

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
	Alerts Needed?	3	149	Ed 19:19:00 Tue Oct 22 2002

	unshuffled board	2	92	queen of clubs 20:58:32 Sun Oct 20 2002
	Doubling partners bid	2	163	bluejak 22:49:31 Sun Oct 13 2002
	Two Hesitations	6	173	Ed 19:51:38 Fri Oct 11 2002
	rco - openings	5	229	bluejak 19:13:08 Mon Oct 7 2002
	Another claim ruling	6	144	bluejak 23:45:37 Thu Oct 3 2002
	Foreign language between boards	4	230	Ed 21:40:10 Thu Oct 3 2002
	Claim Ruling	1	124	bluejak 09:31:09 Mon Sep 30 2002
	Ask and Pass	1	111	JimO 09:08:14 Mon Sep 30 2002
	Change of call	2	113	bluejak 13:01:22 Fri Sep 27 2002
	Unauthorised Info	8	192	bluejak 15:59:05 Thu Sep 26 2002
	miss boarded board	4	166	JimO 13:20:25 Tue Sep 17 2002
	Revoking	1	183	bluejak 22:37:49 Tue Sep 10 2002
	the score sheet has gone	2	192	bluejak 22:46:00 Tue Sep 10 2002
	Change of cards	3	151	bluejak 22:32:26 Thu Sep 5 2002
	average for late	1	123	bluejak 19:30:04 Sun Sep 1 2002
	Dummy draws attention to revoke	5	213	Joost Boswijk 07:23:53 Tue Aug 27 2002
	card played from dummy	6	211	bluejak 01:31:22 Wed Aug 21 2002
	Psyching Conventional Bids	4	228	bluejak 01:15:51 Wed Aug 21 2002
	Howell Movement	1	197	JimO 23:40:15 Tue Aug 20 2002

**Jamie
McNaughton**

Reply

Alerts Needed? (01:03:06 TueOct 22 2002)

With several of my partners I play "Walsh" type responses at the one level, e.g.

1♣ : 1♦
1NT

1♦ promises either NO 4+ card major or a hand strong enough to bid the major on the next round.

1NT can deny one or even both 4 card majors.

Some people say it's enough for "Walsh responses" to be on your convention card. My own feeling is that even though the above bids are "natural", my pards and I have special understandings about them and therefore we should always alert when they come up. Could you advise please?

[Alan W]

Reply

Re: Alerts Needed? (09:56:05 TueOct 22 2002)

If you're playing in the UK, having Walsh responses on the card certainly shouldn't be enough since it's not a valid description of your methods anyway - only a very few conventions such as Stayman and Blackwood can be explained by name rather than a description of bids and their meanings. For what it's worth, when I've played this method I have always alerted the 1D response. I'm not so sure about the 1NT rebid, though since this seems to me to be entirely natural given the nature of the 1D bid.

kjun

Reply

Re: Alerts Needed? (13:33:50 TueOct 22 2002)

hi jamie... we play walsh treatment also and alert these bids:

1C:1D* - no 4 card major or hand with game going strength

1C:1D*

1NT* - flat distribution, doesn't deny 1 or both 4 card majors

1C:1H(S)* - doesn't deny 4+ diamonds

1C:1H*

1NT* - flat hand, doesn't deny 4 spades

1C: 1H*

1S* - unbalanced hand, 4 spades

1C: 1D*

1H(S)* - unbalanced hand with 4 card suit

on the last two, some say that's going too far.. maybe it is, i don't know

Ed

offline

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Alerts Needed? (19:18:59 TueOct 22 2002)

Not sure where you are, but in the ACBL, the name of a convention or treatment is insufficient disclosure. But the ACBL convention card has a box for "frequently bypass 1D" in response to 1C, not a box for "Walsh responses". No boxes on the EBU card, but again the name is inadequate.

ACBL Alert regs say of this treatment that bidding 1H/S in response to 1C is not alertable just because you might have bypassed a longer diamond suit. Of the 1NT rebid it says only "A 1NT rebid if strong (may have 16 or more HCP) requires an Alert." So if it shows (as it would for most in the ACBL) 12-14 HCP, it's not alertable.

Regarding Kjun's examples, and again speaking to the ACBL:

1C: 1D -- not alertable

1C: 1D: 1NT - not alertable as long as not strong

1C: 1H(S) - not alertable

1C: 1H: 1NT - not alertable as long as not strong

1C: 1H: 1S - not alertable

1C: 1D: 1H(S) - not alertable

If, in your area, Walsh is so unusual as to be unexpected, then alert on that basis.

The sequences above are not alertable in the EBU, either. See Orange Book, section 5.

queen of clubs

[Reply](#)

unshuffled board (02:42:05 SunOct 20 2002)

I was playing at our local club the other day, and a pair, during the 5th round, realized that the board they were playing was the same board from the last club session...obviously had not been reshuffled. What should the director do at this point and what score should be awarded to the pair whom noticed the offending board and to the pair's opponents? Many of the same players were present for both games, and probably had played , and not realized, that they were playing the same board from 3 days prior.

JimO

[offline](#)

175 posts
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

Re: unshuffled board (20:22:13 SunOct 20 2002)

Law 6D2.

No result may stand if the cards are dealt without shuffle from a sorted deck or if the deal had previously been played in a different session.

Under this Law, the TD must cancel all previous results on the board. At this point, the TD should have the board reshuffled, and award A+ to all the pairs who have previously played the board, unless there is time for them to replay the reshuffled board (best). In any case, the pair(s) who was to have shuffled the board should receive a procedural penalty. (If a non-playing TD was to have shuffled the board, he should have to buy a round of drinks afterward.)

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

queen of clubs

[Reply](#)

Re: unshuffled board (20:58:31 SunOct 20 2002)

Thank you very much for the info.

<p>[]Peter</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Doubling partners bid (23:20:14 FriOct 11 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>N 1H E P S X South explains to TD that she thought E was going to bid. We are not using bidding boxes The bids are written on a bidding pad in the middle of the table. How do you rule on this problem?</p>
<p>JimO</p> <hr/> <p>offline 175 posts Forum Host</p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Doubling partners bid (04:53:31 SatOct 12 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>South should wait until East actually bids something.</p> <p>Law 36 deals with inadmissible doubles and redoubles.</p> <p>South must substitute a legal call - pass or any bid of 1S or higher. North must pass for the remainder of the auction. In addition, if NS become defenders, Law 26 applies - declarer will have the option of forbidding the lead of any one particular suit the first time North is on lead, for as long as he remains on lead. (If West ends up declarer, he will have this option on opening lead; if East ends up declarer, he will have the option the first time North gets on lead. If North never gets on lead, he never gets this option).</p> <p>Furthermore, Law 23 may apply if E-W are damaged North's enforced passes.</p> <p>Note that unlike an insufficient bid or bid out of rotation, an inadmissible double or redouble may never be accepted by LHO.</p> <p>---</p> <p>-Jim O'Neil Oak Park, IL</p>

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Doubling partners bid (22:49:31 SunOct 13 2002)

While Jiim is 100% correct, I would suggest that you ignore the reference to Law 23 unless it really looks as though the non-offenders have gained from their offence. Then you might have a quick look at it, but it is a very rare occurrence. 🤔

However, the main thing I wanted to mention was that you said

Quote:

South explains to TD that she thought E was going to bid.

