	Leading from wrong hand	1	63	Ed 23:48:14 Sat Aug 9 2003
	Svan Response To One Club - GCC	3	118	Tim Goodwin 04:11:53 Sat Aug 9 2003
	Dropped Card	2	95	James Vickers 16:34:43 Fri Aug 8 2003
	misinformation case	5	169	bluejak 00:01:01 Thu Aug 7 2003
	bluffing with 2c strong opening	5	139	Earl_Purple 08:29:10 Wed Aug 6 2003
	dummy calls director	7	161	bluejak 02:08:50 Mon Aug 4 2003
	results in pairs	1	68	bluejak 06:56:35 Thu Jul 31 2003
	Talking about alerts...	6	260	bluejak 06:34:08 Thu Jul 31 2003
	hesitation	3	118	Ray 05:25:39 Wed Jul 30 2003
	results in pairs	2	73	Jon 04:57:34 Wed Jul 30 2003
	party bridge scoring rules	2	83	Guest 05:24:35 Mon Jul 28 2003
	alerting limit raises in comp?	3	126	Ed 19:19:48 Wed Jul 23 2003
	The ole 1NT with singleton	6	208	mycroft 23:00:55 Tue Jul 22 2003
	Misinformation?	5	171	Ed 15:21:37 Wed Jul 17 2002
	Alerting/non Alerting rules wrt to low level doubles	1	67	RMB 11:48:22 Wed Jun 11 2003
	Party bridge scoring	3	118	bluejak 17:06:18 Mon Jul 21 2003
	Definition of an honour	4	83	Ed 19:44:31 Sun Jul 20 2003
	Limitations On And Alerting Of Weak 2s For GCC	2	118	mycroft 15:43:26 Fri Jul 18 2003
	scoring with a half table	1	81	RMB 13:56:50 Thu Jul 17 2003

Neal Holub

Reply

5 table bridge (15:28:41 FriAug 8 2003) Select Action

Country: usa

I am looking for a five table movment so men do not play together for four rounds of bridge. I can find 3 table and two table but not five Reply to JoeDhobo@aol.com

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: 5 table bridge (23:57:46 SatAug 9 2003) Select Action

See here:
http://www.bridgeguys.com/MGlossary/Movement5Tables.html

Sorry, replies to questions asked here are made here.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

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

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:27:50 Fri Aug 29 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

bulletjoe2

Reply

Leading from wrong hand (21:02:02 SatAug 9 2003) Select Action

Country: usa

I am playing a hand, and lead from the wrong position. Opponent covers and then calls for a lead from the proper hand. Any penality..what do we do?

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Leading from wrong hand (23:48:14 SatAug 9 2003) Select Action

If this is duplicate bridge, you call the director.

When your opponent covers your lead from the wrong hand, he has accepted that lead. He cannot now require you to lead from the correct hand. However, which laws apply and the effects thereof depend on which opponent covered your lead.

If the LHO of the hand from which you led covered, then the lead stands and the trick progresses from that point (Law 53). There is no penalty. LHO may not retract his played card (Law 47).

If the RHO covered, then his played card becomes a penalty card (Law 57) and you may (a) require his partner to play his highest card of the suit led, (b) play his lowest card of the suit led, or (c) not play a card of any other suit you specify. If he cannot comply with this penalty (e.g., you pick (a) or (b) and he has no card of that suit, or you pick (c) and he **does** have a card of the suit led, then Law 59 applies, and he can make any legal play.

Note: the law cites above refer to the duplicate laws. I haven't checked the rubber laws, but I believe they're similar. You can check them online at
http://www.math.auc.dk/~nwp/bridge/laws/rlaws-a/

pbleighton

offline
103 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Svan Response To One Club - GCC (10:30:12 SunJun 15 2003)

Select Action

Country: USA

Svan is a Swedish ystem where 1C is either 11-13 balanced or 17+ any shape, and thus doesn't qualify for the 15+ hcp response exemption. The response structure to an opening of one club specifies that all hands with 8+ hcp and a 4 card major respond 1 of a major, even if, say, there a 4 spades and 7 clubs. You only respond 2 of a minor, 1NT, etc. without 4 in a major.

The GCC says that a response is natural if it show 4+ in a major. Does this mean a canape response is legal?

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Svan Response To One Club - GCC (22:55:27 SunJun 15 2003)

Select Action

I'm not entirely certain, but I believe a canapé response is legal.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Svan Response To One Club - GCC (01:22:50 MonJun 16 2003)

Select Action

I am convinced that your methods are GCC legal. For a start canape is not mentioned under 'Disallowed' so it should be allowed. Secondly some players have played canape openings without difficulty.

But the final reason to convince me is that if playing Walsh-type resonses a 1♥ or 1♠ response to 1♣ may conceal a much longer ♦ suit. These are certainly legal, so if they are permitted under GCC so are your responses.

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

Tim Goodwin

Reply

Re: Svan Response To One Club - GCC (04:11:53 SatAug 9 2003)

Select Action

Country: USA

While Svan 1M responses ot 1C are GCC, the 2H response showinf invitational or better with both minors is not GCC legal. Artificial responses (except 1D) must be game forcing.

Tim

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

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

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

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:28:56 Fri Aug 29 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

magebhardt

offline
3 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Dropped Card (19:38:13 TueAug 5 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

In the play of a hand declarer leads a heart. LHO drops a small club on the table and says sorry I have a heart. Declarer wins that trick and promptly plays the queen of clubs upon which LHO plays the king of clubs. Declarer now calls the director and demands that LHO be forced to play the small club card. What is the correct ruling at the table.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Dropped Card (00:03:25 WedAug 6 2003) Select Action

I would probably penalise declarer for deliberate bridge lawyering. He sounds the sort of player we can do well without.

When the club was dropped the Director should have been called. Failure to do so, and then waiting until an advantage is likely to be gained, and then calling the Director is just not acceptable.

Fortunately there is a Law for people like this, 11A, which means the Director now need not enforce the penalty. Furthermore, he can deem the card dropped not a penalty card - see Law 50.

So the correct ruling is to tell the defender to put the little club back in his hand, and tell declarer that if he wants his rights under the Laws he should call the Director, not rule himself.

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

James Vickers

Reply

Re: Dropped Card (16:34:43 FriAug 8 2003) Select Action

Country: UK

In addition to everything David has said, with which I entirely agree, if the small club was indeed dropped (i.e. not played intentionally) it was destined to become a minor penalty anyway and offender would have been well within his rights to take the queen of clubs with the king.

James

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

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

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:29:14 Fri Aug 29 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**

djn

Reply

misinformation case (07:22:09 SatAug 2 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

Hi all,
North: Kxx KQJx Ax Kxxx
South: Jxxx x xxx AQxxx

West: ATxx xx KQJT9x J
East: Qx AT9xxx xx xxx

North opens 1N 15-17, East passes, South responds 2C stayman, West (30 mp) bids 2D. East (300 mp) alerts it as capp for the majors. North shrugs and bids 2H. East passes. South bids 2S (intended as forcing, when asked later). North passes. N-S go down 2 for -200 and a bad score. I the mis-director am called after the hands are known.

E-W's convention card is marked just normally as Capp, and even though E-W are a relatively new partnership, I think it isn't even rub of the green where nobody knows anything. So there is MI I said.

But the score adjustement. I think N-S kind of did themselves in a bit by even starting the stayman ball rolling (how would South safely stop?). So I was inclined to let N-S keep their result and E-W get some other score. But since I couldn't figure out what should have happened, I ended up going for ye olde Av+/Av-.

Your thoughts?

Dan

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: misinformation case (13:12:00 MonAug 4 2003) Select Action

First of all, "ye olde Av+/Av-" is illegal, and has been for years. Either there is an infraction and damage, in which case you work out an assigned score, or there isn't, in which case the score stands.

Second, was there misinformation? The Law book instructs you to assume there was without compelling reason to suppose otherwise - and there is no such reason otherwise. They clearly have no agreement to play capp here.

Third, "did themselves in a bit" is not sufficient reason to deny redress. N/S are in a situation caused by an infraction by opponents. Even in North America, where people are least sympathetic to the non-offenders, you only deny redress where there has been a complete failure to play bridge, an egregious error.

Fourth, before ruling, you find out all the facts. You say "how would South safely stop?" - that's easy, you ask him! You should find out what he was going to call next if opponents had passed.

Fifth, there was misinformation. Now, was there damage caused by it? This is the problem - it is not immediately obvious that there was. What would have happened without the 2♦ bid? Personally, I am inclined to think the auction might have been the same. So, what would have happened if N/S had been told 2♦ was natural? Perhaps North would have bid 2NT. OK, that's good enough.

Sixth, what would happen in 2NT? East might lead a heart or a club - he is not allowed to "know" 2♦ is natural - and eight tricks now make. So I would rule 2NT making.

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

djn

Reply

Re: misinformation case (13:32:14 MonAug 4 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

Hi all,
Thank you very much for the correction. Would the AI for East that North holds 4 hearts and he has 6 hearts allow him to reason a diamond lead?

Thanks,
Dan

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: misinformation case (13:53:48 MonAug 4 2003) Select Action

Not from a ruling point of view: when you adjust you give the benefit of any doubt to the non-offenders. Sure, he might not lead a heart, but that is no particular reason to lead a diamond.

If there was no infraction then a diamond lead might be a reasonable guess, certainly.

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

James Vickers

Reply

Re: misinformation case (18:43:50 WedAug 6 2003) Select Action

Country: UK

I have some misgivings about David's adjustment to 2NT=. North bid 2H after being told that West held both majors. David's ruling seems to be based on the assumption that North would be LESS likely to make that bid if told that 2D were natural. Even if North is very experienced and let himself get rattled by the explanation, I don't buy this argument.

Another aspect of this case which I don't understand is why East did not bid 4H, knowing they have a 10 or 11-card fit. If this doesn't make it will surely be a good sacrifice. It seems a little suspicious to me that East can explain a bid in a situation fraught with doubt and

then fail to act as if this explanation were correct.

East can say that North's 2H bid put him off bidding, an argument which has some validity, but doesn't East have a duty to assume that partner's rather than the opponents' bidding is pure as the driven snow in case of doubt? It looks rather like a fielded psyche or misbid (except that there was no psyche, or misbid).

I would love to adjust to 4HX-2 by East, but I don't think the laws allow it. Given the correct explanation, North would still bid 2H, East can hardly be misled by the infraction (his own explanation), so unless I felt moved to issue a PP to East for offering dubious explanations, I think I would have to let the table result stand and give East a warning.

James

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: misinformation case (00:01:01 ThuAug 7 2003) Select Action

My ruling was based on North rebidding 2NT over 2♠, not on him not bidding 2♥. sorry if I did not make this clear.

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] [>]

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

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:29:28 Fri Aug 29 2003

guest

Reply

bluffing with 2c strong opening (20:16:29 SatAug 2 2003) Select Action

I am interested if it is allowed to bluff with 2c as strong GF opening. Thanks a lot.

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: bluffing with 2c strong opening (00:32:22 SunAug 3 2003) Select Action

It will depend on where you are, and you didn't say. In the ACBL, "bluffing" (we call it "psyching") by making an artificial or conventional opening bid when your hand doesn't meet the requirements for that bid is violation of the convention regulations (on the General Convention Chart). So in the ACBL, no it's not allowed. Other jurisdictions may have other rules.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: bluffing with 2c strong opening (01:53:20 MonAug 4 2003) Select Action

We do ask people to put their country when asking questions - there is a little box especially for it. Just enter your country, or put Online if it is an online query. Many question shave different answers in different jurisdictions.

As Ed says this is one such question. It is not allowed to psyche a game-forcing or near-game-forcing artificial bid in England or Wales, but that may not be true in other countries.

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

Earl_Purple

offline
79 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: bluffing with 2c strong opening (19:33:18 TueAug 5 2003)

Select Action

You might be allowed though to play the 2♣ opening as 2-way, either

strong, game force or
weak with diamonds.

Partner will respond 2♦ whenever he doesn't mind a pass.

Whether this method would be allowed depends on where you are and the "level" of this method.

In the UK, many multi bids are allowed with both strong and weak options at level 3 (I think) so my guess is that this convention would be that level. No doubt you'll use 2♦ for some other purpose eg also a multi (weak 2 in either major possibly with a strong option) or as flannery. If you play it as the multi then your 2♥ and 2♠ bids would probably be "tartan" (5 cards + 5 in lower ranking suit) or possibly a strong bid.

Why it is important for me to list these variations of the other bids is so that you are sure to check the "level" of those bids too before you employ them.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: bluffing with 2c strong opening (23:56:21 TueAug 5 2003)

Select Action

In the UK only the traditional Multi, with a weak hand that can hold either hearts or spades, or a strong hand, is allowed at Level 3. The 2♣ bid you mention is allowed at Level 4 - though we have quite a lot of level 4 competitions.

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

Earl_Purple

offline
79 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: bluffing with 2c strong opening (08:29:10 WedAug 6 2003)

Select Action

In case people wonder why the traditional multi is permitted at level 3, this is historic:

- Acol 2 bids were very popular and people didn't want to give them up, but liked the idea of weak 2 opening bids. Thus they did give up the acol 2 bid in diamonds for the "multi" version.

- Those who adopted the multi were often players who were otherwise inexperienced with conventions and not always aware about licensing.

- It was considered that the multi in its traditional form was widespread enough that opponents could expect to come up against it and would therefore have a defence prepared.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

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

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:29:46 Fri Aug 29 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**

Ray Crowe

Reply

dummy calls director (01:22:16 ThuJul 31 2003) Select Action

Country: New Zealand

As a playing Director, you are called to a table where a defender has a Major penalty card on the table and his partner is on lead. You were not called at the time of the original infraction.

