



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE
HELD AT 2 BLOOMSBURY STREET, LONDON WC1B 3ST ON WEDNESDAY
JANUARY 29TH 2014**

Present:	Tim Rees (TR)	Chairman and Elected Member
	Mike Amos (MA)	Elected Member
	Robin Barker (RB)	Elected Member
	David Burn (DB)	Elected Member
	Jeremy Dhondy (JD)	EBU Chairman
	Frances Hinden (FH)	Vice Chairman and Elected Member
	Neil Morley (NM)	Elected Member
	Martin Pool (MP)	Elected Member
	Gordon Rainsford (GR)	Chief Tournament Director
	John Pain (JP)	Secretary

1A The Secretary opened the meeting and called for nominations for Chairman for 2013-14. JD proposed Tim Rees as Chairman, seconded by FH. With no other nominations TR was declared elected and took the chair. JD proposed Frances Hinden as Vice Chairman, seconded by TR. With no other nominations FH was declared elected.

1B The chairman welcomed Robin Barker to his first meeting as an elected committee member, noting that he had already attended as a guest while preparing the White Book.

1C	Apologies for Absence	Barry Capal (BC)	EBU General Manager
		Grattan Endicott (GE)	Vice-President
		Gerard Faulkner (GF)	Vice-President
		Ian Payn (IP)	EBU Vice Chairman

2

2.1/2 *Minutes of the previous meeting*

The minutes of the meeting of September 9th 2013 were approved and signed. A vote of thanks to the proof-readers of both the new White Book and Blue Book was recorded, together with a minor typographical error identified by GF.

2.3 *Matters arising*

2.3.1 *Defining and determining red misbids*

FH asked the item on defining and determining red misbids to be held over.

3 Appeals to the National Authority

The Committee considered an appeal to the National Authority arising from a Crockfords Round 2 match.

Part 1: Background

On January 23rd 2014 a match was played in Crockfords Cup Round 2 between Team M and Team S.

A ruling was given by the TD on Board 24 in favour of Team M. This was appealed by Team S to the Referee. The Referee revised the ruling given by TD in favour of Team S.

Team M then appealed to the National Authority.

Part 2: Original Ruling and Appeal

<p>♠ KJ73 ♥ 96 ♦ K10762 ♣ A10</p> <p>♠ Q95 ♠ 2 ♥ AK5 ♥ QJ108732 ♦ J53 ♦ 4 ♣ J865 ♣ 9742</p> <p>♠ A10864 ♥ 4 ♦ AQ98 ♣ KQ3</p>	<p>Board 24 : Dealer West : Love all</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">West</th> <th style="text-align: left;">North</th> <th style="text-align: left;">East</th> <th style="text-align: left;">South</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>1♦</td> <td>3♥</td> <td>Dbl</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>3♠</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>4♠</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">All Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">Dbl by South announced as penalties</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	West	North	East	South	Pass	1♦	3♥	Dbl	Pass	3♠	Pass	4♠	All Pass				Dbl by South announced as penalties			
West	North	East	South																		
Pass	1♦	3♥	Dbl																		
Pass	3♠	Pass	4♠																		
All Pass																					
Dbl by South announced as penalties																					

West said that had he known the nature of the double he would have bid 4♥. North maintained he would have bid 4♠ in that case. The TD ruled the result to stand.

TD's own words:

I was called after the board was played. I came to the table after East called me. They gave me the bidding - West passed, North opened 1D (playing 5 card majors, strong NT) East overcalled 3H and South doubled (which was alerted for penalty). When West heard that he passed (after the board he said he would bid 4H) then North bid 3S which was raised to 4S by South.

My thoughts were: anyone can overrule his partner (bidding 3S after the double) especially when you feel you would rather play the hand than defend (which is what I was told by North).

Referee's decision in his own words

The hand and the auction are as stated. At the table the double was "announced" I asked North why he did this although it had no bearing on any ruling and he said he thought he ought to as they were not playing the double in a normal i.e. take out way. It was penalties, a remark he later amended slightly to penalty oriented.

I was told that the TD viewed, when called to the table, that he would have removed a penalty double so thought the action taken by North was ok and ruled no adjustment.

I checked with South that her understanding of the system was as North stated and she said it was.

I asked whether the double was typical. They replied something to the effect that they expected the contract be beaten as South had enough high cards. I asked West what he would have done if he had had a different explanation and he said if he was told it was a take out double or simply based on points with no guarantee of length in hearts he would have bid 4H

The basis of our ruling was that the combination of South's double and North's removal meant that there had been a misdescription of the double and that had made West bidding 4H not only a highly risky proposition but he might have had an expectation that 3Hx would have been passed out. If 4H had been bid then the overwhelmingly likely result would have been 4Hx

If the description of the double was correct North had no reason to remove. The combination of the explanation, the action of North and the hand type of South led us to believe that the correct information was not being given to the opponents. There was no evidence to suggest this was deliberate.

