Newsletter

Hong Kong Contract Bridge Association Ltd.

Web Site: http://www.hkcba.org

April 2003

CONTENTS

Minutes of 4th Council Meeting, 2002/3

Date & Time	:	December 16, 2002 (Monday) at 6:53 pm				
Venue	:	Room 2105, West Tower, Shun Tak Centre, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong				
Present	:	Anthony Ching – President		AC		
		Steve Wong – Treasurer		SW		
		Council Members				
		Bell Tam	BT	Billy Szeto	BS	
		Flora Wong	FW	Chan Yiu	CY	
		Laurance Lo	LLO	Shirley Chang	SC	
In attendance:		David C.C. Ng		DN		
Apologies:		Nancy Neumann – Vice President	NN			
		Benjamin Kwok – Secretary	BK			
		Lawrence Lau		LL		
		Ringo Lee		RL		

Item		Content	When	By
1.		The minutes of the 3rd meeting 2002/3 was adopted.		
2.		MATTERS ARISING:-		
	(a)	New Handbook – After final revision by FW, LLo will post it on web. If no further comment is received within 1 month, the new handbook will be adopted.	Next Meeting	FW/LLO
	(b)	Bridgzette – 297 questionnaires were sent to our members. Out of 129 questionnaires returned, 99 preferred reading bridgzette on web, 20 preferred hard copy only while 10 others wanted it both ways. It was resolved that from the first issue of 2003 onwards, bridgzette will be posted on web on a quarterly basis, with hard copy being sent to those who specifically requested it. Minutes will not be posted on web for privacy sake. Typing may be handled by others at nominal cost in future but FW and CY will be responsible for the first issue to see whether there is any other unforeseen difficulty.		FW/CY
	(c)	RL will submit the report of PABF Ladies Team in next meeting	Next Meeting	RL
	(d)	Booking of National Squad Training Centre – RL will formally apply for a venue, preferrably in Wanchai.		RL
	(e)	Wearing the SFOC Hong Kong team uniform in international events – in progress and will report in next meeting.	Next Meeting	SW
	(f)	Subvention budget from LCSD – in progress and will submit in next meeting.	Next Meeting	AC/SW/LL
	(g)	Web-Site – LLo will follow up.		LLO
	(h)	Potential Venues :-	Next Meeting	
		B.P. International House – DN will further negotiate rate.		DN
		Macau Jockey Club – LL will follow up.		LL
		Y.M.C.A. – LL will make the contact.		LL

3. IN PROGRESS:-

(a) Financial situation, membership and tournament attendance – SW reported as follows: -

	October 02	**November 02**
Financial situation	Surplus HK$4,756	Surplus HK$13,031
Tournament attendance	9.56 tables	10.04 tables
Membership	291	297

(b) Intercity – It was resolved that Intercity 2003 will be held at Regal Kowloon Hotel.

(c) Bid for Bermuda Bowl 2005 – As there is no feedback from WBF, it was resolved that HKCBAL withdraws her bid to host the event. AC will advise WBF accordingly. AC

(d) Venues :- AC/DN

AC and RL met with LCSD staff. AC and DN will submit the minimum size, tournament frequency, site requirements and size of storeroom required for potential venues before they can investigate whether they may be of further assistance.

The Chinese Club is not available on weekends and rate for Mariners' Club may change if we cut their booking. It was resolved that HKCBAL will continue to host tournaments at Mariners' Club.

4. Youth & Ladies Trial AC/DN

13 pairs of youth and 4 pairs of ladies had registered for a 5 to 6 day trial to be held on weekends.

5. Library Card & Membership Card : - Next Meeting LL

It was resolved that HKD1,500 is allocated to Robert Zajac, the librarian of the Association, for purchase of book shelf and necessary stationery.

LL will look for other cheaper sources of smart card.

6. A.O.B.:-

(a) All Council members are reminded to attend the Spring Dinner of SFOC to be held on March 10.

(b) To enhance SFOC's understanding of the Association, AC will send our Annual Report to SFOC for circulation before her next meeting on February 25, 2003. AC

(c) BS will co-ordinate with Sabrine Auken for activities related to the "Bridge at School" programme advocated by WBF. BS

(d) It was resolved to adopt the revised Knock-out Team format.

(e) LLO will circulate his report on the LCSD programme. In future, LCSD may directly deals with our Official Instructors whose list will be updated by the Association from time to time. LLO

(f) It was resolved that BS will replace NN as the Chairman of the Tournament Operations Subcommittee.

7. Dates of next meetings – January 20, February 17, March 17.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Prepared by SW

Minutes of 5th Council Meeting, 2002/3

Date & Time : January 22, 2002 (Wednesday) at 7:00 pm

Venue : Room 2105, West Tower, Shun Tak Centre, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong

Present :

Anthony Ching – President		AC	
Nancy Neumann – Vice President		NN	
Steve Wong – Treasurer		SW	
<u>Council Members</u>			
Bell Tam	BT	Billy Szeto	BS
Flora Wong	FW	Chan Yiu	CY
Laurance Lo	LLO	Lawrence Lau	LL
Ringo Lee	RL		

In attendance: David C.C. Ng DN

Apologies: Benjamin Kwok – Secretary BK
Shirley Chang SC

Item	Content	When	By
1.	The minutes of the 4th meeting 2002/3 was adopted as amended.		
2.	MATTERS ARISING:-		
(a)	The Captain's Report on PABF Ladies Team was adopted as amended.		
(b)	Booking of National Squad Training Centre – RL will formally apply for a venue, preferrably in Wanchai.	Next Meeting	RL
(c)	Wearing the SFOC Hong Kong team uniform in international events – in progress and will report in next meeting.	Next Meeting	SW
(d)	Subvention budget from LCSD – in progress and will submit in next meeting.	Next Meeting	AC/SW/LL
(e)	Web-Site – LLO will follow up.		LLO
(f)	Potential Venues :-	Next Meeting	
	B.P. International House – DN will further negotiate rate.		DN
	Macau Jockey Club – LL will follow up.		LL
	Y.M.C.A. – LL will make the contact.		LL
(g)	Venue - AC and DN will submit the minimum size, tournament frequency, site requirements and size of storeroom required for potential venues before LCSD can investigate whether they may be of further assistance.		AC/DN
(h)	Membership Card - LL will look for other cheaper sources of smart card.		LL
(i)	To enhance SFOC's understanding of the Association, SW will send our Annual Report to SFOC for circulation before her next meeting on February 25, 2003.		SW
(j)	Sabine Auken has not replied to BS for activities related to the "Bridge at School" programme advocated by WBF.		
(k)	LLO will circulate his report on the LCSD programme.	Next Meeting	LLO
3.	IN PROGRESS:-		

(a) Financial situation, membership and tournament attendance – SW reported as follows: -

	November 02	**December 02**
Financial situation	Surplus HK$13,031	Surplus HK$7,621
Tournament attendance	10.04 tables	10.56 tables
Membership	297	301

(b) Intercity – Sponsorship has not yet been confirmed. The first invitation letters will be sent after Chinese New Year.

(c) Withdrawal from Bid for Bermuda Bowl 2005 – The letter drafted by AC was adopted and will be sent to WBF. AC

(d) Venue – Mariners' Club may be demolished by August 2003. However, this could not be confirmed until their staffs receive formal 6-month termination notice after the Chinese New Year.

4. Youth Development Fund Raising : -

Tournament fee for the Youth Development Fund Raising Pairs on February 22 is HKD250 per person. Venue is free but buffet dinner costs HKD126 per person. As far as sponsorship is concerned, Allen Zemann, Linda Tao and Koon Cheng have agreed to donate HKD10,000, HKD2,500 and HKD2,000 respectively while David Tang has agreed to donate HKD2,200 worth of Shanghai Tang coupon. SC will also donate HKD2,500 worth of prizes and is looking for more gifts as raffle prizes. SC aims at raising HKD50,000 from this event.