Now you are told that it is dummy (he knew all about law 50D2 who called the Director.
How do you rule?

Jon

Reply

Re: dummy calls director (02:12:44 ThuJul 31 2003) Select Action

Under Law 9B1b, "Any player, including dummy, may summon the Director after attention has been drawn to an irregularity." You say that one of the defenders has a major penalty card on the table, so it seems likely that, at some earlier point in the hand, that defender revoked, called attention to his own revoke, corrected it, and on his own initiative determined the card wrongly played to be a major penalty card (this is a common practice where I play although of course the Director should really be called at the time of the revoke). Assuming this to be the case, attention has been drawn to an irregularity and dummy is as entitled as any other player to call the Director, so the fact that it was dummy who called the Director does not affect the ruling. But of course you should ascertain the facts as there are other possible explanations as to how that major penalty card got there.

That still leaves the question of how to rule, given that you were not properly summoned at the time of the initial irregularity. Some Directors I know get very prickly about this point in this precise situation, but if the facts are as hypothesized above, and assuming the revoker's partner is on lead but has not yet led, I would apply Law 50D2 as usual; that is, declarer may require or forbid the lead of the suit of the penalty card (in which case the penalty card is picked up) or declarer may allow allow any lead (in which case the penalty card remains a penalty card).

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: dummy calls director (06:48:50 ThuJul 31 2003) Select Action

Sorry, Jon, I do not agree with your answer at all. Attention was drawn to an irreguarity, you postulate, all four players were required to call the TD, and none of them did.

Now at a later stage dummy calls the TD at a time when it is likely to be advantageous to his side. The fact that declarer did not call even at this later stage means he may easily be unaware of his options, and dummy is trying to play the hand for him.

I would issue a large procedural penalty to dummy, at least half a top, designate the card as not a peanlty card at all under Law 50 [first sentence], tell the player to pick it up, and tell all four players in future to call the TD at the correct time.

It is very important to stop dummies from playing declarer's cards for him: you **must** strongly discourage this.

Even if declarer had called I would not allow declarer his lead options. The defenders had a right to know them before they played on after the penalty card. Declarers who do not call the TD until they want their lead options are trying to gain an unfair advantage and must be stopped.

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

Ray

Reply

Re: dummy calls director (23:19:28 SatAug 2 2003) Select Action

Country: New Zealand

I don't think shooting the messenger is the way to go.
How do you rule if dummy had waited until the end of play to call you? Probably 40/40.
Calling the Director when he did was not the correct thing for dummy to do, but waiting until the end of play was only going to esculate the problem. Less visual evidence and more arguement for the Director to cope with.
As Jon pointed out with his analises and ruling, the Director actually has the opportunity to restore some sort of equity at this point and let the game of bridge carry on.

By all means throw in a pp. if you wish, but why just pick on poor old dummy.
The defenders, in their own right, have already breached Laws 9B1, 10A and 50D2.
This has to be a consideration in any ruling by the Director.

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: dummy calls director (00:27:16 SunAug 3 2003) Select Action

This isn't a case of shooting the messenger. Dummy commited an infraction. If he "knew all about Law 50D2", it seems likely he also knew about Law 43A1. So I think David's right about the PP, at least.

You can't rule "40/40". A result will be obtained at the table (you're not gonna just stop play right there), so you cannot award an artificial adjusted score. As for escalating the problem, well, maybe and maybe not, but the director is required to deal with that, if it happens, because he is required to direct the game in accordance with the laws. He can't accept a violation of those laws just because he thinks it'll be easier for him.

All four players have breached 9B1. The defenders are no more guilty of that than are the declaring side. And if the defenders have breached 10A, so have their opponents. As for 50D2, I don't see how they can be held to have breached that, since the PC is only now at the point of disposition.

Law 81C6 requires the TD to rectify an irregularity of which he becomes aware, regardless **how** he becomes aware. So the TD has to deal with the "penalty card". We don't know how it got there. We should ask. David rules that it's **not** a penalty card, and he does so because, I gather, he believes dummy has gone way too far in his efforts to help declarer. On reflection, so do I. But an investigation **might** turn up some reason to let the PC stand, and make a Law 50D2 ruling. So, like I said, the TD should investigate.

Ray

Reply

Re: dummy calls director (03:18:57 SunAug 3 2003) Select Action

Country: New Zealand

My intentions of this post is to for me to understand the reasons for David's ruling and sort out a few unanswered questions
(a) The initial infraction is the MPC. How did it get there? We are not told.
The fact that play has continued means that both sides have breached Laws 9B1 and 10A and so are equally guilty at this point. That's where the first infraction was and that's where I believe the Director should focus on for his ruling. Anything after that was a consequence.
David may have his reasons for not starting at the beginning of the events.

(b) If dummy had not called the Director,would it be consisered an irregularity for the declarer not to have stated his options, as allowed under Law 50D2, before the defender lead to the next trick?

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: dummy calls director (06:52:39 SunAug 3 2003) Select Action

Well, these are my thoughts on your questions.

The initial infraction is **not** the MPC - it's whatever led to the MPC. The irregularities here are:

1. whatever led the players to decide that the card was an MPC.
2. failure to call the TD when attention was drawn to (1).
3. players making their own ruling, without calling the TD
4. dummy calling the TD at a later point.

Once the TD is called, though, he has to make a ruling. Since it seems that dummy, at least, wants declarer to take advantage of law 50D, and since dummy is not allowed, and should not be allowed, to make that happen, I would deal, as David did, with the original irregularity (1) above, by taking the option allowed to me by Law 50, and designating the "MPC" as no penalty card at all. And I would, as David did, issue a significant PP to the declaring side to deter dummy from trying this again. As for irregularities #s 2 and 3, I consider those less serious than #4. David did not suggest a PP for them, and he tells me that I'm too free with PPs for those kinds of infractions, but I think at least a warning would be appropriate, again hoping to deter further "player rulings". As for David's

reasons, I'm sure he'll explain them himself.

In answer to your second question, for declarer to "state his options" is for him to make his own ruling, which he cannot do. So it would be an irregularity for him to do so, rather than for him not to do so as you suggest.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: dummy calls director (02:08:50 MonAug 4 2003) Select Action

I do not understand what the TD would have to "sort out at the end". If there was an MPC without the TD's knowledge, and if everyone assumed it had to be played at the first legal opportunity, which is what a lot of players assume, and if this is what happened then if the TD was called at the end he would do nothing. 40/40 is unnecessary: score stands is clear.

But the disadvantage of not calling the TD at the right time is the additional options when partner gets on lead. Players often are ignorant of this bit of the Law. Occasionally the declarer's side know about them and the defenders do not, and if they cannot be bothered to call the TD then we do not allow these options at a later date - see Law 11A.

This case is much worse: **dummy** wants to play the hand! That is awful!

The best use for dummy is to send him to the bar where he can do no harm.

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] [>]

albert Ohana

Reply

results in pairs (06:15:11 ThuJul 31 2003) Select Action

Country: FRANCE

Hi all

Many thanks for your answers
I have another question please
Sat we have 10 tables , 2O boards played. The top is 18, the total points is 90x20 = 1800
Suppose one pair obtains the top on each board, that is a total of 18x2O = 360. His percentage is 100%. How can we obtain this result in calculating the rapport of 360 with 1800 ?
Best regards
Al. Ohana

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Results in pairs (06:56:35 ThuJul 31 2003) Select Action

You should stop worrying about how many matchpoints are available in the whole event - the FFB do not charge for them, surely?

Percentages are based on a pair's total score over their total possible score. In your example their total possible score is 360, their total score is 360. 360/360x100=100, and that is their percentage.

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] [>]

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

[]

Reply

Talking about alerts... (16:46:21 FriNov 15 2002) Select Action

If we are playing
1 NT - 2 C
2 D - 2 H (=pass/correct to S)

which bid is to be alerted:
- 2 C
- 2 H
- 2 C and 2 H?

Thanks a lot.
Katarina

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Talking about alerts... (16:56:25 FriNov 15 2002) Select Action

Alerting **especially** we need to know where you are, I am afraid: the alerting regulations differ from country to country.

In England and Wales, 2♣ is alertable, so is 2♦, since both are non-natural. I do not think 2♥ is, though it is interesting, showing spades and hearts!

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

Guest

Reply

Re: Talking about alerts... (14:48:23 TueJul 8 2003) Select Action

Country: Scotland

Here in Scotland the sequence describe shows a weak hand with 5H and 4S, with 1NT, 2c, 2d, 2s showing a weak hand with 5S and 4H. 2H and 2S are not here

martynk

offline
2 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Talking about alerts... (08:15:52 WedJul 9 2003) Select Action

Country: England

In our style the sequence:

1NT.....2C
2D 2S

Does not show 4 hearts, just 5 spades. So we alert this as most people would expect 4 hearts from the use of Stayman. Since this could affect choice of opening lead and defence strategy we alert, but I don't know if this is really necessary

[2 edits; Last edit by martynk at 08:18:20 Wed Jul 9 2003]

Martyn

mycroft

offline
67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Talking about alerts... (15:20:51 WedJul 9 2003) Select Action

Canada

In ACBLland, as far as I can work out, no treatment of this auction is Alertable (except if it's short-suit showing, I guess, a la Smolen). Doesn't matter if it's both majors, bad hand, INV with 5, INV with 5-4, ... I'm sure if you did Alert it (especially if it were not bailout, most common here) nobody would complain. And you are encouraged, no matter what the agreement is, whether or not you Alerted it, to give a quick explanation before the opening lead (provided you bought the contract, of course).

Allow me to (what is it, third?) David's request that all Alerting queries post the country of origin (more specifically, their Sponsoring organization - WBF's Alerting rules different from ACBL different from BBO different from OKBridge, as a potential example in my case). As you can see from these responses, it makes a *huge* difference.

Michael.

paleale

offline
1 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Talking about alerts... (20:19:21 WedJul 30 2003)

Select Action

Country: Canada

I believe that the 2 Heart bid is alertable in ACBL-land.
It's a new suit Non-forcing at the 2 level.
Normal treatments would have this bid mean 5+ hearts, 4 spades, and forcing.
In addition, playing this as non-forcing is just asking for trouble when the opponents are caught unawares. I would never consider not alerting this bid.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Talking about alerts... (06:34:08 ThuJul 31 2003)

Select Action

Even in the ACBL I do not think that "most" pairs play 2♥ as forcing. I think it is ambiguous enough not to worry.

Alert it if you like - it will not do much harm.

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] [>]

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

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:30:56 Fri Aug 29 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

Ray Crowe

Reply

hesitation (09:43:28 TueJul 29 2003) Select Action

Country: New Zealand

Dealer: East
Vul: E/W

East; A732, A2, AQT43, 82.
South; Q865, KT98, 92, J75.
West; 94, J64, KT6, K9643.
North: KJT, Q753, 875, AQT.

The bidding,
East South West North
1D p 1NT X
p 2H p* p
3D all pass.

* an agreed hesitation of at least 20 seconds.

Do you allow East's bid of 3D?

Thanks,

Ray.

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: hesitation (21:49:30 TueJul 29 2003) Select Action

Certainly. The laws don't provide for disallowing it. They do provide for adjusting the score if

a) Unauthorized Information (UI) was conveyed to a player
b) That player chose from amongst logical alternatives one that could have been demonstrably suggested by the UI
c) the opponents were damaged thereby.

The slow tempo of West's pass suggests that he was considering some other action. Given his previous bidding, it seems to me it suggests that he has some support for diamonds, but is concerned about East's holding in that suit. So for East, bidding diamonds seems to me to be "demonstrably suggested", given his good five card diamond suit. Does East have a logical alternative to 3♦? Seems to me pass fits that bill. So two of the three criteria are fulfilled. Were N/S damaged by the bid? I dunno. What happened when it was played out? If, as seems likely from the posted hands,

E/W made 3♦, while N/S can make 2 or 3 ♥, I'd say yes, they were damaged. So I'd adjust the score to 2♥ making 3, +140 to N/S. Laws 73F1, 16, and 12C2. Also, Law 83 requires the players be notified of their right to appeal.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: hesitation (01:51:09 WedJul 30 2003) Select Action

Ed's right, of course, but it is a generally accepted piece of slang to talk of disallowing a call when it is meant that the TD disallows it afterwards when ruling.

Otherwise I agree with Ed, subject to two provisos.

First, the hand has two ♦Ts and no ♦J. If the ♦ J is actually with opener then he is getting closer to having an obvious bid of 3♦ - but I do not really think so. I expect it does not affect it.

Second, if this is in a place where Law 12C3 is enabled then I believe that my ruling would be

.. 70% of NS +140
+ 30% of NS +110

The trouble wiht this is that I have seen writing by the NZ CTD which suggests that while NZ does use Law 12C3 they do not follow the rest of the world: they just pick a random score. So perhaps the correct ruling in NZ **only** is NS +130.

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

Ray

Reply

Re: hesitation (05:25:39 WedJul 30 2003) Select Action

Country: NZ

West has KJ6 of diamonds
East has AQT43 of diamonds

Thanks for your comments.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

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

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:31:12 Fri Aug 29 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

albert Ohana

Reply

results in pairs (13:01:42 TueJul 29 2003) Select Action

Country: FRANCE

Hi all

Does a rule exist to calculate the sum of the results in percentages (adding NS and EW) in rapport with the number of parcipants? I mean if there is ten tables, therefore 2O results, is the total of percentages in relation with the number of tables ?
Many thanks in advance
Best regards
Al. Ohana

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: results in pairs (01:34:42 WedJul 30 2003) Select Action

No, this does not sound right, though I am not quite sure what you mean. Results in pairs tournaments are generally either shown in matchpoints, which means you have to adjust for pairs who play different numbers of boards, or in percentages of the pair's score divided by the total possible score available.