I trust the TD made every effort to stop South explaining. It does not affect the ruling at all, and gives unauthorised information to partner. Players do try to tell the TD why they did something wrong, and part of the skill of the TD is silencing them when they do! 🤖

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 08:40:18 Mon Sep 1 2003

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

Shuffler

offline

7 posts

bridgetalk member



Reply

Two Hesitations (15:10:14 SatOct 5 2002)

South Dealer:

2C... *Pass...2D... *Pass

2H... *3C.....P.....3S**

4H...All Pass

*Hesitation, then

**Director called, ACBLand

2C=strong, 2D=neg/wait.

West has 7-card suit to AKQ

East is void in clubs and has a long spade suit

4H made, misdefended, NS+420. I have two questions:

1. Is West's 3C bid allowed after both she and partner made separate hesitations?

2. If 4H were minus one, would the club director, because of the two hesitations, adjust the score for NS to 3H making +140 (or possibly even 3H down 1, -50)? N/S have the agreement if after opening 2C the opener's repeat of their suit below game can be passed.

Thank you.

JimO

offline

175 posts

Forum Host

Reply

Re: Two Hesitations (15:31:13 SunOct 6 2002)

Quote: Shuffler at 15:10:14 Sat Oct 5 2002

South Dealer:

1. Is West's 3C bid allowed after both she and partner made separate hesitations?

2. If 4H were minus one, would the club director, because of the two hesitations, adjust the score for NS to 3H making +140 (or possibly even 3H down 1, -50)? N/S have the

agreement if after opening 2C the opener's repeat of their suit below game can be passed.

1. West's 3C bid is a legal call. A hesitation itself is not an infraction - it is the partner of the hesitator who must not base any action on unauthorized information gained from the hesitation. So was the 3C bid based on East's hesitation? Hard to say without seeing all 4 hands and asking a few questions. Why did West not bid 3C the first time? It sounds like the 3C bid could have been influenced by the hesitation.

2. If the Director feels that E-W's bidding was improper, and that it was at all likely that N-S would have stopped in 3H, he should adjust the score to +140.
On the actual hand, though, he would of course let the +420 stand.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Two Hesitations (23:59:04 SunOct 6 2002)

A general comment.

Jim, Ed and I will do our best to answer general questions like this one. But if you really want a proper opinion on a specific hand then please give us the full hand, all 52 cards, with the dealer, vulnerability, and form of scoring [eg Swiss Teams, club duplicate] and from which country the query comes.

If you just type the hands in and push the button the software will tend to mess them up! 🤖

So if you wish to show us a hand I suggest you use the PRE code from 'Select a code here' and put the diagrams between PRE and /PRE. Then the hand diagrams will look sensible! See also Posting Hints [link at top and bottom of page].

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

Shuffler

offline

7 posts

bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Two Hesitations (03:49:29 FriOct 11 2002)

Here are the hands, sorry for the delay.

Pairs, USA

None Vul

South Dealer

♠732
♥542
♦J9
♣J8432

♠A6
♥63
♦87
♣AKQ10765

♠QJ10854
♥QJ
♦Q6532
♣Void

♠K9
♥AK10987
♦AK104
♣9

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Two Hesitations (16:08:10 FriOct 11 2002)

A perfect diagram! 🌈

A hesitation says "I have a problem". Opponents are allowed to use this information: partners are not. In fact, it goes further: players should bend over backwards not to use a hesitation from partner.

Now, you are asking about West's 3♣ bid on the second round. No-one is ever going to pass with this hand throughout the auction. To bid 3♣ is totally routine. So, despite partner's hesitation, the 3♣ bid is definitely permitted.

How about East's 3♠ bid? I do not think it a very good bid - I would pass - but it is not suggested by the hesitation and he has not taken advantage of the hesitation in any way. So, it is permitted.

Thsu the answer to your second question is **NO**, the result stands, because neither East nor West made any call that is not permitted after the hesitations.

I hope this reply helps. Like most decisions after hesitations, it is a matter of bridge judgement as well as Laws, so it will be interesting to see if Jim and Ed agree with me. 😊

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

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Two Hesitations (17:39:46 FriOct 11 2002)

I have no problem with West's actions.

Holding Ax,xx,xx,AKQTxxx, after:

2C-p-2D-p

2H

bidding 3C here seems pretty routine (does this sequence show a better hand than an immediate 3C? Was West making a tactical pass, hoping the auction he might be on lead against 3NT?)

But what about East?

Holding QJTxxx,QJ,Qxxxx,void, after:

2C-p-2D-

pass seems right.

After:

2C-p-2D-p

2H-3C-p-

what are the logical alternatives?

1) Pass. Don't rescue partner.

2) Pass, but run if doubled. Don't rescue an undoubled partner.

3) Bid 3S.

All these are logical alternatives, but is one suggested by another over the hesitation? This is a part of Law 16A that many players and even directors don't seem to take into account. I'm not so sure that any one of these is suggested over another by the hesitation. I think not but expect there are a few AC members who think 1) or 2) might be suggested over 3).

There is an unfortunate ACBL practice of automatically ruling against the hesitator, (or offending side for other offenses), and letting the OS take it to committee.

"If it hesitates, shoot it!"

My inclination is to let a table result of 4H-1 stand. Of course I would let a result of 4Hm4 (or 4H=, depending on your preferred notation) stand.

I would expect there is a good chance an AC would reverse this decision, but then, I never worry about that.

Random ramblings:

N-S are still required to "play bridge". Note that 3C is off 3 at least, and that 3S is routinely off 2. N doesn't have a 2C opener, and shouldn't be bidding 4H by himself anyway.

N-S were entitled to +300 on a partscore deal.

-Jim O'Neil

Oak Park, IL

Ed

offline

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Two Hesitations (19:51:38 Fri Oct 11 2002)

Quote: bluejak at 16:08:10 Fri Oct 11 2002

I hope this reply helps. Like most decisions after hesitations, it is a matter of bridge judgement as well as Laws, so it will be interesting to see if Jim and Ed agree with me. 😞

Well, I do. 🌈

I also agree with Jim that "if it hesitates, shoot it" is a bad way to rule. I hope it's dying out. 🤖

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 08:40:38 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**

**[annelène
balk]**

Reply

rco - openings (09:20:44 SatSep 28 2002)

in addition to multi 2 diamonds we open 2 hearts/2 spades/2nt to indicate weak 2-suited hands: 2 hearts at least two five cards same rank/2 spades at least two five cards same colour/2 nt at least two five cards odd

we were told by friends that this is illegal.
Is that correct and if so, why?

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: rco - openings (14:19:02 SatSep 28 2002)

You don't say where you are. Different organizations have different regulations on conventions. But most National Bridge Organizations place some restrictions on artificial preempts.

Some will allow a convention at a higher level, but disallow it at lower levels - e.g., in the ACBL, there is a General Chart for almost all games, a Mid-Chart for National Events, and the top flight/bracket(s) at many Sectional or Regional Events, and a Super-Chart usually only for the top National KO team events.

Multi 2D is only allowed in Mid-Chart events in the ACBL (and, I believe, Level 3 events in the UK.)

Opening 2H,2S and 2NT as crash is illegal at any level in the ACBL. From the Super-Chart:

Allowed #1: Artificial Weak Bids at the 2 or 3 level must possess a) a known suit, or b) one of no more than two possible suits not to include the suit bid).

(If I read the Orange Book correctly, it is illegal in the UK as well. Even at level 4, 1 suit must be specified.)

You should be able to check with your NBO to find out the legality of any convention.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

bergenbalk

offline

2 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: rco - openings (14:54:41 SatSep 28 2002)

thank you very much, jim
i am playing in the bridgeclub of msn zone bridge.
This is where my friends got penalized for using the rco-openings

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: rco - openings (09:38:20 MonSep 30 2002)

Yes, CRO openings [which is our name for CRASH] are illegal in EBU events.

