



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE
HELD AT AYLESBURY OFFICES ON WEDNESDAY 25TH JANUARY 2006**

Present:

Richard Fleet	Chairman
Max Bavin	Chief Tournament Director
Jeremy Dhondy	
David Stevenson	
Nick Doe	Secretary

1. Apologies for Absence

Steve Barnfield	
David Burn	
David Martin	
Philip Mason	EBU Vice-Chairman
Martin Pool	Committee Chairman
Denis Robson	EBU Chairman
Grattan Endicott	Vice-President
Gerard Faulkner	Vice-President

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting (11th January 2006)

2.1 Accuracy

It was agreed that minute 3.9 was incorrect. The L&E had decided to make no change to the provision concerned.

Subject to this correction the minutes were agreed to be a true record and signed by the Chairman.

2.2 Matters arising

2.2.1 White Book – index (item 2.2.3)

The L&E noted that approval had been given to enlisting outside assistance, and the matter was being progressed.

2.2.2 Psyches and “forgets” (item 2.2.4)

The L&E noted that criticism of the legality of the decision appeared to be continuing. It reaffirmed the decision which it believed to be legal. The practical justification was that full disclosure in these particular circumstances was considered to be likely to be more confusing than helpful to the opponents.

3. Orange Book changes

3.1 Convention cards – EBU 20B

The L&E considered a suggestion for a further amendment, but did not think that it was necessary. The design was therefore now final.

3.2 Valuation methods and minimum opening strength

The L&E considered a suggestion that the decision made at the previous meeting would lead to difficulties when applied to strong opening bids. It noted the view that the expression “equivalent playing strength” was capable of different interpretations, especially when applied to stronger hands, and that some guidance should be given if the decision was to remain unaltered.

After discussion of a number of possible options, a proposal from the Chair that in respect of strong openings, the minimum strength should be “Rule of 25, or equivalent playing strength subject to an absolute minimum of 14 HCP” was agreed without a vote.

Note – the decision of the previous meeting is unaltered in respect of other uses of “Rule of X”.

3.3 Psychic bidding - terminology

The L&E noted a suggestion that it would be appropriate to change references to “an unauthorised understanding” to “a concealed understanding”. The suggestion did not find favour.

3.4 Agreements after infractions

The L&E noted that there was some doubt as to the present policy with regard to agreements which apply only after an opponent has committed an infraction. It agreed that in future such agreements would be allowed in principle. However, there are currently no specific provisions authorising such agreements. Accordingly, unless and until any application is made for a specific scheme, the only such agreements which will actually be authorised are those covered by blanket provisions.

It was not considered necessary to include any reference to such agreements in the *Orange Book*.

3.5 Permitted methods – application – F. Hinden

The L&E considered an application concerning double jump cue bids. It decided to widen the existing provisions with regard to cue-bids generally, to include the methods applied for, as follows:-

Levels 3 and 4:-

A cue-bid may be played as an unspecified one-suiter. This applies whether the cue-bid is simple, jump, or a higher jump.

Level 2:-

A jump cue-bid may be played as an unspecified one-suiter. This applies whether the cue-bid is a single or higher jump.

Note – these provisions extend the present provisions relating to the Bliss cue-bid and the jump cue-bid to show a solid suit.

3.6 Language

Mr Fleet drew the L&E's attention to the fact that the mixture of second and third person language in the present *Orange Book* has been changed in the draft to exclusively third person language. He thought that such a change was sufficiently important that the L&E should make a specific decision one way or the other. The L&E approved the change, but noted that the wording of a few specific provisions still needed to be tidied up.

3.7 The way forward

The L&E noted that L&E members and others have had extensive opportunities to comment on the draft text, and that the issues raised in the comments made have now been discussed and decided. Subject to implementation of the changes agreed at this meeting, therefore, the text was now ready to go forward to the final proof-reading stage.

