a hand suitable for some other action could have made North's decision to bid 5D easier, and the non-offenders were damaged as a result, you can adjust the score according to L12C2 and / or L12C3.</p> <p>What contract other tables ended up in on the same board is not a good basis for making your decision, as they may have arrived there by a different route. E.g. the reason some tables played in 4S might be because only a few South's were good enough to recognise that they should be competing in diamonds, most of the others gave East-West a free ride to 4S. You should not undo all this good work because of a later hesitation.</p> <p>Other points to consider are whether the 5S bid was an example of self-inflicted damage, i.e. was it reckless action, but this doesn't appear likely from what you have said.</p> <p>I hope this helps - in short, I'd need to see the hands, and I'm not interested in what contract other players reached.</p>

<p>Ed</p> <hr/> <p> 173 posts Forum Host</p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Hesitation (18:54:36 TueOct 22 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>I agree completely with James, although I should point out that whether Law 12C3 is available to the director depends on where you are (it is not available in the ACBL, for example).</p>
<p>bluejak</p> <hr/> <p> 435 posts Forum Host</p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Hesitation (01:51:07 WedOct 23 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>There are quite a few differences in the application of the Laws in different parts fo the world. We shall always do our best to answer questions, but it makes it much easier if people giving us the questions say where they are - at least the country. 🌈</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](#)] [[>](#)]

12 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 12 guest(s).

(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

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

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

The time is now 08:29:24 Mon Sep 1 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

[top](#) ↑

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