After the ruling, North described it as "one from Fantasy Island". I told him I thought he was being a little rude. He then went on to say it was "automatic" to remove the double to 3S and even if West had raised after what he had announced as a penalty double to 4H he would have bid 4S.

South then grabbed the phone and said that if 4H had been passed round to her she would have bid 4S because there was evidence of EW having what she called a "superfit" North also stressed that there was a "superfit" Further discussion would not have led to a meeting of minds so I viewed to retire although another member of Team M then wanted to appeal a decision about a psyche that he had received in Set 1 and that he had accepted at the time. I viewed he could not appeal this now after the match had finished unless there was new evidence that had come to light and we did not pursue this element any further.

Comments by Team M in its own words

At the end of the match East contacted a Referee who allowed West to bid 4H and said that the result should be changed to 4Hx – 2, not allowing North to overcall 4S or South to bid 4S rather than doubling.

Originally board 24 was scored $510 + 50 = 560$ for 11 Imps, after the ruling $300 + 50 = 350$ for 8 Imps. As the match was won by the NS team by 2 Imps this reduction by 3 imps gives the EW team the win by 1 Imp.

North maintains that any player knowing that they had the high card points for a possible game whilst EW had an obvious fit of 10 cards would try and find that fit as a penalty double is unlikely to achieve a better score.

The ruling of 4Hx-2 seems inconsistent. Prohibiting NS to bid over 4H (other than double) is unrealistic in these circumstances.

We would wish to see the original confirmation by the tournament director restored.

Comments by Team S (EW Pair) in its own words

1. A ruling was requested at the time of the incident and not as an afterthought because of the match score.

2. There was a noticeable but not excessive pause after the 3H bid which was reported to the TD but not recorded on the appeal document.

3. North said that he had bid 3S on general bridge principles. If that principle was that he had a marginal opening then it is hardly likely that he would have made a free bid of 4S (over 4H).

The only principles involved in removing a PENALTY double are (a) a concern that it might make or (b) that any penalty might be inadequate compensation for a contract that ones own side can make. neither seems to apply in this case.

Grounds for Appeal from team M

We request an appeal against the Referee's ruling on this board (which overturned the Tournament Directors ruling) under Law 92A (Law 93C)

We consider that the Referees decision raises

- (a) question of principle
- (b) an error of direction
- (c) contains an error in the application of the law

We believe the decision to revert to a contract of 4Hx-2 is dogmatic and incorrect, precluding as it does any action by north, or especially by south, in the finality of the decision made. No consideration of general bridge principles is to be allowed.

(1) north, if precluded by the dogmatic ruling, must pass then he awaits south's actions. If north is allowed to reflect on the auction

east 7+ hearts west 3+ hearts. using basic knowledge and judgement NS will not get rich on 4Hx with opponents having a known 10+ card fit
therefore NS have a known fit, therefore logical to bid 4 spades to find fit

(2) if north precluded by the dogmatic ruling to do anything other than pass, south must be able, in all justice, to reflect on the 10+ heart fit (as demonstrated above) therefore bid 4 spades in first instance. does not preclude NS finding 6D or 6S as happened at other table.

Part 3: Should the appeal be heard?

Team M submitted its grounds for appeal using the criteria laid down in the White Book for Appeals to the National Authority. The appeal was considered by the seven elected members of the L&E Committee plus the EBU Chief TD.

The Committee considered a completed Appeal form with contributions from Team S, Team M, the appeal by Team M, the report by the TD and the Referee's decision.

The grounds for appeal were stated as:

a) A question of principle

The Committee unanimously decided there was no question of principle. The Committee considered there were questions of judgement used by the TD and referee but that did not amount to a question of principle.

b) An error in direction

The Committee unanimously decided that there was no error in direction by either the TD or the Referee. A judgement ruling overturned by a referee or an Appeals Committee does not constitute an error.

c) An error in the application of law

The Committee unanimously decided that there had been no error in the application of law.

Whilst a different TD or Referee may have decided to weight the score to include some percentages of scores other than 4♥x, the Committee did not consider it grossly inappropriate to rule 100% of 4♥x.

The guidance for Appeals to the National Authority says the following:

If none of these factors is present the appeal will be dismissed and the deposit forfeited. Note that a request to revise a value judgement which falls short of being grossly inappropriate is not a sound basis for an appeal to the National Authority.

Part 4 : Decision

1. The Committee decided that none of the criteria for an Appeal to the National Authority had been met.
2. The revised ruling given by the Referee was therefore confirmed
3. The deposit for the appeal is forfeited.

