CONTENTS

CONTENTS 1
APPEAL No 1: Did he or didn't he? 2
APPEAL No 2: It's not for takeout? 4
APPEAL No 3: Weak and Defenceless 8
APPEAL No 4: Imprecision club 10
APPEAL No 5: I was confused 12
APPEAL No 6: Fielded misbid? 14
APPEAL No 7: Another misbid? 16
APPEAL No 8: Would he pass? 18
APPEAL No 9: Who has the diamonds? 20
APPEAL No 10: An improving five-count 22
APPEAL No 11: Lucas or Weak? 24
APPEAL No 12: My spade holding is a bit poor 26
APPEAL No 13: Unauthorised Panic 28
APPEAL No 14: Six, what six? 30
APPEAL No 15: How weak is intermediate? 32
APPEAL No 16: Can I protect? 34
APPEAL No 17: Slow signoff 36
APPEAL No 18: Is pass forcing? 38
APPEAL No 19: Hesitation or not? 40
APPEAL No 20: Not a skip bid 42
APPEAL No 21: Transfer advances 44
APPEAL No 22: 'I thought it was routine' 46
APPEAL No 23: 'Can I overtake?' 48
APPEAL No 24: The king? 50
APPEAL No 25: An unexplained double 52
APPEAL No 26: Tolerance for spades 54
APPEAL No 27: Probably natural 56
APPEAL No 28: 'The Laws require an adjustment …' 58
General comments 60

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 1: Did he or didn't he?

08.002 Swiss Teams Congress

Tournament Director:
John Pyner

Appeals Committee:
Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), David Burn, Richard Bowdery

IMPs to VPs Board no 13 Dealer N Both vulnerable	♠ Q 9 ♥ A 7 ♦ A 8 7 6 3 ♣ A K 7 3	
♠ K J 10 8 4 2 ♥ J 3 ♦ Q 2 ♣ Q 6 4	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ 7 6 3 ♥ Q 10 9 8 5 2 ♦ 10 5 ♣ 9 8
	♠ A 5 ♥ K 6 4 ♦ K J 9 4 ♣ J 10 5 2	

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
	1♦	pass	2♣
pass	3♥	pass	3♠(A)
dble	5♣	pass	6♦
All pass			

Play	Lead	W	N	E	S
Tr1	E	♠8	♠9	♠6	♠A
Tr2	S	♣4	♣3	♣9	♣J
Tr3	S	♦2	♦A	♦5	♦4
Tr4	N	♦Q	♦3	♦10	♦J

Result at table:
6♦ - 1 by North. Lead ♠6

Director first called:
After trick 4

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's statement of facts:
North stated that East had hesitated before playing ♦10, an allegation strongly denied by East, who said he had played in his normal tempo, which he attempted to demonstrate. South said East's alleged hesitation had deflected him from his intended line. He always plays for the drop with a combined holding of 9 cards unless there is reason to do otherwise. Later the TD observed East's tempo from a distance and would describe it as measured and steady.

Director's ruling:
Table result stands

Details of ruling:
An observation of East's tempo leads the TD to conclude that no hesitation has occurred and that in any case, whatever rate the ♦10 is played declarer draws any conclusions at his own risk.

Appeal lodged by:
North-South

Basis of appeal:
East's alleged hesitation

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
The TD found by observation that East played consistently and steadily and that there was not a hesitation. Nothing we heard persuaded us otherwise. In any event we considered that even if a hesitation had occurred it was not reasonable to draw the conclusion that it was from Q 10 x.

We thought this appeal was quite close to a retention of the deposit.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 2: It's not for takeout?

08.003 Swiss Teams Congress

Tournament Director:
Barrie Partridge

Appeals Committee:
Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), David Burn, Richard Bowdery

IMPs to VPs Board no 9 Dealer N EW vulnerable	♠ Q 10 8 5 ♥ 2 ♦ A Q 7 3 ♣ K Q 8 7	
♠ K 9 4 ♥ J 10 9 5 ♦ 9 6 4 ♣ 10 9 2	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ J 6 ♥ A Q 7 6 ♦ K J 10 5 2 ♣ J 5
	♠ A 7 3 2 ♥ K 8 4 3 ♦ 8 ♣ A 6 4 3	

Basic systems:
North-South play Strong club, Precision style
East-West play SAYC

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
	1♦(A1)	Pass Dble (2)	 Redble
pass	pass 1NT (3)	pass (3) pass	 pass
pass			

(1) Precision style with 2+ diamonds
(2) E passed before 1♦ was alerted. The players decided amongst themselves to allow a change of call by E. double was for penalties, not alerted.
(3) See TD statement of facts.

Result at table:
1NT + 2 by North, NS +150

Director first called:
At point (3) in the auction.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's statement of facts:
EW had a clear agreement that the double of 1♦ was for penalties but were unaware that it was alertable. This is an area found confusing by some players and EW play more frequently in France. OB 5H2 states that tolerance should be applied although adjustments may be necessary when the opponents have been damaged.

First though it was possible under L21B for N to change his final call but it was not possible for S to do so. N changed his call to 1NT and, as shown, this was passed out. This made 9 tricks. I was called back and S claimed that despite N having been allowed to change his pass, their side were still damaged as, with correct information, S would not have redoubled but bid 1♥, whereupon N would bid 1♠ and they would reach the making spade game. A ruling under L21B3 was thus requested.

Note by editor:
OB 5H2:

> *For a year from the effective date of this Orange Book a certain amount of latitude should be shown to players while they get used to the new alerting and announcing rules. Penalties should only be given to repeat offenders who make no effort whatever to follow the new rules. Adjustments may be necessary where the opponents have been damaged, but 5 H 1 should be remembered.*

Director's ruling:
Table result stands

Details of ruling:
The TD consulted with colleagues and they considered that South, with her holding, should be aware of the likely meaning of the double and had the opportunity to ask without putting her side's interest at risk. The TD ruled the result to stand. (L21B1 and 3, 21 and 9B1 (see below). Also OB 5H1 and 2 refers.

Note by editor:
OB 5H1:

> *A player's claim to have been damaged because the opponents failed to alert or announce a call will fail if it is judged that the player was aware of its likely meaning and if he had the opportunity to ask without putting his side's interests at risk.*

Appeal lodged by:
East-West

Basis of appeal:
Misinformation. Would reach 4♠

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's comments:
In addition to taking account of OB 5H1, the TD and his colleagues considered the effect of not taking such account, but concluded that if South had known that the double was for penalties, then in view of the actual bidding decisions made, the probability of N/S reaching a spade game contract was too low to consider a ruling under L12C3. North's action in bidding 1NT is odd. 1♠ seems a much more normal action and they consider 1NT to be wild or gambling.

The TD also learned that at the table, East passed before the 1♦ was alerted. The players decided amongst themselves to allow a change of call by East. Law 21 states 'until the end of the auction, a player may, without penalty, change a call when it is probable he made the call as a result of misinformation given to him by an opponent (failure to alert promptly….)'

However Law 9B1 states 'the director must be summoned at once when attention is drawn to an irregularity'.

Players cannot make changes of call under Law 21 without the TD. The TD needs to establish the probability that the original call has been made as a result of misinformation. This would certainly have made it clear that the change was because 1♦ doubled becomes penalty when 1♦ was alerted.

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Appeals Committee's comments:
The failure of NS to get to 4♠ was not a result of misinformation but the choice of N to bid 1NT. When he changed his call to 1NT he had the info (authorised) that S had a real (9+) redouble and it was his choice that led to the problem.
NB we did not agree that 1NT was wild or gambling (TD's additional notes) but we did think it inferior.

