

Ruling Perron 2 – Riviera 3 (1 Nat) of 28 November 2015

Board 7 S/All

	♠ J x		
	♥ J 10 9 x		
	♦ x		
	♣ A K 10 x x x		
♠ x		♠ A K 10 x	
♥ K Q x x		♥ -	
♦ A J 10 x x		♦ K Q x x x x x	
♣ x x x		♣ J x	
	♠ Q 9 8 x x x		
	♥ A 8 x x x		
	♦ -		
	♣ Q 9		

Bidding

N	E	S	W
		2♥	P
4♥	P	P	Dbl
All pass			

Facts

Screens are in use.

Play

N	E	S	W	N	E	S	W
			♠x	♠x	♠K	♠x	
	♠A	♠x	♣x	♠J			
	♦K	♥x	♦x	♦x			
		♠Q	♣x	♣x	♠x		
		♥A	♥x	♥x	♦x		
		♥x	♥Q	♥9	♦x		
			♥K	♥10	♦x	♥x	
			♥x	♥J	♦x	♥8	
♣x	♣x	♣Q	♣x				
....							

Both teams disagree on what happened after trick 9 and play goes on. EW still win four tricks.

Declaration of Team A: after the ninth trick declarer says the clubs are good and plays ♠9. He did not claim the rest of the tricks and did not put his cards on the table.

Declaration of Team B: after the ninth trick declarer claims, says “all clubs are good” and puts his cards on the table.

Ruling

Law 68A says “Any statement to the effect that a contestant will win a specific number of tricks is a claim of those tricks.”

Both parties agree that declarer said “all clubs are good” at the moment there were still four cards in dummy, all clubs (declarer still holding ♣9). In accordance with Law 68A his words are to be considered as a claim for the four remaining tricks (“**any** statement...”).

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.)*”

It is true that declarer did not act as required by Law 68C (“*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*”), but it is clear that after playing ♣x to his ♣Q he wanted to cash the remaining tricks in clubs.

Conclusion: a claim was actually made and play should have ceased. The claim is accepted as it is clear the only normal line of play is to play all clubs, which declarer clearly intended to do.

Decision

The result reached at the table is annulled and replaced by 4♥ doubled played by North, result -1 (instead of -5), being +200 for Team A.

The balance on board 7 then is +400 for Team B (600-200), which is +9 IMPs for Team B instead of -13.

After two rulings (boards 3 and 7) the final score of the match Perron 2- Riviera 1 is 93-98 in IMPs or 9,04-10,96 in VPs (instead of 13,59-6,41)

Paul Meerbergen