



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE
HELD AT THE IMPERIAL HOTEL, RUSSELL SQUARE, LONDON WC1
ON WEDNESDAY 10TH JANUARY 2007**

Present:	Martin Pool	Chairman
	Steve Barnfield	
	Max Bavin	Chief Tournament Director
	Sally Bugden	EBU Vice-Chairman
	Barry Capal	General Manager
	Jeremy Dhondy	
	David Martin	
	David Stevenson	
	Grattan Endicott	Vice-President
	Gerard Faulkner	Vice-President
	John Pain	Secretary

- 1. Apologies for Absence** Mike Amos
David Burn
Peter Stocken EBU Chairman

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting (October 25th 2006)

2.1 Accuracy

The minutes of the meeting of October 25th 2006 were taken as read, approved and signed. There were no corrections.

2.2 Matters arising

2.2.1 White Book

The secretary reported that the White Book had been printed with the index and distributed to panel TDs, panel Referees and one copy to each County. Mr Dhondy noted that when the new laws were produced then the White Book will have to be revised. He also mentioned that he had searched the index for four items and failed in each case to find what he required.

2.2.2 Disciplinary Case – ‘Lion’

The secretary reported on correspondence he had received which appeared to conclude the matter. The Committee closed the case.

2.2.3 Disciplinary Case – ‘Meerkat’

The secretary reported on correspondence he had received which appeared to conclude the matter. The Committee closed the case.

2.2.4 Disciplinary Case – ‘Jackal’

Mr Pool and Mrs Bugden withdrew for this item; Mr Dhondy took the chair.

The committee voted to proceed to a hearing. The secretary was asked to make the necessary arrangements.

Mr Stevenson said that in this particular case some unnecessary work had been caused by the fact that it was not clear that the L&E had received a copy of the formal complaint. In other cases it had not always been clear that a correspondent had intended a matter to be treated as a formal complaint. He suggested a simple, one page form to be completed that would identify the complaint. The Committee agreed and the secretary was asked to draft something suitable.

2.2.5 Disciplinary Case – ‘Porcupine’

The Chairman reported that he had had no reply from the person who might wish to proceed with the complaint. Previous discussions had identified that this might be the case. Accordingly the Committee closed the case.

2.2.6 Disciplinary Case – ‘Quail’

The committee considered the psyche record of a member together with replies from him and his partner. The Committee considered no further action was required at this time and the secretary was asked to write to both the player and his partner thanking them for their responses. Mr Dhondy undertook to speak to one of the parties to explain the process further.

2.2.7 Correspondence from A J Kambites

The Committee considered correspondence from Andrew Kambites regarding players general lack of understanding of what constitutes an Acol two opening. Mr Stevenson suggested that as a panel TD Mr Kambites could be taking steps to educate his county members. It was important, however, that players did not gain an advantage through doing illegal things. Mr Martin felt that the L&E sometimes looked at matters as if the players involved were better or expert but this was frequently not the case. He could agree with Mr Kambites' tone. Mrs Bugden asked that when changes were made more explanation was provided on why the change was thought a good idea and in any case there should be more simple and straightforward communication. She strongly agreed with Mr Kambites' sentiments in his second paragraph.

Mr Barnfield noted that he had been one of those who conducted the preliminary review of the appeals and psyche forms for several years. He thought the committee did consider the player's standard, if known, and also having regard to the information on the form. If anything, the committee generally assumed the player not to be a good player if there was no information to the contrary.

2.2.8 EBU20B – Derek Oram

The committee thanked Mr Oram for his suggested improvements to the 20B Convention Card. Mr Dhondy reminded the committee that it had agreed not to make piecemeal changes for a year. Whenever a revision was contemplated it was essential to have a good designer for the card available for download from the website. Mr Faulkner said it was essential to liaise with Mr Capal to ensure that stock levels of the current card were monitored so that any reprint could be coordinated with the revised design.

Mr Stevenson confirmed that the old EBU20 and EBU20A were still permitted at events.

Action: Secretary to determine stock levels for the next meeting and to have copies of Mr Oram's card available.

2.2.9 Sample Benjaminised Acol card

Mr Dhondy had produced a suitable Benjaminised Acol card to be placed on the website.

2.3 Request for information from players

2.3.1 06.50 – Psyche from Pachabo

The Committee considered the following psyche from the Pachabo Cup together with additional comments received from East and West.