4 Disciplinary Cases

4.1 Wroxall

The secretary reported that the matter was 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 Ottawa

The Committee confirmed the decision of the previous Chairman and Vice Chairman to refer the case of a walk-out from the Guernsey Congress to the Disciplinary Panel.

Statement by the Disciplinary Panel:

The Disciplinary Panel has read and discussed the papers relating to the matter that under paragraph 3.2(v) of the Disciplinary Rules the conduct of Ms Sue Evans fell below the accepted standards required of EBU members. Ms Evans pleaded guilty to this charge.

We have read the complaint made by Malcolm Carey detailing the events where he was called to the table to make a ruling over a claim which was disputed by Ms Evans. We note that Mr Carey had allowed the score to stand and that he would consider the matter further at the end of the evening's play. Following this, Mr Carey states that Ms Evans and her partner left the tournament and had to be replaced. Mr Carey further states that Ms Evans continued to complain the following evening with regard to the ruling made by him, resulting in further argument between them.

We have read the email sent to the EBU by Ms Evans dated 16 October in which she offers an unreserved apology for her behaviour and her subsequent letter dated 5 November in which she again apologises and admits that her behaviour was unacceptable. She puts forward in mitigation her previous good character, which includes receiving the John Armstrong Award in 2011 and her regret that her actions potentially spoiled the enjoyment of other players at the congress.

In all the above circumstances, we are imposing a £50 fine and a letter of censure.

4.3 New case – Proclaimers

The Committee considered correspondence from the TD and a member following a walk-out from the Autumn Congress. The Committee confirmed its intention to prosecute the member and the Secretary was asked to set the procedure in motion.

Action: JP

4.4 New case - Queen

The Committee considered the matter of a member who remained in arrears for entry fees for an event in April 2012. The matter was now before the Small Claims Court. The Committee agreed to take no further action until the court proceedings were concluded.

4.5 Dispute with an affiliated bridge club

The Committee noted the difficulties encountered by Head Office in recovering monies sent to a club under the *Bridge for All* refund scheme that should have been sent to the teacher instead. The matter had now been resolved.

5 Technical Matters

5.1 EBU Online games with BBO

The Committee confirmed that all the sanctions available to a club running face-to-face games applied to Online games run by the EBU and in this context the Online games constituted a club. GR said that the software did not allow for fines and/or procedural penalties to be entered by the TD but they could be applied afterwards. MA said that as an Online TD the timescale for investigating problems was very tight. GR mentioned that one member was causing problems through poor disclosure (players disclose their own methods) and off centre bids and their partner must be becoming aware of such tendencies. GR would write to the member reminding him of his obligations but leaving him in no doubt what sanctions were available should he persist.

Action: GR

5.2 TD report screeners for 2014

The Committee confirmed TR and FH as the screeners of TD reports.

5.3 Comments from a member regarding an appeal

See 13.069

5.4 WBF Laws Committee minutes 19/9/13

The Committee noted the following minute to be included in the August 2014 White Book:

Law 21B2 – When a player elects not to change a call because of misinformation, Law 16D will still apply. The situation is analogous to the withdrawal of an original call followed by the subsequent replacement of the same call. Information arising from inferences that only become available because of the correction of misinformation is authorized to the non-offending side, but unauthorized to the offending side.

5.5 Electronic version of the Blue and White Books

The Committee considered correspondence from a member regarding the provision of Kindle versions of the new books. The Committee considered the current arrangements of providing PDF versions together with the Page Tiger facility were adequate. DB said there were considerable problems associated with the resizing and reflowing required for Kindle. It was considered that current versions of software on tablets and Kindle coped well enough.

5.6 Gross and manifest scoring errors

GR asked for the Committee to consider the wording within WB 2.5.4 Correction Periods. He said it needed clarification as it was not at all clear what was intended. What did gross mean in this context?

Further discussion was delayed until the next meeting for the Committee to consider its decision.

Action: GR

5.7 Laws of Contract Bridge 2014

The EBU had been contacted by the Portland Club to provide some input into the revised code of laws for rubber bridge. The EBU Chairman, the Chief TD and the Laws and Ethics Committee secretary had met with Giles Hargreave to discuss changes put forward by the ACBL and to suggest other changes. It was likely to

have an implementation date of April 1st 2014. It would be for the Portland Club to arrange publication of the new laws even if the Secretary arranged for the printing work to be done.

5.8 *Correspondence from Hertfordshire CBA following the Tollemache Cup qualifier*

The Committee considered correspondence from the Hertfordshire president following the Tollemache qualifying round. GR had been contacted on the Wednesday after the event by another county. A score in a match not involving Hertfordshire had initially not been entered and then the score from the wrong board had been entered. Although something had seemed strange to the player about the results, it was not made clear to the TD what the specific problem was and he didn't realise that anything further need be done. As it was beyond the '5pm Tuesday' deadline when the player brought this to the attention of the Chief TD, nothing could be done which meant Hertfordshire did not qualify for the final.

