

## Ruling Cercle Perron 4 - Pieterman 1 (2 Nat A) of 26 November 2016

Bord 30 E/-

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

### Bidding

N	E	S	W
	P	1NT	Dbf
P	P	Rdbl	P
2♣	Dbf	P	P
P			

### Facts

The order of play which Team B wrote down, was inaccurate and could therefore not be used: several cards were played twice, in one and the same trick a card is played from a hand that did not hold that card and two cards were played from the same hand...

However, this was not essential as both parties agree on the essence of the case.

In the tenth trick ♠J is played from North, Oost small ♦, South ruffs and West overruffs still holding a ♠ (revoke). West then returns a ♠, by which his revoke becomes established.

Play continues and the result is 2♣ doubled by North (Team B) -2.

Result in the other room 3NT by EW (Team B) -2

### Ruling

North revokes and his revoke becomes established as he plays a card in the next trick (Law 63A1).

When a revoke is established and the trick on which the revoke occurred was won by the offending player, at the end of the play the trick on which the revoke occurred is transferred to the non-offending side together with one of any subsequent tricks won by the offending side (Law 64A1).

As West won the trick in which he revoked and EW afterwards still won a trick (with ♣A) EW have to transfer two tricks.

### Decision

The result reached at the table is annulled and replaced by the adjusted score of 2♣ doubled by North, just made, 180 for North (Team B).

The balance of board 30 then becomes -80 for Team B (+100-180) meaning -2 IMPs for Team A instead of +9

The result of the match **Cercle Perron 4 - Pieterman 1** becomes 96-74 instead of 105-72 in IMPs or **14,09-5,91** (instead of 15,63-4,38).

### **Additional note**

The day after the match I received a complaint from Pieterman 1 on the behaviour of a player of Cercle Perron 4 after the match. When asked (by e-mail) for his reaction that player in his turn complained about the fact that complainer kept talking Dutch during play.

Neither of the complaints was mentioned in the match form, which is the reason why this incident cannot be sanctioned in this ruling.

However, the incident is recorded and can be taken into account in future incidents.

As for now, both parties are informed that complaints about incidents of this kind can be sent to the The Commission of Ethics and Discipline at the latest two months after the facts occurred; for the procedure see the website of the Royal Belgian Bridge Federation.

Paul Meerbergen