

**NEW ZEALAND BRIDGE
Incorporated**

ZONE 7

**LAW INTERPRETATION
REGULATION
AND
GUIDANCE**

Effective 1 June 2008

(Addendum to Manual)

ZONE 7

LAW INTERPRETATION, REGULATION AND GUIDANCE

(Effective 1 June 2008, excluding 2008 Queen's Birthday Tournaments)

The 2007 Laws of Duplicate Bridge provide for the Regulating Authority (NZ Bridge) to select certain Law options and to regulate their usage within its geographical region. Regulating Authorities are further permitted to provide regional interpretation and guidance as to the application of such options and regulations.

The following interpretations have been made by Zone 7 and accepted by both NZ Bridge and the Australian Bridge Federation.

Law 12C1(c) Directors are permitted to award a single weighted score that endeavours to restore the balance of equity on the hand in the instant prior to the infraction. The calculation of the weightings relates to the expected outcomes from that point forward in an auction unaffected by any irregularity. Any residual doubt that exists in the assessment of the relative weightings should be resolved in favour of the non-offending side.

Example: As a result of misinformation, a pair defends 4H^X. If they had been correctly informed, they would certainly have bid game in spades and possibly slam, making 11 or 12 tricks depending on declarer's line of play.

The Director may conclude that equity is best served by substituting a single weighted score as follows:

	30% of +1430	(6S =)
Plus	40% of +680	(4S +2)
Plus	20% of +650	(4S +1)
Plus	10% of -100	(6S -1)

At Pairs: Assuming that there are 12 tables, the frequency table would look something like this:

Frequency	Score	Match-points
2.3	+1430	20.7
5.4	+680	13.0
2.2	+650	5.4
2.1	-100	1.1

The weighted score would be:

$(0.3 \times 20.7) + (0.4 \times 13.0) + (0.2 \times 5.4) + (0.1 \times 1.1) = +12.6$ — rounded to one decimal place.

A single score of N/S +12.6 would be entered.

At Teams: Assume that the score in the other room was N/S +650:

<u>Net Score</u>	<u>IMPs</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Adjust</u>
+1430 – 650 = +780	+13	30%	3.9
+ 680 – 650 = +30	+1	40%	0.4
+ 650 – 650 = 0		20%	0.0
– 100 – 650 = –750	–13	10%	–1.3
Total			3.0

The IMP total would be rounded to the nearest whole number and the board would be scored as +3 to the non-offending side.

Alternative Manual Calculation Method for Pairs Tournaments Scored by Computer

Clearly, to make one of these weighted adjustments for match-point scoring without the aid of computer software would be tedious, if not impossible, particularly in large fields. Many software packages do not currently cater for this type of adjustment. Until a software modification is implemented, the following procedure shall, by regulation, be deemed to be the correct procedure.

Enter the scores into the software as normal, substituting average to both sides at the table to which the ruling applies. Then calculate the weighted score using the match-points assigned by the software (a board printout will provide this).

In the above example, the following results will be obtained:

Score	Match-points
+1430	20
+680	13
+650	6
–100	2

The weighted score will be:
 $(0.3 \times 20) + (0.4 \times 13) + (0.2 \times 6) + (0.1 \times 2) = +12.6$.

Finally, correct the match-points for both sides, rounded to one decimal place, using the software's adjusted score (penalty) routine. As the average on the board is 11 and has already been assigned, the Director will add 1.6 match-points to N/S and will deduct 1.6 match-points from E/W.

Law 12C1(d) Although this is essentially a matter of judgement for the Director (and subsequently the Appeals Committee), in general, if more than four possible outcomes exist, then the Director should consider applying this provision of the Laws and award an artificial adjusted score.

Law 12C1(e) None of the provisions of this Law apply in New Zealand.

Law 12C2(b) For IMP play — see Law 86A.

Law 16B1(b) For the purpose of this Law, a significant number is defined as more than one in four players.

This means that, if it is judged that more than 75% of the class of players in question using the same partnership methods would select the same action as that taken by the player in receipt of the unauthorised information, then the Director shall proceed on the basis that no other logical alternative actions exist.

