

Some claim cases to prepare for a discussion.

1)

The bidding was:

W	N	E	S
-	-	1♦	2♦
p	3♦	X	3♥
p	4♥	all pass	

AJ9	
A95	
Q4	
AKQJ10	
10642	K
3	K842
K1087	AJ9652
9863	52
Q8753	
QJ1076	
3	
74	

'My partner lead ♦K and switched to spades. I made my ♠K and played ♦A. Declarer ruffed and took a finesse with ♥Q. I upheld once and the declarer continued with ♥J and seeing the discard in West claimed just made without any statement. The TD ruled 4♥ made.

Is that the right decision? '

2)

♠A76542	
♥985	
♦754	
♣T	
♠T8	♠KQ3
♥A3	♥KT62
♦QJ9	♦AKT82
♣AQ9754	♣3
♠J9	
♥QJ74	
♦63	
♣KJ862	

West plays 3NT with just no bids from NS.

♠5 for the Q, ♣3 for the Q, ♣4 for the 8 in South and discarding a heart from dummy, ♠J to the A and ♠6 for the K.

West now leads ♦2 to the Q and claims losing one more trick to a heart at the end. After something like 8 seconds he correct this statement saying that all tricks are his.

What decision should the TD take?

3)

♠AQJ75	
♥AKT65	
♦K	
♣52	
♠863	♠T942
♥9	♥Q84
♦T96	♦J853
♣J98643	♣KT
♠K	
♥J732	
♦AQ742	
♣AQ7	

South plays 7NT and gets the lead of ♥9. He takes the A and plays a small spade to the K. Then ♦2 to the K in dummy after which he catches four spade tricks. East discards the ♣T. Now a small club to the K and A. He puts ♣Q on the table and miscounting the tricks he claims the grand.

Does he get it?

More general question: should the laws allow claims like (in this case) ‘if East has 3 hearts and 4 diamonds he is squeezed’?

4)

E/All

♠KJ83	
♥JT92	
♦852	
♣K8	
♠AQ65	♠T72
♥AQ74	♥53
♦KQ4	♦AJ96
♣A3	♣T982
♠94	
♥K86	
♦T73	
♣QJ874	

West is declarer after 2NT-3NT. North leads ♥J for Q. From West a small spade to ♠T and ♣2 from dummy for 4,3,5. Another heart for 5, K, A. Now West cashes 4 diamond tricks. South discards ♠4, west ♥4 and North ♣K. ♣6 from dummy for the ace.

With

♠KJ	
♥92	
♦--	
♣--	
♠AQ5	♠72
♥7	♥--
♦--	♦--
♣--	♣T9
♠--	
♥8	
♦--	
♣QJ8	

declarer plays ♥7 and at that moment South claims the remaining 4 tricks. Declarer acquiesces, but sometime later (having acquiesced) he discovers the heart position with South preventing a mistake by his partner.

He asks the TD to adjust the score.

5)

Let us take another example of a premature acquiescence:

Dummy irrelevant

♠7	♠8
♥4	♦6
♠95	

Spades trumps. West just cashed his ♥A with East discarding and south following suit.. Declarer claims the last two tricks (no cards shown), accepted without discussion. Last board, result written down. Now west discovers that declarer has 95, where he expected 98. Screaming ‘how can you claim this for 2 tricks?’; he calls the TD.

Is there a reason to change L69B? Either being more lenient to the opponents of the claiming side or deciding to introduce splitscores in these cases?

I'll show you the surprise of a strong player from Norway who sent this case to blml:

I was quite sure I had a firm and correct understanding of the claim laws, but a recent case gave me a couple of surprising views. I'm not sure why my fellow TD's disagree with me, and therefore I present the case to BLML.

In a knock out match this occurred:

AKJxx	
AQxx	
Kxx	
K	
xx	98x
xxxx	xx
Jxx	Qxxx
Axxx	QJTx
	QTx
	KJx
	Axx
	xxxx

Contract: 6S by North.

Lead: CQ to the ace.

North now claimed the rest of the tricks, saying he would discard a diamond in dummy on the fourth heart and ruff a diamond.

This, of course, would only succeed if after drawing two rounds of trump the hand with long trumps held four hearts. Thus, if the opponents protested the claim, the contract would fail. As it happened, the opponents was just as asleep as declarer, and acquiesced to the claim.

After the match the board was discussed, and the discovered that the claim was false.

But that the contract could have been made playing on reverse dummy.

But they still didn't protest against the claim within the correction period, which for this tournament is prolonged to 24 hours after finishing the match.

(Matches are played privately, frequently with no TD present.)

The board decided the match.

The losing team contacted our federation two days after the correction period ended.

Supposing the opponents protested against the claim within the 24 hour correction period, how would you rule?

*Kind regards,
Harald Skjærان*

6)

♠AKJT4	♠73
♥AK95	♥T84
♦--	♦Q63
♣AT72	♣K9543
♠865	♠Q92
♥QJ632	♥7
♦K82	♦AJT9754
♣86	♣QJ

North plays 6♠. East leads a diamond for the ace (in north a ♥-discard). ♣Q for the K. East a spade for the A and then the ♠K. Now a ♥-ruff and the ♣-J. Going back to his hand with a ♦-ruff he claimes all the remaining tricks and the contract, without mentioning the last spade left.

What should the TD decide?

There are too many situations of outstanding trumps creating calls by the opponents in claiming cases. Would it be an improvement not to allow such claims anymore, making the laws such that a trump left makes a trick if possible in normal play, removing L70C2 from the present laws?

7)

W/all

♠AJ9	♠T8642
♥AKJ2	♥Q854
♦AT95	♦6
♣K2	♣J43
♠K5	♠Q73
♥T9763	♥--
♦Q42	♦KJ873
♣T85	♣AQ976

North is declarer in 6NT. ♠8-lead for 3, 5 and 9. North plays ♦A and ♦T for the Q. West plays a small heart for the ace after which North catches the ♥K and claims the contract without any statement in the folowing position:

♠AJ	
♥J2	
♦95	
♣K2	
♠K	♠T64
♥T97	♥Q8
♦4	♦
♣T85	♣J43
♠Q7	
♥	
♦KJ8	
♣AQ9	

West shows him the ♠K and north admits that he thought the ♠K already being played. But then he discovers the ♠K being bare bringing him the 8th trick automatically.

West doesn't like it and calls the TD. Decision?

How do you estimate the chance that declarer would not make his contract? If zero, shouldn't the TD take that into consideration when deciding?

8)

Declarer has ♠x ♥QTx ♦-- ♣x left. Clubs trumps, still a spade to loose, ♥A,K already gone. Being in hand he plays ♥Q and claims 4 tricks stating that the last trick is for the winning spade. But the claim is wrong, one of the opponents has still ♥Jx.

If declarer continues hearts he wil loose 2 tricks, if he plays the trump now he will loose 3 tricks.

Should there be a difference between having ♣T and ♣3 as the last trump?

Should we rewrite the laws to get more consistent rulings in these cases? And what way do we go then?