



DIRECTORS' BULLETIN

Bulletin of the Australian Bridge Directors' Association

Issue No. 52 - June 2017

Editor: Jan Peach
42 Tait Street, Kelvin Grove, 4059.
janpeach8@bigpond.com
07 3352 6929 0487 466 109

Printpost approved PP 424022/00144

Important Changes 2017 Laws	2	Judgement Rulings (1)	16
Detailed Changes 2017 Laws	3	Judgement Rulings (2)	23

AUSTRALIAN BRIDGE DIRECTORS' ASSOCIATION

abda@abf.com.au

President: Sean Mullamphy
Vice President: Jonathan Free

Webmaster: Peter Busch
peter@altosoft.com.au

Secretary & Treasurer: Matt Raj Mal
PO Box 9457 DEAKIN ACT 2600
mdrajmal@gmail.com

Please forward cheques to the Treasurer not to the Editor

2017 Laws of Duplicate Bridge - Editor

Australia starts to use the 2017 Laws on 1st August. There is much to like in the most recent revision. Many passages are presented more clearly without changing the essential meaning. Some laws have moved. Several laws will require directors to seriously rethink their rulings and there are many with subtle changes. Some changes will not be universally popular and some will take time for directors to settle into the best ways to apply them. The overall result is good.

Important Changes to the Laws – A Very Quick Look

Ton Kooijman - Laurie Kelso

When a player has given wrong information about a partnership agreement and becomes aware of it during the auction, he is no longer obliged to rectify it immediately, but may wait till the auction is completed.

We have introduced the concept of a ‘comparable call’. If a player replaces his illegal call with a comparable call, then the consequences will be less severe than in the present laws. We embarked upon this approach with insufficient bids in 2007 and have now extended it to calls out of rotation. An important benefit of this is that in most cases partner is no longer silenced for the entire auction, which in turn removes the need to select a unilateral (gambling) final action. This also will reduce the frequency of when a lead penalty applies and we have taken this opportunity to also make Law 26 less complicated.

The number of instances within the laws where a Regulating Authority is presented with an option to vary the default position has been reduced in an effort to ensure greater global uniformity in the way the Laws are applied. One example of this is that defenders will now be permitted to ask one another about a possible revoke, irrespective of which Regulating Authority’s auspices the event is being held under. Another is that the option to award split (rather than weighted) assigned adjusted scores has been removed.

All the Regulating Authority options are now presented such that the default position is that used in WBF events.

Dummy will now be permitted to prevent any player (previously it was just declarer) from committing an irregularity.

When a player has a penalty card, information related to that card is authorized for his partner as long as that card stays on the table. It becomes unauthorized when that card is played or taken back into the hand.

When both sides have revoked on the same trick and only one side has played to the next trick; both revokes must now be corrected.

When a player claims/concedes, both sides (all four players) may now agree to continue play, rather than summon the Director. If they do however agree to play on, then the table result will stand.

When a player makes a claim or concession, that player is now required to face his hand.

When there is a scoring error discovered after the correction period, that error may still be corrected, but only when the Director is satisfied beyond all reasonable doubt that a mistake has been made. To make this type of (late) correction, the Director will need the permission of the Tournament Organizer (but the involvement of the Regulating Authority is no longer required).

Australian Bridge Directors Association Seminar

Please be advised that the ABDA will be holding their 2017 workshop/seminar in Sydney

Saturday 5th August (10 am - 4.30 pm) to Sunday 6th August (9 am - 3:30 pm).

Venue is North Shore Bridge Club, at Club Willoughby 26 Crabbes Avenue, Willoughby NSW 2068.

- Major highlight will be new “2017 Laws of Duplicate Bridge” to be applied from 1st August
 - There is a new law “comparable” call, what does it mean?
- Handling common director calls
- Common misconceptions
- Unauthorized Information, misbids and misinformation
- Unintended calls
- Insufficient bids

Cost is \$55 for 2 days (includes lunch).

If you were a financial member of the ABDA as at 31st May 2017 and live out-of-town,
you may be eligible for a travel subsidy.

All registrations and enquiries to abda@abf.com.au

2017 Laws Changes – A Little More Detail

Jan Peach

Queensland

Law 1B The Face of the Cards

The Regulating Authority may require the face of each card to be symmetrical.

Using cards with symmetrical faces and backs aims to stop information being conveyed by presenting a particular part of the card to the top or to the bottom.

Law 1C The Backs of the Cards

The backs of all 52 cards in a deck should be identical. They may incorporate words, a logo or a pictorial design but the image used should possess a centre of symmetry.

A “should do” is milder than a “must do”. Clubs are not required to discard perfectly good cards say, for example, with one directional pictures on them. This law should be borne in mind when new cards are purchased.

Law 7A Placement of Board

When a board is to be played it is placed in the centre of the table where it shall remain, correctly oriented, until play is completed.

Turning a board or allowing a board to swivel can lead to the board being fouled. It may mislead players about the vulnerability or Dealer as well as leading to players taking out the wrong hand.

Law 7B3 Removal of Cards from the Board

During play each player retains possession of his own cards, not permitting them to be mixed with those of any other player. No player shall touch any cards other than his own (but declarer may play dummy's cards in accordance with Law 45) during or after play except by permission of an opponent or the Director.

A player may now give permission for an opponent to touch his cards. This could be proffered or be in response to a request.

Law 9A3 Drawing Attention to an Irregularity

Any player, including dummy, may attempt to prevent an irregularity (but for dummy subject to Laws 42 and 43).

There are limitations on dummy should he have lost his qualified rights. Dummy must still not take part in play.

Law 11A Action by Non-Offending Side

The right to rectification of an irregularity may be forfeited if either member of the non-offending side takes any action before summoning the Director. If a side has gained through subsequent action taken by an opponent in ignorance of the relevant provisions of the law, the Director adjusts only that side's score by taking away any accrued advantage. The other side retains the score achieved at the table.

Law 11A emphasises that only the non-offending side in the original irregularity has its score adjusted when that side has gained.

Law 12C1(c) Awarding an Adjusted Score

An assigned adjusted score may be weighted to reflect the probabilities of a number of potential results, but only outcomes that could have been achieved in a legal manner may be included.

The authority of Regulating Authorities to forbid this has been removed.

The tainted result is not usually included in a weighting. This is not new. There may be occasions when the cancelled result could be reached lawfully, and could be used.

Weightings that lean in favour of the non-offending side (sympathetic weightings) are not precluded by the laws.

Law 12C1(e) Awarding an Adjusted Score

If, subsequent to the irregularity, the non-offending side has contributed to its own damage by an extremely serious error (unrelated to the infraction) or by a gambling action, which if unsuccessful it might have hoped to recover through rectification, then:

(i) The offending side is awarded the score it would have been allotted as the consequence of rectifying its infraction.

(ii) The non-offending side does not receive relief for such part of its damage as is self-inflicted.

"Wild" has been removed. "Gambling" is a double shot. The error is now "extremely serious".

Law 12C2(b) Awarding an Adjusted Score

When the Director chooses to award an artificial adjusted score of average plus or average minus at IMP play, that score is plus 3 IMPs or minus 3 IMPs respectively. Subject to approval by the Regulating Authority, this may be varied by the Tournament Organizer as provided for by Laws 78D, 86B3 and (d) hereunder.

There is no authority to vary +/- 3 imps for teams.

Law 12C2(d) Awarding an Adjusted Score

The Regulating Authority may provide for circumstances where a contestant fails to obtain a result on multiple boards during the same session. The scores assigned for each subsequent board may be varied by regulation from those prescribed in (a) and (b) above.

This is also covered in Law 86B.

Law 13A2 No Call Made

When the Director determines that one or more pockets of the board contained an incorrect number of cards and a player has seen one or more cards of another player's hand, the Director allows the board to be played and scored. If he then considers the extraneous information has

affected the outcome of the board the Director shall adjust the score [see Law 12C1(b)] and may penalize an offender.