Law 16B2 The preferred procedure is to summon the Director at the end of the hand, but only if it becomes apparent that an opponent may have acted upon extraneous information made available by his/her partner. The Director need be called only if the non-offenders believe that they may have been damaged.

Whenever a player believes that there is a possibility that an opponent may have acted on unauthorised information from his/her partner's gesture, comment, hesitation or the like, he/she should immediately try to establish the facts about what has occurred. This should be done as pleasantly as possible, stressing that, if the Director needs to be called at the end of the hand, there will now be no dispute about the facts. The Director should be called earlier only if there is no agreement about what has occurred. If, at the end of the hand, the non-offending side believe that they have been disadvantaged, the Director can then be summoned.

Law 25A The 2007 Laws now use the word unintended (rather than inadvertent). In applying this Law, the Director must still be satisfied that the player never had it in his/her mind to take the action he/she took. For example, opening 1♥ with one heart and five spades clearly suggests some sort of inexplicable mental aberration. In contrast, a player who opens 1♣ with a four-card suit and then quickly changes it to 1NT, because he/she has remembered that he/she is playing a strong no trump, should not have the first call considered as unintentional, no matter how quick the change was. The acid test is the player's incontrovertible intention, not the speed of the change.

A bid may be treated as unintentional under this Law even if the player's attention is drawn to it by the action of his/her partner alerting the bid or an opponent's question. Once again, the clear intention of the player as suggested by the

hand is the guideline the Director should use. Cue bidding 2♠ over 1♠ with a hand that has only 13 points and a six-card club suit clearly suggests that it is appropriate to allow a change under this Law. In contrast, bidding 2♥ in response to 1NT with a heart suit, when playing transfers, would not qualify.

Law 27B1(a) Players are still permitted to replace an insufficient bid with a bid in the same denomination at the lowest legal level without restriction provided that, in the opinion of the Director, neither the insufficient bid nor the substituted bid is artificial. The auction continues normally and the information that the bid was intended to be natural is authorised to all players at the table and therefore Law 16D does not apply.

Law 27B1(b) Players are also permitted to substitute other legal calls without restriction (irrespective of any artificiality) provided that, in the opinion of the Director, the selected call has the same meaning as or a more precise meaning than the insufficient bid (i.e. the replacement conveys the same or more precise information).

In order for the Director to correctly exercise this discretion, he/she must first determine the offending player's original intent at the time of the infraction and then investigate the pair's methods. This will often entail quizzing the players away from the table and/or an examination of the pair's system card. Only after these investigations should the Director then explain the options.

Note that:

- A truly unintentional action may be corrected via Law 25.
- Occasionally, it will be unclear whether to allow the correction without restriction under Law 27B1(b), or to require the offender's partner to pass throughout the remainder of the auction under Law 27B2. In those cases, the Director is advised to err on the side of applying Law 27B1(b) (i.e. attempt to get a normal bridge result).

Law 27D Whenever the Director allows the correction of an insufficient bid without restriction, he/she should advise the non-offending side to call him/her back at the end of play if they consider that the outcome of the hand may have been different had the offender's partner not had the assistance of the withdrawn bid. In situations where the Director considers that the non-offending side has been damaged, he/she applies Law 27D.

Any such adjustment should be based upon the most likely outcome(s), had the original infraction (i.e. the insufficient bid) not occurred. Under no circumstances may an adjusted score be awarded that gives any weight to the perceived benefit that might have accrued to the non-offending side if the Director had elected to apply Law 27B2 (even if subsequently it is considered that this may have been the more appropriate action, i.e. Law 82C is not applicable).

Examples

(a) **West East**

4NT 4♦

If the Director is satisfied that East was answering Blackwood but at the wrong level, then East will be allowed to correct to 5♦ without any restriction.

(b) **West North East**

1♦ 1♠ 1♥

If 1♥ was intended to show at least four hearts and enough HCP to respond, then a replacement of 2♥ is permitted under Law 27B1(a) without any further restriction.

