

Notes on Jan Peach's Presentation QBA Director Training Day 2026

Laws 9 & 10

Directors tend not say enough when handling a rectification.

10C1: When these Laws provide an option after an irregularity, the Director *shall explain all the options* available.

84C: If a Law gives a player a choice of rectification the Director *explains the options* and sees that the choice is made and implemented.

Instead of saying, "You can accept that if you like," state what will happen (a) if the infraction is accepted and (b) if the infraction is not accepted.

Instead of saying, "This is a penalty card," say "This is a penalty card to be played at the first legal opportunity. Should it still be on the table when partner is to lead then declarer will have the option of lead restrictions."

A player needing to make a choice from among a number of options needs to be able to make an informed choice.

Faced leads out of turn, insufficient bids and calls out of rotation for example require a lot of detail. If your message isn't getting across then it is time to practise your patter.

Players may be well aware of their rights and know what option they will choose long before the Director arrives at the table. If they indicate that they don't need to hear the ruling then that is fine. Consider marking the fact so that there may be no later claim that a full explanation was not given.

Other players at the table are still entitled to know what's going on so an explanation, even if brief, may still be necessary.

Consider the skills required to gather the facts in an orderly process: allowing one person at a time to speak, checking that facts are agreed (or not).

Many Laws touch on the fact that only the Director makes rulings:

- Law 9B1(a) The Director should be summoned at once when attention is drawn to an irregularity.
- Law 9B2 No player shall take any action until the Director has explained all matters in regard to rectification.
- Law 9C Any premature correction of an irregularity by the offender may subject him to a further rectification (see the lead restrictions in Law 26B).
- Law 10A The Director alone has the right to determine rectifications when applicable. Players do not have the right to determine (or waive – see Law 81C5) rectifications on their own initiative.
- Law 10B The Director may allow or cancel any enforcement or waiver of a rectification made by the players without his instructions.

The Director will often arrive to find a penalty card sitting on the table, perhaps from several tricks earlier. Question as to how the card reached the table to determine its type and whether play has been as it would have been had the Director been called at the time.

If players have made their own ruling it is usual to allow the ruling if it is correct.

Asking for rectifications to be waived should be for cause and not because players want to be nice or kind. Perhaps a player felt he contributed to the infraction by distracting the opponent with a comment.

Take time to check whether the Law found is qualified or cross-referenced. “Unless prohibited by Law” or “but see Law XYZ” may preclude its application for the current infraction.

In some situations, the absence of a cross reference does not mean that another law does not have relevance.

Dummy’s qualified rights are reduced should he have exchanged hands with declarer or looked at an opponent’s or declarer’s hand. Law 43B

During the play period, declarer or either defender may draw attention to an irregularity but there are qualifications. A player wishing to draw attention to a quitted trick pointed the wrong way must do so before his side leads or plays to the following trick. Law 65B3

Should dummy have been the first to draw attention to an infraction, and provided that he has not lost his qualified rights, the Director would still apply rectification because Law 81B3 requires the Director to rectify an error or irregularity of which he becomes aware in any manner, within the periods established in accordance with Laws 79C and 92B.

Avoid justifying or discussing your ruling at the table. Be more than happy to talk about it later but make your ruling and move away from the table unless there is a rectification to supervise.

Appeals may stem simply from the way a judgement ruling is delivered. I am not averse to mentioning, as part of my ruling, that I have polled and consulted. This may settle a player who disagrees with the ruling. No details of course. No discussion. Move away.

Having said that, experienced players can be a great help to the newer Director and friendly words of advice are best not ignored. Get the ruling right the first time.

Law 26B

It is possible for declarer to forbid the lead of a suit that had no connection to the withdrawn call.

N	E	S	W
	~~P~~	1C	P
1D	1H	2C	PPP

East has called out of turn, not accepted. West is to lead so there are lead restrictions. The meaning of 1H is not comparable to East’s withdrawn pass. Declarer may forbid the lead of a club, diamond or spade for as long as West retains the lead at this time.

Law 27

Any insufficient bid may be accepted so take a few seconds on arrival at the table to make sure it has not already been accepted. Similarly for a claim of unintended call. Don’t rush in. Make sure partner has not called.

Note the distinction within 27B1:

27B1(a): if the insufficient bid is corrected by the lowest sufficient bid which *specifies* the same denomination(s) as that *specified* by the withdrawn call, the auction proceeds without further rectification. Laws 26B and 16C do not apply but see D following.

27B1(b) except as in (a), if the insufficient bid is corrected with a comparable call (see Law 23A) the auction proceeds without further rectification. Law 16C does not apply but see D following.

Going to 23A we find:

23A A call that replaces a withdrawn call is a comparable call, if it:

1. has the same or similar meaning as that *attributable* to the withdrawn call, or
2. defines a subset of the possible meanings *attributable* to the withdrawn call, or
3. has the same purpose (e.g. an asking bid or a relay) as that *attributable* to the withdrawn call.

To apply Law 27B1(a) the Director does need to find out what denomination(s) was/were being specified by the insufficient bid. Remember, specifying something about a suit is not just showing length in that suit. Shortages may be specified and stoppers may be specified.

Most commonly, an insufficient bid at low levels will be specifying length.

Strictly speaking, to apply Law 27B1(a), the Director does not need to find out the *intended* meaning. A meaning needs to be *attributed*. Almost always, the attributed meaning will be the intended meaning.

Unauthorised Information does not apply after a 27B1 correction of an insufficient bid. Especially after an insufficient bid has been corrected using the lowest sufficient bid available in the system to specify the same denomination, it is important to explain to the partner that he is entitled to know that the replacement bid may not match the system and that UI does not apply but that Law 27D might.

Despite a correct ruling, it is possible that the offending side gets a better score than the one they would have obtained in a normal auction, just because there was an insufficient bid. 27D is used to fix that. 27D and 23C have nothing about UI because there is none. 27D and 23C are the used to correct a Director Error.

More than one revoke by the same player in the same suit

There is no Law 64B Automatic Trick Adjustment for a subsequent revoke in the same suit by the same player, the first revoke having been established

However, 64C2(a) says that after repeated revokes by the *same player* in the *same suit* (see B2 above), the Director adjusts the score if the non-offending side would likely have made more tricks had one or more of the subsequent revokes not occurred.

To do this, the Director determines the number of tricks likely immediately before each subsequent revoke. Don't forget to carry forward the automatic trick adjustment for the first revoke.

Epidemic of players sending one of their number from the table

Only the Director may send a player from the table so that his partner may explain the partnership agreement for his own call and only in the exact situation that the player knows there is an agreement but has forgotten it. Partner gives the agreement, not say what his hand holds.

Sending a player away may *not* be done to confirm an explanation is correct or when the player says there is no agreement.

The Director might ask questions to be sure whether there is no agreement or whether it has been forgotten. Should the attention lead the player to realise his explanation was wrong, he must now give the correct information, while continuing to call and play according to his first mistaken explanation.