



Asia Pacific Bridge Federation

Zone 6 TD Newsletter

Newsletter No. 4

November 2013



APBF

Delegation



2013 is a busy year for international bridge in our zone. Thailand started the 1st Bangkok Bridge Festival Championships in January which was well attended with 34 teams. The 49th APBF Championships in Hong Kong in June attracted 38 teams and the 19th APBF Youth Championships in Wuhan had 22 teams. The 41st World Bridge Teams Championships was held in Bali in September. The 35th ASEAN Bridge Club Championships will be held later this month in Manila. The year will finish with the SportAccord World Mind Games in December in Beijing, which is now the 3rd edition. We can look forward to another exciting year with the 2nd Asia Cup Bridge Championships in June, tentatively in Jinhua, and the 15th World Bridge Series to be held in Sanya in October.

2nd APBF TD Seminar (Zone 6)

The 2nd APBF TD Seminar for Zone 6 TDs is planned for 2014, tentatively to be held from 2 - 4 April before the Bangkok Bridge Festival. Announcement and invitation will be sent in due course. Please watch out for it.



2013/4 Major Confirmed Events in Our Zone (WBF & Zonal)

35 th ASEAN Bridge Club Championships Makati City, Manila, Philippines	27 November - 1 December 2013
SportAccord World Mind Games Beijing, China	12 - 18 December 2013
19 th NEC Bridge Festival Yokohama, Japan	11 - 16 February 2014
2 nd Bangkok Bridge Festival Championships Bangkok, Thailand	5 - 9 April 2014
2 nd Asia Cup Bridge Championships Jinhua, Zhejiang Province, China (Tentative)	13 - 22 June 2014
15 th World Bridge Series Sanya, Hainan Island, China	10 - 25 October 2014

The following cases came from recent Zone 6 and World Championships.

Board 19
 Dealer: S, Vul: EW
 (Misinformation)

	♠ 96			
	♥ QT42			
	♦ A2			
	♣ AKJ32			
♠ AK43 ♥ KJ87 ♦ Q8 ♣ T94	<table border="1" style="width: 100px; height: 100px; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">N</td></tr> </table>	N	♠ QT ♥ A953 ♦ KT97653 ♣ -	
N				
	♠ J8752			
	♥ 6			
	♦ J4			
	♣ Q8765			

Ruling:

On further investigation, the TD found that EW had no agreement on the 3♠ bid. North has thus been misinformed and there had been an infraction by North according to Laws 40A & 40B. However, all players consulted would have passed holding the North hand, irrespective of the meaning of 3♠. The same players also mentioned that South’s 2♠ bid would most likely be made with a ♣ fit, hence the chance of scoring 2♣ tricks was unlikely. The TD hence ruled that the table result stands according to Law 12C1.

W	N	E	S
			P
1♣	P	1♦	P
INT	2♣	2♥	2♠
3♠ ⁽¹⁾	P	5♦	P
P	x	AP	

(Open Team, Round Robin)

- (1) W -> S ♠ value, ♥ agreed
- E -> N Good hand for ♦

Result: 5♦ x by E= NS -750



Facts:

The TD was called by North after play has ended. North claimed that had he known the “real” meaning of 3♠, he would not have doubled 5♦. There was nothing on EW’s CC describing the meaning of 3♠.

Board 32

Dealer: W, Vul: EW
(Misinformation)

♠ JT853 ♥ KJ9864 ♦ 84 ♣ -	♠ 94 ♥ 3 ♦ KT65 ♣ KT8743 N ♠ AK76 ♥ AT ♦ QJ9 ♣ AJ92	♠ Q2 ♥ Q752 ♦ A732 ♣ Q65	
------------------------------------	---	-----------------------------------	--

W	N	E	S
2 ♦ ⁽¹⁾	3 ♣	4 ♦ ⁽²⁾	P
5 ♦	P	6 ♠	AP

(Women Team, Round Robin)

(1) Both majors, weak 5+/5+

(2) E -> N Asking bid in ♦
W -> S Natural

Lead: ♣ 5

Result: 6 ♠ by E = NS -1430

Facts:

The TD was called by South to the table when the play was over. South claimed that had she known the “real” meaning of the 4 ♦ bid, she could have led the ♦ A and defeated the contract. There was nothing on EW’s convention card about the meaning of 4 ♦, but on further investigation East’s explanation appeared to be their agreement.

