

# Ruling Report National Competition

Division : II A

Date : 14 October 2023

Match : Sandeman 2 – BBC 5

~~Open~~/Closed Room

Players: NS Amélie Gobbe – Martine Berben (BBC 5)

EW Antoine De Wispelaere – Ivan Van De Steene (Sandeman 2)

Board : 29 Dealer : N Vulnerability : All

Bidding

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

West	North	East	South
	1 ♣	3 ♣ <sup>A</sup>	3 ♥
X	4 ♣	Pass	Pass
Pass			

3 ♣ Explained by East to North as ♠ and ♦  
Explained by West to South as ♥ and ♦

## 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 ♣ = by N → 130 for NS (BBC 5)

Result and score in the other room :

5 ♥ -4 by S → 400 for EW (BBC 5) \*

Balance : 530 or 11 IMP for BBC 5 \*

Result of the match with this board \*

IMP : 20 – 91

Result of the match without this board \*

IMP : 20 – 80

\* = pending a request for ruling in the open room on the same board

## Remarks from team A (Sandeman 2)

NIHIL

## Remarks from team B (BBC 5)

3 ♣ explained by East to North as ♠ and ♦ and by West to South as ♥ and ♦. No explanations on system card.

We regret to have been misinformed and regret not to have found 3 NT.

## Analysis

The correct meaning of 3 ♣ is shown on the convention card: "Adopted Ghestem-bid: cuebid = 2 highest, 2NT 2 lowest, 3♣ others". Consequently, the partnership agreement has been explained correctly by East but not by West.

If NS are damaged as a consequence of West'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 NS "regretted not to have found 3 NT", I asked them how they would find 3 NT if West would have provided the correct explanation. North provided the following answer:

*I thought for a long time before making the bid of 4 ♣, after asking East the meaning of the double of 3 ♥ because my desire was to play 3NT with 8 tricks in clubs. East told me that the double was punitive. I therefore felt that West's heart colour was unsafe to find my 9th trick and keep control as a result.*

*Without this double (which I suppose shows a nice fit of heart in front of a partner who he believes has hearts...) I would have considered showing a spade piece (Q6) with the hope of playing 3NT if South can help me with spades and diamonds.*

As all the explanations by East were correct, there was no infraction on that side of the screen. The reasoning of North is based on North's supposition that West would probably not have doubled, had he known that his partner has ♠ and ♦. If I follow this reasoning, then one could say that the double was a mistaken call. When the partnership agreement has been explained correctly (X = punitive), the mistake being the call made and not the explanation, there is no infraction. Regardless of damage, the result stands (law 75 C).

Although NS said nothing about the bidding of South, who got the wrong explanation, I asked myself what South would have done with the correct explanation. According to NS's convention card 3 ♥ is now a cue bid, forcing for 1 round and usually with fit. With the correct explanation West, with a nice 6-card hearts, would still have bid 3 ♥ which is natural and forcing for 1 round. So, the mistaken explanation did not affect South's bidding.

## **Decision**

The mistaken explanation by West is an infraction of Law 75.B.1. As a consequence of this infraction, NS were not damaged and so they are not entitled to rectification through the award of an adjusted score.

The result on board 29 in the closed room is maintained.

The result of the match Sandeman 2 – BBC 5 remains 20 – 91 in IMP or 0,82 – 19,18 in VP, pending a request for ruling in the open room on the same board.

I would like to thank both teams for filling in accurately the ruling request form. This really makes it a lot easier for the Tournament Director who is not present at the table.

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 20 October 2023

Robert Ketels

Tournament Director for the national competition