This law now contains a helpful footnote. Note that such boards must now be played. There is no option to award an adjusted score immediately. The reference to 12C1(b) includes relevant clauses that follow (b).

Law 13B Discovered during the Auction or Play

When the Director determines that a player's hand originally contained more than 13 cards with another player holding fewer, and a player with an incorrect hand has made a call:

- 1. If the Director judges that the deal can be corrected and played, then the deal may be so played with no change of call. At the end of play the Director may award an adjusted score.**
- 2. Otherwise when a call has been made with an incorrect number of cards, the Director shall award an adjusted score [see Law 12C1(b)] and may penalize an offender.**

This is not necessarily an artificial adjusted score. The primary instruction and emphasis throughout the laws is to give an assigned adjusted score wherever possible.

Law 13C Surplus Card

Any surplus card not part of the deal is removed if found. The auction and play continue without further rectification. No adjusted score may be awarded unless such a card is found to have been played to a quitted trick.

A rewording of the old 13F. As before, it is inappropriate to refer any case to Law 67.

Law 15A1 Card from Wrong Board

A call is cancelled (together with any subsequent call) if it is made by a player holding cards that he has picked up from a wrong board.

The old 17D has moved here but essentially retains the same meaning. There is a very small window of opportunity to try to save this board when the offender has made a call holding the wrong hand - only if partner has not subsequently called.

Law 15A2(a) Cards from the Wrong Board

If the offender's partner has subsequently called, the Director shall award an adjusted score.

*Once partner has called nothing can be done to salvage this board. It cannot be played.
An adjusted score is awarded.*

Law 15A2(b) Cards from the Wrong Board

Otherwise, after looking at the correct hand the offender calls again and the auction continues normally from that point.

South opens 1♥ before he realizes he still has his cards from the previous board. 1♥ is cancelled. South takes out the correct hand and makes the call of his choice and the auction proceeds normally from there. The bid of 1♥ simply has no meaning relevant to the current hand.

South opens 1♥ and West overcalls 1♠ before South realizes he still has his cards from the previous board. 1♥ and 1♠ are cancelled. South takes out the correct hand. A new auction starts. The withdrawn 1♠ is authorised to advance but unauthorised to the offending side.

South opens 1♥, West overcalls 1♠ and North bids 1NT before South realizes he still has his cards from the previous board. The board cannot be played.

Law 15A3 Cards from the Wrong Board

If the offender subsequently repeats his call on the board from which he mistakenly drew his cards the Director may allow that board to be played normally, but the Director shall award an adjusted

score when offender's call differs³ from his original cancelled call.
differs if its meaning is much different or if it is psychic

³ A substituted call

It will be a less common situation for the offender's incorrect cards to be from a board he is yet to play. Particular problems may arise from the offender being in a different position relative to the dealer and different vulnerability will be a factor.

South opens 1NT as Dealer showing 15-17 Balanced with the cards he has taken from the next board. The auction on the next board is 1♥ (Pass) 1♠ before it reaches South. 1NT now shows a weakish hand with 5/5 in the minors so an adjusted score is awarded.

Law 15B1 Wrong Board Discovered During Auction(Period) or Play Period

If, after the commencement of the auction period, the Director discovers that a contestant is playing a board not designated for him to play in the current round, then:

if one or more players at the table have previously played the board, with the correct opponents or otherwise, the board is cancelled for both his side and his opponents.

This law applies only to pair and individual events. A and B start to play the wrong board. A has already played the board. The board is cancelled. B was scheduled to play the board against C later. It is cancelled against B and C.

Law 15B2 Wrong Board Discovered During Auction(Period) or Play Period

if none of the four players have previously played the board the Director shall require the auction and play to be completed. He allows the score to stand and may require both pairs to play the correct board against one another later.

This is no longer something that the director "may do". He shall allow the board to be played.

Law 18D Insufficient Bid

A bid that fails to supersede the last preceding bid is an insufficient bid. **It is an infraction to make an insufficient bid (see Law 27 for rectification).** Added sentence.

Law 20F4(a) Explanation of Calls

If a player realizes during the auction that his own explanation was erroneous or incomplete, he must summon the Director before the end of the Clarification Period and correct the misexplanation. He may elect to call the Director sooner, but he is under no obligation to do so. **(For a correction during the play period, see Law 75B2.)**

A big change. Places players on the same level. During the auction, a player is no longer required to correct immediately a wrong explanation that he himself has given. The obligation has moved to the end of the auction before the opening lead is faced. Some number of players will prefer to call the director immediately than risk an unfavourable adjustment. A player who realises his mistake between LHO asking a question and RHO asking a supplementary question must summon the director then and not repeat his misexplanation.

Law 20G2 Incorrect Procedure

A player may not ask a question if his sole purpose is to elicit an incorrect response from an opponent. An anti-fishing law.

Law 23 Comparable Call

A brand new law. The old Law 23 Awareness of Potential Damage has moved to Law 72C. Comparable – similar, close, near, approximate, akin, equivalent, corresponding, analogous, matching. Calls need to satisfy only one of the following categories to be considered comparable.

Law 23A1 Comparable Call

has the same or similar meaning as that attributable to the withdrawn call, or

Neither the withdrawn call nor the replacement call is required to be natural. 4 card suits and 5 card suits might be considered similar. Point counts need not be exactly the same. Suits shown need to be the same suits. An unknown suit remains an unknown suit.

Law 23A2 Comparable Call

defines a subset of the possible meanings attributable to the withdrawn call, or

Replacement calls that have “a more precise meaning” that may have satisfied requirements of the 2007 Insufficient Bid Law 27B1(b) are likely to satisfy this test for comparable call.

A set of hands with 5+ hearts and 10-20 hcp might have as subsets:

Hands with 6 hearts 16-20 hcp; Hands with 5 hearts and 4 clubs 10-15 hcp;

Hands with 5 hearts and a 5 card minor suit 10-15 hcp, as just a few samples.

Hands with a 6 card suit and 6-10 hcp will not be a subset. 6-10 is outside the 10-20 range. Hands with 4 hearts are not a subset of hands with 5 hearts.

Law 23A3 Comparable Call

has the same purpose (e.g. an asking bid or a relay) as that attributable to the withdrawn call.

Stayman and Ace/Keycard Asks fit in here.

Law 23B No Rectification

When a call is cancelled (as per Law 29B) and the offender chooses at his proper turn to replace the irregularity with a comparable call, then both the auction and play continue without further rectification. Law 16C2 does not apply, but see C following.

Law 29B concerns calls out of rotation that have been cancelled because they have not been accepted as Law 29A provides.

Law 23C Non-Offending Side Damaged

If following the substitution of a comparable call [see Laws 27B1(b), 30B1(b)(i), 31A2(a) and 32A2(a)] the Director judges at the end of the play that without the assistance gained through the infraction the outcome of the board could well have been different, and in consequence the non-offending side is damaged, he shall award an adjusted score [see Law 12C1(b)].

30B1(b)(i) is the correction to printed copies already circulated.

Law 24 Card Exposed Or Led During The Auction

When the Director determines that during the auction, because of a player’s own error, one or more cards of that player’s hand were in position for the face to be seen by his partner, the Director shall require that every such card be placed face up on the table until the auction ends. Information from cards thus exposed is authorized for the non-offending side but unauthorized for the offending side (see Law 16C).

Law 24 now applies only during the auction. Apply Law 16 for cards exposed prior to the start of the auction and exposed between the end of the auction and the end of the Clarification Period (which is when an opening lead is faced).

Law 25A1 Unintended Call

If a player discovers that he has not made the call he intended to make, he may, until his partner makes a call, substitute the call he intended for the unintended call. The second (intended) call stands and is subject to the appropriate Law, but the lead restrictions in Law 26 do not apply.

