

# Ruling Report National Competition

Division : 1

Date : 21 October 2023

Match : Cercle Perron 4 – Sandeman 1

~~Open~~/Closed Room

Players: NS Yulian Hristov – Anne-Marie Hardeman (Sandeman 1)

EW Romain Monticelli – Thomas Monticelli (Cercle Perron 4)

Board : 17 Dealer : N Vulnerability : None

Bidding

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

West	North	East	South
	1 NT <sup>A</sup>	Pass	Pass
<b>X</b> <sup>A</sup>	Pass	Pass <sup>A</sup>	2 ♣ <sup>A</sup>
Pass	Pass	2 ♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

1NT (North) = 11-13 balanced ; **X** (West) = 14+ ; Pass (East) = willing to play 1NT X ;  
Pass (West) = giving East the opportunity to double for penalty

- 2 ♣ Explained by South to West as ♣ and another suit  
Explained by North to East 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 :

2 ♠ -1 by E → 50 for NS (Sandeman 1)

Result and score in the other room :

3 ♦ +1 by W → 130 for EW (Sandeman 1)

Balance : 180 or 5 IMP for Sandeman 1

Result of the match with this board

IMP : 36 – 41

Result of the match without this board

IMP : 36 – 36

### **Remarks from team A (Cercle Perron 4)**

2 ♣ was explained by North to East as both minors and by South to West as clubs and another suit.

West passed so that East can double for penalty

East does not want to play 2 clubs doubled and as he was told that South had minors he said 2 spades and not 2 diamonds.

### **Remarks from team B (Sandeman 1)**

The remark of team A is correct. South forgot for a moment the partnership agreements. It is not certain that East is going to choose 2 diamonds even if he knows that 2 clubs by South means clubs plus something else (also possible diamonds).

### **Analysis**

At my request, the team Sandeman 1 provided me a copy of their system book, wherein the following is mentioned.

- After a double of the 2<sup>nd</sup> hand after a weak NT then a bid at the 2 level promises at least a 4-card in that suit + another higher suit (DONT)
- After a double of the 4<sup>th</sup> hand after a weak NT and a Pass by opener, then 2 clubs promises both minors.

From the above, as it was a double from the 4<sup>th</sup> hand, it is clear that the partnership agreement was explained correctly by North but not by South.

From East's point of view, when the partnership agreement has been explained correctly, the mistake being the call made and not the explanation, there is no infraction. Regardless of damage, the result stands (law 75 C).

From West's point of view the situation is different. Although he got the correct description of the South hand, he did not receive the explanation in accordance with the partnership agreement and therefore there is an infraction at the SW side of the screen (Law 75.B.1). If EW are damaged as a consequence of South's failure to provide disclosure of the meaning of a call, as required by the Laws, then EW are entitled to rectification through the award of an adjusted score (Law 40.B.3(a)).

I have asked West what he would have done with the correct explanation (2 ♣ = ♣ + ♦). West confirmed that he would still have passed, hoping that East doubles 2 ♣ for penalty and if the opponents then bid 2 ♦ he doubles for penalty.

### **Decision**

North explained correctly the partnership agreement. South made a mistaken call. Therefore there is no infraction at the NE side of the screen. At the SW side of the screen, the mistaken explanation by South is an infraction of Law 75.B.1. EW were not damaged as a consequence of this infraction and so they are not entitled to rectification through the award of an adjusted score.

The result on board 17 in the closed room is maintained.

The result of the match Cercle Perron 4 – Sandeman 1 remains 36 – 41 in IMP or 8,66 – 11,34 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 29 October 2023

Robert Ketels

Tournament Director for the national competition