



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE  
HELD AT THE IMPERIAL HOTEL, RUSSELL SQUARE, LONDON WC1  
ON WEDNESDAY 25TH OCTOBER 2006**

<b>Present:</b>	Martin Pool	Chairman
	Mike Amos	
	Steve Barnfield	(from item 4.1.3)
	Max Bavin	Chief Tournament Director
	Sally Bugden	EBU Vice-Chairman
	Jeremy Dhondy	
	David Martin	
	Peter Stocken	EBU Chairman
	David Stevenson	
	Grattan Endicott	Vice-President
	Gerard Faulkner	Vice-President
	John Pain	Secretary

**1. Election of Chairman and Vice Chairman**

The Secretary opened the meeting and invited nominations for the post of Chairman for 2006-07. Mr Pool was proposed by Mr Martin and seconded by Mr Stocken. There were no other nominations and Mr Pool took the chair. From the chair Mr Pool nominated Mr Dhondy for the post of Vice Chairman for 2006-07; Mr Amos seconded. There were no other nominations and Mr Dhondy was declared elected. Mr Pool welcomed Mr Amos to his first meeting of the committee.

**2. Apologies for Absence** David Burn

**3. Minutes of Previous Meeting (September 6<sup>th</sup> 2006)**

**3.1 Accuracy**

The minutes of the meeting of September 6<sup>th</sup> 2006 were taken as read.

3.2.5 An error in analysis had been identified by Jim Proctor and Robin Barker in 8.4; Hand 06.43; point (2). However, the minute had been correctly written. There were no other matters of accuracy and the minutes were signed as a true record.

**3.2 Matters arising**

**3.2.1 White Book**

Mr Stevenson reported that the index was now finished and the White Book was ready to be printed. Mr Bavin said a revised quote for printing was being obtained, the previous one being over a year old. It was decided that Panel TDs, Referees and County Associations should receive a copy free of charge. It had been reported to Shareholders that copies would be available at their

next meeting at a cost of £1.50. The committee was concerned that it should be sold for a price which at least covered its cost, with appropriate postage charges being added when sent out from the Aylesbury office.

### **3.2.2**      *Disciplinary Case – ‘Lion’*

The secretary reported that the matter had still not been resolved satisfactorily. The club was proposing a way forward which it was hoped would be acceptable to all parties involved. The Secretary was asked to remind the club that any proceedings should be in accordance with their club rules and he was to recommend that any hearing be conducted in accordance with EBU Disciplinary Rules.

### **3.2.3**      *Disciplinary Case – ‘Meerkat’*

Mr Faulkner has spoken to the Club Chairman and offered advice on how to proceed. The Secretary had spoken to the complainant, but there was no conclusion to report. The club had indicated they would reconsider the matter.

### **3.2.4**      *Reporting of Minutes*

There was a discussion on the reporting of the minutes in connection with the removal of a line from the minutes of June 6<sup>th</sup>. Mr Stevenson suggested that political correctness had intervened; Mr Endicott enquired whether an individual should be allowed to intervene to have a line removed and Mr Martin felt that persons being quoted in the minutes should have sight of them before publication. Mr Stevenson reminded the committee that even though published on the website they were still only draft minutes until the committee approved them at the next meeting.

Mr Pool asked that early copies of the minutes be sent to all Committee Members to report on accuracy with a time limit for return of four days. He and the Vice Chairman would then finalise the version to be put on the website and distributed.      *Action: The Secretary*

### **3.2.5**      Dealt with under accuracy.

## **3.3**      *Minutes of Disciplinary Hearing – July 21<sup>st</sup> 2006*

The minutes of the disciplinary hearing were considered. Mr Faulkner approved of the move to truncate proceedings into a single session (Disciplinary Rules 8.12 and 8.13), but Mr Pool felt that keeping both separate was the correct procedure. In any case it was a matter for the Chairman of the Disciplinary Panel. Mr Pool asked the Secretary to check the Bye-Laws and Articles of Association regarding whether such meetings were open or closed to general members.

