

Discussion

1

	♠(K)T7	
	♥852	
	♦A853	
	♣K64	
♠852		♠AQJ9
♥K63		♥J94
♦J94		♦QT6
♣T853		♣972
	♠643	
	♥AQT7	
	♦K72	
	♣AQJ	

South plays 3NT and gets the ♠5 as lead. The ♠K in dummy is hidden behind the ♠T. North plays ♠7, East ♠A. East continues with the ♠Q and when dummy wants to play the ♠T he discovers the ♠K behind it. East is not pleased and they decide to call the TD.

2

E/NS

	♠843	
	♥AQ	
	♦T8	
	♣AQ8742	
♠AK765		♠T
♥T4		♥9732
♦AKJ5		♦8763
♣J9		♣T653
	♠QJ92	
	♥KJ865	
	♦Q42	
	♣K	

South is declarer in 3NT. The play goes:

♦A, K and J, won by declarer. ♣K and small heart to the ace in trick 5. On the ♣A West revokes by playing the ♠7. South plays the ♣Q (in West the ♠6) and overtakes the ♥Q with the K. On the ♥J West doesn't follow suit and declarer concedes the last 4 tricks for a result of minus 2. Seeing the ♣J in West's hand declarer discovers the revoke and summons the TD.

Decision?

3

We had the problem of both sides revoking in the same trick in the previous course:

Let us see:

	♠8	
	♥	
	♦75	
	♣	
♠		♠9
♥953		♥6
♦		♦3
♣		♣
	♠T	
	♥8	
	♦4	
	♣	

South is declarer in a ♠-contract and West on lead plays ♥9, ruffed in North, overruffed in East and once again in South. Following strictly what the laws say this results in 1 or 2 tricks to be transferred to EW and a quite disputable 1 trick going back. This has resulted in a decision from the WBFLC saying that with revokes from both sides in the same trick L64B and therefore also 64C applies.

An example of more than one revoke on a board gives us another problem (posted in blml some years ago):

	♠AQ8	
	♥94	
	♦JT8542	
	♣T3	
♠KT762		♠J5
♥J876		♥AKT532
♦3		♦A
♣J74		♣K982
	♠943	
	♥Q	
	♦KQ976	
	♣AQ65	

East plays 5♥X

The play: ♦K for A, ♥A and K. North revokes discarding ♦2 on ♥K. ♠J for Q, ♣T for Q, ♣A and 5. On the ♣5 dummy follow suit, North ruffs with ♥9 and East overruffs with ♥T.

What to do? If East had followed suit there would have been a two trick penalty for NS, making his contract. By revoking himself the penalty for NS becomes one trick and East creates a two trick penalty for himself, going three off. It looks like a penalty of 3 tricks for this special revoke?

4 (from a blml discussion)

	♠K8653	
	♥7	
	♦862	
	♣Q965	
♠QJ4		♠AT2
♥J6		♥Q84
♦AKQ53		♦JT94
♣J84		♣AT3
	♠97	
	♥AKT9532	
	♦7	
	♣K72	

East plays 3NT (south overcalled in ♥) and wins the heart lead. He starts playing some rounds of ♦. North revokes on the second diamond trick and follows suit on the third. The TD explains the situation and East decides to cash 8 tricks fulfilling his contract with the penalty trick. Without this penalty trick he would have had no option but to finesse the ♠K, making 10 tricks. Is this a clear (or less clear) reason to apply L64C, considering EW insufficiently compensated?

And what in a pairs event if East had played this way?

More generally:

The revoke penalty does not compensate for the tricks gained if the revoke had not occurred. The reason is that declarer followed a line of play influenced by the idea to receive a bottom anyway. Is there a reason to apply L64C as long as that line of play can be considered to be within the range of normal?

5

W/--; screens

	♠AJ9752	
	♥KJ3	
	♦A4	
	♣A8	
♠4		♠KQT3
♥9		♥Q8654
♦KQT73		♦52
♣KQT943		♣J2
	♠86	
	♥AT72	
	♦J986	
	♣765	

W	N	E	S
1♣	1♠	X	pass
3♦	pass	3NT	all pass

3♦: W to S: long and weak; E to N: long and strong

The contract is 3 off. Assuming that West gave the right explanation is there reason to adjust the score?

6

There are some specific situations in which hesitations occur and where an element of surprise is introduced in the game putting pressure on a player who has to take a key decision which might take some time.

Examples are the search for the Q with AJTx opposite K963 or the play from declarers hand towards Kxx in dummy in trick 2 in a small slam.

If we agree that it might take some time to decide whether to play this key card when in possession of it a player should be allowed to take the same seconds without having that card.

Do you agree with that idea?

(This is not a suggestion to allow hesitating with a singleton, that should never be allowed)

7

North has AT96 A7 53 AKQ43 and opens 1NT explained as 11 -14 hcp. South bids 2H as a transfer and North now jumps to 6♠ which makes.

Is there a reason to adjust the score? North has UI and certainly has a LA. But does the mismatch between his holding and the explanation given suggest to bid 6♠? And if not, and we still feel unhappy, what reason can there be to adjust?

8

	♠843	
	♥A843	
	♦K63	
	♣JT6	
♠Q5		♠T92
♥K92		♥J65
♦QT52		♦J9
♣Q982		♣AK543
	♠AKJ76	
	♥QT7	
	♦A874	
	♣7	

South is declarer in 3♠. He gets a small club lead for the K. East thinks for a long time and keeps his ♣K faced on the table. When the declarer looks up again and sees the ♣K he wrongly interprets it as the lead for the second trick and ruffs low (♠6).

Which law tells us what to do with this ♠6?