

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
	part scores	4	131	bluejak 03:13:23 Wed Jan 22 2003

	manerism [1 2]	20	420	bluejak 03:07:35 Wed Jan 22 2003
	Stop out of turn	2	114	JimO 01:55:35 Wed Jan 22 2003
	table movement	3	89	JimO 01:47:03 Wed Jan 22 2003
	Change in systems	4	131	bluejak 11:30:17 Fri Jan 17 2003
	adjusted score	4	140	bluejak 13:03:45 Tue Jan 14 2003
	Travelling Scoreslip	1	90	bluejak 10:56:51 Tue Jan 7 2003
	Face up lead out of turn	6	161	JimO 22:30:37 Mon Jan 6 2003
	What should be the decision ?	6	231	bluejak 17:01:45 Mon Jan 6 2003
	Ethics and Damage	11	309	Guest 21:06:20 Mon Dec 30 2002
	multi 2 D	2	131	bluejak 08:37:25 Tue Dec 24 2002
	Answering Queries	2	165	James Vickers 20:02:18 Thu Dec 19 2002
	Help?	1	94	James Vickers 14:38:30 Thu Dec 19 2002
	Hesitation plus different explanations	1	145	bluejak 00:14:34 Tue Dec 17 2002
	Appeals committee correct an incorrect director's ruling?	3	173	bluejak 23:29:30 Mon Dec 16 2002
	Revoke/penalty card	1	136	bluejak 00:05:59 Thu Dec 12 2002
	howell movement	1	146	bergid 19:08:01 Mon Dec 9 2002
	Alerting a revoke	4	179	bluejak 21:21:20 Sat Dec 7 2002

	Wrong Explanation	5	173	bluejak 19:23:04 Thu Dec 5 2002
	ACBL Ruling against bid-box error	1	122	AlanW 09:19:57 Thu Dec 5 2002

[New Discussion](#)

[Get Email Advice of New Discussions in This Forum](#)

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

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

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

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

The time is now 08:01:28 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](#)

ppg725wales

Reply

part scores (01:33:29 TueJan 21 2003)

[Small matter of how to score part game have always used 50 pts a; ong comes a new player who insists that the A.C. B. L changed it to 100 pts for a part score about 4 years ago, Can you referee

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: part scores (02:29:32 TueJan 21 2003)

Check out Law 77 for a complete scoring table.
"For making any partscore - 50".

This new player was obviously confused.

He/she may have been thinking of:

1) The bonus for making a redoubled contract was increased from 50 to 100 pts - that was in 1987, a lot more than 4 years ago.

or

2) In some variations of Chicago (four-deal), an unfulfilled partscore is worth 100 pts.

Neither of these have anything to do with the ACBL.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: part scores (02:32:11 TueJan 21 2003)

Assuming that you are talking about Duplicate bridge then the part score bonus is 50 points, and has been for a very long time! The ACBL do not have the right to change it, since it is decided by the World Bridge Federation Laws Committee.

I can guess why your friend is confused. Some time ago the bonus for making a redoubled contract was increased from 50 to 100 points - perhaps this is what he is thinking of? This was longer than four years ago though.

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

Robin Barker

Re: part scores (10:23:55 TueJan 21 2003)

Reply

Is it possible the poster is asking about rubber bridge. According to the 1993 Rubber Bridge Laws the bonus for a remaining partscore is 100 points. It used to be 50 points but I don't know when it changed.

bluejak

Re: part scores (03:13:23 WedJan 22 2003)

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

That's a thought, Robin! 🌈

If anyone needs a look at the Rubber Laws - or any other Laws for that matter, including duplicate Laws in foreign languages - you will find the links to them at

Law book links

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**] [**>**]

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

albert Ohana

Reply

manerism (15:22:05 MonJan 13 2003)

Hello all

East opens 1NT, alerted 12-14 and West bids 2C, alerted Stayman which may be weak. North overcalls 2D, East pass, South 3D, and West bids 3H, not alerted. East bids 4H, and now West takes the 4S carton and puts it on the table with a manerism indicating clearly that partner has not understand the precedent bidding. East takes moment of thought and passes. South calls Director, who says play should continue. 4S is just made (4H would be two down). Director adjusts to 5S-1. E-W appeals, and A.C. restores the store to 4S made.

Here are the two hands :

West East

AJ10xx Qxx

Q10xx KJx

x Ax

Axx Dxxxx

What is your opinion ?

Many thanks in advance

Al. Ohana

AlanW

Reply

Re: manerism (16:38:57 MonJan 13 2003)

Whose action are you questioning here? There seem to be two possibilities. First, West's action in bidding 4S rather than passing 4H, and second, East's action in passing 4S rather than bidding on.

To decide on these, we really need to know what EW's system was - in particular, what did 3H show? If, for example, it showed 4H, 5S and invitational values, then East has perhaps made an eccentric choice in raising to 4H, but West has presumably no way of knowing East has failed to understand 3H other than his failure to alert. This is, of course, unauthorised information and I for one would rule West must pass 4H. If the 4S is the bid being questioned, then the manner in which it was made isn't really relevant.

The director on the other hand, seems to have been happy to allow 4S to stand but to have felt East should have bid on. If 3H is natural and forcing, then 4S sounds to me like a cue-bid and East's only reason for passing looks like the potential unauthorised information

conveyed by West's manner of bidding. Of course, West's 4S bid itself is authorised, and this may have led East to reconsider and remember their system. It sounds inherently a little unlikely to me that it was the authorised rather the unauthorised information that led to this appraisal, but it's possible of course, and I don't really know how you decide between these if East insists it was the bid itself.

So I would first East a) what did 3H mean? If he comes up with an explanantion along the lines of the first possibility above I would ask b) why did he/she bid 4H? If he comes up with an explanation along the lines of the second possibility above I would ask b) why did he pass 4S?

RichM

offline

285 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: manerism (22:13:56 MonJan 13 2003)

Sounds like West was playing Smolen with himself, intending 3H to show 4H and 5S.

Without any hesitation or mannerisms, it seems right to let the correction to 4S stand. East may think that West has bid abnormally, but passing 4S seems to be the normal action.

RichM

AlanW

Reply

Re: manerism (12:00:11 TueJan 14 2003)

Quote: RichM

Sounds like West was playing Smolen with himself, intending 3H to show 4H and 5S. Without any hesitation or mannerisms, it seems right to let the correction to 4S stand.

Rich

If 3H showed 4H+ 5S and East selected 4H on that basis, why is West overruling East's choice to bid 4S? Hasn't he already shown what he has got? Doesn't it look as if the lack of an alert for 3H

warned West of a misunderstanding?

RichM

offline

285 posts

bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: manerism (16:48:33 TueJan 14 2003)

AlanW wrote

< <

If 3H showed 4H+5S and East selected 4H on that basis, why is West overruling East's choice to bid 4S? Hasn't he already shown what he has got? Doesn't it look as if the lack of an alert for 3H warned West of a misunderstanding?

> >

Yes, I think it does look like the lack of an alert of 3H was UI (unauthorized information).

But if we accept that after the first round:

1NT - P - 2C - 2D

opener's second round Pass denied a 4-card major

then it is reasonable to correct 4H to 4S based on good old "bridge logic".

My uninformed opinion is that correcting 4H to 4S is allowable on this basis.

On the other hand, passing 4H is reasonable if you assume that opener neglected to bid a 4-card Heart suit.

RichM

bluejak

offline

435 posts

Forum Host

Reply

Re: manerism (23:38:30 TueJan 14 2003)

Rich, you seem very generous to a pair who are clearly having a misunderstanding in allowing them to get things right. 🤔

First, not everyone agrees on what 1NT p 2♣ 2♦ p shows, and when 3♥ gets raised to 4♥ it sounds like four hearts to me!

I would rule this back to 4♥ -2, and I do not consider it even close. Once 3♥ is not alerted, the 4♣ bid is illegal.

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

al.ohana

Reply

Re: manerism (13:58:39 WedJan 15 2003)

Rich

I agree with you when you say that 4S is allowed and may be considered as "old good bridge", but at one condition: it must be said without manerism, allowing partner to bid again . In this occasion, partner was "summoned" to stop by the attitude taken when bidding 4S

Suppose responder has

AKJx

KQ10xx

xx

Kx

and want to hear Diamond control . Is he not going to be 4S now ?
And partner has to continue bidding, as the Heart fit is found

With the great respect I have for David 's decisions, I do not understand why 4S is illegal, if it is made "normally"

Best regards

RichM

offline

285 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: manerism (14:42:57 WedJan 15 2003)

IMO, there are 2 issues here.

- 1) Is correcting to 4 Spades an reasonable bridge action ?
- 2) Should correction be allowed in light of "mannerism" and/or lack of alert ?

On issue 1), I think it is sort of normal (note the weak qualifier) to correct to 4 Spades. If the table used screens and silent bidding and I was holding the West hand (the one with 4H and 5S) AND -
important qualification - I knew we had not discussed this type of sequence, I would bid 4S as a "safety bid". It does not figure to be worse that 4 Hearts unless pard has 2 Spades and 4 Hearts.