Law 25 has been rewritten without changing its application.

Law 25A2 Unintended Call

If the player's original intent was to make the call selected or voiced, that call stands. A change of call may be allowed because of a mechanical error or a slip of the tongue, but not because of a loss of concentration regarding the intent of the action.

Losing sight of where one is in the auction does not make a call unintended. The lapse needs to be after the call is chosen, not before. As an example, a player has passed partner's Bergen raise, cue raise, fit showing jump or control bid. While he may not have thought, "I want to play in partner's artificial bid," he could have become confused as to where the auction stood and thought, "We are high enough, I will pass." Pass is an intended call. At the moment he passed he intended to pass.

Law 25A3 Unintended Call

A player is allowed to replace an unintended call if the conditions described in A1 above are met, no matter how he may have become aware of his error.

Incorporates what used to be a WBF clarification. It does not matter how the player became aware of his unintended call.

Law 26A No Lead Restrictions

When an offending player's call is withdrawn and it is replaced by a comparable call (see Law 23A), then if he becomes a defender there are no lead restrictions for his side. Law 16C does not apply, but see Law 23C.

The original changes to Law 26 made it too generous to the non-offending side so Law 26B has been changed.

Law 26B Lead Restrictions

*****This is the new version of Law 26B*****

When an offending player's call is withdrawn and it is not replaced by a comparable call, then if he becomes a defender declarer may, at the offender's partner's first turn to lead (which may be the opening lead) prohibit offender's partner from leading any (one) suit which has not been specified in the legal auction by the offender. Such prohibition continues for as long as the offender's partner retains the lead.

Initial consideration is whether the offender's legal call at that turn is comparable. Comparable calls made later do not negate the application of Law 26B though may contribute to the calls specified in the legal auction. Some doubles may specify a suit: (1♣) 1♦ (1♥) X may show 4 spades.

Doubles showing "this or that or some other" do not specify suits. No suit is known for certain. However, a legal call that also said "this or that or some other" would be comparable.

1♦ (1♥) X may initially suggest 4 spades however it may simply be temporising before showing a strong club holding on the next round, without spades. Allowing doubles as comparable calls needs careful thought.

Law 27B1(a) Insufficient Bid not Accepted

if the insufficient bid is corrected by the lowest sufficient bid which specifies the same denomination(s) as that specified by the withdrawn call, the auction proceeds without further rectification. Laws 26B and 16C do not apply but see D following.

27B1(a) no longer requires the insufficient bid nor the sufficient bid to be natural.

(1♠) 1♥, not accepted, could be corrected to a natural 2♥ bid. A comparable call is not required here, merely a lowest sufficient bid (not a jump) that specifies hearts. The point count may be different and 27D may come into play.

2NT (both minors 8-11) withdrawn as an attempt to open the auction. (1♥) Pass (1♠) 1NT showing both minors 8-11 sounds comparable.

Law 27B1(b) Insufficient Bid not Accepted

except as in (a), if the insufficient bid is corrected with a comparable call (see Law 23A) the auction proceeds without further rectification. Law 16C does not apply but see D following.

"Same meaning as, or a more precise meaning than" is superseded by "comparable call".

Law 30A RHO's Turn to Call

When a pass out of rotation is made at offender's RHO's turn to call, the offender must pass when next it is his turn to call and Law 72C may apply.

Whether or not another player has bid is no longer relevant. All those attempted opening passes when not the dealer will require more attention. Law 72C is the "could have been aware law".

Law 30B1 Partner's or LHO's Turn to Call

When the offender has passed at his partner's turn to call, or at his LHO's turn to call if the offender has not previously called, then:

Law 30B1(a) Partner's or LHO's Turn to Call

Offender's partner may make any legal call at his proper turn, but Law 16C2 applies.

There are no restrictions on legal doubles or redoubles other than unauthorised information from the withdrawn call. Some advice around is for the offender's partner to make his normal call. Should the offender not be able to make a comparable call he is then better placed to make a sound decision for his side.

Law 30B1(b) Partner's or LHO's Turn to Call

Offender may make any legal call at his correct turn and:

(i) When the call is a comparable call (see Law 23A), there is no further rectification. Law 26B does not apply, but see Law 23C.

(ii) When the call is not a comparable call (see Law 23A), offender's partner must pass when next it is his turn to call. Laws 16C, 26B and 72C may apply.

(i) NS are playing Standard American. North is Dealer however South passes. West does not accept South's Pass. North opens 1♥ and East passes. South could pass. Being the same call there is no further rectification. South might bid 1NT showing 6-9 hcp. Hands with 6-9 hcp sound like a subset of a hand with which South would pass as dealer so 1NT satisfies the comparable call test.

(ii) NS are playing Standard American. North is Dealer however South passes. West does not accept South's Pass. North opens 1♥ and East passes. Perhaps South bids 1♦ showing 6+ points and 4 spades. This is not a comparable call as the open ended hcp range is more than that of a hand on which South would pass as dealer. North must now pass at his next turn.

Perhaps South bids 2♥ as a minimum raise. He would have passed as dealer with such a hand so North may call unrestricted.

Law 31A Bid Out Of Rotation RHO's Turn to Call

When the offender has called at his RHO's turn to call, then:

1. If that opponent passes, offender must repeat the call out of rotation, and when that call is legal there is no rectification.

2. If that opponent makes a legal⁸ bid, double or redouble, offender may make any legal call:

(a) When the call is a comparable call (see Law 23A), there is no further rectification. Law 26B does not apply, but see Law 23C.

(b) When the call is not a comparable call (see Law 23A), offender's partner must pass when next it is his turn to call. Laws 16C, 26B and 72C may apply.

Very similar treatments to passes out of rotation at partner's or LHO's turn to call.

Law 31B Bid Out Of Rotation Partner's or LHO's Turn to Call

If the offender has bid at his partner's turn to call, or at his LHO's turn to call if the offender has not previously called, then:

- 1. Offender's partner may make any legal call at his proper turn, but Law 16C2 applies.**
- 2. Offender may make any legal call at his correct turn and the Director rules as in A2(a) or A2(b) above.**

Very similar treatments to passes out of rotation at partner's or LHO's turn to call.

Law 32A Double Or Redouble Out Of Rotation RHO's Turn to Call

If a double or redouble out of rotation has been made at offender's RHO's turn to call, then:

- 1. If offender's RHO passes, offender must repeat his out-of-rotation double or redouble and there is no rectification unless the double or redouble is inadmissible, in which case Law 36 applies.**
- 2. If offender's RHO bids, doubles or redoubles, the offender may in turn make any legal call:**
 - (a) When the call is a comparable call (see Law 23A), there is no further rectification. Law 26B does not apply, but see Law 23C.**
 - (b) When the call is not a comparable call (see Law 23A), offender's partner must pass when next it is his turn to call. Laws 16C, 26B and 72C may apply.**

The consideration of comparable call extends Law 32. Offender's partner is no longer required automatically to pass throughout. Whether or not he must pass at all depends on whether the offender's call at that turn is comparable to the withdrawn double or redouble.

Law 32B Double Or Redouble Out Of Rotation Offender's Partner's Turn to Call

If a double or redouble out of rotation has been made when it was the offender's partner's turn to call, then:

- 1. Offender's partner may make any legal call, but Law 16C2 applies.**
- 2. Offender may make any legal call at his proper turn and the Director rules as in A2(a) or A2(b) above.**

Law 36C - Inadmissible Double or Redouble Discovered after the Auction Period

When attention is drawn to an inadmissible double or redouble only after the opening lead has been faced, the final contract is scored as if the inadmissible call had not been made.

1NT (Pass) X (Pass)
Pass (Pass)

The opening lead is faced, or perhaps the hand played out, before the players realise the double is inadmissible. The contract reverts to 1NT.

