Ruling 3Vallées – Wavre 1 (3 Nat D) of 10 October 2015

Preliminary note No teams were mentioned in the form ...

Board	31 S/N	IS			
		▲ 10 6			
		♥ A 8	7		
		♦ Q J	7		
		♣ A K	Q 10 7		
A -				^	K Q J 8 7 5 4
♥ Q J 10 9 6 4				۷.	5
♦ A 9	42			٠	10 5 3
\$ 983	3			*	6 5
		▲ A 9	32		
		♥ K 3	2		
		♦ K 8	6		
		♣ J 4 2	2		
Bidding					
Ν	Ē	S	W		
		Р	2♦ ^A		
Р	2 ▲ ^A	Р	3♥		
Р	3♠	all pass	8		

Facts

2♦ is alerted as Multi.

2♠ is alerted by East to North as "to play", West explains it to South as "to play 3♥"

 $3 \bigstar$ is explained to South as "to play".

After the lead East says to West "you have given the wrong explanation, I don't want to play $3 \checkmark$, I want to play $3 \bigstar$.

This bidding sequence is not mentioned in the convention card.

NS claim that if East passes, South will probably keep the bidding going and NS might reach game.

Ruling

It is very strange that East knows how West explained his bid of $2 \clubsuit$! When playing with screens all questions and answers must be written down, so it is impossible for the partner to know (hear) what explanation is given...

It is normal that the bidding sequence is not to be found in the convention card. The explanation "Multi" apparently was clear to the opponents. In Multi partner's $2 \triangleq$ is convertible to \forall . If East then bids $3 \triangleq$ it is obvious he wants to play $3 \clubsuit$. By his $2 \clubsuit$ he had already indicated he was not interested in game.

NS's remark that IF East had passed the bidding have gone, is not relevant: he did bid 3**v**.

Decision

The result reached at the table is maintained.

Paul Meerbergen