*(Secretary’s note: Bye Law 8.4 – Save where the Disciplinary Committee orders otherwise, all proceedings of the Disciplinary Committee shall take place in private)*

Both Mr Martin and Mr Faulkner felt that it was wrong that the complainants had been present as observers and not been called as witnesses. Mr Faulkner was also concerned about the non attendance of the principal witness. Mr Barnfield said that TDs behaviour was just as important as the players. Mr Bavin said the matter was something for the TD Appointments and Promotions panel which met annually in March.

## **4**      *Technical matters*

### **4.1**      *Review of Orange Book after two months use*

#### **4.1.1**      *Benjaminised 2♣ opening*

Correspondence from R J Fleet and others was considered. Mr Dhondy said he was replying to a question about the Extended Rule of 25 in his *English Bridge* column. Mr Bavin was concerned that the new regulation may be unenforceable. Players could get around the regulation for a limited number of times by saying that a 2♣ opening which did not conform to the Extended Rule of 25 was a psyche or deviation from their methods, whereas a player who said that it was their agreement to open such hands would be penalised. There had been hostility from players about the regulation, and in his view 14HCP minimum was possibly a jack too high. If however you reduced it by 1HCP players would try it with 12HCP. Mr Endicott felt that attaching any HCP value was inappropriate.

Mr Stevenson outlined the creeping change that had taken place over time. Players were now disregarding the 'power and quality' requirement of an Acol-2 opening to open a Benji 2♣ on any hand with 8-playing tricks including hands that were really pre-emptive openings. Regular club players found this difficult to defend against. He pointed out that no-one had applied for permission to have a 2♣ opening as either weak or strong.

Mr Dhondy felt that making any changes after so short a period would be a mistake. Whilst acknowledging that there was disquiet he suggested no changes be made until August 2007 at the earliest.

#### *4.1.2 Correspondence from R J Fleet QPM/1926/6421*

Mr Dhondy said that the new alerting rules for doubles were confusing. Mr Amos agreed that alerting of doubles in some positions was not understood and that the *Orange Book* was confusing. There was a need to write something simple for *English Bridge*. The Secretary was instructed to write to Mr Fleet thanking him for his letter, with a reply composed by Mr Dhondy.

#### *4.1.3 Regulation Complexity – D Martin and others*

Mr Martin opened the discussion by saying that the published regulations were fine for the highest level but those who played for fun found the *Orange Book* a nightmare. He was suggesting a simplified set of regulations that regular club and social members could easily understand. He cited Andrew Robson's club where regulations were simple and easy to follow. Mr Barnfield felt that this was the sort of thing the L&E could provide as a service to members which would be welcomed. Mr Stocken said that 94% of the membership would welcome inaction by the committee. L&E promulgations in the past had done damage. While Mr Stevenson thought that in clubs there was a leader who disseminated information from the EBU Mrs Bugden said that it has to be made easy for regular members to enjoy their game.

Mr Stocken observed that at Andrew Robson's club bridge was still played within the laws of the game but there were no stops, no alerts and no *Orange Book*. He has also used announcements for some years before their introduction in August. Mr Stevenson noted a general resistance to change and reminded members of the resistance to bidding boxes when first introduced.

Mr Endicott said that clubs could have simpler regulations than the *Orange Book* but another group may devise pro forma regulations which should then be issued by the L&E Committee. Simpler approaches to systems could be produced with bridging regulations for those moving on to higher level competition. It would also be useful to provide something for clubs who had nothing else. He said that any publication should be produced in the name of the committee. He enquired whether the issuing of master points at club level was affected if clubs did not adhere to the *Orange Book*, to which the answer was no.