Alternatively, if a negative double by East would systemically guarantee at least a four-card heart holding, then East could also replace the 1♥ with a double under Law 27B1(b) without restriction. However, a pass would not convey a heart suit and therefore Law 27B2 applies, i.e. partner will have to pass whenever it is his/her turn to call and Laws 23 and 26 may also apply.

(c) **West North East**

1NT 2♠ 2♦

If East's intention was to transfer to hearts (he/she did not see the 2♠ bid), then a replacement bid of 3♥ would not bar his/her partner.

(d) **West North East**

1NT 2♦ 2♣

2♣ was intended as simple Stayman. A Lebensohl-type cue bid replacement of 3♦ (asking about a four-card major) would now have the same meaning as the original insufficient bid and thus not bar West.

Alternatively, if the Director is satisfied that the player intended to bid 3♣ naturally, he/she allows that change without restriction under Law 27B1(b).

(e) **West East**
2NT 2♥

Similarly, if 2♥ was intended as a transfer, then a bid of 3♥ (still transferring) would permit the auction to continue without constraints.

(f) **West North East**
1♠ 2♥ 1NT

Here, the replacement of 1NT with 2NT is permitted without restriction under Law 27B1(b) if the Director is satisfied that this was East's original incontrovertible intention.

In other circumstances (e.g. if East did not see the 2♥ bid), the substitution of 2NT is permitted without restriction under Law 27B1(a) if both 1NT and 2NT are natural. The information that East's HCP range might well be different from that of an original 2NT response is authorised to both sides but Law 27D will apply if the offending side achieves a favourable result that would not have been possible without the infraction (such as stopping in 2NT when it makes only eight tricks if played by East).

(g) **West North East**
1♣ 1♥ 1♦

E/W are playing a strong club system and East did not see the 1♥ bid. If 1♦ was intended to show 0–7 HCP, then the substitution of a Pass (showing 0–4 HCP) would not bar West. Note that a call that specifies a narrower HCP range is actually more precise (i.e. it contains more information) than a call with a wider HCP range.

Summary

Most insufficient bids arise from either a failure to observe the call of RHO or a general confusion about the current level of the auction. Therefore, in applying Law 27, the Director should proceed as follows.

- (1) Remove the offender from the table and determine his/her original intent and the specific meaning of the intended call.
- (2) Verify the general methods of the partnership and, if necessary, consult the offender's system card or any other system notes.

- (3) Determine the possible replacement calls available and their meaning.
- (4) Return to the table and explain all the options to the players (including that LHO has the option of accepting the insufficient bid as per Law 27A).
- (5) Allow the (fully informed) player to select a replacement call and then, based upon the investigations detailed in steps (1)–(3), apply either Law 27B1 or Law 27B2.
- (6) If Law 27B1 is applied, the non-offending side are informed of their right to re-call the Director at the end of play if they believe that the outcome of the board would have been different without the assistance of the insufficient bid.

Law 40B2(a) This Law is the basis and authority for the classification and restriction of certain partnership methods as outlined in the System Regulations (see pages D3–D8). It is also the authority for the procedures as described in the Alerting Regulations (see page D30).

Both members of a partnership must play the same system, including bidding and card play agreements. Where, as a matter of style, members frequently adopt different approaches from each other, that difference (or those differences) must be disclosed on the system card.

Law 40B2(b) NZ Bridge does allow written defences to Yellow systems and Brown Sticker conventions to be referred to at the table in many events (see pages D6–D7).

Law 40B(d) NZ Bridge prohibits the psyching of any conventional opening call that has as one of its options a hand that:

- (a) may contain 13 or more HCP **and**
- (b) is unlimited **and**
- (c) does not show either a specific suit or a balanced hand.

In response to any opening bid, the responder is prohibited from psyching any bid that:

- (a) is conventionally a game try or a game force **and**
- (b) neither relates to a specific suit or suits nor shows a balanced hand.

It is also prohibited to psyche a Multi 2♣ or Multi 2♦ as defined by the System Regulations.