An inadmissible double or redouble may happen during the auction rather than at the end.

1♣ 1♥ 1♠ X
Pass XX Pass 2♣ and so on.

Law 40A4 Players' Systemic Agreements

The agreed meaning of a call or play shall not alter by reference to the member of the partnership by whom it is made (this requirement does not restrict style and judgement, only method).

Not a new application. Transfers, for example, may not be made only from the weaker player to the stronger player in a partnership. This does not prevent either player deciding not to transfer to protect the opening lead, whatever.

Law 40B2(c)(iv) Special Partnership Understandings

following an opponent's request for an explanation, pursuant to Law 20F, for the purpose of correctly explaining the significance of his partner's call or play.

2♠ (Alerted) 3♦

Next player asks about the 3♦ bid. In the normal sequence of events, the player being asked may not enquire about the meaning of 2♠ until it is his turn to call however, he needs to know what 2♠ means before he can explain what 3♦ means. He is permitted to look at the opponent's system card at this time – or in practice it might be that he simply asks what 2♠ means.

Law 42A3 Dummy's Rights Absolute Rights

He plays the cards of the dummy as declarer's agent as directed and ensures that dummy follows suit (see Law 45F if dummy suggests a play).

Law 42B2 Dummy's Rights Qualified Rights

He may try to prevent any irregularity.

This is also mentioned in Law 9A3

Law 43A2(c) Limitations on Dummy

Dummy may not look at the face of a card in either defender's hand.

It is not just that dummy may not look on his own initiative. He simply may not look. Dummy may ask a defender to conceal his hand from view if dummy is in the uncomfortable position of not being able to reasonably avoid seeing it.

Law 43A3 Limitations on Dummy

A defender may not show dummy his hand.

A new law.

Law 43B3 If Violation Occurs

If dummy after his violation of the limitations listed in A2 is the first to draw attention to a defender's irregularity, there is no immediate rectification. Play continues as though no irregularity had occurred. At the end of play if the defending side has gained through its irregularity the Director adjusts only its score, taking away that advantage. The declaring side retains the score achieved at the table.

If, having lost his qualified rights, dummy draws attention to a defender's revoke during the play, there is no automatic trick adjustment. Only the defenders have their score adjusted if they gained from the established revoke leading to a split score. A non-established revoke would be corrected as usual however the incorrect card would be returned to hand and not be a major penalty card.

Law 45C4(b) Card Deemed to be Played or Not

Declarer may correct an unintended designation of a card from dummy until he next plays a card from either his own hand or from dummy. A change of designation may be allowed after a slip of the tongue, but not after a loss of concentration or a reconsideration of action. If an opponent has, in turn, played a card that was legal before the change in designation, that opponent may withdraw the card so played, return it to his hand, and substitute another (see Laws 47D and 16C1).

This law has changed to cater for only declarer being able to change an unintended designation because other situations are so very rare.

Law 45D2 Dummy Picks up a Non-designated Card

When it is too late to change dummy's wrongly placed card (see above), the play continues normally without alteration of the cards played to this or any subsequent trick. If the wrongly placed card was the first card of the trick, then the failure to follow suit to that card may now constitute a revoke (see Laws 64A, 64B7 and 64C). If the wrongly placed card was contributed to a trick already in progress and dummy thereby has revoked, see Laws 64B3 and 64C.

This is an interesting change. Declarer calls for the ♦K from the dummy however dummy picks up the ♦K. Declarer and both defenders "follow" with small hearts. The trick is quitted and both sides have played to one or more tricks before declarer notices the ♦K is missing. Declarer and both defenders have established revokes on the same board, if they held diamonds, so Law 64B7 applies.

There are variations. Perhaps one or more players played a diamond or legally discarded some other suit, even legally discarded a heart.

Law 50E Information from a Penalty Card

1. Information derived from a penalty card and the requirements for playing that penalty card are authorized for all players for as long as the penalty card remains on the table.
2. Information derived from a penalty card that has been returned to hand [as per Law 50D2(a)] is unauthorized for the partner of the player who had the penalty card (see Law 16C), but authorized for declarer.
3. Once a penalty card has been played, information derived from the circumstances under which it was created is unauthorized for the partner of the player who had the card. (For a penalty card which has not yet been played, see E1 above.)
4. If following the application of E1 the Director judges at the end of play that without the assistance gained through the exposed card the outcome of the board could well have been different, and in consequence the non-offending side is damaged (see Law 12B1), he shall award an adjusted score. In his adjustment he should seek to recover as nearly as possible the probable outcome of the board without the effect of the penalty card(s).

Initially the underlead from K Q J x to partner's A x is allowed, but subsequently the Director may decide that 50E applies. The player must convince the Director that he has not gained from the information that the player possesses the ace.

Law 51B2(c) Two or More Penalty Cards

When a defender has penalty cards in more than one suit and his partner is to lead, declarer may elect not to require or prohibit a lead, in which case the defender's partner may lead any card and the penalty cards remain on the table as penalty cards¹⁶. If this option is selected Laws 50 and 51 continue to apply for as long as the penalty cards remain.

Not a new application. Some detail for when declarer neither requires nor prohibits a lead.

Law 53A Lead Out of Turn Treated as Correct Lead

Prior to the thirteenth trick¹⁷, any lead faced out of turn may be treated as a correct lead (but see Law 47E1). It becomes a correct lead if declarer or either defender, as the case may be, accepts it by making a statement to that effect, or if a play is made from the hand next in rotation to the irregular lead (but see B). If there is no such acceptance or play, the Director will require that the lead be made from the correct hand (and see Law 47B).

The footnote says that a lead out of turn to trick thirteen must be corrected. Players can get a bit slack at trick thirteen and it may be suggested that a player led out of turn rather than simply displaying the card that he knows must be contributed to the last trick. Excluding the thirteenth trick removes the opportunity of any dubious claims for redress.

Law 54C Declarer Must Accept Lead

If declarer could have seen any of dummy's cards (except cards that dummy may have exposed during the auction and that were subject to Law 24), he must accept the lead **and the presumed declarer then becomes declarer.**

Modified so that there is no option for the presumed declarer to become dummy. There is no reference to cards seen prior to the start of the auction and between the end of the auction and the end of the Clarification Period. To be clarified.

Law 57A3 Premature Play or Lead to the Next Trick

require offender's partner to play a card of another suit specified by declarer, or

Declarer now has another option after a premature lead or play.

Law 57D Premature Play at RHO's Turn

When a defender attempts to play (not lead) to a trick at his RHO's turn, Law 16 may apply. If his card can be legally played to the trick, it must be played at his proper turn: otherwise, it becomes a major penalty card.

This is an added clause but not a change in application.

Law 62A Revoke Must Be Corrected

A player must correct his revoke if attention is drawn to the irregularity before it becomes established.

A player has no obligation to draw attention to his own non-established revoke should he become aware of it. This places players on the same footing. Those who, under 2007 Laws, would have carried out their obligations to draw attention are treated the same as those who might have become aware, yet kept quiet.

Law 62C3 Subsequent Cards Played

If both sides revoke on the same trick and only one side has played to the subsequent trick, then both revokes must be corrected (see Law 16C2). Every card withdrawn by the defending side becomes a penalty card.

A new law.

Law 63A3 Revoke Established by Making a Claim or Concession

when a member of the offending side makes a claim or concession of tricks orally or by facing his hand or in any other way.

Law 63A4 Revoke Established by Agreeing to a Claim or Concession

when agreement is established (as per Law 69A) to an opponent's claim or concession; the offending side having raised no objection to it before the end of the round, or before making a call on a subsequent board.

Law 63A3 and 63A4 have become separate laws to cater for different timing.

Law 64B7 No Automatic Trick Adjustment

both sides have revoked on the same board and both revokes have become established.

