

## Ruling Verviers 1 – UAE 3 (3 Nat D) of 15 October 2016

Board 4 W/all

	♠ K 9 7 6 5	
	♥ A Q 7	
	♦ K Q 7 4 2	
	♣ -	
♠ J 8 2		♠ A 10 4
♥ K J 6 5 3		♥ 10 8
♦ J		♦ A 8 6 5
♣ A J 9 8		♣ Q 6 3 2
	♠ Q 3	
	♥ 9 4 2	
	♦ 10 9 3	
	♣ K 10 7 5 4	

### Bidding

N	E	S	W
			1♥
2♥ <sup>A</sup>	Dbf	P	P
2♠	all pass		

### Facts

North alerts his bid and tells East that he was mistaken and that he actually holds ♠ and ♦. South alerts 2♥ and after some hesitation explains it as ♠ and ♣. West has a look at NS's convention card and sees that South's explanation is correct.

NS claim it is not normal that South passes on North's 2♠, holding five cards in ♣. In their view South should have bid 3♣, North would then have corrected to 3♠, which would have been doubled by East for -1.

### Ruling

As NS had not declared anything on the official form I sent both captains an e-mail on 19 October asking for additional information. According to the line up Mr Ros was South, Mr Damseaux was West.

I wanted to hear

- from Mr Ros why he passed on 2♥x and on 2♠
- from Mr Damseaux whether he had noticed anything special on his side of the screen

Mr Ros let me know that he was North and that Mrs Demarty was South. I then (20 October) asked NS's captain to pass on my questions to Mrs Demarty.

As to today (2 November) I haven't received any reaction from her.

Mr Damseaux let me know that his screen mate was not sure of the meaning of 2♥ and that after some hesitation she answered ♠ and ♣. As she wasn't sure she asked him whether she could check on her convention card, which he refused. Instead Mr Damseaux had a look at the card himself and confirmed to Mrs Demarty that her explanation was correct.

Both East and West received the correct information on the bid of 2♥ (corresponds to what the convention card says).

As West doesn't mention anything about information that could be passed from the other side of the screen, South's decision to pass twice was her own decision and apparently was not influenced by any illicit information.

So there has not been any infraction of the law.

### **Decision**

The result reached at the table stands.

Paul Meerbergen