

Ruling Report National Competition


<u>Division</u>: Honour RR16 <u>Date</u>: 4 December 2021

Match: Squeeze 1 - U.A.E. 1 Open Room

Players: NS Burcu ÜSKÜP – Sylvie CAUWELS (Squeeze 1)

EW Sam BAHBOUT - Robert KHOMIAKOV (U.A.E. 1)

Board: 1 Dealer: N Vulnerability: None <u>Bidding</u>



West	North	East	South	
_	2�	dbl	rdbl	
pass	pass	3♦	pass	
3♥	pass	4	pass	
4 💙	pass	pass	4 🌰	
pass	pass	5	pass	
5 💙	pass	pass	pass	

Playing

Irrelevant

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

Result and score:

5 \heartsuit -2 by W \rightarrow +100 for NS (Squeeze 1)

Result and score in the other room:

5 ♠! **-2** by E → +300 for NS (U.A.E. 1)

Balance: 200 for U.A.E. 1 = +5 IMP

Result of the match with this board

IMP: 25 - 31

Result of the match without this board

IMP: 25 - 31

Remarks from team A (BBC 1)

After the multi $2 \diamondsuit$, South redoubled which was explained as bid your major. However, on the other side North explained it as willing to play $2 \diamondsuit$!!

Remarks from team B (U.A.E. 1)

Same. We feel might be damaged, but don't know where and how.

Analysis

NS are cold for $4 \spadesuit$, which they bid at some point. EW took the save in $5 \spadesuit$, but west "corrected" to $5 \heartsuit$. NS didn't double, the contract went (only) two down.

Decision

NS have no proof of their systemic agreements. In the printed system notes from north, nothing was written, neither in the phone of south; she claims she has something written in her notes at home. That is not sufficient enough proof.

Wrong explanation at (at least) one side of the screen. No direct damage, score stands.

Done at l'Orée, Sint-Pieters-Woluwe on 4 December 2021 at 17.000 Hr Marc van Beijsterveldt Tournament Director