

Ruling Report National Competition

Division : II A

Date : 16 November 2019

Match : Cercle Perron 4 – Genk 2

Open/~~Closed~~ Room

Players: NS Alain Jacquet – Peter Roell (Cercle Perron 4)

EW Hans Exelmans – Arsène Maex (Genk 2)

Board : 26 Dealer : E Vulnerability : ALL

Bidding

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

West	North	East	South
		1 ♣	2 ♦ ^A
X	2 ♥	2 ♠	PAS
3 ♦	PAS	3 ♥	PAS
4 ♦	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		♥ 3					
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							

Result and score :

4 ♦ -1 by W → 100 for NS (Perron 4)

Result and score in the other room :

3NT +1 by ?? → 630 for EW (Perron 4)

Balance : 730 for Perron 4 = + 12 IMP

Result of the match with this board

IMP : 77 – 53

Result of the match without this board

IMP : 65 – 53

Remarks from team A (Cercle Perron 4)

2 ♦ alerté en Nord bicolore rouge, ce qui est écrit sur la feuille de système.

Sur 2 ♦ North bids 2 ♥ East 2 ♠ puis sur 3 ♦ (cue bid ?) 3 ♥ non alerté puis 4 ♦ et all pass.

Ouest dit pas 3SA sur 3 ♥ et donc Est passe sur un cue bid !

Remarks from team B (Genk 2)

2 ♦ alerté : les deux majeurs à mon côté (W) (correct), à l'autre côté carreaux et cœurs

Pour mon partenaire Est 3 ♦ demande arrêt ♦. Il dit 3 ♥ = pas d'arrêt ♦.

Pour moi 3 ♥ = pas d'arrêt ♥, donc je répète les ♦ parce que je n'ai d'arrêt ♥.

Analysis

1. It was only after several e-mails that it became clear to me what was the meaning of the remarks and also why a ruling was requested.

2. Cercle Perron claims that the convention they play after a 1 ♣ opening by opponents can be found on their convention card. There one can find the following:

- Interventions (Style: Réponses: level 1 or 2 ; Reopenings)
Level 2 : 6 cards weak (5..) or two suiter
- Interventions with jump (Style; Responses; Unusual NT)
Weak or asks stoppers if opener suit . Two suiter at level 2 : cue bid highest + another 2 NT two cheapest
- In Annex 2 of the convention card:
On opps strong club
 - Dbl. = 16-18 balanced
 - 1 ♦ = ♥ and ♣
 - 1 ♥ = ♠ and ♦
 - 1 ♠ = ♥
 - 1NT = ♠
 - 2 ♣ = both minors
 - 2 ♦ = both reds
 - 2 ♥ = both majors
 - 2 ♠ = 4+ ♠ + 5 ♣
 - 2NT = both minors at least 5.5 13+h
 - 3minor = long minor

As what is mentioned on the convention card (+Annex) is anything but clear, I 've requested some clarifications. From the response it appears that after a normal club opening (not necessarily strong) they also play what is mentioned in Annex 2 with one difference : **X** after a normal club is not 16-18 balanced but just for take-out.

In their response they also highlighted that this special convention is clearly explained before each session.

3. Based on the above, it is clear what the partnership agreement is namely 2 ♦ = “♦ + ♥”
Consequently, North's explanation was correct and South's bidding erroneous.

4. The partnership agreement has been correctly explained by North to East. So 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).

5. 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).
6. In order to find out what West would have bid with the correct explanation ($2\spadesuit = \spadesuit + \heartsuit$), I polled 3 players (all 2nd National Div) taking into account the system played by EW :
 $X =$ either the 2 other colours (\spadesuit and \clubsuit) and not forcing, or any distribution and game forcing ; $2\spadesuit/\heartsuit =$ classical cue bid ; other bids = natural.
All of them would PAS with the West hand. The following comment summaries well why: "I have only 2 spades and 2 clubs, I am not strong enough to double (game forcing) or to bid $2\heartsuit$ and although we have a lot of points it doesn't seem we have a makeable contract. So if partner remains silent, I prefer to defeat their $2\spadesuit/\heartsuit$ ".
7. As the situation for North is now somewhat different (pass by West instead of double), I have polled 4 players (all 2nd National Div). Two of them would pass and two of them would bid $2\heartsuit$.
This means that either $2\spadesuit$ by South or $2\heartsuit$ by North will become the final contract.
8. According to the double dummy analysis $2\spadesuit$ will be defeated by 5 tricks and $2\heartsuit$ by 3 tricks.
In order to check if this is realistic, I have polled three players of honour division.
- a. Contract $2\spadesuit$ by South
The easiest way is to count the tricks from West's point of view. He has so many trumps that NS will only make those tricks that West can't ruff.
This means 1 club, 1 diamond, 1 spade (if South makes the correct choice) and 1 heart if West can't discard a heart on East's spades.
The discard of a heart is automatic with any normal line of play.
For example : lead clubs, clubs back (not the best line but acceptable), clubs ruffed, A and K of diamonds. Even if West plays hearts, East will now always play spades followed by spades. East has still a high heart to cash his high spade on which West can discard a heart. So South will not make a heart trick.
Conclusion : $2\spadesuit -5$ is a realistic result.
- b. Contract $2\heartsuit$ by North
Here the situation is more complex.
With a perfect defence, which is very difficult to find at the table, the contract goes 3 down. With a natural, but not that good defence, the contract will only be 1 down.
With a good defence, although not that easy to find, the contract will be 2 down.
Conclusion : $2\heartsuit -2$ is a realistic result.
9. 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))
50% of $2\spadesuit -5 \rightarrow 500$ for EW. This gives a balance of 130 or 4 IMP for Cercle Perron
50% of $2\heartsuit -2 \rightarrow 200$ for EW. This gives a balance of 430 or 10 IMP for Cercle Perron
The result on board 26 : $4 \times 0,50 + 10 \times 0,50 = 7$ IMP for Cercle Perron.

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 26 of 7 IMP for Cercle Perron 4 (instead of 12 IMP for Cercle Perron 4).

The result of the match Cercle Perron 4 – Genk 2 becomes 72 – 53 in IMP or 13,62 – 6,38 in VP (instead of respectively 77 – 53 IMP and 14,39 – 5,61 VP).

Additionally, I give to the pair Alain Jacquet – Peter Roell two warnings. One for the insufficient knowledge of their own system and one for the unclear and erroneous convention card (mix-up between different sections and no reference to the annex).

Finally, I invite the pair Alain Jacquet – Peter Roell to correct their convention card before 05 December 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 28 November 2019.

Robert Ketels
Tournament Director for the national competition