5. Inter Post-secondary Subsidy – Further details have to be provided by Eric Tang before Council may consider whether subsidy can be granted. Next Meeting LLO

6. A.O.B.:-

(a) It was resolved that New Year IMP Pairs on February 4 will be cancelled due to venue problem. It was also resolved that to avoid clash with Youth Development Fund Raising Pairs, Open League 9 will be re-scheduled from February 22 to March 8 while Open League Semi-final will be delayed to March 9. The first 16 boards of Open League Play-off will be played in the evening of March 9 and the remaining 48 boards will be played in 3 sessions on March 16. LLo will update the schedule on web and send revised schedule to those members not preferring e-mail contact. LLO

(b) If there are more than 4 persons in the team, free game bonus will be awarded to the 4 persons nominated by the team captain provided that the bonus value does not exceed tournament fee collected from that team.

(c) There are only 11 pairs left for the Youth Trial that would be played on January 25 & 26, February 16 & 23 and March 2. As 1 of the 4 pairs of ladies are not available on January 25. It was resolved that there will be a separate trial for Ladies which will be scheduled on February 16 & 23 and March 2, alongside with Youth Trial. It was also resolved that tournament fee for these trials are HKD60 per day per person. RL

7. Dates of next meetings – February 17, March 17.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Prepared by SW

Minutes of 6th Council Meeting, 2002/3

Date & Time : February 17, 2003 (Monday) at 6:45 p.m.

Venue : Room 2105, West Tower, Shun Tak Centre, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong

Present :

Anthony Ching – President	AC		
Benjamin Kwok - Secretary	BK		
Council Members			
Bell Tam	BT	Billy Szeto	BS
Flora Wong	FW	Chan Yiu	CY
Laurance Lo	LLO	Lawrence Lau	LL
Ringo Lee	RL		

Apologies:

Nancy Neumann – Vice President	NN		
Steve Wong – Treasurer	SW		
Shirley Chang	SC		

Item	Content	When	By
1.	The minutes of the 5th meeting 2002/3 was adopted and amended.		
2.	MATTERS ARISING:-		
(a)	Booking of National Squad Training Centre – AC will submit letter.	Next Meeting	AC
(b)	Wearing the SFOC Hong Kong team uniform in international events – Letter sent and await for reply.	Next Meeting	SW
(c)	Subvention budget from LCSD – No update progress.	Next Meeting	AC/SW/LL
(d)	Web-Site – LLo will report on next meeting.	Next Meeting	LLO
(e)	Potential Venues :- B.P. International House – rate too expensive and will not consider. Macau Jockey Club & Y.M.C.A.– still in process and will report in next meeting.	Next Meeting	LL
(f)	Venue - AC will reply and follow up with LCSD.		AC
(g)	Membership Card – LL received quotation of HK$16K to HK$18K for 300 cards including SKD/programming/1 set terminal. LL will also provide specs to BT to get new quotations.	Next Meeting	BT/LL
(h)	LCSD program – LLO will report in next meeting	Next Meeting	LLO
3.	In Progress:-		
(a)	Financial situation, membership and tournament attendance – SW reported as follows: - **Jan 2003** Financial situation - Surplus HK$6,321- Tournament attendance – 8.42 tables Membership - 304		
(b)	Intercity – reported all invitation letters sent out already.		
4.	Inter Post-secondary Subsidy – Further details by Eric Tang received and all agreed the total subsidy would be HK$7,000-. Also agreed the budget for 2003 should be received by April for our approval. BK will draft the replied letter.	Next Meeting	BK

5. A.O.B.

(a) All agreed to cancel the Promotional Pairs in April and May and move Paul Jones Pairs to supersede the May's schedule.

(b) Adopted the total expenses for AIA Swiss Team under the AIA Funding which was held on December 21, 2002 at Tak Sun Secondary School was HK$12,064-

6. Dates of next meetings – March 17, March 17.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Prepared by BK

♥ Acknowledgement with Thanks ♥

The Youth Development Fund Raising Committee of The Hong Kong Contract Bridge Association Limited wishes to acknowledge our heart-felt thanks to the following sponsors and donors for cash and prizes on the occasion of the YOUTH DEVLOPMENT FUND RAISING BRIDGE TOURNAMENT held on February 22, 2003 at The Ladies' Recreation Club, 10 Old Peak Road, Hong Kong. (***Names are in alphabetical order)***

Mimi Ashworth (Ms.)
Sunil Bahirwani (Mr.)
Tad Beczak (Mrs)
Gilbert Chan (Mr.)
Shirley Chang (Ms.)
Doreen Pao Cheng (Ms.)
Koon Cheng (Mr.)
Vivien Chou (Ms.)
Patrick Choy (Mr.)
Nagy. A. El-Azar (Mr.)
Timothy Fok Tsun Ting (Mr.)
Judy Freshwater (Mrs.)
Fu Kwan (Mr.)
Irene Ho (Ms.)
Nelson Hsu (Mr.)
I. L. Ieong (Mr.)
Wendy Kwok (Mrs.)
Shirley Leong (Ms.)
Vincent Li (Mr.)
York Liao (Mr.)
Lola Linker (Ms.)
Ashley Lung (Mr.)
A. M. Mansfield (Mr.)
Baghwanti Mohan (Mrs.)
Carol Murray (Mrs.)
Nancy Neumann (Mrs.)
Raju Ramchandani (Mr.)
J. M. Shen (Mr.)
Shi Jia Xiang (Mr.)
Linda Tao (Ms.)
Kelly Tsang (Mr.)
Edmond Tse (Mr.)
Terence Tung (Mr.)
Samuel Wan (Mr.)
C. C. Wong (Mr.)
Lise Wong (Ms.)
Allan Zeman (Mr.)
Derek Zen (Mr.)

CORPORATIONS

Excalibur Electronics	By Mr. Richard Law
Cybertronics	By Mr. Daniel Lee
Godiva	By Ms. Helen Ng
King Kow	By Ms. Sabrina Chu
Ladis Recreation Club	
LeaderGene	By Dr. K. T. Tam & Ms Karina Chau
Northeast Wines & Spirits Ltd.	By Ms Angel Cheng
Shanghai Tang	By Mr. David Tang
Viceroy Restaurant	By Mr. Rajeev Bhasin

歐洲冠軍盃橋牌錦標賽
European Champions Cup

二零零二年十月二十五日到二十七日在波蘭首都華沙舉行歐洲冠軍盃橋牌錦標賽。比賽辦法是仿照歐洲足球聯賽，先分四組大循環，各組首二名出線，再舉行淘汰賽。結果，意大利 LAVAZZA TORINO 隊贏得冠軍，獲獎金七仟美元，而亞軍為以色列的 BRIDGE TEL-AVIV 隊，挪威、保加利亞、荷蘭分別獲三、四、五名。

European Champions Cup was held in Warsaw, Poland during October 25-27, 2002. The tournament format follows the model of European Football League. It's divided by 4 sections and followed by a knockout between the 2 winning teams in each section. The result, LAVAZZA TORINA, Italy won and awarded a cash prize of USD7,000. The 1st runner-up is BRIDGE TEL-AVIV, Israel, 2nd, 3rd and 4th by Norway, Bulgaria and Netherlands.

