



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE  
HELD AT IMPERIAL HOTEL, RUSSELL SQUARE, LONDON WC1  
ON THURSDAY 21 JANUARY 2010**

(This meeting was deferred from January 7<sup>th</sup> 2010 due to inclement weather)

<b>Present:</b>	Jeremy Dhondy	Chairman and Elected Member
	Mike Amos	Elected Member
	Max Bavin	Chief Tournament Director
	David Burn	Elected Member
	Frances Hinden	Vice Chairman and Elected Member
	Martin Pool	Elected Member
	David Stevenson	Elected Member
	Grattan Endicott	Vice-President
	John Pain	Secretary

- 1. Apologies for Absence**
- |                 |                     |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Sally Bugden    | EBU Chairman        |
| Barry Capal     | EBU General Manager |
| Gerard Faulkner | Vice-President      |
| Neil Morley     | Elected Member      |
| Andrew Petrie   | EBU Vice Chairman   |

**1A Election of Chairman and Vice Chairman**

Martin Pool proposed and Mike Amos seconded that Jeremy Dhondy be elected as Chairman for 2009-10. There were no other nominations and Jeremy was declared elected.

Martin Pool proposed and David Stevenson seconded that Frances Hinden be elected as Vice Chairman for 2009-10. There were no other nominations and Frances was declared elected.

Jeremy thanked the outgoing Vice Chairman Martin Pool for his services and the Committee concurred.

**2**

**2.1/2 Minutes of the previous meeting**

The minutes of the meeting of September 24<sup>th</sup> 2009 were approved and signed. There was one correction in 5.5 where the words 'unless that result could have been obtained by an otherwise legal auction' were added.

## **2.3 Matters arising**

### **2.3.1 White Book revision**

David Stevenson gave a progress update. There were a few things that still needed attention but the book was ready in draft form to go to the proofreaders. A deadline of February 14<sup>th</sup> 2010 was placed on proofreaders to have their comments back to David. Jeremy thanked David for his hard work in getting the book to the current state. It was agreed that once the text was declared final it would go onto the website as quickly as possible. The definitive version would be the website version with no 'official' hard copies being produced. Individual requests for a printed copy would be entertained but there would be a charge.

*[Secretary's note: copies were emailed to the committee and other suggested proof-readers.]*

### **2.3.2 Simplified law cards**

The set of law cards is now on the website.

### **2.3.3 Tangerine Book**

A second draft was considered by the committee. Members were asked to send corrections direct to Frances so that the final version could be produced and put on the website. Jeremy thanked Frances and Mike for their work.

The secretary would produce a suitable cover. The booklet was officially named 'The Tangerine Book'.

**ACTION: FH**

### **2.3.4 Interpretation of previous minutes by Nick Doe**

Nick Doe had pointed out an error in the application of a 'Reveley Ruling' in the minutes of September 24<sup>th</sup> 2009. (item 5.5). The correction in 2.1/2 was made.

### **2.3.5 Logical Alternatives guidelines**

A further amendment to the wording was considered and approved. The final sentence of point 2 was changed to ' "Serious consideration" is more than a passing thought.'. The final version is now on the website.

## **3 Appeals to the National Authority**

None this time

## **4 Disciplinary Cases**

### **4.1 Morden**

A dispute arose between two members of an affiliated club. The club was unable or unwilling to deal with the matter and referred it to the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Laws and Ethics Committee. They referred it back to the club. Both parties agreed to an independent panel to hear the case and three members of the EBU Disciplinary Panel, together with the Secretary of L&E to conduct a hearing. The hearing was held and the matter was concluded. The expenses for the hearing were borne by the club except for the Secretary's expenses which came from EBU central funds. The club is disaffiliating in April. The papers were put to file.

### **4.2 Osterley**

The EBU was approached for advice by a member who was in dispute with the local bridge club. The Chairman and Vice Chairman offered advice and referred the matter back to the member and the club. However in considering the correspondence it became clear that the club's disciplinary procedures were flawed. The Chairman and Vice Chairman have offered further advice on how to improve the club's disciplinary procedures (for example by adopting the EBU Model Club constitution) and the club has assured them that the procedures will be amended. The club is disaffiliating in April. The papers were put to file.

