



A₁

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE
HELD AT THE 40 BERNARD STREET, RUSSELL SQUARE, LONDON WC1
ON MONDAY 17TH DECEMBER 2007**

Present:	Martin Pool	Chairman and Elected Member
	Mike Amos	Elected Member
	David Burn	Elected Member
	Max Bavin	Chief Tournament Director
	Barry Capal	EBU General Manager
	Jeremy Dhondy	Vice Chairman and Elected Member
	David Stevenson	Elected Member
	Sally Bugden	EBU Vice Chairman
	Grattan Endicott	Vice-President
	Gerard Faulkner	Vice-President
	John Pain	Secretary

- 1. Apologies for Absence**
- | | |
|----------------|----------------|
| Frances Hinden | Elected Member |
| David Martin | Elected Member |
| Peter Stocken | EBU Chairman |

2. Committee Responsibility and confidentiality

The Chairman reminded everyone of the need to be particularly careful in what they said with regard to Committee business. In particular the Private Minutes were issued for the benefit of Committee members only. The paper on Privilege of Committee members first issued in 1978 still applied.

3. Minutes of Previous Meeting (October 18th 2007)

3.1 Accuracy

There were no corrections.

The minutes of the meeting of October 18th were approved and signed.

3.2 Matters arising

3.2.1 Disciplinary case – Mark Reeve

Mark Reeve was prosecuted by the Committee for falsifying a result sheet in the Avon county league. The Committee received the report from the Disciplinary Committee with regard to Mark Reeve as follows:

We consider that in his email dated June 2007 sent to the Laws and Ethics Committee secretary, Mark Reeve's statement 'I do not deny stating on the team sheet that Mr D played ...' is an admission of guilt.

We acknowledge that Mark Reeve may well have been under considerable time pressure during this period as he was holding down two jobs and also trying to find a replacement team member at short notice and indeed fielded a team member 'as nowhere near as high a standard' as the member he claimed played.

However we consider the falsifying of a match returns sheet to be a serious breach of the behaviour expected from an EBU member; it was a dishonest act.

We are imposing a 12 month period of suspension from the EBU commencing at such time that Mark Reeve applies to rejoin the EBU.

The Disciplinary Committee also recommended that details of the case should be published in these minutes and also in *English Bridge*.

(Secretary's note: the above wording will appear in the February EB)

3.2.2 Disciplinary Case – 'Fuji'

The Secretary reported that further correspondence had been received from one party. This had been referred to the Chairman of the Union who would reply.

3.2.3 Disciplinary Case – 'Kilimanjaro'

The Secretary reported that the matter had been reported in December's *English Bridge*. The case was closed.

3.2.4 Disciplinary Case – 'Logan'

The Secretary reported that a date had been fixed for a hearing.

3.2.5 Disciplinary Case – 'Matterhorn'

The Committee considered the response from the member complained of and decided to charge the member with an offence. The Secretary was instructed to progress matters.

3.2.6 Hand ref 07.047

The Committee reconsidered the following hand from the Ross on Wye One Day Green Point Event.

Dealer West, North South
vulnerable
Scoring: IMPs
to VPs

North
♠ J 8 4 2
♥ J 8
♦ A 7 6
♣ A K 9 7

West
♠ K 5
♥ Q 3
♦ Q 10 8 5 4 3
♣ Q 8 5

East
♠ A 7
♥ K 9 7 5 4
♦ K 9 2
♣ 10 6 4

South
♠ Q 10 9 6 3
♥ A 10 6 2
♦ J
♣ J 3 2

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	2♦(1)	Pass (2)	pass	double
	pass	2♠	3♦	3♠
	pass	pass	pass	

(1) weak two
(2) agreed
slow

Result: 3♠ ✓ by North = +140 Lead ♦2

TD's statement: I was called at the start of play to reserve rights on North's hesitation, which was agreed. Called back at the end of play, EW unhappy with North's hesitation and South's double. 3♠ made.

I ruled South's double was allowed. I felt it was clear-cut in this protective position considering it was table 2 in the event.

I did not go on to consider other issues after allowing the double. E/W clearly wanted to appeal, the table had finished late and it was the last board so it was important to form an appeal committee before suitable committee members went home.

