Key to Abbreviations

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

Other bridgetalk forums

Polling Booth
The Bridge Table
Bridge Issues
Ask an Expert
Information

Click here for Code Guide
Click here for Emoticon Key

bridgetalk.com forums :: Laws & Rulings

International Bridge Laws Forum

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

Hosted by David Stevenson
Senior Consultant Director
English Bridge Union

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

Welcome, Register :: Log in

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

Mark Forum Read [New Discussion]

		Subject	Replies	Views	Last Post T U
		claiming	2	35	Ed 18:39:53 Thu Aug 28 2003
		party scoring	3	30	bluejak 15:24:51 Thu Aug 28 2003

	Misinformation appeal	10	353	bluejak 00:26:35 Wed Aug 27 2003
	Rights of dummy	4	99	Ed 02:00:16 Tue Aug 26 2003
	Permitted conventions	9	201	bluejak 01:35:18 Sun Aug 24 2003
	Weak Twos With Mandatory 0-7 HCP, 4+ Cards	3	112	mycroft 15:36:40 Fri Aug 22 2003
	Questions about a possible revoke	3	254	bluejak 12:26:22 Fri Aug 22 2003
	Inappropriate action by a defender	3	141	Star 22:23:36 Thu Aug 21 2003
	Stop Card	2	95	jnichols 18:07:59 Thu Aug 21 2003
	renege penalty scoring	1	62	bluejak 01:38:48 Thu Aug 21 2003
	Comic NT Overcall	1	69	mycroft 15:17:27 Wed Aug 20 2003
	Double edged appeal	4	151	bluejak 14:12:36 Tue Aug 19 2003
	Switched hands	2	61	bluejak 14:01:01 Tue Aug 19 2003
	Nightmare	2	159	bluejak 13:35:19 Tue Aug 19 2003
	Is the Appeal Committee too Lenient	5	152	bluejak 13:25:52 Tue Aug 19 2003
	When is it a psyche of 2C opening	5	123	bluejak 13:06:51 Tue Aug 19 2003
	scoring party bridge or chicago	1	55	bluejak 12:02:07 Tue Aug 19 2003
	need schedule for 8 couples playing marathon bridge	1	41	mycroft 15:54:55 Mon Aug 18 2003
	hcp sanctions	1	62	Ed 17:54:15 Fri Aug 15 2003
	Scoring	1	58	RMB 12:14:10 Fri Aug 15 2003

David L'Estrang

Reply

claiming (15:24:39 ThuAug 28 2003) Select Action

Country: UK

East is playing in 4 Hearts. After the second trick, claims the rest. East holds 9 4 H, West (dummy) holds K Q J T 6 H. Declarer says that they are going to draw the trumps, playing the king, then south jumps in and says hold on exactly how are you going to play it, west (dummy) jumps in and then south shows his hand and is holding 5 hearts to the A 8.

This is when the directer is called.

If east plays K - 6 of hearts, (winning with the 9 in hand) and the back to the table to draw the remaining trumps, east wins all but 1 of them.

South will always win the A of trumps, but on careless play, ie. playing K - Q of trumps souths 8 will become good.

East has no outside losers, it is just the trump holding that is in question as to the number of heart tricks to award the defense.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: claiming (15:36:14 ThuAug 28 2003) Select Action

If you mean exactly what you say, namely that as West was explaining then South "jumped in" then I do the following.

> **I warn South as to his future conduct, and tell him that I shall penalise him in future if he does not permit a claimer to make his claim statement in peace.**
>
> **Then I tell East that since he was interrupted in the middle of his statement I am now asking him to complete his statement.**

There seems to be a growing habit of the totally unethical ploy of interrupting claim statements. This must be stamped out, by penalising if necessary, and it shifts the balance of doubt.

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

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: claiming (18:39:52 ThuAug 28 2003) Select Action

What David said. In this case, I would allow declarer's claim statement to include "I lead the S9 from hand, playing the 6 from dummy"; one trump trick to defense, not two.

Though one wonders how a declarer can claim "the rest" when the Ace of trumps is still out.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

8 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 1 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 7 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)
martynk

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

The time is now 15:12:20 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

jan

Reply

party scoring (13:58:41 ThuAug 28 2003) Select Action

Country: usa

if you are playing four hands of bridge and n-s wins one game then e-w wins one game then n-s wins one game is the rubber finished? Would the scoring be n-s 300 and 500 and e-w 300? If e-w then has another game is the score 300pts? Thank you for your help Jan

Liu

Reply

Re: party scoring (14:25:27 ThuAug 28 2003) Select Action

Country: Singapore

The rubber is finished when one side has two games. In your case, NS has bid and made two games. The rubber bonus is 500 if their opponents are not vulnerable when the rubber ends and 300 if they are. Since your EW has bid and made a game as well NS will get 300 bonus above the line.

Since the rubber has ended, if EW subsequently bid and made a game it should belong to a new rubber.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: party scoring (15:21:44 ThuAug 28 2003) Select Action

No, Liu, you are talking about rubber bridge. I am fairly certain that Jan is talking of four deal bridge, or Chicago.

There are always four deals, however many games are bid and made, in Chicago. The only exception is that if a hand is passed out it does not count as one of the four deals, but is redealt with the same dealer.

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

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: party scoring (15:24:51 ThuAug 28 2003) Select Action

Sorry: I only asnwered half the question. In Chicago it is 300 for a non-vulnerable game, 500 for a vulnerable one. No-one is vulnerable on the first deal, dealer only on the next two, and every one on the fourth.

Jut to complete the rules, part-scores build up into games as in rubber bridge. A part-score on the fourth hand only has a bonus of 100 points.

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

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

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

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:13:14 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

Ray Crowe

Reply

Misinformation appeal (22:03:09 WedFeb 26 2003)

Select Action

Country: New Zealand

Board 12---Dealer West----Vul NS

North---85, A4, JT7654, 432

East---AQ972, 7, 832, JT87

South--KT, KJ8653, Q9, Q65

West--J643, QT92, AK, AK9

The bidding---

West North East South

1C* p 1D* X
1NT 2D 2S p
p p p

1C and 1D are precision and were alerted
In NS's system, the X shows a long suit (points not specified)
1NT is precision, 16 - 18 hcp
North's 2D was a misbid. She forgot their system and replied as to a take-out double (the correct system bid here is 2C)
2S is precision---an invitational bid, showing 5+ spades and 5-7 hcp.

