



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EBU LAWS & ETHICS COMMITTEE  
HELD AT 2 BLOOMSBURY STREET, LONDON WC1B 3ST ON WEDNESDAY  
JANUARY 23<sup>RD</sup> 2013**

<b>Present:</b>	Jeremy Dhondy (JD)	Chairman and Elected Member
	Mike Amos (MA)	Elected Member
	David Burn (DB)	Elected Member
	Neil Morley (NM)	Elected Member
	Martin Pool (MP)	Elected Member
	Gordon Rainsford (GR)	Chief Tournament Director
	Tim Rees (TR)	Vice Chairman and Elected Member
	John Pain (JP)	Secretary

**1A** The Secretary opened the meeting and called for nominations for Chairman for 2012-13. MP proposed Jeremy Dhondy as Chairman, seconded by MA. With no other nominations JD was declared elected and took the chair. JD proposed Tim Rees as Vice Chairman, seconded by MP. With no other nominations TR was declared elected.

JD welcomed GR to his first meeting as Chief TD and wished it placed on record the contribution made by Max Bavin over the years while he was on the Committee as Chief TD. The committee wished him well for the future.

<b>1B</b>	<b>Apologies for Absence</b>	Sally Bugden (SB)	EBU Chairman
		Barry Capal (BC)	EBU General Manager
		Grattan Endicott (GE)	Vice-President
		Gerard Faulkner (GF)	Vice-President
		Frances Hinden (FH)	Elected Member

**2**

**2.1/2** **Minutes of the previous meeting**

The minutes of the meeting of September 19<sup>th</sup> 2012 were approved and signed. There were no matters of accuracy.

**2.3** **Matters arising**

2.3.1 (5.4) JD reported that the case of a club running a simple systems event and appearing to contravene the laws of bridge regarding deviations had been resolved. He had spoken to the club chairman who had accepted the need to conduct matters correctly.

2.3.2 *Ebook versions of the OB and WB*

DB reported that work on the OB was complete and would be available shortly. The WB was still being worked on.

**Action DB**

### **2.3.3 Correspondence with a member regarding hand 12.052**

The correspondence had been brought to a close.

### **2.3.4 Any other matters arising**

#### **2.3.2 Appeals booklets for 2010 and 2011**

These had now been completed and were available on the website. JD thanked FH and NM for their work in getting the booklets prepared and for clearing the backlog. They were presented with a small token of appreciation. NM thanked the committee and said that the preparation of the 2012 forms was well under way. See also 7. 12.057

#### **2.3.3 Standard penalties**

MA had identified an omission in the list, which would be addressed when the WB was updated.

## **3 Appeals to the National Authority**

The Committee noted that an Appeal to the National Authority arising from the Sussex Premier League had been dealt with by a sub-committee of JD, FH, DB and TR. The sub-committee found that none of the conditions for an appeal to the national authority were met and the deposit was forfeited.

NM asked whether, in fact, it should have got that far. The appeal had been made by the captain of the team where it was clear that the team members involved did not wish for it to be appealed. It was confirmed that under Law 92A a contestant or his captain may appeal for a review of any ruling made at the table by the director, so the appeal was in order.

It was also confirmed that the reverse would not be true – if the team members wished to appeal but the captain did not then no appeal would be permitted.

## **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 New case – INXS**

The secretary reported that a disciplinary hearing had been conducted by a club and the member had been sanctioned by the club. He now wished to appeal the decision but in the meantime had resigned from the club. After consulting with the county disciplinary panel he wrote to the EBU for an opinion on the process.

The L&E Officers concluded the following:

They agreed with the county that the original process of the club was flawed as the member did not have an adequate opportunity to represent himself and the process in the club's constitution was not fully adhered to.

They agreed with the county that the process should be set aside and that either the club be asked to deal with it correctly or go to the county to do it afresh.

They considered that a new enquiry would likely produce the same result and question whether either of the approaches would be productive in the light of future developments.

The member had been informed of the officers views and nothing further had been heard.

### 4.3 New case – Jamiroquai

The secretary reported on an incident which took place during an inter-county league match. The member had been sanctioned by his county of prime allegiance and now wished to appeal.

