

1) E/--

	W	N	E	S
				1♦*
	2♦**	pass	2♥	pass
	3♦	all pass		

	♠KJT8(7)		
	♥AQxx(xx)		
	♦(x)		
	♣xx(x)		
♠			♠J95
♥			♥KJ73
♦			♦85
♣			♣Q743
	♠AQ63		
	♥84		
	♦KTxx		
	♣A82		

* = alerted , explained as possibly short in Diamonds (Precision)

** = alerted, explained as major two-suiter

NS call the TD after the play and complain about the explanation of the 2♦-bid. They would have bid at least up to 2♠, they say. What decision does the TD take? The convention card supports the explanation.

- a) West has: xx x AQJxxx KJxx
- b) West has: x Axx AQJxxx KJx
- c) West has: xx x AQJxxxx KJx

2)

	♠JT74	
	♥AQ6	
	♦A42	
	♣A85	
♠Q8		♠A95
♥JT5		♥9742
♦8		♦T97653
♣QJT9763		♣---
	♠K632	
	♥K83	
	♦KQJ	
	♣K42	

South plays 4♠, first lead ♣Q. Declarer plays ♣A and without east playing a card plays a small club from his hand after which he plays a small trump from dummy. East plays at the same time his first card being a small trump (♠5). South wins the trick with the K (west ♠8) and plays a small trump from his hand. At this moment East screams what is going on? I have played one card and declarer three!!

a) TD

b) While East screams west plays the ♠Q and then East calls for the TD

3)

North is dealer. He puts the 1♠ bid on the table, saying 1♥.

a) East passes and then West notices the mistake and calls the TD. What does he do?

b) East and South don't notice and East passes while South bids 1NT. At that moment West notices the mistake and calls the Director. What does he do?

4)

S/EW

	♠A84	
	♥---	
	♦8752	
	♣AQT973	
♠KJ9732		♠QT65
♥AT974		♥KQ8653
♦6		♦AK
♣5		♣8
	♠---	
	♥T2	
	♦QJT943	
	♣KJ642	

W	N	E	S
		2♥?	pass
3NT?	5♣		pass

2♥: 5+/4+ in ♥/♠ and 13 -16 hcp

3NT: blackwood

- East passes after 20 seconds and immediately says: 'sorry I made a mistake'. TD!
East tells the TD that he wants to change his call. If allowed he will not do so.
- South asks about the meaning of pass and West tells that it shows zero aces. Now East calls the TD and want to change his call.

In both cases the auction continues:

	?	6♣
6♥	X	all pass

6♥ makes after the lead with ♦Q and N calls the TD challenging the 6♥ bid made with UI. But West will say that he based this bid on the assumption that east had 0 aces which made 6♣ a certainty. On the contrary, pass or double would have been based on UI (East having at least one ace) in his opinion.

5) pairs

West picks the cards from the previous board and NS bid 6♣ (1NT pass 6♣ pass pass).
Now west discovers his mistake and calls the TD.

- a) When the TD let them start the auction again EW will pass throughout again.
- b) West now has QJT9 in clubs and passes throughout. The slam is one off . When asked why he didn't double he will say that 6NT might be an alternative, but also thought to receive more than average by just passing instead of average – minus which a double
- c) Esat has nothing and doubles the final contract. Asked why he doubled he tells that playing against a slam almost always gives less than average, so average –minus seemed a good decision.

6)

South is declarer in 4♥

- a) but for some strange reason west thinks to be dummy and puts down his cards, starting with ♠Q84. Declarer prevents him from more exposure. TD!
- b) Putting down the ♠4 West drops the ♠Q and 8.

7)

E/--

	♠AQJ4		
	♥72		
	♦J963		
	♣654		
♠K2		♠98765	
♥KQ		♥864	
♦K854		♦72	
♣QJT72		♣AK8	
	♠T3		
	♥AJT953		
	♦AQT		
	♣93		

W	N	E	S
		pass	2♥?
Pass	??		

