



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE
HELD AT 2 BLOOMSBURY STREET, LONDON WC1B 3ST ON
WEDNESDAY MAY 16TH 2012**

Present:	Jeremy Dhondy (JD)	Chairman and Elected Member
	Sally Bugden (SB)	EBU Chairman
	David Burn (DB)	Elected Member
	Frances Hinden (FH)	Vice Chairman and Elected Member
	Neil Morley (NM)	Elected Member
	Martin Pool (MP)	Elected Member
	Gordon Rainsford (GR)	Co-opted. Assistant Chief TD.
	Tim Rees (TR)	Elected Member
	Grattan Endicott (GE)	Vice-President
	John Pain (JP)	Secretary
1 Apologies for Absence	Mike Amos (MA) Max Bavin (MB) Barry Capal (BC) Gerard Faulkner (GF) Andrew Petrie (AP)	Elected Member Chief Tournament Director EBU General Manager Vice-President EBU Vice Chairman
2		

2.1/2 Minutes of the previous meeting

There were no corrections. The minutes of the meeting of January 11th 2012 were approved and signed.

2.3 Matters arising

2.3.1. Time limit for lodging appeals (5.11)

It was confirmed that appeals arising from the final session of EBU events and other licensed events should be held immediately after the session if it were at the end of an event. Delaying the holding of appeals in the hope that they might go away was unacceptable. It was agreed to add a clause into the 2012 edition of the White Book.

2.3.2 Schedule of standard penalties

FH said that there had been no amendments received since the final version was circulated after the last meeting. It was agreed to introduce the schedule from August 1st 2012, meaning that the Brighton Summer Meeting would be the first opportunity to use it. It was suggested that some clubs

were interested in using the schedule but other clubs might find it too much for them. The National Club Committee would be the means of drawing the attention of clubs to its availability either directly or through Club Focus. Clubs could adopt as much or as little as they felt appropriate.

The schedule would be incorporated into the 2012 edition of the White Book and be available as a download from the website, be highlighted in the August edition of *English Bridge* and attached to these minutes (**Appendix A**). Copies would also be available at Brighton.

Action: FH (English Bridge)

2.3.3 *The EBU Mediation Service*

SB said the Mediation Service would be highlighted at the Chairman's Conference in July.

2.3.4 *Appeals Booklet 2010*

NM had finished typesetting the hands. A communication breakdown meant there had been no progress since February, but it was now back on track. FH said she hoped to have it finished by the end of August. NM would start work on typesetting the 2011 hands.

3 *Appeals to the National Authority*

None this time

4 *Disciplinary Cases*

4.1 *Wroxall*

The secretary reported that the matter was still ongoing and that the Club had not completed its own procedures. Consequently the Laws and Ethics committee would take no action at this stage.

4.2 *Doors*

The Chairman reported that the matter had been brought to a conclusion by the County Disciplinary Committee. The defendant had sought leave to appeal to the EBU, but as both sides had agreed to be bound by the findings EBU Honorary Counsel had given his opinion that it was not possible for either side to appeal to the EBU. The L&E Committee accepted this advice. The papers were put to file.

SB said that the Disciplinary procedures had been sent to all counties and that counties had been given the option to discuss these at the County Chairmen's meeting in July. Counties that were drafting updated constitutions had already included them within their constitutions.

The question was raised about the number of appeals a member may make following a disciplinary hearing at county level where a sanction had been imposed. EBU Honorary Counsel had advised that each individual could make one appeal. This did not affect a player's right to request a review of the proceedings where the procedure itself might have been flawed. It was decided that this should be made clear in the bye laws of both county and EBU constitutions.

GR asked about the final sentence in WB91.3 which appeared to be in conflict with the laws (91A and 93B3). It was agreed to ask MB's opinion but it did appear to be wrong. Subject to confirmation it would be removed from the WB.

[Secretary's note: MB confirmed that the sentence should be removed}

Action: GR, MB

4.3 *Essex*

The Chairman reported that an incident had been dealt with by the County Disciplinary Committee and was now concluded. The papers were put to file.

