

## Claims

New Laws 68-71

Maurizio Di Sacco

Cyprus TD Training Series 2018

## Law 68

- Tidy up and clarification of Law 68 with 2007 footnote relating to the current trick now being included in the first paragraph of the law.
- **Declarer or Defender in 2017 were Contestants in 2007**
- **68B2** refers to a concession or claim
- **68C** "The player making the claim or concession faces his hand"

## Law 68D

- **Was titled Play Ceases (2007) but is now Suspension of Play**

D Suspension of Play

After any claim or concession, play is suspended.

1. If the claim or concession is agreed, Law 69 applies.

This is straightforward, it is clause 2 that will need careful attention from the players and the TD.

## 68D2

2. If it is doubted by any player (dummy included); either
  - (a) *the Director may immediately be summoned and no action should be taken pending his arrival, Law 70 applies; or*
  - **This is a substantial change from 2007 Law 68D - not agreed the Director must be summoned immediately.**
  - **The 2017 Laws go on to outline the circumstances under which play may continue.**

## 68D2

(b) *upon the request of the non-claiming or non-conceding side, play may continue subject to the following:*

(i) *all four players must concur; otherwise the Director is summoned, who then proceeds as in (a) above.*

- This means that when the non-claimers say "play on" and the claiming side agrees the claim or concession is simply ignored. Players will need to be educated as to the implications of playing on as the new law states:

(ii) *the prior claim or concession is void and not subject to adjudication. Laws 16 and 50 do not apply, and the score subsequently obtained shall stand.*

## 68D2

- The WBFLC has stressed an important concept:
  - For the Law to be applied the request to play on must have been initiated by the non-claiming side. This Law does not apply if, after the claim, the defenders look doubtful, and subsequently declarer suggests to play on.

## Implications of 68D2

- Players need to appreciate that if all 4 agree to play on there is no redress at the end of the hand
  - Law 16 does not apply
  - Any information obtained by the Claimer is authorised
- TDs may not offer the option to play on

## Law 69

- Clarification and tidy up of wording to give clear instructions

## Law 70

- 70E1 removed “unless failure to adopt that line of play would be irrational.” to simplify and clarify

## Law 71

- Unchanged except that clauses 1 & 2 are now A & B.

## Weighting claims

Minutes of the meeting of the WBF Laws Committee in Koningshof on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2011.

Present: J. Ortiz-Patiño Chairman Emeritus  
 T. Kooijman Chairman  
 G. Endicott Secretary  
 M. Bavin  
 M. Di Sacco  
 J. Gerard  
 A. Levy  
 J. Polakner  
 W. Schoder

9. The Committee considered it appropriate to extend a minute of its meeting of 4<sup>th</sup> September 2009 to read: “In no circumstances can the application of Law 69, 70 or 71, lead to a weighted score. The law requires that “such trick” shall be transferred or not transferred as determined by the Director’s ascertainment of facts. In determining the number of tricks in a claim or concession the Director does not assign an adjusted score. A restriction applies generally that weighting under Law 12C1(c) is applicable only where an assigned adjusted score is awarded under the laws.

## “Play on”

W N E S

4♠ 1♥ 2♥<sup>1</sup> 3♥<sup>2</sup>  
 P 4♥ 5♣ All Pass 6♥ X<sup>2</sup>

1 = Spades and clubs  
 2 = control

North plays 6♥. Lead Q♠ to A♠.  
 North draws 3 rounds of trumps, plays A♥ all follow.  
 North claims “Diamonds are good, you get one spade at the end”  
 West says “Play on!” and all agree to play on.  
 Now North draws the last trump and West calls the TD. “He obviously forgot about the trump and when I said ‘play on’ he realized that there was a trump outstanding and because of that he realized I had a trump. After the claim he is not allowed to draw trumps.”

