

Notes on Jan Peach's Presentation QBA Director Training Day 2025

Law 26B and Denomination(s) Specified

When an offending player's call is withdrawn and it is not replaced by a comparable call,
nor replaced as 27B1(a) allows,

then, declarer may, at the offender's partner's first turn to lead, prohibit offender's partner from leading any (one) suit which has not been specified in the legal auction by the offender.

This includes suits completely unrelated to the withdrawn call.

Such prohibition continues for as long as the offender's partner retains the lead.

For a suit to be exempt from a lead restriction, *the legal auction must have imparted suit-specific information (i.e., information about the actual holding) in that particular suit.*

N	E	S	W
1S	..	4D	

4D not accepted, so withdrawn.

N	E	S	W
1S	4D		

Now is a good time to take South from the table to find out what meaning is attributed to 4D. Directors also need to know the system so they can make the correct ruling when an offender make his replacement call.

The meaning attributed to South's withdrawn 4D: Splinter, showing 4+ spades, a singleton or void in diamonds and mild slam interest. Usually, offenders are happy to consider only their intended meaning, though not what the law actually says.

N	E	S	W
1S	4D	4S	5D

All Passs

4S specifies something about the spade suit only.
The diamond specific information is missing. 4S is not comparable.
North must pass at his next turn.
Should/when North wins a trick and must lead, Declarer may forbid the lead of one suit, H, D or C, for as long as North retains the lead.

N	E	S	W
1S	2D	4D	5D

All Pass

This time East bids a much kinder 2D. The jump cue bid shows a singleton or void in diamonds, 4+ spades and serious slam interest. The same suit specific information attributed to South's withdrawn is repeated. Systemically the hand shows a stronger hand.
4D is comparable so no lead restrictions. 5D shows a subset of the hands that 4D showed i.e. 5D is more precise than 4D.

N	E	S	W
1NT	3S ^A	4S	P
P	4G P		

3S shows an opening hand with a singleton or void in spades and at least 4 cards in the other suits.
4C is "Pass or correct to longer suit", not accepted and replaced with a non-comparable Pass. West is to lead. There are no lead restrictions.
3S was in the legal auction and specified something about all 4 suits.

Adjusted Scores are Distinct from Penalties.

Law 12 sets out our discretionary powers to adjust scores.

Law 90 gives examples of actions that may warrant a procedural penalty.

Law 91 allows disciplinary penalties to maintain order and discipline.

Laws 90 and 91 are not combined with Law 12 to make a single adjustment.

- Rectification is applied to the board score.
- Penalties are deducted from the overall score for the naughty contestant.

Combining an *artificial* adjusted score with a procedural or disciplinary penalty is an easy trap to fall into.

Situation: During a club duplicate matchpoint pairs session, a board cannot be played because NS have conducted a post mortem after almost every board for the last 3 rounds. NS had been asked many times in this session and previous sessions to get boards played before indulging in post mortems. The Director decided a procedural penalty was warranted so awarded 60% to EW and 0% to NS on the board that could not be played.

An artificial adjusted score may only be average, average plus or average minus. 12C2(a). 50% 60% 40% unless 60% and 40% are adjusted upwards/downwards respectively to the session average of the pair.

To get the same loss of matchpoints, the rectification would be NS 40% EW 60% and a procedural penalty of 40% of a *Top off the NS session score*.

40% of a Top is an unusually hefty PP. While 10% is often quoted as a starting point, 10% may be no penalty at all so a larger amount may be reasonable, but perhaps not 40% for starters.

Law 15A3. Later play of the board from which incorrect hand was taken.

When a player holds a hand from the wrong board, he is most likely clutching his hand from the previous board. Law 15A1 and 15A2 are clear as to how this is remedied, depending on when the problem is discovered.

It's a very small window of opportunity to get the board played. Once the offender's partner has made a call it's time for an adjusted score.

15A3 tells us what to do when the wrong hand was from a board to be played later.

If the offender subsequently **repeats his call** on the board from which he mistakenly drew his cards the Director may allow that board to be played normally, but the Director shall award an adjusted score when offender's call differs³ from his original cancelled call.

³ A substituted call differs if its meaning is much different or if it is psychic

I noticed this clarification in the WBF Commentary on the Laws.

"If the board from which the wrong cards were taken is scheduled to also be played, the TD allows it without further rectification if the offender makes a comparable call (see new Law 23)."

I don't agree that making a comparable will always meet the requirement of the law to **repeat** his call subject to the footnote. Comparable calls may be psychic at some risk. At this time, I suggest ruling according to the law as written. A Director who chooses to apply "comparable call" instead of "repeated call" could probably point to the commentary as justification.

It's an uncommon situation, to play the board later, and a difficult one to get the board played either way.

The commentary continues, and this is also interesting:

"The assumption in Law 15A3 is that this board is played against the same opponents. If the board can only be played against different opponents (possibly at a later juncture in the movement) then the TD may either allow the later play or alternately award an adjusted score."