Law 40B3 Prior agreements by a partnership to vary its understanding during the auction or play following a question asked, a response to a question or an irregularity by its own side is prohibited.

Law 41A The opening lead should be made face down. A lead made face down is not an opening lead until faced and may thus be retracted without penalty, but only upon instruction of the Director (i.e. when the lead was made from the wrong side or following the correction of misinformation).

Law 45C4(b) The designation of a card in dummy can be changed only if the Director is satisfied that declarer incontrovertibly never intended to play that card.

Example: Declarer leads towards the AQ in dummy, LHO plays the King and declarer plays the Queen. The Director will not allow the Queen to be changed because declarer cannot now claim that he/she never intended to play that card (i.e. LHO may have played low).

Law 61B3 Defenders may make enquiries of each other or declarer regarding a possible revoke.

Law 70A In adjudicating a contested claim or concession, the Director is required to use his/her bridge judgement to determine as equitably as possible for both sides what in his/her opinion would have happened if play had continued normally (giving no weight to silly or irrational lines for the class of player involved).

There is no option to award a split or weighted adjusted score, as the margin of doubt that might remain with the Director after consultation with his colleagues (or players if appropriate) must be resolved in favour of the non-claiming side.

To assist Directors with making this distinction, please refer to the examples for Laws 70C and 70E below.

Law 70C A declarer who is unaware of a missing trump is “careless” rather than “irrational” in failing to draw that missing trump or stating how he/she will take care of it. Thus, if a trick could be lost by playing other winners first, then the Director should award that trick to the non-claimers.

Examples

(a) Declarer claims all the tricks with a good trump (the ♦9), two spade winners and a heart winner. The defence can ruff the heart with their outstanding small trump. Despite declarer swearing on a stack of bibles that he/she knew that there was a trump out, if he/she was too careless to mention it, then he/she may easily have forgotten it, and the defence is allocated a trick.

- (b) Declarer is in 7♠ with 13 tricks as long as spades (trumps) are not 5–0. He/she cashes one round and says “All mine” when both players follow. He/she has clearly not forgotten the outstanding three trumps and the claim is good.

Law 70E2

In adjudicating disputed claims involving an unstated line of play, the following guidelines apply.

(a) Top down

A declarer who states that he/she is cashing a suit is normally assumed to cash them from the top; this is especially so if there is some solidity.

Example

Suppose declarer claims three tricks with AK5 opposite 42, forgetting that the jack has not gone. It would be normal to give declarer three tricks because it would be considered to be irrational to play the 5 first.

(b) Different suits

If a declarer appears to be unaware of an outstanding winner, or losing line of play [but see (a) above], and a trick could be lost by playing or discarding one suit rather than another, then the Director should award that trick to the non-claiming side.

Example

Declarer has three winners in dummy and must make three discards. Declarer appears to have forgotten that his/her ♦J is not a winner. It is careless rather than irrational that he/she should discard some other winner to retain the ♦J.

Law 73A2

The use of Stop Cards is authorised by NZ Bridge for all A Point Tournaments and is recommended in all other tournaments.

Law 76A2

The Tournament Organiser shall be responsible for deciding which matches should be broadcast on BBO. The Tournament Organiser is also responsible for the prior training of the operators and the efficient delivery of the service on site. BBO must not intrude on the players' amenity or impede the rate of play. It is the responsibility of the BBO operators to keep pace with the play, not the reverse.

Law 76C2

The right to penalise an irregularity may be forfeited if attention is first drawn to the irregularity by a spectator for whose presence at the table the non-offending side is responsible.

The right to correct an irregularity may be forfeited if attention is first drawn to the irregularity by a spectator for whose presence at the table the offending side is responsible.

