

Ruling Knokke 1 - UAE 2 (3 Nat C) of 30 September 2017

Board 32 W/EW

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

Bidding

N	E	S	W
		P	
P	1♣	P	P
1NT	P	2♣ ^A	P
2♠	P	4♠	all pass

Facts

Contract 4♠ by North, result -1.

Team A complained about West's opening bid of 1♣, holding 4 Diamonds and 2 Clubs, whereas EW's convention card says they open 1♦ with a four card.

Team B's statement: "We practically always open 1♣, unless we hold a singleton. I led ♣Q; as we don't play Rusinov, declarer knows that ♣K must be on his right. Ducking ♣Q and later finesse on the ♣K would have been enough to win the contract."

Note: apparently ♣Q and ♣K were switches either in the statement or in the diagram.

Ruling

Apparently the convention card of EW Gilles-De Bodt does not correspond to what they actually play; "nous ouvrons pratiquement toujours d'un Trèfle, sauf avec singleton", whereas their convention card says that 1♦ is opened when holding a four card ♦. Therefore, we have to conclude that NS were given the wrong (incomplete) information.

However, NS do not state in what way they were disadvantaged as a result of the infraction.

Decision

The result reached at the table stands.

The pair Gilles-De Bodt are urgently requested to clarify their opening bids in their convention card.

Paul Meerbergen