I was not aware, however, of system restrictions at all on the internet. I shall make enquiries and return!

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

bergenbalk

offline

2 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: rco - openings (11:44:08 MonSep 30 2002)

thank you very much
we play in msn. zone bridge in the bridgeclub

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: rco - openings (19:13:08 MonOct 7 2002)

It has taken some effort but I have managed to find out the information! 🌈

In the MSN Bridgeclub on the Zone there are some restrictions on allowed systems. They are jolly difficult to find because instead of having a helpful heading like "Permitted conventions" or something you have to look at the Alert Chart and they are at the end! 🤖

Brown Sticker conventions are not permitted. It goes on to describe Brown Sticker conventions, so for details I should take a look for yourself, but anyway that means RCO openings are not allowed in

the Bridgeclub. 

The website is at

<http://www.msnbridgeclub.com/default.htm>

and you should look for the alerting rules.

If you play in the Zone generally, **NOT** in the Bridgeclub, then there are no restrictions on what you may play.

I hope this helps!!!!

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 08:41:04 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](#)

[James Vickers]

Another claim ruling (17:05:54 WedOct 2 2002)

Dummy: J / Q 10 x x / - / -

Declarer: 4 3 / x / Q / Q

Contract is 4S, all the queens are masters. LHO is on lead.

Declarer faces his cards to claim, realises he has made a mistake as RHO has a higher trump than the four, and picks the cards up again. I (dummy) see that the players intend to continue playing and call the director. The TD requires declarer to face his cards and make a claim statement. Declarer says he has to know what LHO intends to lead first, and the TD prompts him to say what he would do if, say, a heart were led. LHO protests that she is not going to lead a heart. TD asks what she is going to lead, and she places a diamond on the table.

The TD rules that declarer makes all the remaining tricks. A club lead would have defeated the contract, as RHO is void in the suit.

In such situations the director has to rule as equitably as possible to both sides, resolving doubtful points against the claimer. Since there is a reasonable line of play which would give the defenders a trick I would have awarded this outcome. I think it is wrong to hold LHO to her diamond lead as this is tantamount to allowing play to continue. However, the fact that she failed to find the killing lead even with declarer's hand on view makes me question whether this counts as a "doubtful point".

I think that the director got this one wrong, but are there any circumstances in which the director should not award the results of best defence? What if the only winning defence is extremely unlikely to be found?

Reply

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Another claim ruling (01:29:42 ThuOct 3 2002)

Claims test the TD's judgement almost more than any other type of ruling! 🤔

I should be very interested to see what Ed and Jim say about this one.

My guess is I would give the defence a trick. The TD seems to have bullied a lead out of the defender, and if left to her own devices with no TD to bully her she might have got it right. However, it is up to the TD to judge, or perhaps better, the Appeals Committee.

That does not mean I like leaving decisions to Appeals Committees, but in this case the TD seems to have created the problem.

The TD should have stuck to his original idea of a claim statement to apply on every lead. 🤖

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

bergid

offline

35 posts
bridgetalk member
♥♥♥♥♥

Reply

Re: Another claim ruling (02:19:26 ThuOct 3 2002)

This is a very interesting situation with many facets! 🌈

I would like to ask three questions, if I may:

(1) Is dummy allowed to call the director?

(2) Is declarer allowed to retract a claim?

(3) Is it legal for either defender to dictate a line of play and if so, under what circumstances?

I thought it was permissible, if a line of play was not clearly stated and/or if there was an outstanding trump, that either defender could do so, such as, in this case, requesting partner to lead a club.

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Another claim ruling (02:42:15 ThuOct 3 2002)

1. Did a claim occur? The TD apparently decided that declarer's actions constituted a claim under Law 69A.

Once a claim has occurred, play ceases.

2. The TD should follow the procedure outlined in Law 70B. He should ask declarer to repeat his "clarification statement". If declarer made no such statement, he should require declarer to state the line of play he intended at the time he claimed. (If this is the case, the TD should not allow declarer to use any inferences from a Defender's objection, nor should Declarer be allowed time to think up a line of play.)

Subsequently, ALL the hands are faced, and the Defenders can state any objections to the claim. (If LHO can't find a club lead now...)

3. It appears that all 3 conditions are met under 70C for awarding a trick to the defenders.

Assuming LHO has something like -,xx,x,x and RHO 5,Jx,x,- I would award a trick to the defenders if they can find a club lead from RHO's hand with all 4 hands exposed.

To answer Bergid's questions:

1.) Dummy may call the Director after play has concluded - this includes a claim being made. (Law 42B3).

2.) Declarer may not retract a claim.

3.) Defender may not "dictate a line of play", that is, may not require Declarer to play irrationally, nor may he require to play in a way contrary to any "clarification statement". But if there is any line of play, not inconsistent with such a statement, that allows a trick or tricks to be won by the defenders, they should be awarded those tricks.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

Ed

offline

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Another claim ruling (21:49:43 ThuOct 3 2002)

I agree completely with Jim, except where he says "if they can find a club lead from RHO's hand", since it's LHO who's on lead, and RHO who's void in clubs. 🌈

Clarification on the question whether declared actually claimed:

"Any statement to the effect that a contestant will win a specific number of tricks is a claim of those tricks. A contestant also claims when he suggests that play be curtailed, or when he shows his cards (unless he demonstrably did not intend to claim)." -- Law 68A

Declarer did show his cards, and he did intend to claim when he did that, so in fact he did claim. All else follows. 🌈

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Another claim ruling (22:47:26 ThuOct 3 2002)

Oops. Of course I meant "a club lead from LHO's hand".

And yes, if Declarer placed his cards on the table, that clearly constitutes a claim.

But one problem I always seem to have when determining whether or not a claim was made, or a card was played, is that the two sides often disagree. I have players demonstrate how they held their cards. "The card was put like this!" "No, it was touching the table!" "No, it was at least 6 inches off the table."

A bridge Director is rarely at the table at the time of such a play. Imagine being a baseball umpire sitting in the dugout when a pitch was made, then being called to the plate to determine whether the pitch was a ball or strike. (For you non-Americans: imagine being a football linesman at the one end of the field, called to the other end of the field to determine whether a player was offside or not).

OK, enough ranting.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Another claim ruling (23:45:36 ThuOct 3 2002)

Quote: bergid at 02:19:26 Thu Oct 3 2002

(3) Is it legal for either defender to dictate a line of play and if so, under what circumstances?

I thought it was permissible, if a line of play was not clearly stated and/or if there was an outstanding trump, that either defender could do so, such as, in this case, requesting partner to lead a club.

What you are thinking of is some Rubber Bridge Laws, and not even the most recent!

But in duplicate there is no playing on, so the TD will make decisions: there is no need and no advantage to defenders telling each other what to do. 🌈

Yes, it might have helped in the actual case, but only because the TD handled it very badly! 😞

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

10 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 10 guest(s).

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

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Foreign language between boards (12:31:49

FriSep 27 2002)

The following query has been copied from IBLF's previous home on Bravenet.

Hi all,
I'm looking for advice (or comments based on appropriate regulations in your country) regarding following opinions:

'It is at any time very unethical to talk in other language during or between hands at the table.' (local club director)

And 'When a foreign language is used, even if it is not when the bidding and play is in progress, but between hands, some members (players) are going to become very uncomfortable, because they don't now what is going on. This is clearly an unacceptable situation.' (local club official)

And
'The use of foreign language between boards is unacceptable.'
(legal authority in such matters')

As an observatory on behalf of the claimant ('not welcome' older person who can speak virtually no English) I need desperately your opinion before Wednesday, 2 October, to form my view on that matter before The Conciliation Conference at the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission.