4.4 Chicago

There had been further correspondence between the club and the L&E secretary but it appeared to have gone quiet again. The papers were put to file.

4.5 Harrogate Congress

A complaint had been received regarding the behaviour of a member. Following enquiries the L&E Officers had ruled that there was insufficient evidence to proceed with a charge but, nevertheless, the Tournament Committee chairman should be advised of the situation. The papers were put to file.

4.6 Manchester League

A complaint and counter-complaint has been received arising from a match played privately in the Manchester League. The incident had been referred to the Manchester Disciplinary Committee who had concluded the matter. The papers were put to file.

4.7 Disruption during the night

FH asked about the jurisdiction of the L&E to consider whether members of a team who were being disruptive (by, for example, having a party) in a neighbouring hotel bedroom at 3am during the course of an event could be charged with an offence if a complaint was made. The committee agreed that it would only fall within its jurisdiction if their behaviour might make the hotel unwilling to host events in future i.e. it would have to be the venue hotel.

5 Technical Matters

5.1 Sale of OBs and WBs

NM said that he supplied approximately six of each book, with slightly more than half going to clubs and the rest to panel TDs. FH mentioned the American company/website 'Lulu' where books could be submitted in pdf form, and be bound into a hard-copy volume, but the costs of postage from America would make the cost prohibitive. There were other methods that could be employed – e-books, Kindle, iPads etc. The secretary stated that a number of delegates attending TD courses now brought the books in electronic form. David Burn offered to produce e-book versions for TDs to use.

Action: DB

5.2/3 OB and WB updates

There was discussion about the lay-out of the Orange Book. JD produced an example (Page 60) where the style of the lay-out

Allowed at Levels 2, 3 and 4

11P2 to 11P6 followed by

Allowed at Levels 3 and 4

11P7 Any defence is permitted

caused many people to misunderstand what was permitted. One possible solution was just to reverse the order so that the more liberal Level 4 came first, with the Level 3 and 2 restrictions afterwards. It was anticipated that a full rewrite of the Orange Book would be undertaken for 2013 with the work starting in September 2012. In the meantime it was agreed that JD would work on removing Level 2 permitted arrangements to a separate section (as is currently the case with Simple System). It was noted that where the Orange Book currently says 'Any defence is permitted' it is understood that it means 'Any defence is permitted, subject to proper disclosure'. The OB for 2012 would contain any new agreements plus minor tidying up as agreed above.

GR agreed to check through the White Book to ensure that the unofficial references attributed to Ton Kooijman (labelled [Ton]) were not offering contrary advice to that offered by the EBU. Any such instances would be removed.

5.4 Law 78D – other scoring methods

FH asked whether the EBU (acting as Regulating Authority) had ever approved the other scoring methods which Law 78D allows for use in its tournaments. It was thought not. FH and the secretary agreed to draw up a list of current scoring methods in EBU tournaments and to offer recommendations. Discussion moved on to the various methods employed by the EBU, Counties and clubs for scoring teams of 8 events. There were various methods in use:

- a) Cross IMPs (Tollemache Qualifying round and final).
- b) Running the event in two sections, scoring within each section as a team of four and adding the two IMP scores together (Garden Cities Trophy event, both the regional final and national final. Counties may, however, use another method to determine the qualifying team for the regional final).
- c) Adding all four scores together before converting to IMPs using the standard IMP table. This method is considered unsound as the IMP scale is designed for teams of four events.
- d) Adding all four scores together and then converting to a revised scale similar to IMPs to take account of the fact of having four scores rather than two.

It was noted that the EBU do not run events in category c) or d).

Action: FH and JP

5.5 TDs serving on Appeals Committees

The Committee noted the minute from August 23rd 2000 and confirmed that active panel TDs should not sit on Appeals Committees unless the Director in Charge found it impossible to form a suitable Appeals Committee without using one of the panel. The Committee could see no reason to have any special cases.