Before West passed, she enquired at length about NS's double. North (mis)informed West that the X was for take-out---as stated,N had forgot their system, as her 2D response verifies this

At the Appeal, West claimed damage and passed because of the M/I-- and said----
"The X by the offenders means just an overcall in one suit, I was not told this, and also it was not a double of diamonds, but instead showed points.
My partner has given an invite of 5-7 and 5+ in suit, and 3S is a force to game which is not suitable as she may be facing a 2 card fit, therefore putting us into 3NT against 16HCP in my hand and a misfit. With a weak very hand she will wait for a reopening double.
Now I have to bid. My correct bid according to our system in an overcall situation is 3S (i.e. accepting the invite). Given the (mis)information, I consider all or most of the points were in the doubler's hand and this is even further aggravated by the minor response by his partner.
Now he has points and both majors. 2 heart losers and 2 spade

losers look obvious and if my partner has hedged ther may be three, why accept an invite to game if it can't make?
If I know it is only an overcall, then the points and spades are more likely to be balanced, leaving a possibility of only one spade loser. Certainly I would bid 3 spades. The M/I caused me to underbid"

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Misinformation appeal (14:36:10 ThuFeb 27 2003)

Select Action

B12
D:W
N/S

♠85
♥A4
♦JT7654
♣432

♠J643
♥QT92
♦AK
♣AK9

♠AQ972
♥7
♦832
♣JT87

♠KT
♥KJ8653
♦Q9
♣Q65

West	North	East	South
1♣*	p	1♦*	X
1NT	2♦	2♠	p
p	p		

One minor matter is that the write-up is confusing as to what North actually described the double as. According to the write-up it was for takeout [of what?] but according to what West said North had said it showed diamonds.

Fortunately, it does not matter very much, since West's arguments have no validity. West is worth 3♠ over 2♠, and it makes no difference whether the double shows diamonds, is for takeout, or is artificial showing a single suit.

"2 heart losers and 2 spade losers look obvious" is neither true nor affected by the meaning of the double. It merely shows a lack of faith in partner's bidding!

There was misinformation but no damage so the result stands.

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

James Vickers

Reply

Re: Misinformation appeal (17:39:25 ThuFeb 27 2003)

Select Action

Country: UK

I would have adjusted the score here, as I think EW could have been talked out of a game contract by the misinformation. I would like to know more about what was said about the double; how can it be for take-out when no-one has yet bid a suit? Was it supposed to be a take-out of diamonds? Was it alerted?

I agree that West is a big jelly not to bid on, and that "two heart losers and two spade losers" is not obvious, but certainly possible if South's double advertises four spades.

EW have not covered themselves with glory here, but with a correct explanation they are more likely to have reached game. If you don't at least give them some recompense for this you will have allowed NS to have gained by breaking the laws which, as we all know, is anathema.

James

Ray Crowe

Reply

Re: Misinformation appeal (21:06:07 ThuFeb 27 2003)

Select Action

Country: New Zealand

At the appeal, there was much disagreement as to what was actually said at the table.
Concerning the double, North stated that she said " I somewhat hesitantly answered that I am not sure, but I think it's for take out.
And (in the appeal) added that she did not say that it showed points, and her partner agreed with this.
In NS's system, a X of a precision 1C shows a long suit.
North actually forgot that this also apllied over the 1D response,

hence the uncetainty (and M/I)
West maintained that she was told, at the table, the double showed "points"
I hope this helps.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Misinformation appeal (23:58:02 ThuFeb 27 2003)

Select Action

Quote: James Vickers

> I would have adjusted the score here, as I think EW could have been talked out of a game contract by the misinformation.

I do not believe this for a moment. What difference does the meaning of double make? If West is going to pass the meaning of double is quite irrelevant and I believe West would have passed whatever it meant.

Quote: James Vickers

> If you don't at least give them some recompense for this you will have allowed NS to have gained by breaking the laws which, as we all know, is anathema.

I see no sign of them having gained from "breaking Laws". Anyway, there is no need for an emotional approach. This is a pure judgement decision, with the Law being completely clear. Either they have been damaged or they have not. A Director or Appeals Committee should just treat this as a pure judgement decision and leave the emotion out of it.

If you do not believe you have game values with fewer than 25 HCP despite a known 5-4 fit what difference does it make whether a double by the opponents was takeout of something or other, or showed diamonds, or showed a single suit? It is a nonsense to suggest that a player would bid on with one of these three explanations and not the others!

I think it quite possible that this level of player might be talked out of the obvious 3♠ bid by the double - but that is by the call, not by its meaning or explanation. There is no reason to be, of course.

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

James Vickers

Reply

Re: Misinformation appeal (14:05:37 FriFeb 28 2003)

Select Action

Country: UK

Who's adopting an "emotional approach"? My calm-as-a-millpond argument is that West, knowing her partner has 5-7 pts and a 5-card spade suit opposite, has the sort of hand where game is a possibility. It is certainly better than the raw point count would suggest.

She has been misinformed about the meaning of the double, (although exactly what was said seems to be in dispute). If she was led to believe that the spades are breaking 4-0 this could easily have deterred her from bidding on. If she were given the correct explanation that it showed a single-suited hand, if anything it might encourage her to bid on.

You have argued very forcefully (dare I say: emotionally?) in recent cases in this forum that players who break the rules should not gain as a result. I was arguing then that the misinformation did not cause the damage, here our roles seem to be reversed. At least we seem to agree on the principles, even though our judgement may be at odds. This example may be borderline, but I think benefit of the doubt should go to the non-offenders.

James

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Misinformation appeal (13:04:34 MonMar 3 2003)

Select Action

When I referred to "emotional approach I was referring to this:

> **Quote: James Vickers**
>
> If you don't at least give them some recompense for this you will have allowed NS to have gained by breaking the laws which, as we all know, is anathema.

and not to your analysis. When a pair "breaks the Laws" by misinforming their opponents there are always some pairs who feel unhappy when they are given no adjustment, but unless the pair concerned make a habit of misinformation there is no adjustment suitable **unless** there is damage.

As to the actual analysis we shall just have to differ. I do not believe the meaning of double made any difference and see no reason to adjust.

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

Ray Crowe

Reply

Re: Misinformation appeal (05:44:03 WedMar 19 2003)

Select Action

Country: New Zealand

This has also been circulated around several of Australasia's best, and all agree there should be no adjustment.

I thank you both for your time and contributions

JimO

offline
175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Misinformation appeal (07:19:28 WedMar 19 2003)

Select Action

I agree that there should be no adjustment. West has an easy 3S bid, and East should bid 4. If W is not going to bid 3S, he should probably give up playing a strong club; he'll be talked out of game whenever the opponents compete.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

wabbitUSA

offline
3 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Misinformation appeal (16:54:37 TueAug 26 2003)

Select Action

Country: USA

I understand the consensus that a score adjustment is not warranted. However, is it

a. Possible under the laws
b. indicated here

to give N-S a precedural penalty because they didn't know their methods? IMO this should depend on their experience.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Misinformation appeal (00:26:35 WedAug 27 2003)

Select Action

The Laws give very wide powers of judgement to the TD to issue procedural penalties, so it might be considered legal.

But it would be a very poor thing to do. A player made a mistake and forgot herself for a moment, and made a bad bid. What on earth would we want to penalise her for? This would be like penalising her for taking a finesse when the expert play is to go for the drop.

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

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

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

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:13:40 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

jediman2002

offline
7 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Rights of dummy (16:12:44 SatAug 23 2003) Select Action

Country: England

A good friend persists in what I think is questionable behaviour when he is dummy. If his partner or the dummy wins the current trick, he almost invariably announces where the lead is as he turns the trick.