- a) North explains 2♥ as multi after which West passes. Looking at his box North now discovers something strange and starts mumbling. The final result of that is that he tells to have erred, thinking to see a 2♦-bid. 2♥ shows 11- 14 with a 6+ card hearts. TD.
- b) North explains 2♥ as multi and on his turn to call takes 2♥ out of the bidding box, but still holds that bid in his hand. Looking at the bidding cards in the South position he says: 'sorry I meant to bid 2♠' and then a few seconds later adds: 'what am I doing ? I thought his bid was 2♦'. West now calls the TD. (West will not replace his pass).

8)

	♠--	
	♥6	
	♦2	
	♣7	
♠7		♠--
♥--		♥A
♦AQ		♦5
♣--		♣A
	♠--	
	♥--	
	♦K	
	♣63	

South plays 3NT and with the lead in dummy concedes all tricks. He calls the TD to tell him that West did revoke in spades some tricks earlier. West did not win a spade trick thereafter yet. How many tricks should be transferred to declarer? West admits that he did revoke.

- Apart from the ♠7 being in west declarer doesn't know the position of any of the other cards.
- Declarer knows that west has the ♦A and the ♠7.
- exchange the ♦A and ♥A between W and E. Declarer knows that east has the ♦A.

9)

Dummy has played the ♠T in trick 4, but it is still on the table at trick 9. (assume dummy went from the table for some seconds)

- a) Now declarer notices to have an extra card in dummy. Nothing strange has happened related to this ♠T yet.
- b) It is led in trick 10 and wins the trick. Now West discovers it to be the 14th spade.
- c) Follow the line in a): nothing seems to have happened but defenders claim to have misdefended.

10) Screens, N and E at one side, S and W at the other

E/--

W	N	E	S
		1♣	(1♦)

- a) South asks about the meaning of the 1♣-bid and West tells him that he forgot whether they need at least 2 or 3 clubs. It is not written on the CC. South calls the TD and tells him that his choice depends on the agreement about 1♣. What to do?
- b) Extending a): Assume South but not West has been told the agreement and makes his choice. He alerts his call. West asks what it means. South calls the TD again and tells him that he doesn't want to inform West, since that reveals also the meaning of the 1♣-bid (it is written on the CC). What to do?

c)

W	N	E	S
		1♣?	2♣
X	3♣		

West has explained 1♣ as 'may be doubleton'. Tray to the other side with North bidding 3♣ and now West says: ' sorry it shows at least 3 clubs'. South calls the TD and tells him that he made a wrong call based on wrong information.

Discussion:

There is something similar when playing without screens.

W	N	E	S
	!♣	1♦?	

1♣ has been alerted and East without asking bids 1♦. West doesn't know what to do. He needs the meaning of the 1♣ opening to explain his partners call. But he is not allowed to look into the CC nor to ask about that meaning at this stage. How to solve this problem? Just alerting won't help if one of the meanings is natural and South doesn't ask.

11)

W/NS

	♠AJT987	
	♥632	
	♦K2	
	♣J2	
♠K2		♠6543
♥KQJT98		♥75
♦543		♦9876
♣K3		♣654
	♠Q	
	♥A4	
	♦AQJT	
	♣AQT987	

(yes, the deal is composed)

W	N	E	S
1♥	1♠	pass	3NT
all pass			

- West starts ♥K ducked. Declarer takes the second heart and plays ♠Q on which West discards the ♦3. Declarer overtakes the Q with the ace and runs the ♣J to the K. The contract is 3 off.
South calls the TD to deal with the revoke.
- Exchange the ♣3 in west with the ♦6 in east. Declarer takes the first trick and then a) occurs. EW claim that declarer should have played the ♣A it being sure that west holds the K.
- Exchange the ♣K in west with the ♣6 in east. Follow b) but now declarer plays the ♣A in his hand, hoping for the drop of the K. EW claim that a simple finesse would have sufficed to make the contract.

