

Ruling Report National Competition

Division : III B

Date : 02 February 2019

Match : Riviera 5 – Perron 7

Closed Room

Players: NS Monticelli Thomas – Monticelli Roman (Perron 7)

EW Robert Ketels – Emiel Oosters (Riviera 5)

Board : 06 Dealer : E Vulnerability : EW

Bidding

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

| West | North | East | South |
|------|-------|------|-------|
| | | 1 ♥ | 2 ♣ |
| 3 ♠ | 5 ♣ | PAS | PAS |
| DbI | PAS | 5 ♠ | 6 ♣ |
| PAS | PAS | DbI | PAS |
| PAS | PAS | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Playing

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

Result and score :

6 ♣ ! -2 by S => 300 for EW

Result and score in the other room :

5 ♣ ! -1 by S => 100 for EW

Balance : 200 for Riviera 5 = + 5 IMP

Result of the match with this board

IMP: 32 - 72

Result of the match without this board

IMP: 27 - 72

Remarks from team A

According to the alert procedure, 3♠ must go without alert if preemptive with 7+ card.

Subsequent explanation:

- "3♠ is natural" = correct
- "Stronger than 2♠" = correct

On the convention card is shown: "After intervention of the opponents a new suit on 2 or 3 level is non forcing".

Remarks from team B

3♠ was not alerted.

When the bidding came back to me at 5♠, South asked: "what was 3♠?". West told me it was natural and when I asked whether it was stronger than 2♠, he told me yes.

Given that information I (*South*) bid 6♣ which was doubled and 2 down.

Knowing it was weak, I (*South*) would settle for 5♠ doubled.

Analysis

Facts:

- 3♠ was alerted by East but no questions were asked by North.
- 3♠ was not alerted by West. Questions were asked by South.

The correct meaning is shown on the convention card: "After intervention of the opponents a new suit on 2 or 3 level is non forcing".

According to the Alert Procedure 3♠ should be alerted:

"Following bids should be alerted:

Non-forcing jump changes of suit responses to opening bids or overcalls, and nonforcing new suit responses by an unpassed hand to opening bids of one of a suit."

South asked two questions to West. The answer on the first question is Ok.

On the second question, West should have given the full explanation.

L40B5(a) clearly states the following:

"When explaining the significance of partner's call or play in reply to an opponent's enquiry (see Law 20) a player shall disclose all special information conveyed to him through partnership agreement or partnership experience"

This is the principle of "full disclosure".

As the explanations of West is not in accordance to the partnership understandings, L40B5(b) gives the director the power to adjust the score if NZ are thereby damaged.

The question is what south would have bid with the right explanation and if this makes a difference for the bidding of South with the given explanation.

I consulted 5 players (1 from 1st national division, 1 from 2nd national division and 3 from 3rd national division) which gave following result:

| West | North | East | South |
|------|-------|------|-------|
| | | 1 ♥ | 2 ♣ |
| 3 ♠ | 5 ♣ | PAS | PAS |
| Dbl | PAS | 5 ♠ | ? |

Correct explanation from system card: 4 players would pass and 1 player would double.

Explanation Given at the table: 4 players would pass and 1 player would double.

We can conclude that South was not damaged in his actions because all the consulted players would have done the same action with both explanations.

Decision

NS were not damaged as a consequence of the incomplete explanation/Alert Failure by West. Consequently the score on board 6 (in the closed room) of 300 for EW is maintained. The result of the match Riviera 5 – Perron 7 remains 32 – 72 in IMP or 3,54 – 16,46 in VP.

Additionally, I give to the pair Robert Ketels – Emiel Oosters a warning for not giving full disclosure of their partnership agreements.

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 Deinze on 14 February 2019.

Dirk Logghe
Tournament Director for the national competition