

## Ruling UAE 4 - Pieterman 2 (3 Nat B) of 12 November 2016

Board 8 W/-

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

### Bidding

N	E	S	W
			P
P	1♦	1♥	1♠
P	P	2♣	Dbl
P	2♠	all pass	

### Facts

Contract of 2♠ is just made.

West's double is explained by East to North as holding 4 cards in ♣. After the board has been played, it appears that West intended his double as showing 3 cards in ♦.

NS claim that if North had had that explanation she would have bid 3♣, which would be just made if ♣J is found, whereas 3♠ by West would be one down (at the table West just made his contract of 2♠).

East said he had interpreted his partner's double as a suggestion as penalty double, which he chose not to accept and therefore bid 2♠.

Result at the other table: 1♠ by West, just made, +80 for Team B.

### Ruling

The double in this bidding sequence is not mentioned in the convention card, so

*“the Director is to presume mistaken explanation, rather than mistaken call, in the absence of evidence to the contrary”* (Law 75).

Four out of the five players that were consulted said their bidding would not be influenced by either of the two explanations. Two players would have bid 3♣ anyway, two would have passed after either explanation. The fifth player thought the right explanation might make it a bit easier to bid 3♣.

We have to conclude that West's not alerting is an infraction of the law, but NS are not disadvantaged by it.

### Decision

The result reached at the table stands.

Paul Meerbergen