12)

E/NS

	♠KJ96432	
	♥AK7	
	♦J7	
	♣J	
♠T5		♠Q8
♥T53		♥QJ642
♦832		♦QT94
♣T8643		♣97
	♠A7	
	♥98	
	♦AK65	
	♣AKQ52	

a)

W	N	E	S	
		(2♥	X)	2♥ shows 5♥ + 4+ in a minor
pass	3♥	pass	4♣	
pass	4♠	pass	4NT	
pass	5♠?	pass	7♠	
pass	7NT	all pass		

Before the opening lead west asks what 5♠ means and gets the answer 2aces and the queen of trumps. He starts ♠T and declarer makes 13 tricks.

- TD. South says that he forgot to say that instead of ♠Q it also could show extra length in spades. West will say that knowing that he would not have started spades.
- Now the first round of bidding is pass - 1♣ - pass - 2♠ after which South bids 4NT and the auction, play and statements continue identically.

13)

East is dealer

- a) He puts the stop card on the table and before being able to make a call South produces the pass card.
- b) He bids 1♣ and south puts a double on the table after which West bids 1♥. South looks surprised and tells that he didn't finish his call. At the same moment he notices the double and tells that he wanted to put the stopcard on the table. TD. (he intended to bid 2♠ showing a weak hand with spades)

14)

E/all

♠62
♥J83
♦A75
♣AJ976

♠9
♥QT4
♦J98643
♣KQ5

♠T8543
♥A765
♦T2
♣T2

♠AKQJ7
♥K92
♦KQ
♣843

North plays 3NT. He has lost 2 tricks and won the last himself in this position:

♠62
♥J83
♦--
♣A

♠9
♥QT4
♦J9
♣--

♠T8543
♥A
♦--
♣--

♠AKQJ7
♥K
♦--
♣--

He now plays ♣A and says: I discard the ♥K and if anyone has 5 spades I loose another trick. East shows his relief and they start writing the score of 3NT + 1. Now North discovers the squeeze East is suffering and wants another trick. TD!

b) Assume a change (ignore the original holding) :

♠62
♥53
♦5
♣A

♠9
♥64
♦J9
♣7

♠T8543
♥8
♦--
♣--

♠AKQJ7
♥7
♦--
♣--

North makes the same statement.
Is there a reason to award him all tricks
when he notices the squeeze on East after
the claim?

15)

	♠8	
	♥T7	
	♦62	
	♣--	
♠J4		♠7
♥--		♥--
♦AT7		♦J943
♣--		♣--
	♠T9	
	♥86	
	♦Q	
	♣--	

South is declarer in a ♥-contract and has won the last trick in his hand. He has lost one trick. He now plays ♠T, west the J, north follows suit but East plays ♦3.

- Now west shows the ♦A saying that he concedes the other tricks. Within a split second East says: ‘sorry, I should have played the ♠7.’
- Now West shows the ♦A and asks declarer: ‘do I make more than this one? A second later East discovers that he revoked and puts the ♠7 on the table.
- Now west shows the ♦A and says that he concedes the other tricks. East immediately objects and wants play to be continued. The TD is called.
When play continues East shows the ♠7 before West can play to the next trick and tells that he revoked.

Discussion. Version d): Now West shows the ♦A and concedes the other tricks. The result is written down, they start bidding the next board and only then West discovers that East should have another spade and tells so.

Is there a reason not to penalize a revoke as L63A3 prescribes in case partner of the revoking side claims/concedes? It encourages a player to hide such a revoke. (On the other hand the laws do ‘encourage’ hiding a revoke anyway)

16)

S/--

	♠KQ975	
	♥94	
	♦6	
	♣KQJ65	
♠AJ		♠T4
♥AKT85		♥QJ7
♦JT83		♦AK9742
♣97		♣A2
	♠8632	
	♥632	
	♦Q5	
	♣T843	

W	N	E	S
			pass
1♠	pass	2♦	

a and b: TD!

