



Royal Belgian
Bridge Federation

Ruling Report National Competition

Division : II A

Date : 02 February 2019

Match : Oostmalle 1 – Cercle Perron 4

Open/~~Closed~~ Room

Players: NS Eric Van Hove – Stefaan Wouters (Oostmalle 1)

EW Christine Orban – Peter Meurens (Cercle Perron 4)

Board : 22 Dealer : S Vulnerability : EW

Bidding

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

West	North	East	South
			1 ♣ ^A
3 ♦	X	PAS	3 ♠
PAS	...3NT	PAS	4 ♣
PAS	6 ♣	PAS	PAS
PAS			

Playing

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

Result and score :

6 ♣ +1 by S → 940 for NS (Oostmalle 1)

Result and score in the other room :

6 ♥ = by S → 980 for NS (Perron 4)

Balance : 40 for Cercle Perron 4 = + 1 IMP

Result of the match with this board

IMP : 95 – 60

Result of the match without this board

IMP : 95 – 59

Remarks from team A (Oostmalle 1)

3 NT by North was after long thinking. Can South still bid 4 ♣? We think NOT.

Remarks from team B (Cercle Perron 4)

Na 3 ♦ van West heb ik (noord speler) even nagedacht wat de beste bieding zou zijn en de beslissing genomen dan te dubbelen (negatief). Zuid biedt hier 3 ♠ op (ontkent 4-kaart ♥). Nu heb ik (Noord) 3 ZT geboden in optiek van verdeelde hand bij Zuid. Op 3 ZT biedt Zuid 4 ♣. Nu heeft Zuid geen verdeelde hand meer aan, maar een bicolor schoppen-klaveren. In dit geval minstens een 5-kaart ♣. Besluit 6 ♣ is het enige goede contract. Opmerking : zowel Noord als Zuid hebben praktisch niet nagedacht.

Analysis

1. Preliminary remarks:

- Apparently there is no agreement between EW and NS that effectively there has been a brake of tempo. Should the Director then assume that there was one, otherwise there would not be a request for ruling?
- From the declaration from team B it is not clear who noticed the break in tempo. If it was East, he is not allowed to draw attention to it. It is only a player on the side of the screen receiving the tray (South or West) that can consider there has been a break in tempo and consequently there may be unauthorised information. He should call the Director or in his absence, come to an agreement with his screen mate on this fact. He may do so at any time before the opening lead is made and the screen opened. Failure to do as described here above may persuade the Director it was the partner (East) who drew attention to the break in tempo. If so he may well rule there was no perceived delay by South or West and thus no unauthorised information.
- Finally, it is considered desirable that players should vary the tempo randomly when returning the tray under the screen. If they do so, then a delay in passing the tray of up to 20 seconds is not regarded as significant.

2. Let us assume that there was a break in tempo (by North or East?) and that it was an unmistakable hesitation by North. This extraneous information is unauthorised for South if it suggests a call or play (Law 16.B.1).

From South's perspective, his partner, by making a positive call of 3NT, could have been thinking about a lot of other possible calls : Pass, cue bid, 4♣, 4♥, 4♠, 4NT,

One can fairly conclude that the hesitation did not suggest something apart from the fact that North had a bidding problem. Consequently South could not choose a call that is demonstrably suggested over another by the unauthorized information. This means that there is no infraction.

Decision

The score on board 22 (in the open room) of 940 for NS is maintained. The result of the match Oostmalle 1 – Cercle Perron 4 remains 95 – 60 in IMP or 15,88 – 4,12 in VP.

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 17 February 2019.

Robert Ketels
Tournament Director for the national competition