Mr Faulkner observed that the L&E was not considered user friendly by many members and providing simpler guidance to be offered to clubs (and not rammed down their throats) would help with public relations at club level. As a non regular club player Mr Barnfield reminded the committee that the *Orange Book* does not have to be used at club level. He, too, wondered whether the L&E was the correct committee to produce such a guide. Mr Stocken agreed that many clubs were unaware that using the *Orange Book* was not compulsory and suggested that a marketing opportunity existed to provide a minimum menu for clubs.

Mr Pool was concerned that while we want to make things more simple for club players there must still be sanctions for those experienced club members who took advantage of less experienced players caused by hesitations and questions. Mr Stocken thanked the committee for the discussion. He said that the Board would be addressing the matter in due course.

#### *4.1.4 Alerting regulations and screens*

Mr Dhondy said that the regulations at the first weekend of the Open Trials had been confusing. It had been made more confusing in that BGB had subsequently announced that screens would not be in use in the forthcoming Camrose series, which is why they were being used in the trials.

Mr Bavin confirmed that the Conditions of Contest produced the Selection Committee for trials would lay down the regulations which would be in force. Normally they would be the same as the

tournament for which the trials were being held. In EBU events where screens were in use the conditions in the White Book would be observed, although no such events are currently held.

*Following the meeting it became clear that the regulations needed clarifying. A proposal by Mr Bavin, seconded by Mr Pool that the Committee to agree to use WBF/EBL Alerting procedures whenever Screens are in use, be it in an EBU tournament or a Trial was carried by an email vote.*

#### **4.1.5      *Sample Announcement Sheet***

The committee noted a sample of a sheet in use at Welwyn Garden City but proposed no further action.

### **5            *Disciplinary Matters***

#### **5.1            *'Jackal'***

Mr Pool reported that the Sussex Conduct Committee now had a new chairman and that the Sussex rules were not yet in line with the revised EBU Disciplinary rules.

Mr Pool and Mrs Bugden then withdrew for this item, with Mr Dhondy taking the chair.

After discussion it was resolved:

The L&E Committee should investigate the matter and the Secretary was asked to start this.

Mr Pool and Mrs Bugden rejoined the meeting.

#### **5.2            *'Octopus'***

There were two matters to consider

a) There was conflicting evidence over an alleged statement which may have led to a misunderstanding. The committee decided there was insufficient evidence to proceed with an enquiry.

b) The committee considered that the 6VP penalty that had been imposed on-site was sufficient penalty and that nothing further need be done.

The Secretary was instructed to write to the parties concerned.

The L&E closed the case.

#### **5.3            *'Porcupine'***

The Secretary reported on the current situation. The Chairman agreed to approach one member to find out if the L&E could help to move the matter on.

### **6            *Reports from Tournament Directors***

#### **6.1            *Composition of the Reviewing Panel***

It was agreed to have only two reviewers for the time being – Mr Barnfield and Mr Stevenson.

6.2            The committee noted that the standard of form filling had slipped with a number of forms poorly completed or with omissions. This did not only apply to TDs but also to Appeals Committee Chairmen.

6.2.01 06.45

Dealer E  
NS game  
Scoring: Match  
Point Pairs

**North**  
♠ A 9 8  
♥ K 9 4  
♦ Q 10 6 3  
♣ K 9 8

**West**  
♠ K J 6 5 4 3 2  
♥ Q 5 2  
♦ None  
♣ A 6 2

**East**  
♠ Q 10  
♥ A J 6  
♦ A K J 5 4  
♣ Q 5 4

**South**  
♠ 7  
♥ 10 8 7 3  
♦ 9 8 7 2  
♣ J 10 7 3

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
			1♦	Pass
	1♠	Pass	2NT	Pass
	4♠	All pass		

**Result:** 4♠ + 1 by West = -650 Lead ♥9

**TD first called:** during the play – trick 7.

**Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling**

West told me that he had asked about opponents lead style at trick one and had been told 'second and fourth'. He had taken this as second from bad suits and played ♥A at trick one, eventually making eleven tricks. If he had known the lead could be from ♥K he could make twelve tricks. South said he had said 'Second and fourth from everything doubleton and from honours'. North agreed this is what South said. East (dummy) agreed with West that South had only said 'Second and fourth'. I later recorded the play to the first seven tricks, but it seems it is only the play to trick one that is crucial.