I believe percentages are much better once players are used to them. It means that a 60% game, for example, is pretty good, but not usually a win, whatever the numbers of pairs or boards.

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

Jon

Reply

Re: results in pairs (04:57:34 WedJul 30 2003) Select Action

On each board, if N/S get x% of the available matchpoints, E/W get (100-x)%. So adding all the percentage scores on any one board for all pairs in both directions should yield a total of 100 times the number of pairs in one direction. The same should therefore be true of adding all the final percentages for all pairs. So taking the example given of a 10 table game, the sum of the final percentages of all pairs in both directions should be 1000.

This assumes a one-section game in which there are the same number of pairs in each direction, all pairs play the same number of boards, and there are no non-offsetting adjusted scores or procedural penalties.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

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

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:31:30 Fri Aug 29 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

Richard Goodnou

Reply

party bridge scoring rules (19:37:12 FriJul 25 2003) Select Action

Country: usa

How do you keep score in party bridge?

jnichols

offline
6 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: party bridge scoring rules (17:58:50 SatJul 26 2003) Select Action

Country: USQ

There are LOTS of ways. One very common way is called "Chicago" and is described in a recent post on this forum.

A slightly different way that is perhaps a bit older is to score as in Rubber Bridge but curtail the play of a round after four hands. Sometimes this is a partial game, sometimes it is a partial rubber, sometimes it is two rubbers.

I am sure there are plenty of other methods as well.

What is the "right" way. However the players in the group have been doing it for years. If you are starting a new group I suggest you use Chicago since it is common and is well documented.

John S. Nichols
Northside Bridge Center
Indianapolis, IN, USA

Guest

Reply

Re: party bridge scoring rules (05:24:35 MonJul 28 2003)

Select Action

Country: Singapore

In some games here they play a 'duplicate chicago'. You only score plus if you make more tricks than what is required of your partnership total HCP. Example, if your partnership have 29 HCP and playing in 3NT, you are required to make 10 tricks or more before you can score the game. If you made only 9 the opponents score it as one down.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

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

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:31:51 Fri Aug 29 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

DN

Reply

alerting limit raises in comp? (20:13:24 MonJul 21 2003)

Select Action

Country: USA

Hi all,
In the ACBL now, any weak jump raise in a contested auction is not alertable. Does that mean that the old limit jump raise is alertable?

Thanks,
Dan

mycroft

offline
67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: alerting limit raises in comp? (23:09:33 TueJul 22 2003)

Select Action

The new convention card has no "red" natural treatments of double raise after overcall - which is a good indicator that it is not Alertable no matter what the strength range.

The Alert pamphlet says that any treatment that is "unexpected" is Alertable. I do not believe that either preemptive or limit raises in competition is "unexpected" - it may be in a particular community, but the Pamphlet also says "in historical usage, not local geographic usage".

I used to Alert all preemptive jump raises in competition, because I couldn't remember that 1S-X-3S weak was "expected", but 1H-1S-3H weak was "unexpected". Nobody had a problem with that - and if you wish to Alert your limit raises now, I don't expect anyone would mind either. But I think this is one of those things that is so much "could be either" that you have to ask or check the CC. Note: this may easily have been the intent of the ACBL Laws Committee!

Michael.

jomurdock

offline
1 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: alerting limit raises in comp? (18:32:54 WedJul 23 2003) Select Action

Is this ftf or online bridge? In ftf I have a problem with people alerting bids that aren't alertable. I sometimes think they are alerting their partners! This could be true in this case for instance with a pickup partner. You aren't sure what partner plays so you alert questionable bids hoping for a chance to "explain" how you understood the bid. Is that paranoid or what?

It's a little easier with online bridge where partner doesn't see the alerts. However, I think alerting slows down the game and people should check cc's first and then ask if they need to.

In answer to the original question - Neither limit in comp nor weak in comp are alertable.

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: alerting limit raises in comp? (19:19:48 WedJul 23 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

The CC is an indicator, but is not definitive. The regulation is definitive. If they conflict, the CC is, by definition, wrong.

As has been said, limit raises in competition are not alertable in the ACBL.

Generally speaking, it's easier on the blood pressure *not* to assume that opponents are cheating. If it becomes blatant, that's a different story, but I would tend to assume most players are honest until there is definite evidence otherwise. Aside from that, some people honestly think that alerts are for partner's benefit. They're wrong, but the answer to that is education (for which you should call the TD and let him do it, assuming there is one).

Alerting may slow down the game, but opponents are entitled to full disclosure, and alerts are part of that.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

Shuffler

Reply

The ole 1NT with singleton (00:56:11 FriJul 18 2003)

Select Action

Country: USA

♠A ♥AK654 ♦A742 ♣532

This player bid 1NT. This player ALWAYS bids 1NT with a singleton whenever the hand is in the 15-17 HCP range. Her partners know this is a real possibility but bid "normally." They do not have bids to uncover a singleton.

Opponents are agitated whether defending or in some cases declaring. Holding a singleton is unexpected. Does this fall into ACBL's "generally no singleton?"

Would alerting a 1NT bid solve everyone's problem or my preference, may we get this player to stop bidding 1NT with a singleton when there is no bridge reason.

Thank you
Shuffler

mycroft

offline
67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: The ole 1NT with singleton (16:21:55 FriJul 18 2003)

Select Action

Here's what the ACBL has to say about NT with a singleton, from "A Player's Guide":

Quote:

> If your notrump opening shows a balanced hand, you may occasionally pick up a hand with a singleton which you may want to treat as balanced. You may use your bridge judgment to open or overcall a notrump with a singleton, provided that:
>
> 1. It is a rare occurrence (no more than 1% of the time), and
>
> 2. Partner expects you to have at least two cards in each suit, and,

> 3. You and your partner have no agreements which enable you to discover the NT opener has a singleton.

It goes on to say that, especially if the singleton is the A or K, and if moving one card would produce a 4-4-3-2 distribution (so, 4-4-4-1 or 5-4-3-1 with a weak 5-card suit), tolerance should be applied.

The hand presented is unusual - though if the red suits were switched, it is almost exactly the example given in the "guide".

What to do about it strongly depends on whether you are a player (talk to the TD and do what she says), the TD (do the right thing), or club management (assuming this is at a club - ACBL clubs have wide discretion in what bidding and play conventions they will allow or not allow).

If this happens at a GCC tournament, then the TDs will definately do the right thing - provided they know about both the occurrance and the frequency. If you are a player and this happens at a tournament, call the TD - politely! - and report it. Just report it. Don't get angry, don't demand an adjustment, don't do any "he can't do that" business. Just "I just wanted to let you know that he opened 1NT on board 14".
You might get an adjustment, if the TD rules that he is doing this systemically and illegally, and it is not a "rare" or a "psychic"; but you want this person to come back to legal, not score off him, right? Just report it.

Remember - he could be perfectly within his rights! I mean, I've even opened 2NT with a singleton K - once.

Michael.

Guest

Reply

Re: The ole 1NT with singleton (00:15:34 SunJul 20 2003) Select Action

While it is not something I would do myself except in extreme circumstances I think it must be OK to open 1nt with a stiff ace so long as it does not carry a method to discover the s'ton. Essentially there is little difference between xx,AKxxx,Axx,Axx and A,AKxxx,Axx,xxxx as a stiff ace is usually a better stopper than xx. The time when it might be useful is holding a strong 4-4-4-1 with no machinery to show that particular shape, such as KQxx,AQxx.AQxx,A opening 2nt.
In any event for the governing body to pontificate about the necessary shape for nt bids is almost as bad as the now abandoned idiotic legislation as to the requisite high card strength for a weak 2. How that was ever approved, much less survived for a while I will never know. It was OK, if not wise, to open 3S on xxxxxxx,x,xxx,xx but not OK (or wise) to open 2S on xxxxxx,xx,xxx,xx. Just goes to show that when committees get their knickers in a twist they can be just as stupid as individuals.

olddude909

Reply

Re: The ole 1NT with singleton (17:00:04 SunJul 20 2003) Select Action

Quote: mycroft at 16:21:55 Fri Jul 18 2003

> You might get an adjustment, if the TD rules that he is doing this systemically and illegally, and it is not a "rare" or a "psychic"; but you want this person to come back to legal, not score off him, right? Just report it.
>
> Remember - he could be perfectly within his rights! I mean, I've even opened 2NT with a singleton K - once.
>
> Michael.

I think this post is missing the point made by the original poster, who claimed that the individual in question opened 1nt whenever he had a hand in the 15-17 hcp range.

if that is really the case, then the 1nt opening bid would seem to be an artificial/strong opening bid, and hence subject to restrictions on use.

Perhaps I've misread the original post, or perhaps the original poster didn't say exactly what was intended, but as I read it again, the claim is that this is not an isolated incident but a regularly recurring act.

HenryS

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: The ole 1NT with singleton (20:15:03 SunJul 20 2003)

Select Action

Quote: Guest (Unregistered) at 17:00:04 Sun Jul 20 2003

> I think this post is missing the point made by the original poster, who claimed that the individual in question opened 1nt whenever he had a hand in the 15-17 hcp range.
>
> if that is really the case, then the 1nt opening bid would seem to be an artificial/strong opening bid, and hence subject to restrictions on use.
>
> Perhaps I've misread the original post, or perhaps the original poster didn't say exactly what was intended, but as I read it again, the claim is that this is not an isolated incident but a regularly recurring act.
>
> HenryS

I read it the same way. It seems to me that (a) this bidding (opening 1NT with a singleton) is not rare for this player, and also that a regular partner of this player will expect it. Thus, it fits the regulation's definition of a conventional 1 NT opening. Since it can be made on as few as 15 HCP, and the regulation requires 16+, I'd say it's an illegal convention (at GCC level). A club might, of course, allow it, thought not in a tournament level game (a STaC, for example, or the ACBL Charity Game). So if the use of this

convention causes damage to the other side (annoyance, btw, is not damage) I would adjust the score. In addition, the first time this came to my attention, I would warn the player that he is not to do it again. If he does so, then I would issue a PP (and possibly, at some point, a DP).

All that said, on the bidder's side, the ACBL article Michael quoted also says this: Bridge players have different understandings of what the rules are concerning opening notrump with a singleton. It is described, depending on who you ask, as illegal, immoral, unethical or fattening. The answer is almost always --- none of the above. One should keep that in mind when calling the Director.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: The ole 1NT with singleton (18:00:36 MonJul 21 2003) Select Action

Quote:

> In any event for the governing body to pontificate about the necessary shape for nt bids is almost as bad as the now abandoned idiotic legislation as to the requisite high card strength for a weak 2. How that was ever approved, much less survived for a while I will never know. It was OK, if not wise, to open 3S on xxxxxxx,x,xxx,xx but not OK (or wise) to open 2S on xxxxxx,xx,xxx,xx. Just goes to show that when committees get their knickers in a twist they can be just as stupid as individuals.

This is an unfortunate post. There are plenty of places to pontificate about what authorities should and should not do: this is not one of them. For example, there are the bridge-laws mailing list and the rec.games.bridge newsgroup - (see here for details of these).

You could also post in the forum Bridge issues.

However, this is a forum designed to understand the Laws and regulations, not to rant about them and decide whether they are right.

Of course, you have missed the main point compeletely anyway: the player concerned is misinforming his opponents by playing an undisclosed system: whether it is illegal as well is another matter.

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

mycroft

offline
67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: The ole 1NT with singleton (23:00:55 TueJul 22 2003)

Select Action

Country: Canada

If 1NT is 15-17, any shape with no voids, then it is conventional (which I did comment on, and then cut out. I was trying to be "evenhanded" :-), and the comments of Henry and Ed apply.

If this person would open with a 4441 or 5431s with any stiff, all the time, then he chooses to treat 1NT openings illegally under the GCC. As soon as partner knows enough to be "aware" that he does this, it becomes an implicit understanding, which in this case happens to be an understanding not allowed under the GCC no matter what opener's partner doesn't do about it.

If he opens the occasional 4441 or 5431 with a stiff A or K, possibly even any hand that fits that description, then I think he falls under the ACBL's rules for deciding - <1% of *1NT openers*, partner expects 2, and system doesn't have a way of uncovering. He just happens to have an off-centre bridge judgement, but one that the ACBL is willing to condone.

I was careful with my first reply, because "always", when used as a complaint, almost always means "he's done it to me more than once, and it's *bad*, and..." Which is another reason I strongly encourage people to call the TD, explain the situation, and have the TD rule. Also, to keep the TD aware of every such occurrance. It's the TD's (or club manager's) job to determine "always", and deal with it if it comes up; not players', and definately not mine - unless you're playing in my game!

I am not going to go anywhere near the "unreasonable" comment except to say that although I have my own disagreements with what, and the way, the ACBL chooses to regulate, everything they

currently do is well within their authority according to the Laws, as interpreted by the WBF. And it seems unfair in hockey for someone to be clearly offside, but not be penalized for it if he gets onside with dispatch and without participating in the play. But that's the rules the NHL want for their game, and that's the way the game is played in North America. No difference.

Michael.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

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

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:32:29 Fri Aug 29 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

JohnD

Reply

Misinformation? (00:13:17 FriJun 21 2002) Select Action

Could you please advise on the following (online bridge) ?

