		roving n/s	7	149	bluejak 10:43:46 Mon Jul 14 2003
		mandatory alert or not?	8	252	ne_trepide 10:02:07 Thu Jul 10 2003
		Announcement or not?	2	95	mycroft 21:33:59 Mon Jul 7 2003
		Overcall Structure	2	136	mycroft 21:12:43 Mon Jul 7 2003
		unauthorised information	4	140	flexm 07:40:47 Fri Jul 4 2003
		ui	8	194	bluejak 15:37:18 Wed Jul 2 2003
		scoring party bridge	1	99	Ed 18:06:07 Sat Jun 28 2003
		Control of boards / travellers	1	95	bluejak 13:55:49 Tue Jun 24 2003
		2NT Response	1	108	bluejak 20:47:50 Mon Jun 23 2003
		1NT no stopper	1	110	mycroft 18:17:05 Mon Jun 23 2003
		Penalty or Takeout	1	83	mycroft 18:01:13 Mon Jun 23 2003
		mistaken bid	1	106	bluejak 11:39:44 Mon Jun 23 2003
		movement rules	1	86	Jeremy 04:31:42 Mon Jun 23 2003
		Making six!	7	205	An Observer 09:59:11 Fri Jun 20 2003
		bidding wrong	2	105	bluejak 00:50:20 Thu Jun 19 2003
		Insufficient corrected	2	112	bluejak 23:17:21 Tue Jun 17 2003
		Club rules	1	92	bluejak 13:21:59 Tue Jun 17 2003
		Lead out of turn	5	189	bluejak 19:11:46 Mon Jun 16 2003
		Insufficient bid	2	175	dagnew 16:52:04 Mon Jun 16 2003

Shuffler

Reply

Dummy gets a review? (02:08:22 MonJul 14 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

When is it too late for dummy to ask for a review of the auction?

Thank you.
Shuffler

Guest

Reply

Re: Dummy gets a review? (09:01:10 MonJul 14 2003) Select Action

Law 41B does not allow a dummy to review the auction. Neither does law 42 (dummy's right) so I guess the dummy is not allowed to review the auction or ask question about the defenders' calls once the auction is over.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Dummy gets a review? (10:51:22 MonJul 14 2003) Select Action

Good answer, but if you want to be totally pedantic the last time dummy is allowed to ask for a review is before he makes his last call.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

Joost_Boswijk

offline
7 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Dummy gets a review? (07:44:38 TueJul 15 2003)

Select Action

I humbly disagree with David. As I can figure out from the laws the (presumed) dummy can ask for a review of the auction till the opening lead is faced.

The definitions state: "Dummy 1. Declarer's partner. He becomes dummy when the opening lead is faced." So he is not the dummy till then. And law 41B explicitly gives him the right to ask for a review of the auction: "Before the opening lead is faced, the leader's partner and the presumed declarer each may require a review of the auction, or request explanation of an opponent's call."

Joost Boswijk

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Dummy gets a review? (10:04:34 TueJul 15 2003)

Select Action

I agree dummy is not dummy [!!!] until the opening lead is faced. But when could dummy ask for a review? During the auction only at his turn to call, which is why I said before his last call.

After the auction ends and before the play period starts is covered by Law 41B, which you quoted: "Before the opening lead is faced, the leader's partner and the presumed declarer each may require a review of the auction, or request explanation of an opponent's call."

That gives declarer and leader's partner the right for a review: but not declarer's partner, ie dummy.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [1]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

DJN

Reply

roving n/s (05:40:57 FriJul 11 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

Hi all,
In the upcoming International Fund game in the ACBL, I see that the recommended treatment of a half-table is to have a roving n/s (the guide cards are included in the director's packet for this n/s pair, for each possible number of tables). Is there a reason this is stressed over the e/w sitout method (a phantom n/s at the highest table)?

Thanks,
Dan

Frances

Reply

Re: roving n/s (10:47:51 FriJul 11 2003) Select Action

Country: UK

I know nothing (Barcelonan accent) about the ACBL international fund game, but I would always choose between a rover and a sitout table depending on the number of tables I have and number of boards I wish to play. I wish to minimise the amount of board sharing & the total number of boards in play while having more rounds rather than fewer. All other things being equal (which they never are), I'd have thought a sit-out is preferable as there's less chance of it going wrong.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: roving n/s (12:05:08 FriJul 11 2003) Select Action

I think the differences are based on nothing more than what is the flavour of the month!

Personally, I believe a n/s sitout is best for most numbers of tables. Since n/s have the benefit of being stationary they should not get the benefit of not sitting out as well.

But all these methods work. As they have sent you guide cards then I should follow their method.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

Guest

Reply

Re: roving n/s (14:01:44 FriJul 11 2003) Select Action

For large number of tables I think a roving NS is better in that in some emergency you can curtail the play. Imagine a 18 tables 36 boards movement, with 18 NS phantom. you have a phantom NS, you have to complete the movement or some boards will have less scores then the others, that's not really desirable. With NS Roving you can perhaps stop at round 14 if you are running short of time.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: roving n/s (17:16:11 FriJul 11 2003) Select Action

Boards with fewer scores than others hardly matters except with very poor software.

All incomplete movements are somewhat inferior to complete movements anyway: that is a rather more serious deficiency.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

mycroft

offline
67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: roving n/s (19:23:12 SatJul 12 2003) Select Action

I don't like sitout and skip. Of course, that can be dealt with with a bye-stand and non-relay (with the sitout table), but at least over here in ACBLland, nobody runs a bye-stand and relay movement, so nobody knows how to play in one, so at least one time in two, there's a board movement error (even when you take pains to make it *really hard* to move the boards to the next lower table and miss the byestand). So, for 13 1/2 tables, I'd rather run a N/S bump (over 13 tables) than a E/W sitout (over 14), but with 14 1/5, an E/W sitout with 15 tables feels better than a N/S bump and skip.

Of course, as always, David has the right idea - if you want to sit stationary, you shouldn't get the "no sitout" bonus as well :-).

Michael (edit to get rid of that BUN-AG).

[1 edits; Last edit by mycroft at 19:24:15 Sat Jul 12 2003]

Val

offline
17 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: roving n/s (01:11:22 SunJul 13 2003) Select Action

Don't know where you play mycroft, but at my clubs, I quite often run a bye-stand and relay. Have had no trouble at all with it.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: roving n/s (10:43:46 MonJul 14 2003) Select Action

I think you will find your opinion that no-one runs it is slightly optimistic!

A lot of these type of choices tend to be geographical. I have no doubt that no-one plays these things within 200 miles of you, but whether you are really sure of Florida, Alaska, Saskatchewan,

Tijuana, Bermuda and Maine I doubt!

It is true that if you are in a club which is used to N/S bumps then in general it is better to play them than a share and relay. However, my experience is that players do not make silly mistakes over boards so long as the TD is careful.