Best Regards

Jarek Gasiorek
Email: jarek_g@hotmail.com

Sydney
Australia

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Foreign language between boards (12:46:04

FriSep 27 2002)

The following reply has been copied from IBLF's previous home on Bravenet.

For a start the word unethical is unfortunate. It is either permitted or not permitted to talk in another language. It would only be unethical if it were not permitted, the players knew it, and did it anyway.

In most events in English-speaking countries players are not permitted to speak in any language but English while the board is in play, but they may converse in their own language between hands. They should stop immediately one of them takes the hands out of the board for their next hand [or, more technically correct, as soon as one of them looks at the face of one of his cards].

It is legal, however, for the sponsoring organisation to have other regulations, and it is known in international events for only English to be permitted during a playing session. If this is one of the Conditions of Contest then it must be adhered to, and it is a legal one.

Now, if there are no regulations in force at all, it would be normal to allow players to talk in other languages between hands but not to permit them during a hand unless the other side knew the language as well.

Now I shall comment on the specific quotes.

Quote:

'It is at any time very unethical to talk in other language during or between hands at the table.' (local club director)

As I explained earlier it is not unethical, and is fairly normal between hands.

Quote:

'When a foreign language is used, even if it is not when the bidding and play is in progress, but between hands, some members (players) are going to become very uncomfortable, because they don't now what is going on. This is clearly an unacceptable situation.' (local club official)

That is pure selfishness. This is the sort of attitude that has led to so much discrimination over the years. Would he ban braille cards if the player was blind saying it is unacceptable for his opponnets?

Quote:

'The use of foreign language between boards is unacceptable.'
(legal authority in such matters')

Same reply: this is discriminatory and persecution.

While internationals are another matter, for ordinary club events to ban speaking in foreign languages between hands is at the same level as banning blacks or women because they make their opponents uncomfortable.

Nevertheless, it is a matter for regulation. In the absence of a regulation speaking in any way between hands is accepted. During hands is different because of the possibilities of illegal communication between partners.

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

**Jens Brix
Christiansen**

Reply

Re: Foreign language between boards (19:51:22

MonSep 30 2002)

In the DBF (Denmark) we have no regulations that cover the choice of language. It is more or less understood that the events are conducted in Danish, but we have players who speak no Danish in our highest level teams competition, and we allow them to request and give explanations at the table in other languages.

Law 73 regulates communication between partners during the auction and play period. It forbids partners to communicate except by means of calls and plays. Any type of communication (if specifically relevant to the game) in any language is thereby not allowed, but small talk as such is usually tolerated. The choice of language for such small talk makes little difference to me.

Law 74A2 instructs players to refrain from actions that annoy the opponents. I suppose that you might annoy the opponents by talking in a language they do not understand, but that would then have to go both ways. If, in a Danish tournament, a pair feels annoyed by an opposing pair that talks privately in Polish, one might consider that a private conversation in Danish would be equally as annoying to the opponents who know no Danish. One could, of course, claim that a pair that plays in Denmark has no right to feel annoyed at a private conversation in Danish, but such a one-sided sentiment cannot, to my mind, be derived from the Bridge Laws.

All in all, it is all a matter of courtesy and etiquette, and it is difficult for me to see how that could warrant a tag of "very unethical".

My personal views on this matter are probably colored by the fact that Danish is spoken by less than one out of every thousand human beings, so for a Dane it is an obvious fact that most people do not speak our language, and we would never find it "very unethical" for foreigners to communicate in a language other than Danish. I cannot imagine that the quotes given in the original post originate in Denmark or in a similar place in the world where a small language is spoken.

[Jesper Dybdal]

Re: Foreign language between boards (18:05:59 TueOct 1 2002)

Reply

I agree with David and Jens, particularly Jens' point that discussion in a foreign language between hands is a matter of courtesy and etiquette. I would definitely not use the word "unethical" about it.

If the players speak the event's official language well enough, I would consider it more polite to do so than to use a foreign language, but that is all.

Jens says that "we have players who speak no Danish in our highest level teams competition". This is of course correct, but perhaps it should be added that these players have partners who speak Danish and can translate questions and explanations if necessary.

Ed

Re: Foreign language between boards (21:40:10 ThuOct 3 2002)

offline

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

I agree with the responses in this thread, mostly. I have some sympathy with a player who does not speak the local language, and thus may need to communicate through an interpreter. But for a pair to conduct a private conversation, in a language foreign to others at the table, **during the round**, seems at best rude to me. The problem, it seems to me, is not so much that they might be (dare I use the word?) cheating, but that their opponents have no way of knowing. At least if they're communicating via some unusual means (Morse code, finger position, kicking each other under the table) opponents (and officials) will have some clue that something odd is going on.

I suppose the TD could tell such players not to conduct such conversations. Continuing to do so would then subject them to penalty under L81B8, if nothing else.

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

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

[[Print](#)]

[[Send](#)]

[[Watch](#)]

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

Derek

offline

2 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Claim Ruling (22:21:37 FriSep 27 2002)

Dummy has a trump , K J 6 of hearts and 8 6 3 of clubs and no diamonds .Declarer has a trump , A Q 4 of hearts and 7 4 3 of diamonds and no clubs .

The Contract is 4S and the lead is in dummy when declarer claims stating "trumps are drawn and the clubs are established , I will discard the losing diamonds " . RHO calls the director to object as she has a top club .Ruffing the club when RHO produces it is a new normal line of play and shall not be accepted by the Director if there is a normal but less successful line play available . When declarer's claim breaks down do you allow him to ruff and award him the rest of the tricks (it would be irrational for this class of player not to ruff) or do you rule that the new line is not accepted and rule for one down .

Thanks in advance .

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Claim Ruling (09:31:08 MonSep 30 2002)

If I have understood correctly, when declarer would have led a "good" club from dummy, to his surprise a bigger club would have appeared from RHO?

It is irrational not to ruff it now, and so the claim is allowed, albeit a faulty one.

If LHO had had the top club then a trick would be lost.

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

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

**Martyn
Kenyon**

Reply

Ask and Pass (08:06:14 MonSep 30 2002)

This comes from a 24 board team of four head to head match played in a home. Before the first set there is some discussion of system with opponents. The opposition ask under what circumstances we would have 7 cards for a weak 2 bid. We explain that in 1st and 2nd positions our 3 level pre-empts in a major show 2 of the top 3 honours, so with a poor suit we would open a weak 2.

In the first stanza I (North) open 3 Hearts, alerted by partner. East holds:

S K J x

H A

D J x x x

C A J x x

East asks the meaning of 3 hearts and is told normal pre-empt with 2 of top 3 cards.

East then passes. South raises to 4 Hearts. This should go one off but on a defensive error it makes for 420.

In the other room North opens 3 Hearts and East Doubles. West has a very poor hand, gets doubled in 3 Spades and goes for 800.

Are we just unlucky, or is there something wrong going on here?

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Ask and Pass (09:08:14 MonSep 30 2002)

I'm not sure what you're implying.

Were you "unlucky"? I'd say you were lucky your opponents made a defensive error, letting you make 4H, so you only lost 9 instead of 13. The fact is your opponent sitting East made a better decision than your teammate sitting East. While on many hands a double could work out better than a pass, it can be dangerous to enter the auction on marginal hands - as this hand indicates.

From the title of this thread, I'd say you're implying there was something improper with the fact that East asked for an explanation, then passed. A bid which is normally not alerted was alerted, after all. Are you suggesting that there was UI passed and acted upon? If so, what could West infer from East's actions? "I have a good hand, so please just pass and misdefend?"

