



2011

EBU Appeals

ENGLISH BRIDGE UNION

2011

APPEALS

All the appeals from the EBU's major events have been included here. It is hoped that they will provide interest and an insight into the way that people in England are ruling the game. The booklet is produced by the Laws & Ethics Committee but the comments shown here (including those from members of the L&EC) are the personal opinions of the writer.

Our thanks to the commentators, who have donated their time and their expertise, and to Neil Morley who volunteered to transcribe all the appeals.

If you have any comments, or would like to be involved in the production of future booklets, please contact the L&EC Secretary, John Pain:

Secretary, Laws and Ethics Committee
English Bridge Union
Broadfields
Bicester Road
AYLESBURY
Bucks HP19 8AZ
England UK

Tel: 01296 317218

Fax: 01296 317220

Email: john@ebu.co.uk

EBU web site: <http://www.ebu.co.uk>

L&EC page: <http://www.ebu.co.uk/lawsandethics/>

From outside UK
replace 0 with +44

Booklet compiled & edited by Frances Hinden

Commentators

Jeffrey Allerton is a tournament player from Surrey, England. He is a past European and World junior champion, and recently won the Gold Cup and the Camrose. He used to direct club and county competitions, and is a member of the EBU panel of referees.

Robin Barker worked for 20 years at National Physical Laboratory as a research computer scientist. He is an EBU National Tournament Director and an EBL Tournament Director. Away from bridge he enjoys walking the coasts and moors of the South-West of England, where he lives. But this has been constrained by medical problems; in particular, periods of wearing an aircast boot, which can be used to stamp his authority when directing.

Heather Dhondy is a professional bridge player, teacher and writer. She is a constant fixture on the England ladies' team and won both the European championships and the Mind Sports Olympiad in 2012. She is also a member of the EBU panel of referees.

Richard Hills' chief claims to Directing and Appeals Committee fame are his frequent (and frequently controversial) contributions to the Bridge Laws Mailing List (blml).

Paul Lamford is the author of a couple of books on bridge, *50 Bridge Puzzles* and *Starting Out in Bridge*, and is a frequent contributor to Bridge magazine and *Metrobridge*. He is a County Director, regular poster on bridge forums, and has been a member of many Appeals Committees.

Tim Rees has been playing bridge since school, and has won most of the English and Welsh national titles at some stage. He has represented Wales at Europeans, Olympiads and Commonwealth Games since devolution from Great Britain in 2000, with his greatest success being a silver medal at the 2002 Commonwealth Games. Tim is a member of the Laws and Ethics Committees for both England and Wales. He works at the Transport Research Laboratory, analysing (and hopefully solving) motorway congestion.

Barry Rigal is a full time player, writer, journalist and commentator married to Sue Picus. After living in London for 35 years he has been resident in New York for nearly 20 years, and now is considered an American by his family and still British by his NY friends. He was chairman of ACBL National Appeals for three years and has commented on appeals for two decades. He is currently trying to construct a handbook for appeals (and good luck with that one!).

Frances Hinden is married to Jeffrey Allerton. She has won many British events and has bronze medals from the European Open Championships. She used to direct club and county competitions, is vice-chairman of the Laws & Ethics Committee and a member of the EBU panel of referees.

APPEAL No: 11.002

Tournament Director: Gordon Rainsford

Appeals Committee: Jeremy Dhondy (Referee + others consulted)

<p>♠ 1074 ♥ J53 ♦ J9743 ♣ 102</p> <p>♠ KJ9862 ♠ A5 ♥ AK976 ♥ Q1042 ♦ 6 ♦ KQ10 ♣ A ♣ KJ74</p> <p>♠ Q3 ♥ 8 ♦ A852 ♣ Q98653</p>	<p>Board 32 : Dealer West : EW vulnerable : IMPs (KO)</p> <table><thead><tr><th><i>West</i></th><th><i>North</i></th><th><i>East</i></th><th><i>South</i></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>2♠(1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♣(2)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>3♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>4NT(3)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>5♥(H)</td><td>Pass</td><td>6♥</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Strong, natural Acol 2-bid (2) Natural positive (3) RKCB or Blackwood – See below (H) Hesitation</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>	2♠(1)	Pass	3♣(2)	Pass	3♥	Pass	4NT(3)	Pass	5♥(H)	Pass	6♥	All Pass
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>														
2♠(1)	Pass	3♣(2)	Pass														
3♥	Pass	4NT(3)	Pass														
5♥(H)	Pass	6♥	All Pass														

Basic systems:

North-South – No system information given.

East-West – No system information given.

Result at table: 6♥ making by North.

Director first called: Information not provided.

Director's ruling: Score adjusted to 5♥+1

Director's comments:

X vs Y were playing their quarter-final match of the Gerard Faulkner Salver on Friday and during the evening Mr Axe (team X) and Mr Bye (team Y) came to me and asked if I could get an opinion about a hand.

I told them I was very pressed (playing and directing a large game on two floors with movement problems), so I wouldn't be able to consult or give a ruling at that time, but that I would be happy give a quick opinion as asked.

They showed me the West hand and gave me the auction. I wasn't told of the doubt about the meaning of 4NT – it was simply presented to me that the auction showed two key-cards missing. On that basis I said that I would expect the 6♥ bid to be disallowed, unless West could present a convincing case (unlikely) that there was no hand his partner could hold for his strong opener where slam would be expected to fail.

I told them that if they wanted me to give a ruling I would be happy to do so after the game had finished, when I would have time to consult with others and consider the matter in more detail. Alternatively, I said they might like to contact another director by phone (I suggested Amos, Barker or Stevenson) and offered them the use of the club phone and the club computer to find out their contact details.

At the end of the evening I saw Mr Axe and asked him what they had decided. He said that the ruling had made a difference to who won the match and that Team Y wished to appeal it. I pointed out that I hadn't given a ruling and he said that they had agreed to treat what I had said as a ruling. I am prepared to for it to be treated as a ruling so long as it is clear the circumstances that led to it and why I have neither consulted nor spoken to the players at the table.

I said that if an appeal had been requested I was happy to arrange it. I collected some more details from Mr Axe and asked him to get Mr Bye's contact details (they had already left the club) so that I could collect a deposit from him (in one form or another).

On Monday I saw Mr Axe again and asked him what was happening about this. He said that Mr Bye was going to appeal directly to the L&E. I commented that this was not the correct procedure and that the L&E were unlikely to

APPEAL No: 11.002

hear the appeal at this stage because the correct procedure had not been followed. I phoned Max Bavin and John Pain to clarify exactly what my role had been in this "ruling"/appeal.

A few further points arise from having seen what had been written.

I am not aware of having been told at the time of the uncertainty of the meaning of 4NT. When I asked why West had bid 6♥, Mr Bye said (commenting that he was putting words into West's mouth) that at worst the slam would be on a finesse. I said that even if that was true (which I don't think is the case as he could be missing two aces or the AK of trumps) he was not in a position to make such judgments when in receipt of UI.

This comment about slam being at worst on a finesse would make no sense unless 4NT was RKCB. 4NT as a tool for seeking a grand slam would only be useful if it were RKCB – otherwise it would not tell him whether or not he was missing the trump king. Since East had enough room to agree spades below game, or rebid clubs, it seems that 4NT would clearly be RKCB for hearts for most players who play it

If the given West hand is considered to be an ACOL Two (which would not be everyone's valuation of it) then there are other hands of similar strength that could be constructed such that the partnership would be missing two key cards. *Gordon Rainsford*

Details of ruling:

Note that the TD did not talk to the players at the table.

The issue is that there was an agreed period of thought by East (at least 30 seconds) before responding 5♥, North/South claimed that West had been influenced by the prolonged thought and that any doubt as to whether it was RKCB (or Blackwood) or even that East might have a void, had been removed.

The TD ruled that the prolonged thought counted as UI and that the result revert to 5♥ for +680 (and therefore a 13 IMPs to Team X instead of a flat board).

Comments by the captain of the East-West Team:

West said he bid 4NT looking for a grand slam and was never stopping short of a small slam. RKCB is on the convention card for when a suit has been agreed. West explained at the table at the end of the hand that his 4NT was 'ambiguous'.

There are some sequences in his system whereby Blackwood applies when a suit is not explicitly agreed. This sequence after an Acol 2 had never been discussed.