冠、亞軍決賽中，以色列隊在處理牌的能力方面，明顯不如意大利隊，最後以 34：83 （IMP） 敗北。請看下面二例：

Israel performed badly in the final match by losing 34：83 IMP to Italian. Two hands in example :-

(1)

	♠ AJ742 ♥ 63 ♦ 765 ♣ Q85	
♠ K986 ♥ 52 ♦ KQ942 ♣ K4	LOVE ALL DEALER W	♠ Q103 ♥ AKQ984 ♦ A ♣ AJ2
	♠ 5 ♥ J107 ♦ J1083 ♣ 109763	

以色列隊坐東西時 Israel in EW and bidding went:

West	East	
1♦	1♥	
1♠	2♣ !	**! (Gameforce)**
2♦	2♥	
2NT	6♥	

東最後選擇 6♥ ，並非最佳合約。因為西是開叫方，♠ 和 ♦ 至少有九張，♣ 有檔，應有 ♣K。如果 ♥ 可得六墩，6NT 必無問題。如 ♥ 不能拿六墩，還有 ♦ 和 ♠ 可以補救；結果外面 ♠ 5－1 分配，首攻是 ♠，一下。再看意大利隊叫牌：

Final choice of contract of 6♥ by East from which was not an optimum contract. As from the bidding by West showing at least 9 cards in both ♠ and ♦ with ♣ stopper, which should be ♣K. When you are able to obtain 6 tricks in ♥, 6NT contract wouldn't be a problem; otherwise there are still ♦ and ♠ available. The result, ♠ was 5－1 break by singleton ♠ led, 6♥ one down. Lets see the bidding by Italian:

West	East	
1♦	1♠ !	**! (♥ suit)**
2♦	3♣ !	**! (Gameforce)**
3NT	6NT	

東依賴大牌點叫到 6NT 完成合約毫無困難。
6NT bid by East making without any difficulty.

(2)

	♠ Q98754 ♥ A97 ♦ 1082 ♣ 10	
♠ 102 ♥ KQ106 ♦ AKQ4 ♣ AQ8	EW GAME DEALER S	♠ K6 ♥ J8532 ♦ 65 ♣ K942
	♠ AJ3 ♥ 4 ♦ J973 ♣ J7653	

以色列隊坐東西時叫牌過程 Israel EW, bidding went:

West	North	East	South	
			pass	
2NT	pass	3♦ !	pass	**! (Transfer)**
4♥	pass	pass	pass	

首攻 ♣10。計算贏墩有四墩 ♥、三墩 ♦ 和三墩 ♣，唯一要防止被將吃。西第一墩以 ♣K 贏得，即出 ♥，北進手出 ♠ 明手上 ♠K，南用 ♠A 得回 ♣ 將吃，北再用 ♠Q 得一墩一下。如果南家出 ♣J ，北再回小 ♠ 定約將二下。不知何以西不能先出三墩♦ 去一張 ♠，這樣將是平牌一付。

♣10 was led. The winning tricks were 4 in ♥, 3 in ♦ and 3 in ♣, only to prevent from a ruff by opponents. West won the 1st trick by ♣K and a ♥ played. North won and ♠ to dummy's ♠K, South took by ♠A and ♣ returned, ruff by North and took ♠Q for one down . If South played the ♣J for North would be happened 2nd ruff in ♠ for down 2. Having no idea why didn't West play 3-round of ♦ for a discard a ♠ to make a fair board.

(3) 挪威隊對荷蘭隊。Norway vs Netherlands.

	♠ 53 ♥ KJ98 ♦ AK964 ♣ 64	
♠ AQJ986 ♥ 65 ♦ 3 ♣ AKQ8	GAME ALL DEALER W	♠ K2 ♥ AQ1043 ♦ 1085 ♣ J72
	♠ 1074 ♥ 72 ♦ QJ72 ♣ 10953	

挪威 Helgemo 坐西家時叫牌 Helgemo from Norway in West, bidding went:

West	North	East	South
1♠	**X**	**XX**	pass
Pass	**2♦**	pass	pass
4♦	pass	4♥	pass
4♠	pass	5♦	pass
6♠	pass	pass	pass

5♦ 邀請滿貫，叫得非常好。因為北叫過牌後，東的 ♠K、♥AQ10 非常有價值了。如果我拿南家的牌，既然同伴叫了 2♦，我會叫 4♦，不知西還會叫到 6♠ 嗎？

An excellent bid of 5♦ which was inviting to slam. Since after North made actions, East judged that his cards placed, ♠K, ♥AQ10 valuable. If I were South, I would have bid 4♦. In such case, guess if West still could reach 6♠!

(4) 荷蘭隊對保加利亞隊 Netherlands vs Bulgaria.

	♠ Q9754 ♥ 86 ♦ J853 ♣ 53	
♠ K ♥ AKQJ1075 ♦ K ♣ A976	GAME NS DEALER E	♠ 1063 ♥ 9432 ♦ Q1074 ♣ 104
	♠ AJ82 ♥ -- ♦ A962 ♣ KQJ82	

保加利亞隊坐南北時叫牌 Bulgaria N-S, bidding went:

West	North	East	South
		pass	2♣
4♥	pass	pass	**X**
XX	4♠	4NT	pass
5♥	pass	pass	pass

首攻 ♣，莊家用 ♣A 拿，調二輪將牌，從明手出 ♦，南家 ♦A。最後下一。荷蘭隊坐南北時，南並未重開叫，讓西打 4♥。我不知道讀者拿南家的牌會重開叫嗎？這付牌重開叫的結果可以贏 10 IMPs。

♣ was led and won by ♣A and cashed 2-round of trump, played small ♦ from dummy and won by South ♦A, one off. Netherlands didn't re-open when they were at N-S. I wasn't sure whether you would take any auction after 4♥; as a result, you would win 10 IMPs if you did.

(5) 以色列隊對波蘭的華沙隊，華沙隊二邊搶打 When Israel vs Poland:

	♠ Q10632 ♥ J83 ♦ QJ2 ♣ Q6	
♠ A ♥ AKQ9652 ♦ K8 ♣ 742	GAME EW DEALER S	♠ K ♥ 104 ♦ 1097643 ♣ KJ83
	♠ J98754 ♥ 7 ♦ A5 ♣ A1095	

West	North	East	South
			2♠
4♥	4♠	5♥	**X**
pass	5♠	**X**	pass
pass	pass	pass	pass

波蘭的華沙隊坐南的加倍表示大牌在另二套上，北的 ♦ 和 ♣Q 是有防守價值的，不知何以還要叫 5♠。首攻 ♥K，再打 ♠A，然後 ♥A 送出，莊家打的很好最後還要輸一墩 ♣ 一下。

Poland in N-S, South's double was showing strength on the other 2-suit, while North had good defensive value in both ♦ and ♣Q and still bidding 5♠. ♥K was led, followed by ♠A, ♥A. The contract was down one as there was still a ♣ loser.

另一桌的叫牌為 The bidding at the other table went:

West	North	East	South
			pass
1♥	pass	1NT	2♠
4♥	4♠	pass	pass
5♥	pass	pass	**X**
pass	pass	pass	pass

從好的分配來看，無法不輸三墩牌，亦是一下。結果以色列隊二邊得分 +7 IMPs。

Although a good distribution, West still couldn't get ride of the 3 losers for down 1. Israel gained positive scores from both sides, +7 IMPs.

牌 桌 戒 律
Table Laws
(摘自 By Marty Bergen)

牌桌戒律，對專家來說，可以寫出幾拾條，這裡我摘錄幾條，供香港橋友參考：

To Bridge Experts, there could easily be tens of table laws or regulations, I have selected some of them from Bergen :-

(1) 絕不可教訓同伴，除非你亦想得到同樣的教訓。
Never give lesson to your partner; unless you are prepared to be lectured likewise.

(2) 當你們叫了一個注定要宕的定約，不要一味責怪同伴，研究他的牌情，要先檢討自己。
When a bad contract is reached, do not blame on partner immediately, gather evidence from his angle and check your own bids too, first.

(3) 如果你忘了以禮相待，小心會自取其辱。
If your manners somehow escape you, remember, when you have a finger pointing at others, you have 3 pointing at yourself.

(4) 把牌打完再與同伴討論，不要急著一吐為快，除非需要溝通，搞清楚二人之間的叫品，信號是不是有誤會的地方。
To discuss with partner when the hand is over, not in the middle of it, and to discuss the overall method, bidding, signals; not just that single hand.