4. Reports from Tournament Directors**4.1 05.103**

[Secretary's note – this report was actually discussed at the previous meeting – see also item 7.1]

Dealer S
E/W vul
MP Pairs

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

West
♠ Q 9 7 2
♥ Q
♦ A Q 5 4 3
♣ Q 5 2

East
♠ J 8 3
♥ A 3 2
♦ K 10 9 7 2
♣ 7 4

South
♠ A K 5 4
♥ 10 9 8
♦ 6
♣ A K 9 8 3

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
				1♣
	1♦	1♥	2♦	2♠
	3♦	3♥	4♦	DbI ^{H?}
	Pass	5♣	5♦	DbI
	All pass			

Result: 5♦^X-2 N/S +500

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

I was called at the end of play. At the end of the auction W had reserved his rights, alleging that S had hesitated before doubling 4♦. No agreement had been obtained. When I was called, N, E and S said they had been unaware of any break in tempo.

I ruled that S had a bridge decision to make, therefore ruled a hesitation had taken place. This conveys unauthorised information to N, who must carefully avoid taking advantage. Pass is a logical alternative which she must take. I considered 4♦^X-2, but saw no reason why the defence should differ.

I considered and rejected the possibility that 5♦ was wild or gambling.

Score adjusted to 4♦^X-1, N/S +200.

Appeals Committee's decision

The removal to 5♣ was not a 70% action and is disallowed, but the 5♦ bid at red when doubled for penalty in four is wild and gambling.

We considered the possibility that N/S might have defended 4♦^X differently to 5, but were not convinced by the arguments at the table that they would have done so.

N/S keep the score (+200) awarded by the TD. E/W keep the original table score (-500).

L&E comment:

The interesting feature of this case is that E is alleged to have taken wild or gambling action despite the fact that she was unaware of her opponent's hesitation, and therefore cannot have known that any adjustment in her side's favour was in prospect. The L&E decided that it is not appropriate to classify the action of a player who is unaware of a possible infraction by an opponent as involving a "double shot". However, it is still possible for the non-

offending side to be denied redress on the grounds that such a player took wild or gambling action.

The Appeals Committee recorded that they found E's 5♦ bid to be "wild and gambling". Whilst it is possible that they did consider the bid to be both wild and gambling, the correct test is whether they found it to be either wild or gambling.

The *White Book* does require that for action to be classified as wild or gambling it must be "markedly worse than bad bridge". The L&E did not think that E's action in bidding 5♦ was sufficiently poor to be classified in this way.

4.2 05.40

Dealer W
N/S vul

Pachabo
scoring

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

West
♠ Q 10 5 3
♥ A 10 9 8 7
♦ 10 7
♣ J 5

East
♠ K 8 7 6 4 2
♥ Q
♦ K Q J 6 2
♣ 8

South
♠ -
♥ 6 5 4 3
♦ 9 8 4 3
♣ A Q 9 4 3

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	Pass	1♣	1♠	Db1 ^{A1}
	3♠	3NT	4♠	Pass ^H
	Pass	Db1 ^H	Pass	5♣
	Pass	6♣	6♠	Pass
	Pass	Db1	All pass	

1 Unlimited, shows 4 ♥s

Result: 6♠^X-3 N/S -500

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

I was called at the end of the auction. I recorded the facts and noted the hesitations before both S's pass and N's double.

At the end of play I was called back by E/W and asked for a ruling, particularly about N's bid of 6♣ after his partner's slow pass.

N/S have no systemic agreement about the strength of hands and bidding or passing in this situation (over 4♠). Therefore the hesitation does suggest a problem but does not suggest additional strength. I ruled that the result should stand.

Appeals Committee's decision

Before we considered the 6♣ bid we looked at the earlier auction and could not see any justification for S bidding 5♣ hence we feel that the 5♣ bid was largely as a result of the slow double of 4♠. We ruled that S has a logical alternative (pass) and adjusted the score to 4♠^X-1, N/S +100. As we decided that [passing 4♠^X] was a 100% action, we didn't consider the merits of 6♣.

We were not specifically asked to consider the legitimacy of the 6♣ bid during the appeal, and focussed on the earlier auction. Question to L&E “is this within our brief or should an Appeal Committee only consider the appeal basis as raised by the side making the appeal?”