East had probably taken 4NT as Blackwood (ie 2 key cards plus the K♥) because he could not construct a Rule of 25 Acol 2 hand for West whereby a small slam is not virtually assured. Even if only 2 key cards were held, there are significant extra chances of a ♥ finesse or a minor suit void (hesitation or no hesitation by partner).

East admitted he was thinking whether 4NT was Blackwood (as no suit had been explicitly agreed) or RKCB. In fact, he asked his partner at the end of the hand what he had intended.

The only comment I would add as team captain is that although E/W were an established partnership for many years until West moved to the west country, for the last 10 years (during which time they added RKCB to their system), they have only played together a few times each year and no longer have any serious system discussions!

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Referee's decision: The TD's ruling is upheld.

Deposit: Forfeited

Referee's comments: None

APPEAL No: 11.002

Barry Rigal's comments:

Were it not for the problem with rulings given or not given this might not be so complex. East used keycard for hearts and used UI to bid on. Correct decision. The write-up appears to confuse East and West a few times. I have some sympathy with this incompetence – I do it myself a lot – but still...

Paul Lamford's comments:

I agree that a very slow response to Blackwood or RKCB conveys UI that one might not have the systemic meaning of the bid. Agree with keeping the deposit.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

I agree with the TD/Referee. Why couldn't West hold something like ♠KQJ10xx ♥AKJxx ♦x ♣Q? OK, that's a fairly specific hand, but it's consistent with what partner has shown.

Robin Barker's comments:

Procedurally, although the captains had consulted with the TD it was not the TD's ruling – instead it was a ruling where the captains agree on outcome (EBU White Book 162.4.1 (a): Matches Played Privately: When a ruling of first instance is required). Such ruling may not be appealed (EBU White Book 162,7: Matches Played Privately: Appeals procedures): "A ruling made under the provisions of 162.4 (b), (c), (d) or (e) above may be appealed by either captain.". The referee appears to have taken that position.

Heather Dhondy's comments:

I agree with the referee's ruling and the forfeiture of the deposit. East/West have no case.

Richard Hills' comments:

My parochial Aussie comment about administration of large Aussie bridge events is that in Oz we always have more than one Director on the floor of such large events. Thus the ABF **never** requires a contestant at a large event to contact an offsite Director by telephone. So I parochially suggest that the EBU powers-that-be should have funded an Assistant Director for the effective but overworked Gordon Rainsford.

Editor's comment: This was a KO match played 'privately' and such would usually take place in the home of one of the teams with any ruling either agreed between the captains or obtained by phoning a TD. This match happened to take place at a bridge club where a regular duplicate was also taking place, so Gordon's physical presence was effectively a coincidence; he had no official responsibility for providing rulings in the KO match.

Frances Hinden's comments:

The two captains consulted a third party, who explicitly said he was not giving a ruling, and then they agreed to treat it a ruling. That means they agreed a ruling between themselves, and as such it was technically not appealable. As they weren't informed of that, perhaps the deposit should have been returned as technically the appeal was never heard.

Tim Rees' comments:

East said he couldn't construct a Rule of 25 hand for partner where slam isn't virtually assured. I thought of two pretty quickly: KQJxxx Axxxx J A or KQJxxx Kxxx J AQ. Opposite those, we might not even make 5♥.

The 6♥ bid was a pretty blatant attempt to take advantage of the UI – I'm not surprised the deposit was forfeited.

APPEAL No: 11.007

Tournament Director: Ted Hill

Appeals Committee: Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), Tom Townsend and Filip Kurbalija

<p>♠ Q76 ♥ AJ ♦ AQ63 ♣ J953</p> <p>♠ A943 ♠ KJ108 ♥ KQ3 ♥ 62 ♦ 85 ♦ KJ942 ♣ K642 ♣ A8</p> <p>♠ 52 ♥ 1098754 ♦ 107 ♣ Q107</p>	<p>Board 24 : Dealer West : Love all : Matchpointed Pairs</p> <table><thead><tr><th><i>West</i></th><th><i>North</i></th><th><i>East</i></th><th><i>South</i></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1♣</td><td>1NT</td><td>Dbl</td><td>2♥</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>2♠</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>The Dbl was penalties. 2♥ was intended as a wriggle and natural. North announced it as transfer.</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>	1♣	1NT	Dbl	2♥	Pass	2♠	All Pass	
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>										
1♣	1NT	Dbl	2♥										
Pass	2♠	All Pass											

Basic systems:

North-South play wriggle after 1NTx

East-West play sound openings

Result at table: 2♠-3 (-150) lead not provided

Director first called: At end of auction

Director's statement of facts:

I was called at the end of the auction when South said his partner's transfer was incorrect. NS eventually agreed it was wrong. I offered West her final pass back under L21B1a. she declined saying the auction would have been different had her partner known the correct explanation. I was recalled at the end of the hand and was told that if NS had not bid 2♠ then East would have doubled 2♥ when it got to him for take-out. Thereafter, they would have come to their 4♠ contract. I said that 2♠ had been bid and there was nothing I could do about it. I asked why they did not double again and he said he left it to partner to reopen. West said she was not able to reopen in her system.

Director's ruling: Table result stands. West was given her final pass back at the end of the auction. L21B1a. 4♠ was not found because West could not reopen systemically. East asked if South had used UI by not rebidding 3♥, I said No.

Comments by North-South: West had the opportunity bid after the revised information was given. The fact that she chose not to should not afford a 'second bite of the cherry'

4♠ is not an automatic make in any case and a split score should be considered if the TD's ruling is overturned.

Comments by East-West: Re UI: Did not mention this at the table, mentioned when appeal money was taken. TD suggested making the UI point when the appeal is held but (he) did not rule on it.

Appeals Committee decision: Director's ruling upheld. That South was in receipt of UI but took an ethical action by passing.

Appeals Committee's comments:

When North bid 2♠ South might assume he had 5 spades and thus it is normal to pass. West was inconvenienced as a Double of 2♠ was take-out. We felt this was 'rub of the green'

There was sufficient to discuss that we thought it clear to return the deposit.

Barry Rigal's comments:

APPEAL No: 11.007

I think South is allowed to bid 3♥ –the auction is impossible after a 1NT overcall, so South can assume system accident. I cant decide about what E/W were allowed to know. West clearly should have doubled 2♠ the second time round so I think the AC did the right thing.

Paul Lamford's comments:

While West could not or would not double 2♠, as it would have been for takeout and she had a minimum anyway, what would a double of 2♠ by East mean? East is entitled to know that South bid a natural 2♥, and is also entitled to use the misexplanation of “transfer”. Anybody with half a brain would play that double of 2♠ was penalties now, and this would end the auction. East did not get her second call back, but this is the point the AC should have focussed on. The correct decision was 2♠x-3 by North. I am pleased the deposit was returned.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

I agree with the TD/AC.

Heather Dhondy's comments:

The only infraction here is the description of the 2♥ bid. With the knowledge of the true meaning of 2♥, East would still have passed, so it is West's decision about what to do, and West chose to do nothing even when given all the facts. Therefore no one was damaged by the infraction, and it would be wrong (in my view) to adjust the score.

Frances Hinden's comments:

From a ruling perspective, East and West were both in the same position: West knew that 2♥ was intended as natural but interpreted as a transfer and had the opportunity to guess that partner was also long in spades and double hoping for a penalty pass. West chose instead to pass it out. If East had full information (the systemic meaning of the 2♥ bid and the announcement of transfer) he also could have guessed to double; given that his partner did not do so in effectively the same position he can't credibly claim damage. E/W would have avoided this poor result had they been playing pass as forcing, but as they weren't, it is as the AC say 'rub of the green' and there was no damage from the infraction.

Tim Rees' comments:

The ruling looks straightforward. South has specifically NOT taken advantage of the UI by passing 2♠.

An aside: I'm not sure E/W should be claiming to play sound openings if they open the West hand. Messrs Roth and Stone would be horrified!