5.6 Penalties for incorrect entry into the BridgeMate

GR asked the Committee's view on the artificial adjusted score to be awarded when a board is made unplayable due to careless action by the player entering the score *and* the opponent player pressing the 'Accept' button. This was likely to be more of a problem now that the Tournament Committee had directed that, where possible, the BridgeMate should display the other results obtained on the board.

E.g.

Case 1 (not fatal): North carelessly enters the details for Board 3 into Board 4; East presses the 'accept' button. The players realise something is amiss when their score for Board 3 is displayed incorrectly (say 3NT= by North which should be +400 since NS are not vulnerable on Board 3 but are on Board 4 so +600 is showing). As the players have not seen any of the results on Board 4 the score can be erased and entered into Board 3. Board 4 remains playable.

Case 2 (fatal): The same scenario, but this time the players have additionally chosen the 'display the results' option so now the score looks out of place alongside the other scores on Board 4 where, say, EW are playing in 6NT making 12 tricks. The score can be erased and entered into Board 3, but Board 4 is unplayable.

After discussion the Committee voted that the artificial score to be entered in Case 2 for the board which was unplayable should be **40% to BOTH pairs**. This assumes one side has entered the score and the other side has accepted it – both sides are deemed to be directly at fault as Law 12C2(a) allows.

FH said she would add this to the list of standard penalties.

5.7 Correspondence from R J Fleet

The Committee considered correspondence from R J Fleet concerning a hand which had been opened a weak 2♥:

♠ X X
♥ Q X X X
♦ 9 X X X
♣ X X X

It was noted that the hand occurred in a Australian Congress, but Mr Fleet observed that it appeared, under current EBU permitted agreements, to be allowed at level 2.

The Committee had no wish to change the current regulation regarding permitted methods for 2-level openings. However they did agree that where the partnership had an agreement to open on a weak two on a 4-card suit this was sufficiently unusual to require an alert rather than an announcement.

6. Applications for new permitted methods

All requests for revisions to the permitted methods were considered:

6.1 Mike Wenble

(a) a 2♦ overcall of an opening 1♣ or 1♦ to show either a weak jump overcall in an unspecified major or one or more of the following a) a balanced hand stronger than a natural 1NT overcall, b) a strong jump overcall in the unbid minor or c) a strong take-out double of the bid minor.

The Committee noted this was already legal when the 1♣ or 1♦ opening showed two cards or fewer, but refused the application for 2012 in other situations citing the fact that there was no anchor suit shown.

(b) a cue-bid overcall of an opening bid to show either a one-suited hand in the next higher ranking suit or a 2-suiter in the remaining two suits.

Again, the Committee noted this was already legal when the 1♣ or 1♦ opening showed two cards or fewer, but refused the application for 2012 in other situations citing the fact that there was no anchor suit shown.

The Committee noted that the rewrite of the Orange Book for 2013 might include a reconsideration of situations which did not promise an anchor suit so the application would be considered again next year.

(c) a 2♣ overcall of an opening bid to show a weak three-suited hand with shortage in the bid suit.

The Committee approved this subject to the hand fitting the definition of a 3-suited hand (either 4441, 5431 or 5440 shape – i.e. at most one card in the opened suit). (OB P65)

(d) a cue-bid overcall of an opening bid to show a weak three-suited hand with a shortage in the bid suit.

Again, the Committee approved this subject to the hand fitting the definition of a 3-suited hand (either 4441, 5431 or 5440 shape – i.e. at most one card in the opened suit). (OB P65)

6.2 Malcolm Hartley

Malcolm Hartley asked for the announcement for Stayman to be changed to ‘Promissory Stayman’ or ‘Non-promissory Stayman’. There was discussion as what ‘promissory’ actually meant. The Orange Book definition (P66) is that

Promissory: The 2♣ response guarantees four or more cards in at least one major.

Non-promissory: The 2♣ response does not guarantee four or more cards in at least one major.

The Committee felt that most pairs do not guarantee a 4-card major as there are hands when Stayman can be used as an escape mechanism. E.g. ♠ x x x ♥ x x x ♦ Q J 10 x x x ♣ x or with a minor suit slam try rather than seeking a major suit fit.

