



Royal Belgian
Bridge Federation

Ruling Report National Competition

Division : I

Date : 19 November 2022

Match : Sandeman 1 – Cercle Perron 3

Open/~~Closed~~ Room

Players: NS Tom Cornelis – Alain Hoogstoel (Sandeman 1)

EW Jean-Louis Swalué – Philippe Yans (Cercle Perron 3)

Board : 15 Dealer : S Vulnerability : NS

Bidding

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

West	North	East	South
			1 ♥
Pass	4 ♣ ^A	X	4 ♥
Pass	4 NT	5 ♠	5 NT ^A
Pass	6 ♥	Pass	Pass
6 ♠	X	Pass	Pass
Pass			

5 NT explained by North to East as an odd number of key cards and a void (statement by N) or as 2 key cards and a void (statement by E)

5 NT explained by South to West as 2 key cards (statement by South) or as 0 or 2 key cards (statement by West)

Playing

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

Result and score :

6 ♠ X -3 by E → 500 for NS (Sandeman 1)

Result and score in the other room :

5 ♥ = by S → 650 for NS (Cercle Perron 3)

Balance : 150 for Cercle Perron 3 = +4 IMP

Result of the match with this board

IMP : 18 – 19

Result of the match without this board

IMP : 18 – 15

Remarks from team A (Sandeman 1)

[Remark: this was not filled in on the ruling request form, but provided on Sunday 20/11/22 because it was already late and the players still had a long drive home (+/- 2 hours)].

I have looked at the facts as presented by NS and would first like to point out that the explanations were indeed different on both sides of the screen, but that they were not the explanations given at the table.

On the side of North and East (I was North), when asked about the 5NT, I explained it as an odd number of key-cards with a void. I did this in French, so the "im" in impair might not have been heard by my screen mate.

Before the lead, East asked confirmation of the explanation by asking (in French) whether it was an even number of key-cards with a void, and I corrected him, saying I said it was an odd number of key-cards with a void (still in French).

At the other side of the screen (SW) 5NT was explained as 2 key-cards, not 0 or 2 as indicated on the ruling request form.

It was clear that after the board either me or my partner gave the wrong explanation, so I said to the opponents that our agreement after intervention over RKCB was on the convention card. It mentions DEPO when opponents intervene above 5 in the trump suit. South forgot that and thought we were playing D0PI/R0PI.

So when the tray came back with 5NT, I thought my partner must have a void, because he didn't double or pass. Hands with voids are the only hands that are allowed to go beyond the normal steps (without voids). Our agreement with voids is part of the answers to RKCB (as many partnerships have), but is not mentioned on the convention card. I refer you to page 14 of our system book where the steps with voids are outlined.

Remarks from team B (Cercle Perron 3)

Explications différentes des adversaires sur 4SA demande de clés.

Nord a dit à Est 5SA = 2 clés et une chicane. Sud a dit à Ouest 5SA = 0 ou 2 clés.

Conséquence Est ne contre pas avec 2 As et Ouest défend à 6 piques.

Analysis

Once more there is a difference between what one side claims they have given as an explanation and what the other side claims they have received as an explanation.

According to the screen regulations, questions and answers **must** be formulated in writing.

As neither side did this, it is impossible for me to determine the facts to my satisfaction. If there were no other elements I should rule in accordance with Law 85.B and assign a split score whereby each pair gets an unfavourable score.

Fortunately, it is not the number of key cards that is relevant in this case but the whether or not presence of a void in the South hand. On this specific point both teams agree: North said that his partner had a void which he did not have.

Is there a mistaken explanation or a mistaken call?

According to the convention card and the system book of NS, they play DEPO after an intervention (5 ♠) over RKCB (4NT) above 5 in trump (♥). A Double shows an Even number of key cards and Pass shows an Odd number of key cards. This means that the call (5NT) by South was wrong. With two key cards and no void he should have doubled.

What is the meaning of 5NT in this bidding sequence? According to the system book of NS (not mentioned on the convention card) every bid above the 'normal' answers on RCKB (in this case DEPO) shows a void. The first possible higher bid (5NT) shows an odd number of key cards and a void and the following higher bid (6 ♣) would have shown an even number of key cards and a void. This means that the explanation given by North to East was correct and that the call by South was mistaken.

Although West did receive the correct description of the South hand, it also means that the explanation given by South to West was wrong. However, this did not influence the bidding of West.

The partnership agreement has been explained correctly to East who needed to make the decision whether to double or to Pass. As the mistake is the call made and not the explanation, there is no infraction. Regardless of damage, the result stands (Law 75.C).

Decision

The result on board 15 is maintained

The result of the match Sandeman 1 – Cercle Perron 3 remains 18 – 19 in IMP or 9,72 – 10,28 in VP.

Both teams can file an appeal against this decision. Please refer to the new regulations for the treatment of an appeal, which can be consulted on the website of the RBBF.

Done at Ruisbroek (Puurs-Sint-Amands) on 23 November 2022

Robert Ketels

Tournament Director for the national competition