Board 1  
 North Deals ♠ K 3  
 None Vul ♥ A K 9 6 4  
 ♦ A Q J 10 2  
 ♣ 8

♠ 8 7 5 ♠ A J 10 9 4  
 ♥ 10 8 5 3 ♥ 2  
 ♦ 9 8 ♦ 7 4  
 ♣ K 7 6 4 ♣ Q J 10 9 2

♠ Q 6 2  
 ♥ Q J 7  
 ♦ K 6 5 3  
 ♣ A 5 3

## “Play on”

Answer : L68D2b

All four players agreed to play on (note if there is a query it is best for the non-claiming side, as here, to suggest play on rather than for the claimer to do so, to avoid risk of the claimer “bullying” other players into continuing without them being aware of their rights.

**NB** Dummy has a right to dispute a defender’s claim as well.

Having agreed to play on, the original claim is void and the score obtained shall stand.  
 (IE if the claimer deduces that he may have forgotten a trump and proceeds accordingly, then there is no redress for the non-offending side subsequently).

## “We played on and...”

Contract: 5♦ from East

1)	♠A	♠6	♠8	♠5
2)	♠2	♠9	♠K	♠Q
3)	♥2	♥A	♥6	♥4
4)	♣7	♣2	♣Q	♣4
5)	♥K	♥3	♣8	♥10
6)	♥Q	♥8	♣9	♥5

♠ K J 8 7  
 ♥ J 9 8 3 2  
 ♦ J 9  
 ♣ 6 4

♠ 10 9 6  
 ♥ K Q 7 5 4  
 ♦ K 4 2  
 ♣ Q 5

N  
 E  
 S

♠ Q 5  
 ♥ A  
 ♦ A Q 10 7 3  
 ♣ A K 9 8 7

♠ A 4 3 2  
 ♥ 10 6  
 ♦ 8 6 5  
 ♣ J 10 3 2

After trick 3 declarer showed her cards, saying “I believe that the balance are mine”. North asked her to continue, and declarer played a small ♣ to the ♠Q, the ♥K and the ♥Q getting ruffed. Down one. The TD was called, and declarer told him “once I was requested to play on, I thought the trumps were not splitting”.

### "We played on and..."

It is likely had the play stopped and with no comparisons available, the declarer would have been awarded 11 tricks. However Law 68D2(b)2 specifically tells the TD to do nothing.

The score stands.

Prior to 2017 the ruling could have been the same but arrived at in a different way:  
 Since there were a lot of comparisons available - it was an Italian teams championship of low level with boards duplicated throughout the field of 90 teams - the TD checked all the other results and found out that no less than six declarers had gone down, and subsequent interviews confirmed that three of them had done so exactly in the same way. Evidently, in that board making a mistake was fairly possible, and this declarer looked like belonging to the ones who could have mistaken.

### I concede, or...

West plays 4♥

1)	♦2	♦6	♦A	♦10
2)	♦K	♥2	♦Q	♦7
3)	♥A	♥6	♥8	♥5
4)	♥3	♥7	♥J	♣3
5)	♠J	♠5	♠2	♠9
6)	♥K	♠5	♥4	♥10
7)	♠4	♠7	♠10	♠5

♠ A J 10 9 5  
 ♥ Q 10 7 6  
 ♦ Q 4 2  
 ♣ 9

N

♠ K 4  
 ♥ A 9 4 3 2  
 ♦ 10  
 ♣ A K 10 3 2

W

E

♠ Q 7 3 2  
 ♥ K J 8  
 ♦ 8 7 6  
 ♣ J 6 4

S

♠ 8 6  
 ♥ 5  
 ♦ A K J 9 5 3  
 ♣ Q 8 7 5

At this point, West showed his cards and North, after some thought, showed the ♥Q and the ♠A. At the end of the following board, NS called the TD and asked to withdraw their concession.

### "I concede, hmmm or..."

Answer: Law 69 states the time for withdrawing a concession or claim

The TD let the result stand, stating that even a multiple world champion can make an occasional mistake.

