



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE  
HELD AT YOUNG CHELSEA BRIDGE CLUB, GOLDHAWK ROAD  
ON WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 11<sup>TH</sup> 2017**

<b>Present:</b>	Tim Rees (TR)	Chairman and Elected Member
	Frances Hinden (FH)	Vice Chairman and Elected Member
	Robin Barker (RB)	Elected Member and Assistant CTD
	David Burn (DB)	Elected member
	Heather Dhondy (HD)	Co-opted member
	Jeremy Dhondy (JD)	EBU Chairman
	Richard Fleet (RF)	Elected member
	Martin Pool (MP)	Elected Member
	Gordon Rainsford (GR)	EBU General Manager
	Ian Mitchell (IM)	Secretary

**1 Apologies for Absence** Ian Payn (IP) EBU Vice Chairman

**2 Minutes of the previous meeting**

**2.2 Accuracy**

1 The committee considered it unlikely that DB had been asked to check the Bye-Laws. The final sentence is therefore removed. In the previous sentence, “ensue” should read “ensure”.

2.3.4 GR stated that this was not what he recalled as having been the decision of the committee. In the absence of any firm agreement that this was wrong, the minute as written was accepted.

2.3.5 was incorrectly numbered as 2.3.4

4.7 In the first sentence, “since” should be replaced by “and”, and that the word “disciplinary” should be inserted before “Penalty”. The unacceptability of the team’s refusal to play a match should be unrelated to the fact that they had represented England.

5.4 and 5.6 both state that these issues should be considered at the next meeting. It was agreed that the intention was that they would be discussed at a future meeting, not necessarily the next meeting, but in time for any changes to be included in the 2018 publication of the Blue Book.

Subject to the above changes, the minutes of the meeting of 31<sup>st</sup> May 2017 were approved and signed.

### **2.3 Matters arising**

#### 2.3.1 JD presented the revised Terms of Reference relating to the Laws and Ethics Committee

RF questioned whether there should be any reference to the European Bridge League in paragraph 2.3, since the WBF alone is responsible for the Laws. It was decided that the reference should remain.

RB observed that there was reference to the Tournament Committee in paragraph 2.4.5, a body that no longer exists. This would be updated.

There was a lengthy discussion about the status of the newly created Prosecution Panel, and whether it should be considered independent to the L&E Committee, or a subcommittee that answers to the L&E. This affects the accuracy of paragraph 2.2. DB observed that the Bye-Laws make no reference to a separate organisation, and that therefore all the responsibilities technically still lay with the L&E committee.

A sentence regarding the appointment would be deleted as it referred to procedure.

JD would ask the Board to approve these minor amendments at the forthcoming Board meeting.

#### 4.3 A collection of old documents was presented, outlining advice from several sources regarding various aspects of disciplinary investigations and the holding of disciplinary hearings. JD also reminded the committee of a document previously circulated, in which the chairman of a disciplinary committee at a recent case made some recommendations.

The committee agreed that the principles should be brought up to date, and merged into a single document. TR and MP to collaborate.

#### 4.7 E-mails were considered from a panel Tournament Director, who related that the Committee had given him advice many years ago that a contestant that refused to play a match should have been disqualified from the tournament, rather than simply given zero VPs.

The committee confirmed that the default position should be that the contestant be disqualified, but that the DiC could be allowed some discretion in the matter, depending on circumstance. Regardless of this, the contestant should nevertheless receive zero VPs

#### 5.13 RF raised the issue of law 9B1, suggesting that the word 'should' is not strong enough, and that it should be replaced by 'must'.

GR observed that it was not in our remit to change the wording of the Laws, but agreed with the sentiment. RB suggested that our advice in the White Book could reflect this emphasis [the word "must" does indeed appear in paragraph 1.1, but "should" appears in 8.9.1]. FH suggested that strict application of "must" would simply become impractical (e.g. in cases of incorrect usage of 'stop card' procedures). RF suggested that such application might serve to reduce the frequency of incorrect procedures being used.

It was agreed that if any statement were needed, the wording "Players are required to" would be more appropriate than "should".

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

None this time

#### **4 Disciplinary Cases**

##### **4.1 Borovik**

IM reported that a charge letter had been sent to the accused, who had denied the charges. A date for the hearing had yet to be arranged, but that he hoped for a date in late November.