GR wrote to the Hertfordshire Captain explaining the decision not to extend the deadline beyond Tuesday 5pm. A separate reply to the Hertfordshire President would also be sent

Extract from GR's letter:

The L&E committee met on Wednesday, and considered a letter from the President of Herts Bridge Association making some of the same points as you. The question of time limits for scoring errors was discussed, but since we already have an extremely generous time limit for scoring errors (possibly more so than any other NBO), and whatever time limit is given there could always be an error that falls outside it, there was no desire to change it.

You say that no team out of contention could be expected to check their scores on the last round, but this is precisely what they were asked to do, check-slips were provided for that purpose, and most teams did manage to do it. It is unfortunate that you suffered at the hands of two teams who failed in that – all the more surprising since one of the players had noticed an error but not properly communicated it. Sadly this possibility (of issues at another table affecting your ranking/qualification) will always exist, and has decided matters at events in the past, including the winners of the Premier League a few years ago. Note that if the irregularity at the other table had been a revoke rather than a scoring error, the time allowed for it to be noticed would only have been 20 minutes, not two days.

You ask about penalties for entering wrong scores: no, we do not usually penalise this, since it happens too frequently and I do not believe it would be an improvement to the game for large numbers of penalties to be issued for such mechanical matters. Only in the case of repeated carelessness would I expect a penalty to be issued.

You talk of the things the TD should have done, and I'm sure he would have done all of them had he been aware of the problem. Unfortunately the player who realised there was a problem failed to communicate it so that the TD understood, and then failed to follow it up until it was all too late.

5.9 *Timeliness of TD rulings*

The Committee considered a ruling from the Tollemache Qualifier which had been requested on Saturday afternoon but had not been delivered until Sunday and then an appeal followed. It was agreed the timescale was unacceptable. GR said he would remind all TDs of the need to deal with matters as promptly as possible given all the calls on TDs time at events.

Action: GR

5.10 *Correspondence from a member concerning the use of 'not played'*

A member had expressed his concern about the requirement to give 'average' or 'average 60/40' for boards removed from a table which ran out of time during the current round rather than using the 'not played' facility on the BridgeMate/Bridge Pad/Bridge Scorer.

GR confirmed that when a board or boards are removed from a single table because of time constraints this constituted a ruling under Law 12C2(a) – the irregularity being that there was insufficient time left for the

board to be completed. Consequently the TD was required to give an artificial adjusted score of either 'average' or 'average 60/40' depending of the responsibility for the slowness.

He further confirmed that 'not played' should only be used when a table is not scheduled to play a board or boards. For example, if it was decided that in a 3-board a round movement there was only time for all tables to only play two boards in the final round that became a general instruction for a board or boards to be 'not played'. A second example would be where a ½ table movement had not been set up with an automatic sit-out built in to the scoring program. In this case the TD would need to enter 'not played' on each round where the ½ table was.

5.11 *Appeal Focus future plans*

TR indicated he would take over from JD in editing the Appeal Focus.

5.12 *Blue Book anomalies*

a) Members had had several months to get used to the new Blue Book. A small number of wording issues had been identified which would be considered in more detail next time.

The Committee considered a pair's method for a 2♣ opening with several options:

Traditional Acol game Force

Balanced 22-23 HCP

Weak 2♦ opening 5 – 9 HCP

Weak major 2-suiter, at least 5-5, 5-9 HCP

DB said he was surprised if the Committee's intention had been to allow all of this. However, close inspection of the Blue Book showed that it was allowed.

The Secretary was to write to the pair advising them that it is permitted for the time being but it might be reconsidered for August.

Action: JP

b) In 7A3 where it said 1-level opening bids the Committee confirmed its intention was 1-level suit opening bids

c) a matter raised by one of the proof-readers was held over.

5.13 *ER25 – 2nd Best break*

The Committee revisited the issue of what constituted the '2nd best break', first considered at the meeting of Feb 12th 2009.

A problem had arisen in an event where the player had a 7-card suit and 6-cards remained out and whether the 2nd best break was 4-2 or 5-1 depending on the player who was considering it. The Committee confirmed that from Declarer's point of view the 2nd Best Break was 4- 2. For an 8-card suit when 5-cards remain out the problem is trivial since the '2nd best break' of 4-1 was the same for both sides.

5.14 *Level 5 and revised WBF guidance of 1♣ openings*

The Committee considered that the current EBU regulations for Brown Sticker openings at Level 5 events did not need changing.

