

## 56 Defender's Lead out of Turn

The Law book rather unhelpfully merely refers one to 54 D which only deals with 'Declarer Refuses Opening Lead'. The Director must however refer to 53 A – and then 47 E1 and 47 B as appropriate.

## 61 Inquiries concerning a Revoke

**B3** A defender can (at the risk of creating UI) ask his partner about a possible revoke. Note this UI risk exists whether there was a revoke or the answer is 'no revoke'.

## 64 Procedure after Establishment of a Revoke

**A** Automatic 'Two trick transfer rectification' for revokes **ONLY\*** applies if offending player took revoke trick and his side took a subsequent trick.

[\* not 'because took subsequent trick with card that could have been played...']

**B7** No rectification if both sides revoke on the same board.

**C** Whenever the Director deems the non-offending side otherwise insufficiently compensated by Law 64 he shall assign an adjusted score. He should alert players to this.

## 65B3 Arrangement of Tricks

Declarer may at any time require that card pointed incorrectly is corrected.

Other players may draw attention to error – but only until lead made to next trick.

## 70,71 Contested Claim or Concession

In this context "normal" includes play that would be careless or inferior (for class of player involved). Note only reference to irrational is in 70 E.

**70 D3** Although play should have ceased when claim/concession made, any play that did subsequently occur may provide evidence to be deemed part of the clarification, and additionally Director may accept it as evidence as to what would probably have happened had there been no claim/concession.

## 86 D In Teams Play

The Director may assign an adjusted score (IMPs or Total points) at one table, and should do so in all cases when board has already been played, or play has commenced, at the other table and that result appears favourable to the non-offending side.

## 90,91 Procedural Penalties; Directors Powers etc

Offences liable to procedural penalty include such things as unduly slow play, unauthorized comparison of scores, failure to comply promptly with tournament regulations and instruction of the Director.

The Director should remember that although he has wide discretion as whether to penalize (or just warn), if penalizing a basic offence then he should normally apply the 'standard penalty' of 3 IMPs, but NOT change the score in any other way.

However such offences as manifest rudeness to other players, or challenging the authority of the Director, which constitute offences against the BB@B code normally attract a 'double standard penalty' of 6 IMPs.

## ORANGE BOOK MATTERS

**These are detailed on the website and elsewhere.**

You are strongly advised to keep yourself familiar with 3E re Asking Questions, UI and the Potential to Mislead; and 10B4 re requirements for Strong Opening Bids.

Neither have been changed again but there have been subsequent offences.

**2010+ Changes** you should be ready to rule on include

(1) allowed agreements to bid natural 1NT with 7222 (7 in a minor);

(2) allowed doubles of 1 of a suit; (3) doubles as suit transfers;

(4) pair use an Illegal Agreement; (5) scoring a Fielded Psyche.

(6) requirement that opening 1♥ or 1♠ guarantees at least 4 cards in that suit – whether forcing or not;

p4

# LCBA GUIDE for HOME PLAY TEAMS-OF-FOUR

## MATCH DIRECTORS

### 80 Some Terms Used

Rectification	Remedial provision applied when irregularity comes to Director's attention
Penalty	Procedural or Disciplinary; applied under Laws 90 and 91
System Card	Commonly called Convention Card
Agreement	Partnership Understanding (Convention)

### 4, 5 Seating Directions

Neither team has any seating rights and if anyone attempts to operate as if they had at the start of any stanza (e.g. by 'holding back' so as to be able to decide orientations in the knowledge of those of the other side) then unless the other team are entirely happy with this the Director should arrange that line-ups are written down and exchanged.

### 7 Control of Board and Cards

- A The Board is to remain centrally placed on table (also see 41 D).
- C Players should shuffle their cards before returning them to the board.

### 9 A3 Drawing attention to Anticipated Irregularity

Any player, including dummy, may attempt to prevent any other player committing an irregularity. Dummy's rights (e.g. to warn declarer) are subject to Laws 42 & 43.