For instance, declarer plays towards dummy, and the trick is won in dummy. My friend turns the played card, announcing, "Lead is in dummy". The same thing happens if declarer wins a trick - as the card is turned at the end of the trick, my friend announces, "Lead is in declarer's hand"or "Lead is in your hand partner!"

I do not think this is correct behaviour. I know dummy can attempt to stop declarer from playing from the wrong hand, for instance calling 'Table!" if he notes declarer drawing a card from his hand as if to play, when the lead is rightly in dummy.

I cannot htink it can be right however for dummy to participate in the way here described. May I have an expert ruling please?

Thank yuou in advance.

Jon

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Rights of dummy (16:34:49 SatAug 23 2003) Select Action

What your friend is doing is not one of dummy's rights as per the Laws. He is not trying to stop an irregularity: he is merely contributing to the general noise level in an unnecessary and provoking way.

There is a common failing amongst dummies that they try to get more involved in the game than hte Laws allow, for example when dummy is all winners but declarer has not noticed they say "You have the rest". It is an unfortunate failing.

In France they call dummy "le mort" which means the dead one and that is a good description of the best dummy. To quote David Burn, a top English player, dummy should be at the bar buying the drinks.

So someone should explain to your friend that he has no right to do this and should desist.

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

jediman2002

offline
7 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Rights of dummy (22:15:13 SatAug 23 2003) Select Action

Country: England

JoAnneM

Reply

Re: Rights of dummy (23:52:11 MonAug 25 2003) Select Action

If I was playing with that partner we would have a serious discussion as soon as I finished declaring my first hand. Declaring my 2nd hand would depend on whether he agreed to stop that nonsense.

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Rights of dummy (02:00:16 TueAug 26 2003) Select Action

Having agreed to play in a duplicate session with someone pretty much obligates you to finish the session with that someone. What you do after that, of course, is strictly up to you.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

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

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:14:20 Fri Aug 29 2003

NeilThomson

offline
7 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Permitted conventions (10:40:19 MonAug 4 2003) Select Action

Country: Scotland

After a natural 1 NT opening, is it possible for the opponents to use following method

2C described as black suits, but subsequently to rebid C's shows only C's?

2D red suits, but to rebid D's shows only D's

2H shows majors, but to rebid H's only H's

If not allowed (reason being incomplete explanation), would it be permissible to explain

2C's as "either blacks or only C's"
2D's as "either reds or only D's"
2H's as "either majors or only H's"

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Permitted conventions (13:06:42 MonAug 4 2003) Select Action

At Level 3, the normal level for clubs and events, all of these methods are permitted in Scotalnd, and the description you mention is perfect.

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

NeilThomson

offline
7 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Permitted conventions (13:20:24 MonAug 4 2003) Select Action

Country: Scotland

Is this the case south of the border (in England) as well?

NeilThomson

offline
7 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Permitted conventions (13:38:30 MonAug 4 2003)

Select Action

Also I slightly different scenario

Overcall of 2C's, alerted and described as H's and another and then the repeat of the orginal suit as meaning single suiter of the bid suit. In this case the "anchor or known suit" is not known when the first overcall is made does this make a difference?

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Permitted conventions (13:59:32 MonAug 4 2003)

Select Action

The system outlined originally may be played in England or Wales at Level 2, and in Scotland at Level 3.

2♣ as ♥ + other, or as ♣, may only be played at Level 4, in England, Wales, or Scotland.

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

Earl_Purple

offline
79 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Permitted conventions (08:15:14 TueAug 5 2003)

Select Action

But here one of the suits is known, i.e. the suit that was overcalled.

In the old EBU levels, at "restricted" license level any defence to 1NT was permitted, and I assume that is what level 3 is.

But there is a big difference of a 2♣ overcall being either "hearts and another" or "clubs" because in that case you don't know any of his suits. But with it being blacks or clubs, you know he has clubs, just that he may have spades as well.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Permitted conventions (12:10:02 TueAug 5 2003)

Select Action

Restricted licence became Level 4 not Level 3.

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

acoales

offline
1 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Permitted conventions (19:14:51 SatAug 23 2003)

Select Action

Country: England

Please comment on the following Bidding Dequence and claim.

All Vul, N dealer.
N E S W
1NT, pass, pass, 2C(note)
pass, 2H, pass, 3C
pass, pass, pass

note: EW did not have completed convention cards (as is common at our club) but 2C bid was alerted and the explanation given by E was that it was Pinpoint Astro showing two suiter - Clubs and Hearts. W actually held a long clubs and short hearts. Played in 3C nine tricks were made.

NS contend that this is not an acceptable bidding sequence - See EBU Orange Book 12.13.1 (b) - which says
--- quote
You may use 2-level bids [over 1NT] .... to show any one of
(i) a single specified suit
(ii) two suits at least 4-4, of which at least one is specified
(iii) three suits, at least 4-4-3-2, of which at least one is specified
Note: players often abuse this by bidding, say, 2C to show Hearts and another suit and then rebidding 3C to show just clubs: this is not allowed.
--- end quote

NS suggest redress awarding an adjusted score either of two ways:
1) Bid of 1NT should stand where 8 tricks made is most likely outcome. - award adjusted score of 120 to NS or
2) Final pass by E who holds stronger Hearts than Clubs is not acceptable - bidding should continue to at least 4C.

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Permitted conventions (21:18:56 SatAug 23 2003)

Select Action

Quote: acoales at 19:14:51 Sat Aug 23 2003

> Please comment on the following Bidding Dequence and claim.
>
> [snip]
> NS contend that this is not an acceptable bidding sequence - See EBU Orange Book 12.13.1 (b) -
>
> [snip]
>
> NS suggest redress awarding an adjusted score either of two ways:
> 1) Bid of 1NT should stand where 8 tricks made is most likely outcome.
> - award adjusted score of 120 to NS or
> 2) Final pass by E who holds stronger Hearts than Clubs is not acceptable - bidding should continue to at least 4C.

First, IMO, players who call the TD should recite the facts, not try to tell the TD how to rule.

Second, based on the laws and the regulation cited, it appears that NS were misinformed by the explanation of the 2C overcall. That is a violation of Law 75. Now, Law 21 deals with changes of calls that were made based on misinformation. Under that law, South may change his final pass to some other call. If he does not wish to do so, the hand will be played in 3C, as it was. Law 40C then permits (but does not require) the TD to award an adjusted score, if he feels the NOS were damaged. However,

Third, it appears that NS did not call the TD until they discovered their bad result. This does not sit well. Are they trying for a double shot? I don't know. I have questions I would like to ask of the players at the table. Based on those answers, I might award an assigned adjusted score (probably 1NT by N making 2, based on the information at hand) or I might rule result stands. I might, but probably would not (but I am not an EBU TD - there may be requirements or precedent of which I'm unaware), award a penalty to EW for using an illegal convention (if I decide they

are). If they are using an illegal convention, I would certainly tell them to stop. And if it looks to me, in the end, like NS **were** trying for a double shot, I'm disinclined to let them have it.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Permitted conventions (01:35:18 SunAug 24 2003)

Select Action

This is very complicated because there are so many different factors but I shall try to list them all!