For example, if there is a relay [which I think is what you call a bye-

stand] then it **must** be phsically between the two tables, and must be on a chair or table. If the TD expects players to moce the boards to somewhere on the edge of the room or the floor then when it goes wrong it is the TD's fault.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [1]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

9 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 1 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 8 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)
FrancesHinden

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 16:14:33 Fri Aug 29 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 BbBoy.net

top ⇧

Thread Index :: FAQ's :: Main Menu :: Posting Hints :: Emoticon Key :: Search
David's Lawspage :: EBU :: ACBL :: WBF

Legend :: **Read Topic ::** **Unread Topic**

Help | Full Format: ON :: OFF | Text: ON :: OFF | Email Status

Guest

Reply

mandatory alert or not? (18:48:57 WedJul 2 2003) Select Action

Country: usa

Would like to know if 1S following partner's opening 1H (playing Flannery) is alertable under ACBL rules?

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: mandatory alert or not? (03:18:18 ThuJul 3 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

Nope. This specific sequence is an example in Part I of the alert procedure, and it is not alertable.

Er, that is, assuming 1♠ is natural, even if it's 5+ cards.

Guest

Reply

Re: mandatory alert or not? (07:42:09 ThuJul 3 2003) Select Action

Country: Aust

Hi Ed, this seems curious to me. In my part of the world, I would feel it incumbent to alert 1S because **I know** that it is 5+, something my opps may not know. Obviously this is not the case in America? We alert whenever we have information the opps do not necessarily have.

---

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: mandatory alert or not? (17:16:58 ThuJul 3 2003) Select Action

Alerting is very different in different countries, and up to a point none of it works perfectly.

Australian alerting is based very much on commonsense - and that always leads to differences of opinion. American alerting is much more based on laid-down rules - and that always leads to problems over what players see as exceptions.

While it sounds easy to alert what your opponents do not expect the trouble is always that players have different expectations!

Incidentally, thanks to Ed for his reply that 1♥ - 1♠ showing 5 cards is not alertable in the ACBL. That is how I read the ACBL rules, but confirmation helps.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

ne_trepide

Reply

Re: mandatory alert or not? (09:41:26 SatJul 5 2003)

Select Action

australia
i don't know where "guest" could have obtained the notion that an overcall of 1S over a 1H opening is alertable because it is a 5+ card suit, but he/she is completely in error.
it is essential that an overcall be alerted if the opponents have an agreement to overcall with a 4 card suit under these conditions but a 5 card suit is recognised as a natural suit overcall and alerting such an overcall is silly.
overcalling with a 5 card suit is the accepted standard play and deviations from the standard require alerting.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: mandatory alert or not? (22:13:23 SatJul 5 2003)

Select Action

This thread is about a **response** of 1♠ showing 5 cards, not an overcall.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

mycroft

offline
67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: mandatory alert or not? (21:27:14 MonJul 7 2003)

Select Action

The ACBL Alert Chart says:

Quote:

> In general, when the use of conventions leads to unexpected understandings about suit length by negative inference, a natural call becomes Alertable. Some such agreements have become expected and are fairly common, therefore no Alert is required.

Flannery is such a common convention over here - especially in Calgary, where "with or without Flannery" seems to be the first query in *pickup* discussions, and most people are upset when I say "without" - that it is the first "people will expect it" example on the ACBL Alert Chart, even before 1H-1NT(forcing); 2m on 3 cards (or 2C on 4522) min.

So, as everyone has said, in ACBL-land, 1H-1S promising 5 is not alertable, nor is 1H-1NT concealing a 4-card spade suit. This happens to be one of my "uncomfort zones" with the Alert chart, because while it is very common, the trigger for the information isn't in the auction, but in a totally different call, so it could very easily be a "surprise", especially if (as is very common here, grumble) there are no CCs on the table. But I don't decide the system, I just rule on and teach it.

Michael.

[1 edits; Last edit by mycroft at 21:28:17 Mon Jul 7 2003]

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: mandatory alert or not? (00:29:30 TueJul 8 2003)

Select Action

Marvin French has made quite a study of ACBL alerting, and agrees 1♥ - 1♠ showing five cards is not alertable. But he is not happy about it!!!

He plays in the San Diego area: there, so he says, Flannery is very rare, so this sequence will come as a total surprise to people.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

ne_trepide

Reply

Re: mandatory alert or not? (10:02:07 ThuJul 10 2003)

Select Action

australia
sorry the only idiot here is myself
indeed partners response showing a 5 card suit is indeed alertable as outlined.
i unreservedly apologise to guest.

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

9 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 1 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 8 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)
FrancesHinden

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden.

Register :: Log in

The time is now 16:14:50 Fri Aug 29 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 BbBoy.net

Hand_Hog

offline
6 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Announcement or not? (09:52:31 SatJul 5 2003) Select Action

Country: Singapore

In ACBL 1NT forcing respond to 1-Major opening is 'announced'. What about a 1NT 'forcing' response to a 1 Major overcall? Is that an announcement or an Alert?

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Announcement or not? (22:21:57 SatJul 5 2003) Select Action

An alert, not an announcement. There is a short list of things to be announced, and this is not on it. Announcements are only for pretty common treatments, and this is not one of them.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

mycroft

offline
67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Announcement or not? (21:33:59 MonJul 7 2003) Select Action

It also, in my reading, is not GCC legal. I don't think anyone is going to call you on it, though!

Similarly to this dichotomy, the range of a 1NT overcall is not announced. Transfer advances of the 1NT overcall, however, *are*. Have fun!

Michael.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

pbleighton

offline
103 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Overcall Structure (19:46:04 ThuJul 3 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

I just ran across this (called simply Overcall Structure), and am strongly considering playing it (at least, a simplified version to start). It seems to me that it is GCC legal, but I would like confirmation.

If you are not familiar with it, over an opening bid of one of a suit, it uses:
1) Double is 15+ hcp, may be any shape, though there are tendencies.
2) 1NT overcall is for takeout, generally 6-15 hcp, though it can occasionally be more.
3) 1 level overcalls frequently are made on 4 cards, aren't made on hands which qualify for 1NT, and are almost always (always? - I'm not sure) less than 15 hcp.
4) 2 level overcalls are either standard or preemptive, depending on the circumstances (the writeup is unclear).
5) Jump overcalls either promise or strongly suggest a two suiter.
6) Many conventional responses to the overcalls are available.

Do you see any problem with any of this?

Do you have any experience playing this, or playing against it? Who invented it?

Are you aware of any comparable systems?

How common is this or other very aggressive overcall systems in the US, and elsewhere?

[1 edits; Last edit by pbleighton at 20:35:55 Thu Jul 3 2003]

Guest

Reply

Re: Overcall Structure (07:10:49 FriJul 4 2003) Select Action

This overcall structure is sometimes called Fout after the person who devised it. It is highly aggressive and works quite well. However if you want to try something a little different, play canape overcalls. They are enormous fun! These are not legal in the US, but you can play them on line and in countries with civilised system regulations.

mycroft

offline
67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Overcall Structure (21:12:43 MonJul 7 2003) Select Action

I've played it (not enough, though) and had it played against me. One thing I will tell you is that you will annoy the opponents (in the good and legal "can't you just pass once?" sense). And so, like any such system, it is best for you (and definately proper and as far as I am concerned, your responsibility if you want to play something unusual) to be **complete and clear** about your Alerts and explanations. And patient! The opponents **will not understand** sometimes, and it will seem "so obvious" to you, because you're used to it. Just calmly explain again. Practice your explanations. Once you have, throw them on your friends, and see what they don't understand. Refine. Repeat. *Then* play it.