### 12 Director's Discretionary Powers – Awarding an Adjusted Score

#### C1(b) Wild, Gambling Action etc

NOS is not entitled to relief of self-inflicted damage; nor OS to gain therefrom

#### C1(c) This Section applies; hence 12 C1(e) is **NEVER** used,

i.e. Director **assigns** adjusted scores – including weighting to reflect the probabilities. [Forget all about the distinction between 'likely' and 'at all probable' and arriving at split scores; but if have to **award artificial** adjusted scores these need not balance.]

### 16 Authorized and Unauthorized Information

**B2/3** If Hesitation (or other extraneous information) is NOT agreed Director **must** be called immediately. Otherwise the best time to claim actual damage is at the end of the hand (e.g. rather than on sight of dummy).

### 20 Review and Explanation of Calls

- F3** A player may ask questions about an individual call instead of the whole auction, but must avoid 'leading' questions which might indicate aspect of own hand to partner.
- F5** A player must give no indication at time of (believed) mistaken explanation by partner, but should call Director and inform opponents at first legal opportunity.  
That is after final pass if declarer/dummy; but only at end of play if defender.
- G1** Explicitly states it is illegal to ask questions for partner's benefit (enlightenment).

### 22 Clarification Period

**(17)** After auction ends there is the CLARIFICATION Period prior to the end of the Auction Period (during which mechanical error can sometimes be corrected)

### 23 Awareness of Potential Damage

Adjust score if consider Offending side has gained through irregularity when offender **COULD** have been (not WAS!) aware of possible damage. (e.g. arising from partner's enforced pass)

## 25 B Legal & Illegal changes of call

A player may no longer lawfully change an INTENDED call.

## 27 INSUFFICIENT BID

This Law was changed to widen the allowed 'correction without further rectification' calls to include any that in the Director's opinion has the same meaning as (or a more precise one within) that of the insufficient bid. It is dangerous and generally unwise for the Playing Director to attempt to make sufficient enquiries so as to judge which corrections under 27 B1 would allow partner to bid again.

**Consequently if the IB is rejected, then the Playing Director should tell the offender that he must decide by himself what replacement call to make without guidance from the Director beyond what is printed in bold at 4 below. That is the IB-er must decide whether his call allows the auction to continue without further rectification or whether it silences partner, and himself announce whether or not Partner is Silenced.**

**Unless he has already played the board the Director must try to avoid acquiring information which would be unauthorised to him as a player either at this table or later at the other table, and/or which could possibly influence his own play of the board.**

## Recommended Director Procedure

1. Advise the offender to say nothing at the table that might indicate what it was he thought he was doing. [He may create Unauthorised Information [UI] for partner (Law 16B refers). e.g. "oops! I never saw that bid" (or similar) would almost always provide UI such that even in a 27 B1(a) situation partners freedom of subsequent action would be restricted]
2. If not yourself playing at the table as a member of the non-offending side, ask a member of the non-offending side to tell you what happened before you arrived. (If already at table as a member of the OS, confirm what had happened with a member of the NOS at the table.) [Reduces chance of UI as in 1; also possible personal deductive self-compromise - 3 2]
3. Advise the left hand opponent [LHO] that he may accept or reject the insufficient bid [IB], explaining that if he rejects it the offender will have the following options:
  - a) If the offender makes the lowest legal bid in the same denomination, and if neither call is artificial, then the auction will continue without any further rectification
  - b) If the offender makes a call (any other legal call) which has either an identical meaning as the IB or has a more precise meaning (such meaning being already fully contained within the scope of the IB), then the auction will continue without any further rectification
  - c) otherwise, the offender can make any legal call he wishes other than a double or redouble, but his partner will be silenced throughout.