### **4.3 Meerkat2**

The EBU was approached for advice by a member who was in dispute with the local bridge club. The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the L&E offered advice on how to settle the dispute and referred it back to the club. The parties accepted the offer of an independent panel to settle the

matter. The panel made several suggestions including a proposal to settle the matter on the basis of written submissions alone. This was rejected and a hearing was due to take place in December. However at almost the last minute the member announced his resignation from the club so the hearing did not take place. The papers were put to file.

#### **4.4 Enquiry from another NBO**

The secretary of the L&E was approached by phone and letter from a resident in another NBO asking the L&E to comment on an issue which had arisen. The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the L&E confirmed that it would be inappropriate to offer an opinion in such a situation and referred the person to the Laws and Ethics Committee of the NBO to deal with the case. The EBU L&E Committee would only become involved if asked to do so by the NBO. Should a similar request be received from a member of any other NBO the person would be referred to that country's NBO.

#### **4.5 Southfields**

Correspondence has been received regarding a complaint from a member. After initial enquiries had been made the Committee confirmed there was insufficient evidence to charge the defendant.

#### **4.6 Temple**

Correspondence has been received regarding a complaint from a member of the same club as in 4.5. After initial enquiries had been made the Committee confirmed there was insufficient evidence to charge the defendant.

In both cases 4.5 and 4.6 it was agreed to write to the Chairman of the Club involved advising him of the outcomes and advising him that the club's constitution was the chief cause of both enquiries coming to the EBU in the first place.

**ACTION: JP and JD**

#### **4.7 Uxbridge**

Correspondence had been received from a non-member regarding the actions of an affiliated club committee. Under para 2.3 of the Disciplinary Rules the non-member was written to and asked to make a formal complaint but none had so far been received.

#### **4.8 Vauxhall**

Correspondence had been received regarding a number of issues in a match played privately. The Secretary was asked to write and clarify some of the points before proceeding to make other enquiries.

#### **4.9 Ban enforced by another NBO**

The secretary reported a phone call from another country regarding the status of a player banned in England. The secretary said that under the terms of our membership of the EBL the EBU was required to notify the EBL of any ban which had been done. The EBL in turn sent details to all other NBOs in Europe who were expected to uphold the ban and this has recently happened.

As a common problem is unclear disciplinary procedures, Frances offered a copy of the recently developed Wimbledon Bridge Club disciplinary procedure for consideration as more general guidance. Martin Pool and the Secretary requested a copy.

### **5 Technical Matters**

#### *5.1 Correspondence*

None

#### *5.2 'Complex Methods'*

Jeremy outlined the background to the item. The Tournament Committee had met to consider complaints about systems involving artificial 1-level opening bids (including transfer openings). Such systems were currently permitted at Level 4 but the TC wanted the L&E to consider protecting less experienced players. Congress Review Forms had included questions about whether transfer openings should be allowed; if so when and at what type of events. The review from the two Year End congresses indicated a geographical divide – namely from Blackpool there more pronounced dislike to allow such systems to be played, whereas the reaction in London was far less hostile.

There was considerable discussion about the merits of allowing or disallowing such methods. Comments such as:

- a) Restrict the method to x boards or more per round
- b) Restrict to later rounds of the same tournament (e.g. Not permitted in the Qualifying round of a congress event, but allowed in the final)
- c) Having some events played at Level 3 where the methods were not permitted
- d) Play 2 different levels at the same event
- e) Top tournament players not the correct pool of players to ask. More relevant to ask 'average' players
- f) Transfer openings are played by about a dozen pairs at the moment but are beginning to catch on
- g) It would be almost impossible to go back and restrict such methods
- h) Retain the status quo but with explanation.

David Burn noted that individual bids are not that difficult to defend against but with five 1-level opening bids it appears to create more difficulty. It would also be wrong to say that the game has gone as far as it can and cannot progress anymore.

The Committee agreed that it did not wish to restrict innovation but acknowledged that the TC might need help and guidance. If the TC insisted on a change then the L&E would consider the matter again (possibly in line with point a) above – restricting the method to rounds of x boards or more.)

The Committee observed that reverting to playing some tournaments at Level 3 would be a retrograde step and cause significant difficulty for a substantial number of players.