The Committee did not wish to alter the wording of the announcement.

6.3 Frances Hinden

FH asked for the permitted methods for 2NT openings to be tidied up. In particular the wording in 11H8(b)(2) *Any combination of meanings which has a specification which does not include holding at least four cards in one specified suit and does not include two-suiter where the same specified suit is the longer suit.* E.g. weak with Spades or both minors.

The Chairman acknowledged that the wording could be difficult to understand. It was agreed not to change it for 2012, but to include it in the full review for 2013.

6.4 Barry Mitchell

Barry Mitchell asked for a 2NT opening to show 5/5 in either minors or majors and 6-10 HCPs.

The Committee refused the application for 2012, citing the fact that there was no anchor suit but it would be considered afresh for 2013.

6.5 Alan Hennessey

Alan Hennessey asked for a sliding scale of HCP values for opening bids and first responses to be allowed. It was noted that the only bids not currently permitted under his scheme were 1♣ and 1♦ openings. All other openings and all the responses were permitted at Level 4.

The Committee did not wish to extend the scope for permitted openings for 1♣ and 1♦. However it was noted that Mr Hennessey wished to play this only at a few clubs in his own locality. It was open to those clubs to allow the methods as clubs are not bound by the provisions of the Orange Book.

7. Reports from Tournament Directors

12.001 Swiss teams Congress

♠ AK1084 ♥ 93 ♦ 10 ♣ A9854 ♠ Q65 ♠ 973 ♥ 6542 ♥ AKQ7 ♦ Q94 ♦ K752 ♣ 1032 ♣ KQ ♠ J2 ♥ J108 ♦ AJ863 ♣ J76	Board 21 : Dealer North : NS vulnerable <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td><td>1♠</td><td>Dbl</td><td>1NT (A)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td><td>3♣</td><td>Dbl(1)</td><td>Pass</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>3♥</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(1) Before the 2nd double East asked for an explanation of the alert (A). North explained 1NT as a transfer to clubs. This is the correct explanation according to the convention card, but South had forgotten.</p> <p>Result: 3♥ - 2 by W. Lead ♠A.</p>	West	North	East	South		1♠	Dbl	1NT (A)	Pass	3♣	Dbl(1)	Pass		3♥	All Pass	
West	North	East	South														
	1♠	Dbl	1NT (A)														
Pass	3♣	Dbl(1)	Pass														
	3♥	All Pass															

The TD had ruled the score to stand; the Appeals Committee varied that by giving a weighted ruling which resulted in a 1IMP change plus they gave a procedural penalty to South the unacceptable use of the UI.

There was considerable correspondence from South which the committee considered. However they made the following points;

The L&E Committee agreed that some of the wording might have been misconstrued but considered there was no error in procedure and the bridge judgements made by the Appeals

Committee were fine. South (in his correspondence) suggested that more to explain the ruling should have been included on the form. The Committee reminded members that

- a) Professional scribes are not employed at EBU tournaments;
- b) Appeals Committee chairmen are volunteers and
- c) the Appeals Committee chairman had, on this occasion, written far more than is normal and had filled up all the space available on the form.

12.005 Tollemache Cup final

♠ 743 ♥ A9 ♦ K109876 ♣ 72 ♠ Q982 ♠ AJ5 ♥ K64 ♥ 10872 ♦ J54 ♦ A ♣ K93 ♣ AQJ84 ♠ K106 ♥ QJ53 ♦ Q32 ♣ 1065	Board 2 : Dealer East : NS vulnerable West North East South 1♣(A) Pass 1♠ Pass 2♠ Pass Pass 3♦ Dbl(A) All Pass (A) = alert. No questions asked or explanations given. The meaning of 1♣ was already known to NS. Result: 3♦x – 2 by N. lead ♠A.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The TD was called at the end of the hand. Declarer said he had been damaged in the play by the alert of the double. If the double was not alerted (and therefore take-out) then he would play trumps differently. The Appeals Committee ruled that the line of play was poor, but not a serious error and there was no evidence as to the meaning of the double. They adjusted to 3♦x – 1. They agreed that the majority of players play this as penalties, but take-out or competitive are also possible and then declarer would then get it right 100% of the time.

