



7th EBL Tournament Directors Course

San Giusto Canavese (TO) – 27th/31st January 2006

ANSWERS TO THE FINAL EXAMINATION

1. It is impossible to write any hand consistent with West's bidding where ducking the ♦ is the right thing to do. Even though we should have no sympathy at all for South, it is also hard to find a way to penalize his revoke.

Result stands. Laws 47B, 16C2.

2.

NS score	NS Frequency	NS mp	EW Frequency	EW mp
1460	9	210	9	8
1430	22	179	22	39
710	11	146	12	73
680	35	100	35	120
650	1	64	1	156
500	23	40	22	179
300	5	12	5	206
-100	2	5	2	213
-200	2	1	2	217

3. There certainly is no bridge reason for East's remark! The finesse is the straightforward action without the illegal deception.

Result adjusted in 7♥ made, NS +1510. Law 73F.2.

4. Tricky, but West's first statement is complete and consistent, and everything seems to point to the fact that it has been South's improper question that has confused West, and made him think that there was still an outstanding trump.

If a player wishes to dispute a claim, then he should do so by summoning the TD.
Result adjudicated as 4♠ made, NS -420. Laws 68C, 68D.

5. The first thing to think about is whether or not East has Unauthorized Information. Certainly, he cannot be sure about how long his partner has hesitated, but on the other hand, it is impossible for him to pretend that it has been only South who has contributed to such a long delay. The answer, therefore, is that East has UI.

The second problem is whether or not the hesitation suggests to bid, and this looks to be a clear cut yes.

The last problem about the bidding is to decide about whether or not passing is a logical alternative. It is a rather close call, but going against the offending side looks the right thing to do.

We should now focus our attention to the play in 4♥. Dropping the K of trump is possible, even if not likely, and the adjusted score should be based on a weighted score, giving South one chance out of three (four) to make his contract.

We may even want to consider North's lead – certainly not the best possible – to decide whether there has been a self-inflicted damage or not, but even though rather bad, it should not be classified any of *wild, gambling or irrational*.

Final result making 4♥ 1/3 of the times, and 4♥-1 2/3 of the times. NS +3 IMPS. Code of Practice, Laws 16A, 12C3.

6. Even though in some countries South's sequence does not necessarily promise a strong hand (in Italy for example, and for most American experts), most of the World play it as showing a very good hand, and South's cards seem to confirm that this is the NS partnership's style.

Result stands, Law 16A.

7. Not too much sympathy for South, but the claim should be allowed. There is indeed no way, other than irrational ones, that the contract can go down.

Final result 6NT made, NS +990. Law 68, 70A and footnote to Laws 69, 70, 71.

8. The damage inflicted by the offence is the difference between the 650 that EW would have scored without the infraction, and the 300 that they should have scored in defending 4♠x, hence 8 IMPS.

However, they lost 15 IMPS in the board, and the further 7 IMPS were the result of their own irrational play.

So, for team "A" a flat board; for team "B" a loss of 7 IMPs. As this is a KO match, the result on the board becomes 3.5 IMPs for team "A".

Final match result: 31.5 – 31.0 in favor of team "A". Law 86B.

9. Does East have a bridge reason to spend some time thinking about what to do? It is certainly arguable. However Law 73D.1 requires a player to do his best, in such positions, to avoid to deceive the opponents. This results in the very well known

general approach that East should now avoid to play a card that might add some deception, the K♣ in our problem, selecting the Q♣ instead.

Law 73F.2 seems to suggest that in order to adjust the score, we must decide that East had no bridge reason to think before playing the K♣, however, the header of 73F says that item F refers to any violation of the properties described in Law 73.

We therefore solve the first problem going with South's complaint. However, we still have to decide how many tricks South would have made without the illegal deception.

Since South may have a complete count of West's hand, and EW carding have suggested that West might be end played, it seems reasonable to adjust to 3NT made, NS +600, while a weighted score which takes in account that the contract might go down anyway is acceptable.

10. The first answer asked of the candidate is to find the Law that requires the TD to explain all the options, and that Law is 10C.1.