Ruling:

The TD ruled that EW had an infraction according to Laws 40A & 40B, and South had been misinformed and damaged as a result. Players consulted, however, would have led the ♦ A in either case and especially when told that EW had a ♦ fit. The TD hence determined that the damage is self-inflicted and ruled that the table result stands according to Law I2C1(b).

Post-mortem:

Would you have adjusted the score if the lead of the ♦ A allowed the contract to be made?

Although you are not adjusting the score, you may be considering taking away EW’s advantage gained as a result of the infraction, according to Law I2B1. However, as a general practice in WBF events, this Law will not be applied once a table result has been obtained (whether assigned or otherwise). In general, you may assign weights according to a number of probabilities, but not splitting the score.



Board 15

Dealer: S, Vul: NS

(Failure to Alert)

♠ AKQ852	♠ 3	♠ 6
♥ A5	♥ J732	♥ 84
♦ 97	♦ J832	♦ AKT65
♣ T92	♣ K853	♣ AQJ64

N

♠ JT974	♠ 7
♥ KQT96	
♦ Q4	
♣ 7	

W	N	E	S
2 ♠	P	5 ♦	2 ♥ ⁽¹⁾
AP			

(Open Team, Round Robin)

⁽¹⁾ Both majors, weak 5+/5+

Result: 5 ♦ by E -1 NS +50

Facts:

The TD was called by West at the end of the play. He said that South had not alerted the 2 ♥ bid, which South disagreed. When asked how he alerted the 2 ♥ bid, South said he put the “Alert” card in front of himself and tabbed on it, then put it to the side. West disagreed and said he never saw the alert. Since this was the 2nd last board of the set, the TD asked how South had alerted prior to this hand and was told that the bidding had been natural and there was no alert up to this point.

Ruling:

The TD considered this to be an improper alert. Since this match was on BBO, the TD verified the facts with the BBO operator and was told that South merely pulled out the “Alert” card, put it next to the bidding box, and tabbed on it. The operator also mentioned that West might not have noticed the alert. The TD ruled that there had been an infraction according to the WBF General Conditions of Contest Section 28.3(a) and EW had been damaged as a result. The score will be adjusted, according to Law 47E2(b), to:

5 ♣ by E +1 NS -420

Post-mortem:

If this match was not on BBO and there was no spectator, would you have done something differently? And would you have ruled differently?



Board 19

Dealer: S, Vul: EW
(Misinformation)

	♠ -		
	♥ KT964		
	♦ 975		
	♣ Q6532		
♠ 95432	N	♠ A76	
♥ J872		♥ AQ53	
♦ K4		♦ T8	
♣ K9		♣ AJT7	
	♠ KQJT8		
	♥ -		
	♦ AQJ632		
	♣ 84		

W	N	E	S
			1 ♠
P	INT ⁽¹⁾	P	3 ♦
P	P	x	P
4 ♥	x	AP	

(Open Team Qualifying)

⁽¹⁾ Forcing

Result: 4 ♥ x by E -2 NS +500

Facts:

The TD was called by East at the end of the auction. NS was playing without convention card. East claimed that North told him at the start that NS played Precision. East said that based on his understanding of Precision he had chosen to double the 3 ♦ bid, but on further enquiry was told by North that it could occasionally be up to 17HCP. East claimed that he might not have doubled if given the correct information.

Ruling:

The TDs in deliberation considered 4 main points:

1. Although NS was playing without CC, this was the 9th board in a 10-board set. If EW was concerned, they could have called the TD much earlier on.
2. There are many versions of Precision. If EW wasn't sure they should have enquired and not assume. East could have clarified this prior to his double and not after.
3. EW's action (especially West) was considered "wild or gambling" under Law 12C1(b) and hence did not warrant a score adjustment.
4. Players consulted could either have passed or doubled as a matter of choice, after South had shown a maximum.