No change to application, just more detail.

Law 64B8 No Automatic Trick Adjustment

the revoke has been corrected as per Law 62C3.

Cross reference for both sides revoking on same trick but only one established.

Law 64C2(a) Redress of Damage

After repeated revokes by the same player in the same suit (see B2 above), the Director adjusts the score if the non-offending side would likely have made more tricks had one or more of the subsequent revokes not occurred.

A player who revokes more than once in the same time cannot end up better off than after the first revoke. Damage from the later revoke(s) is redressed.

Law 64C2(b) Redress of Damage

When both sides have revoked on the same board (see B7 above) and the Director deems that a contestant has been damaged, he shall award an adjusted score based on the likely result had no revokes occurred.

Law 65B3 Keeping Track of the Ownership of Tricks

A player may draw attention to a card pointed incorrectly, but this right expires when his side leads or plays to the following trick. If done later Law 16B may apply.

The time to do this has changed from "a lead is made" and declarer no longer has the right to require at any time that a quitted trick to be pointed correctly.

Law 66B Own Last Card

Until his side has led or played to the next trick, declarer or either defender may inspect, but not expose, his own last card played.

This has changed from either side having led to the next trick.

Law 66D After the Conclusion of Play

After play ceases, the played and unplayed cards may be inspected to settle a claim of a revoke, or of the number of tricks won or lost; but no player should handle cards other than his own. If the Director can no longer ascertain the facts after such a claim has been made, and only one side has mixed its cards, the Director shall rule in favour of the other side.

Changed from "a player mixing" to "only one side mixing".

Law 67B3 Defective Trick After Both Sides Play to Next Trick

When the Director determines that the offender did play a card to the trick, but that card was not placed among the quitted tricks, the Director finds the card and places it correctly among the offender's played cards. The Director shall award an adjusted score if the same card was played to a subsequent trick and it is too late to correct the illegal play.

Say the ♦3 was played to Trick 3 but slipped onto the floor. The player picked it up and absent mindedly returned it to his hand. He played the ♦3 (again) to Trick 10 and this was not noticed until later. Trick 3 was a completed trick. It is Trick 10 that is defective. "Too late to correct" is not defined and is up to the director.

Law 68B Claim or Concession of Tricks

A claim should be accompanied at once by a clear statement of the line of play or defence through which the claimer proposes to win the tricks claimed, including the order in which the cards will be played. The player making the claim or concession faces his hand.

When a player makes a claim or concession, that player is now required to face his hand.

Law 68D Suspension of Play

After any claim or concession, play is suspended.

1. If the claim or concession is agreed, Law 69 applies.
2. If it is doubted by any player (dummy included); either
 - (a) the Director may immediately be summoned and no action should be taken pending his arrival, Law 70 applies; or
 - (b) upon the request of the non-claiming or non-conceding side, play may continue subject to the following:
 - (i) all four players must concur; otherwise the Director is summoned, who then proceeds as in (a) above.
 - (ii) the prior claim or concession is void and not subject to adjudication. Laws 16 and 50 do not apply, and the score subsequently obtained shall stand.

When a player claims/concedes, both sides (all four players) may now agree to continue play, rather than summon the Director. If they do however agree to play on, then the table result will stand. The claimer/conceder picks up his faced hand should everyone agree to play on. Silence in response to a request to play on is deemed to be concurrence. Once the director is called there is no second chance to play on. The director arrives and applies Law 70.

Law 73C2 Player Receives Unauthorized Information from Partner

A penalty may be assessed against a player who violates C1, but if the opponents have been damaged, see also Law 16B3.

A breach of Law 73C1 would usually be egregious before a penalty is assessed and is independent of any score adjustment.

Law 73E Deception

A player may appropriately attempt to deceive an opponent through a call or play (so long as the deception is not emphasized by unwonted haste or hesitancy, nor protected by concealed partnership understanding or experience).

Law 75B2 Mistaken Explanation

If a player becomes aware of his own mistake, he must summon the Director before the opening lead is faced (or during the play, if discovered later), and then provide a correction. The player is also permitted to call the Director before the auction ends, but he is under no obligation to do so (see Law 20F4).

When a player has given wrong information about a partnership agreement and becomes aware of it during the auction, he is no longer obliged to rectify it immediately, but may wait until the auction is completed.

Law 75B3 Mistaken Explanation

The player's partner must do nothing to correct the mistaken explanation while the auction continues and if he subsequently becomes a defender, he must call the Director and correct the explanation only after play ends. If the player's partner is to be declarer or dummy, he must, after the final pass, call the Director and then provide a correction.

There can be no doubt that the director must be called.

Law 75D Director's Determination

1. Players are expected to disclose their partnership agreements accurately (see Law 20F1); failure to do so constitutes Misinformation.

2. It is a condition of any partnership agreement that both players possess the same mutual understanding, and it is an infraction to describe an agreement where the same mutual understanding does not exist. If the Director determines that the misleading explanation was not based upon a partnership agreement, he applies Law 21B.

3. When there is an infraction (as per B1 or D2) and sufficient evidence exists as to the agreed meaning of the call, the Director awards an adjusted score based upon the likely outcome had the opponents received the correct explanation in a timely manner. If the Director determines that the call has no agreed meaning, he awards an adjusted score based upon the likely outcome had the opponents been so informed.

Law 75 has been restructured to remove examples. Using terms like, "I take it to mean," or "I'm guessing that," when no mutual understanding exists is an infraction.

Law 79B3 Disagreement on Tricks Won

If the Director is not called before the round ends, the score may be changed for both sides only when he is clearly convinced as to the result obtained at the table. Otherwise he should either allow the recorded score to stand, or decrease the score for one side without increasing it for the other.

This law now forbids the director to increase a score if there is any doubt. At best one side keeps the table score and one side gets a decreased score. No one gains when there is doubt.

Law 79C2 Error in Score

Subject to approval by the Tournament Organizer, a scoring error may be corrected after expiry of the Correction Period if the Director is satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that the record is wrong.

Regulation is no longer required for this correction. It's a matter for the Tournament Organizer and the Director, not the Regulating Authority.

Law 86B Result Obtained at Other Table

1. Single Result Obtained

In team play when the Director awards an adjusted score and the result at the other table between the same contestants is clearly favourable to one side, the Director shall award an assigned adjusted score [see Law 12C1(c), but for multiple adjusted scores see B2 following].

A clearly favourable score is an unlikely score.

2. Multiple Results Obtained at One or More Tables²⁷ ²⁷including results from a fouled board

Please see 2017 Law Book for clauses 86B2(a)(b)(c) as insufficient space.

Law 90A Director's Authority

The Director, in addition to implementing the rectifications in these Laws, may also assess procedural penalties for any offence that unduly delays or obstructs the game, inconveniences other contestants, violates correct procedure, or requires the award of an adjusted score.

The adjusted score is no longer just at another table. A procedural penalty may be awarded in addition to an adjustment at the same table.

JUDGEMENT RULINGS (1)

Our panel give their views on how to make a ruling for the three situations presented in the last bulletin. The regular panellists for this issue are Rich Colker, Arie Geursen, Richard Hills, Laurie Kelso and Matthew McManus with guest panellist Peter Holloway.

Readers should not be concerned about different views among panellists. This section equates to just the first round of the consultation process and aims to highlight points to be considered.

Hand 1 Mixed Open Event

Bd. 12 / W / NS

♠ AQ82	
♥ AQ85	
♦ Q94	
♣ J3	
♠ J1094	♠ K763
♥ K4	♥ 1063
♦ K3	♦ 7652
♣ A9862	♣ 105
♠ 5	
♥ J972	
♦ AJ108	
♣ KQ74	

The Play:

♣10 ♣4 ♣A ♣3
♣2 ♣J¹ ♣5 ♣7

¹ North thinks for 20 seconds after this trick

♠A ♠3 ♠5 ♠4
♠2 ♠6² ♥2 ♠9

² East placed his card face down for 5 seconds before facing it. When asked if he was ok he replied that he had been thinking.