Table result stands. Ruled on the basis that South said what he said he said. More likely that South gave a long answer and EW switched off after the first few words. No misinformation, no adjustment. (Law 47E2(b), 85B).

**Appeals Committee's decision**

That the explanation was a fair one and the convention card was accurate and complete. We felt that NS had explained their methods and West made a play based on what he thought he had heard. It looks as if it can only gain when hearts are 1-6. Whilst he was unlucky the opponents had committed no infraction.

We recommend to NS that they draw attention to their leads because although a description of 2<sup>nd</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> may be accurate it is not what is most commonly understood in England.

**L&E comment:**

Players should understand their responsibilities when playing very unusual methods (such as leading low from doubletons or the middle card from three to an honour) and should take particular care to explain their methods fully. They should also take particular care to ensure that convention cards are exchanged at the start of each round. It will often be preferable to refer an opponent who asks a question to the convention card as well as answering the question. Answering the question might begin 'We play unusual methods and .....'.

**6.2.02 06.47**

The committee considered a hand from the Corwen Trophy. The committee were concerned that a player had, on his own initiative, sent his partner away from the table in order to explain a bid that had been alerted. The committee considered changing the classification of the misbid from Amber to Red. The Secretary was asked to write to the players concerned inviting their comments and reminding them of clause 3B10 in the Orange Book (which was not in force at the time, but is now) and to the TD who had not filled in the box for the lead.

**6.2.03 06.49**

Dealer S  
NS Game  
Scoring: Match  
Point Pairs

	<b>North</b>	
	♠ A K J 9 7 5 4	
	♥ K	
	♦ A J	
	♣ K 10 9	
<b>West</b>		<b>East</b>
♠ 8		♠ 10 6
♥ A Q 9 8 3		♥ 10 7 6 2
♦ K Q 9 6 3		♦ 5 4
♣ Q 8		♣ J 7 5 4 3
	<b>South</b>	
	♠ Q 3 2	
	♥ J 5 4	
	♦ 10 8 7 2	
	♣ A 6 2	

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	1♥	3♠	Pass	Pass
	4♦(1)	4♠	Pass	Pass
	Pass			

(1) questions asked

**Result:** 4♠+1 by N = 650      Lead ♦5

**TD first called:** at end of hand

***Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling***

Before West's second bid he asked the meaning of 3♠, and was told it was weak. South did admit to some doubt. After West's rebid and North's 4♠ bid, South thought it might have been strong. West felt he was damaged because he would definitely have passed if told that North's 3♠ was strong. The convention card shows that an ordinary overcall is 9 to 15 HCP, and a single jump overcall is 16+ when vulnerable versus not vulnerable. When asked why he bid 3♠ North believed that 3♠ was stronger than 2♠.

Adjusted to 3♠+2. It was not certain what the NS agreement was, but in view of North's comments, his hand, and South's uncertainty, plus the general style of caution at the vulnerability, the TD ruled that NS had an implicit agreement 3♠ was strong, and that West would pass if he had known this. It was noted that North had unauthorised information so his 4♠ bid might have been illegal but this was a moot point because of the adjustment given.

***Appeals Committee's decision***

Committee on enquiry established to their satisfaction that the 3♠ bid systematically was preemptive and that North had misbid. South's explanation that 2♠ would have been strong and that 3♠ would not have been suicidal was felt to be a correct explanation. Committee felt that

the 4♠ bid by North subsequently was not influenced by any unauthorised information. Table score reinstated.

**L&E comment:**

The L&E Committee considers that the Appeals Committee was wrong in its findings. North had received Unauthorised Information through the answer given by South. The Secretary was instructed to write to the Appeals Committee accordingly.

