```
Ruling Report
Honour 2016-17, match 5, 8 october 2016

Squeeze – Phenix, Open Room:

N: (Squeeze) Steven De Donder – S André Van Den Avyle
E: (Phenix) Hervé Huntz – W Damien Calas

deal 9 (N/EW)

• 93

○ K83

○ A52

• A10542
```

```
★ J10872
             ★ AKQ64
♥ Q|9
             \triangle \mathbf{A}
♦ | 103
             ♦ K964
♣ 97
             ♣ K86
      ♦ 5
      ♥ 1076542
      ♦ Q87
      ♣ QJ3
             Ε
W
      Ν
                    S
       Χ
                    2♦
             pass
      3◊
                    4♣
pass
             X
pass
      pass
                    pass
pass
      47
             pass
                    pass
X
      all pass
```

8 tricks, NS -300

I am called by East after the pass on $4\clubsuit$. North has not alerted $2\diamondsuit$ to him so he does not understand the bidding. South intended $2\diamondsuit$ to show hearts. North/South do not offer any proof of their system so the Director chooses to rule that East has been misinformed.

The Director shows the East hand to four players (three from honour division, one from first division), with the explanation that $2\lozenge$ shows hearts. None of the players pass over $3\lozenge$. Three of the four would have bid spades at some point, and there are some criticisms of the first double, but the Director does not feel that East has acted sufficiently bad to warrant a ruling according to L12C1b (in which NS would still get a bad result but E would not get a complimentary good one). One expert gives the same reasoning as East at the table: if he doubles again, partner may bid hearts (in the case where South has shown diamonds, not hearts).

If East acts over 30, it is not a stretch of the imagination to reach 44, which makes.

The result is changed to 4♠ by E/W, making ten tricks.

North/South decide to lodge an appeal.

Herman De Wael.