MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE HELD AT CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF ARBITRATORS, WC1A 2LP ON WEDNESDAY MAY 27TH 2015

Present:	Tim Rees (TR)	Chairman and Elected Member
	Mike Amos (MA)	Elected Member
	Robin Barker (RB)	Elected Member
	Jeremy Dhondy (JD)	EBU Chairman
	Frances Hinden (FH)	Vice Chairman and Elected Member
	Gordon Rainsford (GR)	Chief Tournament Director
	John Pain (JP)	Secretary

1A Apologies for Absence	Barry Capal (BC)	EBU General Manager
	Ian Payn (IP)	EBU Vice Chairman
	Neil Morley (NM)	Elected Member
	Martin Pool (MP)	Elected Member
	David Burn (DB)	Elected Member

The Chairman thanked members for agreeing the change of date from May 20th due to work commitments by himself and FH.

1B Clarification of voting rights for L&E Committee

It was confirmed that ex-officio members of the committee (JD, IP and GR) had full voting rights for L&E meetings. The EBU General Manager and the Secretary cannot vote.

1C Future of the L&E Committee

The Chairman summarised the discussion at the recent Shareholders Meeting where the Board had put forward a consultation paper on the future of the three Standing Committees. The proposal for the L&E Committee was that it be split into 2 bodies – one dealing with law and regulation, the other dealing with disciplinary matters. It would also become a Board sub-committee rather than a standing committee, possibly with nominated members rather than elected.

The matter would be further discussed at the County Chairman's conference in July with a view to publishing a firm proposal for the AGM in November.

It was confirmed that the election for two members of the L&E Committee would still be scheduled to go ahead at the AGM, but candidates would be made aware of the possible change.

Committee members were interested to know how it would work, how the Board appointments would be made and the length of term for appointed members. It was agreed that the split between the law/regulation part and the disciplinary part might not be as easy to achieve as was sought.

JD undertook to make the Committee's views known to the sub-committee considering the proposals.

2

2.1/2 Minutes of the previous meeting and accuracy

The minutes of the meeting of January 21st were approved and signed.

Further to his decision from that meeting not to attend any more, Grattan Endicott has also indicated his wish not to remain as a referee. He was thanked for his years of service in that role.

2.3 Matters arising

2.3.1 (2.3.4) GR had been in contact with a Norwegian TD and informed the meeting that their regulation regarding mandatory pauses was that once both sides have participated in the auction at the 2-level or higher with call(s) other than pass there is a compulsory STOP-pause with each and every call other than pass if either opponent called (other than pass) in the last previous round of the auction.

This was rather different to that reported previously. FH , who had played in Norway, said that her observation was that it was observed about as well as our regulation.

The Committee confirmed that it was content to leave the EBU regulation as it was.

2.3.2 (2.3.3) Appeals booklets follow up.
The Committee noted the long back-up of booklets with 2011 being the last one being shown on the website.

It was agreed to try to move the matter forward. MA would contact various potential commentators and it was agreed to try to get 2012 and 2013 moved on as quickly as possible.

A different format for gathering the information had been suggested (forum-based along the lines of Bridgewinners), but FH said she still favoured the current process where commentators made independent comments on the hands, without it becoming more of a forum where contributors could see others comments before necessarily making their own.

[Action: MA, JP]

2.3.3 (5.4c) County and Club League rules
FH said she had made some progress with producing the guidance but was concerned it would end up being too long. She envisaged a short version and a fuller version. The Committee agreed they had no requirement to produce the guidance but it was felt it would be helpful to league organizers when they were complete.

[Action: FH]

3 Appeals to the National Authority

MA withdrew for this item. An Appeals Committee was formed of TR, RB and FH as all other members of the L&E Committee either had an interest in the result or had already been involved.

The Committee considered an appeal to the national authority arising from a match in the Seniors KO teams (Gerard Faulkner Salver). The match had been played privately at a mid-way venue.

TD Ruling

There had been two requests for rulings by telephone – one about a failure to alert, the other about a disputed claim. This created an atmosphere of bad feeling. It was not entirely clear about the passage of events but, in summary, a member of team A suggested he did not wish to play any more and a member of team B took that to mean that the match had been conceded in his favour. The member of team B left the building and the match remained unfinished. Two of the four stanzas had been completed.