Both sides should be reminded of their responsibilities to call the TD in the event of an infraction. EW should also have alerted the double of 1♦ if it were agreed to be penalty. (W apologised at the appeal for his failure to do so). Their agreement if as stated should be on the card.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 3: Weak and Defenceless

08.004 Swiss Teams Congress

Tournament Director:
Barrie Partridge

Appeals Committee:
Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), David Burn, Richard Bowdery

IMPs to VPs Board no 21 Dealer N NS vulnerable	♠ 9 7 4 3 ♥ A J 9 8 7 5 2 ♦ K ♣ 9	
♠ A 8 ♥ 4 3 ♦ A 9 6 4 2 ♣ Q 6 5 2	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ Q 10 5 2 ♥ none ♦ Q J 10 5 ♣ K J 8 4 3
	♠ K J 6 ♥ K Q 10 6 ♦ 8 7 3 ♣ A 10 7	

Basic systems:
North-South play Acol + 3 weak 2s
East-West play Acol

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
	1♥	dble	2NT(A1)
3♦	3♥	pass	4♥
Dble (H2)	Pass	5♦	All pass

(4) At least a raise to 3♥ without the double
(5) Slow double. Convention card shows that this double shows values.

Result at table:
5♦x ü by West, NS –550

Director first called:
At end of hand

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's statement of facts:
Although the TD was not called until the end of the hand, it had amicably been agreed between the players that there had been a very significant hesitation by W before the double of 4♥. The TD was asked for a ruling concerning E's 5♦ bid. E stated that he had very little defensive strength for his bidding to date and also that W's double showed values and was not described as a penalty double.

Director's ruling:
Score assigned for both sides:

4♥x ü by North, NS +790

Details of ruling:
L12C2 and 3, 16A.

Appeal lodged by:
East-West

Basis of appeal:
EW do not agree that pass is a LA.

Director's comments:
The TD consulted with colleagues and they felt it clear that passing with the E hand was just as much of a LA with the value-showing double as it would have been following a penalty double.

Appeals Committee decision:
Table score re-instated
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
W did not double 2NT.
E had a sub minimum with little defence and good diamonds. We thought it a clear action to pull 4♥x.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 4: Imprecision club

08.010 Spring Congress Swiss Teams

Tournament Director:
Ian Muir

Appeals Committee:
Ted Reveley (Chairman), Richard Pike, Bill Townsend

IMPs to VPs Board no 28 Dealer W NS vulnerable	♠ 10 ♥ 10 5 3 ♦ Q 9 6 4 ♣ J 10 8 7 2	
♠ 9 8 6 5 4 3 ♥ K Q J 7 6 2 ♦ none ♣ 3	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ A ♥ A 9 4 ♦ 10 8 7 5 3 2 ♣ 6 5 4
	♠ K Q J 7 2 ♥ 8 ♦ A K J ♣ A K Q 9	

Basic systems:
East-West play imprecision diamond and some Acol, 5-CM, weak NT

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
pass	pass	1♦(A)	Dble (1)
2♣(2)	pass	2♦(A)	Dble (3)
4♥	pass	pass	4♠
dble	All pass		

(6) S asked W about 1♦. Reply 12-17, no 5-CM, not weak NT
(7) Not alerted. 2♣ shows 8-11, mild game try, 5-CM
(8) S asked W about 2♦. Reply no 4-CM

Result at table:
4♠x – 5 by South, NS –1400, lead ♥K

Director first called:
At end of hand

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's statement of facts:
The TD was called at the end of play and asked by S to record the psyche. W stated that there had been no psyche and the TD asked S to repeat the auction including any alerts or questions. It became known that the conventional 2♣ bid had not been alerted. S claimed that he is damaged by this misinformation and would not bid 4♠ had he been alerted to the artificial 2♣.

Director's ruling:
Score assigned for both sides:

4♥x - 1 by West, NS +100

Details of ruling:
Too late to change a call. (L21B3)
Directors option to award adjusted score (40C)
Assigned score awarded ' most unfavourable' for the offending side. (12C2)

Appeal lodged by:
East-West

Facts under dispute:
That 4♥x is defeated; that W's 2♣ could be natural.

Director's comments:
2♣ shows 8 to 11 and is a mild game try with a 5- CM.

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
Don't keep money as on some defences 4♥ might make. However we agree in general with TD ruling. It should be made clear that if using a complex system, it is incumbent on the players to ensure the opponents know the full meaning.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 5: I was confused

08.011 Spring Congress

Tournament Director:
Ian Spoors

Appeals Committee:
David Burgess (Chairman), Ted Reveley, Clive Owen

MPs to VPs Board no 10 Dealer E All vulnerable	♠ K J 8 7 6 5 ♥ K Q J 3 ♦ none ♣ 7 6 5	
♠ 4 3 2 ♥ 7 6 ♦ J 8 7 5 3 ♣ A J 10	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ 10 9 ♥ 10 9 5 4 ♦ A K Q 6 4 ♣ 4 3
	♠ A Q ♥ A 8 2 ♦ 10 9 2 ♣ K Q 9 8 2	

Basic systems:
North-South play Acol
East-West play Acol

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
		Pass	1♣
pass	1♠	pass	1NT
pass	2♣	pass	2♦
pass	3♥	pass	4♣
pass	4♠	All pass	

Order of play

1. ♦K ruffed
2. ♠A
3. ♠Q
4. Heart to ♥J
5. ♠K
6. Club to K and A
7. Diamond ruffed
8. Heart to ace
9. ♣x ♣10 ♥Q ♣x
10. ♦5 led

Result at table:
4♠ + 1 by North, NS +450, lead ♦K

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director first called:
At trick 10

Director's statement of facts:
The TD was called to the table by W. Apart from dummy, E's ♦5 and N's ♥Q were visible.

West explained that declarer thought it was his lead and EW disagreed and asked the TD to determine whose lead it was. The TD looked at 2 now quitted tricks and asked what the contract was and where the lead had been. The TD was told 4♠ and dummy had led a club. E had won this trick and The TD ruled that it was her lead. The TD was recalled at the end of the hand when declarer was shown to have clubs in her hand.

The TD read L45D to the players and asked whether it applied. E, W and S agreed that attention was not drawn until the end of the hand. N was still trying to work out what had happened.

Director's ruling:
Score assigned for both sides:
4♠ü by North, NS +420

Note by editor:
The TD ruled that declarer had called for a heart on the trick that he revoked, so dummy had misplayed a card. The TD ruled that attention was not drawn to the possibility of dummy's error until the end of the hand, therefore the revoke laws apply. (L45D and L64A2)

Appeal lodged by:
North-South

Basis of appeal:
'I did not revoke'.

Was attention drawn before both sides had played to the next trick?

Director's comments:
If a revoke has occurred, but is not yet established, the TD felt it was his duty to do nothing to help declarer realise his error. The TD did not instruct the table to play on but left after ruling that it was E to lead. The TD suggested that the basis of appeal was about his finding of fact but North denies this.

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
N may (as he claimed) have called for a heart. He ought to have observed that dummy had too many hearts and not enough clubs. He did not correct dummy's play. He did revoke.

The committee felt that N seemed very confused. We felt soft-hearted and returned the deposit.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 6: Fielded misbid?

08.012 Spring Congress

Tournament Director:
Ian Muir

Appeals Committee:
Jason Hackett (Chairman), Michael Byrne, Jon WIlliams

MP to VPs Board no 7 Dealer S All vulnerable	♠ Q J 4 2 ♥ 9 6 5 ♦ K 8 2 ♣ A Q	
♠ A 10 9 ♥ none ♦ A 7 6 4 3 ♣ K J 8 6 5	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ K 8 7 ♥ A K J 8 7 ♦ Q J ♣ 7 4 2
	♠ 5 3 ♥ Q 10 4 3 2 ♦ 10 9 5 ♣ 10 9 3	

Basic systems:
East-West play splinter bids over all openers.

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
			Pass
1♦	Pass	3♥	Dble(1)
4♣	4♥	Dble	All pass

(9) S asked W the meaning of 3♥. After some questioning W alerted the 3♥ bid and explained it as a splinter showing a singleton or void.