I see nothing wrong here. Your teammate's aggressive double

worked out poorly, that's all.

-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 08:42:30 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**

fdobrin

offline

1 posts

bridgetalk member



Reply

Change of call (11:16:08 FriSep 27 2002)

Dear Sir,

My name is Florin DOBRIN. I am from Romania and I am the chief of the FRB (Romanian Bridge Federation) Board of Directors.

Recently, I encountered the following problem at the Mamaia International Bridge Festival 2002.

Pairs event. South and E-W.

S W N E

1NT (i) Pass Pass Double

Pass 2Sp Pass STOP!3Ht

?

(i) 10...12 HCP

At this moment, South summoned the Director. Immediately, East changed his call to 4Ht!

When the Director arrived at table he stated that it was no infraction, based on Law 25A, and allowed the 4Ht call to stay. The contract was just made.

N-S appealed. South said that if he wouldn't draw attention, the final contract would have been 3Ht.

What decision do you take as member of the Appeals Committee?

Thank you.

Best regards,
Florin DOBRIN

[Edited By fdobrin at 12:54:34 Fri Sep 27 2002]

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Change of call (12:40:49 FriSep 27 2002)

If East intended to bid 4H, but pulled the wrong card from the bidding box, (he did pull the stop card), then Law 25A applies: he may change the call to 4H.

If East intended to bid 3H, then Law 25B would apply. He may still change his call to 4H, but not without penalty - see Law 25B2(b)(2).

What would I do as a member of an Appeals Committee? Hard to say without hearing from all sides. But I have no reason to believe I would find the facts to be different from the way the Director found them.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Change of call (13:01:22 FriSep 27 2002)

Pairs event. South and E-W.

W	N	E	S
Pass	Pass	Double	1NT (i)
2♠	Pass	STOP! 3♥?	Pass

(i) 10...12 HCP

In principle I agree with Jim. This is a matter of what East's intention was at the moment when East reached for the bidding box, and the TD is more likely to make a correct decision when the matter is fresh in the mind of the participants than the Appeals Committee when the participants have all had time to discuss it and convince themselves what really happened.

My guess would be that the TD was right. But I could not be sure without hearing from the players and TD. The important thing was whether the TD asked the player what he intended when he reached for the bidding box.

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 08:42:48 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**

[Bruce Owen]

Unauthorised Info (10:09:52 TueSep 24 2002)

Reply

Hi David

I would like opinion on the propriety or otherwise of the following bid made at a senior club session recently. The hand was as follows

S 9

H KQ1042

D AJ102

C AKQ

S AQJ863 S 10752

H J98 H A73

D 643 D Q98

C 9 C 1083

S K4

H 65

D K75

C J76542

The bidding

N E S W

1H P 1NT 2S

3S (A) P 3NT P

4H P P P

The 3S alerted was explained to West who asked after the 3NT bid, and the reply was "Undiscussed". No problem with that. However I have a real problem with the pull to 4H after South's reply. It was clear that North had been asking for a hold. However he claimed he just thought 4H would be better. However while Law 75 covers mistaken explanations and not "undiscussed" I would always assume the fact that your partner is not certain of your bid is unauthorised info, and as such you must let the 3NT remain. North is equally adamant he has the right to change the bid. Your comment please?

[]

Re: Unauthorised Info (11:16:06 TueSep 24 2002)

Reply

Interested to hear other views here. Personally, I don't like 4H any more than you do. What explanation did N give of his 3S bid? Assuming his explanation coincided with your assumption (and mine) that he was looking for 3NT, why should he not play there when he gets the best possible reply from partner? Simply saying he changed his mind about where he thought the best place to play would be looks self-serving. Actions speak louder than words, and it's hard to escape the conclusion that he changed his mind because he learnt his partner wasn't sure what his bid meant. And I also agree that logically this must constitute unauthorised information, although I don't know what the laws would say. (And I don't think N can argue since they hadn't discussed it he must know it was undiscussed even without partner's explanation, since he should have known this before bidding 3S!)

Alan Wilson

[jtorrey]

Re: Unauthorised Info (20:04:08 TueSep 24 2002)

Reply



Why did West need an explanation? I have little sympathy for players who ask unnecessary questions and then call the cops to claim that the answers created unauthorized information for their opponents. West was not going to bid over 3NT, regardless of the answer to the question.

Law 16 says that the UI must "demonstrably" suggest the action taken, in order for the action to be barred. I don't think that "undiscussed" demonstrably suggests anything, at least in this auction. If South had said that 3S "shows a partial spade stopper," that would be different. Even "asks for a spade stop" (the meaning Alan Wilson imposes on the bid) suggests pulling more than "undiscussed," because then 3NT could be "just following orders" rather than a real suggestion of a final contract.

The whole situation is strange: South Alerted so that East-West would know that the bid was not discussed??? In ACBL-land the cue-bid is not alertable.

If we think that North bid 3S intending to play 3NT if South had a spade stop, then pulling to 4H is indeed suspicious. But that would

be a silly thing to intend with that North hand: why would North expect South to have nine tricks after winning the spade lead (even though that appears to be true on this hand)?

It's not relevant to the allowability of 4H, but 3NT appears to be a better contract; it needs a diamond guess after a club lead, is cold after a spade or diamond, and is down only after an unlikely heart. In 4H, after two rounds of spades, North trumps and leads the HK, which holds. (Probably better to just lead small, but that's a hard play to find in real life.) North plays three rounds of clubs, West throwing spades. I guess North can get it right, but it needs perfect guessing - with hearts ideally placed at that.

I think North intended 3S to mean "I have extra values." South's 3NT simply shows a stop, no matter what North's bid is. I'd let North bid anything he wanted.

John Torrey

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Unauthorised Info (11:31:54 WedSep 25 2002)

Hand diagrams do not come out very well because the software deletes multiple spaces. Easiest is to use the PRE tag in 'Select a code here' and then the text is as you type it. I have reformatted this article to make it easier to read.

Hi David

I would like opinion on the propriety or otherwise of the following bid made at a senior club session recently. The hand was as follows

	S 9	
	H KQ1042	
	D AJ102	
	C AKQ	
S AQJ863		S 10752
H J98		H A73
D 643		D Q98
C 9		C 1083
	S K4	
	H 65	
	D K75	
	C J76542	

The bidding

W N E S

	1H	P	1NT
2S	3S (A)	P	3NT
P	4H	P	P
P			

The 3S alerted was explained to West who asked after the 3NT bid, and the reply was "Undiscussed". No problem with that. However I have a real problem with the pull to 4H after South's reply. It was clear that North had been asking for a hold. However he claimed he just thought 4H would be better.

However while Law 75 covers mistaken explanations and not "undiscussed" I would always assume the fact that your partner is not certain of your bid is unauthorised info, and as such you must let the 3NT remain.

North is equally adamant he has the right to change the bid.

Your comment please?

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Unauthorised Info (11:47:52 WedSep 25 2002)

First, the answer "undiscussed" is certainly UI [unauthorised information] to partner. Of course, if North also knew it was undiscussed it tells him nothing he does not already know, but suppose he thought it asks for a double stop in spades for 3NT. Without the UI he would assume that 3NT shows a double stop: with the UI he does not know at all, so perhaps it could be said that the 4♥ bid is suggested over passing 3NT by the UI.