The second answer are the options after West's infraction. First of all, North has the right to accept it (Law 29A). Then, West must pass whenever is his turn to call (Law 30B.1b). Finally, there are two further Laws to be considered: 72B.1, specifically quoted in the Law 30B.1b, and Law 23.

Could West have known that his infraction could have resulted in an advantage for his side? An obvious yes. He has nothing, and it looks like informing his partner of the situation may be a good thing to do.

Did West's enforced pass carry any information that East could have taken benefit from? Another yes, he had been warned to be careful in entering the auction.

Did this result in any advantage for EW? Once again yes. East has an automatic DBL over 3♣, and has been kept out of the auction from knowing that his partner had to pass. He had no reasonable options other than to keep silent. If West had not been subjected to the penalty, East would have doubled, South could have redoubled, and later on he would have been likely to double the final 3♦ contract. This contract should go two off, since only the unlikely lead of a major from North at trick one take South off the hook of a later end play.

Final result 3♦x -2, NS +500.

11. The EBL regulations state that the 2♠ bid should be alerted. Without the infraction, West would have probably doubled 2♠ for T/O, and reaching a slam would now have been surely possible. For NS, the score should, then, be some weighted, such as 6♥ made, NS -1430, one time out of two, and 4♥+2 one time out of two. NS -7 IMPS. Giving NS -1430 more times, or, in general, a different weight is acceptable, while giving them -680 is not.

Looking at EW, the pass over 2♠x cannot be considered other than a *wild, gambling or irrational* action (probably, the three of them together!), hence EW have inflicted some damage to themselves.

Without the infraction, EW would have scored sometimes a slam, and sometimes a game. Giving them the same weight we assigned to NS, we may say that they would have scored +7 IMPs. However, the stupid pass resulted in a further damage of 9 IMPs.

The final result is NS -7 IMPs, EW -2 IMPs board. EBL regulations, EBL/WBF Code of Practice, Laws 40C, 12C3.

12. West has shown a normal hand, and East has driven his partnership to slam anyhow. If West would have doubled 2♣ for T/O, therefore showing either the reds, or a strong heart one suited hand, East would have had even more reasons to bid a slam.

West didn't really have any option other than pass over 2♣, because he would have known that his partner would have taken a double as for T/O.

East received a clear and full explanation of NS agreements, therefore he cannot be entitled to any redress.

South's infraction is then not responsible at all for EW's poor result.

Score stands. Law 40C.

13. We are using here the nice new part of Law 16A: "...could *demonstrably* have been suggested over another by the extraneous information.". It is clear that it is North who is thinking, however his thought does not suggest that bidding 4♠ might be better than doubling again, and, on the other hand, passing is not a logical alternative.

Result stands.

14. South's statement is singular, hence he has clearly shown the intention to draw just one round of trumps. He has obviously miscounted the trumps, and thinks that one further round would be enough to draw all the remaining.

However, there is a way to go down from this point on: he might draw the second round with the Q, thereby being obliged to ruff the fourth ♠ with the A♥ and promoting a trump trick for East. This line is not irrational, specially for a player who thinks that all his trumps are equal.

Score adjudicated as 7♥-1, NS -50. Law 70C.

15.

NS Result	mp
1460	210
1430	178,7
710	145,4
680	99,4
650	63,1
500	39,8
300	12,8

-100	5,4
-200	1

16. South's bidding sequence is definitively alertable. Without the infraction, East would never have led a \diamond , nor a \spadesuit (his partner is bound to have no more than two \spadesuit). With the \clubsuit lead, the declarer may or may not guess the $Q\spadesuit$. Even though he has not done so in real life, with the \clubsuit lead he would have been in hand, and running the $J\spadesuit$ might have looked better.

Once North loses the finesse, it is possible for EW to take up to 9 tricks, however, to do so they have to unblock the \heartsuit , and this does not look too likely, even though it should be taken in account.

The last consideration goes to East's lead: is it wild, gambling or irrational? We may have no sympathy for it, but it doesn't look to fall within any of these categories.

