

Ruling Chaver 1 – Perron 3 (1 Nat) of 10 October 2015

Board 19 S/EW

♠ Q 5 4 2	
♥ 10 9 7 3	
♦ Q 10 8 3 2	
♣ -	
♠ K 8	♠ A J 9 7
♥ A Q J 8 4	♥ K 6 2
♦ 9 6	♦ A 7
♣ J 10 6 5	♣ A K Q 2
	♠ 10 6 3
	♥ 5
	♦ K J 5 4
	♣ 9 8 7 4 3

Bidding

Not given

Facts

South leads 9♣; declarer immediately claims 12 tricks. North says he does not agree with the claim as he can ruff the first trick.

The players continue playing; declarer finesses in Spades and makes his contract. According to him after the first trick had been ruffed, this was “la ligne de jeu obligatoire”.

Ruling

Law 68C says that a claim should be accompanied at once by a clear statement as to the order in which cards will be played, of the line of play or defence through which the claimer proposes to win the tricks claimed.

Law 68D says that after any claim or concession, play ceases.

Law 70A says that in ruling on a contested claim or concession, the Director adjudicates the result of the board as equitably as possible to both sides, but that any doubtful point as to a claim shall be resolved against the claimer.

Law 70D1 says the Director shall not accept from claimer any successful line of play not embraced in the original clarification statement if there is an alternative normal line of play that would be less successful; “normal” includes play that would be careless or inferior for the class of player involved.

Law 70D3 says that in accordance with Law 68D play should have ceased, but if any play has occurred after the claim this may provide evidence to be deemed part of the clarification of the claim. The Director may accept it as evidence of the players’ probable plays subsequent to the claim and/or of the accuracy of the claim.

Declarer did not clarify his claim when he announced the claim. Contrary to Law 68D players continued playing, which they should not have.

Declarer says the line of play he chose was obligatory. There is another line to win the contract, though: he might play Ace and King of Spades and ruff the third round of Spades hoping that the Queen falls. Three players of 1National saw this as a possible line of play.

Basing on Law 70D1 the claim is not correct.

Law 70D3 is not relevant in this case. South might have received extra information by the fact that it was North who contested the claim.

Decision

The claim is not conceded. The result reached at the table is annulled and replaced by 6♥ by West, 1 down.

The result of the match **Chaver 1 – Perron 3** therefore is **74-53** (instead of 74-70) in IMPs or **13,59-6,41** (instead of 10,77-9,23).

Paul Meerbergen