Appeals Committee Decision: Double accepted as just 70%. After dubious 3♠ raise, felt North obliged to bid 4♠. Score adjusted to 4♠ - 1 by North = -100 for both sides.

L&E Comment: North has no unauthorised information but South does. Both the TD and AC accepted that South's double was a legal action. There was a worry, however, that North had allowed his/her hesitation to influence the remaining auction.

4 Appeals to the National Authority

None this time

5 Disciplinary Matters

5.1 'Snowdon'

The Committee considered a complaint from a member arising out of the Tollemache Qualifying round. The Secretary was instructed to make the preliminary investigations.

6 Technical matters

6.1 Correspondence

6.1.1 no additional correspondence

6.2 2007 Laws of Duplicate Bridge – Regulating Authority options

Mr Endicott suggested that under the 2007 Laws of Duplicate Bridge the EBU Board is the Regulating Authority and not the L&E Committee. The Committee agreed. The Committee considered suggestions from Mr Stevenson and Miss Hinden regarding the Regulating Authority options and recommended the following to the Board.

Mr Stevenson said that many of the Regulating Authority options just empower what the EBU already does. Should any of the decisions be discovered to be unsatisfactory they could be changed in the future. In most cases the default option went through, but specific comment was made on the following

12C1(c) Weighted scores would be the norm.

40B1 the fact that a regulation is made concerning a partnership agreement declares it ipso facto to be a special partnership agreement. A blanket statement to this effect might not be a bad thing.

40B2(c)(iii) a player may look at his opponents convention card at any time. Unauthorised Information could well result however and members should be made aware of this.

40B3

(a) A pair is NOT allowed to vary, by prior agreement, its understandings during the auction or play consequent on a question asked by either side.

(b) A pair is allowed to vary, by prior agreement, its understandings during the auction or play consequent on a response by the opponents to a question by this pair.

(c) A pair is NOT allowed to vary, by prior agreement, its understandings during the auction or play consequent on a response by this pair to a question by the opponents.

(d) A pair is allowed to vary, by prior agreement, its understandings during the auction or play consequent on an irregularity by either side.

40C3 confirm the default option, reminding players that, for example, looking at the scores on the back of bidding cards during the hand is considered an aide-memoire and therefore illegal.

61B3 After discussion it was carried by 3 – 2 that the default option be recommended. i.e. defenders will be allowed to ask each other 'having no hearts, partner', for example. The law recognizes that unauthorised information may result from the question.

78D This allows 'other scoring methods'. In the Hubert Phillips, for example, honours count, but are not referred to in the law.

80A The Regulating Authority can delegate its powers to the Tournament Organiser. In practice clubs will often be the Tournament Organiser. The EBU should make it clear which options are to be delegated or assigned.

Mr Endicott noted that some changes to the *White Book* would be needed. For example 70.2 refers to claims that are 'irrational'. The word 'irrational' no longer appears in the laws.

6.3 *2007 Laws of Duplicate Bridge – Implementation date and copyright*

The Committee's preferred date for implementation remained August 1st 2008. Although it appeared to be a European Bridge League decision some countries were pressing ahead with a date of their own choosing. Mr Endicott doubted that the EBL would be recommending a blanket date.

Mrs Bugden was concerned about how to promulgate the changes easily and what training would be needed. Mr Stevenson said that there were substantial changes to about four laws only. Mr Bavin said there was a need for the panel TDs to meet to discuss the changes. The Appointments and Promotions Committee would need to make suitable arrangements. Mr Endicott noted that Richard Hills (Australian TD) had done a considerable amount of work on the law changes producing material for a) players b) TDs and c) Tournament Organisers. It was hoped that his material would be useful to the EBU. Mr Faulkner said that suitable provision was needed for County and Club TDs. The Secretary said that the Club Course Training material would be revised once the panel had been trained.

Regarding the copyright Mr Endicott reported that a meeting between WBF representatives, the Portland Club and the EBU was due to take place on December 19th. Mr Faulkner noted that the ACBL had no intention of surrendering the copyright to the laws in areas where it currently had jurisdiction.

6.4 *Discussion of L&E procedures with a view to streamlining*

Committee members were asked to think about all aspects of L&E business with a view to having a discussion at a future meeting.