When reading the Orange book, especially the part about permitted conventions, you always have to remember that certain extra items are permitted each year. These are published in English Bridge, there is a supplement available from Aylesbury, and for the last two years they have appeared in the Tournament Committee Year book. You will find that the permitted defences to 1NT have been extended at Level 2 and 3 so that a pair may play anything if it guarantees one suit. Thus it is now permitted to play 2♣ over 1NT as either ♣ + ♥ or just ♣ even at Levels 2 and 3.

While they were not playing an illegal convention it is worth noting that if they had been there is an English regulation that the board is cancelled, and Average Plus given to the other side, and Average Minus to the offending side, unless the other side had already done better than that. So the suggested adjustment would have been wrong even before 2001 when this conveniton became legal.

It is very important that players describe their system correctly. If they play it as either ♣ + ♥ or just ♣ then they should say so, **and that is not Pinpoint Astro.** They must **never** describe it as Pinpoint Astro nor must they put Pinpoint Astro on any convention card.

It appears that N/S were misinformed. But were they damaged? Unless they can show that they might have bid differently - perhaps they had a heart fit?

As to not calling the TD until they discovered the result this is perfectly normal. There is nothing wrong with the double shot in 99% of cases. It is not illegal. The only thing that is frowned on is if a pair took a wild or gambling action because they felt they would get a ruling anyway if it failed, and there is no evidence of that here.

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)
martynk

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

The time is now 15:15:05 Fri Aug 29 2003

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

pbleighton

offline
103 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Weak Twos With Mandatory 0-7 HCP, 4+ Cards (00:29:16 ThuAug 21 2003)

Select Action

Country: USA

This is a bit of a ramble, but...

I have seen this described as Lorenzo Twos (4+ cards, mandatory, all 4 suits). This means that Pass = 8-10 hcp (opening light). Is this GCC legal?

Does it matter that it would only be used when not vulnerable?

If not, what 0-7 scheme would be GCC legal? If 2C were strong, or a Precision 2C, then Pass would be 0-10. Would this pass muster (no pun intended). If the bid wasn't mandatory, would that work?

A weak two bid is defined as "natural" if it has five or more cards (at the three level, six plus). Are 4 card weak twos (and 5 card three bids) illegal, or just alertable?

Related issue: ACBL website talks about Pre-Alerting where either:
1) "Partnerships whose systems include extremely aggressive methods, such as frequent use of four-card overcalls at the two level or higher, weak two-bids with bad five-card suits, or three-level preempts with bad six-card and/or most five-card suits must pre-Alert the opponents before the round begins."
2) "If it is your partnership style to routinely open hands with fewer than 11 HCP, preempt with very weak (frequently worse than Qxxxxx) suits, and/or overcalls with fewer than 6 HCP at the one level, the opponents must be pre-Alerted."

Do I have to both Pre-Alert and alert these bids?

I didn't see anything about alerting points and/or short suits for jump and double jump overcalls. Are there such requirements?

With all of the above, what does variable treatment by vulnerability mean to alerting requirements?

Peter

[1 edits; Last edit by pbleighton at 00:46:54 Thu Aug 21 2003]

mycroft

offline
67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Weak Twos With Mandatory 0-7 HCP, 4+ Cards (14:39:00 ThuAug 21 2003)

Select Action

Hi Peter - the bids are GCC legal, but. And it's a big "but"!

If your two-level openers are weak, and do not promise both a 7HCP range (0-7 is 8, sorry) and 5 cards in the suit, you will not be able to play conventions (including a conventional defence to a conventional defence) afterwards. No Blackwood, no fit jump shifts, no SOS XX. So, while you *can* play them in tournaments (and expect frequent, possibly ugly complaints!), you probably won't be able to play them very effectively.

Okay, maybe you couldn't play them in tournaments. The GCC disallows "conventions whose primary purpose is to destroy the opponents' methods." This could very easily be argued here, and if it were, then out you go - especially if it's almost impossible to bid sanely after them, given the ACBL's restrictions on conventional continuations.

I can't imagine any local club allowing them, purportedly GCC or not. The University of Waterloo BC - well, ok. We allowed anything, provided you offered to play standard against the real novices if they asked (IIRC, they never did - and by "real novices", I meant the players who had had three bridge lessons before showing up to the first duplicate "club night"). I know the club I work for now would be very quick to say "Sorry, no can do here."

As for Alerting - Pre-alert would be mandatory. Alerts probably would not, but I'd do it anyway. *And* I'd Alert the pass - you have information opponents are *very unlikely to expect*.

Note: on the Mid-Chart, I played a system where we opened most 8-counts (10-12 NTs, but 4cM, 4cD, 8-14); our 2 structure was mini-Multi 2D, Ekren (4-4+M) 2H, and 2S spades and a minor. All of them 1-7 HCP.
We had no problems - but we guaranteed 5 cards (well except for the Ekren 2H, but that guaranteed 8 cards).

Michael.

pbleighton

offline
103 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Weak Twos With Mandatory 0-7 HCP, 4+ Cards (16:02:57 ThuAug 21 2003)

Select Action

Michael -

Thanks for your response. Disappointing, but not surprising.

If we went to 1-7 hcp and guranteeeing 5 cards, do you think that it would pass muster at tournaments and clubs?

Peter

mycroft

offline
67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Weak Twos With Mandatory 0-7 HCP, 4+ Cards (15:36:40 FriAug 22 2003)

Select Action

Tournaments? Shouldn't be a problem. You might want to let the TDs know in advance, because you're likely to get many "is this legal?" calls, but within 7 HCP and guaranteeing 5 is normal, and when we did it, it was obvious it was in the context of a very light opening system.

Clubs? Ask the club. It all depends :-). I doubt if you'll get to play this in the NLM games...

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 - 1 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 5 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)
martynk

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:15:45 Fri Aug 29 2003

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

top

James Vickers

Reply

Questions about a possible revoke (13:20:23 TueJun 3 2003)

Select Action

Country: UK

At the County Swiss Teams final on Sunday a player asked me who is allowed to ask whom whether they still have cards in the suit led when they fail to follow suit. I gave my usual well-rehersed answer that:

"Declarer may ask any player, and any player may ask declarer. No other questioning is permitted."

So far so good. However, after digesting this she returned and asked me:

"If a defender sees her partner and declarer show out on the same trick, and she knows there is still a card of the suit at large, is she then allowed to ask declarer?"

I said that this is more difficult. Technically, she may ask, but she is committing an offence if she asks for the purpose of alerting partner to the situation. This may be difficult for the director to establish, so she would probably get away with it.

Do you agree with my answer?

James

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Questions about a possible revoke (15:40:25 TueJun 3 2003)

Select Action

Yes.

edric

Reply

Re: Questions about a possible revoke (17:25:14 ThuAug 21 2003)

Select Action

Country: Quebec

In my area, defender usually is allowed to ask partner «no (color)?» when defender does not follow the suit for the first time. Is it only a regional habit or is it accepted by ACBL

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Questions about a possible revoke (12:26:22 FriAug 22 2003)

Select Action

Defenders are allowed to ask each other whether they have cards in the suit in Zone 2 and Zone 7. So it is a Zonal habit rather than a regional one.