L&E comment:

The Appeals Committee has all the responsibilities that a TD has: he is responsible for dealing with anything brought to his notice. Thus the Appeals Committee acted correctly in dealing with a matter that had not been specifically asked.

4.3 05.42

Dealer W
N/S vul

Swiss Pairs

North

♠ 3
♥ 7 5 4 3
♦ A K Q J 6 2
♣ 7 6

West

♠ A 7 2
♥ A K 10 9 2
♦ 8 5
♣ K 8 3

East

♠ Q J 5 4
♥ 8
♦ 10 9
♣ A J 10 9 5 4

South

♠ K 10 9 8 6
♥ Q J 6
♦ 7 4 3
♣ Q 2

Bidding:

West

1♥
3♠
Pass
Pass

North

3♦¹
Pass
Pass
Dbl

East

Dbl^A
Pass
4♣
All pass

South

Pass
Dbl
Pass

1 Described as intermediate

Result: 4♣^X-1 N/S +100

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

I was called to the table at the end of play by E who had been told that 3♦ was intermediate, and had played N for the ♣Q. N had said that they played 3♦ as pre-emptive and this was how it was described in their system notes. S's convention card stated it was intermediate, 6+ suit. N did not have a convention card.

Because the partnership only had one convention card it was not possible to establish their system, so I had to assume mistaken explanation rather than mistaken bid. I adjusted the score to 4♣^X=, N/S -510.

Appeals Committee's decision

4♣^X-1 should stand. The declarer's play was incompetent. He took losing finesses in both ♣s and ♥s (ruffing finesse). This played N to have 14 cards. It would in any case be hard to punish N/S for having only one convention card when one was lost at the end of the previous match. In any case N's hand could come in the range of either weak or intermediate overcalls. But the reason for the decision is that the bad result was a consequence of E's misplay.

L&E comment:

The TD seems to have assumed that she had no choice but to rule misinformation rather than misbid. This is not correct. The Laws only require this in the absence of evidence.

When there is evidence, it is a matter for the TD and Appeals Committee to judge on the basis of the available evidence what it was that the pair had agreed to play. Of course the absence of a convention card without good reason, or a conflict between a pair's two cards, is a telling factor, but it is not conclusive.

It is difficult to judge the play without details of how the play went. The L&E reiterates that TDs should always record this information when damage in the play is alleged.

In order for redress to be denied for damage in the play following misinformation, when the offending side allege a misplay, the line chosen by the non-offending declarer must be markedly worse than bad bridge.

4.4 05.43

The L&E considered a psyche from the Shrewsbury Summer Congress, which had been classified on site as Amber, but reduced on appeal to Green. It decided to write to the players for comments with a view to restoring the Amber classification.

The L&E also noted that the TD had called for the appeal, and had therefore taken no deposit. Whilst it is perfectly legal for a TD to instigate an appeal, it will be a rare occurrence, and the L&E could not see why the TD had considered it appropriate on this occasion. When a TD does instigate an appeal he should always record the reasons for doing so on the appeal form.

4.5 05.46

The L&E considered an appeal from a TD's decision to allow a table result to stand. The Appeals Committee had adjusted the score, but had given no reasons. The L&E reiterated that it expects that, when the TD's decision is changed, Appeals Committees will invariably record the reasons for their decision on the appeal form.

4.6 05.48

Dealer N
N/S vul
Swiss Pairs

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

West
♠ 7
♥ J 6 3
♦ Q 10 8 7 5
♣ A K 7 6

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

South
♠ Q 8 5 3
♥ 10 9 5 2
♦ J 2
♣ 5 3 2

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
		2♦ ^{A1}	Dbl	2♥ ^{A2}
	Pass	2♠ ^{A3}	2NT ^{A4}	Pass
	3♦	Pass	3NT	All pass

- 1 Weak major or strong 3-suiter
- 2 To play if weak in ♥
- 3 To play
- 4 Both minors

Result: 3NT+2 N/S -460

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

I was called at the end of the auction. N called me because he believed E was in receipt of unauthorised information. He reserved his rights and I was called back at the end of play because he felt his side had been damaged.

