

# Ruling Report National Competition

Division : III D

Date : 19 October 2019

Match : Westrand 1 – Fayenbois 1

~~Open~~/Closed Room

Players: NS Christian Wynen – Regis Massange (Fayenbois 1)

EW Tom Wouters – Emile Huybrecht (Westrand 1)

Board : 25 Dealer : N Vulnerability : EW

Bidding

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

West	North	East	South
	PAS	1 ♣	2 ♦ <sup>A</sup>
X	2 ♠	PAS	3 ♦
X	PAS	PAS	PAS

2 ♦ is explained by North to East as “♥ + ♠”  
by South to West as “♦ + ♥”

## 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 :

3 ♦ X -1 by S → 100 for EW (Westrand 1)

Result and score in the other room :

??? → 130 for EW (Fayenbois 1)

Balance : 30 for Fayenbois 1 = + 1 IMP

Result of the match with this board

IMP : 91 – 37

Result of the match without this board

IMP : 91 – 36

### **Remarks from team A (Westrand 1)**

- South explains his 2 diamonds to West as "bi-color avec les 2 couleurs rouges". North explains this 2 diamonds to East as "bi-color avec les 2 majeurs".
- Due to this different explanation, East-West are not playing the same defence. The first Dbl from West is interpreted the same way: "show value". However, the Second Dbl is for West still take-out while for East this can only be penalty-Dbl.
- If East would have received the same explanation as West, being "bi-color avec les 2 couleurs rouges", then East would have known that the 2nd Double was not penalty but still take-out. East would then have bid 5 clubs immediately, instead of the given pass.
- The contract of 5 clubs would also be made due to the bidding: draw trump and play expass in spades.
- for East-West, this means an importance score-difference: +600 instead of the given +100

*[Based on those remarks it is obvious that EW think that the bidding from South is correct and the explanation given by North is wrong.]*

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

*[No remarks/comments from Fayenbois? So they agree entirely with the point of view of Westrand? Easy for the Tournament Director : adjusted score of 5 ♣ = for EW]*

*At my request I received the following input from Fayenbois*

- *Where can one find this bidding sequence on the convention card? On the convention card it says "JUMP OVERCALLS (Style; Responses; Unusual NT) : Natural, weak, 6/10 good hand till opening vul vs non vul"*  
Jump overcall is a 6-card Major overcall on 1C or 1D and 2S over 1H, cue-bids are unprecise Michael's cue-bids, but precise on 1C opening
- *If North was convinced that his explanation "both majors" was correct*
  - *what does 3 diamonds means as a response after 2 spades*  
Normally it means forcing I think
  - *why did North pass after 3 diamonds with a 5 card spades?*  
If the contract had not been doubled I would have bid 3 Spades. But 3D was doubled, so I had no reason to bid 3 Spades, my partner had still the possibility to rectify. My pass shows the weakness of the hand.
  - *If North realised after the 3 diamonds bid of his partner that he has forgotten the partnership agreement and consequently gave the wrong explanation, why did he not correct his explanation at that time?*  
He asked me what meant 3D, I answered : no idea may be forcing or wrong bid.
- *If South was convinced that his bidding was correct (in accordance with the partnership agreement)*
  - *what does 2 spades mean as a response after 2 diamonds (I suppose natural 6+ card and single or void in hearts and diamonds? ; a hand like 7 spades, 1 heart, 1 diamond, 4 clubs)?*  
Yes you're right I think
  - *why did South bid 3 diamonds while having a 2-card spades support?*  
Because he had a nice strong D-suit AKQJX

➤ *What is the partnership agreement?*

*After an opening of 1 club by right hand opponent, please provide in detail the meaning of the following bids : 2 clubs, 2 diamonds, 2 hearts, 2 spades and 2 NT*

2Clubs D+S    2D H+S    2H/S natural weak 6-card    and 2NT D+H 2suiter

## Analysis

### 1. Preliminary remarks

- a. It seems that NS are playing a convention they call Michaels cue bid precise (after 1C opening) and unprecise (after 1 D opening). Well this convention does not exist!
  - (1) If you play the Michaels cue bid convention then:
    - Over an opponent's minor opening, a **cuebid** shows both majors.
    - Over an opponent's major opening, a **cuebid** shows the other major and a minor suit.
  - (2) If you play the Michaels precise convention, which is a modification of Michaels cue bid, then:
    - Over an opponent's minor opening, 2 ♦ (which is not a cue bid after 1 ♣!) shows both majors and 2NT shows the two lowest colours.
    - Over an opponent's major opening, a **cuebid** shows the other major and clubs, 3 ♣ shows the other major and diamonds and 2NT shows both minors.
  - (3) If you play Michaels unprecise, then after an opponent's major opening, a **cuebid** shows the other major and a minor (3 ♣ is then natural pre-emptive). After a minor opening, there is no difference between precise and unprecise.
  - (4) Following the input given by Feyenbois, one can only conclude that NS play a further modification of Michaels (un)precise.
- b. On their convention card NS have put this convention in the section "Direct and Jump cue bids". I really hope that NS do know what is a **cue bid** because many parts of this convention are simply not cue bids.
- c. Furthermore on their convention card they only mentioned "Michaels cue-bid unprecise" without any further explication. Not only is this wrong and misleading but also incomplete. According to the (WBF) guide for completion of the convention card, you should **avoid using "names"** (of inventors, authors, ...) to describe a convention or treatment as they have varying definitions. If you do use one, **always** add **your** interpretation of the particular gadget. Don't forget to include range and shape, and follow-ups.