Result at table:
4♥x - 4 by North, lead ♦Q

Director first called:
At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:
The TD was first called at the end of the play and informed of the auction. The EW convention card confirms that 1♦ 3♥ is a splinter bid, so there is no infraction. TD returned to the table to give his ruling and was asked by NS whether this was supported by W's subsequent pass of the double. TD retired for further consideration to this aspect of the auction.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's ruling:
Artificial score awarded:
Average plus to N/S, 30% to E/W

Details of ruling:
W's failure to bid on over his partner's double of 4♥ indicates to me that he believes his partner to hold values/length in hearts. The TD classified this as a RED fielded misbid.

Note by editor:
According to regulation, a Red Misbid is scored as Ave +/Ave –.

Appeal lodged by:
East-West

Director's comments:
If E has the values for a splinter bid and a penalty double of 4♥, the TD feels that EW should bid on to game or possibly slam. Failure to do so implies that W thinks E now has hearts although the bidding does not support this. EW agree that they do splinter with a singleton ace.

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
The Orange Book clearly states that a fielded misbid falls into the same category as a fielded psyche. Thus there are no grounds for the committee to adjust the score.

The committee strongly considered, in what was a black and white case, retaining the deposit. There are no grounds whatsoever for standing the double opposite a singleton or void heart often leading to defending a cold game with slam possible in diamonds. However the inexperience of the E player, and our being led to believe this to be his first ever appeal, committee just decided to return the deposit.

L&EC Secretary's comments:
East is unranked.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 7: Another misbid?

08.013 Spring Congress

Tournament Director:
Phil Godfrey

Appeals Committee:
Ted Reveley (Chairman), Paul Lamford, Clive Owen

MP to VPs Board no 14 Dealer E None vulnerable	♠ J 10 9 6 3 2 ♥ K 10 8 6 5 2 ♦ 10 ♣ none	
♠ A 8 4 ♥ 9 7 3 ♦ A 6 4 3 ♣ 10 7 2	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ K ♥ J ♦ K Q 8 5 ♣ Q J 9 6 5 4 3
	♠ Q 7 5 ♥ A Q 4 ♦ J 9 7 2 ♣ A K 8	

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
		1♣	1NT
2♣(A1)	2♠	3♣	Pass(2)
pass	3♥	pass	3♠
All pass			

(10) 'the majors', subsequently 5-4
(11) S asked about the alert before call

Result at table:
3♠ + 1 making by North

Director first called:
At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:
N called to state that explanation of 2♣ did not fit the contents of the hand. She would have bid 4♠ if she thought it was intended as club support. This treatment is now on the convention card.

Director's ruling:
Table result stands

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Details of ruling:
The TD was satisfied that East's explanation was correct and W had misbid. No damage.

Note by editor:
Regulations require misbids to be categorised based on the possibility of partner fielding them.

Appeal lodged by:
North-South

Director's comments:
Although this method was not specifically on the card this is such an unusual treatment of the 2♣, it would be difficult to give such an explanation if they were not playing it.

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
The TD decision was a misbid although the explanation did not appear on the card. Whilst we agree with misbid we feel that as the convention was not on the card NS have a reasonable case to make and the deposit is therefore returned.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 8: Would he pass?

08.014 Spring Congress

Tournament Director:
Phil Godfrey

Appeals Committee:
Jeff Smith (Chairman), Richard Winter, Catherine Draper

MP Pairs Board no 5 Dealer N NS vulnerable	♠ 6 ♥ K 4 ♦ K Q J 8 ♣ A K J 5 3 2	
♠ A 10 5 ♥ A 2 ♦ 9 7 5 4 3 2 ♣ Q 7	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ K Q 9 8 7 ♥ 10 8 7 5 ♦ 10 ♣ 10 6 4
	♠ J 4 3 2 ♥ Q J 9 6 3 ♦ A 6 ♣ 9 8	

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
	1♣	pass	1♥
2♦	Dble (1)	All pass	

(12) After opening lead double was explained as 'extra values' with diamonds. Not alerted.

Result at table:
2♦x - 2 by West, NS +300

Director first called:
At opening lead

Director's statement of facts:
S had not alerted the 'non-take out' double as per OB 5E2(a). E claimed that if she had known it was penalty orientated she would have bid 2♠.

Director's ruling:
Score assigned for both sides:

2♠ - 1 by East, NS +50

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Details of ruling:
EW damaged by failure to alert. E should be allowed to bid 2♠ as rescue. N has already shown a good hand with ♣ and ♦ and hand is probably a misfit so may pass this out. (L12C2)

Appeal lodged by:
North-South

Basis of appeal:
N would bid 3♣

Director's comments:
Although several players would bid 3♣ over 2♠, any doubtful points should be resolved in favour of the non-offending side hence the score of 2♠ - 1.

Appeals Committee decision:
Table score re-instated
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
With the correct explanation, we don't believe that E would have pulled to 2♠. Thus we are reverting back to the table score. (It is a little surprising that S passed 2♦x).

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 9: Who has the diamonds?

08.015 Spring Congress

Tournament Director:
Rob Turner

Appeals Committee:
Jon Williams (Chairman), Bill Niccol, Andrew Petrie

IMPs to VPs Board no 27 Dealer S EW vulnerable	♠ Q 5 4 3 ♥ 6 ♦ A K 10 4 ♣ A Q 9 3	
♠ K 10 9 8 7 ♥ A Q 8 5 ♦ 9 ♣ K J 10	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ A J ♥ J 7 3 ♦ 7 6 3 2 ♣ 8 5 4 2
	♠ 6 2 ♥ K 10 9 4 2 ♦ Q J 8 5 ♣ 7 6	

Basic systems:
North-South play transfers after a 1NT overcall

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
			Pass
1♠	1NT	Pass	2♦(1)
Dble	Pass (A2)	Pass	2♥
pass	pass	3♦	dble
All pass			

(13) 2♦ not alerted. W's double was for take-out
(14) The pass <u>was</u> alerted – denies 3 hearts.

Result at table:
3♦x - 4 by East, NS +1100

Director first called:
At end of auction

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's statement of facts:
E asked after the alert and was told 'denies 3 hearts'. 'Why are hearts relevant?' 'Because 2♦ was a transfer' (South). There was general merriment at the table and E argues that since the double showed diamonds he was merely competing. The TD was also concerned that he had not been called as soon as the irregularity became apparent.

Director's ruling:
Split score assigned:

Score assigned for N/S: 2♥ - 1 by South, NS –50
Score assigned for E/W: result stands

Details of ruling:
The TD considers that E, being fully aware that 2♦ was a transfer but W's double had been made in the belief that it was natural, had acted frivolously. He vehemently denies this. (L21)

Appeal lodged by:
Both sides

Appeals Committee decision:
Score assigned for both sides:

2♥ - 1 by North, NS –50

Both deposits returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
Failure to alert 2♦ by N and explanation subsequently supplied by South resulted in misinformation under Law 21 which states 'the quality of the contract is irrelevant, the pair is damaged if it is judged they would have got a better score in the contract they might have reached without the misinformation'.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 10: An improving five-count

08.017 Grand Masters Pairs

Tournament Director:
David Stevenson

Appeals Committee:
Geoff Wolfarth (Chairman), Eddie Lucioni, Richard Pike

Butler Pairs Board no 17 Dealer N None vulnerable	♠ 6 2 ♥ 5 ♦ 10 3 ♣ A Q 10 8 5 4 3 2	
♠ Q J 10 8 4 3 ♥ K ♦ K Q 8 5 ♣ K 7	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ 9 7 5 ♥ J 10 8 6 4 ♦ A 9 7 6 4 ♣ none
	♠ A K ♥ A Q 9 7 3 2 ♦ J 2 ♣ J 9 6	

Basic systems:
North-South play natural
East-West play natural

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
	4♣	Pass	5♣
Pass(1)	Pass	Dble	Pass
5♠	Pass	pass	Dble
All pass			

(15) Alleged hesitation

Result at table:
5♠x ü by West, NS –650, lead ♣A

Director first called:
At end of next board

Director's statement of facts:
Before passing W asked if 5♣ showed several aces: this was understood to be a joke. It was alleged he paused as well: when asked whether he thought W replied that he did think some time before passing. E said she would always double on this sequence.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's ruling:
Score assigned for both sides (Law 12C3):
40% of 5♣ü by N; NS +400
+ 60% of 5♣ - 1 by N, NS –50.