The TD considered that the action of the Team A member had constituted a concession and he awarded the match to Team B.

Appeal to the Referee

Team A appealed the decision saying that no concession had taken place as the Captain had not conceded and their player had agreed to abide by the captain's decision. Consequently the Team B member was wrong to have left the building before the match was complete and team B had effectively conceded the match.

The referee considered various submissions. He wanted to make the ruling that the match be replayed, but did not feel he had the authority to make that decision so he referred it to the Chief TD and the Chair of the Tournament Committee. Their decision was to order the match to be replayed.

Appeal to the National Authority

Team B next appealed to the national authority. The Team B captain was asked to submit his grounds for appeal to the national authority and these were received.

The L&E Committee considered the grounds given by Team B. Whilst the Committee did not think any of Team B's grounds were relevant, it did consider that a matter of principle was involved. This was how to adjudicate a match result in circumstances where the match came to a sudden and abrupt end and there was no one side clearly at fault.

Consequently, the Committee allowed the appeal and refunded the £75 deposit.

In this case half the match had been scored up and play was underway in the third stanza of four.

The Committee considered all the submissions together with the regulations for matches played privately, the Laws and the general EBU regulations. It was apparent that the TD and Referee did not have identical information to work from. The Committee ruled that:

1. The facts were not agreed, but that both sides were at fault.
2. They would not award the match to either side on the basis that the other side had conceded.
3. Only the Captain of the team can concede the match.
4. If Team B's member thought that Team A had conceded (by virtue of a Team A member saying so) then team B might have an acceptable reason for leaving the venue prematurely.

Decision

The Committee considered three possible decisions:

a) Award the match to one side or the other based on the score at the end of the second stanza;

b) Continue the match from stanza three. This would require both sides to produce the same team line up as for the original match.

c) Require the match to be replayed, allowing the teams to alter their line-ups, if necessary (subject to the rules of the competition).

The Committee agreed that as a matter of principle, their order of preference was (b), (c), (a) but that practical considerations (such as the timetable of the event and availability of the players) must always be taken in consideration.

Accordingly the Committee ordered the match to be replayed and allowed two weeks from 27 May for it to be done. If either side refused to play then they would forfeit the match.

4 Disciplinary Cases

4.1 Wroxall

The secretary reported that the matter was ongoing and that the Club had not completed its own procedures. Consequently the Laws and Ethics committee would take no action at this stage.

4.2 Santana

The Committee had considered, by email and phone, an incident arising from the Tollemache Final. The case had been closed and the papers put to file.

5 Technical Matters

5.1 Fielded misbids

The Committee agreed to accept DB's proposal (see Appendix A from Jan 21st meeting) and RB was asked to draft wording for inclusion in the White Book and for promulgation to members.

There was some concern that people might now be seen to be 'getting away with it' and receiving no penalty if the opponents were not damaged, but GR said that TDs retained the right to penalise players who had acted on unauthorised information.

[Action: RB]

5.2 White Book amendments

RB presented his list of proposed changes to the White Book.

Section	1.4
Subject	Fielded misbids
Issue	As discussed at previous meetings
Change	To be provided (DB)
Section	1.7
Subject	Appealing a penalty given or not given
Issue	L&EC minutes 2005-11-30 item 5.4 "The L&E decided that as a matter of Law:- A procedural or disciplinary penalty may be appealed by any contestant involved at the table at which the incident giving rise to the penalty arose, but not by any other contestant. (Note – if the behaviour under penalty takes place away from the table, nobody except the contestant penalised will have a right to appeal)" L&EC minutes 2013-09-09 item 5.3 "The Committee considered an appeal where part of the appellants' argument was that the TD should have imposed a procedural penalty on the other side. GR confirmed that according to Law 92A a contestant or his captain may appeal for a review of any ruling made at his table by the Director. Any such appeal, if deemed to lack merit, may be the subject of a sanction imposed by regulation. The Committee therefore agreed that an appeal could include those grounds. However, an appeal which was lodged solely on that basis might very well be deemed frivolous."