##### **4.2 Cantor**

The committee regretted that suggestions had been previously been made to the member that the matter would not be taken further. It decided, though, that the case be closed regardless, and that nevertheless a letter should be sent to the member, strongly deprecating his actions.

##### **4.3 Member convicted of sex crimes**

##### **& 4.4 Member convicted of hate crimes**

JD reported that the board had considered whether it was within the remit of the EBU, either to bar from playing in tournaments, or to bring disciplinary charges against, members convicted of offences that did not relate to bridge, nor took place in a bridge club or other bridge venue.

The board had decided that the Bye-Laws should be amended, so that offences subject to disciplinary action should include hate crimes directed at other EBU members or affiliated organisations, even when those offences do not take place at a bridge venue (such as online abuse). This could not be applied retrospectively.

FH expressed the opinion that any person who had been convicted of a crime otherwise unrelated to bridge, and had served, or was currently serving, the penalty prescribed by a court of law, should not be subjected to any further punishment by the EBU. RF suggested that because of the importance of the issue, there should be a vote on the matter. The committee voted unanimously to support FH's view.

The committee confirmed that the EBU did not have the power to refuse membership to any person otherwise in good standing, but the board would take advice on the matter. Affiliated clubs and counties, however, could refuse or cancel membership if it were within the terms of their own constitution.

Similarly, the EBU could not refuse entry to a tournament to any eligible member in good standing, unless their presence at the event would violate any restrictions handed down by a court of law (e.g. conditions of bail). Nevertheless, the EBU will ensure that its procedures will enable it to take effective action if made aware of any restrictions and will recognise its responsibilities with regard to child protection policies.

##### **4.5**

Arguments were presented for and against proceeding with a charge against three members, following their failure to adequately respond to the committee w.r.t. accusations they had made which the committee had considered unfounded.

Before a vote, two interested committee members withdrew. A further committee member, who might be seen to be indirectly interested, volunteered to withdraw.

RF proposed that the matter be dropped, seconded by DB. The proposal was carried by four votes to one, with one abstention.

4.6 & 4.7

Two independent incidents at the Spring Foursomes had been brought to the attention of the committee. The secretary wrote to the members involved, and the members had replied. Since they had been sufficiently apologetic, and the hotel considered the matters closed, the committee agreed that no further action needed to be taken, but that the cases would be kept on record.

4.8

A case was presented to the committee in which a player had been banned from a club for five years. The player had appealed to the county, who had recommended that the ban be reduced to one year with a further four years suspended. The club felt that they were not obliged to comply with the county's decision, and that the county had not given the matter sufficient consideration.

The committee read the club's constitution. There was nothing that suggested that the club had the right to reject the finding of the appeal. That the club allows an appeals process at all should mean that the finding of the appeal should be considered to be binding.

It was noted that the wording of the constitution was taken from the EBU's 'model constitution'. Whilst the committee felt that the wording was not ambiguous, it agreed that the wording could be amended to avoid any future misunderstanding.

4.9

Correspondence had been shared with the committee, involving various accusations relating to an affiliated bridge club:

- (i) That a committee member had been abusing privileges of NGS exemptions as a 'host'
- (ii) That an employee of the club had been unfairly dismissed [or had been unfairly treated, leading up to resignation].
- (iii) That the club membership of the same employee had been illegally terminated.

GR reported that the first issue dated back to 2015, and that the EBU considered the matter closed. But the employee concerned in issues (ii) and (iii) had more recently raised the issue again. At the time, the EBU had performed an analysis covering all affiliated clubs, and had discovered widespread abuse, probably based as much on ignorance as intentional manipulation. The EBU made a conscious decision not to proceed with prosecutions against all such players, but chose to follow a programme of education, advising clubs of the regulations, and the responsibility required of club hosts and scorers. Since the 'warning', there was no evidence that the committee member had transgressed.

The Committee felt that any claims of unfair dismissal was a matter between the employee and the club, and that any disputes should be resolved via the laws of the land rather than the EBU.

The committee observed that complaints, in respect to both the second and third issue, had only been raised by a third party, and felt that unless the employee made an official complaint personally to the EBU, then the L&E would not take any further action.