6.5 *Orange Book changes – alerting of doubles*

Mr Dhondy had produced a paper on the alerting of doubles. He said that now the furore on the definition of 'strong' hands had died down the regulations on when doubles should or should not be alerted caused the most discussion. He noted that in the UK there were different regulations in Scotland (no doubles alerted at all), England (current regulations) and in the Gold Cup (the old English regulations) and this was unsatisfactory. He confessed that he had managed to get the current EBU regulations wrong. There was a lengthy discussion on the way forward.

While it was acknowledged that the present regulations are much simpler than they used to be members were getting it wrong. There were many cases of 'I'll alert but I don't know if I have to' and 'It's better to alert even when I don't have to because if I do not alert when I should I will get into trouble'.

Members agreed that whatever was done it should be simple for average players to understand. Some members were concerned that poorer players needed protecting from possibly unscrupulous experienced players who might use the free-for-all of no alerting of doubles. What members needed to know was following a double was partner expected to bid or to pass – that was all.

It was agreed investigate the option of 'alerting only highly unusual doubles'. Mr Amos and Mr Burn agreed to draw up a possible list. Redoubles and passes would be included in the exercise. At the same time it might be possible to reduce the current list of different types of double in the *Orange Book* to whether partner was expected to bid or whether partner was expected to pass.

Action: Mr Amos and Mr Burn

6.6 *Criteria for keeping deposits*

The Committee considered a letter from a member outlining a case from the Autumn Congress where as a non-offending competitor he had appealed a ruling, lost the appeal and had the money retained. (see 7.7 07.082). The Chairman wondered whether there was a principle at stake or whether it really amounted to an appeal to the national authority without depositing £75. The committee concluded that as part of the scrutiny of appeals that it had the power to return a deposit where it considered the retention inappropriate. The committee resisted any move to vary the conditions for retaining deposits for fear that it might appear to give non-offenders a free-shot. Committees would be asked to look carefully at non-offenders who appeal using the normal criteria

but in cases where a quick decision was reached to reject the appeal look again to see whether the appeal had any merit.

In the case in question it was unanimously agreed that the Appeal Committee has been wrong to keep the deposit and it was refunded.

The Secretary was asked to draft a 'standard letter' advising any member that as a matter of routine appeals from EBU events were considered by the Committee. The Committee would not however make a score change during such a review. If a member wished to try to get the score changed then an appeal to the national authority would be necessary, subject to the usual conditions.

6.7 Minutes of the WBU Laws and Ethics Committee

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

6.8 Alerting and announcing in the Gold Cup

Whilst technically a BGB matter and not an L&E matter Mr Dhondy asked that representations be made to BGB in respect of certain conditions in the current Gold Cup regulations. The alerting rules for doubles were neither the current EBU rules nor the SBU ones (in fact they are the previous EBU ones) and the regulations did not allow for announcements but there was no penalty if they were used. Mr Dhondy felt that since most of the Gold Cup entry came from English teams more weight should be given to their domestic regulations.

Mr Endicott wondered who, under the new laws, would be the Regulating Authority for the Gold Cup.

It was decided that the matter should be referred to the EBU Board for consideration as other NBO's were involved. The Secretary was asked to write to the Board accordingly.

6.9 Introduction of cautions

A paper from Mr Faulkner was considered. Following the attendance of Honorary Counsel at the previous meeting he felt unable to recommend a way forward on cautions for on-site incidents. It was pointed out that what was required was something to deal with members who admitted a misdemeanour but for whom the current disciplinary rules were thought to be too cumbersome. Mr Faulkner suggested a way forward was to go back to the lawyers who had drafted the current rules asking them why admonishments had been left out and whether the notion of a caution could go in. This was felt to be a matter for the Board to pursue.

7 **Reports from Tournament Directors**

7.1 07.050

Dealer S
Game All
VPs

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

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	1NT (2)	Dble (3)	Pass	1♣ (1)
	2♣	Pass	2♠	Dble/ Pass (4)
	Pass	Pass	Pass	Dble

- 1 Strong Club
- 2 2-suiter non touching
- 3 5-7 HCP any shape
- 4 At this point S doubled, which was cancelled, replaced by pass, thus N was silenced throughout.

Result: 2♠ x + 1 by East = -870

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

S reserved rights when dummy was spread. 1NT had been described as weak but sensible at this vulnerability. S requested a ruling at the end of the hand based on the description of weak. She did not think the W hand was 'weak'.