Change	Add "1.7.x Appealing a penalty given or not given A procedural or disciplinary penalty may be appealed by any contestant involved at the table at which the incident giving rise to the penalty arose, but not by any other contestant. (If the behaviour under penalty takes place away from the table, nobody except the contestant penalised will have a right to appeal.)" The L&EC considered an appeal where part of the appellants' argument was that the TD should have imposed a procedural penalty on the other side. Any such appeal, if deemed to lack merit, may be the subject of a sanction imposed by regulation. The L&EC therefore agreed that an appeal could include those grounds. However, an appeal which was lodged solely on that basis might very well be deemed frivolous."
Section	2.
Subject	Regulation for league
Issue	As discussed in January
Change	To be provided (FH)
Section	2.5
Subject	Extending the correction period for scoring queries if players are unable to check scores in time
Issue	At one of the National Pairs Regional Finals, the players were not provided with recap sheets for session 1 and a pair had a scoring query related to session 1 which they raised after they had left the venue and seen the scores on the internet. This score query was out of time (unless the failure to provide recap sheets was deemed to be an 'error introduced by an official'). Some extension of the correction period may be appropriate.
Change	Add "If there is insufficient opportunity for players to check scores from one session before the start of the next session, then the 'scoring query' correction period for that session extends to the correction period for the next session."
Section	2.5.1
Subject	Correction periods for fouled boards
Issue	Requests for investigation/rulings under Law 87 'Fouled Board' feel more like scoring queries than table rulings and errors may only be noticed when checking scores later. Should dealing with fouled boards have the correction period as for scoring errors ('scoring queries' or 'later scoring errors' as appropriate)?
Change	In 2.5.1 'Rulings', make Law 87 an exception; and in 'scoring queries' add 'including fouled boards' after 'any aspect of scoring'. OR In 2.5.1 'Rulings' add Law 87 to the list of laws included.
Section	3.2
Subject	Counting wins for split tie procedures when one team has played in a short triangle
Issue	The split tie procedures do not say how to deal with a short triangle for the purposes of counting round/matches won: does a win in each half-match count as half a win, or does more than 10 VP over the two half-matches count as a win? More generally how do we deal with counting round/matches won when rounds are of different lengths? (For example, some teams movements mix 3 and 4 board rounds, and at the Ranked Masters we may play different number of boards per round in different sessions.)
Change	Clarify. I suggest weighting round/matches won by the number of boards in the round; but for short triangles in Swiss, a half-match counts as ½ even if it is 3/7.
Section	3.7.2
Subject	Scoring teams of eight with two missing scores
Issue	At the Tollemache Final, there were multiple late arrivals and some matches started with only two tables in play. There are White Book regulations for scoring boards with one missing result (the remaining comparisons are multiplied by 4/3) but no regulation for dealing with two missing results (so there was no factoring of the remaining comparison). The approach for determining the factoring continues to give sensible answers and should be adopted.

Change	Extend the sections on missing scores for teams-of-8 to deal with two missing scores. Cross-IMP/Tollemache: 2xIMP(A-X) add-then-imp: 1/2 x IMP(A-X) + 1/4 x IMP(A - X + A - X)) imp-then-add/Garden Cities: IMP(A-X) or IMP(B-X) even if this compares scores from different sections.

Section	8.25.3, 8.25.4, 8.47.2
Subject	WBFLC minutes regarding "inadvertent"
Issue	The laws (in particular Law 25A) have changed and now use "unintended", these minute predate that change. I think these minutes are no longer useful and should be deleted. There is a more recent minute re Law 25A (appended to this document).
Change	Delete minutes from before 2008 that refer to "inadvertent"

Section	8.50.x
Subject	Limitations on the ability to designate an exposed card not a be a penalty card
Issue	GR writes: The guidance I've had on thisis that there is no limit in the laws on the ability of the TD to designate otherwise and that it can be applied whenever you think the other side has contributed to the situation that has led the card to become a penalty card.
Change	Add this guidance.