The L&E Committee thought that Declarer had been lucky to get a ruling in his favour. They wished to remind members that doubles of natural suit bids up to the three level which are not for take-out are alertable. This doesn't necessarily mean it is for penalties – see OB5E2. 'Penalty' implies you expect the contract to be defeated and is not necessarily based on a trump stack.

The Chairman would include something to this effect in his *English Bridge* column.

Action: JD

12.007 Harrogate Swiss Pairs

A hand classified by the TD as an Amber Psyche was reclassified as a Green misbid.

12.012 Ranked Masters Pairs

		Board 34 : Dealer East : NS vulnerable						
		West	North	East	South			
<p>♠ A8 ♥ Q87 ♦ AK8 ♣ Q9863</p> <p>♠ Q9732 ♠ KJ1065 ♥ K96 ♥ J32 ♦ 6 ♦ QJ1075 ♣ A754 ♣ -</p> <p>♠ 4 ♥ A1054 ♦ 9432 ♣ KJ102</p>		Pass	1♣	1♠	Pass			
		2NT(1)	Pass(2)	3♠	4♣			
		4♣	Pass	Pass	5♣			
		All Pass						
		(1)	Alerted. A mixed raise to 3.					
		(2)	North enquired meaning of 2NT before passing.					
		Result: 5♣-1 by North.						
		TD ruling: 4♣= by East						

The TD was called to rule on South's action of bidding twice after North's enquiry. The TD ruled it back to 4♣ by East. He ruled that there was UI but the 4♣ bid was not suggested by the UI, but the 5♣ bid had been.

The Appeals Committee returned the result to 5♣-1 by North. In their view when South bid 5♣ any UI from the question about 2NT was not, in their view, relevant.

GR said that if there was UI then it did not 'expire' i.e. one bid might be acceptable but not a second. The committee agreed with this view. In this case GR considered that there was no logical alternative to 4♣; but was there a logical alternative to 5♣ - yes, pass.

12.014 Bedfordshire One Day event

		Board 21 : Dealer North : NS vulnerable			
		West	North	East	South
<p>♠ 105 ♥ J9 ♦ J72 ♣ 987654</p> <p>♠ 4 ♠ KJ762 ♥ KQ8754 ♥ A1062 ♦ AK9 ♦ 3 ♣ Q102 ♣ KJ3 ♠ AQ983 ♥ 3 ♦ Q108654 ♣ A</p>		Pass	1♣	Dbl(1)	
		Rdbl	2♣	Dbl	2♦
		Dbl	All Pass		
		(1)	Agreement is that double shows any hand with opening values (on both convention cards)		

The hand had been classified as a Green Deviation.

The L&E Committee considered it was not a deviation, but part of their system. The unusual nature of the hand means that an agreement such as this should a) be on the card (it is) and b) should be alerted.

It was agreed that the next review of the OB will consider the implications of permitting doubles on any shape which are typically expected to be removed.

Any other business

- a) correspondence from Gary Conrad.

The Committee noted correspondence from Gary Conrad where a situation by a non-panel TD had led to an incorrect ruling as he had not read far enough through the law (Law 64B – revoke situations not subject to rectification). The TD had not gone on to look at Law 64C. This was felt to be sufficiently elementary not to need clarification in the White Book. The secretary noted that instances such as this are covered in the Club TD training courses.

8 *Date of next meeting*

Wednesday September 19th 2012 at 1pm.

Venue is Baker Tilly offices, 2 Bloomsbury Street (nearest tube station is Tottenham Court Road).

The meeting closed at 5.20pm.

