

CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE  
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 11A

A couple of further ruling problems for you. Both have arisen in recent play.

**Question 1**

E/W Vul  
Dealer S

			N		
			3		
			7543		
			AQ876		
			632		
	8762				KQJ94
	98				AJ1062
	J102				93
	KQJ5				10
			A105		
			KQ		
			K54		
			A9874		
Bidding:	S	W	N	E	
	1NT	P	P	2C	
	X	P	2D	2S	
	X	All pass			

Nothing alerted. 2 Clubs systemically was Landy (showing majors). E/W inexperienced players, N/S experienced. West forgot they were playing Landy.

Result: EW +670. NS claim damage because of failure to alert.

How would you rule?

**Question 2.**

Bd 14 Nil vul Dlr E.

		5	
		K65	
		QJ1084	
		J832	
AQ84			K1072
AQ42			J9
96			A73
A74			KQ106
		J963	
		10873	
		K52	
		95	
West	North	East	South
		1C	P
1H	P	1S	P
3S	P	4S	P
4NT(1)	P	5D(2)	P
5S	All pass.		

- (1) Simple Blackwood
- (2) One ace

Result: EW +450.

NS call you to the table at the end of the hand. They claim that East's 5D bid was significantly slow, and East's mannerisms suggested discomfort and disapproval of West's 4NT. West got the most favourable answer he could to his enquiry, yet he signed off in 5S. East admitted a hesitation, but said that they nearly always use 4C Gerber for aces, and she had to think a little before answering. West made a similar explanation – being used to Gerber, he made the mistake of thinking that 5D showed no aces. He wasn't aware of any mannerisms from partner.

How do you rule?

### **Review and Explanation of Calls (Law 20).**

I have often been asked by directors about what they see as an apparent inconsistency in Law 20. Law 20 in its earlier part limits the right to a review of the auction up to the time when each player has played to trick 1. Yet 20F allows questions about bidding agreements during the play. There is no inconsistency. A review of the auction merely means a *restatement of the calls made during the auction to date*, and this includes any alerts. Requests for explanation of an opponent's call are not part of the review, but are covered by a specific law. It would have been better if this law had been perhaps two separate laws: one relating to a review of the auction, and one relating to requests for explanation of the meanings of calls.

These days we are so used to written bidding or to bidding boxes that we don't need to ask for a restatement of the auction: we can see that in front of us. But those using spoken bidding may occasionally need to exercise this right. Note that the right to a restatement of calls expires for each player as soon as he has played to the first trick (for declarer, as soon as he has played from dummy). Technically, to conform with this requirement, our written bidding regulations should require the bidding pad to be covered as soon as the hand on lead has made his lead, with declarer and third hand retaining the right to inspect it until he has played. This is a bit messy, so our regulations require the bidding pad to be covered by dummy as soon as third hand has played to trick 1.

Note Law 20B which says that, if a player is required by Law to pass at his turn, he is not permitted to ask for a restatement of calls. The Law does not forbid him to ask about the meaning of a call, but any such action would be suspect – his only reason for asking at that time could be to alert his partner to something about the opposition bidding, and this would be quite improper.

Reg Busch.