(5) 任何錯誤都是共負其責的，如果他表現失常，對他再責備是徒勞無益，說到底，這只是一場牌戲。
All errors should be borne by both partners. If partner had a bad day, killing him or destroying him boosts no ego, it just happens, shrug it off.

“勇敢的” 專家叫牌
“Exotic” Experts Bidding

大多數專家的表演，都值得我們學習，但有些非常離譜的叫牌，遠背離教科書的教導，大概只有專家才能表演。下面試舉數例，不知讀者會和專家一樣勇敢嗎？

The majority of bridge experts bidding would appeal to us as inspirational, yet there are times when they are way off the classic methods. Probably they have their individual reason to make such calls, let’s see if you would make alike decision.

(1)

	♠ KQ103 ♥ K4 ♦ 8 ♣ K109642	
♠ AJ92 ♥ Q92 ♦ 1097543 ♣ --	GAME NS DEALER N	♠ 864 ♥ A87 ♦ K6 ♣ AQJ75
	♠ 75 ♥ J10653 ♦ AQJ2 ♣ 83	

West	North	East	South
	1♣	pass	1♥
2♦	pass	3NT	pass
4♦	Pass	5♦	**X**
pass	pass	pass	pass

坐西的是荷蘭女將 Berry Westra，雖然是無局方，拿著以 10 為首的六張小方塊，就超叫 2♦。套的質量，遠不符合教科書的教導，在同伴 3NT 之後，又不肯停叫，如果那時 pass，北未必會加倍，最後一錯再錯， 5♦ 四下，-800 分，輸 13 IMPs。

West was Berry Westra, veteran Dutch Lady star, her initial bid of 2♦ with such a miserable suit and overall hand quality, was perhaps in nobody’s book. Her 4♦ subsequently was not recommendable too, had she passed partner’s 3NT, opponents had no real reason to double, now that cost –800 and 13 IMPs.

(2)

	♠ -- ♥ A65 ♦ AKJ86 ♣ Q10962	
♠ K5 ♥ K ♦ 975432 ♣ AK54	GAME EW DEALER S	♠ Q10742 ♥ J1092 ♦ 10 ♣ 873
	♠ AJ9863 ♥ Q8743 ♦ Q ♣ J	

West	North	East	South	
			1♠	
2♦	**X**	pass	2♥	**X: Penalty**
Pass	4♥	pass	pass	
Pass				

這是 1961 年百慕達盃美國隊對法國隊的比賽。坐西的是大名鼎鼎的 Howard Schenken，超叫的套的質量太差，如果南肯放過加倍，南北方可得 800 分。不過據說 20 位專家中，只有兩位拿南家的牌肯放過加倍。此牌實戰中首攻 ♣K，再轉攻 ♦ 結果會二下。另一桌，法國隊（東西方未叫牌）亦叫到 4♥，平牌一付。

This hand was from 1961 Bermuda Bowl, USA vs France. West was the formidable Howard Schenken, overcalling with even a worse Diamond suit but a stronger hand overall, had South passed partner's double of 2♦, that would be another +800. However according to the then records, only 2 out of 20 bridge experts would pass with South's hand. Anyway, after ♣K and ♦ switch, it was 2 down. France played in the same contract with no opposition bidding, flat board.

(3) 前二副牌，超叫的套與同伴失配，故失敗居多，這副牌與同伴極配，但仍遭敗績。
The previous 2 hands, bids with no fit with partner and failed. This one hit partner perfectly yet lost still :-

	♠ 73 ♥ Q ♦ QJ1097 ♣ K10854	
♠ 62 ♥ 765432 ♦ A64 ♣ Q2	LOVE ALL DEALER E	♠ K10854 ♥ KJ1098 ♦ 3 ♣ 63
	♠ AQJ9 ♥ A ♦ K852 ♣ AJ97	

1985 年百慕達盃，巴西對美國隊，坐西是 Lew Stansby:
1985 Bermuda Bowl, Brazil vs USA, West was Lew Stansby, overcalling with the weakest:

West	North	East	South	
		pass	1♣!	**! (Strong)**
2♥	3♦	4♥	4NT	
pass	5♣	pass	6♦	
pass	pass	pass		

拿著最小的六張 ♥，一樣超叫 2♥，照牌的分配，東最佳是立刻叫 5♥，如果這樣，不知南北方仍能叫到 6♦，還是 7♦？東西方不能犧牲叫 6♥，最佳防守可以五下。此牌 6♦ 正好完成。另一桌 Hamman 和 Wolff 只停在 5♦，因猜錯 ♣Q，正好做成 5♦。

Another miserable suit with 6-carder in ♥. Seeing all hands, East best bid would possibly be 5♥ giving South a hard time for 6♦ or 7♦. Of course, EW might bid 6♥/7♥ after that, anyway the board was a loss as Hamman-Wolff stopped in 5♦, just making.

(4) 一個點的超叫 Overcalling at 2 level with 1 single point

2000 年波蘭對美國 Year 2000, Poland vs USA :-

	♠ K83 ♥ QJ ♦ AJ92 ♣ Q1052	
♠ Q9754 ♥ K42 ♦ 653 ♣ AK	GAME EW DEALER S	♠ AJ10 ♥ A3 ♦ KQ1087 ♣ 743
	♠ 62 ♥ 1098765 ♦ 4 ♣ J986	

West	North	East	South
			pass
1♠	pass	2♦	2♥
pass	pass	2♠	pass
2NT	pass	3NT	pass
pass	pass		

波蘭坐南選手一個點，超叫 2♥，如果對方超一做成 3NT。另一桌美國隊開叫 3♥，北加叫 4♥，加倍只下三，-500，還贏 4 IMPs。

The Polish South made that now familiar 2-level overcall with a single-pointer and lost when opponents made 3NT +1 as, in the other room, the USA South opened 3♥ with that single-pointer and was raised to 4, got a double and 3 off, -500 but gained 4 IMPs.

(5) 在 1981 百慕達盃賽中，美國對巴基斯坦的一副牌
Bermuda Bowl 1981, when USA vs Pakistan

	♠ 943 ♥ 6 ♦ QJ1097 ♣ AKJ10	
♠ K2 ♥ A2 ♦ K3 ♣ 9876532	GAME ALL DEALER N	♠ Q8765 ♥ KQ74 ♦ 842 ♣ Q
	♠ AJ10 ♥ J109853 ♦ A65 ♣ 4	

美國隊 Solodar 坐西時的叫牌 Solodar of USA was in West :-

West	North	East	South
	1♦	pass	1♥
3♣	X	pass	pass
pass	pass	pass	

拿著 ♣9 為首的七張牌, 可以叫 3♣, 結果二下, -500. 美國隊坐南北時 Jeff Mekstroth 和 Eric Rodwell 叫到 3♥，結果二下，輸 12 IMPs。綜觀南北牌，在正確防守下，沒有任何成局定約，西拿七張小 ♣ 叫 3♣ 值得嗎？

A 3 level bid with a 9 headed suit was 2 down, -500. Meanwhile, Jeff Mekstroth and Eric Rodwell in NS also bought the contract in 3♥, 2 off, -200 totalling 12 IMPs lost. Taking the 4 hands as a whole, game was unlikely reached by NS, so wasn't 3♣ with such a suit a bit premature!

(6) 在 1958 年百慕達盃賽中，美國隊 John Crawford 坐南對意大利藍隊：
In 1958 Bermuda Bowl, USA's John Crawford was South against the Italian Blue Team:

	♠ 9532 ♥ 7653 ♦ 5 ♣ Q952	
♠ AJ8 ♥ A108 ♦ AQ109 ♣ K106	GAME EW DEALER W	♠ Q1074 ♥ KJ9 ♦ J8 ♣ A843
	♠ K6 ♥ Q42 ♦ K76432 ♣ J7	

West	North	East	South	
1♣ !	pass	2♣!	3♦	1♣ : **Strong** 2♣ : **3 control**
X	pass	pass	pass	

結果南家只拿兩墩 ♦，七下。即使東西家有 6NT （何況很難打），都已輸了。另一桌只叫到 3NT +1 而已。

Result: John only took 2 trump tricks and 7 down. Even if EW could make 6NT (not so easy anyway), they would still lose a lot. In reality, the Italians bid 3NT +1 in the other room.