- Law 79C2** No change in score may occur after expiry of the score correction period.
- Within the correction period, the Director may adjust an inconsistent score (e.g. 4♥ making 11 tricks = 620) to a consistent score (i.e. 650) if both pairs agree that it is the correct result. The Director may not alter an inconsistent score if the pairs are unavailable for consultation or where there is no agreement as to the correct result.
- The Director can also adjust a consistent score if attention is drawn to a possible error within the same time frame. However, in this case, before any change is made, the Director must have complete confidence in the recollections of both pairs, bearing in mind such factors as (a) the time elapsed from the board having been played, (b) the nature of the scoring query, and (c) the possibility of a more experienced pair forcefully stating their version of events thus intimidating a less experienced pair into compliance. If the Director has any doubts at all about what has occurred, then the consistent score as originally recorded shall stand.
- Law 80A3** The powers of the Regulating Authority for New Zealand rest with the Board of New Zealand Bridge Incorporated as provided for in its Constitution and have not been assigned or delegated to any other entity.
- Law 80B** Unless otherwise directed by the Board of NZ Bridge, the Tournament Organiser under these Laws is for:
- (a) national events — the (Match) Committee appointed by the Board;
 - (b) 15A or 10A Point events — the (Match) Committee nominated by the Regional Committee delegated to conduct the event, and approved by the Board or the Chief Director on behalf of the Board (see page B5);
 - (c) all other events — the Club Committee where the event takes place.
- Law 80B1** Where responsibility for a Tournament run under the auspices of the Master Point Scheme is delegated to a Tournament Organiser (be it a Regional Committee, Club or Individual), these entities are not permitted to draft or implement regulations, written or otherwise, that are in conflict with the rules, regulations or requirements as promulgated by NZ Bridge.
- Law 80B2(j)** Although this administrative function may be performed by the Tournament Organiser, ultimate responsibility for the accuracy of the scoring is vested in the Director.

Law 81 The term “Director” means the Director in Charge appointed by the Tournament Organiser under Law 80B2(a) and subject to the Tournament Director’s Policy of NZ Bridge (see page D23).

Law 82(c) This Law makes no suggestion that a Director should automatically cancel a board when he/she (or his/her assistants) has made an error. Play should continue such that a result may be obtained. If it is then necessary to adjust the table score, this will usually lead to an assigned score.

If the Director knows what would have happened if he/she had given the correct ruling originally, then he/she should just correct it. If he/she cannot confidently predict the true outcome on the board, then he/she should award an assigned adjusted score, treating each side for that purpose as non-offending. In doing so, he/she may need to use his/her powers under Law 12C1(c) to substitute an equitable weighted score that reflects all the possible outcomes had the correct ruling been given.

An artificial adjusted score should be required only in those instances where a result could not be obtained (e.g. when a board has been prematurely cancelled) or when too many possible outcomes exist for a weighted score under Law 12C1 (see above).

Any clear error should be corrected, but a ruling that was essentially a matter of judgement, or a ruling where there is a strong argument in favour of the original ruling, should not be corrected. Review of matters of judgement and resolution of arguments as to the correctness of a ruling that was thought to be close are proper matters to be dealt with via an appeal against the ruling.

Examples

- (a) A Director gives an adjustment to 2♠ making. He/she later realises that it will always make nine tricks. Despite the obvious embarrassment, he/she must return to both sides and explain that the ruling has now been amended to 2♠ +1.
- (b) A Director initially fails to recognise that a particular explanation is misinformation. He/she later realises that he/she should have amended the score from 6♣ doubled making in one direction to 6♦ doubled making in the other direction. He/she must now bite the bullet and give the correct ruling (6♦ doubled).
- (c) A Director incorrectly cancels a board part way through the auction, believing a pair to be playing an illegal agreement. This is wrong because the board should always be completed.

However, worse is to follow when he/she discovers that the agreement was not actually illegal. Because the board was not completed, Law 12C1(d) applies and the best he/she can do is to give each side average plus.

(d) RHO leads a spade out of turn. Declarer forbids LHO from leading spades. Unfortunately, the Director tells LHO that he/she may not lead spades again. Later in the play, LHO gets in and fails to find the killing spade switch. If the Director had not got this wrong, then perhaps LHO would have found the switch, perhaps not. Because the spade switch was reasonable but not automatic, the best approach is to weight the possibilities using Law 12C1(c):

	60% of 3NT=	N/S +400
Plus	40% of 3NT-1	N/S -50

Law 86A For matches of less than 11 boards, the score awarded (as average plus or average minus) shall be plus or minus 2 IMPs.