On the legal side:
1. I would Alert the Power doubles. It probably isn't necessary, but the excess strength and the "feel free to pass, I'm not short" nature of them will be really unexpected.
2. 1NT as a three-suit takeout is GCC (as is the rest of the system - oops, maybe not - see below), but definately Alertable. And, at least in my club, if you explain it simply as "takeout", without mentioning that it can be from 4432 to 7330, incomplete explanation rulings will go against you much more frequently than for "standard" MI.
3. Frequent 4-card overcalls at the 1 level are Pre-Alertable. You'll want to discuss the "unsound" nature of the suits in the PreAlert - IIRC, a typical average suit for a simple overcall is KJ9x.

Just looking over the GCC again, I'm not sure that the "lebensohlish" 1NT response to a simple overcall is legal! Fascinating, as it has been played in NA for years...
4. *Simple* - non-jump - two-level overcalls seem to be EHAA-style; very wide-ranging both in suit quality and strength. Be *very careful* responding to these (says the EHAA player). No problem with legality, as long as they show 5+ cards; I'd probably Pre-Alert these as well, though.
5. Both RJOs and IJOs (make sure you know which is which!) are fine, Alertable, but fine.

Like any system that is 180 degrees away from Standard, be prepared to try it for three or four sessions before deciding on it. And be prepared to get it horribly, terribly wrong a few times while you break your "standard" instincts. Be prepared to get a *lot* of practice playing at the one and two level in inadequate fits or with inadequate suits. Be prepared to go down, often a lot, but usually undoubled. Remember that -200, even -250, beats a game their way. Learn what you need to lead partner's 1-level overcall; this will

take time (I haven't played it enough to know myself; I'm extrapolating from EHAA 2-bids).

Make *sure* you and your partner are reading from the same book; IIRC, Jeff Goldsmith has some "thoughts" on the Overcall Structure; and a quick Google search brings up lots of hits. Get the Fout PDF - unadapted by Abraham; transfer advances of overcalls are not GCC legal (yet!) Then decide what you want to adapt from there.

And I definately suggest that you **always** remember to bid with "bad" hands, especially at the beginning. As the system notes say, "partner will expect you to, and he definately will be upset if he misdefends because you failed to bid." Pass is one of the strongest overcalls in the system, because you have *so much more* information about partner's hand (even if it is all negative) than standard pairs do. Conversely, if partner passes - be very wary of getting in! Do *not* automatically balance; opener has a 20 count! And remember "get in and get out". Unless you clearly have the balance of power or are doing a systemic scramble, your first bids should be all you need or want to make.

You might be interested in EHAA if you like aggressive systems. This one is aggressive starting at 1NT, and *very sound* below that. One key on that one, however, is that 2-level opener/overcaller is usually captain - don't worry, the response structure is designed to do that, and it makes sense.

Michael.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

9 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 1 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 8 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)
FrancesHinden

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 16:15:25 Fri Aug 29 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

flexm

offline
2 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

unauthorised information (10:02:45 ThuJul 3 2003) Select Action

♠ K7432
♥ AJ2
♦ J75
♣ 92

♠ QT98
♥ Q543
♦ AT6
♣ K8

♠ J65
♥ 87
♦ 942
♣ Q7843

♠ A
♥ KT96
♦ KQ83
♣ AJT5

N	E	S	W
		2NT	P
3C	P	3NT	P
4S	P	5C	P
P	P		

Bidding Commentary

1. 2NT was alerted and explained as any 4441 with 16+pts

2. 3C was alerted and explained as asking about the singleton

3. West enquired about 3NT. North bids 4S and says that it shows a singleton club

4. On hearing this, South makes a 'hoh' sound and moves (but then withdraws) the pen towards the bidding pad. North hears the sound but does not see the pen movement.

5. After East's pass, South bids 5C which is passed out.

6. East places the lead card face down and West, after a brief discussion with north about his unhappiness with the bidding, calls the director.

Ruling

'If you think you have been disadvantaged, call me back at the end of the play'.

There seemed no necessity to call the director back, however, I am curious about the rights and wrongs of the bidding sequence.

Questions

1. Should North rebid 5S and ignore the possibility that South forgot the system and misbid the hand?

2. Should North interpret the 5C as showing first round control and therefore bid 5H? If so, could South pass instead of bidding 5S or something else?

3. Is it right for West to call the director at the lead stage, or should the director be called at the end of the play?

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: unauthorised information (11:58:30 ThuJul 3 2003)

Select Action

Both South and North have UI from partner, South because of North's explanation, North because of the 'hoh' and the pen movement. He may have been aware subconciously of the pen movement even if he was not aware conciously. Both North and South were required to do their best to take no advantage of this.

South's 5♣ bid is definitely unacceptable. However, there is no need for a ruling since 4♠ is more successful than 5♣ {it might even make} so there is no damage.

South's 5♣ does sound like a cue-bid. If asked the TD will rule an adjusted score, but eventually I am not sure East-West would gain anything. So there probably is no reason for any adjustment. If the TD had been called back he would probably not adjust since there seems no damage, but would have explained to North and South their responsibility under the Law.

As to your questions, North should avoid taking any advantage. It is not entirely clear that he did by passing 5♣ which appears to be a 4-2 fit. What he should bid is not certain, and a TD might or might not adjust. I would not be telling North what he should have done since it is not clear.

Whenever a player is afraid an opponent's action may have been

affected by UI it is normal to call the TD immediately so as to establish the presence of UI as soon as possible. West's only mistake was to "discuss" it with North before calling the TD.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

James Vickers

Reply

Re: unauthorised information (13:33:12 ThuJul 3 2003)

Select Action

Country: UK

I don't know how many tricks were made in 5C, but I would certainly be looking at possible adjusted scores. I don't know what NS's agreement on a bid of partner's singleton in this sequence when no suit has been agreed (to play, presumably), but once South has bid 5C I wouldn't allow North's pass. I agree with the original poster that North would either bid 5H (which South might well pass), or 6S. I would probably dream up some combination of 5H-2, 6SX-2 and 6SX-3, and adjust to this if it leads to a worse result than the one obtained (a near certainty).

We were not told what West said to North, but it may just have been some disarming comment to soften the blow before calling the director, in which case I would not regard this as a mistake. That notwithstanding, I'm not sure I quite understand David's answer to Q3. Should the TD have been called (1) at the moment South articulated their dissatisfaction, (2) when North bid 4S, or (3) when dummy was displayed?

James

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: unauthorised information (17:43:27 ThuJul 3 2003)

Select Action

It is true that we do not know what West said to North, and of course it makes a difference what he actually said. My experience is that

Quote: Flex M

> after a brief discussion with north about his unhappiness with the bidding

means that West said some unfortunate things!

As to when you should call the TD, recommendations differ in different places. {We do ask people making queries to say where they are.} My guess is the query came from Australia or New Zealand, and the recommendations there are similar to English advice, ie to call the TD when there has been UI and possible use of it. Thus the earliest time to call the TD here would be after the 5♣ bid, which could be based on the explanation. Still calling the TD before the opening lead is also fine.

If you call the TD for the first time at the end of the hand you will get a ruling if the UI can be established, but it tends to be far more difficult to do so then.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

flexm

offline
2 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: unauthorised information (07:40:47 FriJul 4 2003)

Select Action

Country: Australia

Thank you for the replies.