West calls the TD and tells him that he took the wrong bidding cards out of his box. He wants to change that call.

The auction continues:

			pass
2♥	pass	3NT	all pass

South starts with ♣8 and after winning that trick with the ace

- East plays the ♦A in dummy playing ♦3. Both opponents following suit declarer now claims for 13 tricks without a further statement.
- East plays 5♥-tricks and then the ♦3 to his ace. Both opponents following suit he claims for 13 tricks without any explanation.

In both cases North calls the TD and tells him that his side is deprived of bidding 4S by the mistake West made.

South meanwhile looking at the East cards discovers that the ♦-suit has the danger of blocking. He asks the TD to look at the claim.

17)

N/--

		♠QT9876	
		♥AQT	
		♦8	
		♣832	
♠53			♠AK2
♥J73			♥K8654
♦JT9			♦Q53
♣AKJ95			♣QT
		♠J4	
		♥92	
		♦AK7642	
		♣764	

W	N	E	S
	2♦	X	all pass

2♦ multi

- After the pass by North East calls the TD telling he is surprised and asking whether the pass by South, apparently showing diamonds, should have been alerted.
- East calls the TD after the play, 2♦X - 2. Shouldn't the pass by South have been alerted?

18)

S/NS

	♠A76	
	♥QJT98	
	♦KJ7	
	♣A6	
♠542		♠983
♥		♥K62
♦AT653		♦92
♣J9874		♣KQT32
	♠KQT7	
	♥A7543	
	♦Q84	
	♣5	

W	N	E	S
			1♥
pass	2NT	pass	3♥
pass	4♣	pass	4♥
pass	4NT	pass	5♣
pass	6♥	all pass	

1♥: 5+; 2NT forcing with trump support: 5♣: 1 ace.

West starts ♣8 for the ace and declarer plays ♥Q from dummy. East plays the ♥6 and ♥2 simultaneously. TD.

a) and b) South plays ♥A and asks the TD to adjust the score, since his plan was to finesse, but the irregularity by East made him play the ace. With normal play from east he would have made his contract, he says.

a) low level play

b) high experienced play

c) After the instruction from the TD South tells him that the board has become unplayable. His decision depends too much on the information given through the irregularity. If told to continue he plays the ace.

19)

N/-

N	E	S	W	
	1 ♦			1 ♦ out of turn

S calls for the TD..

- a) Not waiting for the TD North says: I open 1♥, take your bid back please. Now the TD arrives.
- b) The TD explains the options and S decides to accept the opening bid out of turn. At that moment, hearing this, N shouts to S : “Why the hell did you accept it ? I want to open 1♥!” The TD is still standing at the table.

20)

The auction goes

W	N	E	S
pass	1♥		

Now North calls the TD and tells him that he has 12 cards.

- a) the card is found under his chair (♠K; faced down). North now asks the TD whether he is allowed to change his bid.
- b) As soon as the TD has arrived East discovers to have 12 cards also and informs the TD. At that moment another table calls: they found two cards. (♣3 and ♣4; use a 'print out' to restore the cards to the right hands)

21)

N/all screens

	♠AQ		
	♥AK874		
	♦AKQ		
	♣AQ5		
♠J9865		♠KT7	
♥965		♥T	
♦J		♦T98732	
♣JT92		♣876	
	♠432		
	♥QJ32		
	♦654		
	♣K43		

N	E	S	W	
2♦*	pass	2♥	pass	* gameforcing
3♥	pass	4♥	pass.	
...	pass			

- Without waiting for North East passes and North pushes the tray to the SW-side. When the tray comes back with two more passes North awakes and says that he wanted to make a bid. TD!
 - Without waiting for North East passes and North pushes the tray to the SW-side. South passes and thereafter he discovers that North didn't make a call. TD.
 - Without waiting for North East passes and pushes the tray to the SW-side. When putting the pass card on the tray South discovers that North didn't call at this turn and calls the TD.
- d) In his third turn to call North bids 6♥ and follows East in picking up the bidding cards . This means that West thinks to defend 4♥, an error he only discovers when the play is finished. What kind of procedure should we follow in such case (this is not a rare situation, it happened several times in Estoril for example)