Appendix A

Schedule of standard penalties

Covering Note

The White Book sections 90 and 91 contain some general guidance on procedural and disciplinary penalties and some specific examples. The intent is that

- The general guidance here will be incorporated into those sections in the WB.
- The specific penalties here will become an Appendix to the WB, and any specifics currently in the WB (e.g. 90.4.1) superseded by these will be removed.
- This guidance will become official as of 1st August 2012

Introduction

These penalties are meant as guidance not as regulation. They may be adjusted for either mitigating or aggravating circumstances, which should be explained to the players at the time (“You are the country’s most irritating player” is, sadly, not an objective reason to increase a penalty). The objective is to increase consistency of application, so that players cannot complain that they were penalised when, in identical circumstances, other players were not.

Disciplinary penalties (DPs) increase for additional offences during the same event. A congress with multiple different tournaments is considered to be one event for this purpose. Procedural penalties (PPs) generally do not increase in the same manner. PPs are given to a pair or team (or a person in an individual event). DPs may be given to an individual, a pair or a team.

When a warning is given it should be made explicit what the consequence of another offence will be: another warning or a penalty. Most penalties are only given after an initial warning, although some serious offences are subject to immediate penalty. A ‘warning’ is defined to include any announcement to the room as a whole that (for example) any BB@B offence will be subject to an immediate penalty.

Key: W: Warning, PP: Procedural Penalty, DP: Disciplinary Penalty, DQ: Disqualification, R: Referral to the Regulating Authority (L&EC or the Tournament Committee for EBU-run events) for possible further action.

A ‘rule’ is either a Law, a Regulation or part of the Conditions of Contest (CoC). Generally there is no reason to distinguish between them.

1. Interfering with the smooth running of the event

This section covers problems caused by ignorance or carelessness. Deliberate actions are covered under ‘Behaviour’ below.

Action	First Offence	Second Offence	More
Not scoring a board (written traveller/electronic scorer)	W	W	PP
Not completing the session in the electronic scorer	W	W	PP
Incorrectly scoring or agreeing scores	None	W	PP ¹
Arriving late for a (pairs) session ²	W	PP	PP
Slow play	W ³	PP	PP
Misboarding: passing on the wrong 13 cards	PP	PP	PP
Misboarding: passing on a hand without 13 cards	W	PP	PP
Not arrow-switching	None ⁴	None	None
Not noticing incorrect duplication (hand not matching the curtain card)	PP	PP	PP
Causing a board to be unplayable e.g. by sitting at the wrong table, the wrong way	W ⁵	PP	PP
Not handing in Swiss Teams results as the winning team / not agreeing scores	W	W	PP
Leaving the table unnecessarily, repeatedly	W ⁶	W	PP
Refusing to play a board/complete a round	DP	DQ/R	n/a
Leaving the event early (without permission and without good cause)	PP/ R ⁷		
Not turning up for an event you have entered without notification	None/R ⁸	None	None

¹ Usually no penalty for multiple offences; only a penalty if the TD believes the player is being negligent or deliberately awkward

² Arriving late for a teams match is usually covered directly in the CoC.

³ Any board lost through slow play or late arrival will be scored as Ave+/Ave- . The CoC may have additional penalties for slow play, particularly in elite events.

⁴ As long as the board can still be played

⁵ If one pair is clearly at fault (rather than just careless) they may be given a PP for a first offence. If the sitting pair at a table does not check they have the right opponents this merits a warning only for the first offence. Making a board unplayable by scoring on the electronic scorer against the wrong board number and seeing the results from a board not yet played is scored Ave-/Ave- assuming both pairs had the chance to stop the error (N/S when scoring, E/W when agreeing the score).

⁶ If this does not interfere with the smooth running of the event then usually no penalty is given; however e.g. taking cigarette breaks and returning late for the next round will eventually be subject to penalty

⁷ Leaving before the last board(s) of a session (e.g. to catch a train) is usually subject to a PP as well as Ave- on any boards not played unless the TD agrees that the person leaving has a good, and unforeseen, reason. It is normally considered acceptable to leave a multi-session qual/final event having not qualified for the next round as long as the TD is notified in time to manage the movement. For KO events (e.g. the Spring Foursomes) there is no additional penalty for leaving after being knocked out.

