

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	1
APPEAL No 1: What happened?.....	2
APPEAL No 2: Does anyone pass?	4
APPEAL No 3: Chaos in the club!	6
APPEAL No 4: Of course I have spades!.....	9
APPEAL No 5: What is a fit worth?.....	11
General comments	13

APPEAL No 1: What happened?

08.001 East Wales Congress

Tournament Director:

Ken Richardson

Appeals Committee:

David Harris (Chairman) Tim Rees Peter Goodman

Swiss Teams Board no 2 Dealer East N/S vulnerable	<p>♠ 53 ♥ K92 ♦ A852 ♣ Q864</p>	
<p>♠ AJT76 ♥ J6543 ♦ J9 ♣ 5</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>N</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>W</i> <i>E</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>S</i></p>	<p>♠ 9842 ♥ T8 ♦ KT43 ♣ KJT</p>
	<p>♠ KQ ♥ AQ7 ♦ Q76 ♣ A9732</p>	

Basic systems:

North-South play Blue Club

<i>WEST</i>	<i>NORTH</i>	<i>EAST</i>	<i>SOUTH</i>
		Pass	1♣ (A1)
2♣ (A2)	2NT (A)	3♣ (A3)	Dbl
3♥	Pass	Pass	Dbl
Pass	Pass	3♠	3NT
All pass			

- (1) Blue Club
- (2) Various options depending on South's strength and club holding, but not including 5-5 in majors.
- (3) No explanation asked but asks for major

Note by editor:

The form is somewhat confused and partly illegible. Some clear errors have been corrected, and some comments are partly based on guesswork.

Result at table:

3NT -2 by North, NS -200

Director first called:

After East's 3♠ bid

Director's statement of facts:

East corrected his explanation of the auction (the 2♣ bid) after West bid 3♥.
After the hand West explained East's 3♣ bid as "asking for the major".

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

3♣ doubled -4 by East, NS +800

Details of ruling:

The TD was unhappy that the 3♥ bid revealed to East that West did not hold clubs. Although the 3♣ bid "asks for major" the TD could not see why East should not simply support spades.

Appeal lodged by:

East-West

Basis of appeal:

The TD supported an appeal and took no deposit.

Director's comments:

This a complicated sequence with much room for misunderstanding. The TD was unhappy that East's bidding (3♣) and explanation was corrected only after the 3♥ bid made it clear that West did not have clubs.

Appeals Committee decision:

Score assigned for both sides:

3♣ doubled -2 by East, NS +300

No deposit taken

Appeals Committee's comments:

Appeals Committee is not happy with the explanations given. We do not believe that E/W would have ended up in 3♣ and allow them to find their fit. E/W should note that their convention cards must be fully and properly completed and they should check what system their opponents are playing.

APPEAL No 2: Does anyone pass?

08.002 Llandudno Swiss Teams

Tournament Director:

Sarah Amos

Appeals Committee:

Patrick Jourdain (Chairman) David Stevenson Peter Hand

Swiss Teams Board no 21 Dealer North N/S vulnerable	♠ T92 ♥ KT73 ♦ K ♣ AKT94	
♠ AKQ754 ♥ QJ95 ♦ 2 ♣ 52	<div>N</div> <div>W E</div> <div>S</div>	♠ J86 ♥ A64 ♦ QJT863 ♣ 8
	♠ 3 ♥ 82 ♦ A9754 ♣ QJ763	

Basic systems:

North-South play Acol

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
	1♣	2♦	4♣
4♠	Pass (H1)	Pass	5♣
Pass	Pass	5♠	All pass

(4) Agreed hesitation before North passed over 4♠.

Result at table:

5♠ -2 by West, NS +100

Director first called:

At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:

The TD was called to the table by East who was unhappy about South's bid of 5♣ after his partner's agreed hesitation. South said he was waiting to see what his partner would do over 4♠ and had decided he would pass if partner doubled and bid 5♣ if partner did not.

Director's ruling:

Table result stands

Details of ruling:

Pass is not a logical alternative (Law 16A).

Appeal lodged by:

East-West

Basis of appeal:

The appellants feel pass is a LA.

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

Agree with the TD that pass is not a logical alternative. The debate was sufficient to justify returning the deposit.

We would have preferred N/S to attend in order to answer questions about their system.

APPEAL No 3: Chaos in the club!

08.003 BGB Summer Simultaneous Pairs

Tournament Director:

Eric Favager

Referee:

Anne Jones

Note by editor:

A Referee is an Appeals Committee consisting of one person.

This hand occurred in a Simultaneous Pairs, which is a nationally run event but with individual heats in clubs as ordinary club nights. Thus the TD was the TD in the club. However the appeal was made to the WBU.