For round 2 of a 10T Share and Relay Mitchell, South at Table 5 took 19-21 from the relay table, and placed Board 19 on the table. West withdrew his hand. South realised his error and quickly whisked 19 away and put 16 in its place.

West counted his cards, noted he was dealer (Board 16) and opened 1S. His correct cards are now noticed sitting in Board 16 and it's a simple application of Law 15A2(b).

The more challenging problem is when EW meets Board 19 for real later in the movement. South opens 1H and now West has a problem. A 1S overcall is much different from, as well as not comparable to, a 1S opening. It's adjusted score time. Perhaps 60% NS 50% EW. EW were not solely responsible and NS5 escaped unscathed.

There's also a problem when Table 5 plays Board 19 against new opponents. NS5 have extraneous information that could affect the result. Law 16D.

Increasing Naughtiness

Curing these ills is more about education in club newsletters and classes than hoping to chide enough people to create change.

(1) Declaring sides giving explanations of their auction when not asked to do so.

Perhaps they are trying to be helpful but, Clause 7.6 of the ABF Alerting Regulations is clear. Explanations of alerted calls or delayed alerted calls are given only after a request has been made.

While required to draw attention to unusual features of their auction, possibly unusual self-alerting calls, the declaring side should wait to be asked for an explanation.

Please see Clauses 3.4.1, 3.4.2 and 7.5 for more detail.

(2) Players taking it upon themselves to send a player from the table so that partner may explain his own call or, perhaps even worse, so partner may confirm or otherwise the explanation given.

Only the Director may do this and only when the player asked to give an explanation knows there is an agreement, but he has forgotten it.

From minutes WBF Laws Committee meeting held on 1 September 1998 Lille:

8. If a player knows that his partner's call is conventional but says he cannot recall what was actually agreed [the Director may in his discretion](#) send the player away from the table and allow the partner to tell opponents in his absence what the agreement is. [The Director must be called](#) and no action may be taken before he arrives.

The partner continues in the action on the basis that the player has understood his call, and does not use the unauthorized information that his partner is uncertain of the meaning.

The Director is strongly urged to remain at the table whilst the hand is completed.

[This procedure is only for the exact circumstances described](#); it does not apply when the player says that the position is undiscussed or there is no agreement.

(3) Announcing bids that do not require announcing.

A 1C opening bid and a natural 1NT opening bid are the only calls that require an announcement.

An increasing number of players are announcing 1D openings, balanced 2NT openings and 1NT overcalls.

Failing to announce does not have the same repercussions as failing to alert. Opponents retain their absolute right to ask questions at their turn to call or play. Hopefully this basic information will also have been exchanged before the start of play.

We announce to avoid LHO asking "How many clubs" or "Is that really clubs?" when the opening bid is 1C and asking "How many points is your 1NT?" when holding a 15-17 balanced hand.

Two cards dropped/played, 1 card dropped & 1 played.

I recently had an email from a Director who was mixing up two laws. Law 58B Simultaneous Leads or Plays from One Hand and Law 51A Offender to Play having Two or More Penalty Cards.

If it isn't clear how the two cards became faced on the table, it's best not to guess. Take the player away from table and find out. As always, the Director avoids creating UI and Extraneous Information, essentially not providing information that the table is not entitled to hear.

Suppose a defender who has won a trick is to lead to the next trick.

(a) While trying to pull out a card to lead (and not getting that card into such a position that partner could see its face), two other cards drop face up on the table.

Because there are two, they both become Major Penalty Cards, regardless of their size.

Declarer designates the card to be played and the other remains a Major Penalty card.

(b) Leads one card but drops another in the process.

The led card stays played. The dropped card is either a Minor or Major Penalty card depending on its size.

(c) Leads two cards face up at the same time and both are visible.

The defender designates the card he proposes to play and the other card becomes a penalty card.

On the assumption that this has happened accidentally, a non-honour card would be a minor penalty card.

Suppose the defender's simultaneously led cards are the S3 and the SQ and, the player carelessly announces that he was intending to lead the S3. The law still requires him to propose the card to be played *now*. Should he decide to now lead the SQ, the S2 remains as a major penalty card, because the defender has attached meaning to the card.

Defender to play to someone else's lead.

A little more care is needed when our defender is playing to someone else's lead. When neither visible card is of the suit led, it is just possible that the defender was trying to play a third card, one that wouldn't constitute a revoke.

Artificially Intelligence is best not treated as Gospel when it comes to interpreting the Laws of Bridge.

I was recently asked whether an interpretation of the Law was correct. It was somewhat bizarre and it transpired that AI had been consulted.

Out of curiosity I googled "Law 27B1(a) Laws of Duplicate Bridge".

Just so many errors. I had intended to quote what I found but have decided against it.