The Director needs to remember:

- 1) LHO is not entitled to know what the offender was trying to do when he made the IB - although he is entitled to guess.
- 2) However LHO is entitled to know full details of his opponents system (e.g. he can ask supplementary questions) and he is entitled to know the Law (e.g. he can seek clarification of the Law from the Director). If sadly the Director does know, or has deduced, 'what the player was trying to do' he must avoid revealing this in his answers.
4. If the IB is rejected, then in accordance with TO regulation under Law 80 B2(f) when **presenting the options 3 a - c to the offender** the Director should state that as he is playing he will not carry out the necessary investigations to arrive at an informed 'opinion' as to whether 'Partner is Silenced' but will allow the auction to continue, based on the offender's own judgement. Adding that if the non-offending side believe they have been damaged as a consequence of a misconceived announcement then they should so inform the Director at the end of the stanza, when the hand has been completed at both tables.

**It is recommended the matter then be resolved as an appeal.**

The Director is also reminded that:

- a) There may be Law 26 type lead penalties if the offending side become defenders.

- b) He may need at the end of play to examine whether there is a reason to adjust the score. Usually if the IB has been accepted or part has been silenced throughout then all should be well. Note that 'rub of the green' or 'just being lucky' is no ground for adjustment.
- c) **in the special case of** 'corrected by the lowest sufficient bid in the same denomination' (both being incontrovertibly not artificial) the information from the first bid (what it was and its presumed meaning) IS authorised to IB-ers partner.
- d) If an IB was corrected before he arrived – the new call stands (unless LHO chooses to accept IB) with whatever further rectifications may then be required.
- e). A truly unintentional action may be corrected 'without pause for thought' via Law 25.

### **Adjusted Scores**

If the Director judges that the insufficient bid itself conveyed such information as to damage the non-offending side, he shall assign an adjusted score.

If following the application of 27 B1 the Director judges at the end of the play that without assistance gained through the infraction the outcome of the board could well have been different and in consequence the non-offending side is damaged (see Law 12B1), he shall award an adjusted score. In this adjustment he should seek to recover as nearly as possible the probable outcome of the board had the insufficient bid not occurred.

### **Minor (Deviations) and Gross (Psyches?) 'Mis-bids' and 'Fielding'**

Law 27 works on the assumption that when the IB-er selects a call that does not silence partner, his hand actually conforms to the newly selected bid.

However, this will not necessarily be the case. It may make perfect bridge sense to make a slight 'mis-bid' (deviation) in order to keep the auction open rather than gamble on a final contract by making a call which silences partner; and partner is equally permitted to cater for ('field') this possibility. This is entirely legal

In the special case of 'corrected by the lowest sufficient bid in the same denomination' (both incontrovertibly not artificial) [see c) above] information from the first bid (what it was and its presumed meaning) IS authorised to IB-ers partner. Consequently the IB-er is allowed to make a 27 B1(a) bid with a gross variation in strength from what would normally be required & partner may field this possibility with impunity; Law 16 D not applying. [Neither the IB, nor the replacement, can be other than incontrovertibly not artificial in any other way.]

## **40 Partnership Understandings & Regulating Authority Options**

In general this law inter alia confirms a variety of things already in EBU regulations [Orange Book- see 7D1, 10E].

It also confirms that players cannot have any aide-memoires or aids to calculation.

## **40 B Special Partnership Understandings**

These are **any** agreements subject to a regulation in the Orange Book – including the most commonplace!

**B2(b)** Players of the declaring side (**only**) may consult their own system card during the Clarification period; doing so if necessary to check they have not mis-explained anything.

**B2(c)** A player may consult his opponent's system card at any time, although this may create UI. [see OB 7D1(e)]

**B3** The EBU restrictions on the use of prior agreements to cater for questions, responses and irregularities are set out in OB 7D1 (f-j inc).

## **41 D Commencement of Play – Dummy's hand**

Faced Dummy; each suit is sorted by rank, placed in narrow columns pointing length-wise towards declarer, with the lowest card nearest to declarer (i.e. nearest to board which remains centrally on table separating dummy from declarer's 'playing area').

## 45 Card Played

**C4(b)** Designation of a card in dummy can only be changed if Director is satisfied that declarer incontrovertibly **never** intended to play that card.  
(e.g. he cannot change Q to A when he realises K has appeared on his left)