On issue 2), I have no opinion. David and Ed have more experience with rulings and I would defer to them on whether the contract should or should not revert to 4 Hearts.

RichM

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: manerism (23:16:06 WedJan 15 2003)

Suppose you are playing behind screens, and you bid as shown to 3♥. You believe that you have shown 4♥s and 5♠s. Now partner bids 4♥. What do you do?

The answer is that at least some of you would trust your partners and pass. I certainly would: I would assume partner knows what he is doing. Either he had 4♥s which he did not show over 2♦ or he has something like a good trebleton heart and a doubleton spade and has decided that 4♥ is the answer rather than 3NT. Whichever, I would pass 4♥, and so would some other people.

Back to that actual case. The player that bid 3♥ knows his partner did not alert it - that's UI. Pass over 4♥ is an LA [logical alternative] as shown above. So we disallow 4♠ - a routine UI decision.

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

Ed

Re: manerism (01:50:01 ThuJan 16 2003)

offline

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Quote: bluejak at 23:16:06 Wed Jan 15 2003

[snip]

Back to that actual case. The player that bid 3♥ knows his partner did not alert it - that's UI. Pass over 4♥ is an LA [logical alternative] as shown above. So we disallow 4♠ - a routine UI decision.

Perhaps it's pedantic of me, but let me point out that it's not the fact that an LA exists that means we disallow 4♠ (or, more pedantically, means that we adjust the score 😊) but the fact that the UI suggests bidding 4♠ over 4♥.

albert Ohana

Re: manerism (12:25:31 ThuJan 16 2003)

Reply

David

Thank you for your clear explications as if we were behind screens. I now have understood, and agree completely. We have been focused on the manerism, and in fact it was the absence of alert which was essential
That means that both Director and A.C. had got it wrong....
I can now tell you that I was South

Many thanks to all
Best regards
Al. Ohana

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: manerism (12:55:18 ThuJan 16 2003)

Quote: Ed

Perhaps it's pedantic of me, but let me point out that it's not the fact that an LA exists that means we disallow 4♠ {or, more pedantically, means that we adjust the score 🏠} but the fact that the UI suggests bidding 4♥ over 4♠.

To adjust because of UI you require the following:

- [1] UI
- [2] An LA to the chosen action
- [3] Possible damage
- [4] The UI to suggest the chosen action over the LA

If any one of these are missing we do not adjust.

The reason I stressed [2] rather than [4] is because of the other answers - people were tending to assuming that the 4♠ bid was automatic, but all four items are required.

Quote: Al Ohana

I can now tell you that I was South

I would never have guessed! 🤖

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

RichM

offline

285 posts

bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: manerism (14:58:16 ThuJan 16 2003)

bluejak wrote

< <

Suppose you are playing behind screens, and you bid as shown to 3. You believe that you have shown 4H and 5s. Now partner bids 4H. What do you do?

The answer is that at least some of you would trust your partners and pass. I certainly would: I would assume partner knows what he is doing.

> >

For deciding a real world appeal Davids four-point list looks right.

Practical

=====

There are situations in contested auctions where you *know* that your side does not have a specific agreement. You know based on the fact that you that you and your partner have discussed only a general agreement.

You may have agreed on certain default principles that apply to undiscussed actions; "natural as possible and non-forcing in competetion" is one example. "Treatments stay on unless ridiculous" is another. Unfortunately, default principles can conflict is specific cases.

Procedural

=====

In terms of your obligations to your opponents, what to do when you "know you don't know" ? 🎮 Playing online, I tell the opps and not pard when I am guessing. Playing live, I have no idea of what's right. Any general principles Dave/Ed ????

Opinion

=====

I don't think "trust partner" is a guideline for deciding if and action is sensible, logical, allowable, etc.

Directors and committe members should avoid any tendency to think "I (and other reasonable persons) would trust(or mistrust) partner so this or that call is reasonable or not reasonable". That introduces some prejudgement to step [2.

Done

=====

RichM

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: manerism (00:24:20 FriJan 17 2003)

Quote: Rich M

In terms of your obligations to your opponents, what to do when you "know you don't know" ? Playing online, I tell the opps and not pard when I am guessing. Playing live, I have no idea of what's right. Any general principles Dave/Ed ????

You tell your opponents that you do not know. Perhaps you even offer to call the TD for them. But it is more important to keep your opponents informed than to worry about UI - that is for partner to sort out.

The TD has methods to sort out such problems, but cannot unless he is called.

Quote: Rich M

I don't think "trust partner" is a guideline for deciding if and action is sensible, logical, allowable, etc.

Directors and committe members should avoid any tendency to think "I (and other reasonable persons) would trust(or mistrust) partner so this or that call is reasonable or not reasonable". That introduces some prejudgement to step [2.

TDs and ACs will look at alternatives. If some people would decide to pass, whether on a basis of trusting partner or any other basis,

that is an LA [logical alternative]. Of course item [2] is all about judgement, but pass is clearly a logical alternative on the actual hand because without the UI a number of players would pass.

LAs are always decided by considering what other players would do in the opinion of the TD or AC.

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

AlanW

Re: manerism (08:37:26 FriJan 17 2003)

Reply

Suppose that instead of showing his annoyance at East for not understanding 3H, West had simply bid 4S in tempo and then later claimed that 3H was a psyche to muddy the waters which he was always planning to correct to spades. Would the TD or appeals committee feel obliged to accept this? If West knew 3H was a natural bid when he made it then the correction to 4S may be ill-judged but looks allowable. But how do we know what West meant by 3H when he bid it except by his own, possibly self-serving, comments?

This may sound far-fetched, but it's not so different from something I did see at the table once. I opened a multi 2D, partner responded 2H and the next hand, with 5-5 in the majors, bid 3D (not alerted). I doubled with a strong balanced hand including AJxxx diamonds, and the 3D bidder rescued himself to 3H. This was also doubled and defeated, but not enough to compensate for missing 6D!

Now what is going on here? One possibility that occurred to me was that 3D was intended as Michaels, but once his partner failed to alert he realised it hadn't been understood. One might argue that no-one plays 3D as Michaels here, and I would agree, but it may be relevant that on the very next hand my partner opened 2D multi and the same player now asked what 2D meant, which he hadn't done on the hand in question. One could also argue that the 3D bidder knew they didn't have an agreement here and once his partner failed to bid a major he knew he hadn't shown his hand (ie it was his partner's failure to bid not the failure to alert that warned him his partner hadn't understood). I think I would have gone along with this if argued.

But instead, he claimed 3D was a deliberate psyche that had been very successful in talking us out of the best contract. Now this might be true, of course. It's a very unusual and risky psyche if so, but perhaps the more unusual the psyche the better the pay-off when it works. But I'm afraid it left a bit of a sour taste since I had (and still have) doubts as to how honest he was being. The TD said he had to accept the explanation of a psyche, in which case there were no problems with UI.

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 08:03:29 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**

Helen Barr

Stop out of turn (22:20:44 TueJan 21 2003)

[Reply](#)

North is the dealer. East pulls out the stop card and then says "Oh no, it's not my turn!"

What is the ruling? Stop isn't a call but it must be unauthorised information?

Ed

Re: Stop out of turn (22:43:21 TueJan 21 2003)

[offline](#)

173 posts
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

Law 16 says "Players are authorized to base their calls and plays on information from legal calls and plays and from mannerisms of opponents. To base a call or play on other extraneous information may be an infraction of law."

The fact that East pulled out the Stop Card is certainly "other extraneous information". So West is probably (note the word "may" above) not permitted to base his call(s) on it. If called to the table about this, I would caution West regarding his Law 16 obligation, and tell the table to play on, and call me back if there later appears to have been a problem.

JimO

Re: Stop out of turn (01:55:35 WedJan 22 2003)

[offline](#)

175 posts
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

From "Ruling the Game: A Director's guide to the 1975 Duplicate Code":

"Law 18. Bids

Utterances such as "one..." and "I am about to make a skip bid..." do not constitute bids, or even calls. This type of situation is to be dealt with using Law 16. In no case should the Director ever require that the offender name a denomination or otherwise complete his call."

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

chachi

offline

1 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

table movement (11:23:19 TueJan 21 2003)

I am looking for a 4 table individual movement where everyone will play with everyone as a partner. 2-3 boards each round

Helen Barr

Reply

Re: table movement (22:28:14 TueJan 21 2003)

Try EBU movement book page 173

bergid

Reply

Re: table movement (23:06:42 TueJan 21 2003)

Quote: JimO

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.

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: table movement (01:47:03 WedJan 22 2003)

Actually, that is a pair movement, not a team movement.

Remember, with 4 tables, you will play 15 rounds for everyone to play with everyone else - so 2 board rounds will mean 30 Boards.