NS could indeed have defeated the contract: North should never ruff, and once on lead with the ♠A should first play ♥Q and then his ♦.

The AC upheld the TD's decision.

### "TD. We're ready for you now!"

6SX by South.

Trick	Lead	2nd	3rd	4th
1. W	♥10	3	6	Q
2. S	♠K	5	4	3
3. S	♠2	10	♠A	♦3
4. N	♠4	♦5	7	♠J

Board 4  
 West Deals  
 Both Vul

♠ A 8 6 4  
 ♥ J 3  
 ♦ 9 8  
 ♣ K Q J 10 3

N

W

E

S

♠ Q J 10 5  
 ♥ 10 9 8 7 5  
 ♦ J 4  
 ♣ 9 8

♠ 3  
 ♥ K 6 2  
 ♦ Q 7 6 5 3  
 ♣ 7 6 5 4

♠ K 9 7 2  
 ♥ A Q 4  
 ♦ A K 10 2  
 ♣ A 2

As West wins trick 4, declarer says "I win any return and draw the last trump, making six". The claim was immediately rejected, West pointing at his queen of spades. Eventually they entered the score as -1.

The Director was finally called during board 6, and the players explained that they had rejected the claim at the time the score was entered.

Now the defender's tell the TD that if the declarer claims playing trumps, then they will get to enjoy all their hearts tricks for minus 4 not minus 1.

### "TD. We're ready for you now!"

Answer: Law 79 > 69B

Despite the players lack of propriety in not calling the TD straight away, the non acceptance of the claim seems to have been made in time to consider it.

Had play continued - to achieve -4, West must continue a heart straight off, without pulling the last trump. This was not mentioned at the time so may not have been found.

However, you must give for granted that South, upon winning the heart switch, would have played a fourth round of trumps, since this was included in his original statement.

At the end, since cashing the fourth trump is almost automatic for many players, and West had not immediately spotted the right defense, we cannot say that was likely for EW to extract -4.

TD ruling: 6Sx minus 1

Board 4  
 West Deals  
 Both Vul

♠ A 8 6 4  
 ♥ J 3  
 ♦ 9 8  
 ♣ K Q J 10 3

N

W

E

S

♠ Q J 10 5  
 ♥ 10 9 8 7 5  
 ♦ J 4  
 ♣ 9 8

♠ 3  
 ♥ K 6 2  
 ♦ Q 7 6 5 3  
 ♣ 7 6 5 4

♠ K 9 7 2  
 ♥ A Q 4  
 ♦ A K 10 2  
 ♣ A 2

### "Evil spades give me another"

6♣X by South

At trick three, declarer showed his cards and conceded two trump tricks for one down.

Nothing further was said, but the TD was called. West told the TD that with the evil spade distribution he might get another trick.

TD decision?

6♣x

Trick

1. S

2. N

North Deals  
 None Vul

♠ Q 9  
 ♥ 7 6 3  
 ♦ A 10 8 6 2  
 ♣ 9 8 6

N

W

E

S

♠ 10 7 4 3 2  
 ♥ A 10 8 2  
 ♦ 9  
 ♣ K J 2

♠ 6  
 ♥ K Q J 9 5 4  
 ♦ K J 7 5 4 3  
 ♣ —

♠ A K J 8 5  
 ♥ —  
 ♦ Q  
 ♣ A Q 10 7 5 4 3

Trick	Lead	2nd	3rd	4th
1. S	♦ Q	9	♠ A	3
2. N	♣ 6	♦ 4	♠ A	2

### “Evil spades give me another”

Answer: Law 79 & 70D1

Any doubtful point is resolved against the claimer.

Here you should award two down, because it is certainly possible that South overlooked the distribution and does not pay attention to notice the possible bad split of spades.

The claim that was made could suggest declarer has not considered that there might be more to the play of the hand and might well have played a trump if play had continued.