With N silenced S could choose to make a penalty double of 2♠ or bid 3NT. The choice of double was not well judged when E turned out to have eight spades, W's holding of 'weak' having little or no bearing on the situation.

Ruling: The explanation was not a mistaken explanation nor misinformation. (L75D). Result stands.

Appeals Committee's decision

We agree totally with the TD statement. With N silenced S is clearly forced to guess to some extent. The exact strength of the W hand is not of real relevance. On this occasion S guessed incorrectly. Due to the relative inexperience of N/S and the earlier confusion caused by the illegal double, we returned the deposit, but this was a close decision.

L&E comment:

Deposit might well have been kept.

7.2

07.054

Dealer E

E/W Vul

IMPs to VPs

North

♠ J 9 2
♥ 9 8 4 2
♦ K 8 6 3
♣ Q J

West

♠ A K 6
♥ Q
♦ Q 7 2
♣ 10 9 7 5 4 3

East

♠ 10 5 4 3
♥ A J 7 5 3
♦ A 9
♣ 8 2

South

♠ Q 8 7
♥ K 10 6
♦ J 10 5 4
♣ A K 6

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
			Pass	1♣(A1)
	2♣(A2)	Pass	2♥	Pass
	3♣	Pass	Pass	Pass

A1 could be a 2-card suit

A2 explained as Michaels

Result: 3♣✓ by W = -110

Director first called after E's 2♥ bid

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

After East bid 2♥, S asked W about the meaning of E's bid. From this it emerged that W had intended 2♣ as natural. I explained to both E and W about their obligation to ignore the unauthorised information.

The auction proceeded as shown. N/S mis-defended to allow 3♣ to make.

Ruling: An expert partnership should probably understand the 3♣ bid as forcing, but given E's hand and the fact that S could be short, I felt that E was allowed to conclude that 3♣ exposed the misunderstanding. Result stands.

Appeals Committee's decision

We rule there appears to be some uncertainty about the explanations. We have decided that the 3♣ result would stand for E/W and the N/S pair would get 3♥ - 2 = +200 on the board.

L&E comment:

The Appeals Committee has given an illegal ruling. Either the situation is exposed or it is not. Giving both sides a good score is not permitted.

7.3 07.062

Dealer S
N/S Vul
IMPs to VPs

North
♠ 10 8 7 5 4
♥ Q 10
♦ Q J 3
♣ Q J 10

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

East
♠ A 2
♥ 8 6 5 4 3
♦ 8 6 4 2
♣ 7 5

South
♠ K Q J 3
♥ A K 9
♦ A 10 7 5
♣ 8 2

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	3♣	Pass (H1)	Pass	1NT
	Pass	3♠	Pass	Dble
	Pass			Pass

H1 Questions from N as regards the 3♣ bid – see statement of facts. Agreed hesitation before the pass beyond requisite 10 seconds.

Result: 3♠✓ by N = +140

Director first called end of board, play completed.

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

I was called by W to adjudicate whether the re-opening double by S was a 'normal action' (No logical alternative) after the agreed break in tempo and questions by N. The facts were not disputed. I asked S for the rationale of his re-opening double. He stated that this was always his intention once he saw the 3♣ bid should his partner pass. He was maximum and had appropriate shape. He even considered upgrading his hand to an 18 count but he would then have had to open 1♦. N also mentioned that 'to protect his position' S need to re-open as a direct double would have been take out. I asked, as had N during the auction, what 3♣ meant. W stated that 2♣ was conventional and 'had to bid 3♣ to show suit'.

Ruling: Score adjusted to 3♣ - 2 by W = +100. Player received unauthorised information from partner by way of the questions and break in tempo. (L73C, L73F1)

Appeals Committee's decision

Table score reinstated. S was in receipt of UI however his call was considered as more than a 70% action for a player of his standard.

L&E comment:

Modern style is that the S hand has a reopening double even opposite a hesitation.

7.4 07.069

The Committee confirmed the following hand as falling into the AMBER category.