Details of ruling:
There was a break in tempo before W's pass. E's double was not evident: pass is a logical alternative. Thus double is disallowed. (L16A, 12C3)

Appeal lodged by:
East-West

Basis of appeal:
Double is automatic for East.

Director's comments:
Consideration given to whether NS defence to 5♠x was bad enough to be considered 'wild or gambling'. Decided not. Defence ♣A ruffed, trump to king, trump ace, club.

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit forfeited

Appeals Committee's comments:
Break in tempo established. No E would bid as E did. A clear anti percentage action. Frivolous appeal unanimously agreed.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 11: Lucas or Weak?

08.024 Shapiro Spring 4s

Tournament Director:
Robin Barker

Appeals Committee:
Chris Dixon (Chairman), Roger Bryant, Patrick Jourdain

IMP KO Board no 30 Dealer E None vulnerable	♠ 10 4 ♥ K 2 ♦ A J 10 6 3 2 ♣ Q 5 3	
♠ Q 6 ♥ Q 10 7 6 ♦ K 9 8 4 ♣ K J 2	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ A K 9 5 2 ♥ 9 4 ♦ Q 5 ♣ 10 7 6 4
	♠ J 8 7 3 ♥ A J 8 5 3 ♦ 7 ♣ A 9 8	

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
		2♠(1)	Pass
pass	3♦	pass	3♥
pass	3NT (2)	All Pass	

(16) Announced as weak
(17) Corrected to Lucas 5♠ and 4+minor, weak

Result at table:
3NT - 3 by North, NS –150, lead ♣4

Director first called:
At point (2) – see auction.

Director's statement of facts:
The TD was called by N before 3NT. W had corrected the announcement 'weak' of 2♠ to Lucas (5♠ and 4+ minor, weak). The TD offered S the chance to change 3♥, he declined. The auction continued; E led a club.
At the end of the hand N wanted a ruling.

1) Weak 2♠ changed to Lucas 2♠ might change his marginal overcall.
2) E has UI from the fact that partner passed 2♠ thinking it was weak. This suggests not leading a spade.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's ruling:
Table result stands

Details of ruling:

1) Overcall not affected by weak v Lucas
2) E has UI which suggests a club lead, but a spade lead is equally good.

Appeal lodged by:
North-South

Comments by North-South:
3♦ overcall is very borderline. Would not have done so if known to be Lucas. Also defence on a spade lead might have led to down 2.

Comments by East-West:
3♦ is normal bid by N (identical in other room). Club lead is automatic because of N's 3NT bid.

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
3♦ is normal not affected by misinformation.
3NT – 3 likely outcome even on spade lead as club switch is normal.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 12: My spade holding is a bit poor

08.025 Spring Bank Holiday Congress

Tournament Director:
Kathy Williams

Appeals Committee:
Michael Byrne (Chairman), Anthony Whiteway, Andrew Thompson

MP to VPs Board no 18 Dealer E NS vulnerable	♠ 9 8 7 6 4 ♥ A 2 ♦ A J 6 5 3 ♣ A	
♠ none ♥ Q 10 7 ♦ K 10 2 ♣ K 10 7 6 4 3 2	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ A 10 5 2 ♥ K J 6 4 3 ♦ 8 7 4 ♣ 8
	♠ K Q J 3 ♥ 9 8 5 ♦ Q 9 ♣ Q J 9 5	

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
		pass	Pass
1NT	2♦(A1)	2♥	3♠
pass	4♠	Dble (2)	Pass
4NT	All pass		

(18) Astro
(19) Slow double – agreed.

Result at table:
4NT - 4 by West, NS +200

Director first called:
At end of auction

Director's statement of facts:
The TD was called at end of auction by S to reserve rights because of slow double. The TD was called back to look at hand at end of play. N felt the slow double had induced W to bid again.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's ruling:
Score assigned for both sides (Law 12C3):
50% of 5♥x – 4 by East, NS +800
+ 50% of 4♠ü by South, NS +420

Details of ruling:
UI (L16A)

Appeal lodged by:
East-West

Basis of appeal:
Double of 4♠ was slow; 4NT take out.

Comments by East-West:
We do not agree that pass is a LA – partner has bid a non-forcing and terminal 2♥ over 2♦. I have the authorised information that I have psyched and I am at favourable vulnerability. Even with 2 trump tricks for partner there is unlikely to be any defence to 4♠x.

Further, the opponents pass of 4NT is wild and gambling and shows the desire to achieve a double-shot. The other point is that 4NT isn't demonstrably suggested over 5♥ by the UI.

Appeals Committee decision:
Score assigned for both sides:
50% of 4♠ü by South, NS +420
+ 50% of 4NT – 4 by West, NS +200
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
W's removal of 4♠x is reasonable and consistent with his earlier actions. NS have not taken a double shot but were victims of a psyche that was exposed to EW and not NS (caused by the hesitation)
Everything was handled sensibly by the TD and appellants.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 13: Unauthorised Panic

08.027 Spring Bank Holiday Congress

Tournament Director:
Andrew Kambites

Appeals Committee:
Steve Gore (Chairman), Malcolm Pryor, Paul Denning

IMPs to VPs Board no 6 Dealer E EW vulnerable	♠ 9 2 ♥ K 6 5 4 2 ♦ J ♣ 10 8 5 3 2	
♠ J 10 8 7 6 ♥ A 10 7 3 ♦ K Q 7 ♣ 9	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ A Q 3 ♥ Q J 9 8 ♦ A 4 3 2 ♣ Q 4
	♠ K 5 4 ♥ none ♦ 10 9 8 6 5 ♣ A K J 7 6	

Basic systems:
East-West play strong club

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
		1NT	Dble (1)
2♥ (2)	3♣	3♥	Pass
3♠	All pass		

(20) 1NT = 15-17, double was for minors.
(21) Not alerted. W meant it as transfer because they normally play transfers over double of 1NT.

Result at table:
3♠ü by West

Director first called:
At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:
But they never discussed it if double was conventional (W said this later)
N asked and was told 'undiscussed' by E.
On discussion after N said that W had UI because of failure to alert 2♥ and the answer to N's question. I asked W why he bid 3♠ - he said he had to make a game try opposite a strong NT.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's ruling:
Table result stands

Details of ruling:
W has UI but it is hard to see how it leads to 3♠ - W surely knows of a 4-4 heart fit and a more normal action would be to bid 4♥. My impression is that EW were floundering about in an unfamiliar situation caused by a non-penalty double that they were not used to.

Appeal lodged by:
North-South

Director's comments:
The TD would comment that the 3♠ bid doesn't make much sense with or without UI – the auction suggests 4♥ (if 3♥ is meant as super-accept of S then E will convert 4♥ to 4♠). The UI doesn't alter that and that the only reason spades plays better than hearts is because heart break is 5-0 which W couldn't have known. W could equally be using UI to pass 3♥ if 3♥ accepted spades in system but was meant as natural.