Where are Zone 2 and Zone 7? Zone 2 is North America, basically the USA, Canada, Mexico and Bermuda. Zone 7 is Australasia, basically Australia and New Zealand.

Note this is an example of why we always ask people to put their country when asking questions: there are so many distinctions based on geography in the rules of bridge.

If you are curious as to which countries are in which Zone then take a look at
Zonal Organisations and National Bridge Organisations

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)
martynk

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:16:24 Fri Aug 29 2003

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

top

Toffee

Reply

Inappropriate action by a defender (11:39:18 FriAug 8 2003)

Select Action

Country: England

Please advise me on the following situation:

RHO opened a weak 2 and partner declared 3n. He crosses to dummy and twice throws LHO in to establish sufficient tricks to make contract if RHO can be kept off lead.
LHO now goes into the tank and FINALLY leads a club. Dummy has QTxxx and declarer K8x

RHO if holding the ace can take and rattle off 3 diamonds to set the contract BUT he too goes into the tank (for whatever reason) and FINALLY plays the 9.

Declarer having now presumed after this 5 minute hiatus that he was about to win the trick and take his diamonds falls asleep and plays the 8, (in so much as I at dummy could see it) but not in a way that played the card onto the table and now attempts to correct to the K (which would have then enabled him to make the contract)

Director was called - and in the absence of any agreement on the part of the other 3 players he asked me as dummy if I had seen the 8C, which I said I had in fact seen. He ruled 3n off (and declarer permitted a club back for 3 off)

There are several problems here I believe:

1. The DELIBERATE coffeehousing on the part of a very experienced and strong player.

2. The requirement for Director to ask me (dummy) to clarify.

3. The mistake of the declarer to "fall asleep"

Please could you shed light on the behaviour of RHO and the accuracy of the ruling (it was Teams and we finished 9th of 60) and anything else you wish to add.

Thanks

Toffee

James Vickers

Reply

Re: Inappropriate action by a defender (16:58:50 FriAug 8 2003)

Select Action

Country: UK

I got rather confused as to whether LHO referred to your (dummy's) or declarer's LHO, but no matter.

As far as whether declarer is permitted to change a card played from his (closed) hand, this all depends on whether his card was "held face up, touching or nearly touching the table, or maintained in a position as to indicate whether it has been played" (L44C2). This is a matter for the Director to decide, and it is quite appropriate to ask the other players, including dummy, for their opinions on what happened. Note that whether any other player saw the face of the card is not the criterion for deciding whether it was played.

As for suggesting that the defenders were "coffeehousing", I don't see any reason from your report to suspect this, and you would have to be very sure of your ground before accusing them. Who knows what was going on in their heads when they paused for so long? If this was done deliberately to mislead or disconcert declarer it was indeed an infraction, but do you really suppose they could foresee that this would induce declarer to duck by mistake?

I think declarer has to pay the price for falling asleep. I've done this before myself (I'm sure we all have sometime), and felt pretty stupid.

James

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Inappropriate action by a defender (12:36:34 TueAug 19 2003)

Select Action

I agree with James. Your partner did something silly, and there is no reason for him not to suffer for it. There was nothing in your report that suggested coffee-housing in any way. Good players thought for a long time? Well, why not? Poorer players do as well!

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

Star

Reply

Re: Inappropriate action by a defender (22:23:36 ThuAug 21 2003)

Select Action

It's a shame you appear to have overlooked law 45 and the fact that the card is not "ON THE TABLE" here.

Also a shame you refuse to comment on an awful ruling whereby dummy was called upon to reveal if he had SEEN the 8 of clubs, since this is completely irrelevant viz a viz the actual playing of the card. and appears to contravene the basic tenet that dummy sees and hears nothing.

I think the original author deserves a fair answer to his question - one which I am not well placed to give as I am not a leading authority on such matters.

You seem to have concentrated on his suggestion that very strong players, knowing full well the game was up, made life difficult for a declarer in an inappropriate manner, which the author found unhealthy. Perhaps he was wrong here but that was one of at least three aspects of this problem posed.

The moral seems to be RTQ.

Star

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)
martynk

Christina

Reply

Stop Card (07:13:08 WedAug 13 2003) Select Action

Country: UK

Can someone please give me the correct ruling on pulling out a stop card when it is not a jump bid?

RMB

offline
19 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Stop Card (09:03:11 WedAug 13 2003) Select Action

If a player pulls out a stop card, they are not required to make a jump
bid, whether the stop card was a complete aberation or if they change
their mind. The call is made with the appropriate card - the stop card
does not constitute making (or starting to make) a call.

If a player pulls out a stop card and then makes a non jump bid (or
passes or doubles or redoubles) then the use of the stop card is
unauthorised information to their partner and, if it suggests one action
or another, their partner may be constrained by Law 16A.

jnichols

offline
6 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Stop Card (18:07:59 ThuAug 21 2003) Select Action

RMB is correct, but call the director and have him explain the requirements before the auction proceedes.

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

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

pat stephens

Reply

renege penalty scoring (23:29:03 WedAug 20 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

renege penalty scoring
My year old duplicate group and my foursome of many years are at odds over where to score the renege(revoke) penalty. Some say only above the line---some say with the game score, counting toward the contract.
I think this error penalty is applied toward the game, otherwise there would be a great incentive at times to renege.
Can you please clarify this problem?
Thanks!
Pat Stephens
pat5v23@alltel.net

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: renege penalty scoring (01:38:48 ThuAug 21 2003) Select Action

There is a Law in the Rubber Bridge Law book especially for this, Law 77. It says:

> **A trick transferred through a revoke penalty is reckoned for all scoring purposes as though it had been won in play by the side to which it had been awarded.**

So if you are in 3♥, you make eight tricks, but your opponent has revoked, and two tricks are transferred, then you score 90 below the line and 30 above the line.

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] [>]

pbleighton

offline
103 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Comic NT Overcall (11:18:40 WedAug 20 2003) Select Action

Country: Comic NT

I am interested in playing this, described as 1NT = 15-18 or weak single suited or weak two suited.
Is this GCC legal (country = USA)

[1 edits; Last edit by pbleighton at 11:21:28 Wed Aug 20 2003]

mycroft

offline
67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Comic NT Overcall (15:17:27 WedAug 20 2003) Select Action

Country: Canada

No, silly! (Well, you wanted a comic, no? :-)

You have three options for a NT overcall:
1. Natural.
2. Three-suited takeout (at least 3 cards in each suit).
3. Two-suited takeout, at least one of which suits is known, min 5-4.

You get to pick *one* and one only.

On the GCC, the answer to "I want to play some multi-meaning bid. Is it GCC legal?" is almost always "No." The most common exceptions are:

- 1C or 1D can be anything promising 10 high. Continuations can be messy, however, unless they're GF or the opening is invariably strong.
- Responses to an ACBL-approved (note: not ACBL-legal) 1NT can be anything.
- X and 2C over opponents' 1NT can be anything.
- Defences to conventional calls can be anything provided they are not purely destructive.
- After you get past Opening and Response, anything goes.