The league organizer and the counties had previously come to an arrangement whereby the primary county of the member complained of would deal with disciplinary matters.

Under Law 80A3 the EBU had assigned its Regulating Authority powers to such organizers, so the question of who should hear the appeal was governed by the options in Appendix B, paragraph 2 of the EBU Bye-laws for conducting appeals against County Disciplinary decisions:

2. *When an appeal is referred to it, the Laws and Ethics Committee shall have such of the following options as are consistent with the constitution of the Association concerned:-*

(a) *to constitute itself an Appeal Committee to determine the appeal.*

(b) *to appoint an Appeal Committee to determine the appeal. Such Appeal Committee shall consist of no less than three nor more than five Player Members, who may include one or more members of the Laws and Ethics Committee.*

(c) *to refer the appeal to the Disciplinary Committee, which shall act as an Appeal Committee to determine the appeal*

It had been made clear to the member concerned that he was only allowed one appeal and in this case the L&E Committee had asked the county to conduct the appeal as paragraph (b) allows.

On the wider issue of inter-county events it was agreed that it would be helpful to have some guidelines for the conducting of such events. MP offered to try to put something together.

## 5 Technical Matters

### 5.1 *New addition to the Referees panel*

It was agreed to add Brian Callaghan to the panel of EBU referees.

GR said it would be helpful to give some training to the panel of referees by way of some exemplar material and other guidance given by the L&E over the years. He and the secretary would put a package of materials together to give guidance on matters such as, for example, Reveley rulings and weighted rulings.

**Action: GR, JP**

### 5.2 and 5.3 *Deferred to the next meeting*

### 5.4 *Orange and White Books for August 2013*

The committee began their deliberations on how to improve the Orange Book and revise the White Book. JD said that he hoped the committee would agree the following ground rules:

- The majority of those who refer to the books would use the Orange Book.
- The White Book is a reference work.
- The Orange Book is to be significantly reduced in size
- The Tangerine Book would be discontinued
- Changes only to be made on August 1<sup>st</sup> in each year (as now)
- Have it only as an online publication (as now), although panel TDs would be supplied with a printed copy.
- Set up a time scale for getting the work done
  - All work to be completed by the end of June
  - OB: 1<sup>st</sup> part (Up to section 10): JD and NM; 2<sup>nd</sup> part (permitted methods) FH
  - WB: MA and Robin Barker

Robin was to be invited to the next L&E meeting in March. The committee were grateful for his offer of help.

The committee considered an early draft of a revised first part and took into account submissions from members regarding changes to the alerting and announcing regulations. After discussion JD was to produce a second draft for the next meeting to include the changes agreed below.

Specific considerations:

a) Changes to announcements

It was agreed to extend the scope of announcements for the first time since the introduction 2006.

i) prepared or short 1♣ and 1♦ openings where there may be two cards or fewer are announced as 'may be two', 'may be one', 'may be none'. However Precision Club or Blue Club 1♣ openings are still alerted, as they are strong openings.

ii) natural 2NT openings are to be announced by stating the range.

iii) Stayman and transfer responses to a 2NT opening will be announced where they follow the principles for announcing over natural 1NT openings. This would provide greater consistency between 1NT and 2NT openings.

iv) there would be no other changes to announcements. The committee considered the changes above to represent areas of common agreement to an extension of announcement and thought, whilst there was a case for other areas to also be included, it was wrong to make too big a change to the method at this point.

b) alerting of doubles

The committee agreed to make no change to the current regulations for alerting doubles. However an attempt will be made to make the current rule more accessible to the members.

c) definition of 'strong'

The committee agreed not to make any change to the current OB section 10B3 regarding 'strong' artificial opening bids.

d) Alerting calls above 3NT

The committee agreed to make changes (in principle) to alerting over 3NT on the first round of the auction. The wording would be finalized at the next meeting.

Consideration of levels of permitted methods and additions to permitted methods was left until the next meeting.

