

Ruling Report National Competition

Division : II B

Date : 01 December 2018

Match : U.A.E. 2 – Chaver 1

~~Open~~/Closed Room

Players: NS Luc De Schrijver – Carlo Vandebussche (Chaver 1)

EW Antonella Couteaux – Letizia Angelini (U.A.E. 2)

Board : 6 Dealer : E Vulnerability : EW

Bidding

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

West	North	East	South
		PAS	2 ♦ ^A
PAS	2 ♥	PAS	2 NT
PAS	3 ♥ ^A	PAS	4 ♠
PAS	4 NT	PAS	5 ♣ ^A
PAS	6 ♠	PAS	PAS
PAS			

2 ♦ is explained by North to East as "Game Forcing"
by South to West as "Multi"

Playing

	W	N	E	S	W	N	E
1			♣ 10				
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							

Result and score :

6 ♠ = by S → 980 for NS

Result and score in the other room :

4 ♠ +1 by S → 450 for NS

Balance : 530 for Chaver 1 = + 11 IMP

Result of the match with this board

IMP : 67 – 32

Result of the match without this board

IMP : 67 – 21

Remarks from team A (U.A.E. 2)

On [Sud] m'a informé que l'ouverture de 2 ♦ était Multi. J'ai donc été induite en erreur puisqu'en fait ils jouent cela FM. Je n'ai donc pas entamé mon ♥ A ayant peur d'une coupe chez le répondant. Si je sais que 2 ♦ est toujours fort (et régulier en SA) je n'ai d'autre choix que d'entamer mon ♥ A et ♥ pour la coupe de ma partenaire. Je ne sais pas qu'il a en fait 24+.

I don't agree with the comment of team B. If 2 ♦ is multi, the regular hand should be 22-23 otherwise South should also explain this to me *[additional comment following remarks B]*.

Remarks from team B (Chaver 1)

De opening 2 ♦ is Forcing Game (conventiekaart). Zuid zegt Multi. Na 2 NT is het 24-25 punten *[see additional comment team A]*. Nadien biedt noord zijn schoppen. West beweert dat noord langere hartens zou hebben na de zogenaamde multi maar Noord biedt zijn schoppens!

De uitleg is niet 100% juist maar dit maakt geen enkel verschil.

Na het einde van het spel ziet ze [West] dat partner een singleton heeft en zegt dat ze ♥ A zou uitgekomen zijn.

Analysis

When the partnership agreement is different from the explanation given, the explanation is an infraction of law (law 75.B.1). If EW are damaged **as a consequence** of NS's failure to provide disclosure of the meaning of a call, as the laws require, EW are entitled to rectification through the award of an adjusted score (law 40.B.3(a)).

The bidding after the 2NT bid by South is pretty much straightforward and not a point of discussion. So let us focus on the differences in meaning of 2 ♥ and 2 NT in either case.

According to the WBF convention booklet 2 ♦ Multi shows one of three types: (i) weak two in a major suit, (ii) a strong balanced hand of a defined range or (iii) strong three-suited hand. The response of 2 ♥ shows willingness to play here or in at least 2 ♠ (this is also what North would have bid if they played Multi). The opener's rebid with type (ii) is 2 NT.

According to the convention card of NS (2 ♦ = Game Forcing), the response of 2 ♥ is a relay. The opener's rebid of 2NT shows a balanced hand of 24-25 HCP.

In both cases the response of 2 ♥ does not say anything about hearts. West's assumption that this showed shortness in hearts is wrong. The opener's rebid of 2 NT shows in both cases a strong balanced hand. In the system of NS the strength is defined (24-25 HP) whereas in 2 ♦ Multi the range may vary (most of the time 22-23 or 24-25).

Is it possible that this small difference in meaning might trigger a different lead?

I consulted 7 players (from honour, 1st and 2nd national division) to see what they would lead with the correct explanation (first question) and what with the wrong explanation. In both cases, 6 of them would lead the ♥ A and 1 a minor. They all emphasised that whether 2 ♦ is Multi or only game forcing, this has no influence whatsoever on the lead after this bidding sequence (nor the strength of 2 NT, whether it is 22-23 or 24-25)

Decisions

EW were not damaged as a consequence of the mistaken explanation by South.
Consequently the score on board 6 (in the closed room) of 980 for NS is maintained.
The result of the match U.A.E. 2 – Chaver 1 remains 67 – 32 in IMP or 15,88 – 4,12 in VP.

Additionally, I give to the pair Luc De Schrijver – Carlo Vandebusshe an official warning for insufficient knowledge of their own system.

Both teams can file an appeal against this decision. Please refer to the regulations for the treatment of an appeal, which can be consulted on the website of the RBBF.

Done at Ruisbroek (Puurs) on 03 December 2018.

Robert Ketels
Tournament Director for the national competition