22)

E/NS	N	E	S	W
		-	2 NT	-
	3♥(1)	-	4♠	-
	-	-		
	(1) 3♥ = transfer			

♠98542
♥Q54
♦J72
♣QJ

♠J3
♥10863
♦AK865
♣K6

♠76
♥J972
♦Q10
♣98543

♠AKQ10
♥AK
♦943
♣A1072

South plays 4♠

West leads three rounds of ♦, E ruffing the third. He plays back a club which S follows with the 10.....of ♠. W is somehow sleepy (?) and thinks that a ♠ has been played. He "takes" the trick with the ♠J and

- East asks declarer where the clubs are left The whole table calls for the TD.
- West plays back a heart. (what a mess !!!). Now declarer notices his revoke, west is puzzled and asks for East's card led in the previous trick and both call for the TD.

23)

S/All/Pairs

<p>♠53 ♥952 ♦A5 ♣876542</p>		N	E	S	W
				2♦(1)	-
		3♣(2)	5♦	6♦	-
<p>♠1098764 ♥8763 ♦2 ♣93</p>	<p>♠2 ♥10 ♦KQJ10976543 ♣A</p>	7♣	-	7♥	-
		-	X	-	-
		-			
		(1) : GF			
		(2) : 1 minor suit Ace			
	<p>♠AKQJ ♥AKQJ4 ♦- ♣KQJ10</p>				

W leads the ♠T to South's Ace. South plays ♥A and K (E discards the ♦K). At trick 4, S calls for the ♥9 from dummy (although he is in his hand) and W with some emphasis plays the ♥7 before E plays (or reacts). E then says to S: "You are in your hand". E calls for the TD when S tries to say that W accepted the play from dummy by playing the ♥7 himself.

24)

S/NS

	♠Q853	
	♥95	
	♦KJ54	
	♣972	
♠AJT94		♠K6
♥6		♥QT732
♦73		♦T86
♣KQT86		♣J43
	♠72	
	♥AKJ84	
	♦AQ92	
	♣A5	

West BOOTS with 2♠ showing 5 spades and a minor with 6-10 points.
TD! The bid is not accepted.

The auction now goes:

W	N	E	S
			1♥
1♠	1NT	pass	3NT
all pass			

- At the moment of his last pass East drops the ♥T on the table. The TD is still there to solve the case.
- Before the TD can do or say anything West LOOT's the ♣K. The TD is still there to solve this case.

Not willing to make live easy for the TD North does not accept this LOOT.

Answers

1)

West has UI that his partner believes him to have the majors. So the meaning of 2♥ changes from showing his (East) own suit to support for hearts

In a) west has a clear alternative in pass.

In b) west should bid a heart game at least. Not doing so creates a severe infraction which should be penalized.

In c) passing is not very attractive. 3♦ is acceptable.

Misbidding is not an infraction, so there is no good reason for redress for NS. But if the TD finds out that EW do not know what they are doing and do present a CC which does not reflect their real agreements he could decide for miss-explanation and award an AS based on a spade contract by NS.

2)

What a mess. Not clearly covered by the laws, or is it? A TD who decides that the ♠5 was played to the second trick should apply L67, asking East to contribute a card to trick one, won by the ♣A anyhow (amazingly this creates a revoke: L 67 B1b). A convincing East might let the TD decide that he ruffed the first trick, of course winning it, and still has to contribute a card to the second. That will be the ace, which should alarm the TD.