**6.2.04 06.50**

The Committee considered a hand from the Pachabo Cup. The committee considered changing the classification of the psyche from Green to Red. The Secretary was asked to write to the players concerned inviting their comments and to the TD who had not filled in the box for the lead.

**6.2.05 06.57**

The Committee considered a hand from the English Riviera Swiss Teams. The committee considered changing the classification of the psyche from Amber to Red. The Secretary was asked to write to the players concerned inviting their comments and to the TD who had not filled in the box for the lead.

**6.2.06 06.63**

Dealer S  
East West Game

Scoring: Match  
Points converted to  
VPs

**North**

♠ 10 9 6  
♥ 10 5  
♦ K 8 7 6  
♣ 8 6 4 2

**West**

♠ A K 7 5 4  
♥ A Q 9 7 6 3  
♦ 9 3  
♣ None

**East**

♠ 8 3  
♥ K 8 4  
♦ Q J 10 5  
♣ J 9 5 3

**South**

♠ Q J 2  
♥ J 2  
♦ A 4 2  
♣ A K Q 10 7

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
				1♣
	2♦(1)	Pass	Pass	2NT
	3♥	Pass	4♦	Pass
	4♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

(1) not alerted

**Result:** 4♥+1 by West = -650 Lead ♣x

**TD first called:** before opening lead, by declarer.

**Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling**

West called me before the opening lead as East had failed to alert his 2♦ bid. East left the table and West explained systematically that 2♦ showed 'the majors' – Ghestem. East returned. South offered opportunity to re-open the auction (by changing final pass) – option declined. East confirmed that she had forgotten the system and it was Ghestem as explained. Convention card also confirmed it but not fully explained. When called back I asked South what she would have done had she known the 2♦ was for the majors (when she bid 2NT). She told me she would have bid 3♣.

Score adjusted to 4♦-2 by W = +200. West had unauthorised information when East failed to alert. The pass by East and subsequent 4♦ bid promises a string of diamonds. With screens, it is felt that West must pass 4♦ and that West did not comply with Law 73C. (Laws 16A2, 21B3 and 73C)

**Appeals Committee's decision**

Back to 4♥+1. Unauthorised information did not satisfactorily affect the action. We considered, but rejected, a procedural penalty. Pass after 2♦ 'denies' a string of diamonds, therefore pass was not a logical alternative.

**L&E comment:**

1) The Committee disagreed with the Appeals Committee. Would West have bid the same way if East had alerted 2♦, explained it as showing majors, and then passed 2♦ and subsequently bid 4♦? The Committee doubt it. In particular, the Committee does not understand the AC comment that pass over 2♦ denies a strong of diamonds.

2) This is incredible. You show a two-suiter, and happen to have a doubleton diamond. Partner shows a string of diamonds: you get a chance to bid again to show a freak, partner puts you back to diamonds, What excuse can you possibly have not to pass – or raise diamonds? None. The AC has seriously gone wrong here when it says 'unauthorised information did not satisfactorily affect the action'.

The Secretary was asked to write to the AC Chairman offering the L&E advice.

**6.2.07 06.66.**

Dealer N  
North South Game

Scoring: MPs  
to VPs

**North**

♠ Q 6  
♥ K 5 4  
♦ Q 9 7 6 4  
♣ K 8 5

**West**

♠ A 8 3  
♥ A Q J 9 7 3  
♦ J 5  
♣ 9 4

**East**

♠ 9 4  
♥ 10 8 2  
♦ K 3 2  
♣ Q 7 6 3 2

**South**

♠ K J 10 7 5 2  
♥ 6  
♦ A 10 8  
♣ A J 10

<b>Bidding:</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
		Pass	Pass	1♠
	3♥	Pass (H)	pass	3♠
	Pass	4♠	Pass	Pass
	Pass			

(H) Hesitation agreed, North has available a negative style double

**Result: 4♠ by South = 620** Lead not recorded

**Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling**

I was called to the table by EW after the agreed hesitation and subsequent calls by NS to 4♠.