The Committee noted that the WBF has decided that opening bids of 1♣ that may be made on a doubleton or singleton club and which are ostensibly natural and non-forcing should be regarded as natural and not artificial. However, the Committee decided to retain the definition of artificial minor suit openings in the Blue Book 3E1. Therefore, any defence is permitted to a minor suit opening that might be on fewer than 3 cards.

5.15 Fractional IMPs

The Committee noted that in the recent Camrose Match (organized by BGB) a ruling had been given which involved fractional IMPs. The Committee considered whether or not to introduce fractional IMPs for EBU events. TR said that would require the recently introduced VP scales to be modified again and that was not a good idea. It was resolved not to introduce fractional IMPs to EBU events.

5.16 Correction Periods

GR had identified an issue in Law 69 and Law 71 which refers to the Correction Period in Law 79C. He doubted whether the lawmakers had foreseen the EBU's policy of having different correction periods and this could lead to issues arising in the final session of an event being open for change until Tuesday 5pm. He doubted the Committee had intended this and suggested a footnote to the White Book in section 2.5.4 (* including rulings given under Law 69 or Law 71) to disallow such late requests for a change.

5.17 2NT openings – wording the Blue Book

The Committee considered correspondence from a member over the wording of permitted methods for a 2NT opening. The Committee confirmed the wording was correct. The Committee also confirmed that it had been the intention to make substantive changes when the Blue Book was compiled – not just to shorten it.

5.18 August 1st updates for the Blue and White Books

RB agreed to compile the changes for the White Book and FH the Blue Book, in time for the next meeting.

Action: RB and FH

6. Applications for new permitted methods

Consideration deferred to the next meeting.

7. Reports from Tournament Directors

7.1 Psyche and appeal forms

13.029 Hand report from the Berks and Bucks One Day Swiss Teams

♠ J102 ♥ 952 ♦ J986 ♣ Q64 ♠ A963 ♠ 85 ♥ Q764 ♥ A103 ♦ - ♦ AKQ74 ♣ J10952 ♣ AK3 ♠ KQ74 ♥ KJ8 ♦ 10532 ♣ 87	Board 7 : Dealer South : All vulnerable <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>West</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>North</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>East</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>South</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>2NT</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3♣ (1)</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>3♦ (2)</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3NT</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>(1) Puppet Stayman</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>(2) Showing a 4-card major</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>				Pass	Pass	Pass	2NT	Pass	3♣ (1)	Pass	3♦ (2)	Pass	3NT	All Pass				(1) Puppet Stayman				(2) Showing a 4-card major		
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																										
			Pass																										
Pass	Pass	2NT	Pass																										
3♣ (1)	Pass	3♦ (2)	Pass																										
3NT	All Pass																												
	(1) Puppet Stayman																												
	(2) Showing a 4-card major																												

The TD had ruled it as 'No Classification required'. The L&E Committee felt that it should have been classified as a misbid with possible fielding. East has shown a 4-card major and West has made no attempt to play in a 4-4 major suit fit.

13.034 Appeal from the Pachabo Cup

<p>♠ A108 ♥ K1042 ♦ Q85 ♣ 742</p> <p>♠ 9652 ♠ K74 ♥ 765 ♥ Q983 ♦ K10 ♦ 97632 ♣ K1083 ♣ 9</p> <p>♠ QJ3 ♥ AJ ♦ AJ4 ♣ AQJ65</p>	<p>Board 9 : Dealer North : EW vulnerable</p> <p>Bidding not recorded. South plays 3NT. West leads ♠ 6</p> <p>Tricks played</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">W</th> <th style="text-align: left;">N</th> <th style="text-align: left;">E</th> <th style="text-align: left;">S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>♠ 6</td> <td>♠ 8</td> <td><u>♠ K</u></td> <td>♠ 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>♦ K</u></td> <td>♦ 5</td> <td>♦ 2</td> <td>♦ J</td> </tr> <tr> <td>♠ 5</td> <td>♠ 10</td> <td>♠ 4</td> <td><u>♠ J</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>South claimed the rest of the tricks.</p>	W	N	E	S	♠ 6	♠ 8	<u>♠ K</u>	♠ 3	<u>♦ K</u>	♦ 5	♦ 2	♦ J	♠ 5	♠ 10	♠ 4	<u>♠ J</u>
W	N	E	S														
♠ 6	♠ 8	<u>♠ K</u>	♠ 3														
<u>♦ K</u>	♦ 5	♦ 2	♦ J														
♠ 5	♠ 10	♠ 4	<u>♠ J</u>														

The claim was accepted and later withdrawn claiming that there was no ‘normal line’ of play that would succeed.