Dealer North – Love All

Scoring:
Hybrid

North
 ♠ K 9 7 3
 ♥ 6 4
 ♦ K 10 5
 ♣ K Q 9 7

West
 ♠ J 6 4 2
 ♥ K J 10 7 5 3
 ♦ 9
 ♣ 6 3

East
 ♠ A 5
 ♥ Q 9 8 2
 ♦ Q 8 6 3 2
 ♣ 10 4

South
 ♠ Q 10 8
 ♥ A
 ♦ A J 7 4
 ♣ A J 8 5 2

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
		Pass	pass	1♣
	2♥ ¹	Dble ^{A2}	2♠*	3♦
	pass	4♣	4♥	5♣
	pass	Pass	Pass	

1 – weak jump

A2 – alerted, ‘likely’ to have four spades

Result: 5♣ - 1 by South = -50 Lead

Tournament Director’s comments I feel this is close to being Amber – although pass may be the advisable action, many players would have raised spades, and West must have been aware that this is a potential psyche situation. I ruled the psyche GREEN.

Comments by psycher’s partner My hand is at the bottom end of the range, particularly facing a passed hand. Also partner can have at most five spades (no weak 2 opening) so he’ll only be bidding spades now with some sort of heart support. A WJO bidder shouldn’t bid his hand twice, so I was leaving it for partner to take the further action.

Additional comments by West I agree with the TD’s comment that many players might have raised spades. However, ‘The Law’ suggest only a raise to 3♠ (9-card fit) and that takes up very little bidding space from opponent. Also spades will be 4-0 against us most of the time. For these and other reasons stated on the psyche form I do not think raising spades is clearcut. I wonder if North’s complaint arose more from his partner going off in a cold (and completely normal) contract rather than from my bidding.

L&E comment: The committee considered that since East had bid a new suit, the failure of West to at least bid 3♠ with Jxxx made this psyche RED and the category was thus changed.

2.3.2 06.57 – Psyche from the Riviera Congress

The Committee considered the following psyche from the Riviera congress together with additional comments from North/South.

Dealer East, E/W Vulnerable

Scoring: IMPs

North

♠ A K J 4
♥ K 3
♦ Q 9
♣ K Q 10 7 3

West

♠ 8 7 3
♥ Q J 10 9 2
♦ J 8
♣ A J 9

East

♠ Q 9 6 5 2
♥ 4
♦ A K 6 4 2
♣ 6 4

South

♠ 10
♥ A 8 7 6 5
♦ 10 7 5 3
♣ 8 5 2

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	pass	1♣	pass	pass
	2♥	2♠	dbld	1♠*
	Pass		pass	pass

Result: 2♠ - 1 by South = -50 Lead

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling I ruled the psyche AMBER

Comments from North/South Agreed system £5/100 rubber bridge. Routine £5/100 psyche! Don't need to bid much more than 2♠ after a 4th hand opener. Agree it's a 2½ ♠ hand. Both of us agree on this.

Additional comments by South It's worth stating that we play(ed) a lot of rubber, we do play in different schools and Torquay was the first time we had seriously played together. I hadn't tried this psyche (weak NT, 4th seat minor opening, t/o double, mps, elect to pick off the spade suit) before in our partnership. 'Rubber Bridge' was our agreed system. Experienced players know that the bidding round the table fully accounts for the deck and that it's bad match-points to invite a game when you know that 1) your side is minimum 2) the presumed trump suit is breaking badly and offside 3) your red cards are probably not working. After a 4th seat minor opening we both thought he had a 2½ spade bid and said that at the time. I'm asking you to reclassify it green for the bridge reasons above. It will be why North took the action he did. Imps vul, 3♠ is a bit closer and I could be persuaded to 'amber'. Psyches of given types mostly don't happen often but I guess I've seen this one a dozen or so in the 350000 hands I've played. It's general bridge knowledge. L40, L75. 'Routine', I said, and so it is albeit *rara avis*.

Additional comments by North North had nothing to add.

L&E comment:The committee considered that North should have bid spades to a higher level and reclassified the psyche RED.

The Committee considered further responses by South on other matters. The secretary was asked to respond.

2.3.3 06.82 – appeal from the Brighton Summer Meeting

The Committee considered the response of the pair, who described their system as ‘Every Hand An Adventure’. Whilst EHAA is a published system with a fairly long pedigree it is practically unknown in this country. The pair had submitted their system card which was perfectly satisfactory. The secretary to write thanking them for their cooperation.