Comments by North-South:

1) As TD has stated if W believed E had hearts then 4♥ would seem normal. If 3♥ is conventional agreeing spades then 4♠ presumably (see 4)
2) If E had alerted 2♥ as spades then his 3♥ bid would presumably show 5 hearts, W would presumably raise to 4♥ (see 4)
3) It is possible that W thought that E had misunderstood his partner's 2♥ bid and had UI. Consequently ignoring the implied heart fit to bid 3♠
4) I do not understand EW comments stating that 3♠ is a game try over 3♥ - what would be the bid 'to play at the lowest level'. Following this line 3♥ should have been the try followed by 4♠.

Comments by East-West:
W has UI that E has not simply forgotten to alert. Therefore W should ignore this and assume 3♥ agrees spades with a heart feature, as it would over a penalty double or if uncontested. 3♠ is a game try. Should maybe have alerted 3♥ but this gives partner UI and as we said this is undiscussed over the double showing minors so didn't really know what was going on.

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
We believe W made his 3♠ bid in line with their systematic understandings and took a very pessimistic view of the hand, which turned out to be correct. We agree with the directors assessment that the potential UI was not a factor.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 14: Six, what six?

08.028 Spring Bank Holiday Congress

Tournament Director:
June Booty

Appeals Committee:
Jon Williams (Chairman), Andy Smith, Eddie Lucioni

MP Pairs Board no 3 Dealer S EW vulnerable	♠ Q 9 7 4 3 ♥ none ♦ A Q 8 4 3 ♣ J 10 9	
♠ 8 ♥ K Q 6 ♦ K J 9 7 2 ♣ K Q 7 6	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ A K J 10 6 5 ♥ A J 10 2 ♦ none ♣ 4 3 2
	♠ 2 ♥ 9 8 7 5 4 3 ♦ 10 6 5 ♣ A 8 5	

Basic systems:
East-West play Benji Acol, 4 card majors, 12-14 NT

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
			Pass
1♦	1♠	Pass	Pass
Dble	Pass	Pass	2♥
dble	pass	Pass(H)	Pass

Result at table:
2♥x – 4 by South, NS –800, lead ♠8

Director first called:
At end of hand

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's statement of facts:
S believed the slow pass affected the way he played the hand. The TD ruled the result to stand because of L73D1. E had something to think about and was therefore entitled to do so. If S draws inferences from that then it is at his own risk.

Cards played:

Play	Lead	W	N	E	S
Tr1	W	♠8	♠9	♠10	♠2
Tr2	E	♥6	♠3	♠A	♥4*

* S says that without the hesitation he would have played a higher heart.

Also the TD does not feel the hesitation suggests another play of the cards.

Director's ruling:
Table result stands.

Details of ruling:
L73D1

Appeal lodged by:
North-South

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 15: How weak is intermediate?

08.051 Brighton Swiss Pairs

Note by editor:
Laws of Duplicate Bridge 2007 in force for Appeals 15 onwards.

Tournament Director:
Marilyn Jones

Appeals Committee:
Jeffrey Allerton (Chairman), Michael Bell, Paul Fegarty

MP to VPs Board no 26 Dealer E All vulnerable	♠ A 5 ♥ K J 10 7 3 ♦ A K 10 ♣ A J 2	
♠ 9 7 2 ♥ Q 9 2 ♦ J 9 6 5 ♣ 10 8 7	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ K ♥ A 8 6 ♦ Q 4 3 2 ♣ K Q 9 4 3
	♠ Q J 10 8 6 4 3 ♥ 5 4 ♦ 8 7 ♣ 6 5	

Basic systems:
North-South play strong club
East-West play Benji Acol

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
		1♣	2♠(1)
pass	4♠	All pass	

(22) Intermediate – no range agreement.

Result at table:
4♠ + 1 by South, lead ♣x

Director first called:
At end of hand

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's statement of facts:
EW felt N had made no effort to play beyond game level. N said he was aware that the points didn't add up. N said he felt his cards were wrongly placed and so bid 4♠.

Director's ruling:
Artificial score awarded:
Average plus to N/S, average minus to E/W

Details of ruling:
4♠ was a fielded misbid. Orange book 6B.

Appeal lodged by:
North-South

Comments by North-South:
Intermediate jump overcall shows 6 playing tricks, may be fairly light on high cards.

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
N's comment to the TD 'someone didn't have their bid' suggests he was catering for a psyche or misbid from partner. N could expect slam to be good opposite many hands with 6 playing tricks.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 16: Can I protect?

08.052 Brighton Swiss Pairs

Tournament Director:
Chris Benneworth

Appeals Committee:
Frances Hinden (Chairman), Paul Lamford, Jon Williams

MP to VPs Board no 14 Dealer E None vulnerable	♠ K 9 6 4 ♥ Q 10 4 ♦ A Q J 6 ♣ 10 3	
♠ 10 7 2 ♥ A J 5 ♦ K 2 ♣ A Q 7 5 2	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ A ♥ 8 7 6 ♦ 9 8 5 3 ♣ J 9 8 6 4
	♠ Q J 8 5 3 ♥ K 9 3 2 ♦ 10 7 4 ♣ K	

Basic systems:
North-South play Benji Acol, Astro over 1NT - 2♦ = ♠ and another
East-West play Acol 3 weak 2s, weak NT

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
		Pass	Pass
1NT	Pass (H1)	Pass	2♦(A2)
Pass	2♠	All pass	

(23) N hesitated briefly before passing (see below)
(24) 2♦ = ♠ and another

Result at table:
2♠+3 by North, NS +200, lead ♥7

Director first called:
At end of auction

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's statement of facts:
The TD was called to the table at the end of the auction, but before the opening lead. W said that there had been a 'hitch' before N passed – explained as moving towards the bidding box, then stopping, then (after a delay) removing the pass card. Both E and W agreed that the pause was not long. S Said that 'if there was a pause, it was brief'. No other comments were made. The TD was called back by W at the end of the hand and asked to make a ruling. The TD asked if anyone wished to say anything further – no-one did.

The TD ruled

a) there was a hesitation

b) the alternative call of pass was a real alternative for South.

The TD informed NS they could, if they wished, consult an appeals adviser.

Director's ruling:
Score assigned for both sides:

1NT ü by West, NS –90

Details of ruling:
A hesitation occurred. Laws 84/85A
Not to choose from among logical alternatives. Law 16B1A

Appeal lodged by:
North-South

Basis of appeal:
We think EW are trying to get away with it.

Appeals Committee decision:
Table score re-instated
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
AC see no logical alternative to S acting in the pass out seat with 9 cards in the majors and being a passed hand.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 17: Slow signoff

08.055 Brighton Swiss Pairs

Tournament Director:
Ian Muir

Appeals Committee:
Heather Dhondy (Chairman), Malcolm Harris, Cath Jagger

MP to VPs Board no 15 Dealer S NS vulnerable	♠ Q 8 2 ♥ A J 10 ♦ 2 ♣ A J 9 8 4 3	
♠ 9 3 ♥ 6 ♦ Q J 9 8 6 4 3 ♣ K 10 2	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ K J 10 7 4 ♥ 9 3 2 ♦ K 7 5 ♣ 7 6
	♠ A 6 5 ♥ K Q 8 7 5 4 ♦ A 10 ♣ Q 5	

Basic systems:
North-South play 14-17NT, 4-card majors

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
			1♥
3♦	4♦	Dble	Redble(1)
Pass	4♥	Pass	4♠ (2)
Pass	5♣(3)	Pass	5♥ (H4)
pass	6♥	All pass	

(25) 1st round control
(26) 1st/2nd round control
(27) 1st round control
(28) Agreed slow

Result at table:
6♥ + 1 by South, NS +1460, lead ♦Q

Director first called:
At end of hand

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's ruling:
Table result stands

Details of ruling:
Receipt of UI, logical alternative but in my opinion pass does not meet the new (or old) criteria for logical alternative (Laws 73C, 16B1B)

Appeal lodged by:
East-West

Basis of appeal:
Pass is a logical alternative

Appeals Committee decision:
Score assigned for both sides:

5♥ + 2 by South, NS +710

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
Pass of 5♥ is a logical alternative and the UI has made it more attractive to bid on.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 18: Is pass forcing?