W had an opportunity to show values on the first round of bidding. The 3♦ bid did not suggest extra values. The unauthorised information that W believed E to have both minors and was bidding on that basis could have suggested continuing to 3NT. I ruled that the bidding should be taken back to 3♦ as pass was a logical alternative.

I adjusted the score to 3♦+3, N/S –170.

Appeals Committee's decision

Reverse back to 3NT+2 by E. We do not feel E's choice of bids has been affected by W's description.

L&E comment:

This appeal was chaired by an active member of the EBU Panel of Tournament Directors, contrary to L&E policy, under which most EBU TDs are ineligible to serve on, and all are ineligible to chair, Appeals Committees at EBU events.

The Appeals Committee does not appear to have dealt at all satisfactorily with this appeal. E bid 2NT under the impression that it was natural. The AC should have investigated the E/W pair's methods over natural NT overcalls, as it is quite possible that W's 3♦ should have been interpreted as a transfer to ♥s. If that was the case, then E's choice of 3NT rather than 4♥ appears to be a particularly blatant use of the unauthorised information. Quite apart from the possibility of a procedural penalty, this would lead to consideration of an adjusted score based on a projected auction in which E and W were completely at cross-purposes. Even if it were established that a 3♦ response to a natural 2NT was played as natural, 3NT was suggested by the unauthorised information, and there were logical alternatives.

The TD's inclination to adjust the score was therefore perfectly correct, but her actual adjustment would only have been the right one had she established that 3♦ over a natural 2NT was systemically natural and non-forcing. She should have investigated E/W's methods and recorded her findings on the appeal form.

4.7 05.55

Dealer S
E/W vul
Swiss Pairs

North

♠ J 7 6
♥ Q 7 5
♦ J 7 2
♣ J 10 7 4

West

♠ 10 3
♥ K J 8
♦ 9 8 5 3
♣ A K 5 3

East

♠ K 9 8 5 4
♥ A 9 2
♦ A Q 10 4
♣ 9

South

♠ A Q 2
♥ 10 6 4 3
♦ K 6
♣ Q 8 6 2

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	Pass ¹	Pass	Dbl	1NT
	Pass	Rdbl ^{A2}	Pass	Pass
	Pass	Pass	Dbl ³	2♣
				All pass

- 1 W stated to S “you are playing mini no trump”
- 2 Transfer to ♣s
- 3 Takeout showing extra values

Result: 2♣^X-3 N/S -500

Tournament Director’s statement of facts & ruling

I was called after E doubled the 1NT bid. W agreed that he stated to S “you are playing mini no trump” (third board of match).

I was called back at the end of play. I asked E value of the double over a 12-14 NT. Told 15+, but shaded down over a mini no trump. E also stated that he had option on the hand of using Astro.

I ruled that E [had the] option of doubling or bidding Astro. The statement by W suggested the former would be the correct decision. Replaced double of 1NT by Astro type bid.

I adjusted the score to:-

2/3 of 2♠+1 by E	N/S -140
plus 1/3 of 2♥+2 by E	N/S -170

Appeals Committee’s decision

Score adjusted back to 2♣^X-3.

The discussion at the appeal convinced us that W asked without having sorted his hand and no unauthorised information was given.

Please tell E/W not to do this – find out the range of 1NT at the start of the round and then shut up. Next time you may not be so lucky.

L&E comment:

Although it is unusual for an Appeals Committee to overrule the TD on a question of fact, it does appear that further facts came to light at the hearing of the appeal. It is a question of judgement for an Appeals Committee as to whether to rule on the basis of new facts.

The TD seems to have considered that the statement or question by W automatically passed unauthorised information. This is not correct. It is likely to do so, but if the Appeals Committee decided that W spoke before he had looked at his hand, and that E realised this, then the conclusion that there was no unauthorised information on this occasion seems right.

