Ruling Perron 3 – Riviera 1 (Nat I) of 23 January 2016

Board 6 E/EW

		▲ A Q	J 4 2	
		¥ -		
		♦ Q 1	0985	
		♣Q9	5	
▲ K 8	765		▲ 93	
♥ J 10	52		▼ A 9 7 6 4 3	
♦ A 7	6		♦ J 3	
♣ A			♣ J 8 2	
		▲ 10		
		♥ K Q 8		
		◆ K 4 2		
		♣ K 10 7 6 4 3		
Biddi	ng			
Ν	E	S	W	
	Р	$1 \bigstar^{A}$	Dbl	
Rdbl	1♥	2*	Р	
2♠	Р	3♣	Р	
3♥ ^A	Dbl	3NT	all pass	

Facts

Declaration of Team A: West's double is simply a classical take out: as the 1 \blacklozenge opening does not specify which minor the opener has, West decides to double to show an opening without natural bid.

Declaration of Team B: West's double was not alerted or explained as opening or hand with both majors. The lead was $\forall J$, followed by $\diamond 5 - \forall A - \forall 8$. East returned \forall for $\forall K - \forall 5 - \&?$. Thinking that West's double is a normal take out, South continued with $\clubsuit K$ protecting his Clubs against singleton $\clubsuit J$ in East. After playing $\clubsuit A$ West continued Hearts and the contract was beaten by three. South thinks that this kind of double should be explained as majors. With that explanation normal play for South would have been small \clubsuit .

Ruling

NS play Strong Club.

If in EW's system double on the conventional $1 \blacklozenge$ opening is not a specific defence against the conventional opening bid there is no need to alert it, as it commonly shows both majors. There is no reason to doubt NS's declaration that the double was a classical take out.

With West's hand some players might choose to bid $1 \bigstar$ instead of double, but that choice is up to the player.

The absence of an alert on the double is not considered as wrong information.

Decision

The result reached at the table stands.

Paul Meerbergen