David, you are right on both counts. That is it is from Australia and also some unfortunate things were said. I was sitting West and I said something to the effect that 'I don't think you can pass after South's actions, I think we better call the director because I am unhappy about the bidding". North took offence to this statement so it would have been better just to call the director.

5C was 2 down vulnerable, our partners were in 3nt making 10 tricks so we were not disadvantaged. I was curious though about the rights and wrongs of the bidding.

At the end of the round further discussion took place about North's bid. Apparently in their system the 5C bid was an impossible bid and North saw two alternatives, either South had a 4441 shape with a singleton spade, or South had gotten it all wrong and had a long club suit. He judged the latter to be true so he passed.

I am still not sure whether he was right to do so rather than bid as if South's first bid was accurate.

Thanks again for the reasoning Dave and James.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

9 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 1 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 8 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)
FrancesHinden

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden.

Register :: Log in

The time is now 16:15:43 Fri Aug 29 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

Hand_Hog

offline
6 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

ui (14:27:56 FriJun 27 2003)

Select Action

Country: Singapore

N E S W
1D P 2C P
2H P 2S P
4NT P 5C P
6D P 6NT

At this stage West inquires after the meaning of 2S (there was no alert) and received the answer 'Just forcing, may not be a suit'. West then double 6Nt.

East's hand:

S: 103
H: 987xx
D: K10x
C: Jxx

East summoned the director and asked if she was allowed to lead a spade. The director answered that there was no infraction at the moment and told East to lead whatever her hand suggested.
East led a spade and the contract went down two.

The director the ruled that a club lead would be a LA. On a club lead South would be able to run 7 club winners (North was void in clubs) and the contract would be made. West argued that since 2S wasn't alerted she had to ask and if the spade lead is illegal now the director should allow her to remove the double. The director disallowed that on the basis that 4SF is pretty common and although there wasn't an alert most duplicate players would come to expect its meaning.

Comments please?

[2 edits; Last edit by Hand_Hog at 14:43:25 Fri Jun 27 2003]

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: ui (19:04:25 FriJun 27 2003)

Select Action

Country: Singapore

A bit difficult, since I don't know Singapore's alert regulations, and they don't appear to be on line. But let's see what we can infer from the post.

When West asked about the meaning of 2♠, he pinpointed an interest in that suit. This is UI to East. Particularly in conjunction with West's subsequent double of 6NT, it seems to me to suggest a spade lead. That being the case, East is prohibited by Laws 73C and 16A from leading a spade if he has a logical alternative. If the question and double do not suggest any particular lead, then East can lead whatever she likes.

Later, the director ruled that a club lead was an LA. If so, why didn't he say so at the time East asked her question? The statement "there is no infraction at this point" is literally true (disregarding the question of the failure to alert 2♠), but not helpful. It seems to me the director led East down the garden path here.

Now we get into territory where it would help to know Singapore's alert regulations. Since I don't, there are a couple of possible scenarios.

Scenario 1: Here I make the assumption that FSF is alertable, and that regulations require or at least recommend a question be asked if a bid which might be alertable is not alerted. In this case, West's "I had to ask" is exactly correct, but it does not absolve East of the restriction on leading a spade.

Scenario 2: If FSF is not alertable, or the regulation does not imply or state one "has to ask", then West's argument is incorrect. East is still prohibited from leading a spade.

Either way, East can't lead a spade. Now, is a club lead an LA? I dunno. Personally, I'd lead the ♥9 before a club, but I'm a notoriously bad leader. Regardless, the director rules it is, and adjusts on that basis. But... the infraction which is the basis of his ruling (the spade lead) was caused by his handling of East's question. The director is required by Law 81C5 to inform players of their obligations under the laws. Director did not so inform East. This seems to me a clear case of director error. In that case, Law 82C applies. I don't see any way to rectify this and obtain a normal score, so under Law 12 and Law 88, both sides get average plus.

Director's comment about FSF being pretty common may be true, but I don't see its relevance. Either the bid (2♠ in this case) is alertable by regulation, or it's not.If it's alertable, then there was MI in the failure to alert it. If it's not alertable, there wasn't. However, at this point, the question is moot, given director's error in handling the problem.

Final ruling: Director error (Laws 81C5 and 82C), adjust score to average plus for both sides (Laws 82C, 12 and 88).

Side comment: West might have helped his side a bit by complying with the procedure set forth in Law 20F1 and asking for an explanation of the entire auction, rather than pinpointing a particular bid.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: UI (03:10:35 MonJun 30 2003) Select Action

I think we can safely assume that 4SF is alertable in Singapore from comments in the original query.

While I very rarely find Ed goes off the rails, I do feel he has here!

First of all, the TD **MUST NOT** tell the player whether leading a club is an LA or not. That is a judgement decision that would involve looking at the hand and is completely forbidden. True, the TD may not have handled it very well, since he should have indicated the contents of Law 73C, ie that the player must avoid taking any possible advantage from the UI, but he must never comment on specific calls or plays before the hand is complete.

Secondly, if we had ruled under Director error, an artificial adjusted score is **forbidden**. Since a result was obtained on the board, then the Director **must** give assigned adjusted scores.

Finally, I think this is a good example why some people's interpretation of Law 20F1 is so unworkable. If a player needs to know what 2♠ is, and to do so has to find out the meaning of all eight bids in the auction, the board will simply be cancelled for lack of time. It won't gain much, since his interest in the auction will be pretty clear anyway.

Having said all that, how would I rule?

Well, I have some sympathy for Director error. The TD should have explained the Law. So now it is a question of deciding what difference it would make if he had.

Unless the player is pretty inexperienced I doubt I will go down that road.

Looking overall at the case we had a situation caused by a failure to alert. The player who led was not the offending side in that case so I would have let the result stand. The UI situation was created by the lack of alert, and I see no reason to give the offending side a benefit from not alerting.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

AlanW

Reply

Re: ui (07:28:11 MonJun 30 2003) Select Action

David's ruling of allowing the result to stand (assuming FSF is alertable) seems pretty sensible. Look at it another way. Suppose the director had told East he could lead anything he wanted, but that the question about the meaning of 2S was UI and that he must not choose a lead suggested by UI if he has a LA. Suppose East then led something other than a spade and the contract made. If EW then asked for a ruling on the basis that they had been damaged by the failure to alert 2S, wouldn't you feel pretty sympathetic towards this claim?

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: UI (16:09:26 TueJul 1 2003) Select Action

D'oh! My bad.

(1) I meant to say, and should have said, that TD should have explained to East his obligations under 73C.

(2) Okay, on this one, please shoot me. I was fixated on 88, which speaks to artificial adjusted scores, but 81C just says "adjusted score". David is absolutely right, it should be an assigned adjusted score, which means Law 88 doesn't apply.

(3) I'm not sure I see how asking for an explanation of the auction (a) should take all that long to respond or (b) makes clear an interest in 2♠, but David has far more experience at this than I, so I'll shut up about it.

Thinking about the overall case, as David suggests, I have to agree with his ruling.

Hand_Hog

offline
6 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: ui (06:19:09 WedJul 2 2003) Select Action

Thank you all for the replies.