[minutes continue on next page]

4.8 05.65

Dealer N
E/W vul
Swiss Teams

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

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
		Pass	1NT	Pass
	2♣ ^{A1}	Pass	2♦ ^A	Pass
	3NT	All pass		

1 Questions were asked when dummy went down. The answer was that 2♣ is Stayman and 3NT *strictly* to play. 1NT - 2♣ - 2♥/2♠ - 3NT is also to play, and does not show the other major.

Result: 3NT-6 N/S +600

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

I was called to deal with an alleged revoke by declarer, and ruled 3NT-6. Later I learnt from S about the auction and questions. W said she bid 2♣ to put off a major-suit lead.

Appeals Committee's decision

[There was no appeal]

L&E comment:

If 2♣ is used by agreement in lead-inhibiting fashion, without showing any particular major-suit holding, then players who adopt this method must be especially careful to comply with the requirement of full disclosure. In particular the 3NT rebid as well as the 2♣ response must be alerted.

4.9 05.70/05.71

The L&E considered two psyches by the same pair in similar circumstances in consecutive matches at the Brighton Summer Congress, both of which had been classified on site as Green, and decided to write to the players with a view to re-classifying them as Red.

4.10 05.78

Dealer W
Game all
MP Pairs

North

♠ K Q 6
♥ Q 7 6 4 2
♦ Q 10 4 3
♣ 4

West

♠ 9 8 4 2
♥ K J 10
♦ -
♣ A Q 10 9 7 6

East

♠ 10 7
♥ 8 5 3
♦ A J 9 6 2
♣ 8 3 2

South

♠ A J 5 3
♥ A 9
♦ K 8 7 5
♣ K J 5

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	1♣	Pass	1NT	Pass ^H
	2♣	2♥	Pass	3NT
	All pass			

Result: 3NT+2 N/S +660

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

I was called at the end of play – “rights reserved” at the 2♥ bid and again at the appearance of dummy. The 2♥ bid was questioned by E after S's hesitation. N stated that he bid because he knows partner has a reasonable hand since the opponents' bids are very limited, and neither opponent had shown any major suits. He knows it is a 20/20 hand and will never pass it out.

I felt it was close but would expect an experienced player to take some action (either double or bid).

If the defence had taken the entirely obvious 6 tricks there would be no problem. They had the chance of a good board after declarer played diamonds early.

I ruled that the result should stand.

Appeals Committee's decision

We consider that 2♥ was reasonable and at least would be bid by the majority of players – in any event the S hand is most certainly going to compete with a likely similar result.

L&E comment:

The Appeals Committee used the wrong test. It is irrelevant that it considered the 2♥ bid reasonable, or that a majority of players would make it. It should have considered whether there were logical alternatives, and if there were (i.e. if 2♥ was not a 70%+ action), then the bid should have been disallowed. As both E and W could have been considerably stronger, and thus S very much weaker, the L&E considered that pass was a logical alternative.

It is appropriate to reiterate the existence of Law 73C. In this case, N, a highly experienced player, seems to have been looking for reasons to justify taking action, rather than carefully avoiding taking any advantage.

Whilst the possibility of S taking some action, had 2♣ been passed to her, was relevant in determining the adjusted score, the L&E did not think that it was at all certain that N/S would have got to game after S's first round pass, and a weighted score might therefore have been appropriate.

The TD's comment about the defence is inappropriate. In order to lose redress by poor defence to a contract which they should not have been called on to defend in the absence of an infraction, the defence must have been markedly worse than bad bridge.

4.11 05.82

Dealer W
Love all
Swiss Pairs

North
♠ K J 8 2
♥ Q 2
♦ J 10 9 8 4 2
♣ 2

West
♠ Q 10 3
♥ A 10 9 3
♦ A 5 3
♣ A 8 7

East
♠ 7 6 5 4
♥ 8 7 6
♦ K Q
♣ K J 4 3

South
♠ A 9
♥ K J 5 4
♦ 7 6
♣ Q 10 9 6 5

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	1NT	2♦	Pass ^H	Pass
	Dbl	Pass	2♠	All pass

Result: 2♠= N/S -110

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

N called the director at the end of the bidding to reserve his rights. The director instructed the players to play out the hand and call her back if they were unhappy with the result. They called the director back and stated that they did not think that W had a double. They thought his [call] was influenced by E's pass after hesitating.