### *5.6 Time limits for rulings in Knock Out matches played privately*

GR noted that the wording in the WB, EBU conditions of contest and the BGB Gold Cup for rulings in matches played privately were not consistent. The Gold Cup regulations had been altered two years ago to make them more workable, but the EBU regulations still insisted that the match result became final when captains had signed the official score sheet. Peter Jordan (EBU Competitions) says that only about 5% of results are now sent in on signed official result sheets, most results being sent in by email or phone. The L&E suggested that GR should make some concrete proposals and that the TC should decide on any changes in time for the new season commencing August 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Action: JD to inform Ian Payn**

### *5.7 Substitute players in Swiss Matches*

GR suggested a revision in wording for the new WB in paragraph 144.2 as follows:

144.2(f) Once a substitute player has played more than half the boards in a round, he should be required to continue playing for the remainder of the round.

It was agreed that this would apply to any event with rounds of 3 – 8 boards so also includes, pairs, multiple teams and individuals as well as Swiss events.

## 5.8 New WBF VP scales

The new scales had been used in a WBF event. However DB reported that there was still a mathematical issue with rounding and tie-splitting which had not been completely resolved. There was a discussion as to whether the new continuous scales or the revised discrete scales should be used in EBU events but it was agreed that this was a TC matter. It was confirmed that the selection committee had decided that the Premier League and trials would be using the new continuous scales. The new scales will be made available when the WBF has sorted outstanding matters and, in any case, will appear in the August 2013 edition of the WB. Counties would need to be advised about their existence together with an L&E recommendation about what should be used.

## 6. Applications for new permitted methods

Consideration deferred to the next meeting.

## 7. Reports from Tournament Directors

### 7.1 Psyche and appeal forms

General Comments:

- A form had been received from a licensed congress. Whilst it is not a *requirement* for such forms to be forwarded to the L&E Secretary, counties and also clubs were encouraged to do so.
- The committee noted an increasing number of situations where they were surprised the deposit had been returned. A revised form making the test for the return of the deposit more stringent will be in use shortly.

### 12.057 Guernsey Swiss Pairs

The secretary was asked to write to the pair concerned to ask for further information. The Committee was minded to change the Green classification but would wait for the comments from the pair.

NM asked whether it was appropriate to include Reports of Hands in the Booklet of Appeals. He said that there were some interesting ones which might provide useful responses. The committee agreed that some could be included and would be up to the editor (FH) how many she used without allowing the booklet to grow too much.

### 12.060 West of England Congress

The committee considered a hand where the TD had classified a misbid as red, however there was no indication that a score adjustment had been made. It was agreed to alter the Report form to allow space for recording score adjustments in red psyche and misbid cases. It was accepted that the score achieved may have been better than 60% to the non-offending side in which case there was no need to adjust the score, but an indication to that effect should be present.

### 12.063 Bidding record of a member

The secretary was asked to look in the library for recorded situations regarding a member and to report back.

### 12.066 Seniors Congress

<p>♠ K98432 ♥ A ♦ AKQ75 ♣ 7</p> <p>♠ Q7                      ♠ AJ65 ♥ Q1085                  ♥ KJ764 ♦ 9                            ♦ 832 ♣ AKJ985                ♣ 3</p> <p>♠ 10 ♥ 932 ♦ J1064 ♣ Q10642</p>	<p>Board 14 : Dealer East : Love all</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>West</b></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>North</b></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>East</b></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>South</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Pass</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2♣(1)</td> <td>2♠</td> <td>Dbl(2)</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3♥</td> <td>4♦</td> <td>4♥</td> <td>Pass (H)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>4♠</td> <td>Dbl</td> <td>5♦</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dbl</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1) Intermediate, announced</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>2) Negative double</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Table result: 5♦x✓ = +550. TD ruling: 60% of -420; 40% of -450 AC decision: table result restored.</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>			Pass	Pass	2♣(1)	2♠	Dbl(2)	Pass	3♥	4♦	4♥	Pass (H)	Pass	4♠	Dbl	5♦	Dbl	All Pass					1) Intermediate, announced				2) Negative double	
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																														
		Pass	Pass																														
2♣(1)	2♠	Dbl(2)	Pass																														
3♥	4♦	4♥	Pass (H)																														
Pass	4♠	Dbl	5♦																														
Dbl	All Pass																																
		1) Intermediate, announced																															
		2) Negative double																															

The TD was first called at the end of play.