Second we must remember this is an international forum. The Laws are the same everywhere [subject to a couple of Zonal options] but regulations and customs differ. Alerting a cue-bid which is artificial is wrong in the ACBL, but is correct in [for example] England. Furthermore, some jurisdictions tend to have customs that suggest asking whenever an alert is made: some suggest leaving it to the end of the auction. Whether West was wise to ask or not, he has a right to have the Law applied to N/S as is suitable for his bidding.

Third, TDs should find out as much evidence as possible before ruling. Here, I would ask North two questions: What is your understanding of the meaning of 3♣? Why did you bid 3♠? The answers may affect my ruling.

But my opinion of the hand without those answers is that North

made a silly bid of 4♥ which is not suggested by the UI so the result stands.



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

[jtorrey]

Re: Unauthorised Info (17:31:22 WedSep 25 2002)

Reply

My alert-point was not that a cue bid should not be alerted - this is peculiar to the ACBL as I noted - but that it is very strange to alert a bid and then tell the opponent who asks that it is undiscussed. If undiscussed calls become alertable, the game will slow to a crawl. Since the bid *was* alerted, my lack of sympathy for a player asking an "unnecessary" question was probably misplaced.

I agree that the "undiscussed" explanation is UI to North; I just feel that it did not suggest the action taken.

North's protests that he should be allowed to bid 4H are a strong indication that he is not about to tell us that 3S asked for a double spade stop - but I agree that we should ask the question.

Net: We probably agree on more than it seemed we did.

John Torrey

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Unauthorised Info (19:47:31 WedSep 25 2002)

In England it is required to alert a call which is believed to be probably alertable even if the player is not sure what it means. In the ACBL the similar rule is "When in doubt, alert": admittedly that is not relevant here because artificial cues of the opponent's suit are not alertable. Other jurisdictions have other rules, and it seems reasonable in some places anyway to alert even when the actual meaning is unknown.

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

[Bruce Owen]

Re: Unauthorised Info (05:29:47 ThuSep 26 2002)

Reply

As the original poster of this poser I can answer Davids question about what North meant by the 3S. As the hand confirms it was definitely asking South to 3NT with a hold. It is common in our area. Had the question by West not been asked there is no doubt whatever that North would have passed. I know because I play the same bid with him and we are a smallish group in which the bid is not uncommon. Given that info, does that affect anyone's opinion? For the record the cops were never called on this, since as East my partner and I received a good result with 4H being 2 away. I'm happy with that outcome.
I still think my partner was quite entitled to ask the meaning, as on her hand she sure wants to know where the spades are.

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Unauthorised Info (15:59:05 ThuSep 26 2002)

I would certainly ask North why he bid 3♣ if he was not going to pass 3NT. My guess is that he was until he heard the explanation!

Given that, pass of 3NT which is certainly a logical alternative might be considered suggested by the unauthorised information, so we adjust if there is damage. You are only going to do better in 3NT on a heart lead and a spade back which is three off: any other defence leads to two off, one off or 3NT making!

With hearts being a bid suit I do not think a heart lead likely enough so I do not adjust. I would warn North in a friendly way that I would have adjusted if there had been damage.

As to your partner's question, surely she is not going to bid over 3NT!!!!!! I presume she wants to know where the spades are for the defence, and it seems better to wait until the auction ends before asking.

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 08:43:11 Mon Sep 1 2003

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

top ↑

<p>[george venter]</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>miss boarded board (16:33:49 SatSep 14 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>a board was miss boarded by a sit out pair or the last one to play it east hand was put in n hand untill then east made 4s and then north made 4s so i gave that pair a avrage what should i have done</p>
<p>Ed</p> <hr/> <p>offline 173 posts Forum Host</p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: miss boarded board (23:45:42 SatSep 14 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>For what infraction was "that pair" partly responsible, that you gave them an artificial adjusted score?</p> <p>The board was fouled. You divided the field into two groups: those who played the board before it was fouled, and those who did so afterwards. You matchpoint each group separately. Then you factor the scores. See Law 87.</p> <p>If you can identify which pair was responsible for the fouling, you can give them a procedural penalty under Law 90.</p>
<p>JimO</p> <hr/> <p>offline 173 posts Forum Host</p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: miss boarded board (04:55:47 SunSep 15 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>I don't know where you are, but if you're in N. America, ACBL regulations for fouled boards in pair events: As Ed said, you divide the field into two groups, then matchpoint each group separately. If a board was played once if fouled (or pre-fouled form): Each pair receives 60%. If a board was played twice: The better score receives 65%, the lower score 55%. (If they tie, each gets 60%) If the board was played 3 times in one form (at least 3 in the other form): The best score receives 70%, the middle 60%, and the lowest 50% (again, tie scores split these - e.g., a tie for top gets 65%, a tie for low score gets 55%, a 3-way tie gets 60%) If the board was played 4 or more times, or 3 times where it is the larger of the two groups: The factored board formula is used: $M = N/n \times S + (N-n)/2n$ where M = matchpoint score N = number of scores on a board, i.e., Top + 1</p>

n = number of actual scores within the group
S = Matchpoint score within the group of n scores

There are other regulations for fouled boards in BAM of Swiss or KO Team events.

A procedural penalty should be imposed on the offenders.

[Edited By JimO at 04:57:54 Sun Sep 15 2002]

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: miss boarded board (02:58:35 TueSep 17 2002)

It is not entirely clear from your account, George, exactly what happened after the fouling. If it was played once then as Ed says [well, he means to say 🎲] average plus should have been given to both sides. If it is played more than once then it should be scored as two subfields.

Jim has given you the North American regs, which I think are dreadful [not Jim's fault 😞], and were abandoned many years ago in Europe. They are based on not using computers. Nowadays the norm around the world is to score both subfields using Neuberg's formula, even if the subfield has only two scores.

What is Neuberg's formula? It is what Jim calls the Factored Board formula. But be warned: we do not know where you are but in some parts of the world [eg North America] you get half a matchpoint for each pair you tie with, one matchpoint for each pair you beat. In other parts of the world [eg Great Britain] you get double that. The formula Jim gives is based on North American matchpointing.

In England we use

$$\frac{(M \times E) + (E - A)}{A}$$

where:

M=match-points earned by the pair considering only the group itself
E=total number of scores expected on the board
A=actual number scores obtained on the board

This is in fact the same formula - it just looks different! 🤖

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

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: miss boarded board (13:20:25 TueSep 17 2002)

I agree that the ACBL reg is silly.
A pair goes for 1100 on a partscore deal and gets 50% of the matchpoints (instead of 7-8%), because the board had been fouled.
This happened quite recently.

-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 08:43:36 Mon Sep 1 2003

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

top ⬆

[Julie Semple]

Revoking (14:27:11 FriSep 6 2002)

[Reply](#)

South--declarer_ plays a spade W revokes and all follow--
s West then announces Oh I have spade. What is the penalty ? OR
the above happens---W leads a heart to the next trick and then
announces--Oh I have a spade---what happens???

bluejak

Re: Revoking (22:37:49 TueSep 10 2002)

[offline](#)

435 posts
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

In the first case the revoke is not established because neither West
nor his partner have played to the next trick. The revoke is
corrected. The non-offending side may change any card they played
after it, and **if** they do then the revoker's partner may change his
card if it is after a changed card.

Furthermore, if the revoker was a defender the card that he
originally played and was corrected becomes a major penalty card,
which must be played at the first opportunity [and there are other
options if East gets on lead!].

In the second case since West has played to the next trick the
revoke is established. So it stands as played but there is a penalty
at the end of the hand. Assuming as seems likely from what you
wrote that West won the trick [it seems the revoke was a ruff] then
two tricks are transferred at the end of the hand.