♥7 ♥4 ♥Q ♥3³

³ East paused for 6-8 seconds before playing ♥3

West	North	East	South
Pass	1NT	Pass	2♣
X	2♥	Pass	4♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	

North at this stage assumed the hearts were 4-1 with East (otherwise why the long pause) and played a heart towards the Jack. The club ruff then put the contract down 1.

NS called the director and stated that East's pause was completely unethical and that without the pause North would cash the ♥A and make 4♥+1 (losing 1 club and 1 diamond with spades going away on the clubs after a heart to the Jack).

Ed: Most are adjusting...

Peter Holloway: On play of ♣J no problem, entitled to think and plan ahead. East may have thought with his face down ♠6, again entitled to think ahead. Why did Declarer assume it showed a 4-1 trump break? Initial finesse apparently worked and normally declarer would enter dummy and repeat, but the tank before playing the ♥3 could well suggest East was holding up the King. No apparent reason for the play out of tempo so would adjust score to 4♥+1.

Arie Geursen: What declarer will have been pondering during the 20 seconds pause after two rounds of clubs is that in addition to the ♣A he potentially still has a heart loser, a diamond loser and there is a club ruff looming. He has no clues how best to untangle these. So he will be on high alert for any clues.

For those reasons jumping on East after detaching a card and thinking for “5 seconds before facing the card”, an annoying habit, is probably just being a bit trigger happy. However the 6-8 seconds pause before contributing the ♥3 to the next trick presents a more troubling picture. With a flat 3 count there is no demonstrable bridge reason to not follow suit in tempo, the key point for the Director to resolve is whether East could have known, at the time he hesitated, that this hesitation would work to his benefit see Laws 23 and 73F.

We have always been consistent that when faced with this kind of situation, the Director does not need to make a factual determination that this was a deliberate (illegal) attempt to lure his opponent into drawing a false inference, only that the player was in a bridge situation where he could have known. This is an Open player and I am afraid I expect him to recognize / anticipate that he was in just such a situation and therefore he needed to play in tempo. I am adjusting the score to 4♥N making 11 (as per Law 12B1).

Note: If you are lucky enough to already have your new 2017 Law book, the old Laws 23 and 73F have moved. They are now Laws 72C and 73E2 respectively – their intent is unchanged.

Matthew McManus: 73F applies here. East's first break in tempo on Trick 4 was fine. On that particular trick, there was no indication that he was considering which card to play, but just thinking about the hand generally. Compare that with the impression his actions presented on the following trick. To declarer, it appeared that he was thinking whether or not to win the trick. He had no demonstrable bridge reason for thinking before playing low, and he could have known that it may work to his advantage. I will adjust the score to NS +650.

Laurie Kelso: East's first break-in-tempo is immaterial (except that it sets the scene). The pause in 4th seat on the following trick however is a different issue. As declarer I would also have drawn the inference that East was holding up with the King. The rest of declarer's analysis is unfortunately not correct in that if East really did start with K1063, then playing a heart towards the Jack will inevitably fail because East will just rise with the King and then exit in whichever pointy suit is appropriate. In fact to make the contract on a 4-1 trump split, declarer will need East to hold all three Kings, which means that if he really thought trumps were 4-1 he should instead have played a diamond at trick six!

From a ruling perspective we need to determine if East's pause constitutes an infraction and if so, was declarer damaged because of it? Law 73F requires the Director to determine if East had a ‘demonstrable bridge reason’ for his tempo-break. My view is that he did not. I also think that East ‘could have known’ that his actions might cause declarer to infer that the trump King was off-side,

so I am going to award an adjusted score. Without the pause at trick five, declarer would surely have made his contract.

The only other point to consider is the subsequent line of play chosen by North. His analysis was faulty but I don't consider it to be a 'serious error' as per Law 12C1(b), and even if it was a serious error, it was almost certainly 'related to the infraction'. Score adjusted for both sides to 4♥N +650.

Ed: ... one does not adjust...

Rich Colker: What a bunch of whooey! I find nothing in East's pauses that suggest North's conclusions. East's first pause, as declarer ruffed the second round of spades in dummy, was entirely innocent and established East's penchant for thinking ahead (perhaps a bit slowly, though clearly intensely) on defence from trick to trick. East's second pause, before following low to the ♥Q, was simply more of the same; assuming the hesitation marked East with all the outstanding hearts was totally unwarranted. Plus, I fail to see the connection between that and declarer's ensuing line of play. To begin with, 4♥ was cold even if trumps were four-one but the only way to make it in that case would have been to lead a low trump toward dummy at trick four rather than ruff a spade. Once a spade was ruffed in dummy no line could succeed, regardless of whether East won the ♥K at trick five or ducked. So North's play of a low heart toward dummy at trick six had no chance of success against four-one hearts (East simply wins the king and exits any card). Thus, the contract was already doomed prior to East's pause at trick five. Yes, cashing the ♥A at that point would have made the contract as the cards actually lay, but that was the only line that had any chance of success: cash the ♥A and hope against hope that trumps were three-two, as they were. Cashing the ♥A would not have placed the contract in any greater jeopardy than it was already in; 4 ♥ would still have gone down one. Score stands. Plus, North gets the Law 73D1 lecture about how East had already proven himself a thoughtful, deliberate player on defence (so his trick-five pause could not have involved deceptive intent) so he draws any inferences from East's tempo at his own risk.

Ed: ... and another has other concerns.

Richard Hills: North-South publicly accusing East of being "completely unethical" is an outrageous infraction of the most important Law in the Law book, Law 74A2:

"A player should carefully avoid any remark or action that might cause annoyance or embarrassment to another player or might interfere with the enjoyment of the game."

Therefore as Director I would suspend North-South for the remainder of the session (Law 91A). If the event was a multi-session tournament then I would seek the Tournament Organizer's approval to disqualify North-South (Law 91B). In both cases I would refer North-South to the appropriate committee (Law 81C7).

Ed: Accusations about poor ethics are far too prevalent in our game. I'd be chiding North for his comments on the first occasion. The majority adjust the score. East surely did enough thinking when he annoyingly placed the ♠6 face down.

DEADLINE NEXT BULLETIN

31st July 2017

Hand 2 Club Session

♠ AJ104	♦ J9	♣ KQ64
♥ 532		
♦ K72	♠ Q853	
♥ A987	♥ Q10	
♦ Q843	♦ AK1062	
♣ 97	♣ 53	
♠ 96		
♥ KJ64		
♦ 75		
♣ AJ1082		

Result: NS -100

Bd. 8 / W / Nil

West	North	East	South
Pass	1NT ¹	2♦ ²	X ³
	2♥		

¹ Announced 12-14

² Not Alerted

³ Takeout

After bidding 2♥ West says, "Sorry," and makes a late alert of 2♦. South calls the director. West explains that 2♦ shows 4+ hearts and 5+ of another suit.

South is allowed to change his call so the auction becomes:

Pass	1NT ¹	2♦ ²	Pass
2♥ ⁴	Pass	3♦	3NT
Pass	Pass	Pass	

⁴ Not alerted and NS do not ask. Agreement is that 2♥ asks East to bid 2♠ with a 5 card suit otherwise bid the other suit. The real agreement is that 2♦ shows 4+ spades and 5+ of another suit and as the director you are satisfied that this is so.

South called the director and asked for an adjusted score because of West's mis-explanation and further that East had told them that he had intended 2♦ as natural and had been relieved to realise that he actually had the hand to support the real conventional meaning.

Ed: Two believe there are too many possibilities to assign a weighted score...