In b) it seems unavoidable to apply L 67

What if East hadn't 'followed suit' in the second trick (not playing a spade) when thinking to play in the first? Even worse.

3)

Formally spoken when bidding with bidding cards words do not mean that much. So the call made is 1♠.

- a) But even then using L25A North should get the possibility to clarify his intention, treating the mistake (which one?) as inadvertent.
- b) Following this approach it is too late to change anything now. The TD should inform South that other information than the legal 1♠ call is unauthorized.

Answers

4)

- a) This has to be judged a 25b case and East may change his call for average –minus at most. He is entitled to change his mind hearing the consequences. There is UI for partner.
- b) East is not allowed to use the UI that he made a mistake.

In both cases the TD has a difficult job, isn't West's defence convincing? I think it is, West can't do any good anymore. May be average plus/ average minus in a pairs event and the same in teams in case of a normal result at the other table? But what is normal in this deal?

5)

The WBF laws committee wants boards being played if possible at all and created an impossible law. Does L 17 only apply when the offender only made one call with the wrong hand? And how to judge 'differs in any way'? There is certainly a reason to consider this pass different from the original one. And should the law allow to make a 'free' call for average-minus? We have changed that anomaly for L 15C.

6)

- a) There was no lead from West, so he gives himself 3 penalty cards and South may tell which one to play till there is only one left.
- b) The ♠4 is the legal card to the first trick and the other become (major) penalty cards to be played in the order declarer decides. (law 58B)

Answers

- 7) A lot of confusion coming from North.
- a) This case is easy to handle. Decide for misinformation and allow West to make another call.
- b) This is more complicated. In WBF/EBL events North made a call. The case needs some brain reading, resulting in North taking back all nonsense and replacing the correct agreement. We are still in time to let him withdraw that call in order to give West the opportunity to change his call (L21). But West does not want that option so the TD deals with an insufficient bid. North' 2♥-bid is made, according to EBL-regulations and was not inadvertent, and an insufficient bid can not be replaced in accordance with L 25B. Keep in mind that theoretically L23 might apply if North changes his call in pass (not here). The same for L 26.
- 8) A claim/concession by the player who contests the claim himself. Does he deserve 1 or 2 tricks? For the decision it seems reasonable to assume that EW know the laws and will play in such a way that they avoid to loose a second trick, while declarer will try to win that trick.
- a) Only when playing a diamond South would have 'won' 2 tricks. Weighted score with these odds. (one out of three)
- b) Declarer will find the 'winning' play, 2 tricks back.
- c) West can avoid to win with the ♠7, 1 trick to declarer.
- 9) This is an irregularity for which the laws do not have a clearly described solution. The ♠T should not take part in the play anymore. Notice that L67 does not apply, this is not a case where declarer did not play a card to a trick.
- a) Easy; find out what happened, the status of ♠T that is, and remove the card from dummy.
- b) Impossible situation. I would solve it using the 45D approach. Let all players take back the card played in this trick, remove the ♠T and start trick 9 all over again. Yes, all info from this irregular trick is unauthorized for everyone, both sides being at fault.
- I am in for other (better) solutions.
- c) There seems no reason to do anything. EW should have been aware of the situation. Only if the TD has reason to believe that declarer created this situation to cause confusion he might think of a severe penalty. Even then I see no reason to compensate EW.

Answers

10)

- a) Send West away from the table and ask East what the agreement is.
- b) Avoid to give West this information. I deem it legal to let South tell what the agreement is in each of the two cases, leaving it to West to draw conclusions.
- c) It would have been convenient if North's call could have been withdrawn, with screens not creating too much UI. But the laws (regulations) do not allow it. The auction continues and the TD stands ready to award an adjusted score.

11) The issue is whether declarer mainly damaged himself or was just damaged by the infraction. My opinion is that his play should be considered acceptable in all three cases. Apply L64C.