Opponents' bidding:

1N : 2C
2D : 3S!
4S

3S was self alerted and CC indicated they were playing Smolen (5 hearts 4 spades).

It turned out that responder was 5-5 in the majors.

Defender, assuming a 4-3 fit, defended on that basis (hoping to establish a trump trick for his partner) and consequently gave away an overtrick and got a zero on the board.

The director was called but ruled that no adjustment was needed.

Opener said he bid 4S because he misinterpreted the bid - he thought it showed 5 spades and 4 hearts, not the other way around. If he'd "got it right", he would have bid 4H (he had 3 cards in each major) and the issue of "hoping to establish a trump trick for partner" would not have arisen.

Was the ruling correct?

Opener's hand: ♠KQ10 ♥K94 ♦QJ109 ♣KJ2

Responder's hand: ♠J7542 ♥AQ1075 ♦7 ♣94

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Misinformation? (22:52:07 FriJun 21 2002) Select Action

Interesting problem. I'm not too familiar with self-alerting situations (online bridge or f2f with screens) but let me see...

On the face of it, the self alert is not misinformation, it's an accurate description of the partnership agreements. Responder misbid, which is not an infraction. OTOH, if the bid might include 5-5 hands, then that should have been included in the explanation. Since it wasn't, the explanation would be incomplete, which constitutes misexplanation under Law 75 and Law 40. So the TD should have done a little more, IMO, than just look at the CC. Had he done so, he might have ruled differently. Or not, if 5-5 was not a possibility by (explicit or implicit) partnership agreement or by partnership experience.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Misinformation? (10:01:54 MonJun 24 2002) Select Action

This looks complex! Let me check: the player with 5-5 self-alerted. Now, did he explain it as 5-4? If so, it looks like clear misinformation to me. But if, as I suspect from your narrative, the opponent did not ask, just checked the card, then it is either misinformation, or they actually play it as 5-4 [which is normal with Smolen] and this player misbid or psyched.

If the player misbid or psyched, then there was no misinformation, and no adjustment is suitable. In fact, if done deliberately as a psyche, this is legal even if he described it as 5-4 but bid it on 5-5, which is a disadvantage of self-explanations.

Suppoe it is misinformation. I might adjust, but it would depend on the play to see whether the defence was really damaged by the misinformation, but it seems quite likely.

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

jay7nt

offline
1 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

To bid or not to bid (15:05:41 MonJul 15 2002)

Select Action

Hi all,

I need your help to settle a bet. We were having a fun game of Rubber bridge last night over a few drinks. Only 20c per hundred so nothing serious but it got fairly heated when the following hand came up.

I was playing with my Regular partner of the last 11 years. Here is the hand

S: AT865
H: T
D: KQJT6
C: 87

1NT (15-17) was opened on my right and I thought for about 20 seconds as to what I should bid on this hand.
We play anti over all NT

2C = Diamonds or Both Majors
2D = Hearts or 4 spades and longer minor
2H = 4 hearts and longer minor
2S = Spades

As you can see, this hand fits none of these bids, so I decided I would show just diamonds (We only need 40 to win the rubber). Possibly partner will bid 3D in response which shows interest in going on if I have majors.

So I bid 2C. Alerted by partner. LHO asked my partner what it is and he was trying to remember when LHO said, it doesn't matter and called 2H which was passed around to me.

After the 2H bid I took a view on the hand and decided to bid 2S. This would show both majors but there is no way partner will convert to hearts after LHO bid them. Again, we only need 40 to win the rubber.

So, after

1NT - 2C! - 2H - P
P - 2S! AP

partner put down

S: QJ932

H: A5
D: 742
C: 532

I rattled home for 10 tricks after the heart lead and the opps got upset. They were claiming that I bid on partners hesitation because I do not have both majors. This is complete rubbish. We have been playing Anti for three years. It took partner a couple of seconds to recall (especially with a few pints taken) but LHO wouldn't wait. My bid is dangerous and paid off but how on earth could anyone think it was based on a delayed response to a question at 2:30am.

Please set my mind at ease on this one. I am a tournament director myself but they won't listen to me.

Jay

[jmm]

Reply

Re: To bid or not to bid (15:23:50 TueJul 16 2002) Select Action

I think you are a lucky man. Your LHO has no less than 6 HCP, singleton (probably the K) or void in S, and six cards in H. You are lucky he doesn't bid 4 H on his turn.

May be your bid is not a call covered by your sistem, but it's the hand you have, and I think all players, or at least the 75 % of them, are going to bid like you, especially if you need only 40 to win the rubber, with or without hesitation, hesitation than in fact has no unauthorise information or suggestion about bidding, your partner is just remembering what the call means.

And your LHO is lucky too because you don't bid 2 S which your partner is always going to support at the 3 or 4 level.

Like I director, I think it is clear that you may not bid 3 D, but one thing is sure, if you really have S and H, your are happy to play 2 H (or 2 H doubled). So if you bid in this way you must have a hand like this... It's the only two suits your sistem does not cover.

And last but not least, what has your LHO do to cover himself? Nothing, he doesn't wait to know the meaning of your call, he underbid his hand, and he doesn't rebid.

May be he need only 40 points to win the rubber?

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: To bid or not to bid (15:21:37 WedJul 17 2002) Select Action

"This is complete rubbish."

Absolutely. I don't know the participants, of course, but I daresay there would have been no controversy if everyone had been sober.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

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

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:32:50 Fri Aug 29 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

Bob Bannister

Reply

Alerting/non Alerting rules wrt to low level doubles (10:52:59 WedJun 11 2003)

Select Action

Country: England

Recently, whilst playing a match privately, our opponents thought that the Double in the following sequenece should have been alerted. My partner & I were under the impression that it is not alertable but naturally would like to clarify the matter to avoid any future problems.

The sequence, with E dealer:

E S W N
1C 1H p p
1S Dbl*

* Played as "values" (max overcall), not as showing spades (i.e. not penalty oriented)

Under English Bridge Union rules, is this Dbl alertable or is it not?

RMB

offline
19 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Alerting/non Alerting rules wrt to low level doubles (11:48:22 WedJun 11 2003)

Select Action

Bob,

The main requirement is to alert doubles if they are not natural. The EBU defines a natural doubles as (Orange Book 5.3.1(d)):
" (i) a take out double of a suit bid naturally at the one, two or three
level when your partner has not had a chance to call or has passed without indicating values.
(ii) a penalty double otherwise; " [snipped]

So certainly any double that isn't takeout or penalty is alertable. Since
your double was values it is alertable; and it would have been alertable
if it was penalties.

That you do not alert a takeout double made by a player who has bid,
but whose parter has not, is not well understood - especially at club level. IMHO, if you alert all doubles that are not strictly penalties, except doubles of an opening suit bid below 3NT,

most opponents will be happy.
[2 edits; Last edit by RMB at 11:49:38 Wed Jun 11 2003]

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

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

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:33:09 Fri Aug 29 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

Joan Wixson

Reply

Party bridge scoring (23:34:13 FriJul 18 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

Playing 4 hands. Is not "rubber" bridge. One side makes a game, other side makes a game, first side makes a second game. We give 300 pts to lst side for lst game, 500 pts for second game. The opposing side gets 300 points for their game made.

On 4th deal, second side makes a game. After one side gets two games they are said not to be vulnerable anymore. At that point is the 4th deal a whole new ballgame, with either side getting 300 pts. for making a game then?

Jowixson

Reply

Re: Party bridge scoring (23:44:12 FriJul 18 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

Playing 4 hands. Is not "rubber" scoring bridge. One side makes a game, other side makes a game, first side makes a second game. We give 300 pts to lst side for lst game, 500 pts for second game. The opposing side gets 300 pts for their game made.

On 4th deal, second side makes a game. After one side gets two games they are said not to be vulnerable anymore. At that point is the 4th deal the beginning of a whole new ballgame, with either side getting 300 pts for making a game then.....or in any case would 500 pts be given?

Guest

Reply

Re: Party bridge scoring (01:52:15 SatJul 19 2003) Select Action

playing 4 hands, not Rubber. You mean Chicago, I assume.

Then, VUL are: None, E/W, N/S, Both, for each hand.
I read somewhere some inverts the 2nd and 3rd VUL, so non dealer pair is VUL, not sure about this

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Party bridge scoring (17:06:18 MonJul 21 2003) Select Action

Correct: what is referred to here is a well-known form of rubber bridge called Chicago. On the first deal neither side is vulnerable, on the second and third dealer is vulnerable, on the fourth both are vulnerable. Alternatively some people make dealer's opponents vulnerable on the second and third deal.

There are a few other special Chicago rules. If a hand is passed out it is redealt by the same dealer, and does not count as one of the four deals. The four deals in Chicago are called a rubber.

Scoring: a bonus of 300 for a non-vulnerable game, and a bonus of 500 for a vulnerable game. Part-scores on the first three deals get no bonus, but may be increased to a game on a later deal by another part-score.

Example: Deal 1: side A gets 60: no bonus: Deal 2: side B gets 40: no bonus: Deal 3: side B gets 60, making game with its Deal 2 bonus, so it gets a game bonus [vulnerability as in Deal 3] and side A loses its part-score, and has to get 100 on ht elast deal to get a game bonus.

On the other hand if a side gets a part-score on the fourth deal only, and if it does not add up to game, then they get 100 bonus.

Other scoring [including honours] as in normal rubber bridge.

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] [>]

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

Manuel Paulo

Reply

Definition of an honour (15:11:25 SunJul 20 2003) Select Action

Country: Portugal

Hello, David !
During a recent pairs championship in my country, I played 3NT as South, the deal being : W:AQ53 J764 85 Q82; N:J6 AKT2 KQJT4 93; E:974 Q8 9632 AT76; S:KT82 953 A7 Kj54.
The opening lead was the heart seven (alerted as third or fifth highest card from a suit with honour(s), or second highest card from a suit with no honour). I played low, East won the queen and switched to a low club; I went up with the king, played the heart nine - six, ace and eight - came back to hand with the diamond ace and played the heart three - four, from West. At this point, I thought that the opening lead was not compatible with any alerted hypothesis, and I played the king trying to catch the jack from East. After East's discard, I called the director; he decided that the opponent's info was correct : the heart seven was the second highest card from a suit with no honour (J764), because only the three best honours (A,K or Q) should have been considered as such.
What do you think of this?
Best regards,
Manuel Paulo

Manuel Paulo

Reply

Definition of an honour (16:04:31 SunJul 20 2003) Select Action

Country: Portugal

N.B. My email address:

manuel_j_a_paulo@hotmail.com

Earl_Purple

offline
79 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Definition of an honour (17:19:41 SunJul 20 2003)

Select Action

My view is that an honour is any card Jack or higher, so it depends on what the normal lead is from Jxxx.

If the normal lead is the 3rd highest but on this occasion the leader was false-carding then the opponents have done nothing wrong and you cannot get an adjusted score.

Rod

Reply

Re: Definition of an honour (18:07:16 SunJul 20 2003)

Select Action

Country: England

An honour is defined in the 1997 Laws of Duplicate Contract Bridge as "any Ace, King, Queen, Jack or Ten"

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Definition of an honour (19:44:31 SunJul 20 2003)

Select Action

Clearly a director error, as Rod is correct. The Jack, even the 10, is an honor under the laws. However, Earl is also correct: if the explanation given accurately described their agreements, then there was no infraction of law, and hence no redress.

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

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

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

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:33:59 Fri Aug 29 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

pbleighton

offline
103 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Limitations On And Alerting Of Weak 2s For GCC (18:47:36 TueJul 15 2003)

Select Action

Country: USA

1) When opening traditional weak 2s (2H = hearts only), what limitations are there on strength and suit length. I have read about the "Bergen Rule", and have read that it has been repealed. The only thing I can find in the GCC is under Disallowed: conventional responses after: "...weak two-bids which by partnership agreement are not within a range of 7 HCP and or do not show at least five cards in the suit."

Does this mean that:
a) 0-10 hcp and 3+ cards is OK, but you can't use conventional responses to it?
b) 4-10 hcp and 5+ cards is absolutely OK?

2) If I used b), would this be alertable? How about using it only when NV?

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Limitations On And Alerting Of Weak 2s For GCC (22:41:09 TueJul 15 2003)

Select Action

You seem to have read the regs correctly! Opening a 4-10 weak two is not alertable, though the details must be on your CC. It is also ok to do things differently vulnerable, so long as it is on the CC.

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

mycroft

offline
67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Limitations On And Alerting Of Weak 2s For GCC (15:43:26 FriJul 18 2003)

Select Action

Country: Canada

One warning (and I know that we've discussed this before - the meaning of "preempt" is ambiguous). The Alert Pamphlet says:

Quote:

> If it is your partnership style to routinely...preempt with very weak (frequently worse than Qxxxxx) suits...the opponents must be pre-Alerted.

So, if your "4-10, 5+" are always KJTxx and up, you're probably ok. If you will open with a weak 2 on a bad suit as well, it is best (if maybe not required) to Pre-Alert this.

When I play EHAA, I both Pre-Alert (because EHAA, at least, has to - I've opened 3H on T98643 systemically) and Alert the weak 2s (especially 2C), but that's because of the "unexpected strength and shape" rules for natural bids (nobody would expect 86432 KJT Q8532 -- for a 2S call, nor AKQT87532 -- Q95 3). So - have fun :-).

I have, in a somewhat silly light opening system, played 1-7 weak twos. Perfectly legal - not very nice.

Michael.

Harry

Reply

scoring with a half table (02:57:22 ThuJul 17 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

I run a duplicate game for senior citizens. We often end up with an odd number of couples and I am uncertain as to whether there is an "accepted" way to handle the scoring.