Dealer S

E/W Vul

MPs to VPs

North

♠ Q J
♥ 10 9 8 7 6 4
♦ Q 7
♣ 8 4 3

West

♠ K 10 4 2
♥ A K 5 3
♦ 10 9 3
♣ 7 5

East

♠ 5
♥ Q J
♦ A K J 5 4
♣ K Q J 9 2

South

♠ A 9 8 7 6 3
♥ 2
♦ 8 6 2
♣ A 10 9

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	Pass	2NT(A2)*	3♦	2♠ (1)
	Pass	Pass		Pass

- 1 Weak 5-9 on card; agreement is 6-10
- 2 Strong enquiry

Result: 3♦+2 by E = -150

Tournament Director's statement

S said he passed because an eight count was the middle of his range for 2♠ thinking it was 6-10. Standard EBU convention card shows range as 5 to 9.

Comment by W: When S passes I think N can still have a strong hand. If S acts over 3♦ I will know N has psyched and I will bid.

7.5 07.077

Dealer N
Game All
IMPs to VPs

North
♠ K J 10 6 4
♥ A Q J 9
♦ 8 3
♣ 4 3

West
♠ A 9 7 5
♥ 5 3
♦ Q 10 9 4 2
♣ 5 2

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

South
♠ 8 2
♥ 10 6 4 2
♦ A J 6
♣ K Q J 9

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
		1♠	2♣	Pass
	Pass	Double	Pass	Pass
	2♦	Pass	Pass	Double (1)
	Pass	Pass	Pass	

1 double meant for penalty but not alerted.

Result: 2♦ x ✓ by W = -180

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

I was called by W. He had made his contract but said that he would have finessed for the ♦J had he known that the double was for penalties and thereby making one more trick.

Ruling: Result stands. I ruled that under orange book reference 5H1 the player was aware of the double's likely meaning.

Appeals Committee's decision

Not convinced W was aware of the likely meaning of the double. Assume N/S would have made the same defence. Score adjusted to 2♦ x + 1.

L&E comment:

Under current OB regulations a penalty double of a natural suit bid is alertable but TD found no damage. Committee was surprised the result was adjusted by the Appeal Committee.

7.6

07.081

Dealer N
E/W vul
MPs to VPs

North

♠ 10 6 3 2
♥ 8
♦ Q 8 6 5 4 2
♣ 8 2

West

♠ A Q J
♥ K 10 7 5 3
♦ K 3
♣ K Q 6

East

♠ K 9 7 4
♥ A Q J 4 2
♦ None
♣ 10 7 5 4

South

♠ 8 5
♥ 9 6
♦ A J 10 9 7
♣ A J 9 3

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
		Pass	1♥	2♦
	3♦	5♦(1)	Pass(2)	Pass
	6♥(3)	Pass	Pass	Pass

- 1 stop card removed from table fairly quickly
- 2 some thought – see below
- 3 alleged infraction L16A

Result: 6H ✓ by E = -1430
Director first called: before lead was made.

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

1 N agreed she probably pulled her stop card from table fairly quickly after her bid of 5♦.

2 E is adamant that she is allowed 10 seconds to think and that she was not given that time. I first took W away from table to question her, she stated to me 'I was thinking about what my partner might bid'. W was clear that he did not believe his partner had hesitated and had called in tempo. I believe that her call was not in tempo.

Ruling: I removed the 6♥ to 5♥+1. W has received extraneous information by his partner's out of tempo call. His logical alternatives are: double, 5♥, 6♥ - he has 3 aces missing (L16A2)

I was accosted after my ruling (between rounds) by W saying 'I think your ruling is disgusting'. I responded 'You have the right to appeal, and you are.' The E/W pair were clearly upset and made it clear they were with comments 'I am not coming to any more of these' and 'Let us go now'.

Appeals Committee's decision

6♥ was not suggested by the hesitation even if there was a hesitation. Table score reinstated.

E/W pair are encouraged to treat TDs with more respect in future. They are only trying to do their best.

L&E comment:

Appeals Committees are empowered to give disciplinary penalties. The committee noted the Appeal Committees final comment with pleasure.