Law 86D The Director should always strive to award an assigned, rather than an artificial, adjusted score. This will sometimes require the use of an equitable weighting to reflect the range of possible outcomes — see Law 12C1(c).

Law 92A When an appeal against a decision of the Director at a Tournament conducted under the auspices of NZ Bridge or its Master Point Scheme is unsuccessful, the Appeals Committee shall consider the merit of the case. If the grounds for appeal or the charges brought against another contestant are held to be without merit, the Committee should assess a penalty taking into account the circumstances of each individual case.

Law 92B For all Tournaments run under the auspices of NZ Bridge or its Master Point Scheme, unless an earlier time is promulgated by the Tournament Organiser, the time for requesting a ruling from the Director or for filing an appeal expires 30 minutes after the official end of the session (or match stanza) to which the ruling applies. The time for filing an appeal of a late ruling expires for each party 30 minutes after they were officially advised of the ruling.

Law 93C1 The correct procedure for requesting a qualified review by NZ Bridge of rulings made by an Appeals Committee at any Tournament conducted under the auspices of NZ Bridge or its Master Point Scheme, including the National Congress and the Trials conducted to select the National Representative Teams, is described in Section C of the manual.

Law 93C3(a) (b) For all Tournaments run under the auspices of NZ Bridge or its Master Point Scheme, including the National Congress

and the Trials conducted to select the National Representative Teams, the decision of the Tournament Appeals Committee is final. The Laws and Regulations Committee of the Board will limit its function to clarification/interpretation of the Laws and Regulations in order to establish or confirm a legal precedent or correct procedure.

STOP CARDS

(Effective 1 June 2008)

The use of Stop Cards is mandatory in all A Point Tournaments and is recommended in all other tournaments.

The “STOP CARD” is used during the auction as a Skip Bid Warning.

Before a player makes a bid that skips one or more levels, a Stop Card should be placed face up on the table to LHO, before making the (skip) bid. After allowing for any questions by LHO to be answered, the person who made the bid waits for approximately 10 seconds (but less at one’s own discretion) before removing the Stop Card and LHO may bid.

When a player omits to use the Stop Card before making a skip bid, the failure to do so may be taken into account by the Director, and subsequently by an Appeals Committee, when assessing what action to take under Law 16B (extraneous information from partner).

In addition, frequent omissions may attract a procedural penalty.

WRITTEN BIDDING

(Effective 1 June 2008)

1. The Tournament Organiser may prescribe written instead of spoken bidding for any event conducted under its auspices.
2. The Tournament Organiser should prescribe the form of bidding sheet to be used, which should not substantially differ from the attached Figure 1.
3. The dealer and the vulnerability are not to be marked on the bidding pad.
4. Bidding shall proceed with designated marks as follows:
 - 4.1. A diagonal line (*/*) = pass
 - 4.2. A "C" = clubs
 - 4.3. A "D" = diamonds
 - 4.4. An "H" = hearts
 - 4.5. An "S" = spades
 - 4.6. An "NT" = no trumps
 - 4.7. An "X" = double
 - 4.8. An "XX" = redouble
 - 4.9. A double line (*//*) indicates that the bidding is ended (e.g. in Figure 2, West passed, North opened one spade, East doubled, South passed, West bid one no trump, and all passed).
 - 4.10. Obviously, numerals are used ("1" rather than "one" etc.).
 - 4.11 **Alerts:** The player's partner should immediately circle any bid that requires an alert.
 - 4.12 **Delayed alerts:** Delayed alerts should be indicated by declarer or dummy after the auction is finished but before the opening lead is made with a small plus sign (+) in one corner of the appropriate square of the bidding pad as evidence of the delayed alert.
5. Where a player makes part of a bid out of turn, the Director should first satisfy himself/herself that the bid, as defined above, is incomplete. If so, the Director will cancel the partial bid out of turn and instruct the players that the turn reverts to the correct player.