There are certain scoring combinations that have given me trouble and I could use some good guidance.

Thanks in advance.

You can answer here and directrly to:

somethingnuyahbet.10.nuspamgourmet@spamgourmet.com

RMB

offline
19 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: scoring with a half table (13:56:50 ThuJul 17 2003) Select Action

Country: England

The common approach to scoring match pointed pairs where boards are played different number of times and/or pairs play different number of boards is (1) score each board with a common top and (2) score each pair relative to the number of boards they played.

(1) Determine how many times any board can be played (N), this is normally the number of rounds; unless every board is "played" by the missing pair, in which case it is one less. The common top is then the top on a board played the maximum number of times (N-1 in ACBL, 2N-2 in England).

Boards that are played N times are scored normally, boards that are played less than N times are most easily scored by putting half the missing match points at both the top and bottom. If a board is played M<N times, match point normally with a top of M-1 and then add (N-M)/2 to all the match points: getting scores in the range (N-M)/2 to (N+M)/2-1. [A more sophisticated method factors the scores and involves decimal points and computers.]

(2) Add all scores for a pair on the boards they played and divide by the common top (N-1) and the number of boards played (P) to get a percentage score for the pair. Rank the pairs in order of their percentage scores.

	Robin

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

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

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:34:38 Fri Aug 29 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

		roving n/s	7	149	bluejak 10:43:46 Mon Jul 14 2003
		mandatory alert or not?	8	252	ne_trepide 10:02:07 Thu Jul 10 2003
		Announcement or not?	2	95	mycroft 21:33:59 Mon Jul 7 2003
		Overcall Structure	2	136	mycroft 21:12:43 Mon Jul 7 2003
		unauthorised information	4	140	flexm 07:40:47 Fri Jul 4 2003
		ui	8	194	bluejak 15:37:18 Wed Jul 2 2003
		scoring party bridge	1	99	Ed 18:06:07 Sat Jun 28 2003
		Control of boards / travellers	1	95	bluejak 13:55:49 Tue Jun 24 2003
		2NT Response	1	108	bluejak 20:47:50 Mon Jun 23 2003
		1NT no stopper	1	110	mycroft 18:17:05 Mon Jun 23 2003
		Penalty or Takeout	1	83	mycroft 18:01:13 Mon Jun 23 2003
		mistaken bid	1	106	bluejak 11:39:44 Mon Jun 23 2003
		movement rules	1	86	Jeremy 04:31:42 Mon Jun 23 2003
		Making six!	7	205	An Observer 09:59:11 Fri Jun 20 2003
		bidding wrong	2	105	bluejak 00:50:20 Thu Jun 19 2003
		Insufficient corrected	2	112	bluejak 23:17:21 Tue Jun 17 2003
		Club rules	1	92	bluejak 13:21:59 Tue Jun 17 2003
		Lead out of turn	5	189	bluejak 19:11:46 Mon Jun 16 2003
		Insufficient bid	2	175	dagnew 16:52:04 Mon Jun 16 2003

Shuffler

Reply

Dummy gets a review? (02:08:22 MonJul 14 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

When is it too late for dummy to ask for a review of the auction?

Thank you.
Shuffler

Guest

Reply

Re: Dummy gets a review? (09:01:10 MonJul 14 2003) Select Action

Law 41B does not allow a dummy to review the auction. Neither does law 42 (dummy's right) so I guess the dummy is not allowed to review the auction or ask question about the defenders' calls once the auction is over.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Dummy gets a review? (10:51:22 MonJul 14 2003) Select Action

Good answer, but if you want to be totally pedantic the last time dummy is allowed to ask for a review is before he makes his last call.

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

Joost_Boswijk

offline
7 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Dummy gets a review? (07:44:38 TueJul 15 2003)

Select Action

I humbly disagree with David. As I can figure out from the laws the (presumed) dummy can ask for a review of the auction till the opening lead is faced.

The definitions state: "Dummy 1. Declarer's partner. He becomes dummy when the opening lead is faced." So he is not the dummy till then. And law 41B explicitly gives him the right to ask for a review of the auction: "Before the opening lead is faced, the leader's partner and the presumed declarer each may require a review of the auction, or request explanation of an opponent's call."

Joost Boswijk

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Dummy gets a review? (10:04:34 TueJul 15 2003)

Select Action

I agree dummy is not dummy [!!!] until the opening lead is faced. But when could dummy ask for a review? During the auction only at his turn to call, which is why I said before his last call.

After the auction ends and before the play period starts is covered by Law 41B, which you quoted: "Before the opening lead is faced, the leader's partner and the presumed declarer each may require a review of the auction, or request explanation of an opponent's call."

That gives declarer and leader's partner the right for a review: but not declarer's partner, ie dummy.

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] [>]

DJN

Reply

roving n/s (05:40:57 FriJul 11 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

Hi all,
In the upcoming International Fund game in the ACBL, I see that the recommended treatment of a half-table is to have a roving n/s (the guide cards are included in the director's packet for this n/s pair, for each possible number of tables). Is there a reason this is stressed over the e/w sitout method (a phantom n/s at the highest table)?

Thanks,
Dan

Frances

Reply

Re: roving n/s (10:47:51 FriJul 11 2003) Select Action

Country: UK

I know nothing (Barcelonan accent) about the ACBL international fund game, but I would always choose between a rover and a sitout table depending on the number of tables I have and number of boards I wish to play. I wish to minimise the amount of board sharing & the total number of boards in play while having more rounds rather than fewer. All other things being equal (which they never are), I'd have thought a sit-out is preferable as there's less chance of it going wrong.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: roving n/s (12:05:08 FriJul 11 2003) Select Action

I think the differences are based on nothing more than what is the flavour of the month!

Personally, I believe a n/s sitout is best for most numbers of tables. Since n/s have the benefit of being stationary they should not get the benefit of not sitting out as well.

But all these methods work. As they have sent you guide cards then I should follow their method.

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

Guest

Reply

Re: roving n/s (14:01:44 FriJul 11 2003) Select Action

For large number of tables I think a roving NS is better in that in some emergency you can curtail the play. Imagine a 18 tables 36 boards movement, with 18 NS phantom. you have a phantom NS, you have to complete the movement or some boards will have less scores then the others, that's not really desirable. With NS Roving you can perhaps stop at round 14 if you are running short of time.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: roving n/s (17:16:11 FriJul 11 2003) Select Action

Boards with fewer scores than others hardly matters except with very poor software.

All incomplete movements are somewhat inferior to complete movements anyway: that is a rather more serious deficiency.

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

mycroft

offline
67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: roving n/s (19:23:12 SatJul 12 2003) Select Action

I don't like sitout and skip. Of course, that can be dealt with with a bye-stand and non-relay (with the sitout table), but at least over here in ACBLland, nobody runs a bye-stand and relay movement, so nobody knows how to play in one, so at least one time in two, there's a board movement error (even when you take pains to make it *really hard* to move the boards to the next lower table and miss the byestand). So, for 13 1/2 tables, I'd rather run a N/S bump (over 13 tables) than a E/W sitout (over 14), but with 14 1/5, an E/W sitout with 15 tables feels better than a N/S bump and skip.

Of course, as always, David has the right idea - if you want to sit stationary, you shouldn't get the "no sitout" bonus as well :-).

Michael (edit to get rid of that BUN-AG).

[1 edits; Last edit by mycroft at 19:24:15 Sat Jul 12 2003]

Val

offline
17 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: roving n/s (01:11:22 SunJul 13 2003) Select Action

Don't know where you play mycroft, but at my clubs, I quite often run a bye-stand and relay. Have had no trouble at all with it.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: roving n/s (10:43:46 MonJul 14 2003) Select Action

I think you will find your opinion that no-one runs it is slightly optimistic!

A lot of these type of choices tend to be geographical. I have no doubt that no-one plays these things within 200 miles of you, but whether you are really sure of Florida, Alaska, Saskatchewan,

Tijuana, Bermuda and Maine I doubt!

It is true that if you are in a club which is used to N/S bumps then in general it is better to play them than a share and relay. However, my experience is that players do not make silly mistakes over boards so long as the TD is careful.

For example, if there is a relay [which I think is what you call a bye-

stand] then it **must** be phsically between the two tables, and must be on a chair or table. If the TD expects players to moce the boards to somewhere on the edge of the room or the floor then when it goes wrong it is the TD's fault.

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 - 1 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 8 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)
FrancesHinden

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 16:14:33 Fri Aug 29 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

mandatory alert or not? (18:48:57 WedJul 2 2003) Select Action

Country: usa

Would like to know if 1S following partner's opening 1H (playing Flannery) is alertable under ACBL rules?

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: mandatory alert or not? (03:18:18 ThuJul 3 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

Nope. This specific sequence is an example in Part I of the alert procedure, and it is not alertable.

Er, that is, assuming 1♠ is natural, even if it's 5+ cards.

Guest

Reply

Re: mandatory alert or not? (07:42:09 ThuJul 3 2003) Select Action

Country: Aust

Hi Ed, this seems curious to me. In my part of the world, I would feel it incumbent to alert 1S because **I know** that it is 5+, something my opps may not know. Obviously this is not the case in America? We alert whenever we have information the opps do not necessarily have.

---

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: mandatory alert or not? (17:16:58 ThuJul 3 2003) Select Action

Alerting is very different in different countries, and up to a point none of it works perfectly.

Australian alerting is based very much on commonsense - and that always leads to differences of opinion. American alerting is much more based on laid-down rules - and that always leads to problems over what players see as exceptions.

While it sounds easy to alert what your opponents do not expect the trouble is always that players have different expectations!

Incidentally, thanks to Ed for his reply that 1♥ - 1♠ showing 5 cards is not alertable in the ACBL. That is how I read the ACBL rules, but confirmation helps.

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

ne_trepide

Reply

Re: mandatory alert or not? (09:41:26 SatJul 5 2003)

Select Action

australia
i don't know where "guest" could have obtained the notion that an overcall of 1S over a 1H opening is alertable because it is a 5+ card suit, but he/she is completely in error.
it is essential that an overcall be alerted if the opponents have an agreement to overcall with a 4 card suit under these conditions but a 5 card suit is recognised as a natural suit overcall and alerting such an overcall is silly.
overcalling with a 5 card suit is the accepted standard play and deviations from the standard require alerting.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: mandatory alert or not? (22:13:23 SatJul 5 2003)

Select Action

This thread is about a **response** of 1♠ showing 5 cards, not an overcall.

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

mycroft

offline
67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: mandatory alert or not? (21:27:14 MonJul 7 2003)

Select Action

The ACBL Alert Chart says:

Quote:

> In general, when the use of conventions leads to unexpected understandings about suit length by negative inference, a natural call becomes Alertable. Some such agreements have become expected and are fairly common, therefore no Alert is required.

Flannery is such a common convention over here - especially in Calgary, where "with or without Flannery" seems to be the first query in *pickup* discussions, and most people are upset when I say "without" - that it is the first "people will expect it" example on the ACBL Alert Chart, even before 1H-1NT(forcing); 2m on 3 cards (or 2C on 4522) min.

So, as everyone has said, in ACBL-land, 1H-1S promising 5 is not alertable, nor is 1H-1NT concealing a 4-card spade suit. This happens to be one of my "uncomfort zones" with the Alert chart, because while it is very common, the trigger for the information isn't in the auction, but in a totally different call, so it could very easily be a "surprise", especially if (as is very common here, grumble) there are no CCs on the table. But I don't decide the system, I just rule on and teach it.

Michael.

[1 edits; Last edit by mycroft at 21:28:17 Mon Jul 7 2003]

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: mandatory alert or not? (00:29:30 TueJul 8 2003)

Select Action

Marvin French has made quite a study of ACBL alerting, and agrees 1♥ - 1♠ showing five cards is not alertable. But he is not happy about it!!!

He plays in the San Diego area: there, so he says, Flannery is very rare, so this sequence will come as a total surprise to people.

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

ne_trepide

Reply

Re: mandatory alert or not? (10:02:07 ThuJul 10 2003)

Select Action

australia
sorry the only idiot here is myself
indeed partners response showing a 5 card suit is indeed alertable as outlined.
i unreservedly apologise to guest.

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 - 1 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 8 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)
FrancesHinden

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 16:14:50 Fri Aug 29 2003

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

Hand_Hog

offline
6 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Announcement or not? (09:52:31 SatJul 5 2003) Select Action

Country: Singapore

In ACBL 1NT forcing respond to 1-Major opening is 'announced'. What about a 1NT 'forcing' response to a 1 Major overcall? Is that an announcement or an Alert?

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Announcement or not? (22:21:57 SatJul 5 2003) Select Action

An alert, not an announcement. There is a short list of things to be announced, and this is not on it. Announcements are only for pretty common treatments, and this is not one of them.

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

mycroft

offline
67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Announcement or not? (21:33:59 MonJul 7 2003) Select Action

It also, in my reading, is not GCC legal. I don't think anyone is going to call you on it, though!

Similarly to this dichotomy, the range of a 1NT overcall is not announced. Transfer advances of the 1NT overcall, however, *are*. Have fun!

Michael.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

pbleighton

offline
103 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Overcall Structure (19:46:04 ThuJul 3 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

I just ran across this (called simply Overcall Structure), and am strongly considering playing it (at least, a simplified version to start). It seems to me that it is GCC legal, but I would like confirmation.