The TD ruled that declarer would recognise that the clubs needed to break or the heart finesse succeed. He could enter dummy with the ♦ Q and lead towards AJ and finesse, he can then cash ace etc etc and use ♠ A to get to the ♥ K and would find that the clubs do break. TD ruled result to stand and allowed the original claim (Law 71).

The Appeal Committee adjusted to 3NT – 1; NS -50.

After consultation with the Chief TD we find that the appropriate law is 69B2 and not 71. We consider that since declarer revised his claim from 10 tricks to 9 tricks on finding that West had a club stop there is sufficient likelihood that he would have conceded both a club and a long spade in actual play. The TDs ruling was perfectly correct under Law 71 but after deliberation we felt compelled to reject it.

L&E Comment: Good effort by the AC. There are three levels of contested claim/concession. Law 71 (a withdrawn concession) is the hardest to get a trick back from. Law 70 (contested claim) is the normal one – any doubt is resolved against the claimer. In Law 69 (withdrawal of agreement), there is less doubt – the non claimer only gets a trick he ‘would likely have won had play continued’. Our reading of that is that it needs to be more than 50%. It’s not clear the AC used 50% as a benchmark – they refer to ‘sufficient likelihood’ which sounds more like a Law 70 ruling. However, the final ruling of 8 tricks was correct.

13.035 Psyche from Seniors Pairs QR

<p>♠ 98 ♥ KQ10 ♦ AKJ96 ♣ 1087</p> <p>♠ 10743 ♠ AKQJ652 ♥ A7 ♥ 982 ♦ Q72 ♦ 5 ♣ K964 ♣ J5</p> <p>♠ - ♥ J6543 ♦ 10843 ♣ AQ32</p>	<p>Board 8 : Dealer West : Love all</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">West</th> <th style="text-align: left;">North</th> <th style="text-align: left;">East</th> <th style="text-align: left;">South</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>1♦</td> <td>1NT*(1)</td> <td>2♦</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3♣(2)</td> <td>3♦</td> <td>4♠</td> <td>All Pass</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(1) Explained as 15 to 17</p> <p>(2) Stayman, not alerted. Explained at the end of the auction.</p> <p>N did not wish to change his final pass.</p> <p>Result 4♠+1.</p>	West	North	East	South	Pass	1♦	1NT*(1)	2♦	3♣(2)	3♦	4♠	All Pass
West	North	East	South										
Pass	1♦	1NT*(1)	2♦										
3♣(2)	3♦	4♠	All Pass										

The TD ruled the psyche Green. The pair recorded a similar situation about 20 years ago.

The L&E comment: We are concerned when psyches are accompanied by subsequent infractions such as a failure to alert.

13.058 Fielded misbid from Brighton Swiss Teams

<p>♠ AJ1063 ♥ Q10 ♦ 98 ♣ 10853 ♠ KQ987 ♠ 542 ♥ J4 ♥ A9872 ♦ AKJ107 ♦ 632 ♣ Q ♣ J2 ♠ - ♥ K653 ♦ Q54 ♣ AK9764</p>	<p>Board 13 : Dealer North : All vulnerable</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;"><i>West</i></th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;"><i>North</i></th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;"><i>East</i></th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;"><i>South</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>Pass</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>1♣</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1♠</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>2♠</td> <td>Dbl</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3♦</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>3♠</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>Dbl(1)</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(1) No calls alerted. North's double is by agreement for take out. South's double was also for take out.</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>		Pass	Pass	1♣	1♠	Pass	2♠	Dbl	3♦	Pass	3♠	Pass	Pass	Dbl(1)	All Pass	
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																		
	Pass	Pass	1♣																		
1♠	Pass	2♠	Dbl																		
3♦	Pass	3♠	Pass																		
Pass	Dbl(1)	All Pass																			

The TD asked South why she passed North's double if it was for take out. She felt she had no where to go. This reply is surprising given South has 13 cards outside spades and bidding either hearts or clubs would appear logical given their agreement. North and South commented that they had found themselves in difficulties in this kind of situation a number of times before. I discussed with North and South that they were likely to continue to find themselves in similar difficulties in future and they might give serious consideration to amending their agreements.

The TD ruled a RED misbid and adjusted the score to NS 30%, EW 60%.

L&E Comment: Misbids are currently scored as 40% / 60%. 30% is only given for a fielded RED Psyche. However the whole question of giving score adjustments for fielded misbids should be discussed at a future meeting. The Committee was surprised it was ruled RED. They also suggested it was inappropriate for the TD to suggest to NS to change their methods.

13.059 Brighton Swiss teams ; 13.065 / 13.066 Eastbourne Bowl - 3 psyches by the same player in the same partnership

The Committee considered three psyches by the same player with the same partner. Two had happened four boards apart.