Here's one from Movements - a fair approach:

To start:

Table# - N - E - S - W - Boards

Table 1 | 16*-15 -1 -12 | 1-2

Table 2 | 6 - 9 - 7 - 11 | 5-6

Table 3 | 4 - 14 - 8 - 5 | 13-14

Table 4 | 13-10 - 3 - 2 | 15-16

Player # 16 remains stationary.

Boards and players move as normal - players 1-15 follow the next lower # player; boards follow the next lower pair of boards.

This movement cannot be curtailed without board factoring.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

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

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

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

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

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

The time is now 08:04:12 Mon Sep 1 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

[top](#) ↑

peter

Reply

Change in systems (02:00:27 FriJan 17 2003)

Our Australian Nationals have 20 board matches. Is it legal to change system during the match if you want to? (if so how often can you do it)....
Is this any law against it - or would it depend solely on any local regulations which are in force for the event? Does anyone know the NOT regulations that may prohibit this?

[In particular he would like to play:
First 10 boards -
2D=weak either major (6 card suit)
2H= 5 card H weak
2S= 5 cars S weak
Then from board 11if the match has gone OK
2D-2S 6 card weak two.
If the match hasn't gone well stay with the original structure.]

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Change in systems (02:32:00 FriJan 17 2003)

Certainly it is not a matter Law. Permitted systems are a matter for the sponsoring organisation, the ABF in your case.

I shall see if I can find out, though the person I would normally ask is unavailable at the moment! ☹

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

pmn

offline

1 posts

bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Change in systems (02:36:50 FriJan 17 2003)

Hi David,

I have registered now - yes it is harder to find out with all the directors now in Canberra. The relevant COCs are (AFAIK)

- the NOT

on the brochure - basically refers to the main ABF regs.

- and the ABF system regulations

There seems nothing specific (that I have found yet). The event COC refer to

the ABF system regulations which are available in full at:

<http://www.abf.com.au/events/tournregs/sysregs.pdf>

The only relevant bits seem to be:

(2.3) For all National (Gold Point) events, each pair shall have two systemically identical system

cards on the table for the opposing pair before the start of play.

This

practice is also recommended

for major Red Master Point events.

and

(10) CHANGE OF SYSTEMS:

No pair may play two different RED or YELLOW systems during the course of an

event

without the express permission of the Chief Tournament Director, unless

specifically provided

for in the Supplementary Regulations.

Which don't seem to prohibit this action.

Maybe (1) does but if you were to say:

Play system 1 for our first 10 boards, system 2 for our 2nd 10 boards then

it could all be on the prepared systems.

Wotan

offline

69 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Change in systems (02:57:25 FriJan 17 2003)

I am pretty sure that you cannot play 2 systems in the 1 match at the NOT unless you have registered this beforehand. eg it is legal to play lets say Moscito NV and Standard vul, but this has to be announced at the beginning of the match. You can't switch systems half way through a match just because you are getting crappy results. Check with McMannus just to make sure, but I am pretty sure I am right on this.

Ron Lel

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Change in systems (11:30:17 FriJan 17 2003)

First, if you are permitted to change systems then it is imperative that you go armed with two sets of convention cards.

Second, I do not know what Ron Lel's authority for this is, and I am certainly not saying he is wrong, but it is interesting at least that the regulations you quote do not forbid this practice.

So I agree that the answer is to ask the DIC while you are there. Is that McManus now, not Mullanphy?

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), 1 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 08:04:48 Mon Sep 1 2003

albert ohana

adjusted score (14:13:15 SatJan 11 2003)

Reply

Hello David

Please could you explain tome how to calculate the matchpoints when an assigned adjusted score has not occured on the board : NS are assigned 430, and the board contains no 430 but five 400 and two 460

Many thanks in advance

P.S. Would you be in Menton next June ?

Best regards

Albert

Ed

Re: adjusted score (23:24:35 SunJan 12 2003)

offline

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

If I understand you correctly, there are 5 results of 400, 2 results of 460, and one (assigned) result of 430.

You matchpoint this the same way you would if the assigned result had actually occurred at the table: the two 460s each get 6.5 (in ACBL-land) or 13 (Europe and, I think, most everywhere else outside ACBL-land) matchpoints. The 430 pair gets 5 or 10, and the rest get 2 or 4. This is based, of course, on the standard 1 (or 2) matchpoint(s) for each pair beaten, 0.5 (or 1) matchpoint for each pair tied, and 0 matchpoints (in both cases) for each pair which did better than the pair in question.

bluejak

Re: adjusted score (01:33:57 MonJan 13 2003)

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

I do not know whether I shall be in Menton, but I certainly hope so!



David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>

Liverpool, England, UK

http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

albert ohana

Reply

Re: adjusted score (15:37:05 MonJan 13 2003)

Thank you Ed for your reply, but I am afraid I have not explained my interrogation

In the EBU "White book", there is a paragraph 12.23 concerning "assigned adjusted score has not occurred on board", where it is given an example in which it is question of weighted average of the score next higher and next lower, and I have not understand well how they arrive at that result.

They say that if NS are assigned +430 and the board contains no 430 but five 420 (for 4mps each) and two 450 (for 11 mps each), then 9 mps should be assigned to 430

Can you help me, because I was like you, thinking that is suffices to inscribe 430 as if the result had occurred at the table

Many thanks

Al. Ohana

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: adjusted score (13:03:44 TueJan 14 2003)

I think the White book is wrong in not saying when this applies. Since I am currently re-writing the White book, I shall make sure this appears in the next one!

If you can re-score the board - which is another way of saying do what Ed suggests - then that is definitely best. 🌈

What is contained in the White book has two applications.

First, if you are too late to re-score the board, and especially when it is too complicated, for example you have 150 tables and want to make a small adjustment, perhaps because of an appeal, some hours later, this applies. 🏠

Second, very little software has yet been written to allow for weighted scores. So if you have a weighted score then you have to do something. Now, if you are running a six table event in your club, you could score it properly, by producing different scores for each table dependent on the various scores, and then applying the weighting to every pair. Even for six tables that is very complicated: for any more it is impractical. 😞

So the EBU method is a practical and fairly accurate method of working out how to deal with scores when you are putting in a manual adjustment, either because it is too late to re-score, or

because it is a weighted score. ☹

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), 1 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 08:05:08 Mon Sep 1 2003

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

[top](#) ↑

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

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



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

Guest

Reply

Travelling Scoreslip (01:05:11 TueJan 7 2003)

I run a duplicate bridge club in Hong Kong. The members come from all over the world. The travelling scoreslips are completed in so many different ways I was wondering if there is a standard method for completing scoreslips or does each Zone have the authority to decide. For instance: 4s making the contract. Is it 4S made 4 or is it 4s made 10? Some players even write + 1 next to 4S if there is an over trick. Do I have the authority as the Director to impose a standard method for my club?

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Travelling Scoreslip (10:56:51 TueJan 7 2003)

How to fill in a score-slip is a matter for the sponsoring organisation. In practice there are many different ways. It tends to be different in different countries, not just Zones.

You have a perfect right to insist on your players doing it in a particular way. After all, your club is the sponsoring organisation. But why do you want to? As a scorer, you ignore the number of tricks made nearly all the time, do you not? You just take the score.

If you really feel it is important to get some consistency then I suggest you get travellers with a column headed "Number of tricks". People will tend to fill that in consistently.

As to the examples you offer, if someone makes 11 tricks in 4♣ then 4♠+5 is the North American notation, 4♠+1 is European - I do not know why you put "even" for a method used by hundreds of thousands of bridge players! 🌈 As you say, some people say 4♠ made 5, some 4♠ made 10.

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

Val

offline

17 posts
bridgetalk member



[Reply](#)

Face up lead out of turn (02:58:00 SunJan 5 2003)

When there is a lead out of turn and declarer rejects the lead and wants the correct person to lead, he (the declarer) can demand or forbid the lead of the suit. If he forbids the lead of the suit, and the correct opponent now leads and retains the lead. Is the forbidden suit still forbidden? If so, what law? If not, what law?
Thanks in advance for your advice.

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

[Reply](#)

Re: Face up lead out of turn (04:45:24 SunJan 5 2003)

See Law 56, and 50D.
When declarer exercises his option to forbid the lead of that suit, the card led out of turn is picked up and the correct defender leads. The prohibition is "for as long as he retains the lead" - Law 50D2a. So, for example, the defender would not be allowed to, say, cash an Ace in another suit and then switch to the forbidden suit. Once another player wins a trick and thus obtains the lead, this restriction is no longer in effect.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

Val

offline

17 posts
bridgetalk member



[Reply](#)

Re: Face up lead out of turn (22:35:27 SunJan 5 2003)

Thanks for the prompt reply. For some reason I could not find the correct law at the time. However, I did make the correct ruling.

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Face up lead out of turn (01:36:57 MonJan 6 2003)

The face up lead out of turn is common enough, but very complex to read from the Law book, because so many different Laws are involved. Unlike all other book rulings, English TDs are required to learn a "spiel" so they can deal with this one situation without reading from the Law book. In fact, to pass the EBU Club TD course, you will be tested on your spiel, which you will have to quote from memory.