Section	8.64.x
Subject	In applying Law 64C, the TD may award a weighted score
Issue	A TD thought it was unclear whether they could award a weighted adjusted score in applying equity in revokes. I guess there could be some confusion with claims, in both cases the law is primarily concerned with awarding tricks; but for revokes we can give a weighted score, whereas for claims we can not.
Change	Add text to make this explicit.

Minor / editorial issues

Section	1.6.2
Subject	Failure to use a pass card correctly
Issue	TDs had problems finding all the guidance on missing passes in passout seat because it is in two places: 1.6.2 (from the Orange Book) and 8.22.2 (re Law 22). 8.2.2 repeats some of 1.6.2 but has more detail.
Change	At the end of 1.6.2, add "(See also 8.22.2)".

Section	1.6.4
Subject	References to numbered sub-parts of Law 40B3
Issue	This White Book section has references to Law 40B3 (a)..(d) but Law 40B3 does not have lettered sub-parts.
Change	In 1.6.4 (f)/(g)/(h)/(i), delete "(a)" "(b)" "(c)" "(d)"

Section	7.3.1
Subject	Typos/grammar
Issue	Third paragraph has been garbled
Change	"The scorer is also responsible *for* establishing an internet connection for *uploading* results."

Section	3.2.7.1(a)
Subject	Ambiguity
Issue	Does “(if there was one)” apply to both sentences? Does the second sentence only apply to the match/round between those two contestants?

Change	Replace "A simple tie between two contestants will be resolved by the result of the match/round (see §3.2.5.4) between those contestants (if there was one). If the match/round was tied in terms of VPs, the basic method of scoring (see §3.2.5.1) will decide." with "A simple tie between two contestants who played a match/round (see §3.2.5.4) against each other will be decided by the result of that match. If the match was tied in terms of VPs, the basic method of scoring (see §3.2.5.2) will be applied to that match."

5.3/5.4 Blue Book amendments

FH would draw together the changes for the Blue Book for August 2015. A request from a member for a consistent method of presentation of bidding sequences was agreed.

It was also agreed that Bidding Box regulations should again feature in the Blue Book, rather than be secreted away in the White Book. MA said they were one of the most important things players and TDs ought to know.

[Action: FH]

5.5 Law 50E discussion

Discussion on the interpretation of Law 50E – Information arising from a Penalty Card was deferred until the next meeting.

5.6 Scoring of mis-boards when there are only a few scores in the subfield

The current practice when boards are played in a fouled state is to use the Neuberg method of match pointing. Some members had complained that this gave rise to unfair scoring.

GR said that the ACBL, WBF and EBL all treat sub-fields of 3 or fewer results by giving artificial scores to all of them, based on 60/60, 65/55, 70/60/50. The EBU used to do something similar until it was suggested that we just use Neuberg for any size subfield.

GR had consulted with Max Bavin and he suggests a further modification to deal with small events, which is that any sub-field that is larger than a certain proportion of the whole (1/3?) gets its scores by Neuberg. So a sub-field of two in a five-table event or a sub-field of three in a six-, seven-, or eight-table event would still be treated as we do currently. GR recommended this new approach, which would address the complaint of getting a poor result for what would normally be a good result, when the only other table with which to compare did something ridiculous.

[Committee members were polled by email and agreed to the suggestion nem con]

RB would amend the White Book accordingly and TDs would be informed.

[Action: RB, GR]

6. Applications for new permitted methods

The Committee considered the applications as follows:

6.1 A request to allow a prepared 1♣ opening to include the range 7 to 11 points.

The Committee did not wish to lower the minimum requirement for a 1-level opening bids. The application was refused.

6.2 A request to allow 1NT openings at Level 2 on 4441 hands.

The Committee did not think there was anything wrong in principle, but it was not within the spirit of Level 2 to allow it. Level 2 is the entry level for EBU events and frequently had newer and less experienced players. The application was refused.

6.3 A request to extend the Announcing regulations to responses to 1♥ and 1♠ openings.

The Committee had some sympathy with the suggestions, but did not wish to alter the Announcing regulations this year. The application was refused.