Jeremy to talk to the Chairman of the Tournament Committee about the discussion. **ACTION JD**

### *5.3 Laws and Ethics Committee Terms of Reference.*

The Committee approved certain changes and these are attached to these minutes (Appendix A). The revised terms would be presented to the Board for approval.

### *5.4 Two convention cards and two systems*

The Committee accepted the Chief TDs view that if a pair played 1-level transfer openings in first and second position and reverted to natural openings in third and fourth seat then this constitutes two basic systems and therefore requires two convention cards and may only be played in tournaments where rounds were of seven boards or more duration.

Secretary to write to the pair concerned.

5.5 The committee considered and approved a suggestion from Grattan Endicott that a regulation should be included in the Orange Book to go alongside law 7B1.

*'When under Law 7B1 a player takes a hand from the pocket corresponding to his compass position a member of each side, or the Director, should be present.'*

### *5.6 EBU members banned from a club wanting to play in National Pairs heats*

The committee concluded that it did not have the authority to make the decision and asked the Board to clarify the position. **ACTION SB**

5.7 *Balanced hands and 1NT openings.*

Frances Hinden invited comments about opening strong 1NT on hands such as

a) ♠AKQxx ♥AKxx ♦x ♣J10x and b) ♠Ax ♥KX ♦Qx ♣AQxxxx. Under current regulations a) was permitted and b) was not. Frances was invited to turn the question into an official request for a permitted method for the next meeting.

5.8 *Pairs receiving several ‘average plus/ average minus’ awards in a session*

The committee noted that Ton Kooijman had suggested that the intention of giving average plus / average minus awards was limited to a small number – perhaps two or three per session. Max indicated that we already did this in some cases, such as an 8-board Swiss Pairs match where a pair was not able to play a match through no fault of its own was given 4 x 60% and 4 x 50%. Max considered that if it were legal to have a limit then we should do so. He would consider it and report back.

**ACTION MB**

5.9 *‘Appeal Focus’*

It was agreed to provide an electronic ‘Appeal Focus’ for panel TDs and Appeals Committee members. Max, Grattan and David Stevenson agreed to contribute. The first edition would be produced during the second half of March 2010.

**ACTION JD**

5.10 *‘Clear cut’ tricks and KQ doubleton.*

It was confirmed that KQ doubleton did count as one ‘clear cut’ trick according to the definition.

**6. Applications for new permitted methods**

All applications were deferred to the April meeting.

**7. Reports from Tournament Directors**

**General Comments**

The Committee considered a number of forms where the lack of detail hindered final discussions. For example:

A TD had classified a psyche as amber after the auction (N)1NT (E)2♥ all pass, where the 1NT opener has a 4-0-4-5 shape and South had passed with a 3-6-1-3 7-count. However the TD had not recorded what the meaning of double would have been which would have helped the committee confirm or reject the classification.

**7.1.1 09.070 – ODJV Guildford**

♠ A985 ♥ 9863 ♦ KJ7 ♣ 75  ♠ Q                      ♠ 10632 ♥ AK1042              ♥ 75 ♦ 95                      ♦ A8432 ♣ QJ843                ♣ K2  ♠ KJ74 ♥ QJ ♦ Q106 ♣ A1096	Board 40 : Dealer West : Love all <b>West                  North                  East                  South</b> 1♥                      1♠(1)                  Pass                  2♠*(2) All Pass  (1)                  The system card shows overcalls as natural and non forcing with no mention of suit length. (2)                  The raise to only 2♠ was questioned.
--	---

The North South system card was attached to the form and indicated that the above details were correct. The committee considered this to be a matter of disclosure and the secretary was asked to write to North South advising them that if 4-card overcalls were being played this should be indicated, together with a suitable range. (see remark after next hand).