Rich Colker: Wait. Let me get this straight. West failed to alert his partner's 2♦ bid. He then alerted it belatedly but mis-explained the bid's meaning. His partner then failed to alert the (artificial) 2♥ bid's meaning. South then bid 3NT (to play) without a stopper in East's five-card suit, without knowing whether his partner had a stopper, and with insufficient high-card values for game opposite a 12-14 notrump. East subsequently admitted that he forgot his methods over an opponent's 1NT opening and intended his 2♦ overcall as natural (though his hand was actually consistent with the bid's conventional meaning). Aren't club games fun!?

So, South was clearly misinformed about the meaning of the 2♦ and 2♥ bids but "knew" that 3♦ showed a five-card suit (in addition to East's then-assumed hearts). In spite of that he bid 3NT to play with less-than-game-going values and with hearts stopped but not diamonds. (Why not bid 3♥ to show a stopper and allow his partner to evaluate his diamond holding for notrump?) It's hard to see how the mis-information directly affected NS's poor result but there was so much misinformation floating around that it is difficult not to have sympathy for their dilemma here. So, we might consider what South might have done over 3♦, lacking stoppers in both of East's suits and with only competitive (not game-going) values, if he had been correctly informed that East "showed" four spades and five-plus diamonds. Or, more to the point, what South might have done over 2♦ had he known that East's 2♦ showed four-plus spades and five-plus of another suit.

South's double of the un-alerted 2♦ bid implies that NS played negative doubles over their 1NT openings so a double of 2♦ (showing hearts; assuming East's bid was "known" to show spades and another suit) seems like the indicated action (a Lebensohl 2NT bid might also have been available

or South could wait and double later if he lacked satisfactory methods for entering the auction immediately over 2♦). In any case, after making a negative double of 2♦ South could later double 3♦ as further takeout. NS might then have sat for 3♦X (+100) or found their way to 3♥ (-150 or worse) or 4♣ (-100). I'd rate 3♦x at around 70+%, 3♥ at maybe 5%, and 4♣ at around 25%. Still, that does not take into account other (perhaps more bizarre) possibilities if the auction should develop differently. With the likely outcome in substantial doubt, even if NS had been given the correct explanation of the opponents' bids, and with so many possibilities to consider, I think I'd opt for assigning the two pairs non-reciprocal artificial adjusted scores here under Laws 12C1d and 12C2a.

I'd assign an average to NS since South was partly at fault for his own poor result subsequent to the infraction by bidding 3NT with insufficient values for game and no diamond stopper; he could simply have doubled 3♦ and likely defended for +100. As for EW, I'd assign them average-minus since they were wholly responsible for creating the problem in the first place.

Matthew McManus: There are two aspects to this problem. The first is the misexplanation of the meaning of 2♦. The director needs to determine possible outcomes had the correct information been given at the time. I think it is likely that South would have doubled as occurred in the original auction. There are several potentials continuations, none of them are particularly good for NS. If NS do get to play the hand it is likely to be in 4♣, which will go two off, the same result as achieved at the table. Another possibility is that East plays 3♦. South's normal lead is a heart which allows 3♦ to make. Finding the killing spade lead seems very unlikely, so NS would end up with -110, worse than what they got. Therefore, I would not adjust on the basis of misinformation.

The second matter is that of the unauthorised information that East received due to West's explanation of 2♦. When East bid 2♦, the thought he was just bidding naturally and therefore is required to consider West's 2♥ as also natural. On the assumption that South would double (as he did in the original auction and would be likely to do with a correct explanation), either passing or bidding 2♠ are viable options. Whether these contracts are likely to be doubled will depend on the NS methods. Also, making anything from five to seven (or even eight) tricks is possible. A weighted score seems appropriate. However given the numerous possibilities, it would not be unreasonable for the director to apply 12C1(d) and award an artificial adjusted score. That would be Average minus to EW. However, I have serious misgivings in awarding the complementary score to NS. In the original auction, South's action in bidding 3NT with insufficient points and no stopper in the opponent's suit is, I believe, a serious error unrelated to the infraction. I will therefore allow the table result to stand for NS.

Ed: ... two do not adjust...

Peter Holloway: East has misbid. He was fortunate indeed to find his hand matched the explanation but no damage ensued as partner's explanation was systemically correct. Has the failure to alert the 2♥ bid damaged NS? Possibly, but South has contributed to their bad result with a reckless bid, a 9 count opposite a possible 12-14 even with a 5 card club suit. (I suspect he may have known very well that the 3♦ was showing Diamonds possibly thinking if contract made, good, if not look for an adjustment.) So his 3NT has meant the poor result was self-inflicted. (Law 12C1b). Result to stand.

Richard Hills: What a mess! Lots of UI given by East to West. Lots of MI misgiven by East-West to South. But it seems to me that South was the architect of his own downfall; opposite partner's 12-14 1NT, a raise to 3NT is most unlikely to be the winning action. No damage, no adjusted score.

Ed: ... and finally an assigned adjusted score.

Arie Geursen: Good question! West by his own volition woke up to the fact that he should have alerted his partner's 2♦ over a 12-14 NT opening bid. South calls the Director who presumably wound the auction back and offered South the option to change his call as Law 21B(1) allows. Hopefully in response to a question from South and not one from the Director, West then incorrectly explained that 2♦ showed 4+ hearts and 5 of another suit (it actually shows 4+spades and another suit). South now passes, as you would, and West may now change his call without rectification as per Law 21B(2), which he elected not to do. 2♥ in response to 2♦ systemically asks East to bid 2♠ with a 5 card spade suit or bid his other suit which should have been alerted by East but he didn't.

Suddenly East finds himself under an avalanche of unauthorized information; (i) Partner's late alert and explanation has woken him up that he has forgotten their defence to 1NT; (ii) that partner believes he has 4+ hearts and another suit rather than 4+ spades plus and another suit; and (iii) any information arising from South's withdrawn takeout double. All of which Law 73C mandates he must carefully avoid taking advantage of.

Having been woken up by means other than a legal call, he must now continue to respond as though the 2♥ response from partner was natural. In which case Pass of 2♥ would be definitely be a logical alternative to the 3♦ bid. I am not sure what NS they would do if East had alerted the 2♦ or West had explained the 2♦ correctly as there is no obvious better place for them to play! I am inclined to adjust the score to 2♥W -2, NS+100.

Note: The mandate of Law 73C that a player must carefully avoid taking advantage of Law 73C of unauthorized information from their partner is unaltered but it does now include a provision that a penalty maybe assessed against a player fails to do so. In my opinion, this provision should only be used by the Director sparingly and in the most egregious circumstances. Score adjustment is the mechanism for dealing with damage. Would I assess a penalty in the above case? No.

Hand 3 Overseas Swiss Teams Event

Bd. 8 / W / Nil

♠ AKQ4	
♥ AKQ93	
♦ 43	
♣ 92	
♠ 6	♠ 10732
♥ 86	♥ J2
♦ KJ105	♦ A976
♣ AKQ876	♣ J105
♠ J985	
♥ 10754	
♦ Q82	
♣ 43	

West	North	East	South
1♣	X	1NT	Pass
2♣	2♥	Pass	Pass
3♣	3♥ ¹	Pass	4♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	

¹ Agreed pause of several seconds
Result: NS +420

The director was first called after the 4♥ bid and again after the hand completed. EW claim to have been damaged by South bidding 4♥ after North's agreed pause to think.

Ed: One adjusts and one may or might not adjust after polling ...

Richard Hills: What does North's pause "demonstrably suggest"? Does it suggest:

(a) I want to rebid 4H, but I am too cowardly, or (b) I want to rebid 2♥, but that is an illegal Insufficient Bid. In my three-and-a-half decades experience of playing Duplicate Bridge it is option (a) that I find very frequently correct. So as Director I would deem option (a) to be not an alternative fact, but

rather demonstrably true. Hence as Director (given a Pass of 3♥ by South is a logical alternative) I adjust the score to 3♥ +170.