There are others, but they almost never come up :-).

As far as others go, this *might* be legal Mid-chart provided you authorize a defence (and ACBL-approved defences are murder to create, and they still have to approve it), and they believe it is "constructive" according to their definitions (which I have no idea of). If it isn't Mid-chart legal, it probably isn't Superchart legal, unless the weak suit is limited to one of two.

Good luck!
Michael.

joe_manjoe

offline
1 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Double edged appeal (09:40:56 TueAug 12 2003) Select Action

Country: India

Hand is as below with North as Dealer. NS vulnerable.

64 JT6 T542 8763
AT9 AQ532 J K954 Q52 87 KQ873 AT2
KJ873 K94 A92 QJ

Last deal of a cricual match in the open room with a dozen Kibitzers.

After two passes, South opens 1N (15-17!), a bold semi-psyche or a foolhardy bid which ever way you look. West gave a long look at his cards and passed. Pass to East who gave a really long thought and cameup with 2D. Now West bids 3N, Pass Pass Pass. Before his pass, South calls the Director and explains. Director asks the play to proceed and due to a fortunate lie of the South club cards, the contracts soon makes. Director is called again and South claims that he was damaged by the opponents pause and bid. Director rules that the table result stands and requests NS to appeal.
Meanwhile the closed room players do the scoring and discover that the contract was 3N= in the other room.
NS appeal saying that they were damaged and the result should be adjusted to 2D+5.

What should be done to this appeal?

1. Is the Directors ruling correct?
2. What should the contract be judged as?
2D/E+5 or 3N/W= or 1N/S-4 or a split ruling?

Thanks

Guest

Reply

Re: Double edged appeal (16:28:50 TueAug 12 2003) Select Action

It seems to me that west's hesitation over 1NT suggested to east that action was safe. I would disallow the 2D balancing bid and roll the contract back to 1NT by south. In 1NT, it seems likely to me that declarer would take more than 3 tricks. Down 2 or 3 seems like a reasonable guess.

I believe the director should have ruled in favor of the non-offending side, thus putting the burden of appeal on the offending side.

I would not describe south's opening bid as a semi-psyche. Perhaps it is not a very good use of judgment, but it is not so off as to warrant an exclamation point.

Tim

Earl_Purple

offline
79 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Double edged appeal (14:56:07 WedAug 13 2003) Select Action

1NT would probably make 3 tricks so down 4 would be -400 to NS and a flat board.

Frances Hinden

Reply

Re: Double edged appeal (16:14:30 MonAug 18 2003) Select Action

Country: UK

1. At least in England, the Director should make the best ruling he can. He doesn't just say 'result stands' and request N/S to appeal if they don't like it.

2. West's hestiation and thought over the NT gave UI to East. East is not permitted to choose an action suggested by this over any other logical alternative. If we believe pass is a logical alternative to 2D in the pass out position, we could change to score to 1NT passed out.

3. If we believe pass is not a LA, then the 2D bid is permitted. There is no suggestion that there is anything wrong with the 3NT bid (indeed, some people may say West has 'shown' his values twice - once with the pause, and once with the 3NT bid). So 2D+n is not a possible result.

4. As the possible results appear to be the table result of 3NT making exactly (+400 to EW) and 1NT-4 (+400 to E/W) on a normal heart lead there doesn't seem much point taking this any further.

5. If East had _doubled_ and E/W had taken a large penalty I would be quite likely to adjust.

6. I'm amazed 3NT took only 9 tricks. I wouldn't be suprised to see a few 460s on the traveller at mps, and 430 looks normal. This might convince me to think harder about the possibility of 1NT-3 only, if I think E/W may defend as poorly as they play!

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Double edged appeal (14:12:36 TueAug 19 2003)

Select Action

I agree with Frances' answer but would like to add a couple of points.

England has always had more faith in its TDs giving correct rulings than elsewhere. However, world opinion has swung everywhere towards giving the correct ruling. The idea of always ruling in one direction and letting Appeals Committees do their work for them was at its height in the 1980s especially in North America.

As to whether 2♦ is an LA the standard outside North America, Great Britain and one or two other places tends to be an action that at least one in four players of like ability would find. The old idea of whether the UI makes a bid easier or safer is no longer part of 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] [>]

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

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:18:02 Fri Aug 29 2003

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

top ⇧

Gerry Morris

Reply

Switched hands (05:58:08 TueAug 19 2003) Select Action

Country: Hong Kong

I would appreciate your help to score the following hand. The board was played correctly at table one. The hands were then switched. East/West switched and North/South switched. The mistake was not discovered until the board had been played wrongly three times. The problem was between tables 1 and 2. Table 1 pairs insist the hands were put back correctly. Table 2 insist they did not make a mistake. How do you decide who is at fault? How should I score the board. After the mistake was discovered the hand was then played correctly 6 times.

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Switched hands (07:20:47 TueAug 19 2003) Select Action

If I understand you correctly, it sounds like either at table one the board got turned around before the cards were put back, or at table two the board was turned around, the cards taken out, and then turned around *again*. Either way, the effect seems to be the same as if the board were simply turned around and played with the north arrow pointing to south instead of north. In that case, we simply score the board normally, using the designations in the board rather than the seats of the players to indicate who was north, south, etc. It seems to me the same principal applies here. OTOH, it's 3:30 in the morning, and it's quite possible my brain only **thinks** it's awake.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Switched hands (14:01:01 TueAug 19 2003) Select Action

If the board was played wrongly at table two then the mistake was at table one! Players do not foul a board before playing it.

You should just divide the scores into two fields and score each field separately. Good software will do this. If you are doing it by hand then just treat it as two separate boards with different tops.

If you have poor software then it is more difficult. Score it first: re-calculate it by hand: put the adjustments in manually.

Liu

Reply

Nightmare (08:33:25 SunAug 10 2003) Select Action

Country: Singapore

* *

North: S: 98xx H: - D: xxxx C: 9xxxx

East: S: QJ10x H: Qxxx D: Kx C:Axx

South: S: K7xx H: AKx D: xxx C: KJx

West: S: A H: J10xxx D:AQxx C:Q10

North passed and East opened 1C (West later claimed he announced 'may be short' - South wasn't paying attention and North claimed he didn't hear that). South overcalled 1NT and West doubled. North asked about 1C, upon hearing that it might be short, bid 2C. East passed and South agonized. South reasoned that the question indicated that North had clubs and thus decided to 'go the other way' and treat 2C as STAYMAN (they partnered each other once before only, and agreed 'System On' for 1NT overcall) so he answered 2S. Two passes and East doubled, after that all passed.
N E S W
P 1C 1NT X
2C P 2S P
P X All passed.