Should, in the opinion of the Director, extraneous information have been conveyed by the incomplete bid, then he/she should inform the partner to be careful not to take any advantage of this extraneous information and should inform the non-offending side that, although they may use the extraneous information, they do so at their own risk. At the end of the hand, the non-offending side may apply for an adjusted score under Law 16B if they feel that the offender's partner may have taken advantage of the extraneous information.
6. All calls must be made in neat, legible, handwriting. Where there is any doubt about what is written, players should seek verbal clarification. A player has no redress if he/she has made a call based on his/her own misunderstanding (Law 21A). However, if, in the opinion of the Director, a player has made a call as a result of an opponent's illegible handwriting, Law 21B applies. The Director's decision is final.

7. The bidding sheets should be turned over after the opening leader's partner has played to the first trick. Law 20 gives him/her the right to demand a review of the bidding up to that point. The duty of turning over the bidding sheet is that of dummy but, if he/she omits to do so, all players have the right to rectify his/her omission.

8. The laws as to inflections, changes of bid and so on apply mutatis mutandis to written bidding.

9. Players are required to use the same designations each time they bid and not to vary the way in which they make their bids. Full stops should not be used as a matter of practice.

BIDDING BOXES

(Effective 1 June 2008)

1. The Tournament Organiser may prescribe the use of bidding boxes rather than written or spoken bidding for any event under its auspices.
2. The bidding cards must be placed in front of the player making the bid, starting from the left and facing the player's partner. All calls should remain visible. The cards should be placed toward the centre of the table so that all players can see the auction clearly at a glance.
3. A call has been made when a player removes the cards from the bidding box with the intention of placing them on the table. Players should not fiddle with the bidding cards while they consider their call.
4. For calls resulting from mechanical errors in removing the cards from the bidding box, the Director applies Law 25A.
5. The bidding cards must be left in place until the opening lead has been faced. Once the opening lead has been faced, the cards are removed.
6. Where an alertable call is made, the partner of the player making the bid should use the alert card to indicate that to the opponents.

SCREENS

(Effective 1 June 2008)

The Playing Procedure

Description of the Operation

- The North and East players sit on the same side of the screen throughout.
- It is North's responsibility to place the board on, and to remove the board from, the bidding tray.
- It is West's responsibility to adjust the screen aperture.
- The sequence is as follows.
 - (i) North places the board on the bidding tray.
 - (ii) The aperture is closed (and remains so during the whole of the auction period) so that the bidding tray can just pass under it.
 - (iii) The players remove the cards from the board.
 - (iv) Calls are made with the cards from the bidding box.
 - (v) The player places the selected call in the bidding tray, which will be visible only on the player's side of the screen. A player's first call should touch the extreme left of his own segment of the bidding tray, with subsequent calls overlapping neatly and evenly to the right. A call is considered to be made when it is released on to the tray.
 - (vi) After the two players on the same side of the screen have made their calls, North or South (as the case may be) slides the bidding tray under the centre of the screen so as to be visible only to the players on the other side. They then make their calls in like manner and the bidding tray is slid back again. This procedure is continued until the auction is complete. It is a breach of regulation to transfer the bidding knowing that an irregularity has occurred. After all four players have had the opportunity to review the auction (equivalent to the right of having the auction restated), the players replace their bidding cards in their respective bidding boxes.
 - (vii) After a legal opening lead is faced, the screen aperture is opened the minimum necessary to permit all players to see the dummy cards and the cards played to each trick.

Alerts and Explanations

- Each player must provide his/her screen-mate with a correctly filled-in system card and any relevant system notes. (Failure to comply may result in a procedural penalty.)
- A player who makes an alertable call as defined in the NZ Bridge Alert Regulations must alert his/her screen-mate, and the partner must also alert the call on the other side of the screen when the bidding tray arrives there. The alert must be made by placing the Alert Card over the last call of the screen-mate, in his/her segment of the bidding tray; the alerted player must acknowledge by returning the Alert Card to his/her opponent. A player may, by written question, ask for an explanation of an opponent's call; the screen-mate then provides a written answer.