Suppose a spade has been led out of turn and face up: perhaps the following spiel might help TDs around the world:

You have five options.

First, you may accept the lead, making it legal. Dummy goes down now, and you must remember to play the next card from your hand.

Second, you must not consult partner, but if you want to then you can let partner play it on that lead. In that case you put your own hand down as dummy now.

In the other three cases the lead reverts to the correct hand.

Third, the spade remains on the table as a major penalty card, and must be played at the first legal opportunity. Leader can lead whatever he likes.

Fourth, you can require a spade lead [if leader has a spade]. If so, the spade gets picked up, and that hand can play whatever he likes.

Fifth, you can forbid a spade lead for as long as he retains the lead: again that card gets picked up.

That will do for all but the most expert of games. At top level, if declarer chooses the third, fourth or fifth option, then you should warn the real leader that his partner's spade is unauthorised information to him. In the third option you should add that he is allowed to know that that spade will be played by partner if a spade is led.

Actually, it is not the easiest of Laws. But being so common TDs get used to it.

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

Val

offline

17 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Face up lead out of turn (02:24:32 MonJan 6 2003)

Again, thanks. Here, also the total spiel was given and the option chosen was to forbid the lead of the suit that was led face up out of turn. The correct opponent made the lead of an Ace, winning the trick and then tried to lead the forbidden suit. I was pretty sure it was not permitted, and in fact did not permit the lead, just had a problem going through the laws book to prove the point to the opponent who stated that "in all the years of playing had never heard that the forbidden suit could not be led on the second lead." Since the player that had never heard that the forbidden suit could not be led on the second lead has played bridge for over 70 years, I decided to come here and get the expert help that I have received. Again thanks.

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Face up lead out of turn (16:47:32 MonJan 6 2003)

Let me tell you a story! 🌈

In South Africa an opponent told me that I could not put my card face down until the player who had won the trick did. He told me there was a Law to this effect.

I was amazed. Here I am, a well-known Laws expert around the world, and he has found a Law I have never heard of. I suggested we should get the TD over to read this new Law to me.

The TD, who knew me well, trying hard not to laugh, failed to find that Law in the book, and in fact read the relevant Law out in full.

The opponent, with a perfectly straight face, said the Law was different in World Championships, and decided to write to the WBF to say so. Naturally we all believed him. 🏠

I love the people who tell their opponents and the TDs the Laws,

and quote their experience as though it means something.

Actually, the South African has a reputation for this sort of thing, and people said they were glad I had stood up to him! 🤔

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

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Face up lead out of turn (22:30:37 MonJan 6 2003)

I am compiling a list of such laws - I call it "Law 94".
Apparently, I have a defective Lawbook - it only includes the first 93 Laws. Many players have been kind enough to point out to me the rest of Laws.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

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), 1 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 08:05:54 Mon Sep 1 2003

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

[top](#) ↑

Munna

What should be the decision ? (17:17:28 ThuDec 26 2002)

Reply

In a tournament I played a board as south where I get the following hand:

S--A,j,10,X

H--K,9,X,X

D--A,x

C--A,x,x

N E S W

- - 1c p

1H 2D X! p

3D! p 4H p

4N! p 5C(!) X

5H p 6H p

p p

1. X indicates strong hand.

2.3D " short in diamond.

3.4N Key card asking.

4.5C 0/3 key card.

My partner take time when bidding 5H.So opponent call the director for taking more time which they mentioned as pause.

What would be decision from Director?

N.B:My 6H bid was very easy and simple from my point of view.caz I thought my partner guesses I might have 0 key card. But my view was partner will not ask for mising 4 Aces.

So after having 3 Aces I can easily bid the hand.

early thx for ur answer.

WVLaker

Re: What should be the decision ? (20:02:30 ThuDec 26 2002)

Reply

Don't you have 4 keycards now that hearts are trumps?

munna

offline

2 posts

bridgetalk member



Reply

Very Urgent decision required. (11:19:37 SunDec 29 2002)

I posted the this hand before where the A/h and k/s were mis placed.

In a tournament I played a board as south where I get the following hand:

S--K,j,10,X

H--A,9,X,X

D--A,x

C--A,x,x

N E S W

- - 1c p

1H 2D X! p

3D! p 4H p

4N! p 5C(!) X

5H p 6H p

p p

1. X indicates strong hand.

2.3D " short in diamond.

3.4N Key card asking.

4.5C 0/3 key card.

My partner take time when bidding 5H.So opponent call the director for taking more time which they mentioned as pause.

What would be decision from Director?

N.B:My 6H bid was very easy and simple from my point of view.caz I thought my partner guesses I might have 0 key card. But my view was partner will not ask for mising 4 Aces.

So after having 3 Aces I can easily bid the hand.

early thx for ur answer

bridgeaddict

Unavailable

510 posts



Administrator



Reply

Re: What should be the decision ? (18:56:47

MonDec 30 2002)

Whilst I understand your desire for an early answer to your question, it really does not help to post the same problem again and again, which is why your latest post was moved and the previous one appended to your original one.

This is the holiday season which is no doubt why there has been a delay in answering your question.

However I would say this (and David will correct me if I am wrong), when your partner initiates a Blackwood sequence, he is the "captain of the hand" and you should "normally" respect him if he signs off below slam, though of course there might be times when you consider otherwise (such as when holding a void). In this case however, there appears to have been a clear hesitation by him and you must therefore make sure that you don't take advantage of it.

Quote:

If the Director determines that a player chose **from among logical alternatives**, an action that could have been influenced by his partner's tempo, manner or remark, he should award an adjusted score.

In this case, a "logical alternative" would certainly be "Pass" and although you might have considered bidding on after your partner bid "in tempo", you cannot really do so after the hesitation.

Quote:

So after having 3 Aces I can easily bid the hand.

You already told him that in your Blackwood response!

I'm afraid your reasoning for bidding on was not very convincing and it certainly showed a lack of respect for partner's bridge ability!

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: What should be the decision ? (16:41:21

WedJan 1 2003)

I think the reposting was acceptable because there was an error in the original posting, though it would have helped if the reposting had been to the same thread. Anyway, that is history now.

This type of problem is not very easy. There are two perfectly clear arguments.

[1] Partner knows I have three aces, since partner would not be making a slam try if he did not know that. Therefore, it being clear from his hesitation that he has one of the missing key-cards otherwise he would not be thinking about it, to bid a slam now is relying on the hesitation. This cannot be allowed, so it is automatic to rule it back to 5♥.

[2] Partner may not know whether I have three or zero aces. While his hesitation shows this, so does the bidding. 5♥ asks me to go on with three aces, and pass with none. So it is permissible to bid 6♥ on the example hand, and we should allow 6♥.

To be honest, I can see both arguments. Let see if we can find some more clues. In case [2] we are assuming that partner has something like

♠ AQx
♥ KQxx
♦ Kxxx
♣ Kx

and he is worrying that I might have

♠ KJxx
♥ JTxx
♦ QJx
♣ QJ

which is ludicrous! Check the earlier bidding: you cannot be that weak! 🤖 No, Partner knows you must have an ace, case [2] makes no sense, and we can not allow the 6♥ bid.

So I would rule it back to 5♥ + 1.

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

AlanW

Re: What should be the decision ? (12:03:36
MonJan 6 2003)

Reply

Quote: Bluejak

In case [2] we are assuming that
partner has something like

AQx
KQxx
Kxxx
Kx

and he is worrying that I might have

KJxx
JTxx
QJx
QJ

which is ludicrous! Check the earlier
bidding: you cannot be that weak!
No, Partner knows you must have an
ace, case [2] makes no sense, and
we can not allow the 6 bid.

So I would rule it back to 5 + 1.

While I see the logic of this approach, it conflicts with a simple agreement I have with some of my partners to the effect that responder always bids on over a 5-level sign-off if he has the higher number of possible key-cards. This means that the hand bidding RKCB can always bid on on the assumption that responder has the lower number of key cards, knowing that he won't miss anything if this isn't the case. (He can still decide responder cannot possibly have the lower number if he wants to and avoid a round of bidding, but he doesn't need to since he knows partner will bid again.)

Presumably I can protect against the ruling proposed above by

stating this agreement explicitly on the convention card, but I thought this was the normal way of playing RKCB anyway.

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: What should be the decision ? (17:01:44
MonJan 6 2003)

To play that partner always goes on with the greater number of keycards is certainly playable. It makes Blackwood unusable with no aces, which on certain sequences will cause a lot of pain, since Blackwood is **perfect** with hands with all the second-round controls, but that's your affair.

But you must put it on your CC, and if playing in a jurisdiction whihc employs alerting above 3NT, you must alert it. It is definitely not standard!

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), 1 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 08:06:14 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](#)**

WVLaker

Reply

Ethics and Damage (22:03:10 MonDec 16 2002)

Holding ♠Txx ♥AJxxxx ♦KQJT ♣void

I was playing on e-bridge with a first time partner.

