Ruling Phenix 2 - Riviera 2 (1 Nat) of 12 November 2016

Board 18 E/NS

 ▲ 10 6 ♥ A 9 ♦ J 8 ⁷ ♣ A K 	8 7 5 3	 ▲ 85 ♥ K J ◆ K Q ♣ 10 0 ♣ K 9 ♥ 10 5 ♦ A 9 ♣ J 9 5 	2 10 6 4 5 2 5 4	 ▲ A Q J 7 4 ♥ Q 3 2 ◆ 2 ♣ Q 4 3 	3
Biddiı	ng				
Ν	E	S	W		
	1 🛦	Р	2♦ ^A		
Dbl	2	3♣	Dbl		
3♦	Р	3♥	Dbl		
all pas	S				

Facts

The screen is put wrong: North and West are screen mates and so are East and South, whereas North and East (South and West) should be at the same side of the screen.

West explained his $2 \blacklozenge$ bid to North as "game forcing", but did not add it was natural \blacklozenge . East explained it to South as "natural and game forcing".

NS's agreement is that double on an artificial game forcing bid shows the suit bid for the lead. NS claim that South is misled by the different explanation he received.

EW's statement: "We play 1NT as F1 and 2 over 1 game forcing. It is the first line of the convention card duly presented. It seemed natural to W that "game forcing" was a sufficient explanation as our basic system had been explained through our convention card."

Ruling

West's explanation of his $2 \blacklozenge$ bid completely complies with what EW's convention card says. If the $2 \blacklozenge$ bid had been artificial not promising \blacklozenge then this would have been essential information that had to be included in the explanation. As it is not, adding that $2 \blacklozenge$ is natural is not needed.

Decision

The result reached at the table stands.

Paul Meerbergen