2.3.4 06.47 – report of hand from the Corwen trophy

The Committee considered the following hand from the Corwen Trophy together with additional comments received from North.

Dealer East, Game All

Scoring: MP
pairs.

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

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
			1♠	3♣ ¹
	3♠	4♣	4♠	pass
	pass	5♣	pass	pass
	pass			

1 alerted. NS card says Ghestem. E asked about 3♣. N sent S away from the table. He told EW that systematically 3♣ shows red suits and opening values. But that his hand and the auction suggested that this was not so. N says that he asked if 3♠ was normal and was told that it was. (EW say 3♣ not alerted). EW asked for an opinion at the end of the session

Result: 5♣ ✓ by South = +600 Lead

Tournament Director’s statement of facts & ruling I asked N for an explanation of his actions. He repeated what he had told his opponents, and went on to say that if W had passed he would have bid 4♥. He thought the actual action suggested S held a WJO in clubs because otherwise there are too many HCP for the bidding, and he thought it unlikely that EW were psyching. I ruled the misbid AMBER.

Additional comments by North When the bidding got round to me something was obviously wrong. It was impossible for East to have an opening bid (I asked and was told their bids were reasonably sound), partner to have an opening bid as we play Ghestem as showing an opening bid or better. West to have a vulnerable normal 3♠ bid and me to have the hand I had. My opponents have no reputation for psyching and I had an additional problem (it has become obvious that partner has made a weak jump overcall). If partner had a Ghestem hand 4♣ is the normal bid as it is forcing. However I suspected that if I made what I considered to be the correct bid that partner might pass and the opponents could well have been put at a disadvantage.

I believe that my asking to send my partner away from the table was active ethics in warning the opponents that something had gone wrong. I of course was prepared for the fact that if

partner had in any way been alerted or conscious of what had been happening I was prepared to take my punishment, but I judged that there was little risk of that happening.

The bid of 4♠, vulnerable, reinforced the probability of partner having a weak jump overcall as it is now impossible for partner to have an opening bid unless East has psyched twice vulnerable and I believe I made the logical bid under the circumstances. Partner normally knows his system as it is the only one he ever plays and if West had not bid 3♠ I would have had no reason to suspect what was happening and treated it as a red two suiter.

L&E comment: A member of the committee felt the additional comments by North to be 'self serving'. The committee changed the category of misbid to RED.

Additional L&E Comment (added March 7th 2007) *We found North's argument to be unconvincing.*

3 *Technical matters*

3.1.1 *Appeals Committee Forum*

Mr Stevenson proposed that a forum be arranged for those interested in serving on appeals committees or those who already served. Mr Barnfield thought it an excellent idea and offered to contribute but was unlikely to be available for the likely date. Correspondence from Frances Hinden was also considered offering a possible programme and also the offer of help in putting the course together.

Both Mrs Bugden and Mr Martin asked what advice already existed for Appeals Committees to which the answer was the White Book. Mr Martin suggested that a short booklet of advice might be produced covering the main points. Mr Endicott also thought it an excellent idea with the booklet being made available to referees and Appeals Committee chairman. Mr Stevenson suggested either Friday afternoon during the Brighton Summer Meeting for the pilot event, and while some members expressed concern about Brighton as a venue for it, it was agreed to go ahead. It was agreed that the 2nd Friday was the more practical date. If successful further forums could be held around the country, similar to TD Training Courses.

3.1.2 *Appeals booklet – suggestion to widen the scope*

The secretary reported that he had been approached by several members who considered the annual publication of Appeals was to be commended but they wondered why it only covered Brighton, Crockfords Final and the Spring Foursomes. Mr Stevenson said that the appeals in the booklet were of good quality and could make excellent training material. Mr Dhondy thought it a good idea to extend to other events. There would be an additional cost in preparation in adding extra events. It was suggested that possible additions would be Bournemouth Spring Bank Holiday and Autumn Congresses, London and Blackpool Year End and Easter Congresses.

3.2 *Players with Disabilities – from Welwyn Garden City*

The Committee considered correspondence from Mr R Bourne, trustee of LINK. The Chairman outlined the history of correspondence with Mr Bourne who now accepted that the measures the EBU had taken to accommodate disabled players was reasonable. This was also the view of the Honorary Solicitor who had been consulted by the Chairman. The Committee agreed to make available at events copies of the Silent Announcement sheet. A copy is provided in Appendix A.