There are quite a few people here who post sensible answers to
questions. By locking this thread you have made sure that only Ed or I
can reply. I was curious why - was this an accident or is there a reason?

* The person asking the question sometimes accidentally locks the thread when posting -
the box says "admin only" but it still happens. This will be disabled in a future release. *

[Edited By BbBridgeaddict at 22:51:28 Tue Sep 10 2002]

David Stevenson <bridge2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/brg_menu.htm

bluebird

offline

1 posts
bridgetalk member



[Reply](#)

the score sheet has gone (13:53:07 SatSep 7 2002)

What do you do in the case the score sheet of a hand can not be found and many of the players have gone?

It is the second time that have occurred in my club in this month.

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

Re: the score sheet has gone (14:30:55 SatSep 7 2002)

1. Try to reconstruct all of the scores - get the scores from players who have not yet left, and get a hold of those who have (call them at home, if necessary).
2. Since this seems to be a recurring problem, try using pickup slips in addition to travelers in the future.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

Re: the score sheet has gone (22:46:00 TueSep 10 2002)

I do not think you want to use pickup slips if you can avoid it: they are unpopular with players, and rightly so.

A little investigation would be no bad thing. Unless someone is being very naughty it is likely to be one person's stupidity. Did the same person play the board last? Is there some lady with a large handbag helping collect them at the end?

Hopefully it will not happen again, but I would be cautious for a month or two. Get a couple of useful friends to be on the lookout at the end of the session.

Any scores you cannot reconstruct will have to be scored as average plus to both sides, which is not satisfactory.

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 08:44:25 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>[]Dewy</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Change of cards (14:45:11 SatAug 31 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>What is the ruling when RHO leads & declarer exposes a card & then replaces it with another card (possibly a trump) before LHO plays?</p>
<p>bluejak</p> <hr/> <p>offline 435 posts Forum Host</p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Change of cards (19:33:26 SunSep 1 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>A card is played by declarer when he puts it on the table, or holds it on the table, or holds it near the table, or holds it in such a way as to make it clear that it has been played. Note that holding it means stationary: if he brings it out and puts it back then he has not held it.</p> <p>If it has been played as above thne it may not be changed. If it has not then it may be changed.</p> <p>---</p> <p>David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com> Liverpool, England, UK http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm</p>
<p>[]</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Change of cards (20:04:38 ThuSep 5 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>How would you rule in this situation . Declarer detaches a card and holds it upright with the bottom edge on the table , the defenders are not able to see the face . Meanwhile declarer is thinking about whether to face the card or not . Would you rule it played and what would you do if declarer tries to replace the card in his hand and play something else</p> <p>Regards John</p>

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Change of cards (22:32:26 ThuSep 5 2002)

It is not played, and may be changed.

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 08:44:49 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.ohana

average for late (09:05:38 SatAug 31 2002)

Reply

Hello all

The first board was difficult and the players are in late
They are bidding the second when I ask to move. I see that S have bid 6NT, is declarer, and W have doubled with AK of Spades !
Our rules are to apply 40 minus to both sides, but it is a club tournament, their first infraction, so I give Average to each.
W is not happy, but I explain it is the rules
Say both have finished with 60 %. In fact I have robbed 40 % to E-W (they had a clear top) and I have offered 60 % to N-S (they had a clear zero)

How to respect equity while following the rules ?
Many thanks in advance

bluejak

Re: average for late (19:30:04 SunSep 1 2002)

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

If you are going to have rules like this then you will get arguments, and to be honest, I am afraid you deserve arguments with rules like these! 😞

In most of the world once you have started a board you are **always** allowed to finish it. I strongly advise you to follow this in future.

You can always apply pressure in other ways. You can stop people from starting a board within two minutes of the move being called, apply procedural penalties, or anything else you like.

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

[Helen]

Dummy draws attention to revoke (07:08:23

FriAug 23 2002)

[Reply](#)

Dummy, a 90+ little old lady, innocently asks a defender why he bid spades after he failed to follow suit to the initial lead. Should the revoke be corrected but still subject to penalties under the law as attention has been drawn illegally? Had the opponent not revoked, he would have won the trick and sent a spade back for his partner to ruff.

Ed

Re: Dummy draws attention to revoke (06:45:47

SatAug 24 2002)

[offline](#)

173 posts

Forum Host

[Reply](#)

Interesting question. Let me see....

I gather that the defender who revoked didn't play a trump. I wonder why? It doesn't matter to the ruling, though.

Was the revoke established? (If either defender played to the next trick before dummy asked, then it was.)

Assuming it wasn't established, it must be corrected. Here's where it gets interesting. Law 63B says

Quote:

When there has been a violation of Law 61B, the revoker must substitute a legal card and the penalty provisions of Law 64 apply as if the revoke had been established.

61B speaks to who's allowed to ask whom about possible revokes. Since dummy isn't allowed to ask defenders, 61B has been violated. That law doesn't seem to care which side the asker belongs to. So now the penalties of Law 64 come into effect, even though the revoke wasn't established.

If the revoke **was** established, then it can't be corrected, and the penalty provisions of Law 64 should be applied. So it looks like this revoke rates a penalty whether it was established or not.

We haven't dealt with dummy's infraction, though. It is subject to a

procedural penalty under law 90. In this case, I think I'd be inclined to just make it a warning.

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Dummy draws attention to revoke (21:11:50
SatAug 24 2002)

There is no doubt that Ed has read the Law right, but 😞

It cannot be right that dummy can get penalties from the defenders by doing somethign illegal! If [in a different scenario] dummy realised from the look on the defender's face that he had realised and was about to correct it then he shoudl immediately point it out because the penalty would be worthwhile, even if he gets penalised.

Wjhile I do not disagree with Ed, I shall pass the question on to BLML to see if they have any intelligent comments, or to see if they notice something Ed and I have missed.

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

Joost Boswijk

offline

7 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Dummy draws attention to revoke (07:59:30
MonAug 26 2002)

Law 43B3:

Quote:

If dummy after violation of the limitations listed in A2 preceding is the first to draw attention to a defender's irregularity, no penalty shall be imposed. If the defenders benefit directly through their irregularity, the director shall award an adjusted score to both sides to restore equity.

It seems to me that 'no penalty shall be imposed' would lead to
- no penalty card if the revoke hasn't been established and
- no penalty tricks if established.

But the laws are not particularly clear on this, so I'm quite curious what the result of the BLML posting will be.

Regards,

Joost

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Dummy draws attention to revoke (18:51:44
MonAug 26 2002)

Sadly, Joost, you have fallen headlong into a well-known trap! 😞

Law 43B3 says

Quote:

If dummy after violation of the
limitations listed in A2 preceding is
.....

but that it means it **only** applies after the violations mentioned [eg looking at one of the other hands]. Since this behaviour has just about been stamped out, Laws 43B2 and 43B3 practically never apply.



Fortunately, one of my Norwegian friends has solved the problem. Dummy was in breach of Law 42B1 rather than Law 61B. Ok, I know she was really in breach of both but the European Bridge League TD guide [regrettably both out of print and obsolete, but this Law has not changed fortunately from when it was written] has said that Law 42B1 applies, Law 61B does not. That means that L63B does not apply 🤖 so the revoke is not established nor do any of the nasty penalties therein apply. The defender may correct it if in time.

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

Joost Boswijk

offline

7 posts

bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Dummy draws attention to revoke (07:23:53

TueAug 27 2002)



I know, I know... read first, read again and then make sure that you haven't missed anything. I've been told that over and over again during the course.