LHO opens the bidding with 1♦. Partner bids 2♦, self-alerted and explained as Michaels. RHO passes, I bid 3♥, RHO passes, partner bids 3♠, RHO bids 4♦.

At this point, I am starting to worry that partner doesn't really have 5 hearts for her cue-bid. So I double, which seems sure to give us a positive score. Am I ethically obligated to bid 4♥, which I would bid, if I was sure we had an 11-card fit?

Partner held ♠Axxxx ♥x ♦x ♣AKxxxx, so ops are about to go down 5 doubled.

Ops call the director, and he rules that Michaels is a mis-explanation and skips the board. Partner says that she plays Michaels as spades plus another. I agree that Michaels is a mis-explanation, but how are the ops damaged by this? I could see damage if partner shows up with 5 diamonds, but I was the one who held the long diamonds.

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Ethics and Damage (23:38:08 MonDec 16 2002)

I cannot be sure without the full hands, but you do seem to have a case! 😞

It is possible to construct a hand where 4♦ is unlikely to be bid if it is known that your partner's call shows spades and another. After all, if you partner's call shows the majors, your 3♥ is strong evidence of a fit: when it shows spades and a rounded suit the inference of a fit is far less clear.

Personally I would not worry too much: you may have been hard done by, but your partner surely deserved this bad board for the ridiculous idea that playing 2♦ as spades and a rounded suit [an excellent way to play it: I do myself 😞] can be described as Michaels.

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

JimO

offline

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Ethics and Damage (15:13:56 TueDec 17 2002)

There was clearly misinformation here. I would like to know all the hands - the auction might have developed quite differently had the opps been properly informed.

And how could you only bid 3H with that hand?

I have no reason to doubt the opponents were damaged.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

WVLaker

Reply

Re: Ethics and Damage (17:55:15 WedDec 18 2002)

Full hand was:

♠ T92
♥ AJ8762
♦ KQJT
♣ void

♠ K4
♥ 53
♦ 6542
♣ QJT42

♠ QJ8
♥ KQT9
♦ A973
♣ 75

♠ A7653
♥ 4
♦ 8
♣ AK9863

Bidding was:

East	South	West	North
1♦	2♦	Pass	3♥
Pass	3♠	4♦	X
Pass	Pass	Pass	

It seems like once someone makes a mistake in their bidding, they can never recover.
 If we had gotten to some hopeless 6♥ contract, we would have just had to take it.
 But here, where we managed to luckily land on our feet, the ops can claim misinformation, and we don't get the benefit of our good result.

bluejak

offline

435 posts
 Forum Host

Reply

Re: Ethics and Damage (22:18:59 WedDec 18 2002)

In effect you are right: the Laws of Bridge are such that if you misinform your opponent then they will get an adjustment if they are damaged, but you keep your result if it is terrible. But players need to accept responsibility for their mistakes, and this was all caused by your partner calling her bid Michaels when she is not playing that. I hope she has learnt her lesson.

On the actual hand, however, your opponent's 4♦ bid was dreadful, and they did not deserve redress because of it. In a F2F tourney, they would have got the table result. The Director might have adjusted against you anyway [thus giving different scores to the two sides] since while the 4♦ was terrible, it probably would not have been made if the opponent had realised his opponent might have clubs. Since he might have deduced it anyway from the 3♠ bid which seems strange otherwise, perhaps there should be no adjustment whatever.

Incidentally, why did you bid 3♥ rather than 4♥? Did you know it was spades and another?

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

WVLaker

Reply

Re: Ethics and Damage (23:34:19 WedDec 18 2002)

I assumed we were playing regular Michaels. We just paired up 5 minutes before the tournament, I posted a convention card that said direct cue bid is Michaels. We never discussed this.

I've only heard of playing this kind of cue-bid as Michaels or as game-forcing strong hand. I've never seen anybody play it as spades and another.

I guess 3♥ looks pretty cowardly, but I thought my partner would raise to 4♥, unless she had a very weak hand and bid totally on distribution.

When she bid 3♠, I didn't know what to think. Was she showing ♠A looking for a ♥ slam? Did she not even read that far down on the convention card? The idea that she meant 2♦ as spades and another never even crossed my mind.

Then when the ops bid 4♦, I thought it was better to X, than to try to figure out what partner was up to.

As an example, say partner opens 1♠ and we are playing limit raises. I don't understand what a limit raise is, so I bid 3♠ thinking it is forcing to game. Partner has a minimum hand, and passes.

Under normal circumstances, we will get a poor score, as most of the field will be in game, but we will be in 3♠+1.

But we could get lucky, 4♠ goes down on bad breaks, and get a top score with 3♠. Even after I made a mistake, we still have a chance.

But in the 'mutant Michaels' example, we never had a chance to recover, once my partner doesn't know what Michaels means.

Ed

offline

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Ethics and Damage (07:14:29 ThuDec 19 2002)

Some Sponsoring Organizations have a regulation that says, in effect, that naming a convention is **never** an adequate explanation of partnership methods. This is a good reg. "Michaels" is then technically misinformation even you both know you're playing a 2♦ cuebid as "both majors, 5-5 or better, weak or strong" (one definition of "Michaels"). Had your partner properly explained the bid as (in her understanding) "spades and another", there would, as I understand self-alerts in online bridge, have been (IMO) no MI (because she gave a proper explanation according to her understanding) and no UI (because you didn't hear her alert or her explanation). You would have misunderstood, but what happens after that happens. Opponents are not owed an adjustment because you have a misunderstanding. Especially when, as David points out, they do something irrational.

Joost Boswijk

offline

7 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Ethics and Damage (09:56:24 ThuDec 19 2002)

Your opps. 4D bid is a form of what I call suicidal bridge, which fully and truly deserves a double. So their score stands. But... you've agreed on playing Michael's, so the 2D bid means both majors (5 and 4 at least). With 3H you give a preference for hearts and a minimum (which certainly doesn't describe your hand properly). Notwithstanding your partner bids 3S, IMHO showing extra values and more and probably stronger spades than hearts. So you know that you have a superfit in hearts, a nine card fit in spades and a diamond hand which is worth three tricks. East must probably hold club values, which aren't worth a dime, and west's 4D bid is based on a five card in diamonds and not much else beside it, considering the pass on your partner's 2D bid. So it's at least a game for you, either in hearts or spades, and probably a slam. Doubling the opps 4D won't give a better result than playing yourself. There won't be many tricks beside your three diamond tricks, since the opp's can't have many majors and do have a fit in both minors. (You don't give information about the vulnerability, but even if it's nv for you and v for your opps, the result can't be good). If I were the director in this case I would award a score of 6Mx-4 or 5 for you, being the worst probable result, OW would keep their score.

If you want to avoid such disasters, take more time to decide on which conventions to play, make sure that you both play it the same way or else, keep it simple.

Regards,
Joost Boswijk

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Ethics and Damage (17:01:45 ThuDec 19 2002)

Quote: Joost Boswijk

If you want to avoid such disasters, take more time to decide on which conventions to play, make sure that you both play it the same way or else, keep it simple.

I think this is a little unfair. 🤔 Especially for those with a North American background, playing Michaels **is** keeping it simple.

Quote: WVLaker

As an example, say partner opens 1 and we are playing limit raises. I don't understand what a limit raise is, so I bid 3 thinking it is forcing to game. Partner has a minimum hand, and passes.

Under normal circumstances, we will get a poor score, as most of the field will be in game, but we will be in 3+ 1.

But we could get lucky, 4 goes down on bad breaks, and get a top score with 3. Even after I made a mistake, we still have a chance.

But in the 'mutant Michaels' example, we never had a chance to recover, once my partner doesn't know what Michaels means.

The real difference between this and what actually happened is that

you are allowed to gain or lose through ignorance of partner's methods in your bidding because it is not breaking any Law not to know your own system.

But it **is** breaking a Law not to tell opponents your system. I know it seems strange if you do not know it, but that's life. 🌈

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

Joost Boswijk

offline

7 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Ethics and Damage (09:44:09 FriDec 20 2002)

Quote: bluejak at 17:01:45 Thu Dec 19 2002

Quote: Joost Boswijk

If you want
to avoid
such
disasters,
take more
time to
decide on
which
conventions
to play,
make sure
that you
both play it
the same
way or else,
keep it
simple.

I think this is a little unfair. 🙄
Especially for those with a North
American background, playing
Michaels **is** keeping it simple.

I don't see why my comment is unfair. Even the most common conventions have variations, of which the players sometimes are not aware ("In our club we always play it that way"). E.g. in Holland the multi-coloured 2D is common, but there are those who don't include a form of a strong NT in it and there are many opinions about the way the opener should bid after a 2NT response of the partner. Also 'Blackwood' could mean a lot of different things, like the simple Blackwood, which is taught in the standard courses, or RKC Blackwood, which is very common. If you don't discuss this with a new partner, but just agree on playing 'multi' and 'blackwood', you're doomed to get into trouble. And if you haven't got the time to talk it all over, make sure that you only use those conventions you have agreed upon.