(7) 1989 年世界青年橋牌賽，澳洲隊對印尼隊：
1989 World Junior Teams, Australia vs Indonesia:

	♠ Q72 ♥ 7643 ♦ 8 ♣ 76432	
♠ A943 ♥ J2 ♦ 1074 ♣ AJ95	LOVE ALL DEALER E	♠ 5 ♥ A109 ♦ AKQ965 ♣ KQ8
	♠ KJ1086 ♥ KQ85 ♦ J32 ♣ 10	

印尼象坐南北時 Indonesian were NS :-

West	North	East	South	
		2♦	pass	2♦ : **G.F.**
3♦	5♣	**X**	pass	3♦ : **2 Aces**
pass	pass			

結果八下，-2000 分。拿著五張幾乎最小的 ♣，可以叫到 5♣，是不是亂來！即使對方有大滿貫，都要輸 10 IMPs 吧！！另一桌印尼隊坐東西時，居然叫到 7NT，共輸 19 IMPs。

That was 8 off, -2000. With next to the smallest 5 cards possible North could still bid 5♣ irresponsibly, even with a grand slam the opposing way, that would still cost 10 IMPs. Well, the teammates in the other room did bid to 7NT predictably, 19 IMPs in just one hand.

二 零 零 二 年 度 美 國 大 獎 盃
2002 ACBL Player of the Year Award

在每一個年度中，在所有國家級的隊式、對式比賽中獲得最多大師分的選手，即獲得 【P.O.Y.】大獎，二零零二年度前三名選手分別為：

Every year, the player amassing the most master points from teams or paris events at the national level, will be awarded “Player of The Year Award” 【P.O.Y.】in U.S.A. The best 3 in the 2002 are: (1) Larry Cohen 752 MP

(2) Jeff Meckstroth 718 MP

(3) Norberto Bocchi 705 MP

下面我們介紹 Larry Cohen 有運氣的幾副牌 Here are some “lucky” hands by Larry Cohen:

(1)

	♠ 92 ♥ AKJ10 ♦ K97 ♣ K852	
♠ Q873 ♥ 97 ♦ 1085 ♣ 10973	LOVE ALL DEALER S	♠ AK1054 ♥ 86542 ♦ 62 ♣ 4
	♠ J6 ♥ Q3 ♦ AQJ43 ♣ AQJ6	

這是論對比賽，Larry Cohen 坐南和新搭擋 Lisa 為伴：

In a Pair Event, Larry was in south and playing with a new partner, Lisa:

West	North	East	South	
			1♣	**1♣ : 16 +**
pass	2NT	pass	6NT	**2NT : 14-15 Bal.**
pass	pass	**X**	7♣	
pass	pass	**X**	pass	
pass	Pass			

6NT 是北做莊，東首攻，東有 ♠AK，隨你拿什麼牌，從東的角度來看，合約最少一下，實際是四下（可拿五墩 ♠）。也許是論對比賽吧，+200 已是很好的分數，但他還要更多分數，想得頂分的頂分（？）於是加倍，讓南改成 7♣ 後，東無奈只好再次加倍，即使西出對牌（由西首攻）也不過二下，多 100 分而已。實戰中，西首攻 ♥，你能責怪西嗎？結果南立刻席捲十三墩（+1630）絕對的頂分。坐東的是瑞典國家隊名將 Peter Fredin （二零零二年蒙特利爾世界大賽團體進入前四名的隊，僅次於意大利和印尼隊）。

6NT by North would begin with East leading, at least 1 down, 4 off as the cards lay. Peter Fredin, Swedish International was so contented that little. Did he think Larry would “correct” to 7♣ switching West to lead . . . . . an agonizing ♥ and –1630. I think the 4 players must have fallen from their chairs after the first Club was played and the hands tabled, laughing, I trust, such “luck” Larry deserved! To select Clubs was no major feat, East must have either major tops, ♦ might be just long enough to make useful discards! Likewise, West must have thought this Pair’s bidding was bad, but not as bad as AKQ off in a suit. Incidentally, Sweden came 3rd in 2002 Montreal Olympiad from about 100 teams.

(2)

	♠ J5 ♥ J1085 ♦ K10984 ♣ AJ	
♠ AKQ863 ♥ A7 ♦ AQ2 ♣ 103	GAME EW DEALER N	♠ 974 ♥ KQ42 ♦ 765 ♣ Q65
	♠ 102 ♥ 963 ♦ J3 ♣ K98742	

West	North	East	South
	1♦	pass	pass
X	pass	1♥	pass
2NT	pass	3NT	pass
pass	pass		

這副牌北家拿看帶三個 J 的 10 點就輕開叫，如果不開叫，東西方很可能的合約是 4♠，正常也只有十墩，現在打無將合約，首攻 ♦10，結果莊家連出六副 ♠ 剩餘六張牌將為：

North opened light with a 3Js 10-pointer, had he not opened, E-W would probably reached 4♠ and 10 tricks. As 3NT was now contracted, North led ♦10, 6 more ♠ ensued with this 6-card ending:-

	♠ -- ♥ J1085 ♦ K9 ♣ --	
♠ -- ♥ A7 ♦ A2 ♣ 103	GAME EW DEALER N	♠ -- ♥ KQ42 ♦ -- ♣ Q6
	♠ -- ♥ 96 ♦ J ♣ K98	

Larry Cohen 和他同伴 David 坐東西方，現在莊家只要送出一墩 ♣ 即獲十二墩，即使防守方首攻 ♣A 再攻 ♣J，明手只要不上 Q，最後通過擠牌也有十一墩。

Larry simply played a ♣ for his 12th trick and a top. The cards were so friendly that even a hypothetical lead of ♣A and continuation would yield 11 tricks so long as ♣Q was not played at any time.

(3)

	♠ AKQ65 ♥ -- ♦ KJ102 ♣ K1062	
♠ J ♥ 832 ♦ AQ76 ♣ 98754	LOVE ALL DEALER E	♠ 107432 ♥ A976 ♦ 93 ♣ AQ
	♠ 98 ♥ KQJ1054 ♦ 854 ♣ J3	

West	North	East	South
		pass	3♥
pass	pass	pass	

首攻 ♠J（Larry 坐西），表面上看，只輸 ♦A、♥A、兩墩 ♣，實戰中橋路不通，結果會下四，想不到吧！ Larry 又得一高分。且看莊家怎麼會打成下四：第一墩 ♠A 拿，第二墩出 ♠K，也許他希望西是從 ♠Jx 中攻出吧。Larry 將吃，出 ♣，東提走兩墩 ♣ 再出 ♠，莊家大將吃，出 ♥K，東用 ♥A 得，再出 ♠，南再用大將吃，調將，送出將牌，莊家希望西原有四張將牌，實際東有四張，一共出了四墩 ♠、兩墩 ♣、三墩將牌，各剩四張牌時為：

Larry, West, led ♠J, apparently there were 4 losers, 2 red Aces and 2 in ♣, but it was 4 down!! Declarer won ♠A and continued ♠K, Larry ruffed and played ♣ to East who cashed the 2nd round too before a 3rd round ♠ play. Declarer ruffed high and then ♥K taken by East's Ace for a 4th ♠, declarer ruffed high again and drew a 2nd round of trump then a 3rd round ♥5 exit. So far, 9 tricks had been played: 4 Spades, 2 Clubs, 3 trumps, the 4-card ending:-

	♠ K ♥ -- ♦ KJ ♣ K	
♠ -- ♥ -- ♦ AQ ♣ 98	LOVE ALL DEALER E	♠ 10 ♥ 9 ♦ 93 ♣ --
	♠ -- ♥ 5 ♦ 854 ♣ --	

東再出 ♥9，擠到明手，實戰中明手墊 ♦J，這樣西再取兩墩 ♦，下四。

East's ♥9 now played and squeezed dummy, North actually discarded ♦J, so West took 2 more ♦ for 4 down.