3.3 *Privilege of the Committee – old papers*

The Committee considered papers dating back to 1982 about the privilege of Committee members when carrying out their duties. The Chairman reported that he had asked the Honorary Solicitor to provide help in updating the advice.

4 *Appeal to the National Authority*

4.1 *Appeal from a Sussex match*

The Committee considered an appeal from a match played privately in a Sussex event. Mr Pool and Mrs Bugden withdrew for this item. Mr Dhondy took the chair.

The Committee first considered whether there were grounds for hearing the appeal. The committee considered that there was not a question of principle involved, there was not an error in the application of law or regulation nor was there a grossly inappropriate value judgement. The committee did consider that there might have been an error of tournament direction regarding whether the request for a ruling had been 'out of time'. For that reason the committee allowed the appeal to be heard and refunded the deposit.

Having decided to hear the appeal the Committee considered the matter. In Mr Bavin's opinion it all came down to whether the request for a ruling had been 'in time'. The Sussex regulations said that in matches played privately the following applies:

A player who becomes aware that he may wish to seek a director ruling should normally notify his opponents (for example by reserving his rights) as soon as practical after the incident occurs and confirm the request before the player compare scores at the end of the set.

Mr Bavin likened it to the situation at an event where a player asked for a ruling after comparing scores but before the correction period had expired. A TD would not deny him a ruling, nor should he in this case. If the intention was to say 'must notify his opponents unless something else came to light' then the regulations should be so framed. 'Should normally' did not imply that failure to do so should be refused. After discussion it was agreed that the request for a ruling was 'in time'.

The Committee then considered the substance of the ruling. The TD had already concluded that there was evidence of a partnership agreement and the Committee agreed with this. Accordingly the appeal was dismissed and the TD's ruling and the Appeal Committee's findings were confirmed.

5 *Application for a new permitted method*

5.1 *Timetable for submitting new methods for L&E consideration*

It was agreed that the secretary should retain all submissions, to be dealt with at the first meeting after the end of February deadline (Orange Book 9G4). It was suggested that reminder should go into the February *English Bridge* reminding members of the deadline for submission. Mr Dhondy to liaise with Mrs Bugden over suitable wording.

5.2' *Application from Neil Prebble*

Following the decision in 5.1, consideration of Mr Prebble's request was deferred to the next meeting.

6 *Disciplinary matters*

6.1 *Disciplinary Case - 'Rat'*

The committee considered papers in a case and agreed to move towards a hearing. The secretary was asked to make the necessary arrangements.

7 *Reports from Tournament Directors*

7.1.1 06.88

The Committee considered a hand from the Guernsey Congress. It concluded that there had been no infraction.

7.1.2 06.90

The Committee considered a claim from the West of England Congress.

Dealer North, NS Vulnerable

Scoring: IMPs to VPs	<p>North</p> <p>♠</p> <p>♥ K 7</p> <p>♦ K</p> <p>♣</p>	<p>East</p> <p>♠ Not recorded</p> <p>♥</p> <p>♦</p> <p>♣</p>
<p>West</p> <p>♠</p> <p>♥ 8 6</p> <p>♦</p> <p>♣ Q</p>	<p>South</p> <p>♠ Not recorded</p> <p>♥</p> <p>♦</p> <p>♣</p>	

Bidding: Not recorded.

Result: 4♥ - 1 by North = -100 Lead

TD first called: After trick 10 completed, Declarer face 3 remaining cards.

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling: When called to the table, North's (declarer's) last 3 cards had been faced. West was unhappy. When asked, all players stated that no statement at all had been made concerning the outcome or trump position. When asked further, West stated that there had been adequate time for North to make a statement before she expressed her concerns. With regards to the remaining cards, the hearts shown (trumps) are the only ones outstanding. The South and East hands are irrelevant. The ♦K and ♣Q are both masters. North is on lead. North is a very experienced player.

I ruled 1. a claim has occurred when North exposes his cards

2. a line of play should have been stated – it was not.