- a) Give declarer 12 tricks (or is it in teams not continuing spades from dummy a bad mistake?)
- b) Respect the opinion of EW and award declarer 13 tricks dropping the ♣K.
- c) Playing the ace looks normal, so award 12 tricks.

12) Misinformation that could create damage. West's statement makes sense.

- a) The finesse seems obvious after this auction. Decision 7NT - 1
- b) No clue, so the play for the drop should be taken into account. 70% (100% testing the clubs first?) for the drop?

Answers

13)

- a) South makes a POOT without East having made a call. Allow West to accept the pass. If not apply L30A. The stop card has been removed. Do we allow East to bid something else (pass, 1 in a suit)? Is 'stop' then authorized info for his partner? (answers: reluctantly 'yes' and UI)
- b) Believe South and apply L25A. West takes his 1♥ bid back. Information arising from it is UI for NS.

14) At last a reasonable statement when claiming, mentioning the possibility of 5 spades in one hand, well, well. And then still problems.

- a) Is there a possibility not to make all tricks if play had been continued? No. Give them all.
- b) Can we be sure that declarer knows the ♥7 being a winner if the ♥ 8 is discarded now? And even if he knows will he notice such discard. NO to at least one of them. Declarer loses a trick.

15)

- a) Life is hard. L63A3 tells us that this claim/conceding causes an established revoke. So even the ♦A doesn't make a trick anymore.
- b) How friendly should we take this? Could it be taken as just related to one trick? Or dominates the fact that West proposed to curtail play? My choice is the latter and then we are back in a). But even when just referring to one trick the ♦A has to be considered played (or not?, see c), which makes the revoke established.
- c) Has East avoided the application of L 63A3? If East's objection against the claim, with no other reason than to avoid an established revoke, is legal the answer is 'yes'. Give your opinion please.

Answers

- 16) It is too late to change the 1♠-bid and East can't use any information derived from West calling the TD for this reason. If NS can't bid to 4♠ that is just bad luck for them. Taking a wrong bidding card out of the bidding box is not an infraction.
- a) and b). In b) there is no problem at all not to allow EW 13 tricks, it is quite 'easy' to play the ♦8 on the K. So 11 tricks it is. If in a) the TD is convinced that declarer will continue to play the diamonds his lousy claim will be accepted. Seems the best decision to me, but you might be able to convince me otherwise.
- 17) A question for our chief TD's, is this pass alertable? There seems to be a 'yes' somewhere given. My personal opinion is that it is not. Look at the definition of a conventional pass in L 30C and agree it isn't one. Is the pass that peculiar that it still asks for an alert?
- a) If the TD decides the pass to be alertable things are easy. No harm done, give West his call back and continue.
- b) Why calls East the TD so late? He knew after the pass by North what was going on and should have called the TD at that stage. No redress. But an instruction for NS?
- 18) Those players, how inventive they are!
- a) On this level the TD is happy if players don't drop cards on the table, they would not understand at all why the Td might come up with an adjusted score, though South seems to have some experience.
- b) I am interested in your opinion. I think there to be a good reason to use L72B1 and to make some adjustment. But it would have been better if South had told the TD that in his opinion the board became unplayable after this infraction, as in c).

Answers

19) These situations are not well covered by the laws. North commits an infraction but how to handle it?

- a) The action by North is premature, a call out of turn in itself as long as South has the option to accept the 1♦-bid. But will South ever do so anymore? May I suggest the following? South keeps the possibility to accept (and formally spoken the TD should tell him to ignore what his partner did). If he does so the 1♥-bid is OOT etc. If not North's call of 1♥ stands and the penalty for the 1♦-bid OOT is waived (following the approach expressed in L 28B). I even would go so far to make the information from that call unauthorized for NS (of course it is UI for W). And I wouldn't mind if apart from these measures North gets a disciplinary penalty.
- b) The question here is whether we consider this remark from North as a BOOT. The effect for South is the same, he will not accept the 1♦ anymore (which won't happen often anyway). It is better to consider this screaming as bad behaviour creating UI, than to take it as a bid. North deserves a penalty.

a TD who decides to start this double problem with the 1♥-call considering that to be OOT has my sympathy.