6.4 A request to change the requirements for a Strong 1♣ opening

The Committee considered a request to amend the criteria for opening a strong 1♣ (e.g. Precision) which are currently constrained by the Extended Rule of 25. The proposer had put forward two suggestions:

a. Replicate the WBF systems policy which is simply to state that any hand defined as 'strong' has to contain at least 13 HCPs.

The Committee did not wish to do this.

b. Differentiate a strong 1♣ opening from other strong openings by adding a new section to the Blue Book:

> 'A strong 1♣ opening requires the application of the Extended Rule of 24 which means the minimum is any one of:
>
> i. Any hand of at least 15 HCP OR
>
> ii. Any hand meeting the Rule of 24 (HCP + length of the two longest suits) OR
>
> iii. … at least seven clear cut tricks'.

The Committee said the time had come to make a move in this area and AGREED to part of the request. Namely, to allow the hand to conform to the Rule of 24. However, the other constraints would remain as they are. So the new section would allow both strong 1♣ and strong 1♦ as follows:

> i. Any hand of at least 16 HCP OR
>
> ii. Any hand meeting the Rule of 24 (HCP + length of the two longest suits) OR
>
> iii. … at least eight clear cut tricks'.

To be clear, this change applies ONLY to 1♣ and 1♦ openings which may be strong.

6.5a Openings based on Point Count

The Committee noted the proposal for 1-level opening bids to be based on point count. The request covered only the 1♥ (18 to 20 HCP), 1♠ (21 to 23 HCPs) and 1NT (24+ HCP) openings. The Committee noted that it was already permitted to open 1NT with this strength.

The Committee did not wish to alter the current regulation that 1♥ and 1♠ openings should be natural at both Level 2 and Level 4. (It would be permitted at Level 5).

It remains illegal, under EBU methods, to play 1♣ and 1♦ openings based entirely on point count.

6.5b 3-card overcalls of a 3-card opening bid

The Committee considered the proposal to allow 3-card overcalls of a hand that might have only three clubs. However, they did not wish to change the current regulation.

6.5c Defensive bidding against a strength showing opening.

The Committee considered the proposal to change the regulation whereby any defence to a strong opening bid was permitted (BB 7E1a). However, they did not wish to change the current regulation.

6.6 1-level openings at Level 2

The Committee considered a request to change the minimum requirement for 1-level openings at Level 2. The Committee said that Level 2 was not meant for this style of bidding. See the comment in 6.2. The application was refused.

7. Reports from Tournament Directors

7.1 Psyche and appeal forms

15.002 Spring Congress – Swiss Teams

♠K6 ♥AKQJ7 ♦104 ♣AQJ7 ♠QJ1042 ♠95 ♥9532 ♥864 ♦AJ95 ♦K62 ♣- ♣98653 ♠A873 ♥10 ♦Q873 ♣K1042	Board 20 : Dealer West : All vulnerable ***West*** ***North*** ***East*** ***South*** 2♠(1) 4♥ All Pass (1) Lucas - 5♠ and 4 other

TD first called at Trick 3, after North claimed. A spade was led, won in dummy by the ace. ♥10 cashed. Then claimed.

The TD asked North to repeat his claim statement and was told 'drawing trumps, giving up two diamonds at the end'. North had enquired to the shape of West and was told 5+ spades, may be 6, 4+ of any other suit.

After North claimed, EW seemed unsure and after questioning North explained he would return to hand with ♠K.

TD ruling: No play proposed to return to hand, a club would be trumped; ♦A, ♦K, club trump leads to one down. (Law 70)

Result ruled by the TD: 4♥ - 1 by North.

NS appealed on the grounds 'irrational not to return with a spade'.

Appeal Committee comment: It is unfortunate but we uphold the TDs ruling. While no statement was made there is a possibility that it is not illogical to return with a club. Deposit returned.

L&E Comment: NS have no case under the laws of the game. It isn't 'unfortunate' – it would be wrong to allow the claim. It allows a declarer who is uncertain about how to get back to hand just to claim and see who objects. We are surprised that the deposit was not retained.