<p>♠ A98 ♥ - ♦ J853 ♣ QJ8765 ♠ QJ74 ♠ 106 ♥ Q7543 ♥ A10986 ♦ Q107 ♦ K92 ♣ 9 ♣ 1032 ♠ K532 ♥ KJ2 ♦ A64 ♣ AK4</p>	<p>13.059: Board 24 : Dealer West : Love all</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;"><i>West</i></th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;"><i>North</i></th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;"><i>East</i></th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;"><i>South</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>1♥ *</td> <td>1NT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4♥</td> <td>5♣</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* psyche</p> <p>Ruled by the TD as Green</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>	Pass	Pass	1♥ *	1NT	4♥	5♣	All Pass	
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>										
Pass	Pass	1♥ *	1NT										
4♥	5♣	All Pass											

<p>♠ 9862 ♥ 5 ♦ KQ6 ♣ AJ1043</p> <p>♠ AQ104 ♠ 73 ♥ KJ63 ♥ 1092 ♦ A32 ♦ J1085 ♣ Q6 ♣ K875</p> <p>♠ KJ5 ♥ AQ874 ♦ 974 ♣ 92</p>	<p>13.065: Board 20 : Dealer West : All vulnerable</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>West</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>North</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>East</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>South</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1♥</td> <td>Dbl</td> <td>1♠ *</td> <td>2NT</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>All Pass * psyche</p> <p>Ruled by the TD as Red.</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>	1♥	Dbl	1♠ *	2NT
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>						
1♥	Dbl	1♠ *	2NT						

In later correspondence East said that his psyche was very dangerous considering he had no points and no spades. But his bidding system is such that by responding 1♠ after the double he can show 4+ spades and 4-8 HCP. The only strong response after the double is redouble showing any hand with 9+ HCP. Thus partners maximal (sic) raise is 3♠ showing 18-19 HCP with 4-card support which is the worst it can get. After a 2NT jump by LHO on the specific board partner has a 50-50 choice of passing or bidding 3♠.

<p>♠ J92 ♥ AJ842 ♦ A ♣ 9653</p> <p>♠ Q104 ♠ A763 ♥ 9 ♥ Q53 ♦ KQ1054 ♦ J973 ♣ QJ107 ♣ 42</p> <p>♠ K85 ♥ K1076 ♦ 862 ♣ AK8</p>	<p>13.066: Board 24 : Dealer West : Love all</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>West</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>North</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>East</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>South</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>1♥ *</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2♦</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* Psyche</p> <p>Ruled by the TD as Green</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>	Pass	Pass	1♥ *	Pass	2♦	All Pass		
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>										
Pass	Pass	1♥ *	Pass										
2♦	All Pass												

In later correspondence East said that opening 1♥ in 3rd seat cannot result in a bad score as they play 2NT as a good raise and their 3rd seat openings can be light. Opener can easily pass the 2NT response if needed.

The L&E considered correspondence with the psycher (East) regarding 13.065 and 13.066. The secretary was asked to write to the psycher reminding him of his obligations and about possible frivolous psyching towards the end of an event.

The psycher had also complained that the hands had been discussed on online forums and hoped the L&E had not been responsible for uploading the hands in the first place. The L&E commented that it does not initiate hand discussions on bridge forums, and that this hand had been uploaded by one of the other players at the table. Also, should a member of the L&E make a comment on a forum, this will be a personal view, rather than expressing the view of the L&E.

13.061 Appeal from the Premier League

Appeals from the Premier League have traditionally been done by a referee either by phone or on site. The pool of available referees is considerably reduced as many of the appeal referees are playing in the event. The Selection Committee will make its own regulations for appeals for next season.

13.069 Hand report from Premier League

<p>♠ 1097 ♥ 75 ♦ Q109 ♣ AJ943</p> <p>♠ KQJ843 ♠ A65 ♥ AJ10 ♥ Q8643 ♦ 8 ♦ A7 ♣ Q65 ♣ 1082</p> <p>♠ 2 ♥ K92 ♦ KJ65432 ♣ K7</p>	<p>Board 19 : Dealer South : EW vulnerable</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>West</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>North</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>East</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>South</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>3♦</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3♠</td> <td>4♥(1)</td> <td>4♠</td> <td>5♦</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>Dbl</td> <td>All Pass</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(1) psyche</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>				3♦	3♠	4♥(1)	4♠	5♦	Pass	Pass	Dbl	All Pass
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>														
			3♦														
3♠	4♥(1)	4♠	5♦														
Pass	Pass	Dbl	All Pass														

The TD ruled the psyche amber. There was follow-up correspondence from South. The L&E agreed with South's assertion that bidding 5♦ showed heart support but in not the most appropriate way for this hand. He could easily have bid 5♥. The amber ruling was confirmed.