If you are not familiar with it, over an opening bid of one of a suit, it uses:
1) Double is 15+ hcp, may be any shape, though there are tendencies.
2) 1NT overcall is for takeout, generally 6-15 hcp, though it can occasionally be more.
3) 1 level overcalls frequently are made on 4 cards, aren't made on hands which qualify for 1NT, and are almost always (always? - I'm not sure) less than 15 hcp.
4) 2 level overcalls are either standard or preemptive, depending on the circumstances (the writeup is unclear).
5) Jump overcalls either promise or strongly suggest a two suiter.
6) Many conventional responses to the overcalls are available.

Do you see any problem with any of this?

Do you have any experience playing this, or playing against it? Who invented it?

Are you aware of any comparable systems?

How common is this or other very aggressive overcall systems in the US, and elsewhere?

[1 edits; Last edit by pbleighton at 20:35:55 Thu Jul 3 2003]

Guest

Reply

Re: Overcall Structure (07:10:49 FriJul 4 2003) Select Action

This overcall structure is sometimes called Fout after the person who devised it. It is highly aggressive and works quite well. However if you want to try something a little different, play canape overcalls. They are enormous fun! These are not legal in the US, but you can play them on line and in countries with civilised system regulations.

mycroft

offline
67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Overcall Structure (21:12:43 MonJul 7 2003) Select Action

I've played it (not enough, though) and had it played against me. One thing I will tell you is that you will annoy the opponents (in the good and legal "can't you just pass once?" sense). And so, like any such system, it is best for you (and definately proper and as far as I am concerned, your responsibility if you want to play something unusual) to be **complete and clear** about your Alerts and explanations. And patient! The opponents **will not understand** sometimes, and it will seem "so obvious" to you, because you're used to it. Just calmly explain again. Practice your explanations. Once you have, throw them on your friends, and see what they don't understand. Refine. Repeat. *Then* play it.

On the legal side:
1. I would Alert the Power doubles. It probably isn't necessary, but the excess strength and the "feel free to pass, I'm not short" nature of them will be really unexpected.
2. 1NT as a three-suit takeout is GCC (as is the rest of the system - oops, maybe not - see below), but definately Alertable. And, at least in my club, if you explain it simply as "takeout", without mentioning that it can be from 4432 to 7330, incomplete explanation rulings will go against you much more frequently than for "standard" MI.
3. Frequent 4-card overcalls at the 1 level are Pre-Alertable. You'll want to discuss the "unsound" nature of the suits in the PreAlert - IIRC, a typical average suit for a simple overcall is KJ9x.

Just looking over the GCC again, I'm not sure that the "lebensohlish" 1NT response to a simple overcall is legal! Fascinating, as it has been played in NA for years...
4. *Simple* - non-jump - two-level overcalls seem to be EHAA-style; very wide-ranging both in suit quality and strength. Be *very careful* responding to these (says the EHAA player). No problem with legality, as long as they show 5+ cards; I'd probably Pre-Alert these as well, though.
5. Both RJOs and IJOs (make sure you know which is which!) are fine, Alertable, but fine.

Like any system that is 180 degrees away from Standard, be prepared to try it for three or four sessions before deciding on it. And be prepared to get it horribly, terribly wrong a few times while you break your "standard" instincts. Be prepared to get a *lot* of practice playing at the one and two level in inadequate fits or with inadequate suits. Be prepared to go down, often a lot, but usually undoubled. Remember that -200, even -250, beats a game their way. Learn what you need to lead partner's 1-level overcall; this will

take time (I haven't played it enough to know myself; I'm extrapolating from EHAA 2-bids).

Make *sure* you and your partner are reading from the same book; IIRC, Jeff Goldsmith has some "thoughts" on the Overcall Structure; and a quick Google search brings up lots of hits. Get the Fout PDF - unadapted by Abraham; transfer advances of overcalls are not GCC legal (yet!) Then decide what you want to adapt from there.

And I definately suggest that you **always** remember to bid with "bad" hands, especially at the beginning. As the system notes say, "partner will expect you to, and he definately will be upset if he misdefends because you failed to bid." Pass is one of the strongest overcalls in the system, because you have *so much more* information about partner's hand (even if it is all negative) than standard pairs do. Conversely, if partner passes - be very wary of getting in! Do *not* automatically balance; opener has a 20 count! And remember "get in and get out". Unless you clearly have the balance of power or are doing a systemic scramble, your first bids should be all you need or want to make.

You might be interested in EHAA if you like aggressive systems. This one is aggressive starting at 1NT, and *very sound* below that. One key on that one, however, is that 2-level opener/overcaller is usually captain - don't worry, the response structure is designed to do that, and it makes sense.

Michael.

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 - 1 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 8 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)
FrancesHinden

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 16:15:25 Fri Aug 29 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

flexm

offline
2 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

unauthorised information (10:02:45 ThuJul 3 2003) Select Action

♠ K7432
♥ AJ2
♦ J75
♣ 92

♠ QT98
♥ Q543
♦ AT6
♣ K8

♠ J65
♥ 87
♦ 942
♣ Q7843

♠ A
♥ KT96
♦ KQ83
♣ AJT5

N	E	S	W
		2NT	P
3C	P	3NT	P
4S	P	5C	P
P	P		

Bidding Commentary

1. 2NT was alerted and explained as any 4441 with 16+pts

2. 3C was alerted and explained as asking about the singleton

3. West enquired about 3NT. North bids 4S and says that it shows a singleton club

4. On hearing this, South makes a 'hoh' sound and moves (but then withdraws) the pen towards the bidding pad. North hears the sound but does not see the pen movement.

5. After East's pass, South bids 5C which is passed out.

6. East places the lead card face down and West, after a brief discussion with north about his unhappiness with the bidding, calls the director.

Ruling

'If you think you have been disadvantaged, call me back at the end of the play'.

There seemed no necessity to call the director back, however, I am curious about the rights and wrongs of the bidding sequence.

Questions

1. Should North rebid 5S and ignore the possibility that South forgot the system and misbid the hand?

2. Should North interpret the 5C as showing first round control and therefore bid 5H? If so, could South pass instead of bidding 5S or something else?

3. Is it right for West to call the director at the lead stage, or should the director be called at the end of the play?

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: unauthorised information (11:58:30 ThuJul 3 2003)

Select Action

Both South and North have UI from partner, South because of North's explanation, North because of the 'hoh' and the pen movement. He may have been aware subconciously of the pen movement even if he was not aware conciously. Both North and South were required to do their best to take no advantage of this.

South's 5♣ bid is definitely unacceptable. However, there is no need for a ruling since 4♠ is more successful than 5♣ {it might even make} so there is no damage.

South's 5♣ does sound like a cue-bid. If asked the TD will rule an adjusted score, but eventually I am not sure East-West would gain anything. So there probably is no reason for any adjustment. If the TD had been called back he would probably not adjust since there seems no damage, but would have explained to North and South their responsibility under the Law.

As to your questions, North should avoid taking any advantage. It is not entirely clear that he did by passing 5♣ which appears to be a 4-2 fit. What he should bid is not certain, and a TD might or might not adjust. I would not be telling North what he should have done since it is not clear.

Whenever a player is afraid an opponent's action may have been

affected by UI it is normal to call the TD immediately so as to establish the presence of UI as soon as possible. West's only mistake was to "discuss" it with North before calling the TD.

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

James Vickers

Reply

Re: unauthorised information (13:33:12 ThuJul 3 2003)

Select Action

Country: UK

I don't know how many tricks were made in 5C, but I would certainly be looking at possible adjusted scores. I don't know what NS's agreement on a bid of partner's singleton in this sequence when no suit has been agreed (to play, presumably), but once South has bid 5C I wouldn't allow North's pass. I agree with the original poster that North would either bid 5H (which South might well pass), or 6S. I would probably dream up some combination of 5H-2, 6SX-2 and 6SX-3, and adjust to this if it leads to a worse result than the one obtained (a near certainty).

We were not told what West said to North, but it may just have been some disarming comment to soften the blow before calling the director, in which case I would not regard this as a mistake. That notwithstanding, I'm not sure I quite understand David's answer to Q3. Should the TD have been called (1) at the moment South articulated their dissatisfaction, (2) when North bid 4S, or (3) when dummy was displayed?

James

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: unauthorised information (17:43:27 ThuJul 3 2003)

Select Action

It is true that we do not know what West said to North, and of course it makes a difference what he actually said. My experience is that

Quote: Flex M

> after a brief discussion with north about his unhappiness with the bidding

means that West said some unfortunate things!

As to when you should call the TD, recommendations differ in different places. {We do ask people making queries to say where they are.} My guess is the query came from Australia or New Zealand, and the recommendations there are similar to English advice, ie to call the TD when there has been UI and possible use of it. Thus the earliest time to call the TD here would be after the 5♣ bid, which could be based on the explanation. Still calling the TD before the opening lead is also fine.

If you call the TD for the first time at the end of the hand you will get a ruling if the UI can be established, but it tends to be far more difficult to do so then.

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

flexm

offline
2 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: unauthorised information (07:40:47 FriJul 4 2003)

Select Action

Country: Australia

Thank you for the replies.

David, you are right on both counts. That is it is from Australia and also some unfortunate things were said. I was sitting West and I said something to the effect that 'I don't think you can pass after South's actions, I think we better call the director because I am unhappy about the bidding". North took offence to this statement so it would have been better just to call the director.

5C was 2 down vulnerable, our partners were in 3nt making 10 tricks so we were not disadvantaged. I was curious though about the rights and wrongs of the bidding.

At the end of the round further discussion took place about North's bid. Apparently in their system the 5C bid was an impossible bid and North saw two alternatives, either South had a 4441 shape with a singleton spade, or South had gotten it all wrong and had a long club suit. He judged the latter to be true so he passed.

I am still not sure whether he was right to do so rather than bid as if South's first bid was accurate.

Thanks again for the reasoning Dave and James.

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 - 1 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 8 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)
FrancesHinden

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 16:15:43 Fri Aug 29 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

Hand_Hog

offline
6 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

ui (14:27:56 FriJun 27 2003)

Select Action

Country: Singapore

N E S W
1D P 2C P
2H P 2S P
4NT P 5C P
6D P 6NT

At this stage West inquires after the meaning of 2S (there was no alert) and received the answer 'Just forcing, may not be a suit'. West then double 6Nt.

East's hand:

S: 103
H: 987xx
D: K10x
C: Jxx

East summoned the director and asked if she was allowed to lead a spade. The director answered that there was no infraction at the moment and told East to lead whatever her hand suggested.
East led a spade and the contract went down two.

The director the ruled that a club lead would be a LA. On a club lead South would be able to run 7 club winners (North was void in clubs) and the contract would be made. West argued that since 2S wasn't alerted she had to ask and if the spade lead is illegal now the director should allow her to remove the double. The director disallowed that on the basis that 4SF is pretty common and although there wasn't an alert most duplicate players would come to expect its meaning.

Comments please?

[2 edits; Last edit by Hand_Hog at 14:43:25 Fri Jun 27 2003]

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: ui (19:04:25 FriJun 27 2003)

Select Action

Country: Singapore

A bit difficult, since I don't know Singapore's alert regulations, and they don't appear to be on line. But let's see what we can infer from the post.

When West asked about the meaning of 2♠, he pinpointed an interest in that suit. This is UI to East. Particularly in conjunction with West's subsequent double of 6NT, it seems to me to suggest a spade lead. That being the case, East is prohibited by Laws 73C and 16A from leading a spade if he has a logical alternative. If the question and double do not suggest any particular lead, then East can lead whatever she likes.

Later, the director ruled that a club lead was an LA. If so, why didn't he say so at the time East asked her question? The statement "there is no infraction at this point" is literally true (disregarding the question of the failure to alert 2♠), but not helpful. It seems to me the director led East down the garden path here.

Now we get into territory where it would help to know Singapore's alert regulations. Since I don't, there are a couple of possible scenarios.

Scenario 1: Here I make the assumption that FSF is alertable, and that regulations require or at least recommend a question be asked if a bid which might be alertable is not alerted. In this case, West's "I had to ask" is exactly correct, but it does not absolve East of the restriction on leading a spade.

Scenario 2: If FSF is not alertable, or the regulation does not imply or state one "has to ask", then West's argument is incorrect. East is still prohibited from leading a spade.

Either way, East can't lead a spade. Now, is a club lead an LA? I dunno. Personally, I'd lead the ♥9 before a club, but I'm a notoriously bad leader. Regardless, the director rules it is, and adjusts on that basis. But... the infraction which is the basis of his ruling (the spade lead) was caused by his handling of East's question. The director is required by Law 81C5 to inform players of their obligations under the laws. Director did not so inform East. This seems to me a clear case of director error. In that case, Law 82C applies. I don't see any way to rectify this and obtain a normal score, so under Law 12 and Law 88, both sides get average plus.

Director's comment about FSF being pretty common may be true, but I don't see its relevance. Either the bid (2♠ in this case) is alertable by regulation, or it's not.If it's alertable, then there was MI in the failure to alert it. If it's not alertable, there wasn't. However, at this point, the question is moot, given director's error in handling the problem.

Final ruling: Director error (Laws 81C5 and 82C), adjust score to average plus for both sides (Laws 82C, 12 and 88).

Side comment: West might have helped his side a bit by complying with the procedure set forth in Law 20F1 and asking for an explanation of the entire auction, rather than pinpointing a particular bid.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: UI (03:10:35 MonJun 30 2003) Select Action

I think we can safely assume that 4SF is alertable in Singapore from comments in the original query.

While I very rarely find Ed goes off the rails, I do feel he has here!