Score adjusted to 3♥-2 by West. In accordance with law, I believe South to be in receipt of unauthorised information because of his partners hesitation before passing. I therefore (after consultation) ruled the 3♠ to be not allowed and adjusted the score in accordance with law 12. (Laws 16 and 12). The south hand with 13 HCP and seven losers vulnerable is in my

opinion not worth 3♠. North's hesitation has conveyed unauthorised information to South who could pass or double or bid 3♠. In my opinion 3♠ is not a clear cut action.

**Appeals Committee's decision**

The facts as recorded were all agreed. NS explained that their methods allowed S three options to re-open the auction namely pass, double and 3♠. Note that openings were four card suits.

The AC were unanimous that South had the values to re-open (despite the hesitation) and that most (more than 7 out of 10 at the standard of play) would do so. However, double is a genuine alternative which might be selected by a significant proportion of players, making 3♠ a less than 7 out of 10 action. Accordingly the TD's ruling was allowed to stand.

**L&E comment:**

- 1) The Committee think the AC went wrong. They decided that pass is not a logical alternative – fair enough. So the only logical alternatives are double and 3♠: what they should have asked themselves is whether the unauthorised information suggested 3♠ rather than double, but this does not appear to have been addressed.
- 2) To pass on the hand is not a logical alternative, since less than three out of ten would do so and the AC agreed this. Therefore for them to adjust back to a pass is not correct and the Secretary would write to the AC.

**6.2.08 06.67**

The Committee asked the Secretary to produce the file of other psyches by the South player.

**6.2.09 06.68**

Dealer W  
North South Game  
Scoring: Match  
Points  
converted to  
VPs

	<b>North</b>	
	♠ 7 6	
	♥ A 9 7 5 4 2	
	♦ A 2	
	♣ 8 5 3	
<b>West</b>		<b>East</b>
♠ 10 2		♠ A K J 3
♥ 3		♥ J 10 8 6
♦ Q 7 5 4 3		♦ 10 8 6
♣ K J 9 6 4		♣ Q 7
	<b>South</b>	
	♠ Q 9 8 5 4	
	♥ K Q	
	♦ K J 9	
	♣ A 10 2	

<b>Bidding:</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
	Pass	Pass	Pass (H)	1♠
	2NT (1)	3♥	Pass	Pass
	Pass			

(H) disputed hesitation (1) the minors

**Result:** 3♥-1 by North = -100 Lead ♣Q

**TD first called:** When West called 2NT.

**Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling**

I was called to establish the fact of East's hesitation. West said she had not noticed; East 'I had something to think about'. I was recalled at the end of play. South considers that the auction after 1♠ should go pass 2♥ pass pass pass.

Score stands. The knowledge that partner may be close to an opening bid does not suggest 2NT is likely to reap a better score than passing and that with this distribution, at the vulnerability 2NT would be the choice of more than 70% of similar Wests.

**Appeals Committee's decision**

That 2NT was not made more attractive by any hesitation by East.

NS argued that if West passed then it would go 2♥ pass 2NT all pass. We thought it was very likely that North would continue with 3♥ or 4♥.

**L&E comment:**

The L&E Committee was surprised the deposit was refunded.

**6.2.10 06.70**

Dealer N  
East West Game  
Scoring: left  
blank

	<b>North</b>	
	♠ K x x x	
	♥ Q x x x	
	♦ 8 x	
	♣ 9 x x	
<b>West</b>		<b>East</b>
♠ A Q J x		♠ 9 x
♥ A 9 x x		♥ K 10 x
♦ A K x		♦ Q J x x x
♣ A K		♣ J x x
	<b>South</b>	
	♠ 10 x x	
	♥ J x	
	♦ 10 9 x	
	♣ Q 10 x x x	

<b>Bidding:</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
	3N	Pass Pass	Pass Pass	1N * Pass

\* - psyche

**Result:** 12 tricks                      Lead not completed

**Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling**

West explained at the vulnerability he was too strong to double. NS new partnership. Green psyche.