13.070 Appeal from the West of England Congress

<p>♠ AKJ109763 ♥ 7 ♦ 3 ♣ AQ7</p> <p>♠ 84 ♠ 5 ♥ J5 ♥ AQ963 ♦ AKQJ9854 ♦ 76 ♣ 4 ♣ 109532</p> <p>♠ Q2 ♥ K10842 ♦ 102 ♣ KJ86</p>	<p>Board 36 : Dealer West : All vulnerable</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>West</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>North</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>East</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>South</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3NT(1)</td> <td>4♠</td> <td>Pass(2)</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5♦</td> <td>Dbl (3)</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(1) alerted and explained as Gambling. N then bid 4♠ (2) Agreed hesitation by East. (3) East called the TD to reserve rights and then doubled.</p> <p>Table result : 5♦ x= by West</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>	3NT(1)	4♠	Pass(2)	Pass	5♦	Dbl (3)	All Pass	
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>										
3NT(1)	4♠	Pass(2)	Pass										
5♦	Dbl (3)	All Pass											

The TD was first called after West's 5♦ bid. East's slow pass was agreed by all at the table. The TD ruled that the hesitation by East had passed UI to West and that pass was a logical alternative action for West. (Laws 16B1a, 16B1b, 12C1a). TD ruling: 4♠ + 1 by North.

The Appeal Committee returned the score to the table result. They said the hesitation did not demonstrably suggest the action taken by West. East could easily have been considering a double of 4♠.

L&E Comment: The AC's comment is all very well in theory but in practice slow passes are almost always about bidding on. On this hand, West has defined his hand closely and East would not need to take time to consider a double. The likelihood of East considering bidding is sufficient to satisfy the "demonstrably suggested" requirement of Law 16B1a, and the 5♦ bid should have been disallowed. TR will use this as an example in his first Appeal Focus.

13.073 Appeal from the Middlesex Congress

<p>♠ AJ5 ♥ 10 ♦ AQ102 ♣ AKJ65</p> <p>♠ Q10642 ♠ K83 ♥ KQJ762 ♥ A953 ♦ - ♦ 95 ♣ 87 ♣ Q432</p> <p>♠ 97 ♥ 84 ♦ KJ87643 ♣ 109</p>	<p>Board 37 : Dealer North : NS vulnerable</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>West</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>North</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>East</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>South</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>1♣</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2♣(1)</td> <td>2♦</td> <td>2♥</td> <td>4♦</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4♥</td> <td>5♦</td> <td>Pass(2)</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5♥</td> <td>Dbl</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(1) Both majors (2) Disputed slow</p> <p>Table result: 5♥x – 1 by East.</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>		1♣	Pass	Pass	2♣(1)	2♦	2♥	4♦	4♥	5♦	Pass(2)	Pass	5♥	Dbl	All Pass	
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																		
	1♣	Pass	Pass																		
2♣(1)	2♦	2♥	4♦																		
4♥	5♦	Pass(2)	Pass																		
5♥	Dbl	All Pass																			

The TD was first called at the end of the auction by North. Claimed a short hesitation by East after the 5♦ bid. East said he only hesitated a very short time and his partner said he didn't hesitate for any longer than he usually does.

The TD polled three other TDs and a player and determined that in accordance with Law 16B1(a) that a bid of 5♥ had not been demonstrably suggested by the hesitation. West stated he had no defensive tricks and would always sacrifice in 5♥ on the hand. TD result stands. He did subsequently view the traveller for board 37 and noted that 24 out of 56 tables played in 5♥, 5♥x or even 6♥x.

Appeals Committee: we felt that 5♥ was automatic and that the appeal had no merit. The deposit was forfeited.

L&E Comment: We were astonished the deposit was retained. It is a difficult question whether the slow pass suggests that East wants to bid or not. In practice we don't think people pass slowly when they might make a penalty double, they pass slowly when they want to bid; if we were giving this ruling we would rule in favour of NS. The TD saying how many tables played in a heart contract is totally irrelevant because the whole point of the ruling and appeal is that East showed he 'wanted' to bid hearts by passing slowly; perhaps at every other table East bid more than 2♥.

The L&E recommends that the Middlesex Congress committee reviews the decision to keep the deposit.

The Secretary was asked to contact the Middlesex chairman to convey the recommendations of the Committee.

Action: JP

7.2 Review of disciplinary penalties for 2013

The Committee considered all the disciplinary penalty forms from events held in 2013. There were 18 recorded, but none required any follow up.

8 Date of next meeting

Wednesday May 14th 2014 at 1pm.

Venue is Imperial Hotel, Russell Square, London (change of venue)

The meeting closed at 5pm