

Ruling Report National Competition

Division : 1

Date : 14 October 2023

Match : Cercle Perron 2 – Riviera 2

~~Open~~/Closed Room

Players: NS Dennis Dewit – Jens Van Overmeire (Riviera 2)

EW Etienne Delangre – Marc Lebas (Cercle Perron 2)

Board : 10 Dealer : E Vulnerability : All

Bidding

<p>♠ J 6 ♥ K 7 3 ♦ A 10 9 7 6 ♣ K 8 6</p>	<p style="margin: 0;">N W E S</p>	<p>♠ A Q 9 7 ♥ 8 5 4 2 ♦ J ♣ A Q 9 2</p> <p style="margin-top: 20px;">♠ K 8 3 ♥ A Q 10 9 6 ♦ 5 4 3 2 ♣ 10</p> <p style="margin-top: 20px;">♠ 10 5 4 2 ♥ J ♦ K Q 8 ♣ J 7 5 4 3</p>
---	---	---

West	North	East	South
		Pass	Pass
Pass	1 ♣	1 ♠ ^A	2 ♣
2 ♦	3 ♣	3 ♦	Pass
Pass	Pass		

- 1 ♠ Alerted at the NE side of the screen and explained as 5+ card ♥
Not alerted at the SW side of the screen

Playing

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

Result and score :

3 ♦ +1 by W → 130 for EW (C. Perron 2)

Result and score in the other room :

2 ♠ = by N → 110 for NS (C. Perron 2)

Balance : 240 or 6 IMP for Cercle Perron 2

Result of the match with this board

IMP : 13 – 51

Result of the match without this board

IMP : 7 – 51

Orally remarks from team A (Cercle Perron 2)

West forgot the partnership agreement that 1 ♠ promises at least 5 cards in ♥ and so he did not alert his partner's call.

If South would have doubled, West will still bid 2 ♦. If then North would bid 2 ♠, East will still bid 3 ♦. South and West would Pass. In case that North would now bid 3 ♠, all will Pass.

Orally remarks from team B (Riviera 2)

If West would have alerted (+ correct explanation), South will double instead of bidding 2 ♣. On 2 ♦ by West, North will then bid 2 ♠. If East still bids 3 ♦, North might have bid 3 ♠.

Analysis

By accident, I was present at the venue. After the match I was called at the table. This allowed me to determine accurately the facts and ask the relevant questions. Additionally there were players from Honour Division present, which made it easy to organise a poll if needed.

According to Law 20.F.5(a) "mistaken explanation" includes failure to alert as regulations require. If NS are damaged as a consequence of EW's failure to provide disclosure of the meaning of a call, as required by the Laws, then NS are entitled to rectification through the award of an adjusted score (Law 40.B.3(a)).

As South has a singleton hearts, 4 spades, 5 clubs and some points, it seems to me normal to double and not to bid 2 ♣. This was not contested by Team A.

After 2 ♦ by West, it is also normal for North to bid 2 ♠. This was not contested by team A and while polling what the final contract would be, the three interrogate players said "2 ♠" before I could ask the question.

After 3 ♦ by East and Pass by South and West, North doubts between two calls either Pass or 3 ♠. After insistence, North says that he would choose for the 3 ♠ bid. Apparently it is not so obvious to bid 3 ♠, so I organised a poll among three players of Honour Division. Two of them immediately said, that they would bid 3 ♠. One of them, after reflection, said he would Pass.

What will be the result if North has to play 3 ♠? The player of Cercle Perron 2 who played 2 ♠ = in the open room stated that if he had to play 3 ♠, he would have made the contract. The double dummy analysis confirms his statement.

In line with Law 12.C.1(c), I award an assigned weighted adjusted score on board 10:

2/3 of 3 ♠ just made by North (Riviera 2) and 1/3 of 3 ♦ +1 by W (Cercle Perron 2).

Expressed in IMP this is 2/3 of 1 IMP (140-110) for Riviera 2 and 1/3 of 6 IMP (130+110) for Cercle Perron 2 = 1,33 IMP for Cercle Perron 2 or after rounding 1 IMP for Cercle Perron 2.

Decision

As a consequence of West's failure to alert, NS were damaged.

Therefore, I award an assigned weighted adjusted score of +1 IMP for Cercle Perron 2 instead of the gained +6 IMP by Cercle Perron 2.

The result of the match Cercle Perron 2 – Riviera 2 becomes 8 – 51 in IMP or 2,10 – 17,90 in VP.

Both teams can file an appeal against this decision within 7 calendar days. 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 18 October 2023

Robert Ketels

Tournament Director for the national competition