20)

- a) The card is restored to his hand (L14). And 25b applies, North doesn't use any UI.
- b) This is not a L14 case, strange as it may look. With 2 deficient hands law 13 applies. The TD decides that the board can be played normally and 'convinces' the players to do so.

21)

It is necessary to know the regulations concerning the play with screens.

Generally spoken, if both sides are at fault the irregularity has to be restored without penalties being assessed. If one side is at fault - most of the time the second player making an infraction in the bidding and pushing the tray himself - the normal law penalties apply.

- a) When the tray has been pushed back, normally spoken the irregularity goes unpunished and is not solved anymore. Here without screens we are in L34. But with screens L34 doesn't apply. The problem is that nowhere in the laws we can find what to apply now. It looks like we have to consider the auction closed.
- b) The TD has to find out who pushed the tray. If North, then the tray goes back and the auction is restored.
 - c) If East pushed the tray the screenless laws apply. The TD running around the table has to explain L34: the auction continues and if South passes the last three calls are cancelled and the auction goes back to North.

Answers

22)

- a) It is reasonable to accept East's question as an honest one, not aimed to awake his partner (South really needs a high ♣-honor for his 2NT opening). None of the revokes is established yet, so ♠T and J are taken back, with the J becoming a major PC. (this might be a case where declarer generously waives the PC; L81C8?)
- b) Much nicer case. Any TD brave enough just to follow the laws? There we go: The revoke by West is established, the revoke by South is not. So South gets the opportunity to substitute the ♠T for a club. Which means that West may withdraw his ♠J without penalty (L 47 no PC; this is less clear when reading L 62C: is west the non-offending side? He is when we are just dealing with the revoke caused by South (?)) and which implies that the ♥x is not played either and becomes a major PC. What to do with the established revoke? That has not necessarily disappeared, look at L63B. But the WBF LC has done some good, deciding that when both sides revoke the penalties do not apply anymore. Or was this meant to deal with established revokes from both sides? Then the TD better uses his discretionary powers.

23)

When establishing the facts the TD will be told by West that the play of the ♥7 was meant to say declarer that he had to play from his own hand and not meant to accept the LOOT: 'That is how we play bridge sir!'.
The TD seems to have no choice, this is clearly described in the laws. (L53A,B). Then he decides that the LOOT is accepted and allows declarer to forbid East to play a card of a specified suit (could that be diamonds?).

To be honest I would accept West's statement and even would like to consider changing the laws. If such play happens it means that the LOOT is not accepted. If this goes too far I still would not give South his slam. Indeed: 'that is how we play bridge sir' so South could have known etc. Splitscore.

24)

- Complications everywhere
- a) This one is still covered by the laws. ♥T stays face up on the table and becomes a penalty card. Don't make the mistake to tell partner (W) to pass once, the bidding is closed! We have to go to L50D1 to know that the lead penalty related to the BOOT from West gets priority over the penalty card (my acbl-version of the lawbook has a misprint here, bad luck!) . 26B applies: declarer may forbid the lead in any suit. If he chooses to forbid a heart lead the PC stays on the table, otherwise it has to be played. The TD better explains this carefully to declarer.
- b) Is this covered too? 26B applies for the withdrawn 2♠-bid, see a): 'may forbid the lead in any suit'. What if declarer wants to forbid a club lead, using 26B that is? Is West allowed to pick up his ♣K, which is the normal procedure for a penalty card? Not in my opinion, declarer does not exercise his right connected to the penalty card. Of course he has those rights too, which means that he may demand a ♣-lead. Then the ♣K can be taken back. We probably will discuss this case for many more days, thanks to the French Federation where this was an examination question. I do not know their answer. I know they still discuss it.