First of all, the TD **MUST NOT** tell the player whether leading a club is an LA or not. That is a judgement decision that would involve looking at the hand and is completely forbidden. True, the TD may not have handled it very well, since he should have indicated the contents of Law 73C, ie that the player must avoid taking any possible advantage from the UI, but he must never comment on specific calls or plays before the hand is complete.

Secondly, if we had ruled under Director error, an artificial adjusted score is **forbidden**. Since a result was obtained on the board, then the Director **must** give assigned adjusted scores.

Finally, I think this is a good example why some people's interpretation of Law 20F1 is so unworkable. If a player needs to know what 2♠ is, and to do so has to find out the meaning of all eight bids in the auction, the board will simply be cancelled for lack of time. It won't gain much, since his interest in the auction will be pretty clear anyway.

Having said all that, how would I rule?

Well, I have some sympathy for Director error. The TD should have explained the Law. So now it is a question of deciding what difference it would make if he had.

Unless the player is pretty inexperienced I doubt I will go down that road.

Looking overall at the case we had a situation caused by a failure to alert. The player who led was not the offending side in that case so I would have let the result stand. The UI situation was created by the lack of alert, and I see no reason to give the offending side a benefit from not alerting.

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

AlanW

Reply

Re: ui (07:28:11 MonJun 30 2003) Select Action

David's ruling of allowing the result to stand (assuming FSF is alertable) seems pretty sensible. Look at it another way. Suppose the director had told East he could lead anything he wanted, but that the question about the meaning of 2S was UI and that he must not choose a lead suggested by UI if he has a LA. Suppose East then led something other than a spade and the contract made. If EW then asked for a ruling on the basis that they had been damaged by the failure to alert 2S, wouldn't you feel pretty sympathetic towards this claim?

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: UI (16:09:26 TueJul 1 2003) Select Action

D'oh! My bad.

(1) I meant to say, and should have said, that TD should have explained to East his obligations under 73C.

(2) Okay, on this one, please shoot me. I was fixated on 88, which speaks to artificial adjusted scores, but 81C just says "adjusted score". David is absolutely right, it should be an assigned adjusted score, which means Law 88 doesn't apply.

(3) I'm not sure I see how asking for an explanation of the auction (a) should take all that long to respond or (b) makes clear an interest in 2♠, but David has far more experience at this than I, so I'll shut up about it.

Thinking about the overall case, as David suggests, I have to agree with his ruling.

Hand_Hog

offline
6 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: ui (06:19:09 WedJul 2 2003) Select Action

Thank you all for the replies.

Just some clarification, E-W were every experienced players, so there should be no question about them understanding their legal obligation.

It seems to me both parties are partially to be blamed and if we let the table result stands as that seems to reward EW for the abusing UI. Similarly if we adjust the score to 6NT making it would seem to reward NS for failure to alert.

Would a split score be a fairer solution? Can the director award a split-score here?

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: ui (10:47:48 WedJul 2 2003) Select Action

The UI was created by E/W's infraction: if they had alerted it South might easily have doubled without asking since he would have assumed Fourth Suit Forcing. Furthermore North took the trouble to ask his responsibilities under UI and got the wrong answer from the TD.

No, I think a split score would be most unsuitable. Why should N/S be blamed for a situation brought about by their opponents and the TD?

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

Joost_Boswijk

offline
7 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: ui (12:12:38 WedJul 2 2003) Select Action

I'm afraid you mixed things up a bit: the infraction (non-alerting) was N/S's and east was asking the TD. But what did the TD wrong? As far as I can see he didn't look in East's hand before the game was over, just answered that she could lead 'whatever her hand suggested'. It was when the game was over that the TD decided that the spades lead might have been suggested by the question, that a club lead was a LA, and that the score was adjusted to 6NTx made. Also, given the circumstances which the TD knew and we don't, he decided that the failure to alert was a minor infraction which didn't deserve a penalty. As said, I don't know what the circumstances were or what is usual in Singapore, but it looks quite normal to me.

What I would like to know is wether wests double was only possible if the 2S bid was FSF and not if it was a natural bid? That would be a good reason to ask the meaning of the bid, otherwise he (or she) had either to keep silent or ask for an explanation of the auction (that would have been the best anyway).
IMHO the question is leading. E has a couple of alternatives, spades being one since W must have at least four. What the result would have been if E leads another suit, we can't decide (a club lead I consider the least logical). But S deserves to be reprimanded for not alerting the 2S and W for asking a leading question. And I wonder wether he explained to W that it was no use asking to remove the

double.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: ui (15:37:17 WedJul 2 2003) Select Action

You are correct: I do get confused in the absence of a diagram, and I have got N/S and E/W the wrong way round.

It is very normal for experienced players not to know their rights in UI situations. Perhaps they should, but in this case, they asked, **and were misinformed by the TD.**

Quote: Hand Hog

> The director answered that there was no infraction at the moment and told East to lead whatever her hand suggested.

This is not correct in Law, so constitutes TD error. The TD should have explained the ramifications of UI, at least reading Law 73C to the players. Once the TD did not do this then it is not unreasonable that the player misunderstood the position and to be penalised is not fair.

When you have UI from partner your actions are constrained: it is not good enough to "lead whatever your hand suggests". A player who asks the TD {even if he asks the wrong question} should have this explained to him.

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] [>]

Terry

Reply

scoring party bridge (12:22:04 SatJun 28 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

Playing 6 hands. Each side ends up with a game. What bonus score is given for those 2 separate games?

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: scoring party bridge (18:06:07 SatJun 28 2003) Select Action

It appears you have an incomplete rubber. In that case there is no bonus for either of the completed games. If only one side has a part score in the third, incomplete, game, that side gets a bonus of 100 points. Laws of Contract Bridge, 1993, Law 80.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

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

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 16:55:23 Fri Aug 29 2003

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

top

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

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

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

James Vickers

Reply

Control of boards / travellers (13:18:16 TueJun 24 2003)

Select Action

Country: UK

Someone recently asked me who is responsible for controlling the boards in play at a particular table. My response was "The stationary pair, if there is one" (L7D), although checking the book I see that North is responsible for moving the boards for the next round unless the director instructs otherwise (L8A2).

What prompted the question was an incident (at a different club) where the questioner had tried to check the movement card to make sure they were at the right table with the right boards and was told brusquely by a stationary North to mind her own business.

Now apart from North being in dire need of a lesson in good manners, what's the legal situation here? Whenever I direct a movement involving table cards I announce at the beginning that both pairs should check this information at the beginning of each round, both to minimise the risk of mistakes and so that I can penalise both sides if the wrong boards are played, but supposing no such announcement is made? Who carries the can if the wrong moving pair or boards are played?

Also, as far as I know it used to be a requirement for North to complete the traveller, but this was revoked in 1987. Since most players are blissfully unaware of this change, it rarely causes any problem, and if I ever have to resolve the issue I tell them something like: "North should usually complete the traveller, but if they prefer not to that's OK provided (1) SOMEONE fills out the traveller, and (2) the entry is checked by the opposition."

Just as important as the answers to the above, which law or regulation can I cite to sceptics who assert that "Everyone knows that North moves the boards and fills out the traveller!"?

James

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Control of boards / travellers (13:55:49 TueJun 24 2003)

Select Action

You seem to have read the Law correctly. Stationary players have a primary responsibility for control of boards, but only primary. If the board is put on the table and played arrow-switched all four players were at fault.

Scoring is generally done by North, but unless the TD gives an instruction [which over-rides everything else] then this is a matter of custom and practice.

In Howell movements it is normal for both sides to check, and many TDs make it a requirement.

You will just have to tell your players this. As to the actual North I would suggest a small disciplinary penalty.

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] [>]

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

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 16:56:26 Fri Aug 29 2003

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

top ⇧

pbleighton

offline
103 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

2NT Response (20:39:57 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

Assume the following 2NT response to an opening bid of one of a suit:
It shows invitational (never game-forcing) values, is usually balanced, but will regularly be used in response to an opening of 1 spade when holding 4441, with the singleton in spades.
Is this response GCC legal?

[1 edits; Last edit by pbleighton at 20:40:41 Mon Jun 23 2003]

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: 2NT Response (20:47:50 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action

Yes, that is a natural 2NT response. While it may not be everyone's choice of method that is certainly one way to play it, and legal.

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] [>]

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

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 16:59:25 Fri Aug 29 2003

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

top

Shuffler

Reply

1NT no stopper (17:25:52 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action

Country: USA, ACBL

1C - 1H - 1NT -

1NT only promises point count of 6-9 HCP, habitual use, coincidental if actually holding any stopper in any of opponents' suits. It denies a fit with opener's suit.

Is this alertable?

Thank you.
Shuffler

mycroft

67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: 1NT no stopper (18:17:05 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action

Country: Canada

[1C-(1H)-1NT 6-9, may or may not have stopper. Alertable?]

I would. The ACBL Alert Pamphlet has this to say about treatments (natural calls that by agreement pass additional information):

Quote:

> Natural bids that convey an unexpected meaning must be Alerted. This includes strong bids that sound weak, weak bids that sound strong, and all other bids that, by agreement, convey meanings different from, or in addition to, the expected meaning ascribed to them.

The "expected" meaning of 1NT in this auction includes some heart strength; if by agreement, the partnership would bid 1NT with KQx xxx KTxx 9xx, I would take that as "different from expected meaning".

The underlying concept of Alerting in the ACBL is your partnership's legal and ethical obligation for your opponents to be able to

understand your calls as completely as you do. Therefore, a good guideline, (which happens to be enshrined in the Alert Pamphlet, as well) is:

Quote:

> **WHEN IN DOUBT WHETHER TO ALERT OR NOT, ALERT!**

(caps and emphasis in the original). So, in both this situation and your other ("takeout" NT doubles), where it is "unclear", Alert. For one thing, that's what you're supposed to do. For another, the TD will be much less likely to rule MI against you if you Alert where you, if you were Solomon, shouldn't (especially if they don't bother to ask) than she will be if you fail to Alert where you should. And finally, you will be doing your ethical best to protect your opponents, which is the key to pleasant, fast, good, respectable bridge.

Good bridge!
Michael.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

3 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 3 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 10:19:55 Sat Aug 30 2003

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

top

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

Legend :: Read Topic :: Unread Topic

Shuffler

Reply

Penalty or Takeout (17:33:20 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action

Country: USA, ACBL

1NT - Double

Is the double of an opening 1NT (15-17 HCP)...

1. alertable if it is used strictly as a takeout double?
2. alertable if it is used as penalty regardless?

Thank you.
Shuffler

mycroft

67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Penalty or Takeout (18:01:12 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action

Country: Canada

According to The ACBL Alert Pamphlet,

Quote:

> Except for those doubles with highly unusual or unexpected meanings, doubles do not require an Alert.

I do wish they had provided more examples in common situations like this one (1NT-X).

A natural, penalty double, while uncommon opposite ACBL-style strong NTs, is hardly "highly unusual or unexpected." Definately not Alertable.

While an argument could be made that the double of 1NT is so frequently conventional that it is in nature "self-Alerting" (the idea behind the rule), it's probably just safer (especially if the doubler is one of the many ACBL players that ignore the "two complete and identical CCs *on the table, for the opponents' view*") to Alert any conventional double.

Most "takeout" doubles of NT openings are conventional, having more of a meaning than simply "bid something, partner", so I (and I'd) Alert them, be it "one-suited", "one-suited, good", "11+, spades and another, 4-4 or better", or whatever.

I have played against a pair that played double of 1NT as "4-suit takeout". I don't understand it - how could you possibly have a suitable hand? - and they really did take it out always (to their detriment at least 3 of the 4 times it came up during the match). I would say this is "highly unusual", and Alert it (maybe the opponents' brains will break on the explanation and they'll screw up the auction).

If you want an exact ruling, I'd email The Source, or see if you can get an official response from the ACBL's Alert forum. However, in practice, no matter what the legalities, if you Alert any non-penalty-oriented double, and any double intended as penalty that has any distributional or max strength requirements, you'll win in the long run, because nobody will call the TD on you "failure to Alert".

Michael.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

3 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 3 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 10:20:32 Sat Aug 30 2003

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

top

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

Legend :: Read Topic :: Unread Topic

Ray Crowe

Reply

mistaken bid (03:52:07 MonJun 23 2003)

Select Action

Country: New Zealand

Board 4----Dealer West-----all VUL

The hands:

North: S A742 H T8642 D JT C 72
East : S void H Q9 D 954 C AKQT9853
South: S KQJT653 H AK7 D K76 C void
West: S 98 H J53 D AQ832 C J64

The Bidding:

West North East South
p p 2D* 4S
5D P 6C 6S
all pass

E/W's agreed system was opening weak 2s (in D, H & S)

After East opened 2D, South inquired and was told by West that it was "weak, 6 - 10 pts".
The rest of the bidding went as above. Result N/S - 200.
(this was an intermediate grade tournament, mixed quality)

As director, I was called at the end of play by South who was not happy with East bidding 6C.
(I asked East why she opened 2D. She replied that she had forgotten their agreement and opened a "multi 2D", which has, as one of it's options, an 8 playing tricks in any suit).

I ruled result stands.
I considered there was no U/I to be gained by East from West's bid of 5D, as it was basically a "no brainer". West was still bidding the agreed system.
West could have bid on a very weak hand with only a 2 card support , or he could have had some values. East still had no idea.
Irrespective of this, from East's point of view 6C is always right. He has a 5 trick loosing hand, and if West has no points, a sacrifice is safe against a vul. slam. If West has some values, then -2 is still safe against a probable vul. N/S game in spades.
Where is there an infraction?