### 2. Ruling

- a. Based on what is generally understood under "Michaels (un)precise" and on what NS say their system is, it is clear that the meaning of 2 ♦ = "♥ + ♠" (mistaken call by South).
- b. The partnership agreement has been correctly explained by North to East. Consequently there is no infraction at the North/East side of the screen. Regardless of damage, looking at this fact only, the result must stand (law 75.C).
- c. But what happened at the South/West side of the screen. Although West did receive the correct description of the south hand, the explanation given by South to West is different from the partnership agreement. This is an infraction of Law and if this results in damage for EW then they are entitled to rectification through the award of an adjusted score (Law 75.B.1 and 40.B.3).

- d. In order to find out what West would have bid with the correct explanation ( $2\spadesuit = \heartsuit + \spadesuit$ ), I polled 5 players (all 3<sup>rd</sup> National Div) taking into account the system played by EW :  
PAS = nothing special to report;  
X = forcing for 1 round, shows 10+ HCP without Info about the distribution;  
2NT and 3NT = to play and not forcing (promises stoppers in both majors);  
Others bids = natural.

(1) Two of the West players would bid 2NT.

Now I polled 5 other players (all 3<sup>rd</sup> National Div) to find out what North would have bid after 2NT (being convinced that his partner South has  $\heartsuit + \spadesuit$ )

(a) Two of the North players would bid directly  $4\spadesuit$  (*most probably EW will end up in game (vulnerable) and  $4\spadesuit X$  (not vulnerable) will hopefully not be defeated by more than 3 tricks*).

After PAS by East and South, West will double and thereafter all will PAS. This contract will normally be defeated by 4 tricks for a score of 800 for EW.

(b) Two of the North players would PAS (*It is not sure that EW will end up in game, so there is no reason right now to bid  $4\spadesuit$ . However if they end up in game, then I (North) will bid  $4\spadesuit$* ).

Now East with his two additional stoppers in the majors and his nice 13 HCP will raise to 3 NT. After PAS by South and West, North will bid  $4\spadesuit$  which will be doubled by West. This leads again to a score of 800 for EW.

(c) One of the North players would bid  $3\clubsuit$  (cue bid) (*gives the opportunity to my partner (South) to better describe his hand and if East bids, I still have the opportunity to bid 3 or 4 spades*).

It is unclear what will now be the outcome of the board. Possibilities are:  $4\spadesuit X$  (-4),  $3\heartsuit X$  (-1),  $4\clubsuit$  (=) or  $5\clubsuit$  (-1).

As the explanation is correct,  $5\clubsuit$  will not be made (as Westrand claims) because East will assume that the  $Q\spadesuit$  is in South.

(2) One of the West players would bid immediately 3 NT (*let us make it easy for partner as he does not know I have Axx in clubs, he also might have some values in hearts and who knows we might have 9 tricks from top*).

Now all polled North players would bid  $4\spadesuit$ . This leads again to a score of 800 for EW.

(3) One of the West players would double (*difficult choice as 2NT is a valid option*). Now we get in the bidding sequence of the table. All depends on what West might bid in the second round ( $4\clubsuit$ , PAS, X, 3NT, ???) and on what will be North's and East's responses.

The possible outcomes of the board are :  $4\spadesuit X$  (-4),  $3\heartsuit X$  (-1),  $4\clubsuit$  (=) or  $5\clubsuit$  (-1).

(4) One of the West players would PAS (*first I was thinking to bid 3 NT [not without risk], but I prefer to play  $2\heartsuit$  or  $2\spadesuit$  for -2 or -3*).

Probably North will bid  $2\spadesuit$ , PAS by East,  $3\heartsuit$  (?) by South. Again all depends on what West might bid in the second round ( $4\clubsuit$ , PAS, X, 3NT, ???) and on what will be North's and East's responses.

The possible outcomes of the board are :  $4\spadesuit X$  (-4),  $3\heartsuit X$  (-1),  $4\clubsuit$  (=) or  $5\clubsuit$  (-1).

- e. Based on the analysis above, my conclusion is that if West would have received the correct explanation the outcome of the board would have been (Law 12.C.1(c))  
75% of 4♠ X (-4) → 800 for EW. This gives a balance of 670 or 12 IMP for Westrand  
10% of 5♣ (-1) → 100 for NS. This gives a balance of 230 or 6 IMP for Fayenbois  
10% of 4♣ (=) → 130 for EW. This gives a balance of 0 IMP.  
5% of 3♦ X (-1) → 100 for EW. This gives a balance of 30 or 1 IMP for Fayenbois  
The result on board 25 :  $12 \times 0,75 - 6 \times 0,1 + 0 \times 0,1 - 1 \times 0,05 = 8,35$  IMP for Westrand.

### **Decision**

East/West were damaged as a consequence of the mistaken explanation by South. Consequently, in accordance with Law 12.C, I award an weighted adjusted score on board 25 of 8 IMP for Westrand 1 (instead of 1 IMP for Fayenbois).

The result of the match Westrand 1 – Fayenbois 1 becomes 99 – 36 in IMP or 18,61 – 1,39 in VP (instead of respectively 91 – 37 IMP and 17,87 – 2,13 VP).

Additionally, I give to the pair Christian Wynen – Regis Massange two warnings. One for the insufficient knowledge of their own system and one for the incomplete and poorly filled in convention card.

Finally, I strongly recommend the pair Christian Wynen – Regis Massange to update their convention card (column “subsequent action, full description of conventions, using the right sections, ...) before 06 November 2019 and this conform the WBF guide.

<http://www.worldbridge.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Guidetocompletion.pdf>

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 30 October 2019.

Robert Ketels  
Tournament Director for the national competition