**TD:** I was told that it had been agreed during the auction that there had been a hesitation before South's pass over 4♥. I was asked to consider North's 4♠ bid in the light of this. My discussion/polling among my colleagues established that pass was a logical alternative to North's 4♠ bid and so I assigned a contract of 4♥ to West.

The hesitation suggests bidding rather than passing. Pass is a logical alternative, so a contract of 4♥ was assigned. It is noted that when North is on lead, which was the case here, he might not lead a spade at trick one or two and so EW might make 11 tricks. In contrast, had South been on lead a spade lead would have been automatic, leading routinely to 10 tricks.

Weighted ruling as shown.

Appeal lodged by NS.

**Appeal Committee:** Table result reinstated. The AC would all have bid 4♠ without the hesitation. The 6<sup>th</sup> spade is critical. North has only shown a strong 5/5 hand to date. The AC believes players of this standard would have bid 4♠.

**L&E Comment:** The committee disagreed with the AC decision. The TD had carried out a consultation and determined that several people not only felt that pass was a logical alternative, but that they would actually pass at the table. The committee felt that this should have been given more weight by the AC. The fact that all three members of the AC would have bid 4♠ is not sufficient to overturn the TD's ruling.

### 12.067 Seniors Congress

<p>♠ 52 ♥ Q986 ♦ 108742 ♣ J3</p> <p>♠ AKQJ93                ♠ 1064 ♥ 7                        ♥ A10 ♦ K5                      ♦ QJ963 ♣ 10642                ♣ A85</p> <p>♠ 87 ♥ KJ5432 ♦ A ♣ KQ97</p>	<p>Board 10 : Dealer East : All vulnerable</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>West</b></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>North</b></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>East</b></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>South</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1♦</td> <td>1♥</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2♠(1)</td> <td>3♥</td> <td>3♠</td> <td>4♥</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4♠</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1) 2♠ is non-forcing and shows an intermediate hand with 6 or 7 card suit. E did not alert as she didn't think it was alertable.</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Table result: 4♠✓ = -620</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>TD ruling: weighted score 60% of 2♠ + 2, 40% of 4♠✓</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>AC decision: uphold the TDs decision.</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>			1♦	1♥	2♠(1)	3♥	3♠	4♥	4♠	All Pass					1) 2♠ is non-forcing and shows an intermediate hand with 6 or 7 card suit. E did not alert as she didn't think it was alertable.				Table result: 4♠✓ = -620				TD ruling: weighted score 60% of 2♠ + 2, 40% of 4♠✓				AC decision: uphold the TDs decision.	
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																														
		1♦	1♥																														
2♠(1)	3♥	3♠	4♥																														
4♠	All Pass																																
		1) 2♠ is non-forcing and shows an intermediate hand with 6 or 7 card suit. E did not alert as she didn't think it was alertable.																															
		Table result: 4♠✓ = -620																															
		TD ruling: weighted score 60% of 2♠ + 2, 40% of 4♠✓																															
		AC decision: uphold the TDs decision.																															

The TD was first called after play had been completed.

**TD:** North said that if 2♠ had been alerted he would not have bid 3♥ and he did not think EW would now necessarily reach 4♠. I asked East why she had not alerted and her reply was that she did not think jump overcalls were alertable. She said she would still bid 3♠ even if N had passed.

The TD decided on a weighted score. 2♠ is alertable because it is non-forcing. In that case it is very likely that North will pass. Following this, East would not necessarily be raising spades all the time. Weighted score awarded as shown.

**AC decision:** We agree with the TD. We think East would not always bid 3♠ if North passed.

**L&E comment:** Both the TD and the AC have missed the point here. Why would North pass if he is told 2♠ was non-forcing? It looks to us that it would be the other way round. We suspect what North was actually claiming was that he would pass if he knew the opposition were having a misunderstanding and he is not entitled to know that. The TD and AC have awarded 100% of North passing with the correct explanation, and that cannot be right. There has been a tendency towards this i.e. not giving any weighting to the table action in misinformation cases. We think some TDs (and AC members) get confused with when Reveley rulings arise, but those **only** relate to unauthorised information cases.