4.10 JD reported that he had communicated with a representative from another NBO that had had some troubles with the behaviour of an EBU member on more than one occasion. This NBO has subsequently banned the player from tournaments within their auspices, but did not seek for this to be extended to other NBOs. No further action needed to be taken by the EBU.

4.11 JD reported on communications with another club that is in the process of bringing disciplinary action against a committee member, causing division within the club. JD had offered some advice, but at this stage there is no need for the EBU to be involved officially.

**5 Technical Matters**

5.1 There has been much correspondence regarding the new definitions on “Strong” opening bids. FH offered to write a FAQ document offering further advice.

5.2 RB reported on various aspects of the WB that needed revision in light of new laws and regulations:

- a) there are references to the “Tournament Committee” which no longer exists. This should refer to the Chief TD.
- b) 3.7.2.4 and 8.6.2 may be inconsistent with the new law 86B1
- c) 8.80.3 needs to be rewritten to take into account new bye laws relating to disciplinary procedures
- d) There was a suggestion that section 7 should include some advice to club TDs about making rulings as playing TDs, especially regarding rulings at their own table. RB would look at the club TD training material.

RB to write draft changes for approval to take effect in August 2018.

5.3 A response had been received from a pair who had been approached with regard to their apparent randomness of their 1-level suit openings – no consistency as to whether to open a major or minor, or which minor to open, with a 4-card major and a 3-card minor.

The pair confirmed that there was no simple rule, and that they judged each case on its own merit, e.g. suit quality, likely rebid, etc.

FH confirmed, having played against the pair, that the partnership genuinely seemed to have no concealed understanding, and would often make errors based on the lack of knowledge of what to expect in the opposite hand.

It was agreed that no further action should be taken.

**6. Applications for new permitted methods**

None this time.

**7. Reports from Tournament Directors 17.001 to 17.036**

(NB, these are listed in numerical order, though not discussed in that order)

17.008

<p>                     ♠ A974                      ♥ 95                      ♦ J84                      ♣ A873                      ♠ QJ62      ♠ K5                      ♥ 104      ♥ AKJ7                      ♦ KQ75      ♦ 1092                      ♣ 1054      ♣ KQ96                      ♠ 1083                      ♥ Q8632                      ♦ A63                      ♣ J2                 </p>	<p>Board 24 : Dealer West : Love all</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>Pass</td> <td>1NT*</td> <td>Dbl</td> <td>2♥<sup>1</sup></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2♠</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*announced by South as 12-14  <sup>1</sup>Natural</p> <p>Recorded by TD as ‘Amber’ Psyche</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Table Result: 2♠= by West      Lead: ♥9</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>	Pass	1NT*	Dbl	2♥ <sup>1</sup>	2♠	All Pass		
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>										
Pass	1NT*	Dbl	2♥ <sup>1</sup>										
2♠	All Pass												

It was agreed to amend to “Green”. It appears normal to pull 1NTx with a 5-card suit and the minority of points.

17.015

<p>♠ 8643 ♥ 54 ♦ J1062 ♣ A96</p> <p>♠ J2                      ♠ KQ1075 ♥ AQ9                    ♥ 87 ♦ A94                     ♦ KQ8 ♣ QJ853                ♣ K74</p> <p>♠ A9 ♥ KJ10632 ♦ 753 ♣ 102</p>	<p>Board 11 : Dealer South : Love all</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td><b>West</b></td> <td><b>North</b></td> <td><b>East</b></td> <td><b>South</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>2♥<sup>1</sup></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>2NT<sup>2</sup></td> <td>3♠</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass<sup>3</sup></td> <td>Pass</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p><sup>1</sup> Weak <sup>2</sup> Alerted, described as 15-18 <sup>3</sup> Agreed time to think</p> <p>After opening lead made, with South away from table, East asked North if correct explanation given. "Just shows a feature, no guarantee of HCPs"</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Table Result: 3♠+1 by East                      Lead: ?</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>				2♥ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	2NT <sup>2</sup>	3♠	Pass	Pass <sup>3</sup>	Pass		
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>														
			2♥ <sup>1</sup>														
Pass	2NT <sup>2</sup>	3♠	Pass														
Pass <sup>3</sup>	Pass																
<p>Directors Ruling:                      No adjustment. West should know that North cannot hold 15-18 HCP A/C Decision:                      E/W damaged; weighted ruling given (of different game contracts and results).</p>																	

This was considered together with 17.024, since they involved the same principle: On both occasions, the non-offending side had received Misinformation, but had made very poor decisions in the auction which, in the opinion of the TDs they should not have made even given the incorrect explanations. The TDs therefore made no adjustment.