The TDs ruled that the table result stands.

Law reference: 12C1(b), 21B1(a), 40.

Appeal:

EW appealed. The Appeals Committee unanimously upheld the TD's decision. In deliberation, the Committee considered that there had been no misinformation or lack of disclosure at the table. The Committee was not happy with the comments given by East at the hearing, but returned the deposit in accordance with the social and harmonious character of the event.



Board 22

Dealer: E, Vul: EW
(Misinformation)

♠ K987 ♥ - ♦ AQT5 ♣ AKQT4	♠ Q ♥ K654 ♦ KJ2 ♣ 98652 <table border="1" style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 50px; text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">N</td></tr> </table>	N	♠ AJ5 ♥ JT872 ♦ 976 ♣ 73
N			
♠ T6432 ♥ AQ93 ♦ 843 ♣ J			

W	N	E	S
		P	P
1 ♣ ⁽¹⁾	P	1 ♥ ⁽²⁾	P
2 ♣	P	2NT	P
3NT	AP		

(Match Point Pairs)

- (1) Precision
 - (2) E -> N 6+HCP
W -> S 8+HCP
- Result: 3NT by E = NS -600

W	N	E	S
♠ 7	♠ Q	♠ A	♠ 3
♦ T	♦ J	♦ 6	♦ 3
♦ 5	♥ 4	♥ T	♥ Q
♠ 8	♥ 5	♠ A	♠ 2

Facts:

The TD was called by South when the play was over. South claimed that had he known that East could have only 6HCP, he could have returned a small ♥ and defeated the contract.

Ruling:

EW was playing without a convention card. When asked by the TD, East insisted that his explanation was correct and that was what he told North. Nothing was written down. In the absence of proof to the contrary, the TD ruled that there had been an infraction by West according to Law 21B1(b). Assuming that East's explanation was their agreement, the bidding sequence suggested that East had the minimum 6HCP. If South was given the correct information, he could have returned a ♥ and defeated the contract. The TD hence ruled, according to Law 47E2(b), that the table score be adjusted to:

3NT by E -1 NS +100

Post-mortem:

Would you have proceeded (or ruled) differently if East disputed the facts and told you that he never said anything about having 6+HCP? Would you have ruled differently if this was a team event?



Board 16

Dealer: W, Vul: EW
(Misinformation)

♠ K8762 ♥ 96 ♦ KT8742 ♣ -	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 100px; margin: 0 auto; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> N </div>	♠ Q954 ♥ A2 ♦ QJ9 ♣ AQ53	♠ J ♥ QJ874 ♦ A6 ♣ KJ872
		♠ AT3 ♥ KT53 ♦ 53 ♣ T964	

W	N	E	S
2 ♠ ⁽¹⁾	2NT	x ⁽²⁾	P
3 ♦	P	P	3 ♥
AP			

(Match Point Pairs)

- (1) ♠ + minor, weak
- (2) E -> N Natural
W -> S Asking for minor

Result: 3 ♥ by S -2 NS -100

Facts:

The TD was called by South when play was over. South claimed that if he was given the correct information of the double, he would have passed 3 ♦. The meaning of the double was not on EW's convention card. On further investigation, EW apparently has no agreement on the meaning of the double.

Ruling:

The TD ruled that there had been an infraction by West according to Laws 40A & 40B and NS had been damaged. In determining whether the infraction was related to the infraction, 6 players were consulted. Given the bidding sequence and that East's double was natural, all players consulted would have doubled. When asked whether they would have bid 3 ♥, all players consulted considered the bid to be "gambling".

The TD ruled that there had been an infraction according to Laws 40A & 40B by West, but NS's damage resulted from South's "wild & gambling" action. The TD hence ruled that the table result would stand according to Law 12C1(b).