I ruled that less than 70% of players would double on W's hand. Pass is a logical alternative. I adjusted the score to 2♦= by N, N/S +90.

Appeals Committee's decision

We upheld the TD's decision. There is a logical alternative of passing. W cannot justify a reopening double on this shape especially when E does appear to have had a variation of tempo.

L&E comment:

The Appeals Committee's decision seems so obvious that it is surprising that the deposit was not retained.

4.12 05.87/05.88

The L&E considered two appeals from the same event on which no deposit had been taken. In response to a request for comments the TD-in-charge had said that in one case he had judged the situation to be so heated that to take a deposit would simply have made matters worse. In effect he had instigated the appeal. In the other case he had also instigated the appeal.

The L&E did not consider that matters becoming heated was a good reason for the TD instigating an appeal or failing to take a deposit. See also item 4.4 above.

4.13 05.92

Dealer E
E/W vul
MP Pairs

North
♠ A K Q 9 8 4 3
♥ -
♦ J 9 7
♣ K 10 5

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

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

South
♠ J 6 5
♥ Q J 9 8
♦ Q 6 4 3
♣ 3 2

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
			2♥ ^{A1}	Pass
	3♥	3♠	4♥	Pass ^H
	Pass	4♠	Pass	Pass
	Dbf	All pass		

1 5/5 ♥s and another, 5-9 pts

Result: 4♠^{X=} N/S +590

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

I was called to the table at the end of the auction. It was agreed amongst the players that there had been a significant hesitation prior to S's pass after E's bid of 4♥. I instructed play to proceed and was called again at the end of the play of the board. The E/W pair expressed unhappiness with the subsequent bid of 4♠ by N.

Under Law 16A I considered the matter of logical alternative calls to the bid of 4♠, and I consulted with colleagues. I ruled that there were no logical alternative calls to 4♠ that were less suggested by the hesitation, and that the table result should stand.

Appeals Committee's decision

The Committee agreed with the director that 4♠^{X=} should stand. It felt a large majority would bid 4♠ now, if not a round earlier. However there is an argument for passing, as E/W claimed (not very convincing), so we return the deposit.

L&E comment:

The Appeals Committee misdirected itself. The fact that many players would bid 4♠ a round earlier is entirely irrelevant. When assessing logical alternatives for N, her peer group is players of equivalent ability who would have bid only 3♠ on the previous round. On that basis, pass is much more likely to have been a logical alternative.

4.14 05.95

The L&E confirmed the Red classification of the following psyche from the Seniors Congress.

Dealer N
N/S vul
IMPs

North
♠ K J 7 2
♥ A
♦ K J 8 5 4
♣ 8 7 5

West
♠ Q 10 5 3
♥ J 8 6 4 3
♦ 10 6
♣ A 4

East
♠ 6 4
♥ K Q 7 2
♦ 9 3
♣ K J 9 3 2

South
♠ A 9 8
♥ 10 9 5
♦ A Q 7 2
♣ Q 10 6

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	Pass	1♦	Pass	1♠*
	All pass	2♠	Pass	3NT

4.15 05.98

Dealer N
E/W vul
Cross-IMPs

North
♠ J 8 7 4
♥ 7 4
♦ Q 8
♣ A J 8 7 3

West
♠ A 6 5
♥ Q 10 5
♦ K J 7
♣ Q 10 5 4

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

South
♠ K 10 3 2
♥ K 9 8 6
♦ 10 9 3
♣ K 2

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	1NT	Pass	Pass	Pass
	2♦ ^A	Pass	2♣ ^{A1}	Pass
	2NT	Pass	2♠ ^A	Pass
		Pass	3NT	All pass

1 5 card Stayman

Result: 3NT-1 N/S +100

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

I was called at the end of the auction after S had asked about the 2♠ bid and established that S asked about the 2♠ call before N had led.