**L&E comment:**

The committee were appalled by the poorly completed form and the Secretary was asked to write to the TD concerned.

6.2.11 06.71

Dealer E  
Love all

Scoring: Match Points  
converted to VPs

**North**  
♠ 8 5  
♥ J 2  
♦ 10 6 4 3 2  
♣ K J 7 5

**West**  
♠ K Q 10  
♥ 8 5 4 3  
♦ K 9 7  
♣ 8 6 3

**East**  
♠ A 6  
♥ Q 10 9 7 6  
♦ A Q J 8  
♣ 10 2

**South**  
♠ J 9 7 4 3 2  
♥ A K  
♦ 5  
♣ A Q 9 4

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
			1♥	Double
	2NT (A)	Pass	3♦	3♠ (1)
	Pass	Pass	Pass	

(1) Before bidding 3♠ South asked for explanation of 2NT. East said '16pts, 4-card support' (confirmed on convention card but no mention of whether this applies over double)

**Result:** 3♠✓ by South = 140 Lead ♥8

***Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling***

I was called at the end of the auction by South. NS were concerned that EW had had a misunderstanding. It was not clear whether Bergen raises apply over a double, West thought he was making an invitational heart raise (explained after East had been sent from the table).

East explained that it was clear to him his partner had misbid when he passed over 3♠.

Green psyche.

***Comments by EW***

Following a comment from the review panel, EW had been invited to comment further. Their comments were considered by the Committee.

***L&E comment:***

The EW comments indicated that failure by West to alert the 3♦ bid passed unauthorised information to East who should have been particularly careful not to take advantage of it. The TD should have explored this when considering his decision. On the face of it pass does not seem a possible action with the East hand.

6.2.12 06.72

Dealer W  
North South Game  
Scoring: Match  
Points converted to  
VPs

**North**  
♠ A 6 4 2  
♥ K 7 2  
♦ K Q J 5 3  
♣ Q

**West**  
♠ 10  
♥ A 8 6 5  
♦ 7  
♣ A 10 9 8 7 6 4

**East**  
♠ Q J 9 8 3  
♥ Q J 10  
♦ 10 6 4 2  
♣ J

**South**  
♠ K 7 5  
♥ 9 4 3  
♦ A 9 8  
♣ K 5 3 2

<b>Bidding:</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
	Pass	1NT (1)	Pass	3NT
	Pass	Pass	Pass	

(1) No announcement. 14-16 may contain singleton.

**Result:** 3NT ✓ by North = 600      Lead ♠Q

**TD first called:** at end of play.

**Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling**

I was called at the end of play by West who said if he had known 1NT could have contained a singleton he would have played ♣A when a small club was led at trick 3.

I formed the opinion that both East and West could have asked for an announcement after North had opened 1NT. West could also have looked at the opponents convention card which showed the 1NT could contain a singleton – North should also have alerted EW.

Score adjusted : For NS 3NT – 1 = -100; For EW 3NT ✓ = 600

**Appeals Committee's decision**

South should have announced but EW also know that there was a problem and did nothing to protect themselves. The advice given at the start of announcing is not to apply a penalty unless it is deliberate or repeated so we return the score to the table score of 3NT ✓ = 600. NS did have a properly completed card. The TD should remind NS of their obligation.

**L&E comment:**

The L&E Committee thought the AC had been unnecessarily generous to NS although understood a procedural penalty had not been given as this was the first EBU event where announcements were being used.