### 12.068 Premier League

<p>♠ AJ82 ♥ K106 ♦ J1043 ♣ 93</p> <p>♠ Q65      ♠ K1073 ♥ Q9        ♥ AJ87 ♦ AQ62     ♦ 5 ♣ Q654     ♣ AJ87</p> <p>♠ 94 ♥ 5432 ♦ K987 ♣ K102</p>	<p>Board 20 : Dealer West : All vulnerable (screens in use)</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>West</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>North</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>East</i></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><i>South</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1♦</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>1♥</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1NT(1)</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>2♦(2)</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2NT</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>pass/3NT</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>1) Weak NT 2) Game forcing relay/enquiry</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>	1♦	Pass	1♥	Pass	1NT(1)	Pass	2♦(2)	Pass	2NT	Pass	pass/3NT	
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>														
1♦	Pass	1♥	Pass														
1NT(1)	Pass	2♦(2)	Pass														
2NT	Pass	pass/3NT															

The TD was first called when East changed his pass to 3NT.

**TD:** When the tray passed through the screen North passed and East passed quite quickly. He then replaced pass with 3NT. I was called by East whom I took away from the table. He explained that 2♦ was game forcing and that he had intended to bid 3NT but somehow had put the pass card on the tray.

I did not allow East's change under Law 25A – the auction was completed with South's final pass. Result was 2NT + 2.

The TD does not believe that it is clear that 'pass' was unintended as Law 25A requires, although he was content that the other conditions are met.

**East's comment:** I did not intend to pass 2NT. A common reason for people passing by accident is that they think partner has bid 3NT, but that was not the case here as 3NT is not a possible response in our system. I realised immediately and wanted to change it. I don't see how the TD can claim that pass was intended when I have stated repeatedly it was not.

**Referee's decision:** TDs ruling upheld. After taking advice on the laws from the Chief TD about the interpretation of 'intentional' and 'inadvertent' bids I judge that East had intended to pick up and place the pass card possibly in a moment of distraction. Even if he then immediately realises that

this is not what he intended to bid, this does not come within the accepted range of unintentional actions and for this reason I judge the TDs ruling be upheld. Deposit returned.

**L&E comment:** We think that the referee should have given greater consideration to the forfeiture of the deposit.

### 12.070 Premier League

<p>♠ AKJ1063 ♥ AJ9 ♦ 10 ♣ K92</p> <p>♠ 875                      ♠ Q94 ♥ K7632                  ♥ 4 ♦ 862                        ♦ KJ75 ♣ Q7                         ♣ AJ1086</p> <p>♠ 2 ♥ Q1085 ♦ AQ943 ♣ 543</p>	<p>Board 20 : Dealer West : All vulnerable (screens in use)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>West</b></th> <th><b>North</b></th> <th><b>East</b></th> <th><b>South</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>1♠</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>1NT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>2♥(1)</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>2♠</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>3♥(2)</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>4♦</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>4♠</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>1) Transfer to spades 2) Described by S to W as shortage. System notes do not support this and N thought it showed a fragment.</p> <p>Table result: 4♠+1 = +450 TDs ruling: 4♠ - 1 = -50 Referees decision: TD ruling upheld.</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>	Pass	1♠	Pass	1NT	Pass	2♥(1)	Pass	2♠	Pass	3♥(2)	Pass	4♦	Pass	4♠	All Pass	
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																		
Pass	1♠	Pass	1NT																		
Pass	2♥(1)	Pass	2♠																		
Pass	3♥(2)	Pass	4♦																		
Pass	4♠	All Pass																			

**TD:** West had been told by South that North's 3♥ showed a shortage and when declarer played ♥Q from dummy at trick one, he covered it with the king. Although NS system notes do not cover this auction exactly, they do cover 1♠-1NT-2♥-2NT-3♥, where 3♥ is defined as a fragment and so I ruled that South's description of 3♥ as showing shortage was misinformation. West says he would not have covered the ♥Q had he not believed declarer to have a singleton.

