



Royal Belgian  
Bridge Federation

# Ruling Report National Competition

Division : III B

Date : 28 September 2019

Match : Phénix 3 – Beerschot 1

~~Open~~/Closed Room

Players: NS Mibeth Breckpot – Christian Swolfs (Beerschot 1)

EW Georges Jamin – Jean Chabotier (Phénix 3)

Board : 17 Dealer : N Vulnerability : none

Bidding

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

West	North	East	South
	1 NT	2 ♦ <sup>A</sup>	3 ♥
PAS	3 ♠	PAS	4 ♣
PAS	4 ♠	PAS	5 ♥
PAS	6 ♠	PAS	PAS
X	PAS	PAS	PAS

2 ♦ is explained by East to North as “Texas Hearts”  
by West to South as “Multi-Landy, a long major”

## 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 ♠ X -6 by N → 1400 for EW (Phénix 3)

Result and score in the other room :

3 NT = by N → 400 for NS (Phénix 3)

Balance : 1800 for Phénix 3 = + 18 IMP

Result of the match with this board

IMP : 74 – 44

Result of the match without this board

IMP : 56 – 44

### **Remarks from team A (Phénix 3)**

Je [Ouest] reconnais avoir donné une explication incorrecte.

Remarques : 1<sup>ière</sup> Si Sud passe sur 2 ♦, j'aurais mis 2 ♠  
2<sup>ème</sup> 3SA en NS chute sur entame piques

### **Remarks from team B (Beerschot 1)**

Est alerte 2 ♦ et explique longue à cœur

Ouest dit que 2 ♦ est longue en Majeure

Nord, vu l'alerte par Est, interprète 3 ♥ comme étant pour les piques et continue dans cette couleur.

Si Sud a l'explication correcte, il dit 3SA et le contrat sera fait.

### **Analysis**

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

However if, subsequent to the irregularity, NS have contributed to their own damage by an extremely serious error (unrelated to the infraction) then:

- EW are awarded the score they would have been allotted as the consequence of rectifying their infraction
- NS do not receive relief for such part of their damage as is self-inflicted (law 12.C.1(e))

Let us first of all examine what would have happened if South had received the correct explanation. South would never have tried to show his hearts (by bidding 3 ♦ as they play Rubensohl). I polled 5 payers and taking into account the system played by NS, they would bid 3 NT. The following comment summaries well why: "First I was thinking to pass and in the next round to double 2 ♥, but then West has a free escape to spades (it is very likely that West has a void in hearts and a 6-card spades). Therefore I bid directly 3NT (not without risk!) and let them find the spade lead."

The next question is what would East lead against 3NT played by North? Here I polled 5 other players. Four of them would start with hearts (3 of them with the 10 and one of them with the K). Of those four, three of them considered starting with spades. They did not choose to do so because it is very likely that there will be a blockage in spades. One of the five polled players leads a small spade (leading a heart is not an option for him).

Depending on the lead, how many tricks the NS will make? If North does not cover the J ♠ with the Q ♠, as long as the Ace has not yet been played (blockage of the spades), NS will always make 4 club, 3 diamond and 2 heart tricks (with a normal line of play considering the level of the players).

So without the infraction (wrong explanation) the contract would have been 3NT = by North.

Now we should also examine if NS contributed to their own damage.

After 2 ♦ by East, South bid 3 ♥ meant as natural hearts and forcing but, according to their convention card, they play Rubensohl after an intervention of the opponents (3 ♥ = transfer

for spades and forcing). Apart from this undeniable mistake, also the bidding afterwards of 4 ♣ by South merits further investigation. Here I polled 6 additional players to find out what they would have done in a similar situation. Four of them would have bid 3 NT (one was considering 4 ♣ and another one was considering 4 ♥), one of them would have bid 4 ♥ (not strong enough for 4 ♣) and the last one would have bid 4 ♣ (3NT and 4 ♥ being options). Consequently, it is only due to the initial mistake (3 ♥) that NS end up in 6 ♠ X.

Taking into account the following elements:

- the class of the players involved;
- the experience of the partnership (they play together on regular basis);
- the fact that Rubensohl is a pretty standard convention which occurs frequently;
- the advice from several players of which one is a Belgian international tournament director and another one a renowned teacher, not only for beginners but also for intermediate and experienced players;
- the advice from two renowned tournament directors, namely on one hand a Chief Tournament Director of the European Bridge League and the World Bridge Federation and on the other hand the president of the Laws Committee of the WBF (both are from the Netherlands),

I conclude that forgetting the Rubensohl convention is an extremely serious error. It is also obvious that forgetting this convention is unrelated to the infraction committed by West.

I should be noted that the ruling for NS would be completely different if South would have bid 3 ♦ in accordance with their system (transfer for hearts and forcing).

## **Decisions**

EW (Phénix 3) gained an advantage from the irregularity (wrong explanation). For their side I award an adjusted score on board 17 of 400 for NS (3 NT = by North) which gives a balance of 0 (= 0 IMP) instead of 1800 (= 18 IMP).

For Phénix 3 the result of the match becomes +12 IMP (56-44) or 12,42 VP

NS (Beerschot 1) contributed to their own damage by an extremely serious error (forgetting a basic partnership agreement). As the entire damage is self-inflicted, the result on the board 17 of 6 ♠ X -6 by North is maintained (1400 for Phénix 3).

For Beerschot 1 the result of the match remains -30 IMP (44-74) or 4,76 VP

Additionally, I give to the pair Georges Jamin – Jean Chabotier (Phénix 3) a 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 15 October 2019.

Robert Ketels  
Tournament Director for the national competition