## Ruling Cercle Perron 3 – Teuten 1 (2 Nat B) of 15 October 2016

Board 13 N/All

```
4 9
             ♥ K 5 4
             ♦ A 10 9 5
             ♣ AJ 1082
∧ K 8 7 6 3
                         ♦ J 5
♥ J 9
                         ♥ Q8762
♦ K Q 4 3
                          • 2
♣ Q 3
                         497654
             ▲ A Q 10 4 2
             ♥ A 10 3
             ♦ J876
             ♣ K
Bidding
N
      Ε
            S
                   W
1 &
      P
            1 🗸
                   1 🛦
P
      2v
            P
                   2
Р
            Dbl
      3♣
                   3♦
Dbl
      3♥
            Dbl
                   P
P
      3♠
            Dbl
                   all pass
```

## **Facts**

Screens are in use.

Statement of Team A (EW): North alerts South's 1 ♥ as 4+♠, but South does not alert it to West.

West says he wouldn't have bid  $1 \blacktriangle$  if he had known that  $1 \blacktriangledown$  showed  $4+ \blacktriangle$ . Before the start of the match Team B had not said they played T-Walsh.

South on the other hand says she did alert  $1 \vee as 4 + 4$ , as – she wrote - it is described in her convention card, and she adds that the opponent did not ask for any explanation.

Result 3 x by West -5, -1400 for Team A. Result in the open room 3NT+1, 630 for Team A.

## Ruling

The statements of West and South as to the alert of 1♥ are contradictory.

South claims she alerted  $1 \vee as 4 + \spadesuit$ , but adds that the opponent did not ask for any information; this remark and the reference to her convention card seems to imply that she did not explain anything in word.

Further communication with the captains by e-mail clarified the situation. West says that in the conversation both players had after the match about the alert both players were sincere in what they said. He believes South when she said that she alerted her  $1 \vee$  bid (with her hand though, not with the alert card), but that he didn't see her doing so. As he didn't see her alert, he didn't ask what  $1 \vee$  meant (natural he thought) and bid 1S.

The Regulations for Bidding boxes of the EBL stipulate that "Alerts should be made by use of the Alert card. It is the responsibility of the alerting player to ensure that both his opponents are aware of the alert." (see also Appendix of the Laws). (Remark: when screens are in use 'opponents' should be singular meaning the screen mate.)

The EBL Regulations for Screens say that "The alert must be made by placing the Alert Card over the last call of the screen mate, in his segment of the bidding tray; the alerted player must acknowledge by returning the Alert Card to his opponent." (see also Regulations for Screens of the BBF 5.1)

Apparently South did not alert her  $1 \vee$  as prescribed. Her not alerting the conventional bid of  $1 \vee$  properly is an infraction of the law as she gives wrong information to her screen mate West. It is hard to believe that West would bid  $1 \wedge$  if he had had the correct explanation. He would probably have passed and NS would probably have reached 3NT.

## **Decision**

The result reached at the table is annulled and replaced by 3NT played NS +1, being +630 for Team A. The balance of board 13 then is 0, instead of -13VPs for Team A.

The **final result of the match Cercle Perron 3 – Teuten 1** therefore is 77-96 (instead of 77-109) in IMPs or **6,38-13,62** (instead of 4,5-15,5) in VPs.

Paul Meerbergen