APPEAL No: 11.008

Tournament Director: Gary Conrad

Appeals Committee: Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), Brian Senior and Filip Kurbalija

<p>♠ K107 ♥ K632 ♦ 1094 ♣ 964</p> <p>♠ 84 ♠ AQ95 ♥ 98754 ♥ A10 ♦ A863 ♦ 52 ♣ KJ ♣ A10873</p> <p>♠ J632 ♥ QJ ♦ KQJ7 ♣ Q52</p>	<p>Board 27 : Dealer South : Love all :</p> <table><thead><tr><th><i>West</i></th><th><i>North</i></th><th><i>East</i></th><th><i>South</i></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>Dbl (1)</td><td>1NT</td></tr><tr><td>2♥ A (2)</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♠</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>3♦</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♥</td><td>All Pass</td></tr><tr><td>(1)</td><td>TD asked – penalty</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>(2)</td><td>Transfer to spades</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>	Pass	Pass	Dbl (1)	1NT	2♥ A (2)	Pass	2♠	Pass	3♦	Pass	3♥	All Pass	(1)	TD asked – penalty			(2)	Transfer to spades		
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																						
Pass	Pass	Dbl (1)	1NT																						
2♥ A (2)	Pass	2♠	Pass																						
3♦	Pass	3♥	All Pass																						
(1)	TD asked – penalty																								
(2)	Transfer to spades																								

Basic systems:

North-South play: Weak NT

East-West play: information not provided

Result at table: 3♥=

Director first called: At end of auction

Director's statement of facts:

I was called to the table (at the end of the auction) to reserve rights by NS and took details of the auction. The hand was played and EW made 9 tricks. I was called back at the end the hand. Clearly, West had forgotten the system and then bid 3♦ which East now realised and corrected to hearts. I ruled that the 3♦ bid was based on the realization that they had forgotten the system. I ruled that the 2♠ bid should be the final bid. This would make 9 tricks for the same score. NS have appealed that East should be forced to bid 4♠ after the 3♦ bid.

Director's ruling: Score assigned for both sides: 2♠ + 1

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Appeals Committee decision:

Score assigned for both sides:

4♠ -1 by East. Both deposits returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

After questioning, we did not think that East was in receipt of UI so his bid of 3♥ which was questioned might not be a good bid but there was nothing to disallow it. West was in receipt of UI because of the alert. When East bid 2♠ he will have a hand too good to pass 2♥. When he bids 3♥ west would expect (probably) 6 spades + 2 hearts +16+ so 4♠ is a reasonable contract. We thought most times this would lead to 9 tricks.

Barry Rigal's comments:

West would indeed drive to game after 2♠ without the alert – how he would do that is not clear. And indeed why he removed from 1Nx is also not clear! AC ruling is as good as any...though might not E/W have played 3NT?

APPEAL No: 11.008

Tim Rees' comments:

West is in receipt of UI, and in trying to take advantage, he's actually missed game (3NT is making). But West had alternative actions that would get to 4♥ or 4♠, so he has improved his score by playing in 3♥. Therefore, the TD and AC are right to adjust the score to 4♥/♠, down 1.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

As West considers 2♥ to be the right call over 1NTx, I suspect it would not occur to him to bid 4♠ over 3♥. Although East has no UI, his 3♥ bid (when 3♠ and 4♠ would be the obvious options) seems to be catering for partner having forgotten the system. Therefore, the TD/AC should have considered ruling 'fielded misbid' here: N/S receiving at least average plus, E/W at most average minus. By the way, is 4♠ really only one off?

Heather Dhondy's comments:

I think this is quite a tough one. It is possible that it could be right to pass 2♠ (non-forcing) with no guaranteed fit, and possibly without the values for game, however the hand does seem a little too strong to take that view. 3♦ seems a normal continuation. Now we have to look at the 3♥ bid. Clearly the UI makes it more attractive to pass 3♥ before something bad happens, but what are the alternatives? The AC suggest that East has shown 6♠ and 2♥, but I'm not sure why we are so sure that he has a 6-card suit. I would have thought there was a case for 3NT, however we can't do that because it's cold! I would leave the table result to stand on the basis that we can't give them a better score than they achieved at the table, and I don't think it is normal to bid 4♠.

Frances Hinden's comments:

West has UI while East doesn't. The problem is that it's very hard to guess what would/should have happened without the UI once we know West is a player who thought it correct to remove partner's penalty double of 1NT to 2♥.

Paul Lamford's comments:

AC decision seems OK, but I don't think nine tricks are normal. And North might double. If declarer wins the diamond lead, cashes two clubs and ruffs a club, he needs to play a spade to the queen and continue spades to make nine tricks. Even cashing the ace of hearts first is fatal.

APPEAL No: 11.012

Tournament Director: Nicole Cook

Appeals Committee: Heather Dhondy (Chairman), Neil Rosen and Richard Bowdery

♠ KQ4		Board 8 : Dealer West : Love all : Matchpointed Pairs			
♥ AKQ6		<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>
♦ 874		Pass	1NT(1)	Pass (H)	Pass
♣ K65		Dbl(2)	Pass	2♠	Dbl
♠ 10953	♠ AJ62	Pass	3♥	3♠	All Pass
♥ 74	♥ J1032	(1)	15-17		
♦ AJ632	♦ 10	(2)	Spades and a minor or 5 spades and 3 hearts		
♣ A3	♣ J987				
♠ 87					
♥ 985					
♦ KQ95					
♣ Q1042					

Result at table: 3♠-1 NS+50

Director first called: At end of play of the hand

Director's statement of facts:

When the hand was completed I was called to the table by South who asked me to review West's action following an agreed hesitation by East.

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

50% +90 & 50% +120

Details of ruling:

Following a player consultation I concluded that Pass is a logical alternative and I am required to adjust the result to an assigned score. L16.1A, L16.1B and L16.3

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Basis of appeal: Pass is not a Logical Alternative

Director's comments:

The player consultation was made among a wide variety of age and range of experience and bridge knowledge. It is one of the largest consultations I have made prior to making a ruling and while some players were vehemently for or against, the majority considered Pass before deciding.

Comments by North-South: After the hesitation a logical alternative is to Pass. My partner is aged 22 agrees with this statement. (I might add that the opponents' comments could be construed as ageist.)

Comments by East-West:

Given that our system allows us to enter the auction with spades and a minor showing 5-4 either way and that we open all 11's, pass is not a LA for any competent player under 40 – at least at love all. None of the juniors whom I would have expected to have been polled say they have been asked. We have the best suit and fear a heart led from partner. Why play this system and then not use it?

Appeals Committee decision:

Table result restored. Despite all being over 40 we feel that bidding with the West hand is absolutely clear.

APPEAL No: 11.012

Barry Rigal's comments:

I feel I have to get the 'absolute b****ocks' comment out again..... oh all right. I fear that the AC must have been blinded by science. It isn't that West might not bid some, most or all of the time. The tempo break made it more attractive. Now West can't take an action of this sort and must be actively discouraged from doing so again.

Paul Lamford's comments:

While I would also bid, the TD conducted a poll of what he considered similar players and found significant number would pass. Therefore pass is an LA. Is bidding demonstrably suggested however? You know that partner has at least some values, and the opponents were maximum for their actions on the actual hand. Partner's hesitation does not make it particularly more likely that showing spades and diamonds will succeed, so overall I agree with the AC but for different reasons. The bid worked because partner had four spades – much against the odds.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

The AC seems to have ruled 'no logical alternative' but if that is the case, they really ought to explain why they have ignored the results of the TD's poll. The fact that all three AC members consider protecting automatic does not mean that such an action is automatic for the player at the table; the AC should take into account all of the evidence available.

As it happens, 'table result stands' is the correct ruling, but for a different reason. Here, West's conventional double could not demonstrably have been suggested by knowing that East was considering an action other than pass. Protecting on the West hand is most likely to be successful if his side has a fit somewhere. If anything, the UI *decreases* the chance of his side having a fit as it suggests that East is not 4333, for example. Whilst East might equally have been considering bidding with 5224 and 2524 shapes, the former is very unlikely when South has passed out 1NT.

Richard Hills' comments:

The young-at-heart Appeals Committee presumably agreed with East-West that the very large poll of players was as unrepresentative of youthful experts as was the unrepresentative very large poll that the Literary Digest magazine ran before the 1936 Presidential election. The Literary Digest telephoned millions of voters, thus predicted that Landon would beat Roosevelt in a landslide. Sure enough there was a landslide, but Roosevelt beat Landon, because many Roosevelt supporters were too poor to own a telephone during the Great Depression.

