

LAW 20 – REVIEW AND EXPLANATION OF CALLS

Review after Final Pass

- After final pass either defender has the right to ask if it is his opening lead
- Declarer or either defender may, at his first turn to play require all previous calls to be restated. (**Assists in covering possible early return of bidding cards to box**) – BUT may not ask for a partial restatement nor halt the review (**as it may give information to partner of defender by identifying what aspect requester is interested in**)
- **Request to have calls restated can only be responded to by an opponent**
- **All players (INCLUDING DUMMY)** are responsible for prompt correction of errors in restatement.

Explanation of Calls - During the Action and BEFORE the final pass

ANY player may request **AT HIS OWN TURN TO CALL** an explanation of opponents call.

He is entitled to know

1. About the calls actually made
2. Relevant calls available which were not made
3. And about the inferences which may be drawn from the choice where these are a matter of partnership agreement. e.g. (higher point count when vulnerable)

Replies should be given by the partner of the player who made the call.

Partner of player asking question may not ask any supplementary question until it is his turn to call or play.

Explanation of Calls – AFTER THE FINAL PASS AND DURING PLAY

EITHER DEFENDER may request an explanation of opposing auction e.g 1NT bid – interference and then a jump to 3 level by partner of 1NT caller.

DECLARER may request an explanation of a defenders call **OR CARD PLAY UNDERSTANDING** (usually regarding Discards and Attitude)

IN THESE INSTANCES THE REQUEST MAY BE IN REGARD TO A SINGLE CALL – but should be careful not to give rise for a breach of Law 16B1 regarding possibility of giving extraneous information to partner

INCORRECT OR ERRONEOUS EXPLANATIONS

If any player has given an explanation which he realises (from any source) is incorrect or erroneous HE MUST SUMMON THE TD BEFORE THE END OF THE CLARIFICATION PERIOD AND CORRECT THE MISEXPLANATION (i.e. before the opening lead is faced)

He can call the TD earlier BUT IS NOT OBLIGED TO DO SO.

A player whose partner has given a mistaken explanation **may not correct it during the auction, nor indicate that an error has been made.**

THIS INCLUDES

- **FAILURE TO ALERT OR ANNOUNCE AS REQUIRED** e.g. 12 – 14 or 15 – 17 for 1NT OPENING BID **ALSO**
- **AN ALERT WHICH IS NOT REQUIRED** E.G. BIDDING 1 CLUB WHEN PLAYING 5 CARDS MAJORS WHERE HOLDING IS AT LEAST 3 OR MORE CLUBS.

PLEASE SEE - <http://www.ebu.co.uk/documents/laws-and-ethics/convention-cards/announcements-table.pdf> for correct procedure for alerts and announcements.

The player must call the TD and inform his opponents that in his opinion his partners explanation was incorrect or erroneous **BUT ONLY AT THE FIRST LEGAL OPPORTUNITY**

- **For a DEFENDER at the end of play of the hand**
- **For DECLARER or DUMMY after the final pass of the auction**

N.B. - A player may not consult his own system card between beginning of auction and the end of play EXCEPT declaring side MAY consult own system card during the CLARIFICATION PERIOD ONLY (Law 40 B 2)

LAW 75 – MISTAKEN EXPLANATION OR CALL

Players are expected to disclose partnership agreements accurately.

It is not legal to describe an agreement where there is not the SAME MUTUAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTNERS. If TD determines that a misleading explanation which was NOT BASED ON A MUTUAL AGREEMENT HAS BEEN GIVEN LAW 21 B applies

1. **NOS may change a call without rectification (provided partner has not bid)**
2. **AND O.S. MUST NOT USE THE UNAUTHORISED INFORMATION IN THE REMAINING BIDDING AUCTION OR DURING PLAY OF THE HAND. (LAW 16 applies)**
3. **If the TD determines that the call **HAS NO AGREED MEANING** he awards an adjusted score based on the likely outcome had the opponents received the correct explanation.**

See handout re LAW 21 - MISINFORMATION regarding the TD REASONING PROCESS

LAW 21 – MISINFORMATION

There is no rectification or redress for any player who acts on the basis of their own misunderstanding.

Until end of the auction period AND PROVIDED HIS PARTNER HAS NOT CALLED, a player **may change his call without other rectification** when TD judges that the call could have been influenced by the misinformation given by an opponent.

N.B. - Failure to alert (or announce e.g. 1nt Point count) PROMPTLY where required is deemed misinformation **(but would need to have influenced the original bid)**

When a player elects to change a call because of misinformation the LHO may in turn change any subsequent call made BUT LAW 16C applies – i.e. information given by withdrawn calls.

Example – North Opening bid of 1NT – **(NO ANNOUNCEMENT)** East Doubles (holding 16+) – **Late announcement by opener's partner of 15 – 17** TD called. Unlikely that 15 – 17 holding would have been doubled therefore can be changed **(WITHOUT RECTIFICATION)** to Pass (or any other legal call) – Openers partner South can now make any legal bid

BUT BECAUSE OF THE CHANGE OF LAW 16 B1(a) - he must not choose a call (or play) that is suggested over another by unauthorised information if another call (or play) is logical. IN OTHER WORDS THE NEW LAW SPECIFICALLY PROHIBITS ANY CALL OR PLAY BEING CHOSEN IF THERE IS A LOGICAL ALTERNATIVE

AND OFFENDER AND HIS PARTNER MUST NOT TAKE ADVANTAGE OF KNOWING THAT EAST HOLDS 16 + points either in their further bidding OR in their PLAY of the hand e.g. making bids which appear to take account of 16+

points in a specific hand or a play by finessing through the likely weaker / stronger hand to gain tricks.

FAILURE TO POSITIVELY AVOID taking advantage **MAY** result in an adjusted score against the offending side.

WHERE IT IS TOO LATE TO CHANGE A CALL (e.g. Partner of non offender has called) AND THE TD JUDGES THAT THE OFFENDING SIDE HAS GAINED AN ADVANTAGE FROM THE IRREGULATORY HE AWARDS AN ADJUSTED SCORE.

WHAT IS THE LIKELY “REASONING / DECISION MAKING PROCESS FOR A T.D?

LAW 12 C 1 c - Requires a considered ruling in terms of a contract possibly making a specific number of tricks where U.I may have been beneficial

TD Considers 1. – Given the misinformation – did the opposition adopt a reasonable line of play?

YES

NO – He misplayed – SCORE STANDS

.
.

TD 2 – Did the misinformation cause the error

YES

NO – It was irrelevant – SCORE STANDS

.
.

TD 3 – Could the CORRECT INFORMATION point to a winning line of play

YES

**NO – Correct explanation would be uninformative
SCORE STANDS**

.
.

TD 4 – Given the correct explanation WOULD the opposition find the correct line of play a reasonable amount of the time

YES

NO – SCORE STANDS

.
.

TD 5 - SHOULD ADJUST THE SCORE ACCORDINGLY.