**Ruling Charleroi – Squeeze 2 (2 Nat B) of 17 October 2015**

Board 9 N/EW

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

**Bidding**

| N | E | S | W |
|---|---|---|---|
| P | 1NT[A] | 2♦[A] | Dbl |
| 2♠ | Dbl | 3♥ | 3NT |
| all pass | | | |

**Facts**

1NT is 14-16.

The versions of Teams A and B slightly differ.

Version of Team B

2♦ is alerted at both sides of the screen and explained as one suiter major or both minors, whereas the convention card only mentions Multi Landy.

2♠ is not alerted at either side.

Team B claims that if West had known 2♠ supported to play 3♥ he would have passed, which was forcing after the initial double. East would have bid 3♠, followed by 4♠ by West.

Version of Team A

2♦ is alerted and explained as Multi Landy by South to West. West's double is not alerted.

2♠ is alerted by North, South does not alert it as "2♠ is natural and asks partner to convert into Hearts if his suit is Hearts." West bids 3NT with Ax in Hearts, East passes with Qx hoping ♥K is in South.

The lead of a small ♥ is won by North with the King.

According to Team A there is no reason for Team B for a complaint. Moreover, they add, 4♠ goes one down as well.

**Ruling**

As there is no written proof of what was actually said at the table as the questions and explanations apparently were not given in writing (as should be done), it is not clear whether 2♦ was explained as 'Multi Landy' (as Team A says) or as 'one suiter major or both minors' (as Team B says).

2♠ must be alerted. Contrary to what South thinks, 2♠ is not a natural bid. The bid does not show a length in Spades, the conventional meaning is that is convertible to Hearts if South is weak in Hearts. By not alerting 2♠ South commits an infraction of the Law.

However, the meaning of 2♠ as a response after 2♦ Multi Landy can be considered as common knowledge for any average bridge player. Therefore, we can say that EW are not disadvantaged **as a result** of South's infraction.
Whether 4♠ would or would not be won is not relevant.

**Decision**
The result reached at the table is maintained.

Paul Meerbergen