West led the queen of clubs, not a great success. South played well and managed only two down (ace of clubs by East, club continued. South won and discard 2 diamonds on his AK hearts. heart ruff in dummy and low club to jack. West ruffed with ace and played 3 rounds of diamonds. Dummy ruff high and East overuffed. Heart return ruffed by South and diamond ruff high and overuffed. South must made two more tricks with K7x trumps.) East-West cried foul and asked for a ruling. East-West contended that North Question made certain that South would answer Stayman and that South pass of 2C should be LA. South countered that he's in a no-win situation no matter how he bid as North's question could be interpret both ways. I was the director and to get the game going I ruled that the table result stand as it was due largely to a unfortunate lead and South's fine play that East-West missed their heavy penalty. I of course informed the players their rights to appeal but in the end N-S's team won by a big enough margin to make this board a non-issue. Still, academically it will be interesting to know how should the ruling be.

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Nightmare (18:04:11 FriAug 15 2003) Select Action

I think your ruling was correct.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Nightmare (13:35:19 TueAug 19 2003) Select Action

Goodness, you do have some complaining pairs, Liu! South was as ethical as possible: if he had passed that would have got howls from East-West. Excellent ruling.

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

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

8 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 1 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 7 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)
martynk

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:18:50 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

Liu

Reply

Is the Appeal Committee too Lenient (08:53:34 SunAug 10 2003) Select Action

Country: Singapore

♠102
♥AQ2
♦Q10632
♣AQ6
♠KQ75 ♠J843
♥943 ♥J
♦J8 ♦AK54
♣10984 ♣K753
♠A96
♥K108765
♦97
♣J2
The Bidding
North East South West
1D P 1H P
2H P 3C P
4H All Pass

The Facts:
There was no alert for 3C. After the hand was played East-West approached the director to lodge a complaint against their opponents, claiming that had they knew that 3C was not a suit West could have led a spade and brought the contract down. They also objected to the fact that the opponents did not have a convention card and thus the TD must ruled the infraction as misinformation. They cite an two earlier incidents when the director was also called as examples of N-S's unorthodox methods (The TD was called and dismissed both incidents - one was when North opened 3rd in hand nonV weak 2 on KQ10xx, and the other was when South opened 1NT with a balanced 16 count and 5-hearts) The TD approached North-South for an explanation of their auction. North-South claimed they were using simple Standard methods, that 3C invites the partner to bid game if he has values in the suit.

The Director's Findings:
The action of North supported his explanation of his partner’s call and it was thus decided that there had been no misinformation.

The Director's Ruling:
The TD allowed the table result, 4H making 10 tricks, to stand but caution North-South that normally opponents are entitled to expect 3C to be based on at least a 3-card suit and that if they continued to bid on a doubleton they would have to alert in future and give adequate explanation to their opponents. The TD further

indicated that he would make a note of the hand and watch out for future complaints against North-South for similar incidents. East-West appealed.

The Committee's Finding:
3C as 'help-suit' game try is natural and doesn't require an alert. In addition, East-West could have defeated 4H. The committee upheld the ruling.

Deposit
The deposit is refunded.

Do you agree with the decisions?

Earl_Purple

offline
79 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Is the Appeal Committee too Lenient (12:59:39 SunAug 10 2003)

Select Action

I agree with the decisions except perhaps the returning of the deposit.

N/S should probably have a convention card though.

However E/W sound like one of those pairs who can't bear losing and will go by any means (i.e. calling the director) to overturn a bad result.

James Vickers

Reply

Re: Is the Appeal Committee too Lenient (16:34:05 ThuAug 14 2003)

Select Action

Country: UK

I don't quite understand the basis for the appeal. If they had been told that NS didn't have CLUBS they would have led SPADES??? There may be some logic behind this reasoning, but I'd like to have this explained before I would consider giving EW any redress.

Not only do you have to show there was misinformation, you also need to show that this caused the damage. What did they lead, anyway?

James

Liu

Reply

Re: Is the Appeal Committee too Lenient (04:33:46 FriAug 15 2003)

Select Action

West led a club, in an effort to try to give his partner a ruff.

Guest

Reply

Re: Is the Appeal Committee too Lenient (09:22:39 FriAug 15 2003)

Select Action

Country: Scotland

I would totally agree with ruling, but EW could (and probably should) have asked about 3C, especially when trying to base a defence on a speculative rough.

Here in Scotland with have a strange scenario in that both long suit trial bids (needing help) and values showing trial bids(need help elsewhere) are non-alertable and as such if you suspect the opposition to have made a trial bid then it is a necessity to ask to find out which trial bid has been used

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Is the Appeal Committee too Lenient (13:25:52 TueAug 19 2003)

Select Action

The ruling and appeal look OK. N/S should be warned about the lack of a convention card though.

E/W sound a nagging pair, don't they? They should not demand rulings, they may not tell the TD that lack of a convention card means they get a ruling, and the two previous things they cite are the most minor of minor deviations. Furthermore, 4♥ goes off so long as East makes the obvious spade switch whatever the lead.

Incidentally, the diagram is very difficult to read. The software does not allow multiple spaces! You should either use dots, or use the PRE facility - and it is always worth reviewing what you are going to send before you do. But do not worry this time - it was clear enough.

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

Andrew Worth

Reply

When is it a psyche of 2C opening (00:49:36 WedAug 13 2003)

Select Action

Country: England EBU

There is controversy about the legality of making a strong opening of a hand with a large number of playing tricks but few hcp.

S 4
H 6
D T4
C AKQJ76543

Consider the above, it has 10 hcp, and 9 almost certain playing tricks in clubs.
Under EBU regs is it illegal (i.e. a psyche) to open 2C (ACOL).

If one's CC is amended to say "2c - 23+hcp OR 9 pt" woudl it be illegal to open 2C.

RMB

offline
19 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: When is it a psyche of 2C opening (09:15:40 WedAug 13 2003)

Select Action

Traditionally all Acol two bids showed some defence. The EBU approach
to permitted two bids reflects this: at level 2/3, bids must shows a
strong hand (playing strength and values) or they must be non-strong
and natural-ish (4 cards in the suit).

The Orange Book defines permitted conventional two bids to be: game forcing, balanced 18+, acol two - rule of 25, or 4441 16+.
The hand you quote is rule of 21 (10HCP+2D+9C) so it is not permitted
to agree to open this hand with 2C that could also be 23+HCP.

Why do you want to open this hand 2C? - what's wrong with 3C, 3NT,
4C, 4NT, 5C?

[1 edits; Last edit by RMB at 09:16:19 Wed Aug 13 2003]

Guest

Reply

Re: When is it a psyche of 2C opening (09:30:00 WedAug 13 2003)

Select Action

This happened once to me many years ago...one pair who claimed they were playing ACOL opened 2C with a similar hand and the explanation was just 'Strong'. My pardner believed that and passed with a good opening hand but a moderate 5-card holding in a major and we missed a game in the end. There was an uproar after the game of course, and in the midst of all the recrimation and argument I heard the bidder of 2C told his pardner off that 'it would had be alright if you had explained it as 9 playing tricks'.
So I believe that players who open 2C on that type of hands are seeking to exploit a loophole in the laws, with the primary aim of misleading and disuading their opponent from bidding and finding their contract.

Andrew Worth

Reply

Re: When is it a psyche of 2C opening (11:02:39 WedAug 13 2003)

Select Action

Country: England

Thanks for replys.