The Appeals Committees on both occasions overturned the TD's ruling. The L&E confirmed this position, that the TD should not be examining whether or not the players 'ought to have got it right' given the incorrect explanation, but should ask 'would they have got it right' with the correct explanation. If there is no doubt that they would get it right, then the TD should adjust, regardless of how poor their decisions were given the wrong explanation.

FH to write to the TDs involved in 17.015, to clarify this position.

17.024

<p>♠ 94 ♥ KJ2 ♦ KJ1052 ♣ 964</p> <p>♠ AQJ83                    ♠ K652 ♥ A83                      ♥ 10 ♦ 43                        ♦ AQ986 ♣ A53                      ♣ Q72</p> <p>♠ 107 ♥ Q97654 ♦ 7 ♣ KJ108</p>	<p>Board 19 : Dealer South : EW vulnerable</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td><b>West</b></td> <td><b>North</b></td> <td><b>East</b></td> <td><b>South</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>2♥</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2♠</td> <td>3♦*</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>*non-forcing, but not alerted. Before opening lead, North observed that 3D should have been alerted. East asked if auction could be unwound to her.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Table Result: 3♦-4 by North                      Lead: ♥10</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>				2♥	2♠	3♦*	All Pass	
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>										
			2♥										
2♠	3♦*	All Pass											
<p>Directors Ruling:                      No adjustment. (On consultation with other players) MI made no difference to East's decision. A/C Decision:                      Result amended to 4♠+1 by West. Poll unhelpful, since it involved nobody that would have passed given the MI.</p>													

GR added that he had condoned the TD's original ruling, based on his view that the only logical reasoning for the non-offender's poor decision was more consistent with the correct explanation than with the incorrect explanation, and therefore was not influenced by the Misinformation. FH observed that this reasoning had not been presented on the appeal form or to the AC.

17.025

<p>♠ 104 ♥ KQJ543 ♦ 932 ♣ AQ</p> <p>♠ 32 ♥ 9 ♦ KQJ10865 ♣ 954</p> <p>♠ AKJ876 ♥ 2 ♦ 4 ♣ 108632</p> <p>♠ Q95 ♥ A10876 ♦ A7 ♣ KJ7</p>	<p>Board 1 : Dealer North : Love all</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>West</b></th> <th><b>North</b></th> <th><b>East</b></th> <th><b>South</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>1♥</td> <td>1♠</td> <td>Dbl</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2♦</td> <td>2♥</td> <td>3♣</td> <td>4♥</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass<sup>H</sup></td> <td>Pass</td> <td>4♠</td> <td>Dbl</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><sup>H</sup> undisputed hesitation</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Table Result: 4♠*-2 by East      Lead: ♥A</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>		1♥	1♠	Dbl	2♦	2♥	3♣	4♥	Pass <sup>H</sup>	Pass	4♠	Dbl	All Pass			
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																		
	1♥	1♠	Dbl																		
2♦	2♥	3♣	4♥																		
Pass <sup>H</sup>	Pass	4♠	Dbl																		
All Pass																					
<p>Directors Ruling:      No adjustment. There are Logical Alternatives, but unlikely that West was considering bidding, and that therefore if any action is suggested by UI, it is Pass.</p> <p>A/C Decision:      Director's Ruling Upheld.</p>																					

There was some concern about TDs and ACs arguing that a slow pass in a potential sacrifice situation might suggest that the passer was considering doubling, and therefore that the hesitation might suggest that passing (or doubling) would be more successful than bidding on. In this case, the Committee felt that the slow pass indicated positive action of some sort.