08.056 Brighton Swiss Pairs

Tournament Director:
June Booty

Appeals Committee:
Frances Hinden (Chairman), Jonathan Mistel, Malcolm Prior

MP to VPs Board no 15 Dealer S NS vulnerable	♠ Q 8 2 ♥ A J 10 ♦ 2 ♣ A J 9 8 4 3	
♠ 9 3 ♥ 6 ♦ Q J 9 8 6 4 3 ♣ K 10 2	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ K J 10 7 4 ♥ 9 3 2 ♦ K 7 5 ♣ 7 6
	♠ A 6 5 ♥ K Q 8 7 5 4 ♦ A 10 ♣ Q 5	

Basic systems:
North-South play Acol weak NT, multi 2D and weak 2HS
East-West play better minor, 2 over 1 game force. Variable NT

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
			1♥
3♦	4♣	4♠	Pass(H1)
pass	4NT (2)	5♦	5♠
pass	6♣	pass	Pass
6♦	Pass (H)	pass	7♣
pass	pass	7♦	Pass (H)
pass	dble	pass	Pass (H)
Pass			

(29) NS claim pass is forcing in this situation
(30) This is RCKB in clubs

Result at table:
7♦x - 5 by West , NS +1100

Director first called:
At end of auction

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's statement of facts:
EW complained that N should not be allowed to bid 4NT after his partner's hesitation. The TD ruled the result should stand because at H1 the TD felt that the partnership was in a game forcing situation and that it was a forcing pass. When partner makes a forcing pass he effectively says 'I know we should take some action but I don't know what' and if partner hesitates and passes he is effectively says 'I know we should take some action but don't know what'. L16B1A says that after receiving UI the partner 'may not choose among logical alternatives one that could demonstrably have been suggested over another'. Although there are alternatives the TD does not believe 4NT has been demonstrably suggested.

Director's ruling:
Table result stands

Details of ruling:
Action has not been demonstrably suggested over another. (Law 16B1A)

Appeal lodged by:
East-West

Comments by North-South:
5♣ not LA after pass by S as this suggests slam.

Comments by East-West:
We have no agreement with taking a bid. 4NT is not a 70% action unless the hesitation suggests extra strength. In Acol opening bids are 10+ points.

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
Deposit returned due to uncertainty over forcing nature of the pass.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 19: Hesitation or not?

08.059 Brighton Play with the experts

Tournament Director:
Jim Proctor

Appeals Committee:
Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), David Price, Tom Gisborne

IMPs Board no 6 Dealer E EW vulnerable	♠ 10 7 ♥ 8 3 ♦ 9 8 6 5 3 2 ♣ K Q 7	
♠ K Q 5 4 ♥ A K Q 6 2 ♦ K 4 ♣ A 2	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ J 8 6 3 2 ♥ 7 4 ♦ A Q J ♣ 8 5 3
	♠ A 9 ♥ J 10 9 5 ♦ 10 7 ♣ J 10 9 6 4	

Basic systems:
East-West play 5-card majors, strong NT

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
		Pass	Pass
2♣(A1)	3♦	3♠	Pass
4♠(H)	Pass	4NT	Pass
5♦	Pass	6♠	All pass

(31) Strongest bid

Result at table:
6♠ü by East , NS –1430

Director first called:
During the play

Director's statement of facts:
The TD was recalled at the end of play. N and S thought that the 4♠ bid was out of tempo. E thought only slightly so.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's ruling:
Score assigned for both sides:
4♠ + 2 by East , NS –680

Details of ruling:
The TD decided that it was a hesitation situation and gave an adjusted score of 4♠ + 2 by E (Laws 16B1, 12C1A, 12B1)

Appeal lodged by:
East-West

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
The 4♠ was out of tempo. The continuation after the hesitation was not evident (Law 16B)

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 20: Not a skip bid

08.063 Brighton Open Pairs

Tournament Director:
Jim Proctor

Appeals Committee:
Jon Williams (Chairman), P Collins, R Miller

MP Pairs Board no 22 Dealer E EW vulnerable	♠ K Q J ♥ K Q 10 6 ♦ 9 7 3 ♣ K 10 2	
♠ 10 9 5 4 3 ♥ 9 2 ♦ A Q J 10 8 ♣ A	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ A 2 ♥ 8 3 ♦ 6 5 4 ♣ J 9 6 5 4 3
	♠ 8 7 6 ♥ A J 7 5 4 ♦ K 2 ♣ Q 8 7	

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
		Pass	Pass
1♠	dble	Pass	2♥(1)
Pass	Pass	2♠	Pass
Pass	3♥	All pass	

(32) The 2♥ bid was preceded by 'stop'. The 2♥ bid point-count is 6 to 9. 2♣ is negative.

Result at table:
3♥ - 1 by South, NS –50

Director first called:
When 'stop 2♥' was bid.

Director's statement of facts:
The TD told NS that the bid was 2♥ and the 'stop' was unauthorised information to N. (The TD was satisfied it was not a mechanical error). The TD was recalled by EW at the end of play.

Director's ruling:
Score assigned for both sides:
2♠ü by West, NS –110

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Details of ruling:
3♥ bid cancelled; 2♠ü by West awarded (Laws 16B1, 12C1A)

Appeal lodged by:
North-South

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
It was felt that any 3♥ bid should have been made by S notwithstanding that with Herbert negatives S had shown 6-9 points. N is minimum with poor distribution.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 21: Transfer advances

08.066 Brighton Swiss Teams

Tournament Director:
Chris Barrable

Appeals Committee:
Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), Paul Hackett, Rob Cliffe

IMPs to VPs Board no 3 Dealer S EW vulnerable	♠ 9 ♥ Q 9 5 2 ♦ A J 6 4 2 ♣ 10 5 4	
♠ K 8 2 ♥ 10 8 ♦ Q 8 ♣ A K J 7 6 3	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ Q 10 6 5 4 3 ♥ K 7 3 ♦ K 9 ♣ 9 8
	♠ A J 7 ♥ A J 6 4 ♦ 10 7 5 3 ♣ Q 2	

Basic systems:
North-South play strong 5-cards

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
			1♦
2♣	Dble (A)	2♥(1)	Pass
3♣	3♦	Pass	Pass
3♥	4♦	All pass	

(33) Not alerted but EW say it should have been alerted – shows spades.

Result at table:
4♦ ü by South, NS +130

Director first called:
At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:
EW said that 2♥ should have been alerted as it shows spades and N claims that they have 4♥ on – they have a 4-4 heart fit and because of this claim damage. The TD concluded 4♦ was the maximum on the hand. (♣AK, small club, ruff with ♥7 gives a trump promotion). Note there is no guarantee that N or S would play the contract.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's ruling:
Table result stands

Details of ruling:
NS have MI (failure to alert 2♥), however looking at the possible results (4♦, 4♥, 4♥–1, 3♥, 3♥+1) we believe that the score of –2 IMPs (–200 at other table +130) will not improve.

Appeal lodged by:
North-South

Basis of appeal:
N believes he will bid and make 4♥.

Director's comments:
NS have lost 2 IMPs on the board since EW played in 4♠-2. Match result 18-2.