### “Oh actually three please”

W	N	E	S	♠ A102	N	♠ QJ
pass	INT	pass	2♣	♥ Q72		♥ J4
pass	2♦	X	4♥	♦ 75	W	♦ KQ1096
pass	pass	pass	pass	♣ J10965	E	♣ 7432
♠ 7	♠ A	♠ 8	♠ 9		S	
♠ A	♠ 2	♠ 8	♠ 5			
♠ K	♠ 3	♠ 3	♠ 6			
♠ O	♠ 4	♠ 5	♠ 9			
♠ 4	♠ O	♠ K	♠ A			
♠ 5	♠ 2	♠ 10	♠ 3			
♥ A	♥ 2	♥ 5	♥ 4			
♥ K	♥ 7	♥ 9	♥ J			

The facts: In the ninth trick South was on lead and West said: “Will we score a spade and a heart?” South confirmed showing his cards and at that point the defenders noticed that he had to lose a further spade.

### “Oh actually three please”

Answer: Law 70D1

Any doubtful point is resolved against the claimer.

**TD's ruling:** Three tricks to declarer.

**Reasons of the TD's ruling:** The defender had not foreseen the possibility to score two spade tricks. West's question is a claim. The subsequent claim of a further spade is an attempt to cancel the concession of a trick. The TD decided that the defense may lose the spade trick: when South plays a spade, West may play his 10. East-West appealed, stating that playing the spade 10 would be irrational. The AC upheld the TD's decision. A player who expects to win only two tricks, may carelessly play the 10 to prevent an overtrick.

### Board 8

West	North	East	South	♠ 10 5 3	N	♠ 9 7
1♦ <sup>(1)</sup>	1♠	2♣ <sup>(2)</sup>	X <sup>(3)</sup>	♥ 5		♥ A 8 4 3
3♦	3♠	4♦	all pass	♦ K Q J 10 9	W	♦ A 7 4 3
				♣ A J 9 4	E	♣ 7 6 5
					S	

(1) 3+ cards  
(2) Shows ♦  
(3) Explained as "I think he has ♠"

1)	♠ K	♠ 7	♠ A	♠ 3	♠ K Q J 8 6 4	♠ 9 7
2)	♠ 2	♠ 5	♠ J	♠ 9	♥ Q 7 6 2	♥ A 8 4 3
3)	♠ K	♠ 5	♠ 8	♠ A	♦ 5	♦ A 7 4 3
4)	♦ K	♦ 5	♦ 3	♦ 2	♣ K 3	♣ 7 6 5
5)	♦ Q	♦ 4	♦ 4	♦ 6		
6)	♦ J	♦ 6	♦ A	♦ 8		
7)	♠ 6	♠ Q				

Table result: 4♦ making from West, NS -130

The facts: At trick 7, as soon as South played the ♠Q, declarer put down his cards, saying "I'm ruffing a spade". After a pause declarer said "OK I'll keep playing", but the opponents questioned that. At that point declarer added "after the spade ruff, I'm finessing the ♠9".

### Board 8

Answer: Law 70E1

Any doubtful point is resolved against the claimer.

**TD's ruling:** The club finesse was not mentioned in the original statement. It would be careless not to finesse but not irrational. 4♦ -1

East-West appealed

The AC upheld the TD's ruling.

North plays 3NT.

1)	♠ 3	♠ 7	♠ J	♠ K	♠ A K Q 6	♠ 10 8 4 3 2
2)	♠ J	♠ 5	♠ 8	♠ Q	♥ A Q 9 8	♥ 7 6
3)	♠ 5	♠ A	♠ 2	♠ 9	♦ 7 6	♦ J 10 9 4
4)	♠ 2	♠ 3	♠ 9	♠ A	♣ J 6 2	♣ 5 3
5)	♥ J	♥ Q	♥ 7	♥ 2		
6)	♠ 6	♠ 4	♠ 10	♠ 4		
7)	♥ 3	♥ 10	♥ A	♥ 6		
8)	♥ 9	♥ 8	♥ 5	♥ K		
9)	♠ 7	♠ 6	♠ 10	♠ K		
10)	♦ 3	♦ Q	♦ 7	♦ 10		

At this point West conceded the remaining tricks and East objected. West played the ♥2 and the contract went down one.