Just some clarification, E-W were every experienced players, so there should be no question about them understanding their legal obligation.

It seems to me both parties are partially to be blamed and if we let the table result stands as that seems to reward EW for the abusing UI. Similarly if we adjust the score to 6NT making it would seem to reward NS for failure to alert.

Would a split score be a fairer solution? Can the director award a split-score here?

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: ui (10:47:48 WedJul 2 2003) Select Action

The UI was created by E/W's infraction: if they had alerted it South might easily have doubled without asking since he would have assumed Fourth Suit Forcing. Furthermore North took the trouble to ask his responsibilities under UI and got the wrong answer from the TD.

No, I think a split score would be most unsuitable. Why should N/S be blamed for a situation brought about by their opponents and the TD?

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

Joost_Boswijk

offline
7 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: ui (12:12:38 WedJul 2 2003) Select Action

I'm afraid you mixed things up a bit: the infraction (non-alerting) was N/S's and east was asking the TD. But what did the TD wrong? As far as I can see he didn't look in East's hand before the game was over, just answered that she could lead 'whatever her hand suggested'. It was when the game was over that the TD decided that the spades lead might have been suggested by the question, that a club lead was a LA, and that the score was adjusted to 6NTx made. Also, given the circumstances which the TD knew and we don't, he decided that the failure to alert was a minor infraction which didn't deserve a penalty. As said, I don't know what the circumstances were or what is usual in Singapore, but it looks quite normal to me.

What I would like to know is wether wests double was only possible if the 2S bid was FSF and not if it was a natural bid? That would be a good reason to ask the meaning of the bid, otherwise he (or she) had either to keep silent or ask for an explanation of the auction (that would have been the best anyway).
IMHO the question is leading. E has a couple of alternatives, spades being one since W must have at least four. What the result would have been if E leads another suit, we can't decide (a club lead I consider the least logical). But S deserves to be reprimanded for not alerting the 2S and W for asking a leading question. And I wonder wether he explained to W that it was no use asking to remove the

double.

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: ui (15:37:17 WedJul 2 2003) Select Action

You are correct: I do get confused in the absence of a diagram, and I have got N/S and E/W the wrong way round.

It is very normal for experienced players not to know their rights in UI situations. Perhaps they should, but in this case, they asked, **and were misinformed by the TD.**

Quote: Hand Hog

> The director answered that there was no infraction at the moment and told East to lead whatever her hand suggested.

This is not correct in Law, so constitutes TD error. The TD should have explained the ramifications of UI, at least reading Law 73C to the players. Once the TD did not do this then it is not unreasonable that the player misunderstood the position and to be penalised is not fair.

When you have UI from partner your actions are constrained: it is not good enough to "lead whatever your hand suggests". A player who asks the TD {even if he asks the wrong question} should have this explained to him.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [1]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

Terry

Reply

scoring party bridge (12:22:04 SatJun 28 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

Playing 6 hands. Each side ends up with a game. What bonus score is given for those 2 separate games?

Ed

offline
173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: scoring party bridge (18:06:07 SatJun 28 2003) Select Action

It appears you have an incomplete rubber. In that case there is no bonus for either of the completed games. If only one side has a part score in the third, incomplete, game, that side gets a bonus of 100 points. Laws of Contract Bridge, 1993, Law 80.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

3 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 1 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 2 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)
ELvee

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden.

Register :: Log in

The time is now 16:55:23 Fri Aug 29 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 BbBoy.net

top

Thread Index :: **FAQ's** :: **Main Menu** :: **Posting Hints** :: **Emoticon Key** :: **Search**
David's Lawspage :: **EBU** :: **ACBL** :: **WBF**

Legend :: **Read Topic** :: **Unread Topic**

Help | **Full Format: ON** :: **OFF** | **Text: ON** :: **OFF** | **Email Status**

James Vickers

Reply

Control of boards / travellers (13:18:16 TueJun 24 2003)

Select Action

Country: UK

Someone recently asked me who is responsible for controlling the boards in play at a particular table. My response was "The stationary pair, if there is one" (L7D), although checking the book I see that North is responsible for moving the boards for the next round unless the director instructs otherwise (L8A2).

What prompted the question was an incident (at a different club) where the questioner had tried to check the movement card to make sure they were at the right table with the right boards and was told brusquely by a stationary North to mind her own business.

Now apart from North being in dire need of a lesson in good manners, what's the legal situation here? Whenever I direct a movement involving table cards I announce at the beginning that both pairs should check this information at the beginning of each round, both to minimise the risk of mistakes and so that I can penalise both sides if the wrong boards are played, but supposing no such announcement is made? Who carries the can if the wrong moving pair or boards are played?

Also, as far as I know it used to be a requirement for North to complete the traveller, but this was revoked in 1987. Since most players are blissfully unaware of this change, it rarely causes any problem, and if I ever have to resolve the issue I tell them something like: "North should usually complete the traveller, but if they prefer not to that's OK provided (1) SOMEONE fills out the traveller, and (2) the entry is checked by the opposition."

Just as important as the answers to the above, which law or regulation can I cite to sceptics who assert that "Everyone knows that North moves the boards and fills out the traveller!"?

James

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Control of boards / travellers (13:55:49 TueJun 24 2003)

Select Action

You seem to have read the Law correctly. Stationary players have a primary responsibility for control of boards, but only primary. If the board is put on the table and played arrow-switched all four players were at fault.

Scoring is generally done by North, but unless the TD gives an instruction [which over-rides everything else] then this is a matter of custom and practice.

In Howell movements it is normal for both sides to check, and many TDs make it a requirement.

You will just have to tell your players this. As to the actual North I would suggest a small disciplinary penalty.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [1]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

3 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 1 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 2 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)
ELvee

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden.

Register :: Log in

The time is now 16:56:26 Fri Aug 29 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 BbBoy.net

top ⇧

pbleighton

offline
103 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

2NT Response (20:39:57 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

Assume the following 2NT response to an opening bid of one of a suit:
It shows invitational (never game-forcing) values, is usually balanced, but will regularly be used in response to an opening of 1 spade when holding 4441, with the singleton in spades.
Is this response GCC legal?

[1 edits; Last edit by pbleighton at 20:40:41 Mon Jun 23 2003]

bluejak

offline
434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: 2NT Response (20:47:50 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action

Yes, that is a natural 2NT response. While it may not be everyone's choice of method that is certainly one way to play it, and legal.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [1]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

6 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 1 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 5 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)
ELvee

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden.

Register :: Log in

The time is now 16:59:25 Fri Aug 29 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 BbBoy.net

top

Shuffler

Reply

1NT no stopper (17:25:52 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action

Country: USA, ACBL

1C - 1H - 1NT -

1NT only promises point count of 6-9 HCP, habitual use, coincidental if actually holding any stopper in any of opponents' suits. It denies a fit with opener's suit.

Is this alertable?

Thank you.
Shuffler

mycroft

67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: 1NT no stopper (18:17:05 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action

Country: Canada

[1C-(1H)-1NT 6-9, may or may not have stopper. Alertable?]

