

Ruling Report National Competition

Division : Honour RR1 Date : 05 October 2019

Match : BCOB 1 – BCOB 2 ~~Open~~/Closed Room

Players: NS Frédéric CARPENTIER – Daniel KURGAN (BCOB 2)
EW Valérie LABAERE – Alain LABAERE (BCOB 1)

Board : 9 Dealer : N Vulnerability : EW

Bidding

Board: 9
Dealer: N
Vul.: EW

♠ 65	♣ 84	♠ QJ982
♥ 962		♥ AQ
♦ AT632		♦
♣ A95		♣ KQJ762

N ♠ 2 2
 S ♥ 2 2
 E 2 2 5
 W 2 3 5

♠ KT73
 ♥ J3
 ♦ KQJ97
 ♣ 84

♠ A4
 ♥ KT8754
 ♦ 854
 ♣ T3

10
 8 HCP 15
 7

West	North	East	South
	1NT ^A	2♠ ^A	3♦ ^A
X	3♥	4♣	4♥
PAS	PAS	PAS	

1NT alerted by North to East as 9-11 HCP
 not alerted by South to West

Playing

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

Result and score :

4♥ -2 by N → 100 for EW (BCOB 1)

Result and score in the other room :

5♣ = by E → 600 for EW (BCOB 2)

Balance : 500 for BCOB 2 = + 11 IMP

Result of the match with this board

IMP : 34 – 47

Result of the match without this board

IMP : 34 – 36

Remarks from team A (BCOB 1)

South did not alert 1NT. If I (West) had known that 1NT is weak, I would have bid 5 ♣ which always makes

Remarks from team B (BCOB 2)

- When East bids 2 ♠ (V/NV) and then 4 ♣, the distribution of the points between North and South (15-2, 10-7, etc) is not the most relevant criteria for West to make his decision to bid 5 ♣ or not (he has 2 aces and 3 small hearts against opponents having a heart fit)
- At the beginning of the match, N/S informed E/W of the convention of 1NT 9-11 1st and 2nd position Non Vulnerable; is thus possible that West knew that 1NT was weak + there was a convention card on each side
- There was no reaction at the end of the board. The Tournament Director was called about 2 hours later.

Analysis

According to Law 92.B the time to request a Director's ruling expires 30 minutes after the official score has been made available for inspection.

The score on Board 9 was entered in the Bridgmate at 12.15 Hr. At that moment they still had to play 7 boards. They finished playing at 13.13 Hr. The official score was made available around 13.18 Hr (official time end of the match). The director's ruling was requested at approx. 13.35 Hr. So this was well within the regulatory time limit.

The obligation to alert is absolute. The pre-alert or a convention card does not waive this obligation.

According to Law 27.F.5(a), a "mistaken explanation" also includes failure to alert as regulations require.

If EW are damaged as a consequence of the infraction (South failing to alert) they are entitled to rectification through the award of an adjusted score (Law 40.B.3(a)).

I polled three players of Honour who were not present during the first match. With the correct explanation they would all have bid 5 ♣.

Decision

East/West were damaged as a consequence of South's failure to alert 1NT.

Consequently, in accordance with Law 12.C, I award an adjusted score on board 9 of 5 ♣ = by East (600 for BCOB 1). The balance on board 9 becomes 0 instead of 11 IMP for BCOB 2).

The result of the match BCOB 1 – BCOB 2 becomes 34 – 36 in IMP or 9,39 – 10,61 in VP (instead of respectively 34 – 47 IMP and 7,40 – 12,60 VP).

In line with the relevant regulations, the team BCOB 2 decided to file an appeal against this decision.

Done at Deurne on 05 October 2019.

Robert Ketels
Tournament Director