- At any time during the auction, a player may request of his/her screen-mate, in writing, a full explanation of an opponent's call. The reply is also in writing.
- Questions during the play period should be in writing with the aperture closed. The screen is raised after the response has been made.

Modifications of Rectifications and Restrictions when Screens are in Use

The Laws of Duplicate Bridge 2007 are in effect except as specified below.

- Law 9A3; Law 42B(3); Law 43A(1)(b) — Dummy may call attention to a defender's card prematurely exposed.
- Law 13B — Applies only if the call has been transmitted to the other side of the screen.
- Law 16B2&3 — Occasionally during the auction, a breach in the tempo in which the tray is returned to the other side may be identifiable to one side over another, thereby conveying unauthorised information. NZ Bridge is concerned that this is confined to proven cases only and it is not considered that a delay in the return of the tray of some 20–30 seconds is sufficient to convey unauthorised information. The players who receive the tray are the only players who can speak to any abnormality. Consequently, it is an infraction for the player on the same side of the screen where the variation occurred to first draw attention to it.
- Law 20 — Review of the auction. Until the bidding cards are removed from the tray, a player obtains a review of the auction by inspecting them. At trick one, when a player is still entitled to obtain a review and an inspection of the bidding cards is no longer feasible, a player obtains a written review of the auction from his/her screen-mate.
- Laws 25 through 32; Law 34; Laws 36 through 39 — For the infractions covered by these laws, the following procedures are used.
 - (i) Tray not passed: Before the tray is passed, the offender's screen-mate shall call attention to the infraction and summon the Director. The Director shall see that the infraction is rectified without penalty. These infringing calls may not be accepted.
 - (ii) Both sides at fault: When the infringing call is nonetheless passed across the screen, both sides being at fault (as when either player commits a bidding infraction and the proper player — North or South — moves the tray before rectification), both players on the other side of the screen are responsible for calling attention to the infraction and summoning the Director. The Director shall return the tray to the offending players for rectification of the irregularity without penalty. These infringing calls may not be accepted.
 - (iii) Only one side at fault: When a call is passed across the screen, both players on the other side of the screen are responsible for drawing attention to any infraction and summoning the Director. If (ii) above is not found to apply and, except as otherwise provided for under these regulations, a call placed and transferred to the other side of the screen is subject to the normal provisions of the laws.

- (iv) Irregularity not noticed: When the infringing call is passed across the screen, and neither player there draws attention to it, the tray eventually being returned to the side of the screen where the bidding irregularity was committed, the auction stands without penalty or rectification. However, in the case of an inadmissible call, Laws 36A, 37A and 38A still apply.
- (v) Information — authorised or not: Information from withdrawn calls is unauthorised for any partnerships at fault but authorised for a player or partnership that has committed no irregularity. If the Director determines that the unauthorised information from withdrawn calls precludes normal bidding, he/she shall award an artificial adjusted score.
- Law 33 — The subsequent call is cancelled without penalty.
 - Law 40 — Alerts. When an alertable call is made, the player alerts his/her screen-mate. When the tray is passed, both players should immediately alert their respective partner's alertable call.
 - Law 41A — Opening lead out of turn. The offender's screen-mate should attempt to prevent any opening lead out of turn. A faced-down lead out of turn is retracted without penalty. A faced opening lead out of turn is retracted without penalty if the screen has not been raised. When the screen has been raised after a faced opening lead out of turn — through no fault of the declaring side (a) and the other side has not yet led face up, the lead is considered to be out of turn and Law 54 applies; (b) and the other side has also led face up, the card becomes a major penalty card. When the declaring side has incorrectly opened the screen, the lead is accepted. The Director shall award an adjusted score if he/she considers that the player who opened the screen could have known that it would be to his/her advantage to accept the lead.
 - Law 73D — During the auction period, after an opponent has acted quickly, it is proper to adjust the tempo back to normal by either delaying one's own call (place the bidding card faced, in front of, but not on, the tray) or by waiting before passing the tray.
 - Law 76 — Spectators. Spectators may not sit so that they can see both sides of the screen.