17.026

<p>♠ QJ5 ♥ A752 ♦ - ♣ J108532</p> <p>♠ A92 ♥ - ♦ QJ983 ♣ AKQ96</p> <p>♠ K763 ♥ J963 ♦ K10654 ♣ -</p> <p>♠ 1084 ♥ KQ1084 ♦ A72 ♣ 74</p>	<p>Board 4 : Dealer West : All vulnerable</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>West</b></th> <th><b>North</b></th> <th><b>East</b></th> <th><b>South</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1♦</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>2♦</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>Dbl</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>2♥</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3♦</td> <td>3♥</td> <td>Pass<sup>H</sup></td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4♦<sup>2</sup></td> <td>Pass</td> <td>5♦</td> <td>Dbl</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><sup>H</sup> agreed hesitation <sup>2</sup> before bidding, acknowledged to oppo that there had been hesitation.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Table Result: 5♦*=- by West      Lead: ?</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>	1♦	Pass	2♦	Pass	Pass	Dbl	Pass	2♥	3♦	3♥	Pass <sup>H</sup>	Pass	4♦ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	5♦	Dbl	All Pass			
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																						
1♦	Pass	2♦	Pass																						
Pass	Dbl	Pass	2♥																						
3♦	3♥	Pass <sup>H</sup>	Pass																						
4♦ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	5♦	Dbl																						
All Pass																									
<p>Directors Ruling:      Adjusted to 3♥ – 1 by South.</p> <p>A/C Decision:      Amended. 65% of the time, West would bid 4♣, which is not suggested by UI, leading to 4♦+1 by West.</p>																									

The committee considered the AC's decision to be a Reveley ruling. The AC justified a weighted ruling by claiming that 4♣ was not suggested over Pass by the UI. This is clearly not the case, and the Committee's view was that the TD's original ruling was correct. GR to write to the AC.

17.027

<p>♠ 532 ♥ A1076 ♦ 3 ♣ K9852</p> <p>♠ Q97                      ♠ AJ864 ♥ 542                        ♥ 983 ♦ Q962                     ♦ AK8 ♣ Q63                       ♣ 104</p> <p>♠ K10 ♥ KQJ ♦ J10754 ♣ AJ7</p>	<p>Board 12 : Dealer West : NS vulnerable</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>West</b></th> <th><b>North</b></th> <th><b>East</b></th> <th><b>South</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>1♠</td> <td>Dbl</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2♠<sup>1</sup></td> <td>3♥</td> <td>3♠</td> <td>Pass<sup>H</sup></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>4♣</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>4♥</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">All Pass</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><sup>1</sup> Bad raise <sup>H</sup> agreed hesitation</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Table Result: 4♥ = by North                      Lead: ?</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>	Pass	Pass	1♠	Dbl	2♠ <sup>1</sup>	3♥	3♠	Pass <sup>H</sup>	Pass	4♣	Pass	4♥	All Pass			
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																		
Pass	Pass	1♠	Dbl																		
2♠ <sup>1</sup>	3♥	3♠	Pass <sup>H</sup>																		
Pass	4♣	Pass	4♥																		
All Pass																					
<p>Directors Ruling:                      Adjusted to 3♠ – 3 by East. “Four out of six players polled chose to pass” A/C Decision:                      Amended, table result restored. “Initial survey of 4 players, all 4 of whom would have bid 4♣”, together with own unanimous belief that 4♣ was self-evident...</p>																					

There was an apparent discrepancy between the TD’s statement of figures in the poll and those quoted by the AC. Part of this discrepancy was based on the TD consulting four players sitting at a table together. Because their views were likely to conform, the TD did not give full weighting to their views. The committee pointed out that this is not recommended practice.

17.028

<p>♠ K98 ♥ A543 ♦ AJ ♣ K643</p> <p>♠ QJ62                      ♠ 1074 ♥ QJ1092                    ♥ K7 ♦ 53                            ♦ Q8762 ♣ 108                        ♣ AQ9</p> <p>♠ A53 ♥ 86 ♦ K1094 ♣ J752</p>	<p>Board 22 : Dealer East : EW vulnerable</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>West</b></th> <th><b>North</b></th> <th><b>East</b></th> <th><b>South</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Pass</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1♥*</td> <td>1NT</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>2♣</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>2♦</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>2NT</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">All Pass</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*This hand fails to satisfy BB 7A3 System card shows “third hand openings could be extremely light”</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Table Result: 2NT-2 by North                      Lead: HK</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>			Pass	Pass	1♥*	1NT	Pass	2♣	Pass	2♦	Pass	2NT	All Pass			
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																		
		Pass	Pass																		
1♥*	1NT	Pass	2♣																		
Pass	2♦	Pass	2NT																		
All Pass																					
<p>Directors Ruling:                      Illegal agreement. (60/40) A/C Decision:                      Director’s Ruling Upheld.</p>																					