(4) 隊式賽，運氣的一副牌 Another hand from Team Event.

	♠ 72 ♥ Q109 ♦ QJ852 ♣ 963	
♠ AQ653 ♥ KJ875 ♦ -- ♣ J54	GAME ALL DEALER S	♠ 8 ♥ 62 ♦ A109643 ♣ AQ72
	♠ KJ1094 ♥ A43 ♦ K7 ♣ K108	

West	North	East	South
			1♠
pass	1NT	2♦	pass
2♥	pass	pass	**X**
pass	2♠	**X**	pass
pass	pass		

莊家只得到三墩 ♠，兩墩 ♥，下三，-800，這桌 Larry 坐東。另一桌，他的隊友是 Zia 坐南，叫牌如下：

Declarer could only manage 3 trump tricks and two ♥ tricks, 3 off, -800. Larry was East. In the other room, South was Zia, Larry's teammates, the bidding went:-

West	North	East	South	
			1NT	
2♣	2♦	pass	pass	**2♣ : 2 Majors**
pass	pass	pass		

對著 6-0 的 ♦，結果下三，-300。這樣的牌還贏 500 分。Trumps broke 6-0, 3 down.

(5) 論對賽，也有不走運的牌 This was an unlucky hand in Pairs Event :-

	♠ 108654 ♥ 6 ♦ 43 ♣ Q10832	
♠ 3 ♥ KQ7 ♦ AKJ108 ♣ AK74	GAME NS DEALER S	♠ AQJ972 ♥ J10 ♦ 6 ♣ J965
	♠ K ♥ A985432 ♦ Q9752 ♣ --	

West	North	East	South
			4♥
X	pass	4♠	pass
4NT	pass	5♣	pass
pass	pass		

首攻 ♥A，將吃 ♥，還要再輸一墩 ♣，下一。拿著西的牌共二十點，不叫嗎？叫加倍也預料同伴叫 4♠，你肯 pass 嗎？可能 4NT，4♠或加倍 4♥ 是最佳合約，停得來嗎？二手共二十九點的牌，被南阻擊後，一樣叫不到最佳合約。

♥A was led and ♥ ruff, 1 sure trump loser for 1 down. Larry had the 20-point hand and the bidding could hardly be criticized, 29-point yet no way to reach the optimum contract after the 4♥ preempt. Nowadays, we would bid 3NT over 3♥ on West's hand, but 4♥, should the reasoning be the same, particularly if the vulnerability were reversed?

APPEALS CASE (200301)

Appeals Form

EVENT	Ladder Team 7A

ROUND		DATE	18th February 2003

Board 27
S / NIL

	♠ J92 ♥ QJT852 ♦ 3 ♣ 432	
♠ A765 ♥ 74 ♦ Q654 ♣ QT9		♠ K843 ♥ 96 ♦ 97 ♣ J8765
	♠ QT ♥ AK3 ♦ AKJT82 ♣ AK	

Team 3 (NS) vs Team 4 (EW)

NS – Bell Tam / Ng Wai Kin

EW – Lawrence Lau / Ringo Lee

N	E	S	W
		2♣	Pass
2♦	Pass	3NT	Pass
4♥*	Pass	4♠*	Pass
5♥	Pass	6♥*	Pass

Opening Lead: ♦9

Result: 6♥ by N +1 NS +1010

Facts collected by ATD at the table: -:

1. 2♣ by South was explained as strong and 2♦ shown 0-1 controls by North.
2. After South had bid 3NT, showing a balance hand with 25-27 HCP, North bid 4♥ with 'obvious' break of tempo. According to ATD, Ben Lam, the Chinese word of ***'obvious'*** was used and agreed at the table when the ATD collected the facts. South then bid 4♠ without alerting North's 4♥ bid. All the bids made thereafter were in normal tempo.
3. The final contract was 6♥ by North. Before the opening lead, East intended to point towards the bids of 4♥ & 4♠. Before any question was being asked, South volunteered the information that he and his partner (i.e. Anthony Ng and Bell Tam) seldom played together, and therefore, he did not know whether 4♥ was a transfer bid for Spade or natural. Hence he bid 4♠.
4. TD was summoned after the play. East **claimed** that:
   - 4.1 There was hesitation before North bid 4♥.
   - 4.2 After bidding was completed, North failed to correct the wrong explanation/guess by South. East then trusted North got 2 Majors due to no interference by EW and just South was uncertain on the conventional bid of 4♥. As East held short Diamonds and long Clubs, he assumed that South, holding a balance hand, could not provide 4 to 5 minor winning tricks to discard North's Spade. If ♠A was held by NS, it should be on South hand due to 0-1 control by North, there was no reason for East to lead Spade to give North a free finesse especially the position of ♠QJT9 were unknown. East, with no choice but finally led ♦9.

5. Subsequent clarification with South by David CC Ng over the phone the next day as to his bidding of 4♠, and 6♥. South claimed that he purely guessed the meaning of 4♥ on the table in view of the absence of any partnership agreement. After North's 5♥, he guessed that the North hand might be either, both majors or single ♥ suit. Having known that North had only a maximum of 1 control, his bid of 6♥ was purely a gamble and would not be accused of utilizing the unauthorized information. South volunteered the information to East that his bid of 4♠ was taken that the 4♥ was a transfer bid, without partnership agreement, because he was trying to be ethical so as not to mislead East on his first lead.

DIRECTOR'S RULING: The table result stands since South had disclosed all his partnership agreement with North. Also, South had acted on his good faith, explaining to East his reason for bidding 4♠ and the subsequent 6♥ and he did mention that he was not sure whether North had Spade suit or not. He had disclosed all he needed to disclose. The TD also trusts that South has not utilized any unauthorized information (UI) with his bidding 6♥. Now the question is whether North has the obligation under the law to reveal his actual holding to East. If North has such obligation, then East is being misinformed in a way that he has not be given the information he is entitled to receive under the law.

Law cited: Law 21B; Law 75D and Law 40C

Under Law 75 D.2 Partnership Agreement [Correcting Error in Explanation]: -
A player whose partner has given a mistaken explanation ---- the player MUST inform his opponents about his partner's erroneous explanation.

The reason for ruling in favor of North-South is that, in the opinion of the TD, North has no obligation to inform his opponents about his partner's erroneous explanation because his partner **was not explaining the partnership agreements to this opponents**. South has mentioned clearly that he and North were not fixed partnership (which the TD agreed), so his bidding of 4♠ and 6♥ was purely taking a position. The intricate point of this case is that North-South has no partnership agreement regarding to the bid of 4♥/4♠/5♥ and 6♥. South only volunteers the information as how he takes the meaning of 4♥, as an ethical player always does. Under such circumstance, North has no obligation to clarify any explanation, which is outside the scope of their partnership agreement.

In the prevailing practice, most of us, occupying North's position, would inform the opponents in case our partner's explanation was erroneous. However, it is **active ethics** promoted by the WBF. As Bobby Wolff, in one of the appeal cases, did mention that we have to be very careful when we draw a line between active ethics and obligation under the law. We are not empowered to punish a player whose ethical standard is minimal so long as he does not break the law. In spite of the lack of any convention card, the TD trusts that NS did not have any partnership agreement with regard to the development of 3NT.

Since the similar cases occur very often during the Club games, I strongly recommend Lawrence Lau to appeal because my intention is to have the Appeal Committee to clarify the issue so that the majority of the players can have a guidance to follow.