Frances Hinden's comments:

When performing a player poll, in this type of the case the TD needs to find peers of the West player in style as well as system. I know who the players were, and I can't imagine West passing on this hand under any circumstances. Note sometimes one can argue that the slow pass of 1NT doesn't demonstrably suggest bidding, but if it suggests values then an artificial double caters for any possible hand and if pass is an LA, it is correct to adjust.

Tim Rees' comments:

What actions should be allowed depends on the standard and style (as well as age) of the West player. Here, West was a strong aggressive player (and a junior). For him (or more precisely, for a group of his peers), bidding would be automatic. It's unusual to overturn the results of a player consultation, but here I think the wrong group of players was polled.

APPEAL No: 11.014

Tournament Director: Martin Lee

Appeals Committee: David Burn (Chairman), Nick Sandqvist and Paula Leslie

<p>♠ AJ82 ♥ 62 ♦ A1042 ♣ A86 ♠ K643 ♠ Q10975 ♥ 108 ♥ A43 ♦ K3 ♦ 876 ♣ KQJ54 ♣ 103 ♠ - ♥ KQJ975 ♦ QJ95 ♣ 972</p>	<p>Board 21 : Dealer North : NS vulnerable : Swiss Teams</p> <table><thead><tr><th><i>West</i></th><th><i>North</i></th><th><i>East</i></th><th><i>South</i></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td>1NT</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♦ (1)</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl (2)</td><td>Rdbl</td><td>2♠</td><td>3♥ (3)</td></tr><tr><td>3♠</td><td>Dbl</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Transfer to Hearts (correctly announced) (2) Intended as a take-out of hearts but see (3) (3) Question asked about the double of 2♦ bid. Explained by East as lead directing not necessarily showing length.</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>		1NT	Pass	2♦ (1)	Dbl (2)	Rdbl	2♠	3♥ (3)	3♠	Dbl	All Pass	
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>														
	1NT	Pass	2♦ (1)														
Dbl (2)	Rdbl	2♠	3♥ (3)														
3♠	Dbl	All Pass															

Basic systems:

North-South play Weak NT and 5 card majors

East-West play Strong NT and 5 card majors

Result at table: 3♠ doubled making by East (-530), lead not disclosed

Director first called: At end of play by North

Director's statement of facts:

North felt that he had been damaged by the ME of the 2♦ bid. He had doubled 3♠ on his A1042 diamond holding and would not have done so had he known it was intended as a take-out of hearts. Nothing more was said by any player and I left the table to consult.

Director's ruling: My ruling was to adjust the score to 3 spades undoubled by East

Details of ruling: Assumption of ME L21B1(b). Adjustment of score L21B3

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: South would have bid 4 hearts

Director's comments:

I considered allowing South to bid 4 hearts but did not include this in my ruling as:

- South did not bid 4 hearts (but only bid 3 hearts) during the auction and
- South did not mention this before I left the table originally (to consult). He did mention it subsequently after I returned. At this time South told me he did not bid 4 hearts because of the double by his partner. Without the double he "would have bid 4 hearts".

Appeals Committee decision:

The ruling was amended:

75% of -530 (3 spades doubled, making by East)

25% of +650 (4 hearts +1 by South)

APPEAL No: 11.014

We consider that if North had received the correct explanation of double of 2 diamonds, ie 'no agreement', he would almost always double 3 spades (and the table result would stand). If he does not double 3 spades then we accept that South would bid 4 hearts (preference of no wasted spades with partner).

Barry Rigal's comments:

Very generous to E/W. I'd be much happier with a 50-50 outcome of the two possibilities – but I'd certainly have a 3♠/4♣ element in there. The bottom line is that West benefited by his partnership's MI; I don't like that.

Tim Rees' comments:

I don't see that the MI had much effect on North's action. Does the diamond holding make that much difference?

One thing everyone seems to have missed is that West was in receipt of UI. The authorised information is that he has made a takeout double, and partner has suggested spade support. Why should West be competing to 3♠? The unauthorised information is that partner has bid his own spade suit, so has shown a 5-card suit. So I'd disallow West's 3♠, and therefore North would have nothing to double. East would have no reason to bid 3♠, so I don't think 3♠ doubled should be part of the weighting. I'd have adjusted to 3♥+2.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

Given that South failed to bid 4♥ on either of the first two rounds of the auction and failed to mention the possibility when the TD first attended the table, the AC was perhaps a little generous to South in believing that he would always bid 4♥ if 3♠ undoubled had been passed round to him.

Heather Dhondy's comments:

I agree with the TD. If South didn't mention this 4♥ bid at the time, and had only bid 3♥ on the previous round, it sounds as though he's trying it on having examined the board in more detail. This seems quite clear cut to me, so South must have been very persuasive at the appeal!

Frances Hinden's comments:

N/S must have been very persuasive to convince the TD that North's diamond holding makes such a difference to the double to 3♠. I don't mind South taking a while to work out that he would have bid 4♥ on a different auction – at the table you are dealing with what actually happened, not what might have happened had partner bid differently. However, I think E/W have been treated very generously: West has UI that partner thinks his double was lead-directing, so therefore East has shown more in spades than opposite a take-out double. I would have thought pass over 3♥ was a LA for West and the final contract might well be 3♥ making with overtricks.

Paul Lamford's comments:

Good effort by the AC deciding what would have happened without any infraction, and thus restoring equity.

APPEAL No : 11.024

Tournament Director: Gordon Rainsford

Appeals Committee: Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), Tim Rees and Graham Osborne

<p>♠ KQ86 ♥ 64 ♦ 876 ♣ K1097</p> <p>♠ A109732 ♠ J54 ♥ Q853 ♥ J10 ♦ 54 ♦ AKQ32 ♣ 5 ♣ A63</p> <p>♠ - ♥ AK972 ♦ J109 ♣ QJ842</p>	<p>Board 3 : Dealer South : EW vulnerable : Matchpoint Pairs</p> <table><thead><tr><th><i>West</i></th><th><i>North</i></th><th><i>East</i></th><th><i>South</i></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1♥</td></tr><tr><td>1♠</td><td>1NT</td><td>2♥ (H)</td><td>3♣</td></tr><tr><td>3♠</td><td>Dbl (H)(1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♣</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♠</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>Dbl</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>(1)</td><td>Penalty</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>(H)</td><td>Hesitation</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>				1♥	1♠	1NT	2♥ (H)	3♣	3♠	Dbl (H)(1)	Pass	4♣	Pass	Pass	4♠	Pass	Pass	Dbl	All Pass		(1)	Penalty			(H)	Hesitation		
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																														
			1♥																														
1♠	1NT	2♥ (H)	3♣																														
3♠	Dbl (H)(1)	Pass	4♣																														
Pass	Pass	4♠	Pass																														
Pass	Dbl	All Pass																															
(1)	Penalty																																
(H)	Hesitation																																

Basic systems: East-West play Acol 12-14 NT

Result at table: 4♠x-1 by East West, lead – not provided

Director first called: At end of auction

Director's statement of facts: 1NT 8-10. North's first penalty double was agreed to be slow

Director's ruling: Score assigned for both sides: 3♠ doubled making by East West

Details of ruling: A slow penalty double expresses doubt. Pass is a logical alternative. L16B1

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Appeals Committee decision: Director's ruling upheld. The committee agreed that South had used UI to remove the penalty double which was slow. Deposit withheld.

Appeals Committee's comments:

South said he believed East had 4 trumps for his 2♥ (slow) bid but there is no evidence to support this. South had a defence (AK♥). We felt he used the UI to remove, we did not consider South made any valid points to indicate why he removed. The committee came to a unanimous decision quickly and withheld the deposit.

Heather Dhondy's comments:

I agree with the AC.

Richard Hills' comments:

In my opinion whether a unanimous decision is quick or slow is totally irrelevant to whether a deposit is forfeited or returned. The only criterion for the forfeiture of a deposit should be this question, "Is the appeal without merit?"

Frances Hinden's comments:

Well said by the AC. Complete waste of their time.

Paul Lamford's comments:

I agree that Pass is an LA, and would also have kept the deposit.

Barry Rigal's comments:

Excellent; and terse. Well done. The committee came to a unanimous decision quickly and withheld the deposit.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

A straightforward case. I agree with the AC, including the decision to retain the deposit.