15.004 Premier Grand Masters Pairs

♠J10 ♥J108765 ♦A9865 ♣- ♠AKQ32 ♠9865 ♥Q ♥A42 ♦73 ♦QJ10 ♣QJ1064 ♣AK3 ♠74 ♥K93 ♦K42 ♣98752	Board 22 : Dealer East : EW vulnerable ***West*** ***North*** ***East*** ***South*** 1♣(1) Pass 1♠ 2♠(2) All Pass (1) Announced as 'could be 2' (2) Not alerted, but East had enquired, to which South replied that he thought they had discussed it and believed it was natural. East also looked on the system card.

Table result: 2♠ - 6 by North

TD's statement: I was called by West, before he made his final pass. South was asked to leave the table. North explained that, in some situations bidding the opponents suit could be natural, but not in this case.

He pointed to where the system card showed the bid as Michaels. Now that East had a correct explanation she was offered the opportunity to change her call, but declined. After further explanation that 2♠ showed hearts and a minor, West thought for some time before passing to end the auction. I was called back at the end of play and, after consultation, ruled that since East and West both had full explanations of the meaning of North's 2♠ before making their final calls there was no misinformation and so the result should stand.

Although not wishing to appeal West was unhappy with the outcome and the way the Laws applied in this situation. In particular he felt a procedural penalty should be applied to North/South for not knowing their system. He also pointed out that they were using a WBF system card, which was legitimate in this Level 5 event.

L&E Comment: We do not penalise players for not knowing their system.

15.005 Nat Pairs Regional Final

	♠K853 ♥AKQ9 ♦97 ♣976	
♠107 ♥J532 ♦QJ85 ♣K84		♠AQJ962 ♥- ♦AK643 ♣105
	♠4 ♥108764 ♦102 ♣AQJ32	

Board 12 : Dealer West : NS vulnerable

West	***North***	***East***	***South***
Pass	1NT(1)	3♠	4♥(2)
Pass	Pass	4♠	Pass
Pass	Dbl	All Pass	

(1) Weak

(2) Questions about 3♠ before bidding 4♥ (see statement)

TD first called during the break between sessions.
Table result: 4♠x + 1 by East

TD's statement: I was called by North after he had seen the hand records during the break after S1 had finished. He told me that his partner had asked about the 3♠ bid and was told it was weak when in fact it is clearly not the case. I subsequently spoke to all four players although I did not speak to EW in the presence of NS as they were elsewhere. I am satisfied that the following is agreed: South asked what 3♠ meant and initially West stated 'no agreement'. South asked a supplementary question, asking what was the difference between 2♠ and 3♠ in this situation. The accounts now differ. West states that she was being pushed and said that 'I don't know, *perhaps* 3♠ is weaker than 2♠ but longer spades'. NS both contend that the word 'perhaps' was not used and that they were told that the hand was weak. South contends that had he known that East was strong, he would not have bid 4♥. West did say to me that had she known it was strong herself, she would probably have bid 4♠ herself as well.

On EW system card they do have a 2-suited defence to 1NT: 2♦ showing a major and diamonds, however East did not want 2♦ to be passed out and thus did not bid it.

I consulted as regards the hand, including taking counsel from a TD consultant on the phone.

Director's ruling:
Score stands.

Details of ruling:
It was my ruling that South had been told initially that there was no agreement but when pushed, West had said words which South interpreted as being told the hand was weak. West felt under a little bit of pressure from the added question.

I ruled that there was however sufficient information for South to realise that West did not know (and that there was no agreement) what the strength of her partner's hand was and as such there is no damage. EW are an established partnership. I also took advice as regards whether the 4♥ bid was wild and gambling – it was not.

North South appealed on the grounds of misinformation.

Appeal Committee: adjusted the score to 3♠ + 2 by East. We felt there was misinformation. There was no clear evidence of EW agreement and Law 75 stated that the TD was to presume mistaken explanation. I think it is less likely that South would have bid 4♥ with the correct explanation 'no agreement'.

L&E Comment: Based on the write-up, we far prefer the TD's ruling to the AC's. West gave an explanation of "no agreement", then when questioned further, gave an opinion that turned out to not match her partner's hand. But we believe that the original explanation of "no agreement" should still stand, so (assuming that there really was no agreement) there was no MI.