**7.1.2 09.075 – Tollemache Qualifier.**

<p>♠ 7643 ♥ J43 ♦ J9653 ♣ 5</p> <p>♠ AKJ8      ♠ Q102 ♥ 962      ♥ A8 ♦ Q108      ♦ A72 ♣ KJ9      ♣ A8762</p> <p>♠ 95 ♥ KQ1075 ♦ K4 ♣ Q1043</p>	<p>Board 3 : Dealer South : EW vulnerable</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;"><b>West</b></th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;"><b>North</b></th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;"><b>East</b></th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;"><b>South</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1♣</td> <td>1♦*</td> <td>2♦(1)</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2♠</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>3♦(2)</td> <td>Dbl</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4♠</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(1)</td> <td colspan="3">Forcing, values, favourable club support</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(2)</td> <td colspan="3">forcing</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>				Pass	1♣	1♦*	2♦(1)	Pass	2♠	Pass	3♦(2)	Dbl	4♠	All Pass			(1)	Forcing, values, favourable club support			(2)	forcing		
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																										
			Pass																										
1♣	1♦*	2♦(1)	Pass																										
2♠	Pass	3♦(2)	Dbl																										
4♠	All Pass																												
(1)	Forcing, values, favourable club support																												
(2)	forcing																												

North South showed a system card which had a note saying that all weak jump overcalls and overcalls opposite a passed hand were wide ranging. The secretary was asked to write to North South pointing out that a) 'wide ranging' is inadequate disclosure – is there an agreement that it might be as low as just two jacks (for example double with 8+, bid with fewer). In any case if the method was to overcall with such sparse values then it should be indicated on the system card.

*(OB 4D2 –if a partnership habitually overcalls on four card suits, or five card suits without an honour, or with fewer than 6HCP or more than 18HCP, then this should be disclosed on the convention card.)*

**7.1.3 09.079 – Tollemache Qualifier**

<p>♠ J98 ♥ QJ5 ♦ K10632 ♣ Q2</p> <p>♠ KQ65      ♠ 1074 ♥ -      ♥ K743 ♦ AJ754      ♦ 9 ♣ AJ43      ♣ 108765</p> <p>♠ A32 ♥ A109862 ♦ Q8 ♣ K9</p>	<p>Board 8 : Dealer West : Love all</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;"><b>West</b></th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;"><b>North</b></th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;"><b>East</b></th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;"><b>South</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1♣(1)</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>1♦(2)</td> <td>1♥</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dbl(3)</td> <td>2♥</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>2♠</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>3♦</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>3♥</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(1)</td> <td colspan="3">11-13 balanced with 4-card major or 16+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(2)</td> <td colspan="3">0-7 or balanced 8-10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(3)</td> <td colspan="3">Take out with strong option</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Table result 3♥ - 1 = -50. TD ruling: Ave + to NS / Ave - to EW Appeal committee: table result restored.</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>	1♣(1)	Pass	1♦(2)	1♥	Dbl(3)	2♥	Pass	2♠	Pass	3♦	Pass	3♥	All Pass				(1)	11-13 balanced with 4-card major or 16+			(2)	0-7 or balanced 8-10			(3)	Take out with strong option		
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																														
1♣(1)	Pass	1♦(2)	1♥																														
Dbl(3)	2♥	Pass	2♠																														
Pass	3♦	Pass	3♥																														
All Pass																																	
(1)	11-13 balanced with 4-card major or 16+																																
(2)	0-7 or balanced 8-10																																
(3)	Take out with strong option																																

At the end of the hand NS asked W why he opened 1♣. He said it was the strong option – meeting Rule of 24. The TD confirmed that the regulation for strong hands was Rule of 25 and he ruled 'illegal agreement' and awarded an artificial adjusted score of average + / average -.

The ruling was appealed and the Appeals Committee found that EW did not have an agreement to open 1♣ but West had upgraded his hand. The AC also found that East did not consider it a strong opener. Even though the regulation is clear the AC restored the result.

The L&E committee confirmed that the TD's ruling was correct. The AC had no basis in bridge law to restore the table result. The secretary to write to the committee advising them of the decision.