⁸ In general there is no penalty (other than an administration fee if you entered late); not turning up for events with pre-qualification such as the National Pairs Final or Corwen will be included in the TD's report and may be referred to the Regulating Authority as it means that another pair has been prevented from playing and there is usually a detrimental impact on the movement.

2. Not conforming to the Laws or the Regulations

This section covers breaching the rules through ignorance or carelessness. These penalties are in addition to any adjustment on a board. Deliberate disobedience is covered under ‘Behaviour’ below – a ‘second offence’ here means the same pair breaching the same regulation but with respect to a different call. Once a pair has been told, for example, that a particular agreement is illegal then continuing to play the agreement is covered by section 3.

Use of UI: Breaches of 16C1 and 73C

In UI cases the TD may adjust based on a breach of these Laws. If it is a matter of judgement what the UI has suggested, or what the Logical Alternatives actually are, then it is normal not to give a PP in addition to (or instead of) adjusting the score (the purpose of score adjustment is to provide rectification only). If, however, the TD believes that both

- The player concerned was aware of these Laws and their consequences; and
- The player took what every person consulted believes is obviously not a legal action (e.g. passing in a forcing auction),

then he should apply a PP, independent of whether or not he adjusts the score. (Note that a score adjustment affects both sides, while a penalty only affects the score of the offending side.)

In some cases a penalty of double (or more) of the standard amount is merited, if the TD believes that a player deliberately broke the Law.

Action	First Offence	Second Offence	More
Incomplete disclosure of methods	W	PP	PP
Failing to alert an alertable call	W ⁹	W	PP
Deliberate use of UI ¹⁰	PP-DQ		
Incomplete convention card ¹¹ - inexperienced or irregular partnership	W	PP	DP
Incomplete convention card – regular partnership	W/PP ¹²	PP	DP
Playing an illegal agreement	W/PP ¹³	PP	DP
Not observing the STOP regulation	W	W	PP
Red ('fielded') psyche	PP ¹⁴	PP	PP
Not announcing correctly	None	W	PP
Making gratuitous or misleading remarks during the play of the hand	W	PP	DP
Not shuffling before replacing cards in the board	None	W	PP ¹⁵
Not calling the TD once an irregularity is pointed out/making up your own ruling	W	PP ¹⁶	DP
Deliberately misleading an opponent during the play e.g. by a hesitation	DP		
Deliberately concealing an irregularity (e.g. a revoke, lying about methods)	DP / R	DQ	
Deliberately playing in an event for which you have not qualified ¹⁷ ; playing under the name of another member	DQ / R		

⁹ If the pair concerned clearly know that the call is alertable a penalty may be given for a first and second offence.

¹⁰ Deliberate use of UI (e.g. from hearing something from another table) should usually be penalized in addition to any adjustment. See the note on the previous page.

¹¹ A CC is 'incomplete' for this purpose if it does not have the opening NT range and 2-level responses, 1- and 2-level openings, any artificial defensive bids or responses, or opening leads, signals and discards filled in correctly.

¹² If an incorrect or incomplete card causes damage at the table, the TD should usually give a PP as well as an adjustment on the board if the pair concerned are known to be a regular partnership. If the TD announced at the start of the event that two CCs were compulsory, this may be considered to be the warning.

¹³ If the pair would be expected to know that the agreement was illegal then it is reasonable to give a penalty for the first offence. (See OB 10 A 10.)

¹⁴ The standard score adjustment for a CPU/red psyche is 60/30 at matchpoints i.e. Ave- plus an additional penalty. The penalty can be higher. (See OB 6 D 3.)

¹⁵ There is usually no penalty for this; only if it is causing inconvenience to another table or there is some suspicion that they are using the cards to communicate.

¹⁶ The TD uses his judgement whether to penalise both pairs, or if it is clear that one pair have intimidated another into not calling the TD, one pair only.