MP Pairs Board no 25 Dealer North E/W vulnerable	♠ 4 ♥ T8765 ♦ AKQ2 ♣ K62	
♠ AQJ986 ♥ 4 ♦ 865 ♣ QT9	<i>N</i> <i>W</i> <i>E</i> <i>S</i>	♠ T7532 ♥ A9 ♦ 94 ♣ A754
	♠ K ♥ KQJ52 ♦ JT73 ♣ J83	

Basic systems:

North-South play Benjaminised Acoll

East-West play Acoll

<i>WEST</i>	<i>NORTH</i>	<i>EAST</i>	<i>SOUTH</i>
	1♥	Pass	3♠ (A1)
Pass (2)	4♦	Pass (3)	4♥
4♠	5♥	Dble	Pass
Pass	Pass		

(5) Alert made by tapping the table.

(6) West passed but after realising the tapping was an alert wanted to bid 4♠, This was disallowed by South.

(7) East wanted to bid 4♠. At this point the playing TD was called but did not arrive and play continued. East was discouraged by South from bidding 4♠ so passed.

Result at table:

5♥ doubled -1 by North, NS -100

Director first called:

After East's pause over 4♦. Actually arrived after play finished.

Director's statement of facts:

East attempted to bid on second round – dissuaded, therefore hesitation.

North clear about alert, West not familiar with tapping table to alert, then tried to bid 4♠.

If director had been called, this may or may not have been allowed. But hand was going to playing director's table next.

West misguidedly bid 4♠ this time, because of intent on bidding 3♠ first time. Hesitation, from attempted bid by East influences this bid.

Strictly speaking the 4♠ bid should be disallowed because there were alternatives (pass, double) which were ignored.

If 3♠ had been allowed the first time round, then I can well see 5♥ doubled being final contract (4♠ is a make).

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

5♥ –1 by North, NS –50

Details of ruling:

On discussion with all four players and John Salisbury and inspection of results, I removed the double to restore equity.

This changed the N/S matchpoints from 3/12 to 8/12 – better than 60/40. Most 4♥ contracts were 1 off, some 2 off. One 3♥ just made.

Note by editor:

It is not clear where John Salisbury comes into it: he is not one of the players at the table. He is an excellent player. Bidding boxes were in use and alerts by regulation have to be given by use of the alert card. Previous to bidding boxes, alerting in Wales was by knocking the table but it is many years since spoken bidding was used.

Appeal lodged by:

North-South

Director's comments:

No deposit taken because telephone referee (email).

Comments by North-South:

Over 4♦ East attempts to bid touching cards in box. South said "I think we should call the director now". East went to fetch director. While waiting East said "I'll not bother" and passed.

Director called at end of session. Details for the above bidding given, and director brought it back to 4♥.

...as happy with that decision, then John Salisbury said the ten tricks should be reduced to nine as it doesn't make ten, if de.....upset and sad that wasn't on. North had made ten and ten it should be. I asked East if the spades had not been mentioned would have led and she said exactly the same.

This is exactly as I recall it, your comments would be appreciated.

Note by editor:

Exactly as typed on the form. The typing goes off both sides of the form.

Referee's decision:

Table score re-instated

No deposit taken

Referee's comments:

Alert was tenuous and not understood immediately it was made., so initial pass was under MI. 4♠ bid by West should have been allowed.

It is North's duty to ensure that West has seen and understands that an alert has been made, and this it would appear had not happened, so the 4♠ bid should have been allowed. If this had happened East would not have given the unauthorised information that she did. If North was mindful to stop the 4♠ bid by West they should not have called until a ID had sorted the problem.

I am aware of the unauthorised information given to West by East but I do not think West used it. West was always wanting to bid 4S and had made this clear from the start.

I was in some doubt as to who had doubled, but I now understand that it was East. East has no unauthorised information as 4S has now been bid in the legal auction, so is under no constraint, and is free to bid whatever they like. (I would not have allowed a double by West, because Pass would be a logical alternative given that West has UI.

My ruling is that the table result should stand. 5Hx-1.

TD should always be available to give a ruling, even if playing.

N/S should not rule in the absence of the TD especially if such ruling damages E/W.

APPEAL No 4: Of course I have spades!

08.004 Welsh Foursomes

Tournament Director:

Ted Hill

Appeals Committee:

Tony Hill (Chairman) Paddy Murphy Alan Screen

Swiss Teams Board no 9 Dealer North E/W vulnerable	♠ QT72 ♥ AQT ♦ 97 ♣ QT76	
♠ AKJ ♥ 92 ♦ K8652 ♣ AK3	<div> <div>N</div> <div>W E</div> <div>S</div> </div>	♠ 9653 ♥ 87654 ♦ T4 ♣ 92
	♠ 84 ♥ KJ8 ♦ AQJ3 ♣ J854	

Basic systems:

North-South play Benjy Acol, 5 card suits. Play penalty pass and takeout double so long as 2♠ available.

