



Royal Belgian
Bridge Federation

Ruling Report National Competition

Division : III B

Date : 19 January 2019

Match : Pieterman 2 – Phenix 4

Open/~~Closed~~ Room

Players: NS Simon Beerten – Jens Jossaer (Pieterman 2)

EW Nicolas Marinof – Luc Vingerhoets (Phenix 4)

Board : 18 Dealer : E Vulnerability : NS

Bidding

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

West	North	East	South
		PAS	PAS
PAS	1 ♦	1 ♠	PAS
3 ♠ ^A	PAS	PAS	PAS

Playing

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

Result and score :

3 ♠ -3 by E → 150 for NS (Pieterman 2)

Result and score in the other room :

4 ♥ +1 by S → 650 for NS (Phenix 4)

Balance : 500 for Phenix 4 = + 11 IMP

Result of the match with this board

IMP : 41 – 73

Result of the match without this board

IMP : 41 – 62

Remarks from team A (Pieterman 2)

Drie schoppen wordt uitgelegd als limiet (maximale voorpas). Daarom pas ik [Noord], aangezien mijn partner waarschijnlijk slechts rond de 4 punten zal hebben (18 + 10-11 + volgbod ±8). Ik speel dan liever 3 ♠ tegen, zeker gezien de kwetsbaarheid.

Als 3 ♠ zwak is (zoals de hand uiteindelijk blijkt) dubbel ik [Noord], omdat wij dan zeker wel iets te spelen hebben. Door deze verkeerde uitleg missen wij dus een altijd gemaakte 4 ♥. In de andere zaal wordt 4 ♥ +1 gemaakt.

Remarks from team B (Phenix 5)

En Est, j'ai expliqué le 3 ♠ de mon partenaire comme étant limite avec 4 atouts probablement 11-12 DH. Mon partenaire a décidé qu'avec son 5^{ième} atout il était dans cette zone.

Analysis

What are the partnership agreements of E-W? According to their convention card the general style of an overcall is sound. The meaning of a raise by partner after an overcall is the same as after an opening bid. This implies that in this case 3 ♠ promises a 4-card ♠ and a limit hand (10-12 DHP). This is exactly the explanation given by East. When the partnership agreement has been explained correctly, there is no infraction and, regardless of damage, the result stands (law 75 C).

The West hand has only 8 DHP instead of the required 10-12 DHP. So West has deviated (slightly taking into account to the vulnerability) from his side's understandings. This is explicitly authorised by the laws provided that his partner has no more reason than the opponents to be aware of the deviation (law 40.C.1). Here there is no indication whatsoever that his partner was aware of the deviation nor has there been previous deviations reported.

Decisions

The score on board 6 (in the open room) of 150 for NS is maintained. The result of the match Pieterman 2 – Phenix 7 remains 41 – 73 in IMP or 4,50 – 15,50 in VP.

The deviation from the partnership understandings by the pair Nicolas Marinof – Luc Vingerhoets has been recorded.

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 22 January 2019.

Robert Ketels
Tournament Director for the national competition