

## Ruling Squeeze 2 – Phenix 2 (2 Nat B) of 10 January 2015

Board 3 S/EW

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

Remarks

- in the diagram ♠ 4 occurs twice (not important), whereas ♠ 5 is missing
- unlike what Team A wrote on the official document it is EW that are vulnerable, not NS

### Bidding

N	E	S	W
		1♣ <sup>A</sup>	1♦
1♠	1NT	3♠ <sup>A</sup>	P
4♠	all pass		

### Facts

East says South's 3♠ was explained by North as 15-17. South on the other hand explains his bid to South as distributional, non forcing, opening bid with 5<sup>+</sup> cards in Clubs and 4 cards in Spades.

Expecting 15-17 HP at her left handside East does not dare to double.

North said he specified to East that he saw 15 HP with his partner as she would have doubled with 16-17. He claims that in fact she did have 15 distribution points: 12 HP + 3 for singleton Diamonds. He decided to bid 4♠ knowing that they had a 9 cards fit and hoping that his ♦Q would be a useful card.

### Ruling

North and South gave a different explanation of South's 3♠. There is a slight disagreement as to what exactly North said to East. North claims he restricted his initial explanation (15-17) to "I see 15". This was not contradicted by East, so that we can assume this was indeed what North actually said. Even then there were two different explanations.

As NS's convention card cannot prove that North's explanation was correct we have to decide his explanation was wrong (Law 75C "the Director is to presume Mistaken Explanation, rather than Mistaken Call, in the absence of evidence to the contrary), which means an infraction of the law. The question then is whether EW were disadvantaged by that infraction.

East holds 11HP; to play game NS need about 25HP, less if there is considerable distributional strength. NS will certainly not hold 25HP as West bid 1♦ over South's 1♣. Being vulnerable, West may be supposed to have a sound suit, so East can conclude that points are probably about 20-20 or even better for EW. Even if East has the information on South's 3♠ that West received, a double on 4♠ is very risky. Four players (level 1 Nat) were asked what they would do with East's hand if they had received the information on the 3♠ that West got. None of them would have doubled, which makes us conclude that EW were not disadvantaged by NS's infraction.

### **Decision**

**The result reached at the table stands.**

Paul Meerbergen