Post-mortem:

Would you have ruled differently if South had passed? Would you ruled differently if West's explanation was in fact their agreement and North was the one who called the TD with the same bidding sequence?



Board 3

Dealer: S, Vul: EW
(Break in Tempo)

♠ 86 ♥ KQT86 ♦ T63 ♣ Q94	♠ T952 ♥ 3 ♦ A942 ♣ AT52	<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; width: 100px; height: 100px;"> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">N</td></tr> </table>	N	♠ AJ7 ♥ A942 ♦ KQJ ♣ J76
N				
♠ KQ43 ♥ J75 ♦ 875 ♣ K83				

W	N	E	S
			P
P	P	INT	P
2 ♦ ⁽¹⁾	P	3 ♦ ⁽²⁾	P
3 ♥ ⁽³⁾	P	3NT	AP

(Swiss Team)

- (1) Transfer to ♥.
- (2) Super accept with ♦ feature.
- (3) Break in tempo over 30 seconds.

Result: 3NT by E = NS -600

Facts:

The TD was called by North when the bidding was over. North indicated that there had been a significant break in tempo when the tray was over on the SW side after the 3 ♦ bid. They were told to continue. The TD was recalled after the play was over. When asked, West said he was thinking of bidding 3 ♥ or 4 ♥ while East said that the super accept was FG.

Ruling:

On further investigation, the TD found out from West that the 2 ♦ bid could be made with as little as 0 HCP, and that with a 5+card major, they would always transfer after a INT opening. The TD ruled that there had been an infraction by EW according to Law 16B1(a); unauthorised information had been passed by West and used by East, and adjusted the score to:

3 ♥ by W = NS -140

Post-mortem:

It appeared that East, in trying to justify his use of UI, had not been telling the truth. Would you, the TD, give him a procedural penalty for unsportsmanlike conduct?

In this particular hand, 3 ♥ could only be made if West could locate the ♣ T. Would you have given a weighted score?



Board 4
 Dealer: W, Vul: All
 (Misinformation)

♠ AQ43 ♥ AKQ2 ♦ 2 ♣ AQT5	♠ K986 ♥ 5 ♦ 87 ♣ KJ8762 <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 100px; margin: 10px auto; position: relative;"> <div style="position: absolute; top: 50%; left: 50%; transform: translate(-50%, -50%); font-weight: bold; font-size: 2em;">N</div> </div>	♠ JT5 ♥ 9743 ♦ KQT65 ♣ 4
♠ 72 ♥ JT86 ♦ AJ943 ♣ 93		

W	N	E	S
1 ♣	P	1 ♦	P
2NT	P	3 ♣ ⁽¹⁾	P
3NT ⁽²⁾	AP		

(Swiss Team)

- (1) Stayman not alerted by W.
- (2) E -> N don't play Puppet Stayman.
 No 4-card major.

Lead: ♠ 6
 Result: 3NT by W = NS -600

Facts:

The TD was called by North when the play was over. North claimed that if he was given the correct information of the 3 ♣ bid, he might not have led a ♠ and the contract might have been defeated. EW did not have anything on their convention card that showed the meaning of the 3 ♣ bid.

Ruling:

On further investigation the TD found out that there had not been an agreement between EW of the 3 ♣ bid in this situation. The TD ruled that there had been an infraction of Laws 40A & 40B by East, and North had been damaged. The TD then considered whether 3NT could have been defeated on any other lead. It was found that the contract, when played by West, cannot be defeated on any lead. The TD hence ruled that the table result stands.

Post-mortem:

What would have happened if 3NT could have been defeated on a ♦ lead? Would you have given North 100% of the adjusted score, or would you weight the score?

What would happen if 3 ♣ is really Stayman in EW's agreement?