APPEAL No : 11.026

Tournament Director: Gordon Rainsford

Appeals Committee: Tim Rees (Chairman), Chris Jagger and Graham Osborne

♠ J765		Board 33 : Dealer North : Love all : Matchpointed Pairs			
♥ QJ		<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>
♦ AQJ76			1♦	Pass	Pass
♣ Q10		2NT	Pass	3NT	Pass
♠ AKQ94	♠ 1032	4♥	All Pass		
♥ K9653	♥ A872				
♦ 2	♦ K1094				
♣ 97	♣ K4				
	♠ 8				
	♥ 104				
	♦ 853				
	♣ AJ86532				

Basic systems: Not provided for either partnership

Result at table: 4♥+1 for -450 to EW, lead not provided

Director first called: At end of auction.

Director's statement of facts:

West thought his 2NT shows two suits of the same rank. East expected strong balanced so did not alert.

Director's ruling: Score assigned for both sides: 3NT making by East West, NS -400

Details of ruling:

The failure to alert 2NT suggested bidding rather than passing 3NT. West has bid his hand and Pass is a logical alternative. A diamond lead is likely and leads to 9 tricks. L12B1

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: The question of the lead.

Appeals Committee decision:

Score assigned for both sides (Law 12C1(c)):

20% of 3NT -4 by East, NS +200

80% of 3NT= by East, NS -400

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

We feel that A♦ is a likely lead. We have awarded 80% of this lead.

However, the club switch at trick 2 is not obvious. South is known to have 7 clubs (West is 5512), but has not responded. We have awarded a 25% chance of club switch (given the A♦ lead). This is 20% overall.

Tim Rees' comments:

In discussion after we gave this ruling, a few people commented that N/S's actual defence was relevant. That's not the case, as although West has corrected the MI, he's still made use of the UI. N/S should have been defending 3NT, not 4♥, so whatever they did against 4♥ (including the lead) is irrelevant.

APPEAL No : 11.026

What should have happened at the table was for West to pass 3NT (not using the UI), then volunteer a correction of the explanation (removing the MI). North would then have had an opportunity to work out what had happened and lead the ♦A. Although he's not entitled to know the opposition have had a misunderstanding, he should be able to work it out here (at his own risk).

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

The form omits a very important detail: what was the E/W agreement? There is a space for this sequence on all versions of the EBU convention card, so what did this say? N/S are only allowed to know the E/W agreement; if 2NT was natural and West realised that the non-alert was correct, he would have no misexplanation to correct at the end of the auction and the defence would not become aware of the nature of West's hand during the early play in 3NT.

Frances Hinden's comments:

Having passed 3NT, West is only obliged to 'correct' the explanation if 2NT was not systemically natural so (depending on the actual partnership methods), North may be on lead against an auction with no alerts and no correction from declarer. However, in this (hypothetical) auction, West would have to be on very solid ground that he has misbid rather than partner has misexplained. In real life he did volunteer a correction, so it is reasonable to assume he would also do so in the hypothetical auction and thus NS would become aware of the misunderstanding even though they are not entitled to know about it. Without any firm evidence of their partnership agreement I think the AC have this right.

Paul Lamford's comments:

When adjusting, the AC can only assume it has gone 2NT -3NT. North is not entitled to the information that West has misbid (assuming that 2NT was natural according to the partnership methods). The club switch is therefore impossible to find, and I agree with the original TD ruling.

Barry Rigal's comments:

Generous to N/S but at pairs I guess it's reasonable – and not material? Once E/W don't play hearts they are due for a zero?

APPEAL No : 11.028

Tournament Director: I W Hoskins

Appeals Committee: Paul Hackett (Chairman), Bob Baker and Dan McIntosh

<p>♠ 93 ♥ K1074 ♦ KJ762 ♣ 62 ♠ KJ652 ♠ AQ874 ♥ A82 ♥ 63 ♦ 85 ♦ 1094 ♣ A85 ♣ 1094 ♠ 10 ♥ QJ95 ♦ AQ3 ♣ KQJ73</p>	<p>Board 11 : Dealer South : Love all : Swiss Teams</p> <table><thead><tr><th><i>West</i></th><th><i>North</i></th><th><i>East</i></th><th><i>South</i></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1♣</td></tr><tr><td>1♠</td><td>Dbl</td><td>2♠</td><td>4♥</td></tr><tr><td>Pass(1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♠</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>Dbl</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) West passes after asking questions regarding the meaning of North's double</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>				1♣	1♠	Dbl	2♠	4♥	Pass(1)	Pass	4♠	Pass	Pass	Dbl	All Pass	
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																		
			1♣																		
1♠	Dbl	2♠	4♥																		
Pass(1)	Pass	4♠	Pass																		
Pass	Dbl	All Pass																			

Basic systems:

North-South play 4 card majors.

East-West system not provided.

Result at table: 4♠-2 doubled by East/West, NS +300, lead not provided.

Director first called: Not described.

Director's ruling: Table result stands

Details of ruling: The bid of 4♠ was not suggested by the questions of West.

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Appeals Committee decision: Director's ruling upheld Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments: The question asked did not, in our opinion, influence the decision to bid 4♠ as it may well suggest that 4♥ was going down.

Barry Rigal's comments:

Strongly disagree. Once east did not bid 4♠ the first time what made him do it the second time? Anyone who answers anything should be interested in this 'genuine' gold brick I can let you have at a VERY reasonable rate. East was trying to exploit his partner's question and may not have got it right but we know what he was trying to do.

Tim Rees' comments:

Pass is certainly an LA here (East only bid 2♠ at his previous opportunity), so the question is whether West's question suggested the 4♠ bid. I don't know, as West doesn't seem to have any reason for asking. Perhaps that's why the TD and AC said that the question didn't suggest 4♠, but would West only ask on certain hand types?

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

The double was not alerted and South's 4♥ bid is entirely consistent with the double having its normal meaning. If West was not considering acting, this seems like a strange question to ask.

Robin Barker's comments:

It would be good to know what the TD/AC thought were the logical alternatives to 4♠

APPEAL No : 11.028

Heather Dhondy's comments:

I don't like these rulings. The question demonstrates a further interest in participating in the sequence. Presumably the answer was not unexpected, so why ask the question if you are going to pass? If he thought it was going down given the expected answer, he would have doubled, so East knows that he has a different sort of hand, and has taken a unilateral decision to bid 2♠ and then 4♠, which turns out to be the right thing to do when partner has a suitable hand. I would not allow the 4♠ bid.

Frances Hinden's comments:

While I agree with the AC that questions shouldn't really suggest anything, and so I grudgingly accept the ruling is correct, I can't help but dislike the EW actions. We don't have the evidence to know if West only asks pointless questions when he has a 'pure' hand and passes on a hand where he doesn't want partner to save, but the auction certainly suggests that as a possibility. However, it's equally possible that East bid 2♠ on the first round just to see what was going to happen, and was always going to bid 4♠ over 4# whatever partner did or asked.

Paul Lamford's comments:

I agree that it is the fifth spade that suggests bidding 4♠, not the questions. That is authorised. Agree with the AC.

APPEAL No : 11.033

Tournament Director: R M Turner

Appeals Committee: Brian Senior (Chairman), Ron Davis and Croz Crosswell

<p>♠ Q986 ♥ - ♦ J875432 ♣ K2</p> <p>♠ 1052 ♠ AK73 ♥ 10986 ♥ KJ32 ♦ Q ♦ 96 ♣ AQJ95 ♣ 1074</p> <p>♠ J4 ♥ AQ754 ♦ AK10 ♣ 863</p>	<p>Board 17 : Dealer North : Love all : Swiss Teams</p> <table><thead><tr><th><i>West</i></th><th><i>North</i></th><th><i>East</i></th><th><i>South</i></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td>Pass</td><td>2♥ (1)</td><td>Pass (2)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>3♦</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>3♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>Dbl</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) 2♥ = weak both majors. (2) South asked questions and looked at the EW CC before passing.</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>		Pass	2♥ (1)	Pass (2)	Pass	3♦	Pass	Pass	3♥	Pass	Pass	Dbl	All Pass			
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																		
	Pass	2♥ (1)	Pass (2)																		
Pass	3♦	Pass	Pass																		
3♥	Pass	Pass	Dbl																		
All Pass																					

Basic systems:

North-South play 5 card majors, strong NT.

East-West play 5 card majors, weak NT.