REASON FOR APPEAL (written by Player [East]: Lawrence Lau):

EW appealed that an established partnership should not be bid and explained like that without any interference, if North corrected South's explanation of 4♥ was not a transfer bid for ♠ but really natural ♥ to play before East's led, East would not have many options to lead for defeating 6♥ since South marked with at least 3 Aces. The only hope for East was either West has ♠A or ♠Q plus another winning entry from the rest of 3 suits.

Lawrence Lau disputes part of the facts mentioned above after reading the TD's report. The following being his reply in e-mail: - (those statements in ***italic*** are further clarification with ATD).

The appeal case has been perused and most of the facts agreed except:

1. Anthony Ng & I agreed when I pointed to 4♥ & 4♠, it was equivalent to asking the meaning of the bid. Hence Anthony was trying to answer my QUESTION rather than volunteered inform me the meaning/guess of the bid. Hence, North has the obligation to inform his opponents about his partner's erroneous explanation.
   The ATD confirmed that he received the following statements when he was collecting facts at the table: -
   "While East leans forward, showing his intention to ask questions, South starts to explain."

2. Although there was no convention card at the table, N- has never mentioned they were not fixed partnership at the table. Even so, my argument was obvious, and that's the reason why I appeal, any partnership should not abused by claiming, "we are not regular partner" and take advantage of not correcting partner's erroneous explanation.
   The ATD repeated the following statement as what he heard at the table in Cantonese: - South stated that " My partner and I seldom played together, and therefore, I do not know whether 4♥ was a transfer bid for Spade or natural. Hence I bid 4♠."

RESPONSES ON THE APPEALS CASE (written by Player [North]: Bell Tam):

A. On the Facts (collected by ATD at the table and the disputes made by Lawrence Lau "LL"):

(1) Seems Anthony and LL can't agree on whether the words from Anthony are volunteer offer of information PLUS a guess or answering questions. I won't have much to say on this because the timing of this process was very short and maybe both think that they have the initiation.

(2) I was shocked that LL said, "N-S has never mentioned they were not fixed partnership at the table". This was loudly and clearly said when Anthony started to offer his explanations and guess.

B. On the "claims" made by LL

(1) "North <u>failed</u> to correct the <u>wrong</u> explanation/guess by South"

-- As I considered that there was no erroneous explanation, Anthony has clearly explained that "there was no agreement on the 4♥ bid", there is nothing to correct.

-- I don't know whether a player needs to correct partner's guess on his own hand or not, at that time, I thought it is not, so I remained silence.

(2) "East then trusted North got 2 Majors"

-- I don't know where from East draw this conclusion, from opponent's guess?

(3) "Assumed that South, holding a balance hand .... could not provide .... winning tricks"

-- I don't think we are responsible for what an opponent assumes our hands are. When you heard your opponents open 2♣ and then rebid 3NT, how many times you have seen it is flat balance or with a running suit ? Look at the actual South hand and you will know that LL's guess was wrong.

(4) "East, with no choice but finally led D9"

-- This is really derisory. I can't buy LL's linking up of the "both major" North hand and "balanced" South hand to his unsuccessful lead, give North ♥QJxxx and ♦Q, whatever shape, there is 13 tricks in pocket if he doesn't cash his side's winners. It is very clear that the poor lead was a result of his wrong guess rather than from any legal information he obtained.

(5) "An established partnership should not be bid and explained like that without any interference"

-- Excuse me, what's mean by established partnership? I don't think there is anyone in HKCBA considers that Anthony and I are an established partnership, the last time I played with Anthony was at least 1.5 years ago. Despite that, we tried our best to respect the tournament/opponents and have discussed our system 45 minutes before the game started (hard luck, we haven't covered that 2♣-2♦-3NT-4♥ sequence). I can't recall how many times did my opponents only started to discuss system/convention with his partner **AFTER** the game had started and used our tournament time (the last time happened at my table was last week's Open League when LL partner with Yau Ngai).

-- I don't think you can find more than 2 convention cards in HKCBA that will clearly state what that 4♥ bid is after this not frequent appear sequence. However, I have heard that LL and his Grand Master partner, playing in Open League, doesn't have a mutual understanding on a simple sequence of 1NT-2♥. So this "bid like that" comment should apply to them, not us.

-- The explanation given can't be more clear and precise, "ad hoc partnership, no agreement on this bid".

(6) "Any partnership should not abuse by claiming 'we are not regular partner' and take advantage of not correcting partner's erroneous explanation"

-- Totally agree on the above statement, although this is irrelevant for this Appeal Case.

C. Director's comments on active/minimal ethics and LL's comments on abuse/take advantage

(1) I personally don't like the tone of the director's comments on the above, although I know David doesn't mean it, but it sounds like accusing me of not having active ethics or ethical standard is minimal. I always believe myself is one of the most ethical players in HKCBAL and always want to play fair game.

I remained silent after Anthony had given his explanation to LL was because I was very satisfied of what he said and at that time I had zero doubt and trusted that opponents already known that I had a single suiter in ♥ (Now I know I was wrong, of course, he said he doesn't know). Partner did not alert my 4♥ bid and I didn't say he failed to alert it, to me, this negative inference was enough for clarification, if I had a ♠ suit and intended 4♥ was a transfer, I would inform opponents that partner really "failed" to alert.

(2) LL's comments on abuse/take advantage, if he intends to apply to this case, it is totally unacceptable to me. On the contrary, I am very suspicious on opponent's ethics in this case:

a) I feel that opponents want to take advantage by trying to catch the non-perfect wordings from the explanations given —>> As an ethical player, Anthony Ng, volunteered information to opponents in desire to play a fair game, the opponents took it but keep trying to catch mistakes/tones in his wordings (not the meaning). I know that David has spent more than a week's time and lots of works to do in order to obtain the "facts" on the "actual wordings".

b) After that bidding sequence, I think all knows that there is some problem in the bidding —>> why didn't East ask North for further clarification if you want to play a good game? LL, a very experienced player and many times HK representative, for sure knows that he has that right. I can't stop assuming that he wants to reserve rights for calling director for "damage" if there is something wrong, because he knows that the onus is on North to correct his "claim" erroneous explanation. And, just in case, if, North really turned out to have both majors, he can call director for North's failure to say that South failed to alert 4♥, and he has trusted that North is single suiter in heart and that's why he lead wrong?

(3) I don't understand why David "strongly recommends Lawrence Lau to appeal". This is not a recurring issue, from my point of view; it is a single joke only. I don't know after David has "strongly recommended LL to appeal", will it affect the Appeals Committee's rulings on "without merit" decision.

D. Sorry to make my statement so long. My teammates and myself always enjoy playing good bridge under friendly environment, like most of the players in the Association. However, if somebody tries to attack our integrity and level of ethics, we are very firm and won't step back.

Deposit Received	Tournament Director
HK$500 was received on 4th March 2003	Ben Lam (ATD) David CC Ng (TD)

DECISION OF APPEALS COMMITTEE	
(Appeals committee members participating: S.S. Bux, Karic Chiu, Samuel Wan. Anthony Ching abstaining as an interested party and David Chan abstained, as he was involved as a party on N-S's rebuttal.) The Appeals Committee unanimously decided that this is not a case of ethics and that there was no unauthorized information involved. It was felt that there was obvious misunderstanding and confusion between N-S. South final bid of 6♥, looking at his hand, was quite justified. The Committee also felt that the Director did the right thing when he advised E-W to appeal, as this is not a clear-cut case. What the Committee took time on was whether "*North has an obligation to explain to East what happened*". The Committee unanimously agreed that North should, under Law 75D2, clarify the situation to East, and especially when there is no Convention Card available. It was felt that N-S has caused the confusion and North should not assumed that E-W could have known about it. The Committee did not particularly like East's argument, especially when he is an experienced international player. However, in line with the WBF Code of Practice the Committee resolves any doubtful point in favor of the non-offending side, in accordance with Law 84D. The Committee resolves that in future the TD should rule in accordance with Law 84D in the absence of a Convention Card.	
Result: **Adjusted to 6♥ by North -1 for - 50 to N-S.**	Chairperson Signature

Commentary on Appeals Case 200301

This case has aroused a lot of interest, and induced a lot of heated arguments as seen in the latest email exchange. I believe that as the Appeals Committee, we should provide some additional commentary on the matter. First of all, let us clarify a few points.