Regards,

Joost Boswijk

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Ethics and Damage (17:30:29 FriDec 20 2002)

You really cannot discuss everything with a new partner, so you do have to trust that well-known simple conventions are played consistently. The Multi is not a well-known simple convention [it is well-known in some places, sure, but it is not simple] and certainly people play it in different ways.

But if you agree on Michaels there is only one way to play it, and you can take the time to discuss more important things. The way this lady played it is just not Michaels.

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

Guest

Re: Ethics and Damage (21:06:20 MonDec 30 2002)

Reply

Quote: Guest [Unregistered]

at 22:03:10 Mon Dec 16
2002]Holding ♠Txx ♥AJxxxx ♦KQJT
♣void

I was playing on e-bridge with a first
time partner.

LHO opens the bidding with 1♦.
Partner bids 2♦, self-alerted and
explained as Michaels. RHO passes, I
bid 3♥, RHO passes, partner bids 3
♠,

as a point of bidding theory, quite apart from the question of
damage, the sequence michaels qbid followed by a rebid in a major
commonly shows an exaggerated freak type holding. in this specific
case, i'd consider it entirely likely that partner is 7-4 in spades and
hearts. given that interpretation, the worst hand partner is likely to
have is aqxxxxx; kxxx; x; x, and i personally would not consider
that hand to be a candidate for the sequence.

consquently, your hand should be very strongly interested in a
grand slam in a major, and i would judge the double of 4d to reflect
an unfortunate choice of actions.

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), 1 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 08:06:34 Mon Sep 1 2003

sabine

Reply

multi 2 D (16:08:35 MonDec 23 2002)

Hi

Here is my question: is it permitted to play multi 2D with the following 3 alternatives:

- weak2 in one of the Majors
- 5+ H and 4+ S with 9-15 HCP
- very strong hand (3-4 losers) with distributions 6-5-1-1 or 5-5-2-1 in two not touching suits (i.e. H and C or S and D) no aces or voids in side suits?

Furthermore: I just started to read Orange book: can you tell me what tournaments are covered with level 1,2 etc..
Thank you.

Wotan

Re: multi 2 D (03:57:27 TueDec 24 2002)

offline

69 posts
bridgetalk member



Reply

Quote: Guest [Unregistered]

at 16:08:35 Mon Dec 23 2002]Hi
Here is my question: is it permitted to play multi 2D with the following 3 alternatives:
- weak2 in one of the Majors
- 5+ H and 4+ S with 9-15 HCP
- very strong hand (3-4 losers) with distributions 6-5-1-1 or 5-5-2-1 in two not touching suits (i.e. H and C or S and D) no aces or voids in side suits?

Can't answer this as I assume you are in England and I don't know EBU regs. However from a theoretical point of view to play 2D as a weak 2 in the Ms OR as 5H/4S is poor. You will miss your 4-4 S fit and play in a 5-2, maybe even 5-1 H fit sometimes when the bidding goes 2D 2H. If opener does decide to bid 2S to show this hand type, you will often end up too high if there is say a 4-2 S fit and a 5-3 or 5-2 H fit. You are putting yourself at a major, (excuse the pun), disadvantage for very little gain.

Ron

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: multi 2 D (08:37:25 TueDec 24 2002)

The way you describe a Multi 2D is permitted at Level 4 or 5, but not at Level 2 or 3.

To play Multi 2D at Level 3 it has to be played in a very specific fashion but it is allowed to play it in a wide variety of styles at Level 4.

It is often difficult to know whether tournament is Level 3 or 4 without looking at the advertising. For EBU and WBU events the Level is shown in the EBU or WBU Year book as well.

Roughly speaking the Levels are as follows:

Level 1. Events for beginners and novices advertised as "Simple System" or Limited Conventions" or "Standard English"

Level 2. Bridge Holidays, plus occasional Flight C events, and some lesser Congress side events. Clubs where people dislike conventions, or cater to inexperienced players.

Level 3. Most Congress events, most Clubs. The easier County events, or sometimes just pairs events. Many EBU and WBU events, especially those with shorter rounds. Note that three leading Counties **only** run Level 3 events. 🤔

Level 4. Many Congress events, some Clubs. The stronger County events, especially teams events. Many EBU and WBU events, especially those with longer rounds.

Level 5. Friday night at the Young Chelsea BC, the EBU Spring Foursomes, and the European Bridge League/EBU Seniors Congress at Brighton.

If you want to know about a specific event I can find out for you. 🌈

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

Jeremy

offline

7 posts

bridgetalk member



Reply

Answering Queries (05:24:29 WedDec 18 2002)

Hi there

There are two situations that I'm not clear on (especially relating to online bridge):

Case 1: Answering an opponent's question on a "normal" bid. For instance my partner opens 1♣ and I respond 1♠. LHO says "Please explain your bid" or words to that effect. I believe this to be an inappropriate question, but still, if it's asked, what is the best way to reply? The question could perhaps have been asked by someone who "knows no better", but in my experience, it's been known to carry somewhat more unethical connotations.

Case 2: My pard and I have a fairly involved bidding sequence and at some point, my LHO queries my last bid. Let's assume we have no clear cut agreement on the meaning of that bid - in other words, it's not part of a specific convention or agreement, it's "just bridge". I'm sure you know what I mean. Anyway, what's the best way to answer that one?

I don't want to answer the question in an unhelpful manner, but at the same time, don't feel I should have to disclose my interpretation of a bid, given that it might differ considerably from my partner's interpretation and might well be influenced by my actual hand! I always used to repond "we have no specific agreement about that bid" but I've been told that I *shouldn't* say that.

In face to face bridge, I don't think I've ever (nor do I expect to) get questioned on a simple one over one bid, as in the first case above.

The second situation crops up fairly regularly in f2f bridge though (except that this time, I'm asked about my **partner's bid** of course, rather than my own. My own interpretation of the bid depends to a large extent on (a) my hand, (b) the previous bidding and (c) by bidding "experience" (in the general sense, not specifically with this partner). Again, my feeling is that I should be able to answer "no special agreement", but is this the right thing to do?

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Answering Queries (11:55:35 WedDec 18 2002)

People ask questions of simple auctions for three basic reasons.

First, not everyone plays things the same, and there is a lot of ignorance. For example, in the sequence you quoted, 1♣ P 1♠, are you playing Standard American? If you are playing Acol, for example, it means exactly the same as in Standard, but the asker may not know that.

Of course, the nuances may be different to you. I asked not so long ago about a fourth suit sequence. I know exactly how I play it, but I had no idea whether my opponents played it the same way. They refused to answer, which was unacceptable.

Second reason for asking is just to put opponents off. While this is very rare, if you find opponents are **always** asking on every hand, how about looking for new opponents? In F2F the Director will stop harrassment.

The third reason is to establish a case for misinformation. There is little you can do about this sort of bridge lawyering except to grin and bear it. The Director will stop it in F2F bridge but you have no way of dealing with it in OLB.

So my advice is just answer the question, however inane, and do not worry unless it is continuous questioning.

As for your second question, answering "We have no special agreement" is absolutely fine, and several authorities have made this clear. If opponents moan, tell them they are wrong. But be clear, if you do have information, eg a similar sequence last week, tell them so, even if the sequence was not the same: that's partnership experience, and they have a right to know that.

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

James Vickers

Re: Answering Queries (20:02:18 ThuDec 19 2002)

Reply

Many players have difficulty answering questions on the basis of their partnership agreement alone, and let their own feeling for what is going on, or the cards they are holding influence their reply. This is partly because they feel uneasy about misleading their opponents if partner has most likely deviated from their agreed system, and partly because inappropriate questions are often asked.

E.g. your agreement is to play gambling 3NT opener based on a solid minor, but opposite partner's 3NT opener you find yourself holding high honours in both minors.

My mother (not accustomed to telling lies), would shift uncomfortably if asked, and say "Well....our *agreement* is...." leaving it clear to everyone that she knows her partner does not have the advertised hand.

My advice is to apply the "Zettel test" (German: Zettel = piece of paper). You should put out of your mind the cards you are holding or any other irrelevant information, and imagine someone had written the bidding sequence down on a piece of paper and asked you "What would this call mean in your system?" Answer accordingly (bearing in mind what David said about implicit agreements), and if the answer would be "undiscussed" or "no partnership agreement", so be it. This removes the temptation to try to interpret the call for the opponents when you don't have an agreement. You cannot say "I'm taking it to mean..." when you are faced with an abstract sequence on a piece of paper.

I also try to discourage inappropriate questioning. My partner has an unfortunate habit of pointing to the opening lead and asking "Fourth highest?" rather than "What are your lead styles?" This encourages unwary opponents to provide more information than he is entitled to. (They might reply "No, I don't think *that* card could be fourth highest, it's more likely to be...")

Likewise every time I play the game I hear the question: "What does the ten of hearts discard mean?" rather than "What system of discard signals are you playing?" or better still, finding out the opponents' methods from their convention card before the round begins.