Board 24
 Dealer: W, Vul: None
 (Misinformation)

♠ KJ97 ♥ K72 ♦ QJ9642 ♣ -	♠ Q654 ♥ A3 ♦ 7 ♣ AKQ865 <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 100px; margin: 0 auto; position: relative;"> <div style="position: absolute; top: 50%; left: 50%; transform: translate(-50%, -50%); font-weight: bold; font-size: 2em;">N</div> </div>	♠ T ♥ QJ984 ♦ K53 ♣ J973
♠ A832 ♥ T65 ♦ AT8 ♣ T42		

W	N	E	S
1 ♦	2 ♣	2 ♥ ⁽¹⁾	3 ♣
4 ♣	4 ♠	P	5 ♣
P	P	x	AP

(Swiss Team)

(1) W -> S 5+♠ FG.
 E -> N 5+♥ Natural.

Result: 5 ♣ x by N -1 NS -100

Facts:

The TD was called by North when the play was over. North claimed that if he was given the correct meaning of the 2 ♥ bid, he could have passed or doubled the 4 ♣ bid instead of bidding 4 ♠ and NS could never have landed in the 5 ♣ x contract. EW did not have anything in their convention card showing the meaning of the 2 ♥ bid.

Ruling:

The TD found out subsequent (from the system notes in East's tablet) that 2 ♥ showed 5+♠ and was FG. There had been an infraction of Laws 40A & 40B by East, and North has been damaged.

The TD then considered what would have happened if North had either passed or doubled over 4 ♣. East, not knowing that there had been a mistake, would have bid 4 ♥; which would be "corrected" to 4 ♠ by West. East would convert this to 5 ♦ which would be doubled by South and would have been the final contract. The TD hence ruled, according to Law 12C, to adjust the score to:

$$5 \spadesuit \times \text{ by W} -1 \text{ NS} +100$$

Post-mortem:

What would have happened if EW's agreement of the 2 ♥ bid had been 5+♥ and natural? What would the TD do differently in that case?

If 5 ♦ could have been made, would the TD let the table result stand? Would the TD do anything extra?



Questions & Answers

(Email to: awching@netvigator.com)

Q: Playing with screen, with East-West passing throughout, North opened 2 ♦ (multi), South bid 2NT (relay), North 3 ♦ (maximum with ♠), South 3 ♠ (FG and waiting), North 4 ♠. East now enquired and pass. Without passing the tray, North and East said “contract”. South made 11 tricks. The TD is now called as South and West thought they were playing 3 ♠ but North and East thought they were playing in 4 ♠. How would you rule?

A: According to Law 22A, the auction has not end. South and West will be given a chance to “complete” the auction. If they would have passed, then the final contract would have been 4 ♠. However, North shared a greater part of the responsibility. If there is a chance to defeat 4 ♠ or holding that to 10 tricks, that would be the final result. If, however, South or West would have bid, then an adjustment of score will be required. In a team event, if the board has not been played at the other table, a re-deal is probably the best solution (Law 6D & 86C), otherwise you will need to assign an artificial score after consultation. In a pair event, a 60-40 solution is probably appropriate.

Q: In a team game with screens, I (North) opened a natural 1 ♦, East doubled and South bid 1 ♥ which is FI. After West passed, I rebid 2 ♦ showing 5+♦. East doubled again and South bid 2 ♠. We do not have an explicit agreement on the 2 ♠ bid, but I guessed he should be competing with a ♦ fit. Do I need to alert the bid?

A: You are only required by Law 40 to fully disclose your partnership agreements and understandings. Since there is no agreement you don't have to alert this bid. You may, as a matter of courtesy, explain to your opponent what you think. But be warned that this may work against you as your opponent may call the TD on misinformation if your partner explained it differently.

Food for Thought!!

The following question is hypothetical. There is no definite answer. Send in your thoughts, indicating the relevant laws.

Playing without screen in a club event, South opened 1 ♥, West passed and North bid 2 ♠. After East passed, now South said “I should have alerted 2 ♠, it was non-forcing”. You are called to the table by East.

1. How would you normally proceed? Would you check NS's convention card to see whether 2 ♠ is NF?
2. If you looked at NS's convention card and found that 2 ♠ is FG, what should you do to prevent creating UI (or AI for that matter) for the parties concerned, and at the same time ensure that the hand will be played as “normally” as possible?