Yes the controversy also rages about the "best" bid to open with, and 1C, 3NT (gambling), 4C, 5C, etc. are all on offer. The deeper issue is that opening 2C (under normal ACOL) would be completley illegal according to the orange book, whereas the other openings are merely the subject of debate.

In fact the issue started with a slightly different hand:

S 4
H 65
D T4
C AKQ76543

Where the same argument arose regarding the use of the Benji 2C (ACOL 2 in unspecified suit) comes up. The hand has 8 playing tricks and so some felt it qualified for an ACOL 2 opening (but being in clubs this couldn't be done). It would appear that this is not the case.

Earl_Purple

offline
79 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: When is it a psyche of 2C opening (14:50:49 WedAug 13 2003)

Select Action

If you want to include this type of hand in the opening 2♣ bid it is perfectly permissible (but check the level) as long as it is disclosed.

What is your plan if partner responds 2♦? Would you rebid 3♣ and would partner be permitted to pass?

If the next player does intervene, are you expected to double them if you can't bid game yourself? In a game-forcing situation that is required.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: When is it a psyche of 2C opening (13:06:51 TueAug 19 2003)

Select Action

This is a complex subject as shown by the perfectly sensible but partly incorrect replies already given!

Is it permissible to open 2♣ with

x
xx
xx
AKQxxxxx

either {a} by agreement or {b} just as a one-off because it seemed a good idea at the time?

The answer is **no.**

OK, let's look at why. To open it by agreement means your 2♣ opening must include the possibility of this hand - and there is nothing in the Orange book that permits it. I expect you have looked at what is allowed for a strong opening, but a strong opening is defined as Rule of 23 or more, and this hand is Rule of 19.

> **Note: Rule of 23, also called 23 Opening Points, is calculated by adding your High Card Points to the number of cards in your longest suit to the number of cards in your second longest suit. So the given hand is 9 HCP plus 8 {clubs} plus 2 {diamonds}.**

So it is an illegal convention if your 2♣ opening, whether Acol or

Benjamin, includes this hand. You may not psyche an Acol or Benjamin 2♣ opening, so you may not open this hand 2♣.

Two other small points.

First, players who do this are not trying to exploit a loophole in the Laws at all. What happens is they come to some agreement or other without considering this hand. Then it arrives, they look at it, count the tricks, and decide they need to show the number of tricks in some way. As Robin suggest, good players do not consider 2♣!

Second, the system is called Acol not ACOL. It is a proper noun, not an acronym.

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)
martynk

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:19:42 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**

Joyce Wacks

Reply

scoring party bridge or chicago (17:39:22 ThuAug 7 2003)

Select Action

Country: USA

scoring party bridge or chicago

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: scoring party bridge or chicago (12:02:07 TueAug 19 2003)

Select Action

To score Chicago:

You play four deals. On the first no-one is vulnerable, on the second and third dealer is vulnerable, on the fourth everyone is vulnerable.

Note: Some places play that dealer's opponents are vulnerable on the second and third deals, and not dealer: make sure your group is agreed.

If a hand is passed out it is re-dealt with the same dealer and same vulnerability, ie the passed out hand does not count as one of the four deals.

Score for tricks and overtricks and undertricks and honours and bonuses for making doubled or redoubled contracts are normal.

As in rubber bridge tricks scores for tricks bid and made count towards game bonuses. The game bonuses are 300 for a non-vulnerable game, and 500 for a vulnerable game.

If a side bids and makes a part-score on the first three deals it counts towards game and may be made up to game. For example if A-B make 60 on the first hand and 40 on the second that is 100 which is game so the get the game bonus that applied on the hand where they reached game.

Scores below the line are lost if the opponents make game. For example if A-B make 60 on the first hand and 40 on the third but X-Y made game on the second then the 60 is lost as in rubber bridge.

A part-score on the fourth hand may reach game with a previous score: if it does not then it gets a bonus of 100.

Four-deal bridge is sometimes played whereby the scoring is just duplicate, though the vulnerabilities are as in Chicago. For party bridge Four-deal bridge is often preferred to Chicago.

power

Reply

need schedule for 8 couples playing marathon bridge (18:50:46 SunAug 17 2003)

Select Action

We have eight coup0les. Play marathon bridge one a month for 8 months. Am tryinjg to firgure a schedule of playing in wihich the rotation of the teams is as equal as possible. Can you help. Thanks.

mycroft

offline
67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: need schedule for 8 coules playing marathon bridge (15:54:55 MonAug 18 2003)

Select Action

Country: Canada

What you want is to start with a 4 Table Howell Movement (thanks, Sid!).

Unfortunately, with only 8 pairs, there are only 7 different sets of opponents, so unless you have a "revenge round" or "final month playoff", your 8th month won't be used. However, with this movement (tweaked appropriately, see below) in 7 months, every pair will have played every other once.

To make it work for homes: first, ignore the "boards" column - you'd be able to have everyone play the same hands, if you could keep 7 evenings' worth safe and undiscussed for 7 months. Not going to happen! Similarly, you can ignore the "table" name - just pretend it's just "game #1, game #2, ... #4".

Next, each month is a "round". So the first month is "round 1", the next is "round 2", and so on. On the game night, the couple at each table labelled "North/South" hosts the couple labelled "East/West" (to be fair to pair 8, you probably wish to alternate who hosts "Table 1" every month).

Don't bother telling the players "which table", or "what table you're going to next" - it's irrelevant to them. Just give them who each month's opponents are, and who's hosting this month. You're the only one who has to know the mechanics!

Have fun,
Michael.

[1 edits; Last edit by mycroft at 15:56:31 Mon Aug 18 2003]

View Thread Page(s): [1]

dake50

offline
1 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

hcp sanctions (14:16:06 FriAug 15 2003) Select Action

Country: usa

WBF sanctions HUM with rule of 18. Does ACBL also sanction with the rule of 18? Or additional high card points sanctions for opening bids at one level? two level? three level?

How constrained am I for opening bid agressiveness?

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: hcp sanctions (17:54:15 FriAug 15 2003) Select Action

ACBL convention regulations make no mention of the rule of 18 or similar rules. On the General Convention Chart, opening at the one level by partnership agreement on less than 8 HCP is prohibited.

The only restriction I can see for natural preempts at the two and three level (or higher, for that matter) is that if you have an agreement to open a weak two on a range greater than 7 points or with fewer than 5 cards you may not use conventional calls thereafter.

You may find, particularly in clubs, that the actual rule is "whatever the TD - or some influential player - doesn't like is prohibited" even when the GCC is nominally in force.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

8 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 1 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 7 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)
martynk

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:21:14 Fri Aug 29 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

Cliff Curtis

Reply

Scoring (20:25:57 ThuAug 14 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

When did the scoring change for undertricks of four or more?

RMB

offline
19 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Scoring (12:14:10 FriAug 15 2003) Select Action

1987 for duplicate bridge and 1993 for rubber bridge

View Thread Page(s): [1]

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

8 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 1 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 7 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)
martynk

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

Register :: Log in

The time is now 15:21:38 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