The appeal was initially heard by the Director in Charge, on the grounds that it was a matter of Law or Regulation. On the request of E/W, this was subsequently referred to a Committee. Both the DiC and AC upheld the director’s ruling. The L&E Committee agrees with this decision.

The appeal was based on the call being a psyche, but TR suggested that even if that were the case, it should clearly be a Red Psyche, and since this would result in a worse score for the appellants (30/60 rather than 40/60), he wondered why the deposit was not kept. GR said that one of the AC members had not been convinced that the ‘psyche’ had been fielded.



17.032

<p>♠ Q xx ♥ AQJ9x ♦ Qx ♣ 109x</p> <p>♠ Kxx                      ♠ xxx ♥ xxxx                      ♥ 109 ♦ AJxxxx                    ♦ 109x ♣ -                              ♣ AKJxx</p> <p>♠ AJxx ♥ Kx ♦ Kx ♣ Qxxxx</p>	<p>Board ? : Dealer South : vulnerability not recorded</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>West</th> <th>North</th> <th>East</th> <th>South</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1♣<sup>1</sup></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2♦<sup>2</sup></td> <td>Pass</td> <td>2♥</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>3NT</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><sup>1</sup> Announced "Could be Two" <sup>2</sup> Alerted, described as majors (5+ ♥, 4+ ♠)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Table Result: 3NT= by North                      Lead: ♠ x</p>	West	North	East	South				1♣ <sup>1</sup>	2♦ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	2♥	Pass	Pass	3NT	All Pass	
West	North	East	South														
			1♣ <sup>1</sup>														
2♦ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	2♥	Pass														
Pass	3NT	All Pass															
<p>Directors Ruling:                      Score adjusted to 4♥x -6. PP against EW (-3 IMPs) for failing to avoid taking advantage of UI (73C2)</p>																	

The Committee welcomed the assignment of a PP for blatant use of UI. TR wondered whether a 6 IMP penalty might have been more appropriate. RF commented on the fact that 'x's were used for small cards on the appeal form, and that there was a duplication of one of the cards actually specified. It was observed that this was a ruling made by telephone, and that it is often hard for accurate details to be obtained from the competitors.

17.033

<p>♠ KJ976 ♥ 8754 ♦ 102 ♣ 92</p> <p>♠ A53                      ♠ 104 ♥ Q96                      ♥ AKJ1032 ♦ QJ                              ♦ A ♣ AKQ53                    ♣ 8764</p> <p>♠ Q82 ♥ - ♦ K9876543 ♣ J10</p>	<p>Board 10 : Dealer East : All vulnerable</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>West</th> <th>North</th> <th>East</th> <th>South</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1♥</td> <td>3♦</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4♦<sup>1</sup></td> <td>Pass</td> <td>4♥<sup>H</sup></td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4NT</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>5♦</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6♥</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><sup>1</sup> Alerted, but no one asked. No specific agreement. <sup>H</sup> agreed hesitation</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Table Result: 6♥+1 by East                      Lead: ♣ J</p>	West	North	East	South			1♥	3♦	4♦ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	4♥ <sup>H</sup>	Pass	4NT	Pass	5♦	Pass	6♥	All Pass		
West	North	East	South																		
		1♥	3♦																		
4♦ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	4♥ <sup>H</sup>	Pass																		
4NT	Pass	5♦	Pass																		
6♥	All Pass																				
<p>Directors Ruling:                      Table Result stands. Several players polled, somewhat more than should be considered necessary, none of whom would pass 4♥.</p> <p>A/C Decision:                      Director's Ruling Upheld. Deposit Forfeited. Appeal based on players being told by other peers advising "pass is a logical alternative". A/C observed that this is not the same as saying some players would actually have passed, which is the true test. Further players consulted by A/C, none of whom would choose to pass.</p>																					

RB observed that, together with 17.036, this was the first time that deposits had been retained, including a score adjustment as part of the deposit, since the latter had come into regulation over a year ago.

