

Ruling Cercle Perron 7 - Westrand (3 Nat D) of 21 October 2017

Both teams pointed out some irregularities during the match and worded them in the section General Remarks. Neither of them asked for a ruling.

With an eye to future matches, the incidents were important enough to be commented.

Incident 1

Board 27 Z/-

	♠ 4 2	
	♥ J x x x	
	♦ Q x x	
	♣ x x x x	
♠ K x x		♠ A 10 x
♥ Q x x		♥ x x x
♦ J 9 x x		♦ A K 10 x
♣ J x x		♣ K Q x
	♠ Q J 9 x x	
	♥ A K x	
	♦ x x	
	♣ A x x	

Bidding

N	E	S	W
		1♠	P
1NT ^A	Dbl	P	2♦
all pass			

Facts

1 NT^A is explained as 'forcing'.

North leads ♠4 and declarer asks South how many HPs North is supposed to hold with his 1NT bid. Answer is "At least five".

When the board has been played, East points out that North holds only 3 HPs and wants this deviation to be recorded.

North answers "Je fais avec mes cartes ce que je veux et partenaire, vous savez quand-même que je peux avoir 0 points si je suis fitté a piques."

East's reaction: "I don't mind their playing 1NT forcing from 0 HP, but the explanation should be more than just 'forcing'".

EW don't ask for a correction of the result on the board, but point out that with a more complete explanation of 1 NT West might have considered passing on partner's double.

Comment

Law 40C1 says "A player may deviate from his side's announced understandings, provided that his partner has no more reason than the opponents to be aware of the deviation. Repeated deviations lead to implicit understandings which then form part of the partnership's methods and must be disclosed in accordance with the regulations governing disclosure of system." In itself North's deviation is not necessarily an infraction of the law. However, North's reaction saying that his partner knows he can hold 0 HPs, may indicate there is an implicit understanding.

If in NS's system 1NT in the situation above can be bid with 0 HP their **convention card has to be adapted**. It should be realized that incomplete information is considered wrong information.

The deviation of the pair Jacquet (4816) – Goessens (4410) is recorded and may be taken into account in future rulings.

Incident 2

Board 32

West opens 1♣, North passes and East bids 1♥ holding

♠ 10 3 2

♥ J 6 5 3

♦ Q 7 5

♣ 8 6 5

Comment

See Law 40C1 above.

At the moment, there is no reason to believe that the deviation of the system by East is part of an implicit agreement, but **the deviation of the pair Huybrecht (16357) – Huybrecht (28704) is recorded** and may be taken into account in future rulings.

Incident 3

Team A claims that on several occasions Mr Huybrecht (not specified which of the two) bent over to the other side of the screen at his partner's time to play.

This remark is referred to the competition director.

Paul Meerbergen