3. doubtful points to be resolved against the claimer

4. Two tricks could be lost by playing ♥K, then ♥7. Laws 68A, 68C and 70A.

There is little doubt that declarer was aware that there were trump(s) outstanding and therefore Law 70C does not apply. However, I have allowed inferior play. White Book comments state the 'normal' play by declarer includes 'careless or inferior' but not 'irrational'. I ruled two tricks to E/W.

Appeals Committee's decision:

The question revolved around whether, for a player of North's standard, North's potential play would have been careless or irrational. The committee felt it was very close and on a 2-1 split decision decided it would have been irrational. This position occurs frequently and appeals committees rule both ways. It would be helpful if the L&E clarified the position.

Result awarded - 4♥ ✓ = +620

L&E comment: The committee considered that it was not actually a saving of time to write out only the position at the time of the claim. Especially where the claimant is an experienced player the play is very likely to be significant. For the L&E to consider fully the problem all the details would have been helpful.

However, although the Committee found it difficult to judge, its best guess was the TD had been correct in his ruling.

7.1.3 06.91

Dealer South, Game All

Scoring: Swiss
Pairs (MPs to
VPs)

North

♠
♥ Q J 10 8 7 5 4 2
♦ A Q J 4
♣ 10

West

♠ A Q J 9 7 3
♥ K
♦ K 9 7 2
♣ J 8

East

♠ 10 5 4 2
♥
♦ 10 5 3
♣ A K Q 9 4 2

South

♠ K 8 6
♥ A 9 6 3
♦ 8 6
♣ 7 6 5 3

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	1♠	4♥	5♥	pass
	5♠	6♥	dbld	?Q pass
	pass	Pass		pass

?Q – Question

Result: 6♥x ✓ by North = 1660 Lead ♣K

TD first called: after the board had been played

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling: South asked the meaning of the 5♥ bid – and then passed. Pass is a logical alternative for North. Law 16A. Ruling 5♠ + 1 by West = -680.

Appeals Committee's decision: We are not convinced that 70% of players would bid 6♥ over 5♠ without the question by South, which could have shown an interest in hearts making it a good sacrifice. Therefore 5♠ + 1 = -680. We do have sympathy with the 6♥ bid.

L&E comment: The TD might have found out what action South was thinking of taking, as a weighted score might have been given had it been clear South was thinking about saving.

7.1.4 06.95

The Committee considered a hand from the Satellite Final at the Bournemouth Autumn Congress where the question of whether an otherwise announceable 2-opening became alertable because of particular constraints. On the hand in question a player had opened 2♠, which was weak but showed exactly five spades. The Committee confirmed that such an opening was announceable and the distributional constraints did not affect this. Players were still at liberty to ask about announceable calls where strength and distribution would be disclosed.

Only in circumstances where a call is unexpected should a call be alerted where otherwise it might be announced/alerted. E.g. 1♣ 1♦ dble. If this double shows precisely four hearts then it would be alertable, even though it was for take out as this would be unexpected by the opponents.

7.1.5 06.103

The Committee considered an appeal from the Tollemache Qualifying round.

Dealer

Scoring: Cross
IMPs teams of
8

North
♠ K 6 2
♥ K 10 5 4
♦ 9
♣ K J 10 5 4

West
♠ 9
♥ Q J 9 7 6
♦ A 10 6 4
♣ Q 3 2

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

South
♠ A Q 10 5 4 3
♥
♦ K Q 8 7
♣ A 8 7

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
		pass	pass	1♠
	pass	3♣ ^{A1}	pass	3♦ ^{A2}
	pass	4♠	pass	5♣ ³
	pass	5♠ ^H	pass	6♠
	pass	pass	pass	

A1 fit jump 'goodish club suit', spade honour
A2 game try
3 cue bid

Result: 6♠ ✓ by South = +1430 Lead ♥Q

TD first called: end of play

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling: The fact of the hesitation was agreed. 6♠ cancelled. Pass is a logical alternative. 6♠ suggested over pass by the slow 5♠. Laws 16A, 12C2. Score adjusted to 5♠ + 1 = +680

Appeals Committee's decision: Pass was a logical alternative. No evidence that fit jump promised spade honour. Grand slam try not accepted as reasonable. TD ruling upheld. Deposit refunded.

L&E comment: Standard text book adjustment.

7.1.6 06.104

The committee considered a report from the TD at the Tollemache Qualifying Round.

