Ruling Chaver 2 – Charleroi 1 (2 Nat B) of 21 November 2015

Board 14 E/-

The hands are not accurate: $\mathbf{v}Q$ and $\mathbf{4}$. There is no impact on the ruling.

| | | ♦ 92 | | |
|--------------|------|-------------|------------|-------------------|
| | | ♥ A K | 1096 | |
| | | ♦ Q 4 | | |
| | | ♣ A Q | J 3 | |
| 🔺 A K | 10 8 | | | ♠ Q J 7 4 |
| ♥ Q 5 | 32 | | | ♥ 4 |
| ♦ 103 | i | | | ♦ K J 7 5 |
| ♣ K 7 | 5 | | | ♣ 10 9 4 2 |
| | | ♠65 | 3 | |
| | | ♥ Q 8 7 | | |
| | | ♦ A 9 | 642 | |
| | | * 86 | | |
| Bidding | | | | |
| Ν | E | S | W | |
| | Р | Р | 1♥ | |
| Р | 1♠ | Р | all pas | S |

Facts

Screens are in use.

West alerts and explains his 1♥ to South as 5 cards in Hearts, 4 cards possible though if also 4 cards in Spades.

1♥ was not alerted by East to North.

North claims that if he had known East could hold only 4 Hearts it would have been evident for him to bid Hearts and NS could have bid up to 4Ψ , a contract which could have been made knowing that West held 4 Hearts.

Result at the other table: 4♥ by North -1

Ruling

By not alerting West's 1♥ East commits an infraction of the law (wrong information, West's explanation corresponds to EW's convention card).

After East's 1 A North knows that

- neither his partner nor East have opening power
- East very probably has weak opening strength as he passes on partner's 1 **A**.

Despite these facts and his holding 16 HP North decides to pass out, which can be considered rather passive bidding. We can therefore conclude that the unfavourable result on the board is not caused by East's infraction, the damage for East-West can be called self-inflicted.

Decision

The result reached at the table stands.

Paul Meerbergen