Alert Policy

As the HKCBAL adopts the WBF policy on alerts, we should note that in the absence of screens "*We should not alert bids, with the exception of conventional opening suit bids, at the four level or higher*". In this context, we would assume that in this case all bids starting from 4♥ were not alerted. However, this does not prohibit a player from asking.

Convention Card

The policy, adopted since April 2000, is that a player must have a properly filled out convention card at the table. A copy of the policy is attached in Appendix A. The directors at our regular tournaments, however, have not strictly enforced this policy. It has hence resulted in some unnecessary disputes.

What is a properly filled out convention card? WBF has some very clear guidelines. However, since we are adopting an ACBL version at our regular events, these guidelines are not appropriate. We would suggest that a convention card is properly filled if it includes all conventions used, general approach, response methods, offensive and defensive methods, leads and signals, and all exceptional cases. It will then be up to the director to ascertain the "correct" meanings of bids not covered on the convention card.

The Case

The Appeals Committee is satisfied with the facts of the case as presented on the Appeals Form. The following points were considered before coming to the final decision:

1. Was there an infraction?
2. Was there damage caused?
3. Was the damage, if any, caused by the infraction?
4. Was there an ethical issue involved?

Infraction

In accordance with the alert policy, N-S was proper in not alerting the bids at 4-level and above. South offered an explanation when asked after the bidding was over. However, since N-S was not a regular partnership and the bidding sequence probably has never come up before, South might not be certain what the meaning of 4♥ and the subsequent 5♥ meant. According to the Laws, E-W is entitled to full disclosure of the partnership agreement and treatment. Since this was probably not a convention or an agreement, South's explanation should be adequate.

However, in the absence of a convention card, there was nothing to support South's claim. Whether there was no agreement or South simply forgot was not clear to E-W. In a case like this, North should have offered the explanation in accordance with Law 75D2. This would remove any doubt for E-W. Granted East could have asked North, but not doing so did not remove N-S's responsibility. (Note: It was clear to us that there was probably no agreement as South claimed because we know the players, and East probably knew as well. However, we can only be objective in applying the Laws.) The current HKCBAL practice, in the absence of a convention card and where there is a difference between the explanation and the hand, is to rule for a mis-bid unless the situation is clear. We therefore believe that there was an infraction.

Damage

This point is clear. If a spade was led and continued, the contract of 6♥ would have been defeated. Any other lead would have allowed the contract to make. The damage was directly a result of the choice of the lead.

We can understand why East did not lead a spade in case North was holding both majors. Whether East could have led a spade had he known the meaning of all the bids was not at all clear to us. East argument on the Appeals Form was not convincing. However, leading a spade is a viable option in this case. According to Law 84D and the WBF Code of Practice, the director and the Appeals Committee can only rule in favor of the non-offending side. Since we believe that there was an infraction, the damage would be likely be a result of the infraction, in not having a clearer option available.

Ethics

On the matter of ethics, the Appeals Committee had a clear view. We believe that N-S had acted ethically in this case. We felt that it was normal for North and South to think thoroughly in this situation and that unauthorised information was neither passed nor used. We believe that North should have offered East an explanation of his 4♥ bid. However, in not doing so were not a matter of ethics but his lack of full knowledge of the Laws. We felt that East accusation was groundless and not fair to the N-S pair, who has tried to be helpful.

The Appeals Committee did question why East had not asked North for further explanation. By not doing so, was he trying to play both ways and "have the cake and eat it too". However, we gave him the benefit of the doubt and assumed that in the midst of the rather unusual auction and discussion, he had simply forgotten.

Recommendation

Why wasn't the director called when the bidding was over the explanation not clear? None of these would have happened if the director were called then. He could have given clear instructions to the players to follow according to the Laws. We recommend players, once faced with an irregularity or even suspecting an irregularity, should call the director immediately.

We wish to remind the directors to strictly enforce the convention card policy. This will make the game more enjoyable for everyone and prevent uneasy feeling from developing amongst players.

We strongly recommend that players be very careful on the ethical issue. It is a very serious matter to accuse another player of being unethical. Unless you have solid proof, you can face disciplinary action according to the Laws. Remember what Confucius said, "Do not treat others in ways you do not want to be treated".

Appendix A

Convention Card Procedure

The HKCBA published the convention card procedure in the HKCBA Handbook in 1991 with the intention of enforcing this in our regular tournaments. A number of minor revisions have since been introduced to make the procedure simpler. The current practice, however, is inconsistent with that of the WBF. The Council at the 13 April 2000 meeting, resolved that:

1. Effective 1 June 2000, all pairs must have a HKCBAL or WBF convention card, properly filled, at all HKCBAL regular tournaments. The requirement for trials will be 2 copies of WBF convention card, properly filled, for each pair. If a pair does not have a properly filled convention card, the director will prescribe one and only "natural" system will be allowed.

2. All conventional calls and the general offensive and defensive approaches of the pair ***MUST*** be included in the convention card. Should this not be the case, any explanation that is different from the actual holding will be treated as a misexplanation.

3. We understand that it is not impossible, nor is it practical, for players to include all subsequent offensive bids in the convention card. This is especially true of offensive bids against uncommon overcalls and openings. In these cases when there is a difference between the explanation and the actual holding, the directors are explicitly instructed to ascertain whether it is a misbid or a misexplanation based in the consistency with the system approach described in the convention card.

4. If players intend to reuse the conventions, we will store them for you at the venues. Just deposit them with the directors.

SCHEDULE FOR APRIL — MAY 2003

APRIL 2003

1	TUE	***TOURNAMENT CANCELLED***	
4	FRI	***TOURNAMENT CANCELLED***	
7-13	全國橋牌協會錦標賽 —四川成都		
8	TUE	***TOURNAMENT CANCELLED***	
11	FRI	***TOURNAMENT CANCELLED***	
12	SAT	***TOURNAMENT CANCELLED***	
13	SUN	***TOURNAMENT CANCELLED***	
15	TUE	***TOURNAMENT CANCELLED***	
18	FRI	National Team Trial 01 2003 (Semi-Final)	TRIAL
19	SAT	National Team Trial 02 2003 (Semi-Final)	TRIAL
22	TUE	Ladder Team (9)	2-Session
25	FRI	Knock-Out Team (6)	2-Session
26	SAT	National Team Trial 03 2003 (Final)	TRIAL
27	SUN	National Team Trial 04 2003 (Final)	TRIAL
29	TUE	Paul Jones (9)	YEAR

MAY 2003

2	FRI	IMP Pairs (10)	YEAR
3	SAT	Knock-Out Team (7)	YEAR
6	TUE	Quadruple Pairs (1)	CUP
9	FRI	Continuous Pairs (10)	YEAR
10	SAT	Quadruple Pairs (2) & (3)	CUP
13	TUE	Ladder Team (10)	YEAR
16	FRI	Open Team of Six (1)	CUP
17	SAT	Triangular Interport Trial 2003	TRIAL
20	TUE	Open Team of Six (2)	CUP
23	FRI	Open Team of Six (3)	CUP
27	TUE	Knock-Out Team (8) IF NECESSARY	YEAR
30	FRI	Paul Jones (10)	YEAR
31-5	廣東"得勝盃"橋牌邀請賽 廣東省汕尾市遮浪鎮(紅海灣) — 廣東省國際海上運動俱樂部 FAX: 020-84100687 $150 /日 食宿費 $500 報名費		