I would. The ACBL Alert Pamphlet has this to say about treatments (natural calls that by agreement pass additional information):

Quote:

> Natural bids that convey an unexpected meaning must be Alerted. This includes strong bids that sound weak, weak bids that sound strong, and all other bids that, by agreement, convey meanings different from, or in addition to, the expected meaning ascribed to them.

The "expected" meaning of 1NT in this auction includes some heart strength; if by agreement, the partnership would bid 1NT with KQx xxx KTxx 9xx, I would take that as "different from expected meaning".

The underlying concept of Alerting in the ACBL is your partnership's legal and ethical obligation for your opponents to be able to

understand your calls as completely as you do. Therefore, a good guideline, (which happens to be enshrined in the Alert Pamphlet, as well) is:

Quote:

> **WHEN IN DOUBT WHETHER TO ALERT OR NOT, ALERT!**

(caps and emphasis in the original). So, in both this situation and your other ("takeout" NT doubles), where it is "unclear", Alert. For one thing, that's what you're supposed to do. For another, the TD will be much less likely to rule MI against you if you Alert where you, if you were Solomon, shouldn't (especially if they don't bother to ask) than she will be if you fail to Alert where you should. And finally, you will be doing your ethical best to protect your opponents, which is the key to pleasant, fast, good, respectable bridge.

Good bridge!
Michael.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

3 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 3 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 10:19:55 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 BbBoy.net

top

Thread Index :: FAQ's :: Main Menu :: Posting Hints :: Emoticon Key :: Search
David's Lawspage :: EBU :: ACBL :: WBF

Legend :: Read Topic :: Unread Topic

Shuffler

Reply

Penalty or Takeout (17:33:20 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action

Country: USA, ACBL

1NT - Double

Is the double of an opening 1NT (15-17 HCP)...

1. alertable if it is used strictly as a takeout double?
2. alertable if it is used as penalty regardless?

Thank you.
Shuffler

mycroft

67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Penalty or Takeout (18:01:12 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action

Country: Canada

According to The ACBL Alert Pamphlet,

Quote:

> Except for those doubles with highly unusual or unexpected meanings, doubles do not require an Alert.

I do wish they had provided more examples in common situations like this one (1NT-X).

A natural, penalty double, while uncommon opposite ACBL-style strong NTs, is hardly "highly unusual or unexpected." Definately not Alertable.

While an argument could be made that the double of 1NT is so frequently conventional that it is in nature "self-Alerting" (the idea behind the rule), it's probably just safer (especially if the doubler is one of the many ACBL players that ignore the "two complete and identical CCs *on the table, for the opponents' view*") to Alert any conventional double.

Most "takeout" doubles of NT openings are conventional, having more of a meaning than simply "bid something, partner", so I (and I'd) Alert them, be it "one-suited", "one-suited, good", "11+, spades and another, 4-4 or better", or whatever.

I have played against a pair that played double of 1NT as "4-suit takeout". I don't understand it - how could you possibly have a suitable hand? - and they really did take it out always (to their detriment at least 3 of the 4 times it came up during the match). I would say this is "highly unusual", and Alert it (maybe the opponents' brains will break on the explanation and they'll screw up the auction).

If you want an exact ruling, I'd email The Source, or see if you can get an official response from the ACBL's Alert forum. However, in practice, no matter what the legalities, if you Alert any non-penalty-oriented double, and any double intended as penalty that has any distributional or max strength requirements, you'll win in the long run, because nobody will call the TD on you "failure to Alert".

Michael.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

3 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 3 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden.

Register :: Log in

The time is now 10:20:32 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 BbBoy.net

top

Thread Index :: FAQ's :: Main Menu :: Posting Hints :: Emoticon Key :: Search
David's Lawspage :: EBU :: ACBL :: WBF

Legend :: Read Topic :: Unread Topic

Ray Crowe

Reply

mistaken bid (03:52:07 MonJun 23 2003)

Select Action

Country: New Zealand

Board 4----Dealer West-----all VUL

The hands:

North: S A742 H T8642 D JT C 72
East : S void H Q9 D 954 C AKQT9853
South: S KQJT653 H AK7 D K76 C void
West: S 98 H J53 D AQ832 C J64

The Bidding:

West North East South
p p 2D* 4S
5D P 6C 6S
all pass

E/W's agreed system was opening weak 2s (in D, H & S)

After East opened 2D, South inquired and was told by West that it was "weak, 6 - 10 pts".
The rest of the bidding went as above. Result N/S - 200.
(this was an intermediate grade tournament, mixed quality)

As director, I was called at the end of play by South who was not happy with East bidding 6C.
(I asked East why she opened 2D. She replied that she had forgotten their agreement and opened a "multi 2D", which has, as one of it's options, an 8 playing tricks in any suit).

I ruled result stands.
I considered there was no U/I to be gained by East from West's bid of 5D, as it was basically a "no brainer". West was still bidding the agreed system.
West could have bid on a very weak hand with only a 2 card support , or he could have had some values. East still had no idea.
Irrespective of this, from East's point of view 6C is always right. He has a 5 trick loosing hand, and if West has no points, a sacrifice is safe against a vul. slam. If West has some values, then -2 is still safe against a probable vul. N/S game in spades.
Where is there an infraction?

This went to an appeal.
The A/C decided there was damage and awarded a score of

5S = 5 for NS, and EW -650.

bluejak

434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: mistaken bid (11:39:44 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action

It is only because of the UI that East knows what West has. West's 5 bid does not show "only a 2 card support" from the bidding: it looks as though West has got six or seven card suit that West deemed unsuitable for a pre-empt.

How does East know his 2 opening was the Multi? From partner's explanation, of course. So he must make every effort not to take any advantage from the UI available to him, and this he has failed to do.

You ask where the infraction is. East has chosen amongst LAs one suggested by the UI: pass over 5 is certainly an LA. I am quite sure that if West had said that East's 2 was Multi that quite a few Easts would now pass.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [1]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

judith hobcroft Reply	**movement rules** (04:26:20 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action **Country**: vietnam please would you send howell movement for 4 tables 20 boards ... urgentlr required for a group of expats tonight !! thanks !
Jeremy 7 posts bridgetalk member Reply	**Re: movement rules** (04:31:42 MonJun 23 2003) Select Action You'll find the info you need in this thread.

View Thread Page(s): [1]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

3 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 3 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 10:22:38 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 BbBoy.net

top

Thread Index :: FAQ's :: Main Menu :: Posting Hints :: Emoticon Key :: Search
David's Lawspage :: EBU :: ACBL :: WBF

Legend :: Read Topic :: Unread Topic

Email **Help | Full Format: ON :: OFF | Text: ON :: OFF | Email Status**

Shuffler

Reply

Making six! (23:25:12 SatJun 14 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

ACBL - USA

I have a player with over 800 MP's that constantly comments after the opening lead is faced: "Making six!" or "Making 4." Can I consider such statements as a claim? How about comments during the hand when he doesn't consider it a claim. He is not always right. It is intimidating to beginners.

Thanks for your help.

Shuffler

player

80 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Making six! (07:44:25 SunJun 15 2003) Select Action

Challenge her to state a line. Call the director if you disagree.