I know I'm fighting a losing battle, but I keep trying.

James

<p>Amanda Doran</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Help? (11:20:41 ThuDec 19 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>How many games are played in a rubber of bridge?</p>
<p>James Vickers</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Help? (14:38:30 ThuDec 19 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>Hi Amanda. It's a long time since I played rubber bridge, but if I remember correctly a rubber is won by the first side to score two games. A game is won by a side which accumulates at least 100 points below the line (for tricks contracted for and made). Once a game has been scored, a line is drawn beneath the scores and "below the line" scoring starts afresh.</p> <p>In this respect it is similar to a three-set tennis match in which the first side to score two sets wins the match.</p> <p>I hope this helps rather than confuses, any form of bridge scoring is not easy to explain in a paragraph of text, it's something that's much more easily learned by doing.</p> <p>James</p>

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), 1 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 08:07:46 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](#)**

Gareth

Hesitation plus different explanations (19:57:08

FriDec 13 2002)









Reply

UK, Imp Teams of 4 KO match, Love All, Dlr W.

West	East
1D	1S
1N(15-17)	2C checkback
2H	3D
4C	4N
5C	5D after 5 min think
6D	

NS reserve their rights. While thinking about his lead, North asks about the bidding and the following discrepancy comes to light. According to West, 4NT was RKCB, 5C was 0/3. According to East, 4NT showed a bad hand for the bidding so far, and 5C was a further slam try with CK.

North leads HQ

 8	 AK109
 AK54	 72
 A864	 K1097
 A872	 J53

6D makes when North fails to split from SQJx at trick 2 and trumps split 3-2.

Please explain what should the ruling be?

Cheers
Gareth

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Hesitation plus different explanations (

00: 14: 34 TueDec 17 2002)

First of all, consider misinformation. N/S were not going to bid, and when North mis-defended he knew what declarer thought the bidding meant, so even if there was misinformation there was cklearly no damage.

It is difficult to beleive that West could possibly pass 5♦. Even with the hesitation surely no West would ever pass at this stage, so the result stands.

You might ask why it is sucha bad slam if West's bidding is evident. I really think East's actions show a degree of optimism that deserved a minus score. 😊

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), 1 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 08:08:08 Mon Sep 1 2003

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

top ↑

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

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

**Frances
Hinden**

**Appeals committee correct an incorrect
director's ruling?** (12:53:43 MonDec 9 2002)

Reply

Playing in a club heat of the National Pairs, I was nearly on an appeals committee for the following hand:

♠ x
♥ QJ98x
♦ KJ8
♣ KTxx

♠ KJ98
♥ Kx
♦ QTxx
♣ AQx

♠ 10xxx
♥ xxxxx
♦ xx
♣ xxx

♠ AQxx
♥ AT
♦ A9xx
♣ Jxx

Game all, matchpoints.

South opened 1D, West overcalled 1NT and North doubled. North then said 'oh sorry, I should have alerted the 1D'. The director was called, and discovered that the 1D could have been a short suit planning to rebid in NT (I assumed better minor, but I didn't get to hear any further details). The director told West he could change his call. West did, and the auction proceeded:

S	W	N	E
1D	1S	2H*	P
2NT	P	3NT	all pass

2H was alerted and described as non-forcing. South made 9 tricks in 3NT for 18 mps out of 24. West asked for a ruling, saying that South had made use of the fact he knew his partner had a maximum for the 2H bid because of the withdrawn double of 1NT. The director asked N/S about what sort of hand 2H showed, and eventually decided to let the score stand. West objected, and the director came and discussed the hand with us. When we discovered that she had already given a ruling (rather than was asking before ruling) we said she shouldn't change a ruling just because West doesn't like it; he could appeal if he wanted to. West did not appeal (West was a strong tournament player, the other 3 people at the

table were standard club players).

When we got round to looking at a rule book, it seemed to us that the director had been wrong in allowing West to change his 1NT call as it did not seem probable that he made the call as a result of misinformation (21B1). So my question is this: suppose E/W had appealed suggesting the contract should be 2H+2. Suppose that the appeals committee believe that the director had made an incorrect ruling earlier on the auction, even though that ruling is not being appealed. Do we adjust the score to 1NTx-3? East might feel aggrieved at this and say that at pairs he would pull the double of 1NT (or xx for rescue depending on their methods); 2Sx might only lose 500, gaining a few matchpoints over 3NT making.

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Appeals committee correct an incorrect director's ruling? (22:49:42 WedDec 11 2002)

Phew! 🌈 Bit complicated! 😊

First, the answer to the basic question. ACs may correct or amend any judgement ruling by the TD, but may not over-rule him on a matter of Law or Regulation. However, except when a TD suspends a player, an AC may hear a case and recommend to the TD that he should change his ruling - and it would have to be a TD very sure of his ground who ignored such advice.

Second, the withdrawn double was **authorised**, so the main reason for the ruling/appeal fails anyway. South was allowed to use the information from it.

Third, the TD should have told West he could change the call if it was because of the misinformation [the lack of alert]. Since he did not, we have Director error, and should consider a split score as a result, cconsidering both sides as non-offending.

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

James Vickers

Reply

Re: Appeals committee correct an incorrect director's ruling? (16:15:11 ThuDec 12 2002)

David, I don't have my rule book with me, so I might be missing something simple, but could you explain why the withdrawn double is authorized for South? NS are, after all, the offending side as it was their failure to alert which started this whole business.

I agree with Frances that the change of call was not based on the misinformation, but I think some directors might disagree and give EW as non-offenders the benefit of the doubt. I think, oddly enough, the outcome is dependent on whether the Director (not the AC) considers that West's first call was based on the misinformation.

If the TD judged that West would have made a different call given the correct information presumably the AC can overrule her on the exercising of her judgement. In this case the adjusted score is the most favourable likely absent the infraction to EW, the least favourable at all probable to NS.

If the TD was unaware of L21B1 and agrees with the AC that the change of call was not based on misinformation then she has made an error and law eighty-something (director's error) applies and both sides are considered non-offending.

As to which scores to award, I would need evidence that EW have an arranged rescue procedure (e.g. xx as you suggested) before allowing them to escape from 1NTX.

James

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Appeals committee correct an incorrect director's ruling? (23:29:30 MonDec 16 2002)

You are right, I seem to have confused the two sides, so the double is not authorised for N/S. 🤔

So I generally agree with you, except about the arranged rescue manoeuvre. Surely you do not need an agreement to bid 2D with a 4=4=2=3 and then redouble?

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), 1 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 08:08:37 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**

Peter

Revoke/penalty card (05:28:50 TueDec 10 2002)

Reply

Club Duplicate Bridge (Hong Kong)
The following incident happened last night. Would appreciate your ruling. S is the declarer in 1NT. Halfway through playing the hand S plays C10 from his hand. W plays S2 and dummy and E both discard. S now plays H7 and at this stage W drops, by accident, a card onto the table. It is C8. W now realizes, as do the rest of the players, that he has revoked. I now have to make a ruling. I believed that the revoke had not been established because W had not played to the next trick. Under normal circumstances the C8 would have been a minor penalty card. I stated that the revoke should be corrected and the S2 would become a major penalty card. I am not sure that this ruling is correct. Was the revoke established and can S change his H7 after W had corrected the revoke.

bluejak

Re: Revoke/penalty card (00:05:58 ThuDec 12 2002)

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Looks a perfect ruling to me. 🌈

A dropped card is not a played card. As you say, it is usually a minor penalty card, so the revoke must be corrected, the ♠2 becomes a major penalty card. The only slight addition is that cards by the non-offending side after the revoke may be changed, so not only may the ♥7 be changed, so may the discard from dummy on the previous round.

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

joe huser

howell movement (17:24:21 MonDec 9 2002)

[Reply](#)

We need yhe howell movement for three table, six pair, twenty boards.
Thank you
jhuser1@comcast.net

bergid

Re: howell movement (19:08:01 MonDec 9 2002)

offline

35 posts
bridgetalk member



[Reply](#)

Hi Joe,

You'll find the answer [in this thread](#). 🌈

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), 1 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 08:09:22 Mon Sep 1 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

[top](#) ↑

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

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



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

<p>Peter</p> <hr/> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Alerting a revoke (10:17:39 WedNov 27 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>I would appreciate your ruling on the following incident. S was declarer in 4H. E/W had both been bidding spades. W led a small spade. A spade was played from dummy and E trumped with a heart. S played a singleton King of spades. W showed surprise at E trumping a suit they had both been bidding. E realising his mistake announces that he has a spade and then plays the Ace of spades. As the revoke is not established the heart becomes a penalty card. S feels that if W had not indicated surprise then E might have led to the next trick and the revoke would have been establised. How would you rule on this?</p>
<p>JimO</p> <hr/> <p>offline 175 posts Forum Host</p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Alerting a revoke (14:57:02 WedNov 27 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>Where are you? In some juristictions, including the ACBL, a defender may ask his partner whether or not he has any cards of the suit led when he fails to follow suit. (See Law 61B).</p> <p>---</p> <p>-Jim O'Neil Oak Park, IL</p>
<p>bluejak</p> <hr/> <p>offline 435 posts Forum Host</p> <p>Reply</p>	<p>Re: Alerting a revoke (20:18:20 WedNov 27 2002)</p> <hr/> <p>Of course Jim is right. Generally it helps us give sensible answers to rulings when people give the countries they play bridge in because there are differences in the rules between countries.</p> <p>If you are in Zone 2 [North America], Zone 7 [Australia and New Zealand or part of Zone 8 [South Africa] then defenders are allowed to ask their partners whether they have any of the suit. In effect this is what happened here, so there would be no penalty.</p> <p>In the rest of the world they are not allowed to ask, whether directly or [as here] by inference, and Law 63B kicks in, which in effect means that the revoke is corrected but is treated for penalty purposes as though it was established.</p>

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

bluebird

Reply

Re: Alerting a revoke (20:53:48 FriDec 6 2002)

And what is the penalty? I do not andrestan this law very vell...