¹⁷ 'Not Qualified' either through insufficiently good results or e.g. through not being a member of the relevant club/county. Doing this accidentally still results in disqualification but usually no further action will be taken.

3. Behaviour

NB: The BB@B guidance suggests that congratulating partner for a well-played hand is a breach of BB@B because it is gloating. A genuine compliment to partner is not considered a misdemeanour.

These offences need the most discretion from the TD because it is often not the words used that offend but the manner in which they are spoken.

In many cases the TD may consider both pairs at the table at fault and may penalise both, not necessarily by the same amount. TDs should be wary of giving a larger penalty to one pair “because they started it” as the actual initiator may not be obvious; things often escalate from what may have been intended to be an innocent or humorous remark.

It is easy to commit many of these offences at the same time. This would usually be treated as one offence, the most serious. This list cannot be exhaustive, the closest category should be used (for example, ‘Tearing up an appeal form’ would come under ‘being rude to the TD’).

Bad behaviour may be brought to the TD’s attention by someone other than the players concerned.

Note that it usually only ‘public’ behaviour that is penalised. Arguments, swearing or offensive remarks between members of a partnership or team are usually considered to be a private matter unless either

- The player insulted complains to the TD himself, or
- The player causes offence to, or inconvenience, other players at the same or nearby tables

Offensive remarks, swearing, etc can still be subject to disciplinary action or referral to the L&E if they take place away from the playing area (e.g. in the bar after play has completed) but penalties would usually only be applied if the person directly insulted complained (it would have to be exceptional for a third party complaint to result in any action).

It should be extremely rare for a first offence of any kind to merit immediate disqualification. When given a warning or penalty for a first offence, the TD should be clear if the next offence will lead to expulsion from the event, or if any actions will be reported to the L&EC with a request for further disciplinary action.

Spectators or other non-players may also behave badly. Under Law 76A, the TD has the right to ban any spectator from the playing area. However, even if a player is ‘responsible’ for a spectator (e.g. a relation) they should not be penalised for the spectator’s behaviour unless they are also deemed to have caused it.

Action	First Offence	Second Offence	More
Deliberately & knowingly breaching the laws ¹⁸	DP	DQ / R	
Swearing/being rude to partner in public	W ¹⁹	DP	DP+
Swearing or being grossly offensive to the TD, opponents, an appeals consultant, the tournament host or a member of an appeals committee	DP	DP	DQ
Arguing with the TD	W	DP	DP+
Shouting at anyone	DP	DP	DQ
Violence or other physical intimidation of any form (e.g. throwing a drink at someone)	DQ / R		
Ignoring opponents through long post mortem / not starting the next board (general BB@B breaches)	W	DP	DP
Throwing cards/scorecard/pen etc across the table	DP	DP	DQ
Not paying attention as dummy (reading, txtng ²⁰ etc)	W	PP ²¹	PP
Mobile phone or other electronic device going off	PP ²²		
Inconveniencing nearby tables (scoring up loudly, not passing boards etc)	W ²³	PP	PP
Shouting/swearing at paid staff at the venue (e.g. waiters, bar staff, hotel receptionists)	R ²⁴		
Breaching venue regulations (e.g. taking own refreshments into the playing area against hotel rules)	W	R ²⁵	

¹⁸ This includes repeating breaches of the rules in (2) above having already been instructed by the TD not to e.g. not alerting having been officially told that a call is alertable.

¹⁹ Partners are considered to have chosen to play with each other. A complaint from their opponents or other tables that they are reducing other players' enjoyment of the game (or if that is the case in the TD's opinion) usually results in an initial warning followed by penalties.

²⁰ Texting as dummy may also breach the mobile phone regulations

²¹ Often a penalty would not be applied unless there is a complaint

²² This is often explicitly covered in the CoC for the competition, which take precedence.

²³ Scoring up in such a way that it prevents another table playing the board is usually subject to a penalty for the first offence.

²⁴ This is not usually a matter for the TD to deal with but if the Chief TD thinks it may jeopardise our relationship with the venue then it should be referred to the L&EC.

²⁵ See note 21