Arie Geursen: Hmm... how did declarer avoid losing 4 tricks? Perhaps West tried to cash 3 rounds of clubs thereby giving declarer a welcome ruff and sluff. Never mind, that is irrelevant to issue at hand. The pivotal issue is what does the hesitation demonstrably suggests and is pass a logical alternative to 4♥ (Law 16B1(a & b))?

The Director will need to establish how NS systemically show a strong hand after the opponents have opened the bidding. Personally I play a takeout double followed by a bid on the next round as showing a strong playing hand with at least 5 of the bid suit. So I am not at all sure what a slow 3♥ suggests that has not already been conveyed. So when North bids again how can you afford to stay out of game with 4 card trump support? In fact I would probably give partner a push in response to his 2♥ call. But this is not about me. *"It's time to poll the players"*. Write the South hand and auction out on a piece of paper and poll 5 players of a similar standard as South to find out what they would do in a smooth, natural auction (don't tell them about the hesitation until they have told you what they would do with their regular partner). If two of the players you surveyed find a pass then you can safely rule that Pass is a logical alternative to 4♥. Also ask those player who indicated that they would raise 3♥ to 4 if they would still do so bid if partner had hesitated before bidding 3♥.

Note that in the 2017 Laws 16B1(a & b) have been rewritten to make them less wordy but their intent remains the same.

Ed: ...with the majority keeping the table result.

Rich Colker: So, how did NS make 4♥ here with four top losers and no place to dispose of any of them? The only way I can think of is if East leads the ♣J, West signals encouragement (instead of discouraging, hoping East can find a diamond shift), East continues clubs and West plays a third club playing East for a doubleton and hoping he can score a putative ♥J. If so, EW's damage is wholly of their own making. Looking at this from another angle, I do not consider "several seconds" to be out of tempo for a player (North) with an (obviously) strong hand to pause before taking a third bid, at the three level, after both opponents have shown strength and partner has twice failed to contribute to the auction. As for South's belated raise, North's bidding alone suggests South stretching for game. And in addition, even if unauthorized information were present, it caused NS to reach a no-play contract that they (presumably) would not have reached otherwise, giving EW a chance for a sizeable pick-up. No foul, but even assuming one there was no consequent damage. EW were responsible for their own misfortune, so no adjustment. Table result stands (and EW get a mini-lecture on trying to get something they don't deserve).

Laurie Kelso: This is by far the easiest of the three problems – table result stands. South's slow 3♥ is not in any way suggestive of values greater than those already shown by the same player via his 2♥ bid on the previous round. In fact I think a slow action within this context is indicative of a slightly underweight North hand.

I am also slightly curious as to what the opening lead was (given that the defence failed to cash their four defensive winners).

Matthew McManus: Firstly I am interested in knowing how 4♥ was allowed to make. There is no obvious line without some significant help from the defenders. If the defensive line which allowed the contract to make was adjudged to be a serious error, then NS would carry that part of the

damage that arose from this error. (What that might be would depend on the result from the other table.)

However, in the current case, my feeling is that this will not be relevant. I do not see an infraction. I agree that South had a logical alternative to bidding 4♥: Pass. However I do not believe that that action was demonstrably suggested by the break in tempo. In fact, if anything, the pause probably suggested that North had less values or shape and was considering passing rather than bidding. So it turned out - bidding on was an error in judgement and would have been punished had EW defended even vaguely well. I allow the table score to stand.

Peter Holloway: On face value south has bid 4♥ with no defence to clubs and a probable second fit in spades. A possible poll with this hand? South's game bid has turned a positive into a negative for EW. Their bad defence has let the game make. (Perhaps ♣A followed by a switch to ♦K, small diamond to the ace and another diamond allowing declarer to discard a losing club.) I would let result stand.

JUDGEMENT RULINGS (2)

We present some situations for reader and panel discussion in the next issue. Please note that, even though most of these situations are taken from real life, no guarantees are given that every relevant fact has been included. Since any minor factual variation could influence the deliberations, these problems should be regarded as purely theoretical exercises. It is therefore only to be expected that in some cases the majority decision will differ from the ruling made at the time.

Readers are invited to send in responses and contributions of interesting directing problems for inclusion in this column are very welcome.

Hand 1 Club Duplicate Session

Bd. 10 / E / All

♠ 74	
♥ 3	
♦ KQ9	
♣ AKQ9754	
♠ AQ1032	♠ KJ986
♥ AQJ94	♥ 10762
♦ 7	♦ A1042
♣ 102	♣ -
♠ 5	
♥ Q85	
♦ J8653	
♣ J863	

West	North	East	South
		Pass	Pass
1♠	2♣	4♦	Pass
4NT ¹	Pass	5♥ ²	Pass
5♠ ³	Pass	6♦	Pass
Pass	Pass		

¹ RKC Blackwood

² 2 key cards without ♣Q

³ Agreed Very Long Thought

Result: EW +1430

NS called the director to say they thought East bidding slam could have been influenced by West's very long pause before his bid of 5♠. West said that he hadn't wanted to use Blackwood and now couldn't be sure just where his losers were. He said 4♠ should be based on a shortage somewhere but East had sometimes made such a bid with a small doubleton.

Hand 2 Major Pairs Event**Bd. 2 / E / NS**

♠ AK732	
♥ 95432	
♦ 4	
♣ 102	
♠ 64	♠ Q
♥ KQ86	♥ AJ
♦ Q3	♦ AK1076
♣ AJ754	♣ KQ863
♠ J10985	
♥ 107	
♦ J9852	
♣ 9	

West	North	East	South
	X ¹	1♦	Pass
2♣		3♣ ²	X
3NT	Pass	4NT ³	Pass
5♦	Pass	6♣	Pass
Pass	Pass		

¹ Shows spades and hearts² No alert required by regulation. Splinter.³ Blackwood 03/14

Result: NS +920

East intended 3♣ to be a splinter but West explained it as natural to South on request. (Splinter is correct.) East said that he was always going to use Blackwood and still wanted to play in clubs even though he knew his partner had taken 3♣ as natural. North queried why East had gone on after 3NT as that was surely a signoff. He added that had he not been told that 3♣ was natural then he may have bid 4♣ and even 6♣. East said he not take 3NT as a sign off particularly.

Hand 3 Swiss Pairs Congress**Bd. 9 / N / EW**

♠ Q7643	
♥ K9	
♦ AQ	
♣ K964	
♠ AJ108	♠ 92
♥ Q72	♥ A1063
♦ 7652	♦ 94
♣ 52	♣ AJ1087
♠ K5	
♥ J854	
♦ KJ1083	
♣ Q3	

West	North	East	South
	1♠	Pass	1NT ¹
Pass	2♣ ²	Pass	2NT
Pass	3NT	Pass	Pass
Pass			

¹ Alerted as a one round force² Shows 4 clubs

Result: NS +400

North, East and South are all very experienced players, West is relatively inexperienced.

After some thought, West led the ♣5, the 6 from dummy, the 7 from East, won by declarer with the ♣Q. Before the trick was quit, South asked West, "What is your carding?" Somewhat bemused by the question, West was slow to reply. Before he could do so, South pointed to the ♣7 and asked West, "What is that?" More or less simultaneously, East asked, "What sort of question is that?" and West said, "That's the seven of clubs." Play then continued. A couple of tricks later, West got on lead with the ♠A and switched to the ♥Q. The contract made.

At the end of the hand, East called the director. East explained the facts as he saw them - they were not disputed - and asserted that South's line of questioning was blatant coffee-housing designed to mislead West as to the layout of the club suit. West said that, without South's questions, he probably would have continued clubs when in with the spade ace.