Of course, if the AC decided there was an agreement that 3♠ was strong, then they were correct to rule as they did, but that's not what they've put on the form.

15.010 Northern Easter Festival Swiss Teams

	♠A72 ♥AKQ7 ♦A10972 ♣Q	
♠J84 ♥J86 ♦8 ♣AKJ1052		♠KQ65 ♥9 ♦J643 ♣9873
	♠1093 ♥105432 ♦KQ5 ♣64	

Board 1 : Dealer North : Love all

West	***North***	***East***	***South***
	2♦(A1)	Pass	2♥ (A)
3♣	3♦(A2)	Pass (3)	3♥ (4)
Pass	4♥	All Pass	

1) Multi
2) Alerted
3) Asked about 3♦, told unbalanced, distributional, 18+ D and S
4) Pick a place to play

Result at table: 4♥ + 1 by South, +450

Director first called: when dummy went down

Director's statement of facts:
I was called by East when dummy went down. I was recalled at the end of the hand and ascertained the facts.
South explained 3♦ as shown above. The system cards said 3-suiter but as one of the suits could be 3-cards long he thought it better to describe the bid as he did (D + S could be 4-4)

Director's ruling:
4♣ = by West , -130.

Details of ruling:
I ruled misinformation. Given the correct explanation, East would bid 4♣ and all would pass (Law 40B4).

South has Unauthorised Information from North's non-alert if 3♥ also. The ruling on misinformation gives East/West a better score than any ruling from this consideration.

North/South appealed on the grounds 'North was always going to bid 4♥'

Appeals Committee's comments:
The Committee felt that the ruling was unduly harsh to North/South. East had passed throughout with 4-card support + a singleton + the arguments given are insufficiently convincing.
The Committee suggest that North/South be informed to describe the strong option as semi- or complete 3-suiters not as strong 2-suiters. The Committee do not believe that North/South would ever pass out 4♣ or double it. The Committee rules to both sides 70% of 5♣x – 1 and 30% of the table result.

Deposit returned.

L&E Committee: The Committee's ruling looks better than the TD's but we don't understand the write-up. What actually is the North/South agreement? What exactly was the MI provided and why did the MI affect East's choice of call? The TD appears to have ruled that you are automatically allowed a double shot when you aren't given a full explanation. The AC have done the same, but applied a bit more reasoning to how the auction might continue. We do not see why East was damaged as a consequence of any MI.

15.011 National Pairs Final

	♠962 ♥Q ♦Q3 ♣KQJ9876	
♠AK85 ♥K10987 ♦74 ♣103		♠J1074 ♥A654 ♦A962 ♣4
	♠Q3 ♥J32 ♦KJ1085 ♣A52	

Board 16 : Dealer West : EW vulnerable

West	*North*	*East*	*South*
1♥	2♣	3♣ (A)	4♣
4♥	Pass	Pass	5♣
Pass	Pass	5♥	All Pass

(A) – meaning not recorded

Result at table: 5♥ - 1 by W, +100. Lead: ♣K

Director's statement of facts:
Play proceeded as follows: ♣K and another club ruffed in dummy. Declarer now led the ♥7 from the wrong hand. Nobody drew attention to the infraction, and after some time North played the ♥Q. Declarer played a spade to hand and then cashed ♥K, calling for the TD when North discarded. West protested North's pause before playing his singleton. North said he was waiting to see whether or not South wished to accept Declarer's lead out of turn. West claims she was damaged by North's hesitation.

Director's ruling:
Law 9A2 says declarer or either defender may draw attention to an irregularity during the play period, not must. North has a demonstrable bridge reason for his break in tempo under Law 73F. Law 55A (Declarer's lead out of turn) also applies.

Details of ruling: Table result stands.

Appeal lodged by: East/West on the grounds that North is at fault by his hesitation.

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling stands. Deposit returned
North has a reason for his pause.

It may be that this situation should be covered in the rules as an allowed hesitation.

L&E Comment: Obvious to keep the deposit. Why didn't they?

8 Date of next meeting

Wednesday October 14th at 1pm.

Venue is Chartered Institute of Arbitrators.

The meeting closed at 5.05pm.