Thank you

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Alerting a revoke (21:21:20 SatDec 7 2002)

I do not blame you! It is a horrible Law! 😞

In Zone 1 [Europe] and several other Zones a defender may not ask his partner whether he has any more of the suit led. That is in Law 61B.

Let us suppose that hearts are led, a defender plays a club, and his partner asks "No hearts, partner?". If he has no hearts then no harm, no foul, though the defender should be told not to do so in future. But suppose he has a heart.

Now Law 63B [the Law which causes the trouble] says that the defender must change his club to a heart. The club stays on the table as a major penalty card. Any card played from by declarer or dummy after this revoke may be changed.

Despite the fact that the revoke has been corrected, Law 63B goes on to say that a penalty is assessed as though the revoke was established, so the normal penalty for a revoke is also assessed, one two or no tricks as appropriate.

Of course, with the major penalty card as well, this can on occasion lead to a loss of three tricks, which seems a very harsh penalty indeed. 😞

It has been suggested to the WBF laws Commission that in the new Law book this should be simplified by returning to the 1985 Law, which just said the revoke is established. That is much easier, and

can never cost more than two tricks. 🌈

If you want to find out which country is in which Zone there is a full list at http://blakjak.com/brg_lkn.htm

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), 1 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 08:09:55 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**

MartynK**Reply****Wrong Explanation** (09:41:42 TueDec 3 2002)

Pairs game in an English club. Game all, dealer West:

♠ 9 8 7 5
♥ A 8 6 3
♦ Q 6
♣ A J 6

♠ A
♥ J T 7 5 4
♦ K J T 9 8 4
♣ 3

♠ Q J T 6
♥ K 9
♦ A 7 3 2
♣ T 7 4

♠ K 4 3 2
♥ Q 2
♦ 5
♣ K Q 9 8 5 2

Bidding:

W	N	E	S
P	P	P	1C
2NT	DBLE	3D	P
4D	DBLE	P	P
P			

The 2NT bid was alerted. North asked the meaning before bidding and was told that it was 2 unspecified suits. After the bidding and before the lead West explained that the 2NT bid, in their system, showed a 2 suiter in Diamonds and Hearts. East/West did not have a completed convention card.

South was the playing director at the club. He said there would be no problem unless there was damage caused. East made 10 tricks. North claims that if he knows the 2 specified suits their methods are that he would bid 3 Hearts to show values and support for clubs. After this start they would allow East/West to play in a diamond part score undoubled. South, as playing director said he would ask for an independent ruling.

I would appreciate your views on how to rule. If an adjusted score is appropriate, what should it be?

Thanks in anticipation of your help,

Martyn

James Vickers

Re: Wrong Explanation (17:18:28 TueDec 3 2002)

Reply

North is entitled to a correct explanation of the opponent's methods. This he has not received, and so he is entitled to redress if he has been damaged by the misinformation. However, I would not entertain every claim for damage following misinformation.

North's claim for damage seems to be:

(i) As West's suits are not defined, a cue-bid is unavailable, so his choices are restricted to p, X (and possibly 3C).

(ii) If the suits had been defined he could have cue-bid to show values and support, presumably transferring the responsibility for doubling the final contract to partner.

My argument with this is that by taking the option of doubling on the first round, he has surely conveyed the information about his values to partner, so the second double is entirely on his own head and really has nothing to do with the misinformation. And if he tries to make any beef about his "support for partner", well he doesn't really have much more than tolerance for his partner's possible four-card suit, so I'm not too convinced about that line either.

I'm not convinced that the misinformation really made any difference to the final result, North should have taken heed of partner's pass over 3D. My ruling is: score stands, lecture to EW for forgetting / misexplaining their system (procedural penalty if they make a habit of this).

James

James Vickers

Reply

Re: Wrong Explanation (18:47:06 TueDec 3 2002)

When writing the above, I had assumed that the original explanation of "any two-suiter" is legal for a passed hand, but I have just checked the Orange Book and found this is not the case (at least up to level 4 competitions). As this explanation was incorrect (or is assumed to be), I don't think this makes any difference, but I'm not certain. North is claiming to have been damaged by an explanation of an agreement that the opponents are not allowed to play in any case.

James

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Wrong Explanation (18:53:48 TueDec 3 2002)

The reason that "any two-suiter" is not allowed [and it is not even allowed at Level 4] is precisely because of this problem. If the pair was playing it that way, the board should be cancelled, and Ave+ /Ave- given.

However, it seems more likely that it was misinformation, and this was the primary cause of the bad result. I would certainly adjust for E/W. However, North's final double is so awful as to be considered "wild or gambling" [probably both!] so I might consider a split score: N/S keep their score, adjust to some number of clubs for E/W.

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

James Vickers

Re: Wrong Explanation (14:25:20 WedDec 4 2002)

Reply

Hi David. When the phrase "wild and gambling" is used, it is to indicate that the chosen action was so bad that it has "broken the link of causality between the misinformation and the damage". My concern here (and in many other situations) is that there was never any such link to break. This is why I would not adjust for either side.

Do you really believe North is willing to venture to the four level at game all, pairs, on a possible 4-3 fit with barely the balance of the high-card points? This is what his claim implies. It seems to me more as if North is trying to dig himself out of a hole once he has seen he has made a poor decision.

I had to rule on an incident at a recent county teams tournament. I don't remember the exact hand, or the vulnerability, but it was something like:

KQx / Ax / AKQxx / xxx

After: (3C) - p - (3H) - ?

our man came in with 4D, then claimed damage after being left in, making eight tricks, when he discovered that the 3H bid was non-forcing (in which case it should have been alerted).

He tried to claim he would have doubled with the correct information, and that he only bid because he thought 3H was forcing. I was not convinced, as the forcing nature of the auction does not afford him any protection from 4DX-lots when he has made the wrong decision, and bidding 4D is quite likely to be wrong whatever the forcing nature of the opponents' auction. I am not happy that failure to alert in such cases opens the door to all manner of damage claims, especially as plaintiff and I seemed to be the only people in the room who were aware that the bid required an alert. (The ruling was appealed, TD's decision upheld.)

So in short, wild and gambling actions notwithstanding, the claim for damage has to be credible.

Is my line of thinking here reasonable, or totally out-of-line?

James

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Wrong Explanation (19:23:04 ThuDec 5 2002)

I believe you are completely right in the example you gave, James. The 4D bid is not based on the misinformation so there is no reason to adjust. 🌈

But in the example that started this thread, I believe that there is at least a reasonable possibility that if 2NT was explained as two specific suits the next player would have cue-bid, thus that side were damaged by the misinformation. Thus the offenders did gain from the misinformation and thus the result should be adjusted.

As explained earlier, since the later action was so awful, I would not adjust for the other side: not because there was no damage, but because the later action was wild or gambling. 😞

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), 1 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 08:10:16 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](#)**

Shuffler

ACBL Ruling against bid-box error (22:26:16
WedDec 4 2002)

Reply

Using bidding boxes in an ACBL sanctioned game in a local club:

East bid 1H, South bid (2S) [AKxxxxx void xxx Qxx].

West asks North if 2NT is unusual.

North says YES

South now notices he put down 2NT, not 2S and says OOPS.

Director called and ruled unauthorized information and South may not correct his oops. Also because West brought it to South's attention.

1. Isn't South allowed to change his bid up until the time his partner bids when the misbid is mechanical?

2. Isn't this also true even though the misbid was "learned" from an opponent's questioning?

Thank you,
Shuffler

AlanW

Re: ACBL Ruling against bid-box error (09:19:57
ThuDec 5 2002)

Reply

Your understanding coincides with the conclusions of the recent discussion here in the thread 'Change of Call'. If you read that thread you will see that the circumstances in which a player realises he has pulled the wrong bid can lead people to assume it affects the ruling, but this appears to be a misconception.

Quote: bluejak

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.