

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 10B

Q. 1

West is the dealer and passes. While North is contemplating his bid, South passes out of turn. How do you rule?

A 1: As you may have guessed, a little trap in this one. Law 30 covers a pass out of rotation. Law 30A applies *before any player has bid*, and Law 30B *after any player has bid*. Which do you apply?

South has opened the auction with a pass. A pass is not a bid. If you look at Definitions (P.11), you will see the definitions. Distinguish between 'calls' and 'bids'. Calls include all bids, but also passes, doubles and redoubles. So in this situation you apply 30A (before any player has bid), and offender must merely pass at his first legal turn. If West had opened the bidding with say 1C and South had then passed, you would apply 30B2.

There are a few areas where you need to be alert to this difference.

Q 2

Bd 15 Dlr S Vul NS

76
J72
53
AQJ764

AK43	10982
K10864	93
2.	KJ987
10	82

QJ5
AQ5
AQ4
K953

Bidding:	West	North	East	South
				1C (1)
	1D (2)	2D (3)	5D	Dbl
	5H (4)	6C	All pass	

Result: NS -200.

1. Precision

2. For majors (not alerted)
3. Positive hand 8+ HCP
4. At this stage you are called by North. It transpires West's 1D bid was systemically correct, but East did not realize that NS were playing Precision. You offer South the option of retracting her double without penalty, which she declines. Bidding proceeds.

Do you adjust? If so, to what?

A 2:

As I think I've mentioned before, an excellent way of approaching these MI and UI situations is the one Kaplan recommended years ago. Picture a situation where each player has his own personal hand held computer, on which a full explanation of the opponents' calls comes up as each call is made (but not of course his own). So there is no need to alert, and no UI from a false alert or a failure to alert. So that in this auction, North and South immediately know what West's 1D bid means, but East's misunderstanding remains.

Let's look in sequence. The first infraction occurred when East failed to alert the conventional 1D overcall. This was an alertable call even though East did not register because he forgot that NS were playing Precision. Law 21B makes it clear that failure to alert represents misinformation, and the MI Laws apply.

South doubles the 5D bid, and West bids 5H. At this stage, you are called. How do you proceed? By this time, East has realized that he had got it wrong and had not alerted. Law 21B allows a player to change without penalty a call made after misinformation, but only provided his partner has not subsequently called. The wording of this law is not all that great. Does 'subsequently' mean after the MI (i.e. the failure to alert) or after the call that opponent may wish to change? The latter is the correct understanding. So how far back can you take the auction?. North bid 2D after the failure to alert, but South has since called with a double of 5D. So North can no longer change his 2D call. However South may change her 5DX call, because North has not yet bid subsequently. So you allow South to change her call, but she opts to leave it. Note that law 21B3 makes it clear that, when it is too late to change a call, the TD may still award an adjusted score in case of damage, and you advise the table thus. Bidding proceeds.

You are called back at the end of the hand. NS have a terrible score (6C for -200) and ask for an adjustment. You start by looking at any infraction. Failure to alert was one infraction. But there was another. I'll repeat what we discussed in the previous series of lessons.

When there is misinformation, there is often also unauthorized information.

Always remember this adage when making a ruling, and check it out. West, by East's failure to alert, suspects that East has forgotten that her 1D call was conventional. This is UI, and she may not take any action suggested over another by this UI. If I show a major

two suiter and believe that partner understands, and despite that partner jumps to 5D, I would be quite happy to pass 5D. I've got a great hand for partner with his presumed long diamond suit. Clearly, pass is one of West's options, and the 5H bid could have been based on UI.

So, in adjusting the score, we'll disallow the 5H bid. What would have been the likely outcome without these infractions? East would still have bid his 5D (having forgotten that NS were playing Precision) and South would have doubled. There is a good chance that North would have passed, and NS could get +800 with good defence. Do we give them this score?

Normally yes. But consider the issue of 'consequent damage' and subsequent damage'. 'Consequent' means damage resulting from the infraction. 'Subsequent' means damage arising after the infraction, but not arising directly from it. Take a situation where South has been pushed to 5S after EW have used UI to push to 5H. South plays rather poorly and makes only 10 tricks for -100. As South should never been playing in 5S except for the EW infraction, he will be given the score for 4S making i.e. +620. The WBF Laws Committee have made it clear that, in arriving at such adjusted scores, we do not take into account subsequent poor play or even poor bidding, where there has been damage. The only situation where the non-offenders may lose their right to an adjusted score is if they take action that is 'wild' gambling, or irrational'. This proviso is particularly aimed at the 'double shot'.

Take North's situation after the 5H bid. His options are to pass (leaving decision to partner) or double. Is 6C a realistic option? He has no reason to think this a winning option. I see the 6C bid as a double shot. The philosophy behind the double shot is 'I'll take this gamble, but if it doesn't come off, then the Director will adjust our score anyway because of the MI'. So I see the 6C bid as fitting the 'gambling' concept.

So I would allow NS to keep their score of -200. The 'double shot' has cut the nexus between infraction and damage. However, EW should not be allowed to advantage from their infraction, and I shall still adjust their score to -800. So we have a split score here.

Two of our panel wrote in with their answers, and both suggested adjusting to -500 representing three off in 5DX. Incidentally, this was a Butler Pairs, and -500 would still be a good result for EW, as the par result is NS 3NT for +600. Look at Law 12. It requires us to award the probable score to the non-offenders, but to award the offenders the worst score they may get without drawing too long a bow. I see a possible defence as CA, diamond switch, 3 rounds of diamonds. Provided South ducks the first heart to the king, and splits his honours (preferably with the queen) when the spades are led from East, dummy will have used his last trump to get back to hand to repeat the finesse. Will he so repeat (if it loses he will go -1400), or will he settle for -800? The latter is certainly a possibility. Perhaps my analysis is wrong, but that is what appeals committees are for.