7.7 07.082

Dealer S
E/W vul
IMPs

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

West
♠ Q 8 4 3
♥ 8 3 2
♦ A K Q
♣ 5 3 2

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

South
♠ K 9 6 5 2
♥ 10 4
♦ J 7 2
♣ Q 8 7

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
	Pass	1♥ (1)	Pass	Pass
	Pass	2♥	Pass	1♠
	Pass			Pass

1 should have been alerted. N player was informed of this by the TD

Result: 2♥✓ by N = +110

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

I was called by W at the end of the hand. He told me that because he was not informed (by alert) of the possible canapé bid he did not realise that N had a 5-card club suit. Hence he mis-defended. The play was as follows:

W	N	E	S	
<u>♦K</u>	♦3	♦10	♦2	♦10 led by E.
♦A	<u>♥5</u>	♦4	♦7	
♣2 (1)	♣4	<u>♣K</u>	♣7	(1) count
♣3 (2)	♣9	♣6	<u>♣Q</u>	(2) neutral
♥2	♥5	<u>♥K</u>	♥10	
<u>♠Q</u> (3)	♠7	♠10	♠2	(3) at this point W continued with a spade. He claimed he would continue a club if the possible canapé sequence had been alerted.

Ruling: I ruled result to stand, the player having made an error. The indication by the play of a) ♣10 and b) ♣6 is that E is seeking a club ruff.

Appeals Committee's decision

Director's ruling upheld. We considered that the club that was played back should have made W aware of the position and a club can never cost anything. We came to a quick decision therefore forfeited the deposit.

L&E comment:

See 6.6. The Committee unanimously agreed to return the deposit.

7.8 07.083

The committee confirmed this psyche to be in the RED category.

Dealer S

E/W vul

IMPs

North

♠ J 2
♥ 10 8 4
♦ 10 7 4
♣ Q 8 7 6 2

West

♠ 9 6 5 4
♥ A K 7
♦ Q 9 5
♣ 10 9 3

East

♠ A Q 10 8
♥ Q 5 2
♦ A 8 6
♣ A J 4

South

♠ K 7 3
♥ J 9 6 3
♦ K J 3 2
♣ K 5

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
				Pass
	Pass	1♥ *	double	4♥
	4♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

* - psyche

Result: 4♠✓ by W = -620

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

After consultation with fellow directors and asking S why she did not double 4♠, I have ruled this to be a RED psyche. S's comments away from the table were 'I did not double because I do not believe my kings will stand up'. Result will be +3IMPs to E/W, -6 IMPs to N/S or if E/W get a better result then fine N/S 3 IMPs.

Comment by S: N is known to be 3rd in hand and will frequently open light with a long suit and hence I do not expect any heart tricks to stand up in defence. Furthermore 4♥ was bid as a pre-emptive raise (which may make or may not) and hence opponents will not be idiots to be bidding at red (and we would get a positive score anyway if we beat it).

L&E comment:

Third in hand openings can be light subject to disclosure, but not as light as a 3-count.

7.9 07.084

Dealer N
Love All
VPs

North
♠ J
♥ K J 7 2
♦ J 6 4
♣ A K 8 3 2

West
♠ A K 10
♥ A 9 8 3
♦ K 9 5
♣ Q J 4

East
♠ 9 7 4 2
♥ Q 10 6 4
♦ A Q 8 7
♣ 6

South
♠ Q 8 6 5 3
♥ 5
♦ 10 3 2
♣ 10 9 7 5

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
		1♣	Pass	Pass
	Double	Pass	2♣ (1)	Pass
	3NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

1 Not alerted, asking partner to bid a suit.

Result: 3NT+1 by W = -430

Tournament Director's statement of facts & ruling

Called to the table by S who said if W had alerted the 2♣ bid he might have bid 3♣ but even if he had not his partner would now lead a club. When I asked W what he would have bid he said without hesitation 3NT.

On a club lead, probably fourth highest the making of 3NT not only depends on the spade play and finesse but the order in playing the diamonds to ensure both dropping ♠J and being able to return to dummy to finesse the ♠Q.

Ruling: It was noted that the correct play would be achieved 50% of the time and go down one 50% of the time. (L12C3, 21B3)

Appeals Committee's decision

Adjusted to 3NT making. S is unlikely to bid 3♣ and N can ask about the 2♣ bid before leading. Also on a club lead W will make 3NT most of the time.

L&E comment:

The Committee was surprised that S even asked for a ruling and even more surprised that he got anything out of it.

8 Date of next meeting

Monday 11th February 2008 at 1.15pm. The Dorchester Room, McAlpine's, 40 Bernard Street, London W1.

The meeting closed at 5pm