Ruling Perron 3 – Riviera 1 (1 Nat) of 10 January 2015

```
Board 14 E/-
              ♠ X X
              ♥ A K J 10 9 x
              ♦ x
              ♣ A K 9 x
♦ 10 x x x x
                            \triangle AJ x
♥ x
                            \forall x x x x
♦ J x x
                            ♦ KQxx
♣ 8 x x x
                            ♣ J 10
              ∧ K Q x
              ♥ Q x
              ♦ A 10 x x x
              ♣ Q x x
Bidding
N
                     W
       Ε
              S
       1NT
              Dbl
                     2v
Dbl
       Rdbl P
                     2
       P
              5*
                     P
4.
       all pass
5♥
```

Facts

East's redouble is explained by West to South as fit in Spades and a stopper in Hearts. East explains his bid to North as fit in Spades without a stopper in Hearts. On North's 5♥ South does not bid 6♥ as he knows NS miss the Ace of Spades and that they will lose a trick in Hearts as he had been told by West that East had a stopper in Hearts. South alleges he would have bid 6♥ if he had known East did not have a stopper.

When the board had been played, West admitted his explanation was wrong.

Ruling

West's wrong information of East's redouble is an infraction of the law. The question is whether NS have been disadvantaged by this infraction.

Four players that were consulted would have passed after North's $5 \, \mathbf{v}$; in their view South had no reason to raise to $6 \, \mathbf{v}$ and the fact whether East did or did not hold a stopper in Hearts was of no importance in this matter.

Decision

There was an infraction by EW, but NS were not disadvantaged by this infraction.

The result reached at the table stands.

Paul Meerbergen