Dealer North, Love All

Scoring: Cross
IMPs teams of
8

North
♠ J 10 7 5
♥ K 7
♦ A 7
♣ 10 7 5 3 2

West
♠ 8 4 3 2
♥ 8 5 4
♦ Q 10 9 6 5
♣ 4

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

South
♠ K 9
♥ Q 6 3 2
♦ K J 2
♣ A K 8 6

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
		pass	1NT ¹	Dble ^{A2}
	2♣ ^{A3}	dble	2♥	Dble ⁴
	pass	pass	pass	

1 12-14

A2 – single suited hand

A3 – Stayman

4 – not alerted, but should have been

Result: 2♥x by East – 1 = +100 Lead ♣K

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling: EW called me at the end of play and asked me to record a psyche. Although I do not believe they have a partnership understanding to bid this way in this situation, one may easily arise if they are forced to invent bids to cover strong hands. I ruled this a GREEN psyche.

Comments by South: Partner has passed, we have no call to show a strong hand, I doubled intending to pass a 2♣ non-forcing relay from partner, or raise a 2NT forcing relay to 3NT. We have no agreement to bid this way.

L&E comment: Players seem to be using this as a 2-way bid – either single suited or strong balanced. The Committee asked for it to be recorded in case of a repetition.

7.2 *Disciplinary forms – 06.12 to 06.15*

The Committee noted the contents.

8 Any other business

8.1 *Minutes of the WBU L&E Committee*

The Committee noted the minutes of the annual meeting of the WBU L&E Committee.

8.2 *ZT form from the ACBL*

Mr Stevenson showed the committee a copy of the Behaviour Violation form used in ACBL events. The form is in triplicate – so that the member receiving the penalty is given a copy to keep, as well as the other copies being kept by the authorities. A copy is attached to these minutes – Appendix B

8.3 appointment of pro-bono adviser.

Mr Faulkner reported that he had not been formally asked by the Chairman of the Board to continue in his role of Pro-Bono Advisor.

[Secretary's note : The letter asking Mr Faulkner to continue in the role was received several days after the meeting.]

9 *Date of next meeting*

Wednesday 7th March at 1.15pm. Imperial Hotel, Park Room.

[Secretary's note : Bernard Street not available]



Silent Announcement Card



10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19

POSSIBLE SINGLETON

STAYMAN

HEARTS

SPADES

STRONG

WEAK

INTERMEDIATE

FORCING

**NOT
FORCING**

FORCING

**NOT
FORCING**

ALERT

With thanks to Welwyn Garden City Bridge Club for permission to use the design.

Behavior Violation



Tournament _____

Date _____

Sanction Number _____

Name of Offender _____

ACBL Player # _____

Offense: (Circle)

Negative Comments about Play Badgering Intimidation

Gloating/Gamesmanship Profanity Threats

Frivolous Accusations Rudeness Violence

Loud and/or disruptive Insinuations Bickering
 Arguing with Director

Gratuitous Lessons and/or Analyses

Other _____

Describe behavior if necessary _____

Penalty _____

Warning _____

Report to Director-in-Charge immediately after the
 session at _____

Issued by _____, TD

ACBL Player # _____



*Enjoy Bridge More
 Stay Cool!
 (It's ACBL Policy.)*

To establish an atmosphere which promotes the enjoyment of bridge as both a competitive and a social game, the ACBL has adopted a policy of courteous behavior. The ACBL stands for *American Contract Bridge League* and *Always Courteous Behavior League*. For tournaments to be fun, cooperation from all (players, organizers, officials, staff, volunteers) is necessary.

Please report conduct that is unacceptable while keeping in mind that we must be tolerant of other people in general and bridge players in particular. Also, conduct that is especially outstanding or refreshing should be reported.

Commendable

Being a good "host" or "guest" at the table.

Greeting others in a friendly manner.

Praising the bidding and/ or play of an opponent.

Unacceptable

Badgering, rudeness, insinuations, intimidation, profanity, threats or violence

Negative comments concerning opponents' or partner's play or bidding

Gloating over good results.

Constant and gratuitous lessons and analyses at the table.

Loud and disruptive arguing with a tournament director.

Courteous behavior brings out the best in everyone. Please consider the manner in which you have been behaving. Try to eliminate those mannerisms and behavior which cause annoyance to others and increase those that make you a person that others wish to be around.

We all have a common love of bridge. We should focus on our similarities, increase our tolerance of one another and behave civilly toward other players.