Ed

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Making six! (08:34:45 SunJun 15 2003) Select Action

The challenge is not necessary. Law 68A is quite clear: "Any statement to the effect that a contestant will win a specific number of tricks is a claim of those tricks." Law 68D says "After any claim or concession, play ceases. All play subsequent to a claim or concession shall be voided by the Director. If the claim or concession is acquiesced in, Law 69 applies; if it is disputed by any player (dummy included), the Director must be summoned immediately to apply Law 70 or Law 71, and no action may be taken pending the Director's arrival."

So. When this happens, call the Director, who will rule on the claim according to, probably, Law 70, which says in part "The Director shall not accept from claimer any unstated line of play the success of which depends upon finding one opponent rather than the other with a particular card, unless an opponent failed to follow to the suit of that card before the claim was made, or would subsequently fail to follow to that suit on any normal line of play; or unless failure to adopt this line of play would be irrational."

One time oughta do it.

Two other points: it doesn't matter whether the player considers his comments a claim or not - if he says he gonna when a specific number of tricks, it's a claim. Also, this is law, not regulation - it applies everywhere, not just in the ACBL.

bluejak

434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Making six! (15:34:26 SunJun 15 2003) Select Action

Opinions differ as to whether this constitutes a claim. The problem is in the wording.

Quote: Law 68A

> Any statement to the effect that a contestant will win a specific number of tricks is a claim of those tricks. A contestant also claims when he suggests that play be curtailed, or when he shows his cards (unless he demonstrably did not intend to claim).

The question is whether the clause "unless he demonstrably did not intend to claim" applies to the whole Law or only the second sentence. After all, we know perfectly well that he did not intend to claim.

I doubt that most TDs would treat this as a claim. It seems unfair and unnecessary.

That does not mean that I do not suggest you call the TD, or that the TD will not deal with it. It is a clear breach of various other Laws, mainly 74B2, but also 74A2, and possible 74C3 or 74C2.

Quote: Law 74B2

> As a matter of courtesy a player should refrain from:
> 2. making gratuitous comments during the auction and play.

The important thing is that this player needs to be dealt firmly! No

doubt the TD will give him a firm warning or two, and apply PPs from then on if the player does not mend his ways.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

Ed

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Making six! (22:51:27 SunJun 15 2003) Select Action

Quote: bluejak at 15:34:26 Sun Jun 15 2003

> Opinions differ as to whether this constitutes a claim. The problem is in the wording.
>
> **Quote: Law 68A**
>
> > Any statement to the effect that a contestant will win a specific number of tricks is a claim of those tricks. A contestant also claims when he suggests that play be curtailed, or when he shows his cards (unless he demonstrably did not intend to claim).

> The question is whether the clause "unless he demonstrably did not intend to claim" applies to the whole Law or only the second sentence. After all, we know perfectly well that he did not intend to claim.

I'm not a professional grammarian, but it is my understanding that the parenthetical clause in the law applies only to the second sentence at best, and possibly only to the second clause ("or when he shows his cards") of that sentence.

James Vickers

Reply

Re: Making six! (12:41:05 TueJun 17 2003) Select Action

Country: UK

Players at my club, my partner being a particularly serious offender, have the tendency to comment on the suitability of the contract as soon as dummy goes down. They are not attempting to claim, nor do they say in so many words how many tricks they think they can make, but say something like:

"I think we've missed a slam, partner!"

I complain that such comments could easily mislead the defence into the wrong line of play, and even if it helps the defence, they do not necessarily appreciate such extraneous assistance. I pay my money to play bridge, not bridge-with-extra-helpful-comments, and I want to pit my wits against other players on equal terms.

However, my complaints only meet with looks of incompehension, and since the other major offender at the club is often the director, calling the TD will not help.

Any suggestions as to what I can do, other than find a new partner and a new club?

James

bluejak

434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Making six! (13:15:50 TueJun 17 2003) Select Action

If you cannot deal with partner and the Director is at fault you have problems!

However, printing out this thread and offering tio to the two offenders may help.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

An Observer

Reply

Re: Making six! (09:59:02 FriJun 20 2003) Select Action

Country: England

I'm not a professional grammarian

Ed, I think you need to bear in mind that the people who formed the laws of bridge weren't either. Nor were they legal experts.

In all probability parenthetical qualification of the Law applies to the last part of the sentence, insofar as players can inadvertently expose their hand to either opponents depending on seating arrangements, body postures or even physical disabilities or impairments.

However, it would be a very tough TD who applied the law (as it stands :smile:smile: without allowing the "offending" player to **demonstrate** that they ...did not intend to claim. Inevitably, the TD must be called.

I would emphasise that which has already been said, that the severity of the penalty levelled against the "offender" can only reflect the number of times that the TD is called to deal with said "offender".

View Thread Page(s): [1]

sharwell

Reply

bidding wrong (20:02:01 WedJun 18 2003) Select Action

Country: usa

Dealer opens 1 diamond at west; north passes, west then says -no bidding box-a mistake was made and bids 2 diamonds. can the pass then be ignored?

mycroft

67 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: bidding wrong (21:26:38 WedJun 18 2003) Select Action

Country: Canada

In Duplicate bridge, there are two situations whether or not bidding boxes are used, and because they are so different, the TD should be immediately called (hopefully before West tells us what he "should" have bid).

If West misspoke - he meant to say 2, but 1 came out of his mouth - then he is allowed to change the bid until partner calls, provided the announced wish for change (or change attempt) is done immediately upon him noticing (the Laws say "without pause for thought" - note that this is not the same as "without pause").(Law 25A).

This is why you call the TD immediately - it is her job to investigate and determine whether the conditions for "inadvertent call" apply.

If it is ruled inadvertent, and attempted to correct "without pause for thought", North not only may, but must retract her call, and call again to the correct opening. Of course, there's nothing saying she can't pass again!

If West has changed his mind - if he meant to say 1, no matter what pigs flew by that caused him to want to, or if the TD decides that he did "pause for thought", then Law 25B applies. Since North has called, West can no longer change his call, 1-P- stays the legal auction, and the fact that West wanted to open 2 is unauthorized for West's partner - he may not make a call that caters to west being light (if 2 would have been weak) or strong (if 2 would be strong) or strange (if 2, or 1, for that matter, was artificial) unless no other sensible action exists (and yeah, the TD has to judge on that as well.) Here, although North cannot change her pass, she (and South) *are* allowed to use the

information that west wanted to bid 2, at their own risk.

The rubber bridge laws are similar, but not identical (after all, there is no TD to make judgement rulings, so...) You can read them here (Laws 24, 25, and 26).

Michael.

bluejak

434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: bidding wrong (00:50:19 ThuJun 19 2003) Select Action

While Michael's answer was 100% correct as far as it went, it actually forgets the question asked! :smile:

IF :rolleyes: the Director decides that it was an inadvertent 1 bid so allows it to be changed to 2 then **Yes,** the pass can be changed without penalty.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

3 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 3 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 10:25:23 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 BbBoy.net

top

Guest

Reply

Insufficient corrected (14:38:15 TueJun 17 2003) Select Action

Country: Hong Kong

East bids 3S. South bids 3C. East says 'Insufficient Bid'. South immediately changes his bid to a 'Pass'. Which law should I be looking at? Law 25 Change of Call or Law 27 Insufficient Bid.