Appeals Committee decision:
Score assigned for both sides (Law 12C1C):
50% of 4♥ üby N/S, NS +420
+ 10% of 3NT –2 by East, NS +200
+ 40% of 4♥ –1 by N/S, NS –50
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
There was misinformation. NS were damaged. They might well have reached 4♥ with a double fit. This could be defeated if a 3rd club is ruffed with ♥7 or declarer gets hearts wrong. EW could find that if W bids 3♥ E will think he has a strongish 4-6 and may play 3NT which on normal defence will go down 2.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 22: 'I thought it was routine'

08.067 Brighton Swiss Teams

Tournament Director:
Neil Morley

Appeals Committee:
Heather Dhondy (Chairman), Neil Rosen, Tim Rees

IMP to VPs Board no 7 Dealer S All vulnerable	♠ Q J 8 6 ♥ K Q 5 3 ♦ 8 2 ♣ Q 5 4	
♠ K ♥ 8 ♦ J 9 7 6 4 ♣ A K J 9 8 3	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ 9 7 5 3 ♥ A 10 9 6 ♦ K 10 5 3 ♣ 6
	♠ A 10 4 2 ♥ J 7 4 2 ♦ A Q ♣ 10 7 2	

Basic systems:
North-South play 5 card majors, weak NT

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
			1♣(1)
Pass	1♥	Pass	2♥
3♣	3♥	Pass	Pass
3NT(2)	Dble	4♦	Dble
All pass			

(34) Alerted
(35) Not alerted and showing diamond stop and suit

Result at table:
4♦xü by East, NS –710, lead ♥2

Director first called:
After opening lead faced

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's statement of facts:
S called the TD to the table after dummy had been tabled claiming that he had been damaged by the failure to alert 3NT. He said that N was inexperienced and that N had doubled 3NT for penalties as she thought it was natural. S said that he would not have doubled 4♦ had 3NT below alerted.

Director's ruling:
Table result stands

Details of ruling:
Both N and S are experienced players and in the top ½ of field. Both players are sufficiently experienced to realise that 3NT was not 'to play'.

Appeal lodged by:
North-South

Director's comments:
N is a Premier Life Master (554 greens and 8 gold points). Even if N believed that 3NT was natural S by his own statement said he realised that it was not natural. His double of 4♦ must be for business.

Comments by East-West:
'I thought it was routine'

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
At this level we feel that N could have worked out the 3NT would not be natural – N is not an inexperienced player. Also the double of 4♦ was thought ill-judged.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 23: 'Can I overtake?'

08.068 Brighton Swiss Teams

Tournament Director:
Gordon Rainsford

Appeals Committee:
Tim Rees (Chairman), Andrew Thompson, Cameron Small

IMPs to VPs Board no 19 Dealer S EW vulnerable	♠ A 8 ♥ Q 6 5 4 2 ♦ 7 5 ♣ Q 8 7 2	
♠ K Q J 7 4 3 ♥ 10 8 ♦ J 10 ♣ 10 9 3	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ 10 9 2 ♥ K J 9 ♦ A K Q 9 2 ♣ J 4
	♠ 6 5 ♥ A 7 3 ♦ 8 6 4 3 ♣ A K 6 5	

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
			1NT(1)
2♠	pass	3♦	Pass
3♠	pass	4♠	All pass

(36) 10-12 HCP

Result at table:
4♠ü by West, NS –620, lead ♣x

Director first called:
At end of hand

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's statement of facts:
The play had gone ♣x to king; ♣A winning, ♣x to queen ruffed in dummy with ♠2. Then declarer led ♠10 and when S played low she hesitated (agreed hesitation explained to the TD as wondering whether she could afford to overtake) before playing low. N won the ♠A and returned a 4th club.

N explained to the TD that she knew her partner could not have ♠Q and ♥A because of the 10-12 NT opening. The hesitation had led her to believe that she had the ♠Q and not the ♥A and so she had returned a 4th club reasoning that the only way to defeat the contract was if S had started with three clubs and could ruff the 4th round with ♠Q.

Director's ruling:
Score assigned for both sides:
4♠ –1 by West, NS +100

Details of ruling:
W had failed to be particularly careful when variations might work to the benefit of their side. W had no demonstrable bridge reason for her hesitation – she should have decided to overtake before leading – and she could have known that it might work to her benefit (L73D1, 73F)

Appeal lodged by:
East-West

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
There was an agreed hesitation by W after the ♠10 and ♠5 had been played.

W's hesitation during a trick gave the impression to the defence that there was a problem in the suit led. Although we are sure that declarer had no intent to deceive, that was the effect of the hesitation. L73D1 allows the opposition redress. If W had thought before leading the ♠10 from dummy then there would not have been the same inferences about the spades.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 24: The king?

08.074 Autumn Congress Pairs

Tournament Director:
Martin Lee

Appeals Committee:
Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), Jon Williams, Paul Lamford

MP Pairs Board no 7 Dealer S All vulnerable	♠ 8 5 ♥ Q 10 7 3 2 ♦ Q 8 ♣ K 5	
♠ A K ♥ J ♦ 10 5 4 3 ♣ 10 8 7 6	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ J 9 4 ♥ A 8 6 4 ♦ 9 7 ♣ 9 4
	♠ 7 3 ♥ K 9 5 ♦ A K J 6 2 ♣ Q	

Basic systems:
North-South play Acol mini NT
East-West play Strong 1♣, 15-17 NT

Result at table:
2NT - 1 by South

Director first called:
At trick 3 before E had played to the trick, after card played from dummy. The position before that trick is as shown in the diagram.

Director's statement of facts:
The TD was called by S (declarer) who told the TD that although he had already called the ♣K from dummy he wanted to play the ♣5. After speaking to all at the table the TD was satisfied that there was a pause of about 2 seconds after the ♣K was called when he stated he wanted the ♣5. The TD read Law 45C4. In the TD's view a delay of 1-2 seconds is not 'without pause for thought'. The TD ruled the ♣K played.

Director's ruling:
Table result stands

Details of ruling:
Compulsory play of card (Law 45C4)

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Appeal lodged by:
North-South

Basis of appeal:
Does not agree with TD's interpretation of the law.

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
The ♣K was designated; there was pause for thought so it must be played.

Law 45C4A applies.

Law 45C4B although the pause was agreed to be brief nonetheless the designation was not changed quickly enough.

The deposit was returned because we thought this relatively close and discussed it for some time.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 25: An unexplained double

08.079 Autumn Congress Teams of Four

Tournament Director:
Eddie Williams

Appeals Committee:
Jon Williams (Chairman), John Amor, Ed Scerri

IMPs Board no 25 Dealer N All vulnerable	♠ 8 5 ♥ J 10 7 4 ♦ 7 2 ♣ A K Q 10 8	
♠ K Q 9 3 ♥ 8 2 ♦ J 9 5 ♣ 9 7 5 4	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ J 6 ♥ Q 9 5 3 ♦ A K Q 8 6 4 ♣ 2
	♠ A 10 7 4 2 ♥ A K 6 ♦ 10 3 ♣ J 6 3	

Basic systems:
North-South play strong NT, 5 card majors, 2 over 1 game force.
East-West play Acol and Multi

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
	Pass	1♦	1♠
1NT	Dble (1)	Pass (H2)	Pass
2♦	Pass	Pass	Dble (3)
All pass			

(37) NS could not give an explanation of what the double meant in this sequence
(38) E's pass was only slightly out of tempo in my opinion
(39) N did not alert this double and subsequently passed.

Result at table:
2♦x + 1 by East , NS –380

Director first called:
After North's double.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's statement of facts:
The TD was called to the table after N's double as S was unable to give an explanation of the double. The TD sent N away from the table and asked S to explain the system. He said that his partnership had no agreement in this sequence. The TD asked N back to the table and sent S away. When asked N said that their partnership had no agreement in this sequence.

The TD stayed at the table while the auction continued. N failed to alert S's double and at the end of the auction E asked N what the double meant. N's answer was that she didn't know in this sequence. The TD explained that as she had passed she obviously thought it was for penalty in which case she should have alerted it.

At the end of the auction S reserved his rights because of E's alleged slow pass. The TD was asked back at the end of play by S and asked to look at the board as S felt W's 2♦ bid was suggested by E's slow pass.