The score should be adjusted as 3NT-2, NS - 100 some of the times, 3NT-5, NS -250 lesser times, with the inclusion of a weighted score of NS making 3NT once in a while as a possible alternative. My suggestion: -250 1/5, +400 1/5, -100 3/5. Laws 40C, 75C, 12C.

17. Difficult to find the right way. Certainly North has UI, but does he have an alternative once the bid is up to 3 \heartsuit ?

The bid of 3NT looks clearly influenced by UI, and there are two possible alternatives: 3 \spadesuit , in order to get to 3NT by South, and 4 \diamond . If North bids 3 \spadesuit , East has a chance to DBL, and now the \spadesuit lead from West gives to the defence a big chance to defeat the contract. It is acceptable to adjust to 3NT-1, however there is a better option: to consider that 3 \spadesuit might have been suggested over 4 \diamond by UI (he knows that South has a \clubsuit stopper), and adjust the score as 4 \diamond by North.

The final problem is to decide the final outcome in 4 \diamond . The contract makes easily with the \spadesuit lead, and it should not make with the \clubsuit lead, while with the \heartsuit lead the defence needs to be careful to defeat 4 \diamond . Down one half of the times sounds reasonable.

Final result 4 \diamond -1 one time out of two, 4 \diamond made one time out of 2, NS -2 IMPs. A different weight is acceptable, as it is a weighted score which takes in account 3NT-1. Laws 40C, 75C, 12C.

18, The case A) is rather easy: it could have easily been South who hesitated before bidding 5 \clubsuit , therefore East has no UI, and result stands.

However, in case B) we have to decide whether or not pass is a logical alternative. A close call, but in real life all the experts interviewed bid, and once again the result should stand. Code of Practice, Law 16A.

19. North's bid looks clearly unacceptable, and not influenced by the wrong information received. However, if not in the bidding, North can claim some damage in the play.

Playing the $K\diamond$ at trick one is ridiculous with the right information, while it is possible for a player who knows the minors to be on his right, and is happy to shorten

LHO's trumps. If the declarer ducks the lead, and later on plays ♥ to the 10, he may escape with down two.

A weighted score which takes in account the two possibilities of two and three down seems appropriate.

My suggestion for the final result is 3♥-2 two times out of three, 3♥-3 one time out of three, NS -2 IMPs. A different weight is acceptable, as is 3♥-2 all the times. Laws 40C, 75C, 12C.

20. Tricky. The first problem is to decide whether or not West has UI, and the key point is to judge about whether or not West knows that it is East who has hesitated.

It would be rather strange to think that it is North who has taken long time before supporting ♠, while a long thought from a player who has to decide about whether to DBL or pass, or whether to DBL or bid 4♥, is much more likely.

We should, then, rule on basis of UI.

The further question is to decide whether or not pass is a logical alternative. Here the answer is easier: East had the chance to bid 4♥ himself, and on the other hand West has many defensive tricks.

The last problem is the number of tricks in 3♠ doubled. The declarer has to be careful, but has a big chance to succeed, and we should give him his doubled contract.

Final result 3♠x made, NS +730, while a weighted score of 3♠x-1 some of the time is also accepted. Law 16A, 12C.

1

W/EW

♠KQ76
♥J
♦K32
♣AQ765

♠8
♥K8765432
♦1095
♣10

♠A2
♥AQ9
♦J876
♣KJ98

♠J109543
♥10
♦AQ4
♣432

W	N	E	S
Pass	4♠	end	2♠

The play goes:

West	North	East	South
10♦	2♦	6♦	<u>Q♦</u>
8♠	Q♠	<u>A♠</u>	4♠
3♥	J♥	<u>A♥</u>	10♥
4♥	<u>7♠</u>	2♠	5♠
5♦	<u>K♦</u>	7♦	4♦
9♦	3♦	8♦	<u>A♦</u>
10♣*	Q♣	<u>K♣</u>	2♣

DOWN ONE

At the end of play. South calls the TD, complaining that while he was upon deciding what to play from dummy on W's 10♦, E had said, bending over to speak to him, "no way you can make five". Thus, he had lost his concentration, and had carelessly played the Q♣, losing his contract. Had he ducked instead, W would have been end played, having to concede a ruff and discard, and the contract.