**7.1.4 09.081 – Year End Congress (London)**

<p>♠ K10964 ♥ A975 ♦ A102 ♣ K</p> <p>♠ J                      ♠ AQ8 ♥ 103                    ♥ KQ84 ♦ K8764                ♦ - ♣ 108743              ♣ AQJ962</p> <p>♠ 7532 ♥ J62 ♦ QJ953 ♣ 5</p>	<p>Board 25 : Dealer North : EW vulnerable</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>West</b></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>North</b></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>East</b></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>South</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>1♠</td> <td>Dbl</td> <td>3♠</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>3NT(1)</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4♦</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>5♣</td> <td>All Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(1)</td> <td>Slow</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Table result 5♣ + 1 by East = -620 TD ruling: score adjusted to 3NT by E. Weighted 60% -600; 40% +100. Appeal committee: 3NT by E. 100% of -600.</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>		1♠	Dbl	3♠	Pass	Pass	3NT(1)	Pass	4♦	Pass	5♣	All Pass	(1)	Slow		
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																		
	1♠	Dbl	3♠																		
Pass	Pass	3NT(1)	Pass																		
4♦	Pass	5♣	All Pass																		
(1)	Slow																				

The Appeal Committee had suggested that because the 3NT was slow, there had to be an adjustment. The L&E committee confirmed that this was not the case. An action is only to be disallowed under Law 16B if the TD/Appeal Committee considered that the player had used the unauthorised information in an illegal way.

One view was that the removal to 4♦ was not the action suggested by the slow 3NT or else the slowness suggests general uncertainty which West should not pass. However others disagreed.

Again the L&E Committee requested that Appeals Committees give reasons for their decisions.

**8 Venue for future meetings and date of next meeting**

Thursday 15th April 2010 at 1.15pm.

Meeting venue: **TGR's Club, New Cavendish Hotel, 44 Great Cumberland Place, W1H 7BS.**

Jeremy reported that there was some pressure to relocate meetings to the CCPR venue in St James's Park mainly on the grounds of costs. This would adversely affect some members travelling from the North if the timing of the meetings was made earlier to fit in with CCPR's conditions of hire – meetings have to be concluded by 4.30pm.

It was agreed to look carefully at the CCPR and also TGR's which was playing host to the next Selection Committee. In the meantime the secretary was asked to book the Imperial anyway with a view to cancelling (providing that can be done with no cancellation fee) should an alternative venue prove available.

**ACTION JD – other venues**

*[Secretary's note: TGR's indicated their willingness to host the meeting so a provisional booking of the Imperial was cancelled.]*

The meeting closed at 5.10pm

## Appendix A

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE (APPROVED AT THE LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE MEETING OF 21.01.10 AND ADOPTED AT THE BOARD MEETING OF XX.XX.10)**

#### **Terms of reference for the EBU Laws & Ethics Committee**

##### **1. Status**

1.1 The Laws & Ethics Committee is a Standing Committee of the Board of Directors of The English Bridge Union Ltd, established under paragraph 16 of the Articles of Association of the company.

1.2 These terms of reference are established by the Board under the enabling provision in paragraph 8 of the Bye Laws of the company.

##### **2. Responsibilities**

The principal responsibilities of the Laws & Ethics Committee are as follows:-

2.1 to act as the Regulating Authority for the game of Duplicate Bridge in England, under Law 93C of the Laws of Duplicate Bridge 2007, and as the equivalent body under any future revision of the Laws.

2.2 to discharge the functions relating to disciplinary matters delegated to the Laws & Ethics Committee by virtue of paragraph 6.1 of the Bye Laws of the Company and the Disciplinary Rules established under that Bye Law.

2.3 to issue interpretations of the Laws of Duplicate Bridge 2007 and any future revision of the Laws, to the extent sanctioned by the Laws Committee or other appropriate body of the World Bridge Federation and/or the European Bridge League, which interpretations shall have force in England.

2.4 to issue regulations supplementary to the Laws of Duplicate Bridge 2007 and any future revision of the Laws, and directives and other guidance in connection with the game of Duplicate Bridge in England, including, but not limited to, the following matters:-

2.4.1 disclosure of system, alerting, system cards and related matters

2.4.2 permitted methods

2.4.3 tournament direction

2.4.4 appeals

2.4.5 tournament regulations of extensive or general application (detailed regulations for specific tournaments being the responsibility of the Tournament Committee or the Selection Committee, as the case may be).

2.5 to cause to be published, in consultation with the Board, such records of the interpretations, regulations, directives and other guidance issued by the Committee as may be considered appropriate.

2.6 to exercise a general supervisory role in relation to the game of Duplicate Bridge in England, and to take such action as may be considered appropriate to ensure that as far as possible the game is played in accordance with the Laws and applicable regulations, directives or other guidance.