The TD was called.

**Answer: Law 68B1 & 16C**

Even with the UI, the TD thought that playing a ♥ did not represent a logical alternative for West and he let East score a ♦. The strongest argument for this reasoning is West's defence on the ninth trick, which shows the intention of not allowing North to cash his ♥ winner. On the other hand one might assume that West is not paying attention anymore.

The case was brought to the AC, who upheld the TD's decision. However one member, Richard Colker, wrote a dissenting opinion on the ground just mentioned. In synthesis, his opinion was that once West has conceded, any losing alternative is logical.

### Malmö 2004, European Teams

The French player Palau was playing 4♥ against Lauria –Versace. After declarer had already lost three tricks, West was on lead in the above ending. At that point Palau, having lost the count of the diamonds and thinking that the ♠10 would be good after cashing the Q, claimed the balance, and the Italians accepted. During the play of the next board, Lauria realised that if Versace had played a club declarer would have been stuck in dummy and with the ♥J not falling, the Frenchman did not have ten tricks.

♠	K 3 2	N	♠ 10 8 4
♥	—	W	♥ —
♦	—	E	♦ J 6
♣	10 9	S	♣ —

  

♠	A Q 7		
♥	—		
♦	Q		
♣	Q		

  

♠	J 9		
♥	9		
♦	10 5		
♣	—		

### Malmö 2004

However that was not necessarily so. If Versace plays a club his partner is squeezed! If East throws a diamond the Jack will fall, and if pitches a spade declarer can ruff in hand and run the ♠.

Nowadays, since winning all the tricks is extremely unlikely, declarer would have gone down, as he would even in 2004 if the Italians had called the TD in time.

However in those times the Law was different, and once Versace was given a not irrational play (a club and not a spade), the only condition for declarer to make all the tricks was merely for it to be possible. And possible it was. Nevertheless, even though there was no way to touch the Italian's score, it looked unfair to award France a contract that would never have made. The Law, indeed, mentioned the non-offending side only, and was silent about the offenders, therefore the TDs decided for a split score.

### Just the Ace

Contract: 4♣ by South

Declarer, who is on lead, puts down his cards, saying: "I concede the ♣A". There is no ♣A among the cards to be played, but it is still in declarer's mind.

TD please.

**Law: 70 A & 70D**

**TD Ruling:** Declarer will play a ♣ to the K (Q) for sure, but it will not necessarily be followed by the Q (K), since South thinks that, no matter what he plays, it will be caught by the ♣A.

One trick to the defenders.

♠	—	N	♠ —
♥	9 8	W	♥ Q
♦	10	E	♦ J
♣	3 2	S	♣ J 6 5

  

♠	Q 9 4		
♥	—		
♦	—		
♣	4 2		

In a spade contract: South shows his cards conceding the ♠10.

♠ 4	N	♠ —
♥ 6 2	W	♥ 10 8
♦ 10 8	E	♦ 7 2
♣ 10	S	♣ 7 6

**TD Ruling: Law 70C3**  
A classic: South will play his winners, and West will get a heart ruff. Sometimes the solution is as easy as to be contained in the claimer's statement, some other time, especially when there is an outstanding trump, the TD should dig deeper to get a clue.

♠ 9		
♥ K Q 4		
♦ Q 4		
♣ —		

In a spade contract: South: "All mine but the ♠10"

TD please.

**TD Ruling: NOT Law 70C3**  
Apparently the situation is the same as before, but here there is no way for the declarer to lose a trick.

♠ 4	N	♠ —
♥ 9 6 2	W	♥ 10 8
♦ 10 8	E	♦ 7 2
♣ —	S	♣ 7 6

  

♠ 9		
♥ K Q 4		
♦ Q 4		
♣ —		