Regards,

Joost

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

[**Get Email Advice of Replies**]

[**Print**]

[**Send**]

[**Watch**]

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

6 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 6 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 08:45:45 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. Ohana

card played from dummy (06:23:36 SatAug 17 2002)

Reply

S is playing 3NT and calls for the H Queen, which is high, but dummy hears S Ace and plays it
East follows Spades, S Hearts, W Spades, and now South realises that it is not the H Queen which is on the table. Director !
Many thanks in advance

JimO

Re: card played from dummy (15:25:10 SatAug 17 2002)

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

At the 1999 Summer NABCs in San Antonio, The ACBL Laws Commission determined that if declarer makes a play after an inadvertent designation from dummy, "pause for thought" has occurred and the card may not be changed.

For a further and fuller description:

<http://www.acbl.org/nabc/sananton/sabull09.htm>

Or, if you have access to ACBLscore, try the Tech Files, R-LWSCOM.993

Also, when facts are disputed (what card was called from dummy?) when three players heard one thing (SA) and one player heard another (HQ), the Director should go with the majority, in absence of strong evidence to the contrary.

In any case, Spade Ace led, declarer must correct his revoke.

[Edited By JimO at 15:26:19 Sat Aug 17 2002]

[Edited By JimO at 15:28:18 Sat Aug 17 2002]

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

Ed

offline

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: card played from dummy (05:12:23 MonAug 19 2002)

That url won't work. Try this one:

<http://www.acbl.org/nabc/sananton/sabull09.htm>

This is not a case of inadvertant designation. Nor, it appears, was there a dispute regarding for which card declarer called - he called for the HQ. Law 45D applies. It says:

Quote:

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

So the SA is withdrawn, the HQ substituted, and all three players may change their played cards without penalty (presumably declarer, who played a heart, won't want to change that).

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: card played from dummy (14:21:51 MonAug 19 2002)

I respectfully disagtree with Ed.

If declarer actually called for the Heart Queen, why did dummy play the SA? And why did neither defender object when dummy played the SA?

In cases where there is a dispute over a call during the auction, or a call of a card from dummy during the play, we usually give a little more weight to the "speaker", and in cases where it is 2-2 or 1-1, or even 2-1, we rule in favor of the "speaker" in absence of strong eveidence to the contrary.

When it is 3-1 against, we rule with the majority.

From the ACBLscore Tech Files (R-CARDS.951):

"Where all the other players (excepting the "speaker") have given some indication that they thought the "speaker" said something else, TD's should rule with the majority."

So. SA played, Declarer must correct his revoke, assuming he has a Spade.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

Ed

offline

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: card played from dummy (07:13:30 TueAug 20 2002)

<shrug> On the evidence presented, dummy put the wrong card in the played position. If further investigation were to show that is not in fact what happened, that instead declarer **did** call for the SA, and then revoked, then I agree with Jim.

The only dispute in evidence is that declarer, upon realizing (according to the original post) that the wrong card had been played by dummy, called the director. I suppose we need to know what the other three players told the director before making a ruling. 🏠

[]al.ohana

Reply

Re: card played from dummy (14:37:47 TueAug 20 2002)

Many thanks to Ed and Jim for their expications
The other two players did not hear anything, but simply played Spades because they saw the Ace in played position, declarer is an old man speaking in his beard
But the play of Spade Ace was obviously bad for declarer, so defenders wanted to let it played
I think events were like Ed supposed to be, and I have applied the law 45
But I did not know about ACBL San Antonio, and thanks to Jim for that

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: card played from dummy (01:31:22 WedAug 21 2002)

There is no doubt that the cited case is a Law 45D one. Al Ohana said:

Quote:

S is playing 3NT and calls for the H Queen, which is high, but dummy hears S Ace and plays it.

So Ed's answer is correct.

Sure, Jim, your answer is interesting, but on this forum we like to answer the questions asked, and Al's question made it clear that South called for the ♥Q.

As to why the other players did not object when dummy played the wrong card, it happens. I remember when I put a card in such a position myself - and the next three players followed before partner realised! 😞

Of course, there are other matters, such as that the ACBL conclusion that you quote was merely over-reaction to the famous "Oh sh*t" incident, and is certainly not recommended practice outside the ACBL. It is better to follow the laws as written. But lengthy discussion on the subject is more a matter for BLML.

One other thing I would say is that good TDs do not start with preconceived notions about votes. If three people say one thing and one the other you will usually go with the majority - but not invariably. 🌈

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

View Thread Page(s): [1]

[]JoAnneM

Psyching Conventional Bids (04:05:33 TueAug 20 2002)

[Reply](#)

Is it legal to psyche a Flannery 2D opening. The hand was:

S K9875
H KJ7642
D 10
C 9

Ed

Re: Psyching Conventional Bids (07:26:01 TueAug 20 2002)

offline

173 posts
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

It depends on the regulations in force. Under the ACBL General Convention Chart, psychs of artificial or conventional opening bids are disallowed.

A psych is a **deliberate** and gross distortion of suit length or playing strength. The hand in question has only 7 HCP, but it also has 11 cards in the majors. So, if the opener **intended** to psyche, the question boils down to whether this hand fits the definition. Me, I dunno. Probably. Maybe not. 🌈 If he honestly thought this hand was good enough to open 2D on, then it wasn't a psych.

Wotan

Re: Psyching Conventional Bids (07:51:06 TueAug 20 2002)

offline

69 posts
bridgetalk member



[Reply](#)

Depends where too. I assume Joanne is talking about the States. It is legal to psyche a Flannery 2D in Oz. It would not be legal to psyche a strong bid eg 2C.
Wotan

kjun

offline

45 posts

bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Psyching Conventional Bids (13:34:58 TueAug 20 2002)

it depends, i guess, on how the opps described the 2d bid on their card... ours used to have 11-15 hcp, 4 spades and 5 hearts... imo the hand in question isn't a psyche... what did the director say? any 2d bid is limited by definition (a reverse is available after all), but i imagine your complaint has to do with the high card weakness... i like the bid 🌈

bluejak

offline

435 posts

Forum Host

Reply

Re: Psyching Conventional Bids (01:15:51 WedAug 21 2002)

Doesn't look like a psyche to me! 🤖

A psyche is a deliberate attempt to mislead. My guess is that the person who opened this hand intended to describe the hand rather than mislead - and that is not a psyche. 😞

Of course, as mentioned by other responders, this is a matter of regulation. You may not psyche opening conventional bids in European Bridge League pairs events - but you may in their teams events! 🏆

I think the pair just meant it naturally. Sure, it is not 11 HCP, but pairs open 1♥ very light when they are 6-5 and people are not surprised when that is not 11 HCP. It is just the same for a convention. 🤖

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

<p>[]Peter</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Howell Movement (17:54:17 TueAug 20 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>When playing a Howell Movement (6 or 7 tables) some pairs remain at the same table all night alternating between playing N/S and E/W. When they are playing E/W is E in charge of the table because they are the stationary pair at the table?</p>
<p>JimO</p> <hr/> <p>offline 175 posts Forum Host</p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Howell Movement (23:40:15 TueAug 20 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>From: "What ACBL Players should know about the 1997 Laws Changes" by Gary Blaiss, ACBL Chief Tournament Director.</p> <p>'Everyone has always been told that North is responsible for (procedures at) the table. In reality, some people (such as North are more responsible than others. Law 7 is better worded to say that 'Any contestant remaining at a table throughout a session is primarily responsible for maintaining proper conditions of play at the table'. This is much better. We are all responsible, but stationary players are more responsible."</p> <p>---</p> <p>-Jim O'Neil Oak Park, IL</p>

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

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

6 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 6 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 08:47:09 Mon Sep 1 2003

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

top ↑