Result at table: 3♥ doubled -2 by West, NS +300, lead not provided.

Director first called: At end of auction

Director's statement of facts:

I was called back at the end of play. EW considered that North might not have bid 3♦ without the irregularity by South. I think everyone would bid 3♦ in this sequence, given North's hand and the form of scoring (IMP's to VP's).

Director's ruling: Table result stands.

Details of ruling: North has no logical bridge alternative to 3♦. L16B. See also White Book 82.2

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Comments by East-West:

With such a weak hand Pass is a logical alternative, therefore, following the UI North should pass 2♥.

Comments by North-South:

I was in the true protective position. I had no hearts. The hand is a little light on points but the shape makes up for this with 7 diamonds and 4 spades. I would do this normally.

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld. 3♦ looks to be a normal action. Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

3♦ looks a normal action. South is marked with fair values when 2♥ comes around. North is very shapely and it would be very timid not to compete. Also, players who are unused to relatively strange methods will often be a little flustered and will take time over them, with or without a hand which is close to bid.

APPEAL No : 11.033

We would like the appellants to hear that we were very close to keeping the deposit. The appeal had very little merit in our view.

Tim Rees' comments:

I'm not sure of the relevance of the TD's comment about the form of scoring – why should this make a difference? I agree with allowing the 3♦ bid, more because there's available AI that South is strong with hearts (2♥ has been passed out) than because there are no LAs to 3♦.

Heather Dhondy's comments:

I'm happy with the ruling and AC decision, however I would not be close to keeping the deposit on this hand. N/S are the non-offending side, and North's light re-opening (albeit normal) is made safer by the UI.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

Whilst the final ruling seems reasonable, I do not agree with some of the wording in the write-up. The TD refers to "the irregularity by South" but South did not commit one. By itself, hesitating itself is not usually an infraction. If the hesitator's partner's subsequent actions which come under scrutiny, then it is the hesitator's partner who might have committed an infraction (but judged by the TD and AC not to be one in this case). The AC's explanation that "3♦ looks a normal action" is not sufficient to justify their ruling. To rule no logical alternative, 3♦ has to be the only normal action.

Robin Barker's comments:

I am not disagreeing with the ruling but the test should not be is 3♦ a "normal action", but is Pass a logical alternative.

Richard Hills' comments:

"We would like millionaires to hear that they can appeal with trivial monetary consequences." ☹

Frances Hinden's comments:

There was no reason not to keep the deposit. It's an unusual opening bid in England and I would be tempted to say there is no UI from South reading the convention card, but either way re-opening is absolutely automatic and E/W have wasted everyone's time.

Paul Lamford's comments:

The bid that is not allowed by North is double, as it looks like South has a heart stack from the UI. I agree that bidding 3♦ is automatic.

Barry Rigal's comments:

I agree with the AC comments re deposit and merit.

APPEAL No : 11.037

Tournament Director: Kathy Williams

Appeals Committee: Frances Hinden (Chairman), Ryan Stephenson and Jason Hackett

<p>♠ Q62 ♥ AJ1094 ♦ Q6 ♣ QJ5</p> <p>♠ K873 ♠ A54 ♥ 2 ♥ Q7 ♦ A98543 ♦ KJ7 ♣ 76 ♣ AK1083</p> <p>♠ J109 ♥ K8653 ♦ 102 ♣ 942</p>	<p>Board 22 : Dealer East : EW vulnerable : Swiss Pairs (Matchpoints => VPs)</p> <table><thead><tr><th><i>West</i></th><th><i>North</i></th><th><i>East</i></th><th><i>South</i></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1♣</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>1♦</td><td>1♥</td><td>1NT</td><td>3♥ (1) A</td></tr><tr><td>Pass (2) H (1)</td><td>Pass Asked and was told weak.</td><td>Dbl</td><td>All Pass</td></tr><tr><td>(2)</td><td>Agreed Hesitation.</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>			1♣	Pass	1♦	1♥	1NT	3♥ (1) A	Pass (2) H (1)	Pass Asked and was told weak.	Dbl	All Pass	(2)	Agreed Hesitation.		
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																		
		1♣	Pass																		
1♦	1♥	1NT	3♥ (1) A																		
Pass (2) H (1)	Pass Asked and was told weak.	Dbl	All Pass																		
(2)	Agreed Hesitation.																				

Basic systems: North-South not given. East-West play Acol and 3 weak 2's

Result at table: 3♥ doubled -3 by North, NS -500, lead A♣

Director first called: At end of auction

Director's statement of facts: North called me to reserve his rights at the end of the auction due to the hesitation and Pass by West and then East's double. I was called back at the end of play and asked to look at the hand to see if East had his double. West agreed he had hesitated.

Director's ruling: Score assigned for both sides: 3♥ -3 by North, NS, NS -150

Details of ruling: Although East holds a 17 count the hesitation by West may have induced a double. There are logical alternatives. L16B1

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Basis of appeal: East thinks he has his double.

Appeals Committee decision: Director's ruling upheld. Deposit returned. Pass is a logical alternative. Action is suggested by a slow Pass.

Appeals Committee's comments: One member of the AC thinks that passing out 3 hearts is unlikely, love all at matchpoints. The majority view is that Pass could easily be right.

Barry Rigal's comments:

re the maverick AC member: unlikely is one thing...no LA is another. The AC got the decision right and West got what he deserved –and East did also for his trumpless 1NT call and double. Close to a PP in my opinion.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

It would be useful if the form explained E/W's 1NT opening range under 'basic system' and the range of East's 1NT rebid, both of which are potentially relevant to this case. However, the TD/AC ruling looks fine to me.

Heather Dhondy's comments: I agree with the ruling and comments made.

Frances Hinden's comments: When I played this board we had an identical start to the auction but East (who I considered a peer of the East at the table with the ruling) passed out 3♥. That confirmed to me that pass was a LA.

Paul Lamford's comments: I think it is close, but would disallow the double. Presumably you have shown 15-17 with your rebid already. Agree with the AC.

Tim Rees' comments: Pass is an LA here, and the UI suggests that some action would be successful. Double caters for all eventualities, so cannot be allowed once UI is available.

APPEAL No : 11.038

Tournament Director: David Stevenson

Appeals Committee: Jeffrey Allerton (Chairman), Ben Green and Barbara Hackett

♠ A 102		Board 6 : Dealer East : EW vulnerable : : Swiss Pairs			
♥ J 107		(matchpoints => VPs)			
♦ J 982		<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>
♣ K 64				1 ♦ (1) A	1 ♠
♠ 43	♠ J 65	Pass	2 ♦ A	Pass	2 ♥
♥ 984	♥ K 32	Pass	2 ♠	Pass	Pass
♦ A 1073	♦ K Q	2NT (2) A	Pass (3) H	3 ♣	Pass (4) H
♣ Q 752	♣ A J 983	Pass	3 ♠	All Pass	
	♠ K Q 987	(1)	May be doubleton.		
	♥ A Q 65	(2)	Asks for minor		
	♦ 654	(3)	Disputed hesitation.		
	♣ 10	(4)	Questions asked		

Basic systems: North-South play Acol. East-West play Strong Club

Result at table: 3 ♠ making by South, NS +140, lead 2 ♣

Director first called: After 3 ♠ bid.

Director's ruling: Score assigned for both sides: 3 ♣-1 by East, NS +100

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Director's comments: With the North hand minimum for 2 ♦, a significant proportion, probably a majority of people would consider Pass, of those, several would Pass. South's questions have shown an interest and made 3 ♠ a better bid.

Comments by North-South: South said that North bid 3 ♠ because of double fit.

Comments by East-West: If North was bidding 3 ♠ anyway, why do not do so over 2NT?

Appeals Committee decision: Director's ruling upheld. Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

We agree that Pass is a LA for North. South is legally entitled to ask the meaning of the E/W auction but the AC agreed with the TD the questioning demonstrably suggested bidding on.

Heather Dhondy's comments:

I agree with the TD and the AC.

Paul Lamford's comments:

Agree with the AC.

Tim Rees' comments:

As in case 10/052, if 3 ♠ was so obvious, why not bid it immediately over 2NT? As before, I'm sceptical of allowing a bid that could have been made on the previous round.

Barry Rigal's comments:

All true alas. South has a clear bid with all cards in long suits, North a clear pass at his final turn. Again close to withholding deposit.