17.035

<p>♠ Q7 ♥ AK6 ♦ AJ ♣ AKQJ106</p> <p>♠ K64                      ♠ A103 ♥ 10843                    ♥ 97 ♦ 852                        ♦ Q10964 ♣ 872                        ♣ 943</p> <p>♠ J9852 ♥ QJ52 ♦ K73 ♣ 5</p>	<p>Board 1 : Dealer North : Love all</p> <table border="0"> <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>2♣<sup>1</sup></td> <td>Pass</td> <td>2♦<sup>2</sup></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>2NT<sup>3</sup></td> <td>Pass</td> <td>3♣<sup>4</sup></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>3♥</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>4♥</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>5♣</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>5♠</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>6NT</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><sup>1</sup> Game Force <sup>2</sup> Waiting bid <sup>3</sup> announced as 20-21 <sup>4</sup> Shows 5/4 majors</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Table Result: 6N= by North                      Lead: ♦6</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>		2♣ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	2♦ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	2NT <sup>3</sup>	Pass	3♣ <sup>4</sup>	Pass	3♥	Pass	4♥	Pass	5♣	Pass	5♠	Pass	6NT	All Pass	
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																						
	2♣ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	2♦ <sup>2</sup>																						
Pass	2NT <sup>3</sup>	Pass	3♣ <sup>4</sup>																						
Pass	3♥	Pass	4♥																						
Pass	5♣	Pass	5♠																						
Pass	6NT	All Pass																							
<p>Directors Ruling:                      Table Result stands. Correct explanation of system – no MI to E/W. North cannot know that 6NT would be best contract.</p> <p>A/C Decision:                      Score adjusted to 4♥ +3. 3♥ showed clubs, and was not alerted, &amp; North has further UI that partner has not appreciated the strength of his hand.</p>																									

The committee congratulated the AC on a good decision to overturn what appeared to be a poor ruling by the TD.

17.036

<p>♠ AK1073 ♥ J1084 ♦ A104 ♣ 4</p> <p>♠ J65                      ♠ Q94 ♥ K6                        ♥ 73 ♦ KQ83                    ♦ 65 ♣ K1072                   ♣ QJ9865</p> <p>♠ 82 ♥ AQ952 ♦ J972 ♣ A3</p>	<p>Board 12 : Dealer West : NS vulnerable</p> <table border="0"> <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>1♣</td> <td>1♠</td> <td>3♣<sup>1</sup></td> <td>Dbl</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3♥<sup>2</sup></td> <td>Dbl</td> <td>4♣</td> <td>5♦</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: right;">(with screens)</p> <p><sup>1</sup> Pre-emptive <sup>2</sup> explained by West to South as “Natural” explained by East to North as “Natural / Semi-Natural” (some dispute over what precisely was said – explanations given verbally rather than using pads provided) Ruling requested because different explanations offered, affecting South’s interpretation of North’s double.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Table Result: 5♦ -4 by South                      Lead: ♣6</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>	1♣	1♠	3♣ <sup>1</sup>	Dbl	3♥ <sup>2</sup>	Dbl	4♣	5♦	All Pass			
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>														
1♣	1♠	3♣ <sup>1</sup>	Dbl														
3♥ <sup>2</sup>	Dbl	4♣	5♦														
All Pass																	
<p>Directors Ruling:                      Table Result stands. Essentially no difference in explanations.</p> <p>A/C Decision:                      Director’s Ruling Upheld. Deposit Forfeited. Even if South’s version of facts is correct, explanation was materially accurate. Damage arose from North/South’s agreements / interpretations.</p>																	

RF suggested that there should have been a PP for not following correct procedures with regard to written explanations.

### 8                      **Date of next meeting**

IM to contact members by e-mail to fix the next date [Now fixed as Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> January 2018 at 1.15pm. Venue: Young Chelsea Bridge Club, Goldhawk Rd, Shepherds Bush].

The meeting closed at 5.15pm.