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
	Pass	Pass	1♣ (A1)
1NT	Dble	2♣	Pass (A2)
Pass	Dble	2♥	Dble (A3)
2♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

(8) Could be one card

(9) Penalty pass

(10) Takeout

Result at table:

2♠ +2 by West, NS -170

Director first called:

At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:

N/S asked about 2♣ when it was bid, Told natural. Convention card checked. No info.

E/W say that, without the double, they play "system on". But with it is "system off" thus both 2♣ and 2♥ by East were natural. West claimed that it was obvious that his partner had hearts and spades – what else could he have had? East said if he had six hearts [note ***] he would have bid 2♥ immediately. If he had clubs he would have stood the double. West's 2♠ was common sense. N/S believe E/W were playing two way bids.

Note ***. When East read this he said this was wrong: he had said "a single-suit hand with hearts" not "six hearts".

Director's ruling:

Artificial score awarded:

Average plus to N/S, average minus to E/W

Details of ruling:

I was not convinced a spade holding by East was clear and consultation did not find a sound player who would bid anything but pass. When East bids 2♣ he is in charge of the auction. I do not accuse E/W of an undisclosed agreement. It "could" be. Law 40A3.

Note by editor:

In Wales if a pair use an illegal agreement, the board is cancelled and scored as Average Plus/Average Minus (unless the non-offenders got a better result than this).

Appeal lodged by:

East-West

Director's comments:

If I do not adjust I could be setting a dangerous precedent.

Comments by East-West:

East: our agreement in this situation is that bids are natural and redouble is for blood. 2♣ was ostensibly natural. When it was doubled, I ran to 2♥. If I had clubs, I would have left it in 2♣ doubled. If I only had hearts I would have bid 2♥ immediately. By bidding this way, I showed hearts and spades. Although we had no agreement that this was the case, it is the only logical interpretation of this sequence. We fully explained this at the table.

West: I thought partner showed at least 4-4 in the majors and few points. Opponents could have passed 2♣ and collected this in hundreds. Also, opponents should have beaten 2♠.

Appeals Committee decision:

Table score re-instated

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

Although the 2♣ bid could have been better explained, E/W made reasonable attempts to explain that the subsequent auction showed two suits, which could be calculated to be hearts and spades.

The committee felt that the 2♣ bid followed by the subsequent actions was a long established manoeuvre in bridge circles and that N/S were experienced enough to recognise the situation.

APPEAL No 5: What is a fit worth?

08.005 Welsh Foursomes

Tournament Director:

Ted Hill

Appeals Committee:

Anne Jones (Chairman) Lyn Reese Alan Screen

Swiss Teams Board no 2 Dealer East N/S vulnerable	♠ KQ86 ♥ 75 ♦ AJ82 ♣ QJ7	
♠ AJ ♥ 642 ♦ T953 ♣ T854	<div> <div><i>N</i></div> <div><i>W</i> <i>E</i></div> <div><i>S</i></div> </div>	♠ T2 ♥ AT983 ♦ Q76 ♣ A93
	♠ 97543 ♥ KQJ ♦ K4 ♣ K62	

Basic systems:

North-South play Benji Acol, weak NT, transfers

<i>WEST</i>	<i>NORTH</i>	<i>EAST</i>	<i>SOUTH</i>
		Pass	Pass
Pass	1NT	Pass	2♥ (1)
Pass	2♠	Pass	2NT
Pass	3♠ (H)	Pass	4♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

(11) Transfer

Result at table:

4♠ making by North, NS +620

Director first called:

At end of auction

Director's statement of facts:

I was called at the end of the auction and the hesitation was agreed. I was recalled at the end of the hand because E/W did not think South's bid of 4♠ was evident.

Director's ruling:

Table result stands

Details of ruling:

I thought that, if 2NT showed 11-12 points, then, with 12, most players would raise to game at teams. In any event South must avoid actions indicated by the hesitation as described by Law. Law 16B1A.

Appeal lodged by:

East-West

Director's comments:

After a slow 3♠, South must decide what action is indicated? North may have been considering pass, 3NT or 4♠ so South remains a free agent.

Comments by North-South:

N/S do not break transfers so 3♠ is invitational in spades.

Comments by East-West:

North agreed the hesitation and stated that she was thinking of bidding 4♠. This leaves South with a 'simple' decision when 3♠ is clearly to play.

Appeals Committee decision:

Score assigned for both sides:

3♠ +1 by North, NS +170

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

South is limited and hesitation clearly suggests action.

General comments