APPEAL No : 11.039

Tournament Director: J G Pyner

Appeals Committee: Heather Dhondy (Chairman), Paul Lamford and David Ewart

<p>♠ KQ74 ♥ K105 ♦ 92 ♣ J1053</p> <p>♠ J8 ♠ 95 ♥ QJ942 ♥ A763 ♦ Q7 ♦ AK53 ♣ AQ86 ♣ K74</p> <p>♠ A10632 ♥ 8 ♦ J10864 ♣ 92</p>	<p>Board 15 : Dealer South : NS vulnerable : : Swiss Pairs (matchpoints => VPs)</p> <table><thead><tr><th><i>West</i></th><th><i>North</i></th><th><i>East</i></th><th><i>South</i></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>1♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♦</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♥</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>				Pass	1♥	Pass	2♦	Pass	2♥	Pass	4♥	All Pass
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>														
			Pass														
1♥	Pass	2♦	Pass														
2♥	Pass	4♥	All Pass														

Result at table: 4♥+1 making by East, NS -450, lead K♠

Director first called: At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:

North called me to the table. He had led K♠ to trick 1 and as soon as the dummy was displayed East had placed a spade in the played position. South played the 2♠ at this point. West, unaware that East had done this, thought for a while before playing low. North then switched at trick 2 believing that West was ducking with the A♠. I asked west what he was thinking about and he said that he was considering the hand as a whole. He apologised to North saying that he had no intention of misleading him. South believed that West had called for a low spade from dummy before East had played a card.

Director's ruling: Score assigned for both sides: 4♥ making by West, NS -620

Details of ruling:

NS damaged by the break in tempo – result changed to 4♥ making. East has contributed to the problem by his premature play. The onus lies with West to make it plain to North and South that his break in tempo was to do with the hand as a whole, not that specific trick. He could have known N/S might be damaged as a result. L73F

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Appeals Committee decision:

Score assigned for both sides (Law 12C1(c)):

60% of 4♥ making by West, NS -620

40% of 4♥ +1 by West, NS -650

Procedural penalty to E/W of 0.5 VP

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

E/W created the problem by the play from dummy. We believe that North will find the winning defence 60% of the time. Also L73D applies.

APPEAL No : 11.039

Barry Rigal's comments:

It is hard to see how a shift could be right here (what shape does this work for?). Unless North can explain this I don't see damage. If the ♠2 is count and West has 4513 (AJxx/QJxxx/Q/xxx) he would win and pitch a club on the diamonds. And that is not close to an opening bid.

Tim Rees' comments:

I think it should have been made clear that the PP was against East – West's only offence was not noticing what had happened.

I'd have given more than 60% of 4♥= to the defence. It seems highly likely that North would have continued spades if there had been no hesitation.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

If a procedural penalty is awarded, the AC should explain the nature of the infraction which merited the procedural penalty. Although 0.5VP is the basic minimum "standard" PP, this is an insignificant amount when the overtrick in 4♥ could swing several VPs in the context of a 20-0VP scale in an 8-board match.

Richard Hills' comments:

I agree with the Appeals Committee adding 40% of an overtrick, which is significant at matchpoint scoring. I disagree with the Appeals Committee imposing a Procedural Penalty when the Director chose not to do so.

This tendency to impose additional Procedural Penalties is an annoying habit of Appeals Committees throughout the world. (Unless one wishes to argue that the failure to impose Procedural Penalties is an annoying habit of Directors throughout the world.)

Paul Lamford's comments:

There was an infraction by dummy in playing a card at trick one before declarer called for it, a habit this particular dummy was known to have, so that was a second reason for the PP

Editor's Note: The original form does not mention a PP, nor is there any entry in the adjustments column on E/W's score on the EBU ranking list so it seems likely that in fact no PP was given; however the commentators remarks are based on this transcription.

APPEAL No : 11.040

Tournament Director: Chris Benneworth

Appeals Committee: Tim Rees (Chairman), Paul Lamford and Malcolm Pryor

♠ 4		Board 6 : Dealer East : EW vulnerable : Matchpoint Pairs			
♥ J109542		<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>
♦ AQ2				Pass	1♠
♣ 965		Pass	1NT	Pass	2♠
♠ AJ1093	♠ 76	Pass	3♥	Pass	3♠ H
♥ Q83	♥ A7	Dbl	4♥	All Pass	
♦ KJ7	♦ 109654				
♣ J8	♣ K1073				
♠ KQ852					
♥ K6					
♦ 83					
♣ AQ42					

Basic systems:

North-South play Acol, weak NT, 1NT followed by 3♥ is weak.
East-West play 5 card majors, strong NT

Result at table: 4♥ making by North, NS +420, lead 10♦

Director first called: At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:

East was unhappy about North's bid of 4♥ after a hesitation by South. North did not agree there was a hesitation but South said she had thought before bidding 3♠. I ruled there was an unmistakable hesitation (L16B1a) and that consequently North was in possession of UI.

Director's ruling: Score assigned for both sides: 3♠ doubled -2 by South, NS -300

Details of ruling:

I consider that a LA for North's is to Pass and therefore awarded an adjusted score of 3♠x-2. I also considered the possibility that South would bid again if the auction had continued: 3♠ x Pass Pass. South said she would not. L16B1(a), L16B1(b)

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: This is a silly decision.

Director's comments: None.

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld. Deposit forfeited. There was an agreed hesitation

Appeals Committee's comments:

North is in possession of UI from partner's hesitation, suggesting that hearts might be a better shot than spades. There is AI from West's double that the spades are breaking badly but this doesn't outweigh the UI.

Pass of 3♠x is a LA and 4♥ is suggested by the UI. Therefore 4♥ is disallowed. We feel that North (a strong player) should have realised that any appeal would be unsuccessful, so we retained the deposit

APPEAL No : 11.040

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

I agree with the decision to retain the deposit, but if North is a "strong player", would a procedural penalty not be appropriate?

Robin Barker's comments:

I wonder if the stated basis of appeal "this is a silly decision" had some bearing on the forfeiture of the deposit.

Heather Dhondy's comments:

I agree with the AC that pass is a logical alternative, in fact after partner has bid spades 3 times (goodness knows why), I would never be thinking of removing to hearts – a suit in which I have already shown 6. Was it suggested by the slow 3♠ bid though? That would be the only doubt in my mind. I would judge that South was a pretty inexperienced player from the actions so far, so what can be deduced from this slow 3♠? I wouldn't have guessed the actual hand!

Frances Hinden's comments:

It's obvious to keep the money.

Paul Lamford's comments:

Nothing much to say. Playing with a client, as North was, did not absolve him of the need to avoid using UI.

Barry Rigal's comments:

Where's the procedural penalty against North – an acknowledged strong player. A la lanterne! Unacceptable behaviour and absurd appeal. If I'd behaved like that I wouldn't want anyone to know.

APPEAL No : 11.041

Tournament Director: Liz Stevenson

Appeals Committee: David Burn (Chairman), Jason Hackett and Simon Cope

<p>♠ 10872 ♥ A87 ♦ J65 ♣ J102</p> <p>♠ QJ ♠ 93 ♥ 63 ♥ Q95 ♦ A74 ♦ K1032 ♣ AQ7643 ♣ K985</p> <p>♠ AK654 ♥ KJ1042 ♦ Q98 ♣ -</p>	<p>Board 8 : Dealer West : Love all : Swiss Teams No auction provided.</p>
---	--

Result at table:

4♠ making by North, NS +420, lead 5♣

Director first called: At trick 3.

Director's statement of facts:

North stated that he had asked for a top spade on the second trick. Dummy had played a small spade and West won the trick. North called for (another) top spade at the same time West claimed she played a diamond. North claimed she had not. South didn't know what had happened. East agreed that his partner had led a diamond.

Director's ruling: Table result stands.

Details of ruling:

I ruled that under L45D both sides had played to the next trick so although dummy had played the wrong card on trick 2, that card could not be withdrawn.

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Appeals Committee decision: Director's ruling upheld. Deposit returned.

Appeals Committee's comments:

L45D: Both sides had played to trick 3 therefore trick 2 stands as played.

