

Ruling Westrand 1 – Phenix 4 (3 Nat A) of 14 November 2015

Board 7 S/All

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

Bidding

N	E	S	W
		1♥	1NT ^A
2♥	P	P	3♣
all pass			

Facts

Screens are in use.

According to Team A 1NT is explained by EW as two suiter minors. This explanation corresponds to what EW's convention card says. Team A claims that South could have bid 3♦ and EW would then have ended in 3♥ if they had known West's actual hand.

According to Team B West had forgotten the convention (1NT after 1♥ = 2 minors).

Ruling

According to Team A's statement both East and West explained 1NT as showing a 2 suiter ("explained by EW"). On the other hand in EW's statement it says West had forgotten the convention. Did he nevertheless give the right explanation, or was it only East that explained the bid as a two suiter?

Whatever the case, EW's convention card states that 1NT after opponents' 1♥ shows 2 minors; so the information that was given corresponds to the system EW play and therefore, no infraction of the law was made. See Law 40A3 "A player may make any call or play without prior announcement provided that such call or play is not based on an undisclosed partnership understanding" and Law 40 C1 "A player may deviate from his side's announced understandings always provided that his partner has no more reason to be aware of the deviation than have the opponents. Repeated deviations lead to implicit understandings which then form part of the partnership's methods and must be disclosed in accordance with the regulations governing disclosure of system."

Decision

The result reached at the table stands.

Bearing in mind that repeated deviations lead to implicit understandings (Law 40C1) EW's deviation is recorded and may be taken into account in future rulings.

Paul Meerbergen