E felt that he had not hesitated, S suggested there was a long hesitation. The TD was present at the table during the auction and the TD feel there was a break in tempo by E.

Director's ruling:
Table result stands

Details of ruling:
W's 2♦ bid is not suggested by E's break in tempo pass, but more by NS failure to explain their double. The TD do not believe pass is a LA. (Orange book 5B10).

Note by editor:
Orange book 5B10:

> *A player who is not sure whether a call made is alertable, but who is going to act as though it is, should alert the call, as the partnership is likely to be considered to have an agreement, especially if the player's partner's actions are also consistent with that agreement.*

Appeal lodged by:
North-South

Comments by North-South:
I have only had time to look at point 1). I dispute the wording by the TD as it implies deliberate obfuscation. We had no agreement as to what my double meant in an auction like this.

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
It was felt that 2♦ was the LA to leaving 1NTx despite the break in tempo.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 26: Tolerance for spades

08.082 Tollemache QR

Tournament Director:
Nick Woosnam

Appeals Committee:
David Price (Chairman), David Burgess, Jeffrey Allerton

Teams of 8 XIMPs Board no 23 Dealer S All vulnerable	♠ 2 ♥ A J 3 ♦ 9 7 3 ♣ A J 8 6 3 2	
♠ J 9 6 3 ♥ 10 8 4 ♦ K 5 4 2 ♣ 5 4	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ A 8 ♥ Q 7 6 5 2 ♦ A Q J ♣ K 10 9
	♠ K Q 10 7 5 4 ♥ K 9 ♦ 10 8 6 ♣ Q 7	

Basic systems:
North-South play Multi 2♦
East-West play Dixon defence to multi

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
			2♦(A1)
pass	2♠(A2)	Dble (3NA)	All pass

(40) Multi
(41) Explained as prepared to play in 3♥ over weak 2♥
(42) Not alerted – explained as spades or tolerance for spades before play starts.

Result at table:
2♠x – 1 by North, NS –200, lead ♣

Director first called:
At end of hand

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's statement of facts:
Called to the table at end of play. N felt that he had been damaged by the explanation, as he played spade to the 10 and later K expecting E to have at least 3 spades and therefore more likely to have J if has 4 (contract can be made on club lead on actual layout by spade to K or Q and ducking a spade, a more likely line if E bid described as 'values' or takeout.

W seemed certain that their methods showed spades or tolerance for spades (normally 3+) which is why he didn't alert the double of artificial bid (correct). E 'knew' that S has weak 2 spades so his choice was pass/double or 2NT – the latter 2 as last chance to get into auction (as partner unlikely to protect), so chose off-system in terms of spade length with some hope of partner having spades and subsequent penalty (admitted to some element of take out in post mortem).

Director's ruling:
Table result stands

Details of ruling:
Dixon defence not described on the convention card. However the TD is satisfied by W's explanation made before play started that the double normally shows spades or tolerance for spades in this situation and that E had deviated slightly in a 'bid or not to bid' decision.

Appeal lodged by:
North-South

Basis of appeal:
NS believe they deserve some or all of 2♠x making as double is more takeout than spades and would have played hand differently.

Director's comments:
Recommend deposit returned as non-frivolous. Likely to affect qualification as teams in contention. N's actual line chosen for spades 2-4 fails when J offside.

After consulting with other TDs we felt there were not sufficient grounds for adjusting the score to 2♠x making (or part thereof) given that spades may be 3-3 if tolerance N may have given more weight to spade K or Q and duck line considered.

Comments by North-South:
E's double not alerted so assumed to be penalties, having length in spades. W's explanation did not mention take-out. E subsequently explained (with TD present) that 'there is a possibility of an EW heart fit [despite N having some support] or [failing that] a minor suit fit. That sounds like take out to me. Their defence to a multi is not explained at all on their cards. My line of play assumed spade length in the E hand. If described as take out I would have assumed the opposite. On a club lead I can afford 2 spade losers (and 3 diamonds)

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 27: Probably natural

08.083 Tollemache QR

Tournament Director:
Steve Quinn

Appeals Committee:
David Harris (Chairman), Michael Byrne, David Beavan

Teams of 8 XIMPS Board no 6 Dealer E EW vulnerable	♠ K 10 4 2 ♥ Q 10 9 7 5 ♦ A 4 ♣ J 8	
♠ A J 9 7 3 ♥ K 2 ♦ Q ♣ A 9 6 5 4	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ Q 6 5 ♥ A J 6 4 ♦ 10 8 3 ♣ 10 7 2
	♠ 8 ♥ 8 3 ♦ K J 9 7 6 5 2 ♣ K Q 3	

Basic systems:
North-South play strong club

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
		Pass	1♦(1)
2♦(2)	Dble (t/o)	Pass	Pass
2♥	Dble (pens)	Pass	Pass
2♠	Dble (pens)	All pass	

(43) Could be zero diamonds
(44) E said ‘probably natural’.

Result at table:
2♠xü by West, NS –670

Director first called:
At end of hand after board scored.

Director’s statement of facts:
At end of auction before opening lead W explained that 2♦ showed ♣ and ♠. N said that he would not have doubled.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's ruling:
Score assigned for both sides:
2♠ü West, NS –110

Details of ruling:
After consultation with colleagues the TD ruled to remove the double, based on misinformation to N.
EW have no agreement to show 2 suiters over artificial diamonds.

Appeal lodged by:
North-South

Appeals Committee decision:
Score assigned for both sides (Law 12C1C):
70% of 3♦**P** by South, NS +110
+ 30% of 3♦ –1 by South, NS -50
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
Without the misinformation we believe that NS would probably have competed to 3D and made that contract 70% of the time.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

APPEAL No 28: 'The Laws require an adjustment …'

08.085 Year End London

Tournament Director:
David Stevenson

Appeals Committee:
Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), Ryan Stephenson, Nevena Senior

MP to VPs Board no 20 Dealer W All vulnerable	♠ ♥ 10 ♦ 10 8 6 4 ♣ A Q 10 9 8 7 6 3	
♠ K 9 8 6 5 ♥ K Q 7 ♦ J 7 3 ♣ J 5	*N* *W* *E* *S*	♠ A J 10 7 2 ♥ A 6 4 3 ♦ A Q 5 ♣ 2
	♠ Q 4 3 ♥ J 9 8 5 2 ♦ K 9 2 ♣ K 4	

Basic systems:
North-South play natural, 3NT pre-empt in a minor
East-West play 5cd majors, strong NT

WEST	*NORTH*	*EAST*	*SOUTH*
	3NT	Pass(1)	4♣(2)
Pass (3)	pass	4♠	All pass

(45) Before passing looked at convention card and asked but did not understand answer
(46) Pass or correct
(47) Before passing asked meaning of 3NT – see below.

Result at table:
4♠+1 by East, NS –620, lead ♣K

Director first called:
Before W's first pass

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

Director's statement of facts:
There was a language difficulty and TD called before W's first pass. S sent away from the table and N explained meaning of 3NT. N called TD back at the end of the auction to reserve rights after W's questions followed by E's bid. Recalled TD at end of hand to ask for a ruling.

E considered action (as opposed to pass) routine since S had limited hand. She said it was too dangerous previous round when S was unlimited.

Director's ruling:
Table result stands

Details of ruling:
Action rather than passing was evident, i.e. pass was not a logical alternative.

Appeal lodged by:
North-South

Basis of appeal:
4♠ after the questions unacceptable

Director's comments:
N said the laws required an adjustment unless TD asked 10 players and 9 took action. TD explained that was not part of law.

TD only consulted one other person because of practical considerations.

Appeals Committee decision:
Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:
That for E to bid was evident although we believed double was much more clear than 4♠.

W should be told that he should not ask unless he has a reason to do so and we did not accept his explanation that he was considering action based on his hand.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

General comments

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com