If West does not cover at trick one declarer is in dummy and the normal play would be to finesse the spade next. To eschew the finesse could, on other layouts, lead to the contract going off when it was cold. When in with ♠Q East would be expected to lead a diamond, which declarer would successfully finesse, but then he has to decide to either discard a heart on the ♦A or play for the ♣A to be onside, or discard a club and take the heart finesse. With the cards as they lay either line will fail.

South's misinformation to West caused him to mis-defend. Had he not covered the heart at trick one, the contract would have failed by one trick whenever South finessed in trumps next, which would be the normal play. Law 40B

**Both sides:** made verbal statements to each other

**Referees decision:** TDs ruling upheld.

**L&E comments:** We agree with the TD and Referee's rulings. The important thing to note here is that the comments made by the players at the table were made verbally. Players are reminded that the conditions of contest for events played with screens require that questions and answers should be made in writing and not verbally. This is to avoid unauthorised information being transmitted to a) other tables and b) the other side of the screen. The committee invites the Selection Committee to consider to what extent they expect TDs to enforce this regulation. It was noted that at European and World level the 'in writing' regulation was often flouted.

**Action:** JD to inform Heather Dhondy

### 12.072 Tollemache Qualifier

<p>♠ Q7 ♥ AJ2 ♦ AKQJ8 ♣ QJ2</p> <p>♠ 10862      ♠ K4 ♥ K109      ♥ 7653 ♦ 10965      ♦ 743 ♣ 64      ♣ 10985</p> <p>♠ AJ953 ♥ Q84 ♦ 2 ♣ AK73</p>	<p><b>Board 6 : Dealer East : EW vulnerable</b></p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>West</b></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>North</b></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>East</b></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><b>South</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Pass</td> <td>1♠</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>2♦(H)</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>3♣</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>3♥(A)</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>3NT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>4♣</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>4♠</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>4NT</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>5♦(1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>5♥</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>5♠(2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pass</td> <td>7NT</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(1) 0 or 3 (2) Intended as nothing more to show, taken as ♠K</p> <p>Table result: 7NT✓ = 1520 TD ruling: result stands AC decision: TD ruling upheld. Deposit returned.</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>			Pass	1♠	Pass	2♦(H)	Pass	3♣	Pass	3♥(A)	Pass	3NT	Pass	4♣	Pass	4♠	Pass	4NT	Pass	5♦(1)	Pass	5♥	Pass	5♠(2)	Pass	7NT	All Pass	
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																														
		Pass	1♠																														
Pass	2♦(H)	Pass	3♣																														
Pass	3♥(A)	Pass	3NT																														
Pass	4♣	Pass	4♠																														
Pass	4NT	Pass	5♦(1)																														
Pass	5♥	Pass	5♠(2)																														
Pass	7NT	All Pass																															

The TD was first called at the end of the hand by EW.

**TD:** I was asked whether 3♣ was a permitted action after a slow 2♦ - they thought 3♣ an unusual bid. Afterwards I asked South about 3♣ and he said he thought he was borderline between 2♠ and 3♣. I ruled result to stand.

A slow 2♦ could be a hand not quite good enough for 2♦ or a strong hand that does not know how to develop the hand, the former is more likely. As such, a slow 2♦ does not suggest overbidding.

**AC decision:** Uphold the TDs view. Totally unanimous. Not really affected by the slow 2♦, could be weak or strong. Key to reaching 7NT was later misunderstanding i.e. 5♠ bid, not South 3♣ bid. The deposit was returned after some consideration, due to North bidding 2♦ very slowly.

**L&E Comment:** In spite of there being a comment about the reason for returning the deposit, the committee was surprised the deposit was returned.

## 7.2 Disciplinary forms

The secretary was asked to write pointing out to a member that three disciplinary penalties had been issued during the last year and inviting comments.

### 8 Date of next meeting

Wednesday March 27<sup>th</sup> 2013 at 12.30pm. (note earlier time)

The agenda will be primarily concerned with the rewrite of the Orange and White Books.

Venue is Baker Tilly offices, 2 Bloomsbury Street (near to Tottenham Court Road tube station).

The meeting closed at 5.05pm.