I ruled that N could have been influenced by his partner's question and under Law 73C he should have taken care not to be influenced. I therefore felt that N ought to have led a ♣, and when a ♣ was returned he could now switch to a ♠. I ruled that the result should stand.

S was in contravention of Law 41B and should not have asked the question. I therefore fined N/S 1/2VP under Law 90A.

Appeals Committee's decision

We feel that a ♠ switch from N after two rounds of ♣s was not automatic, and with a ♥ switch W would likely finesse in ♦s but has a chance of dropping the ♦Q.

We adjusted the score to:-

75% of 3NT-1 N/S +100
plus 25% of 3NT= N/S -600

L&E comment:

The L&E considered the procedural penalty imposed by the TD, even if not particularly usual, to be justified in the case of a player experienced enough to be playing in the Tollemache.

5. Disciplinary matters

5.1 Complaint from a One-day Joint Venture event ("Donkey")

The L&E consider the matter further in the light of comments from the member complained of. It decided that no further action was warranted.

5.2 Complaint from an EBU event ("Elephant")

The L&E consider the matter further in the light of comments from the members complained of. It decided that the members should be formally charged with a disciplinary offence, and Mr Doe was asked to progress the matter as required.

6. Other correspondence with players

6.1 05.30

The L&E considered the following psyche from a One-day Joint Venture event, which had been classified on site as Amber, in the light of comments from both the players. It re-classified the psyche as being in the Red category.

Dealer S
Love all
Swiss Teams

North

♠ 2
♥ 6 5 3
♦ 10 9
♣ A Q J 10 9 7 5

West

♠ K 10 7 6 4 3
♥ K 9
♦ K Q 4 2
♣ 4

East

♠ A 9 5
♥ A Q 10 8
♦ J 8 5 3
♣ K 3

South

♠ Q J 8
♥ J 7 4 2
♦ A 7 6
♣ 8 6 2

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

L&E comment:

The L&E could not see any justification for S's apparent conclusion that N, as opposed to W, had psyched.

6.2 05.61

The L&E again considered a report from the Brighton Summer Congress in the light of the fact that one of the players had failed to respond to a request for further information. Mr Doe was asked to write again to both players.

7. Technical matters

7.1 Wild or gambling action

[item taken out of order after item 3]

The L&E noted that a discussion at the previous meeting under reports from Tournament Directors appeared to have proceeded on the basis of a misapprehension as to the provisions of the *White Book*. The matter at issue was the circumstances in which the non-offending side would be denied redress for damage following an infraction by their opponents, on the grounds that they had taken wild or gambling action subsequent to the infraction. In particular, there was a reference in one of the *White Book* provisions to a requirement that the action concerned must involve "at least the possibility of a double shot". At the previous meeting this provision had been overlooked, and the discussion had proceeded on the basis that this particular requirement had been abandoned.

The L&E decided that it was appropriate to consider afresh the circumstances in which redress should be denied, and to ensure that the regulations were consistently worded. It noted that the abandonment of the requirement for there to be some element of a double shot would make the provisions easier to administer, and closer in effect to those applying internationally, but it would also mean that the actions of the non-offenders would be judged somewhat more harshly than had previously been the case in England.

The L&E agreed that the standard for denial of redress should be wild or gambling action by the non-offenders, without any reference to the possibility of a double shot being required. Mr Stevenson was asked to make suitable amendments to the text of the *White Book* to reflect this decision, and it was noted that some cross-referencing of the provisions would be helpful.

Note – if a TD or Appeals Committee believes that there is an element of a double shot in the non-offenders' action, it will normally conclude that the action is wild or gambling.

[Secretary's note – the hand discussed at the previous meeting, the detail of which was omitted from the minutes of that meeting, is included as item 4.1 above, with an L&E comment which takes account of this decision].

8. Panel of Referees

The L&E reviewed the composition of the Panel, and decided that no changes were required. It confirmed that it is always happy to consider suggestions of players who might be invited to join the Panel.

9. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 26th April at 1.15 pm at 40 Bernard Street (if available).

10. Any other business

None