

**Law 69 – Agreement of Claim or Concession**

The 2007 code became more lenient towards the agreeing side’s later discovery that it conceded a trick too readily/hastily, in other words, that the claiming side got a trick too easily. The definition of agreement is important.

Agreement exists when the non-claiming side has made a call on the next board. Until that occurs, they may analyse and discuss any detail of the claim. Once that point is past, the TD has to determine whether it is likely that the agreeing side would have won this trick had play continued. If so, they get it back.

	♠ -	
	♥ 8	
	♦ 6	
	♣	
♠ 8	W	♠ 7
♥ J	E	♥ -
♦ -		♦ 8
♣ -		♣ -
	♠ 96	
	♥ -	
	♦ -	
	♣ -	

South plays in a spade contract and when leading the ♥8 from dummy he claims the last 2 tricks without showing any card (he knows that West has the ♥J, and can’t overruff). East assumes that South has both the 9 and 8 of trumps, so everybody is happy and they play the next board.

Only after seeing the hand records does East discover that South made an invalid claim. The TD should rule that had play continued East would have ruffed and award a trick to E/W.

If declarer had actually shown his last two cards (which now is stated as correct procedure in Law 68C), then the TD should not be so generous to E/W. They should have figured out at the time that they could score a ruff, and the TD should not allow them to withdraw their agreement to this claim.

**Example 50:**

	♠ KQJ6	
	♥	
	♦	
	♣	
♠ 52	W	♠ A3
♥ 3	E	♥ 8
♦ 7		♦
♣ -		♣ 2
	♠ 7	
	♥ A	
	♦ A	
	♣ A	

South is declarer in a NT contract. He leads the ♠K from dummy and shows his three aces, claiming three tricks.

**Case 1:** Both defenders accept the claim. But if one of them discovers before their side makes a call on the next board that, by not playing the ♠A now they squeeze declarer, then Law 70A applies and the claim should be denied (unless declarer already knows that East has a diamond void).

**Case 2:** After that time, but within the correction period EW discover that the three tricks are not automatic. The TD should decide that they are too late to change the result. If East did not discover this play at the table it is probably correct to rule that EW would not have won extra tricks had play continued.