Ed

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Insufficient corrected (16:02:37 TueJun 17 2003) Select Action

Law 9. :biggrin: Specifically Law 9B1(a) and law 9B2. East's comment draws attention to South's irregularity (L9A1), so the director *must* be called (Law 9B1(a)), and no player should take any action until the Director does his thing (Law 9B2). Also, South's premature correction of the IB may subject him to further penalty (Law 9C). Now, south's pass is cancelled, and you deal with his insufficient bid (keeping 9C in mind).

bluejak

434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Insufficient corrected (23:17:21 TueJun 17 2003) Select Action

Yerrr-s-s-s-s. While Ed is right up to a point it is a very normal reaction of players to try to correct their insufficient bids. So long as the TD is called immediately by one of the players not much harm is done.

The TD gives the next player the chance to accept the original call - not the attempted correction. If the next player does not do so the full Law is applied and the attempted correction is cancelled - but it is UI to partner.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [1]

James Vickers

Reply

Club rules (13:11:05 TueJun 17 2003)

Select Action

Country: UK

I have been given the task of reviewing the club rules. Ours is a bridge club affiliated to the county association and the EBU. As far as I understand the situation, the club, as the sponsoring organisation, can impose any playing rules it likes so long as these do not conflict with the laws of the game.

So we are bound by the WBF laws (the blue book), but not the EBU regulations (the Orange Book).

For instance we could decide that a Stayman 2C should not be alerted (Orange Book stuff), but not that a passed out hand should be redealt (L22A). We could declare that a bid is not made until the bidding card is placed on the table (contravenes OB 7.3.2, but no law), but not that declarer's deliberately played card can be retracted without penalty (would contravene L45). We could not ban psyches (L75B), but we need not impose a 60/30% score in the case of fielded psyches as the OB recommends (6.2.2). (We could, if we so wished, impose 60/0%, for instance.)

Is my understanding so far correct?

One of our existing rules states that "Any player or players that wilfully refuse to play a board will automatically score zero on the board. Their opponents will score 60% or their own average, whichever is the greater."

Notwithstanding the fact that the TD could award 60/40% in such cases and add a disciplinary penalty of 40% of a top for the offenders, is this rule as it stands in contravention of L12B and L12C?

James

bluejak

434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Club rules (13:21:59 TueJun 17 2003) Select Action

Your perception of the legalities in your first few paragraphs seems completely accurate to me.

A pair that refuses to play a board should consider themselves extremely fortunate to get 0% on a board. Most sponsoring organisations would disqualify them routinely.

I cannot see how 60/0 can be against the Laws.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [1]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

3 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 3 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **395**, Newest Member: FrancesHinden. Register :: Log in

The time is now 10:26:17 Sat Aug 30 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 BbBoy.net

top

Thread Index :: FAQ's :: Main Menu :: Posting Hints :: Emoticon Key :: Search
David's Lawspage :: EBU :: ACBL :: WBF

Legend :: Read Topic :: Unread Topic

Email **Help | Full Format: ON :: OFF | Text: ON :: OFF | Email Status**

Guest

Reply

Lead out of turn (06:52:41 SatMar 15 2003) Select Action

Country: Hong Kong

Club Duplicate Bridge Session
West is declarer in 4S. South leads the DA out of turn. Declarer did not accept the lead and stated that a diamond should not be led. The DA was picked up and returned to the offender's hand. A diamond cannot now be led by offender's partner as long as he retains the lead.

When offender's partner regains the lead after another player has won a trick he is entitled to lead a diamond. Offender's partner could clearly take advantage of the situation knowing that his partner has the ace even though it is unauthorised information. Without this knowledge he might lead another suit that would help the declarer.
How do you rule in incidents like this when declarer feels that the offender's partner has taken advantage of a situation but has difficulty proving it.

bluejak

434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Lead out of turn (14:08:06 SatMar 15 2003) Select Action

Proof is not required in judgement rulings.

Unauthorised information [UI] cases are always treated the same, even though over 90% of them concern hesitations. Despite this, the methodology for non-hesitation UI cases is just the same.

If there is a possibility that a diamond return could be based on the sight of the opening lead out of turn, the Director will consider whether there were logical alternatives to the diamond switch, whether the diamond switch was suggested by the UI, and whether there was damage. If all of these apply he adjusts the score.

Since this is a judgement ruling, the Director will only make it after consultation and it is appealable.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

Robert Johnson

Reply

Re: Lead out of turn (02:04:46 MonMar 24 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

Gentlemen, If I understand the question, Declarer would not have the choice of forbidding offenders partner from leading a Diamond. Under Law 57, declarer can:
1. require offender's partner to play the highest card of the suit led.
2. require offender's partner to play the lowest card he holds of the suit led, or
3. forbid offenders partner to play a card of another suit specified by declarer.

Regards,
Bob

JimO

175 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Lead out of turn (05:25:00 MonMar 24 2003) Select Action

You misunderstand the question, or the Laws.

Law 57 does not apply here; it applies only when 1) a defender leads to the next trick before his partner has played to the current trick, or plays to the current trick out of rotation before his partner has played to the trick.

Law 53A (when the lead is accepted) and Law 56 (when the lead is not) are the laws that apply here; Law 56 will refer you to Law 50D (major penalty card).

Law 16C states that the info from withdrawn calls/plays is UI for the offenders, AI for the non-offenders.

I agree with Mr. Stevenson's answer.

-Jim O'Neil
Oak Park, IL

dagnew

2 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Lead out of turn (18:48:38 MonJun 16 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

As a follow-on question: If, during the course of play, the offending player (with the Ace) makes a discard signal that would call for a diamond, does that 'offset' the UI -- in that now the partner has AI that the offender desires a diamond lead?

Doug

bluejak

434 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Lead out of turn (19:11:46 MonJun 16 2003) Select Action

Nothing 'offsets' UI, per se. The Laws on UI still apply.

But they are affected by the current position. Under Law 73C a player must carefully avoid taking advantage of UI. If he has AI [authorised information] suggesting a particular play he may make that play if he is sure that he is not taking advantage of the UI.

Under Law 16A a player may not choose amongst LAs one suggested by the UI. Particular bits of AI may affect whether a particular alternative is an LA.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [1]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

Carol_Tielsch

2 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Insufficient bid (16:20:24 SatMay 31 2003) Select Action

Country: usa

what is the rule for an insufficient bid

Ed

173 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Insufficient bid (16:54:42 SatMay 31 2003) Select Action

Law 27 governs insufficient bids. Basically, insufficient bidder's LHO may accept the bid - if he does, the bid is treated as legal, and the auction continues. If he does not, the bid must be corrected by either a sufficient bid or a pass (no doubles or redoubles). If the bid is corrected to the lowest sufficient bid in the same denomination, and both the insufficient bid and the new bid are definitely not conventional, there is no penalty; otherwise offender's partner must pass for the remainder of the auction, and there may be lead penalties.

dagnew

2 posts
bridgetalk member

Reply

Re: Insufficient bid (16:52:04 MonJun 16 2003) Select Action

Country: USA

Don't forget, however, the effect of the insufficient call (or its legitimate replacement) being a conventional call. That bars the offender's partner from bidding.

Doug

View Thread Page(s): [1]

[Get Email Advice of Replies] [Print] [Send] [Watch] [<] [Add a Reply] [>]

2 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 2 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)