This went to an appeal.
The A/C decided there was damage and awarded a score of

5S = 5 for NS, and EW -650.

bluejak

434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: mistaken bid (11:39:44 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action

It is only because of the UI that East knows what West has. West's 5 bid does not show "only a 2 card support" from the bidding: it looks as though West has got six or seven card suit that West deemed unsuitable for a pre-empt.

How does East know his 2 opening was the Multi? From partner's explanation, of course. So he must make every effort not to take any advantage from the UI available to him, and this he has failed to do.

You ask where the infraction is. East has chosen amongst LAs one suggested by the UI: pass over 5 is certainly an LA. I am quite sure that if West had said that East's 2 was Multi that quite a few Easts would now pass.

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] [>]

judith hobcroft Reply	**movement rules** (04:26:20 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action **Country**: vietnam please would you send howell movement for 4 tables 20 boards ... urgentlr required for a group of expats tonight !! thanks !
Jeremy 7 posts bridgetalk member Reply	**Re: movement rules** (04:31:42 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action You'll find the info you need in this thread.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

3 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 3 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 10:22:38 Sat Aug 30 2003

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

top

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

Legend :: Read Topic :: Unread Topic

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

Shuffler

Reply

Making six! (23:25:12 SatJun 14 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

ACBL - USA

I have a player with over 800 MP's that constantly comments after the opening lead is faced: "Making six!" or "Making 4." Can I consider such statements as a claim? How about comments during the hand when he doesn't consider it a claim. He is not always right. It is intimidating to beginners.

Thanks for your help.

Shuffler

player

80 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Making six! (07:44:25 SunJun 15 2003) Select Action

Challenge her to state a line. Call the director if you disagree.

Ed

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Making six! (08:34:45 SunJun 15 2003) Select Action

The challenge is not necessary. Law 68A is quite clear: "Any statement to the effect that a contestant will win a specific number of tricks is a claim of those tricks." Law 68D says "After any claim or concession, play ceases. All play subsequent to a claim or concession shall be voided by the Director. If the claim or concession is acquiesced in, Law 69 applies; if it is disputed by any player (dummy included), the Director must be summoned immediately to apply Law 70 or Law 71, and no action may be taken pending the Director's arrival."

So. When this happens, call the Director, who will rule on the claim according to, probably, Law 70, which says in part "The Director shall not accept from claimer any unstated line of play the success of which depends upon finding one opponent rather than the other with a particular card, unless an opponent failed to follow to the suit of that card before the claim was made, or would subsequently fail to follow to that suit on any normal line of play; or unless failure to adopt this line of play would be irrational."

One time oughta do it.

Two other points: it doesn't matter whether the player considers his comments a claim or not - if he says he gonna when a specific number of tricks, it's a claim. Also, this is law, not regulation - it applies everywhere, not just in the ACBL.

bluejak

434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Making six! (15:34:26 SunJun 15 2003) Select Action

Opinions differ as to whether this constitutes a claim. The problem is in the wording.

Quote: Law 68A

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

The question is whether the clause "unless he demonstrably did not intend to claim" applies to the whole Law or only the second sentence. After all, we know perfectly well that he did not intend to claim.

I doubt that most TDs would treat this as a claim. It seems unfair and unnecessary.

That does not mean that I do not suggest you call the TD, or that the TD will not deal with it. It is a clear breach of various other Laws, mainly 74B2, but also 74A2, and possible 74C3 or 74C2.

Quote: Law 74B2

> As a matter of courtesy a player should refrain from:
> 2. making gratuitous comments during the auction and play.

The important thing is that this player needs to be dealt firmly! No

doubt the TD will give him a firm warning or two, and apply PPs from then on if the player does not mend his ways.

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

Ed

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Making six! (22:51:27 SunJun 15 2003) Select Action

Quote: bluejak at 15:34:26 Sun Jun 15 2003

> Opinions differ as to whether this constitutes a claim. The problem is in the wording.
>
> **Quote: Law 68A**
>
> > Any statement to the effect that a contestant will win a specific number of tricks is a claim of those tricks. A contestant also claims when he suggests that play be curtailed, or when he shows his cards (unless he demonstrably did not intend to claim).

> The question is whether the clause "unless he demonstrably did not intend to claim" applies to the whole Law or only the second sentence. After all, we know perfectly well that he did not intend to claim.

I'm not a professional grammarian, but it is my understanding that the parenthetical clause in the law applies only to the second sentence at best, and possibly only to the second clause ("or when he shows his cards") of that sentence.

James Vickers

Reply

Re: Making six! (12:41:05 TueJun 17 2003) Select Action

Country: UK

Players at my club, my partner being a particularly serious offender, have the tendency to comment on the suitability of the contract as soon as dummy goes down. They are not attempting to claim, nor do they say in so many words how many tricks they think they can make, but say something like:

"I think we've missed a slam, partner!"

I complain that such comments could easily mislead the defence into the wrong line of play, and even if it helps the defence, they do not necessarily appreciate such extraneous assistance. I pay my money to play bridge, not bridge-with-extra-helpful-comments, and I want to pit my wits against other players on equal terms.

However, my complaints only meet with looks of incompehension, and since the other major offender at the club is often the director, calling the TD will not help.

Any suggestions as to what I can do, other than find a new partner and a new club?

James

bluejak

434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Making six! (13:15:50 TueJun 17 2003) Select Action

If you cannot deal with partner and the Director is at fault you have problems!

However, printing out this thread and offering tio to the two offenders may help.

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

An Observer

Reply

Re: Making six! (09:59:02 FriJun 20 2003) Select Action

Country: England

I'm not a professional grammarian

Ed, I think you need to bear in mind that the people who formed the laws of bridge weren't either. Nor were they legal experts.

In all probability parenthetical qualification of the Law applies to the last part of the sentence, insofar as players can inadvertently expose their hand to either opponents depending on seating arrangements, body postures or even physical disabilities or impairments.

However, it would be a very tough TD who applied the law (as it stands :smile:smile: without allowing the "offending" player to **demonstrate** that they ...did not intend to claim. Inevitably, the TD must be called.

I would emphasise that which has already been said, that the severity of the penalty levelled against the "offender" can only reflect the number of times that the TD is called to deal with said "offender".

View Thread Page(s): [1]

sharwell

Reply

bidding wrong (20:02:01 WedJun 18 2003) Select Action

Country: usa

Dealer opens 1 diamond at west; north passes, west then says -no bidding box-a mistake was made and bids 2 diamonds. can the pass then be ignored?

mycroft

67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: bidding wrong (21:26:38 WedJun 18 2003) Select Action

Country: Canada

In Duplicate bridge, there are two situations whether or not bidding boxes are used, and because they are so different, the TD should be immediately called (hopefully before West tells us what he "should" have bid).

If West misspoke - he meant to say 2, but 1 came out of his mouth - then he is allowed to change the bid until partner calls, provided the announced wish for change (or change attempt) is done immediately upon him noticing (the Laws say "without pause for thought" - note that this is not the same as "without pause").(Law 25A).

This is why you call the TD immediately - it is her job to investigate and determine whether the conditions for "inadvertent call" apply.

If it is ruled inadvertent, and attempted to correct "without pause for thought", North not only may, but must retract her call, and call again to the correct opening. Of course, there's nothing saying she can't pass again!

If West has changed his mind - if he meant to say 1, no matter what pigs flew by that caused him to want to, or if the TD decides that he did "pause for thought", then Law 25B applies. Since North has called, West can no longer change his call, 1-P- stays the legal auction, and the fact that West wanted to open 2 is unauthorized for West's partner - he may not make a call that caters to west being light (if 2 would have been weak) or strong (if 2 would be strong) or strange (if 2, or 1, for that matter, was artificial) unless no other sensible action exists (and yeah, the TD has to judge on that as well.) Here, although North cannot change her pass, she (and South) *are* allowed to use the

information that west wanted to bid 2, at their own risk.

The rubber bridge laws are similar, but not identical (after all, there is no TD to make judgement rulings, so...) You can read them here (Laws 24, 25, and 26).

Michael.

bluejak

434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: bidding wrong (00:50:19 ThuJun 19 2003) Select Action

While Michael's answer was 100% correct as far as it went, it actually forgets the question asked! :smile:

IF :rolleyes: the Director decides that it was an inadvertent 1 bid so allows it to be changed to 2 then **Yes,** the pass can be changed without penalty.

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] [>]

3 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 3 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 10:25:23 Sat Aug 30 2003

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

top

Guest

Reply

Insufficient corrected (14:38:15 TueJun 17 2003) Select Action

Country: Hong Kong

East bids 3S. South bids 3C. East says 'Insufficient Bid'. South immediately changes his bid to a 'Pass'. Which law should I be looking at? Law 25 Change of Call or Law 27 Insufficient Bid.

Ed

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Insufficient corrected (16:02:37 TueJun 17 2003) Select Action

Law 9. :biggrin: Specifically Law 9B1(a) and law 9B2. East's comment draws attention to South's irregularity (L9A1), so the director *must* be called (Law 9B1(a)), and no player should take any action until the Director does his thing (Law 9B2). Also, South's premature correction of the IB may subject him to further penalty (Law 9C). Now, south's pass is cancelled, and you deal with his insufficient bid (keeping 9C in mind).

bluejak

434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Insufficient corrected (23:17:21 TueJun 17 2003) Select Action

Yerrr-s-s-s-s. While Ed is right up to a point it is a very normal reaction of players to try to correct their insufficient bids. So long as the TD is called immediately by one of the players not much harm is done.

The TD gives the next player the chance to accept the original call - not the attempted correction. If the next player does not do so the full Law is applied and the attempted correction is cancelled - but it is UI to partner.

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

View Thread Page(s): [1]

James Vickers

Reply

Club rules (13:11:05 TueJun 17 2003)

Select Action

Country: UK

I have been given the task of reviewing the club rules. Ours is a bridge club affiliated to the county association and the EBU. As far as I understand the situation, the club, as the sponsoring organisation, can impose any playing rules it likes so long as these do not conflict with the laws of the game.

So we are bound by the WBF laws (the blue book), but not the EBU regulations (the Orange Book).

For instance we could decide that a Stayman 2C should not be alerted (Orange Book stuff), but not that a passed out hand should be redealt (L22A). We could declare that a bid is not made until the bidding card is placed on the table (contravenes OB 7.3.2, but no law), but not that declarer's deliberately played card can be retracted without penalty (would contravene L45). We could not ban psyches (L75B), but we need not impose a 60/30% score in the case of fielded psyches as the OB recommends (6.2.2). (We could, if we so wished, impose 60/0%, for instance.)

Is my understanding so far correct?

One of our existing rules states that "Any player or players that wilfully refuse to play a board will automatically score zero on the board. Their opponents will score 60% or their own average, whichever is the greater."

Notwithstanding the fact that the TD could award 60/40% in such cases and add a disciplinary penalty of 40% of a top for the offenders, is this rule as it stands in contravention of L12B and L12C?

James

bluejak

434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Club rules (13:21:59 TueJun 17 2003) Select Action

Your perception of the legalities in your first few paragraphs seems completely accurate to me.

A pair that refuses to play a board should consider themselves extremely fortunate to get 0% on a board. Most sponsoring organisations would disqualify them routinely.

I cannot see how 60/0 can be against the Laws.

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] [>]

3 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 3 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 10:26:17 Sat Aug 30 2003

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

top

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

Legend :: Read Topic :: Unread Topic

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

Guest

Reply

Lead out of turn (06:52:41 SatMar 15 2003) Select Action

Country: Hong Kong

Club Duplicate Bridge Session
West is declarer in 4S. South leads the DA out of turn. Declarer did not accept the lead and stated that a diamond should not be led. The DA was picked up and returned to the offender's hand. A diamond cannot now be led by offender's partner as long as he retains the lead.

When offender's partner regains the lead after another player has won a trick he is entitled to lead a diamond. Offender's partner could clearly take advantage of the situation knowing that his partner has the ace even though it is unauthorised information. Without this knowledge he might lead another suit that would help the declarer.
How do you rule in incidents like this when declarer feels that the offender's partner has taken advantage of a situation but has difficulty proving it.

bluejak

434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Lead out of turn (14:08:06 SatMar 15 2003) Select Action

Proof is not required in judgement rulings.

Unauthorised information [UI] cases are always treated the same, even though over 90% of them concern hesitations. Despite this, the methodology for non-hesitation UI cases is just the same.

If there is a possibility that a diamond return could be based on the sight of the opening lead out of turn, the Director will consider whether there were logical alternatives to the diamond switch, whether the diamond switch was suggested by the UI, and whether there was damage. If all of these apply he adjusts the score.

Since this is a judgement ruling, the Director will only make it after consultation and it is appealable.

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

Robert Johnson

Reply

Re: Lead out of turn (02:04:46 MonMar 24 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

Gentlemen, If I understand the question, Declarer would not have the choice of forbidding offenders partner from leading a Diamond. Under Law 57, declarer can:
1. require offender's partner to play the highest card of the suit led.
2. require offender's partner to play the lowest card he holds of the suit led, or
3. forbid offenders partner to play a card of another suit specified by declarer.

Regards,
Bob

JimO

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Lead out of turn (05:25:00 MonMar 24 2003) Select Action

You misunderstand the question, or the Laws.

Law 57 does not apply here; it applies only when 1) a defender leads to the next trick before his partner has played to the current trick, or plays to the current trick out of rotation before his partner has played to the trick.

Law 53A (when the lead is accepted) and Law 56 (when the lead is not) are the laws that apply here; Law 56 will refer you to Law 50D (major penalty card).

Law 16C states that the info from withdrawn calls/plays is UI for the offenders, AI for the non-offenders.

I agree with Mr. Stevenson's answer.