6.2.13 06.73

Dealer N  
Game All

Scoring: Match Points  
converted to VPs

**North**  
♠ A K J 10 2  
♥ J  
♦ A 10  
♣ Q 10 5 4 2

**West**  
♠ 9 6 4  
♥ Q 8 7 5  
♦ K Q 8 4  
♣ K J

**East**  
♠ Q 8  
♥ 10 9 4 2  
♦ 9 7 5 3 2  
♣ 7 3

**South**  
♠ 7 5 3  
♥ A K 6 3  
♦ J 6  
♣ A 9 8 6

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
		1♠	Pass	2♣
	Pass	3♥(1)	Pass	4NT (2)
	Pass	6♣	Pass	Pass
	Pass			

(1) not alerted

(1) Blackwood

**Result:** 6♣-1 by South = -100 Lead not recorded

**TD first called:** at end of play of the hand.

**Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling**

East called me and asked me to look at the hand because he was unhappy with North's bid of 6♣. He felt that the fact that South had not alerted the 3♥ bid was unauthorised information and that North had taken advantage of the unauthorised information when deciding not to complete the Blackwood sequence but to bid 6♣ instead.

Score adjusted to 6♣-1 by NS and a fine of ½ VP. Law 73C states that a player should carefully avoid taking advantage of unauthorised information. North clearly did not do so. (Law 73C). I felt the auction would have gone 4NT - 5♥/♠ - 6♥ - 6♠ which would have resulted in the same numerical score.

**Appeals Committee's decision**

That North took advantage of the unauthorised information.

The TD's adjustment was entirely appropriate and North was likely to have woken up by the failure to alert that he misbid.

We kept the deposit because we thought the decision entirely clearcut.

**L&E comment:**

The Committee agreed that keeping the deposit was the correct course of action. Some members felt that such a blatant use of unauthorised information should have merited a larger penalty.

**6.2.14 06.75**

Dealer E  
North South  
Game

Scoring: Match  
Points  
converted to  
VPs

**North**

♠ K 10 9 6  
♥ 9 7 2  
♦ 6 5  
♣ A J 8 3

**West**

♠ A Q 8 3  
♥ K 10 8  
♦ 7 2  
♣ K 9 6 4

**East**

♠ J 4 2  
♥ 6 4  
♦ Q 10 9 8  
♣ Q 7 5 2

**South**

♠ 7 5  
♥ A Q J 5 3  
♦ A K J 4 3  
♣ 10

<b>Bidding:</b>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
	Pass	Pass	1NT *	2♥
			Pass	

\* - 15 – 17 NT

**Result: 2♥+2 by South = 170**

***Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling***

I was called by E (who psyched) at the request of NS. I asked W why he passed. He replied that 'double would be take out, I wanted partner to reopen with a double which I could leave for penalties'.

Partner said 'At this vulnerability I thought this was automatic. We are not a regular partnership and I had no reason to suspect he had psyched'.

I ruled this was a Red Psyche.

***Appeals Committee's decision***

No appeal

***L&E comment:***

The L&E Committee confirmed the psyche red.

**6.2.15 06.80**

The L&E Committee considered a hand where a TD had gone to a table to give a ruling where a blood relative was involved. The committee understood there were times when this could not be avoided (e.g. the TD was the only one present). A different TD should attend the table whenever practicable to do so.

**6.2.16 06.82**

The committee considered a hand from the Brighton Summer Meeting where the system information from the pair concerned was inadequate. The Secretary was asked to write to the pair concerned to obtain more information.

**6.3 06.97**

The Secretary asked for guidance on how to proceed in a particular case which was given.

**7            *Any other business***

**7.1          *Revised EBU20B***

Mr Pool passed round a revised EBU20B for the committee's consideration. The card was loosely based on Mr Oram's card.

**7.2          *Publication on the website of a Benji Acol Convention Card***

Mr Dhondy was happy to produce a sample Benji Acol card to go on the website.

**8            *Date of next meeting***

Wednesday 10th January 2007 at 40 Bernard Street, London WC1 – Dorchester Room at 1.15pm.