Tim Rees' comments:

It looks to me like both sides have attempted to play to the next trick, but they haven't done so in a legal manner. Dummy's lead/play is out of turn, and West can't accept it with his diamond without revoking. So I don't believe that both sides have actually played to the next trick, and declarer should have been allowed to correct his designation. It seems clear from the write-up that declarer's actions are consistent with someone who called for a top spade.

Robin Barker's comments:

I agree with the TD/AC ruling. There is an argument that both sides have led to the next trick but they have led to different tricks – so that both sides have not played to (the same) next trick. I do not think this argument has a basis in Law.

APPEAL No : 11.041

Heather Dhondy's comments:

I am not convinced that both sides have played to the next trick. Does declarer calling for a card to be led from dummy when it isn't dummy's lead constitute a played card? I would have thought not.

Frances Hinden's comments:

I don't like this. It is a matter of fact (which the TD has to rule on) what spade North actually called for at trick two, but let's suppose that he did ask for a top spade and South mistakenly played a low one. Now it seems that West can prevent that error being rectified by his own actions – all he has to do is say he's led to the next trick when declarer also tries to lead to the next trick, and declarer has no recourse.

Paul Lamford's comments:

Did both sides play to the next trick? The card played from dummy would have been a revoke out of turn, so I am not sure this was correct. My view is that the only logical way of interpreting this is that both sides must have made a legal play to the next trick, and what would have been a revoke by dummy, ruffing West's diamond is not a "play to the next trick". It seems that the AC and TD interpreted the Law as "any attempt to play to the next trick, even to lead out of turn". My view is that the misplay by dummy can be corrected. An experienced TD on the BridgeBase Online Laws forum confirms that the normal WBFLC interpretation of "plays to the next trick" is "plays to the next trick legally".

Barry Rigal's comments:

This is a laws question not an issue subject for appeal. No comments.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

What happened here? Either North called for a top spade (misheard by South) or North actually called for a small spade in error. It is clear that North had intended to call for a top spade, not least because he attempted to lead for the next trick from dummy. I believe that the TD ought to have asked each of East and West what card they heard North call for. If it was known that North had called for a top spade but that South had placed the wrong card in the 'played' position, it seems wrong that West can make the wrongly played card permanent just by what is effectively leading out of turn to the next trick. Neither West nor South (dummy) was attempting to follow the other one's lead to the next trick, so have they both played to the "next" trick as referred to in Law 45D? Another potentially relevant Law is Law 58A (simultaneous plays) which tells us that the legal lead is deemed to have been made first, but which was the legal lead here?

APPEAL No : 11.042

Tournament Director: Robin Barker

Appeals Committee: David Gold (Chairman), Nevena Senior and Mike Bell

♠ 983		Board 9 : Dealer North : EW vulnerable : Swiss Teams			
♥ 108		<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>
♦ KJ7543			2♦ (1)	2NT (2)	Pass
♣ K7		3♥ (3)	Pass	4♥	Pass
♠ KQJ765	♠ A1042	4♠	All Pass		
♥ Q6	♥ A97	(1)	Announced weak		
♦ 96	♦ AQ2	(2)	17-19		
♣ A103	♣ QJ5	(3)	No alert, transfer to spades		
♠ -					
♥ KJ5432					
♦ 108					
♣ 98642					

Result at table: 4♠ making +1 by West North South, NS -650, lead not provided

Director first called: At end of auction

Director's statement of facts:

North explained what had happened in the auction. West agreed that that 3♥ should have been alerted. I gave South the opportunity to change his final Pass (declined). At the end of play I was recalled and I asked West why he (only) bid 4♠. He said 4♥ was a cue bid but with 2 small diamonds he could not go on.

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

50% of 5♠ making (-650) and 50% of 6♠-1 (+100)

Details of ruling:

Making a slam try opposite 4♥ is a logical alternative to signing off in 4♠ and 4♠ is suggested by partner's failure to alert. L16

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Basis of appeal: "The ruling is harsh"

Director's comments:

Once West makes a try I am not sure how the auction would continue. I decided they might stop in 5♠ and decided they would always manage to end in spades.

Comments by North-South:

East could have ♦K so missing ♦A is not key to success in a slam.

Appeals Committee decision: Director's ruling upheld. Deposit forfeited

Appeals Committee's comments: (We) consider any proportion of 5♠ generous to offenders. Presented no case.

Paul Lamford's comments: I gave 80% of 6♠-1 when given this as a problem originally, and 20% of 5♠=. I now think that 100% of 6♠-1 might be right. It seems hard to stop after East's co-operation, because East will cue 5♦ over 5♣.

APPEAL No : 11.042

Richard Hills' comments:

The answer to "This ruling is harsh" is George Bernard Shaw (Back to Methuselah): "Life is not meant to be easy, my child; but take courage: it can be delightful."

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

A well-reasoned ruling by the TD and another good decision by the AC to retain the deposit.

Robin Barker's comments:

As the TD, I agree with the AC. Even at the time, and certainly in hindsight, I think I knew that any proportion of a positive score for the offenders was generous.

Heather Dhondy's comments:

We are not told about the cue-bidding style of East-West. If they cue bid 1st or 2nd round controls up the line (in other words East has denied the ace or king or diamonds or the king of clubs (just about possible), then West has a case. I presume that they presented no sort of evidence of this kind.

Frances Hinden's comments:

While I agree with keeping the deposit, this is a closer case than many where the deposit has been returned – we need to continue educating ACs on the need to retain the deposit on meritless appeals.

Tim Rees' comments:

A good decision by the TD and AC, including the retention of the deposit.

Barry Rigal's comments:

I would have made the ruling harsher against E/W. Well done both TD and AC.

APPEAL No : 11.043

Tournament Director: Sarah Amos

Appeals Committee: Neil Rosen (Chairman), Frances Hinden and David Ewart

♠ A832		Board 19 : Dealer South : EW vulnerable : Swiss Teams			
♥ 10973		<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>
♦ AK93					Pass
♣ 7		Pass	1♦ (1) A	Pass	1♥ (2) A
♠ Q5	♠ 974	Pass	1NT (3)	Pass	2NT
♥ 54	♥ KQ6	Pass	3♥ (4)	Pass	3NT
♦ J106	♦ Q82	Pass	4♥	All Pass	
♣ KQJ832	♣ A965	(1) Nebulous diamond			
	♠ KJ106	(2) Mistaken alert. North withdrew the alert after bidding 1NT.			
	♥ AJ82	(3) Shows 13-15 opposite a natural 1♥ response.			
	♦ 754	(4) Forcing			
	♣ 104				

Basic systems:

North-South play Strong club

Result at table: 4♥ making by South, NS +420, lead not provided.

Director first called: At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:

When South bid 1♥ North alerted, West did not ask at this point but passed. North bid 1NT but withdrew his alert after bidding. EW did not want to call the TD at this stage.

North/South's methods are that by non passed hand 1♥ = 11+ relay and 1NT rebid = 11-13 unbalanced but both majors. By a passed hand 1♥ = natural 6+ and 1NT = 13-15 balanced. South bid on as if partner had shown 13-15 which she felt was the ethical thing to do. South said that she has a good 9 points with two nice suits. She fully expected the contract to fail.

Director's ruling: Table result stands

Details of ruling: South's actions were not suggested by the UI. L16B1a

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Basis of appeal: South should not bid over 1NT

Director's comments:

I was not called to the table but walked past as all four players were looking at South's hand and discussing the auction. It was South who stopped me and asked for advice. Once the bidding had been explained EW asked for a ruling.

Appeals Committee decision: Director's ruling upheld. Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

South clearly demonstrated that:

1. She had genuinely messed up on her NT range and assumed 13-15
2. Her actions in bidding both 2NT and 3NT rather than introducing her spades swayed us to believe she was not in any way trying to use any possible UI to her side's benefit.

APPEAL No : 11.043

Barry Rigal's comments:

I cant see anything but two rueful rabbits. Karapet was East-West and gets his usual result. AC did the right thing.

Tim Rees' comments:

I don't agree. South has a pretty good idea of what is going on after North's actions (alerting, bidding 1NT, then withdrawing the alert). South knows that they might have a major fit (although the AI indicates that they can't have one). If South had bid either major over 1NT, that would have been blatantly taking advantage of the UI, but 2NT was also taking advantage, keeping the auction open in the hope that North could introduce a major (having realised what South's bidding meant, subsequent to his 1NT bid).

Pass is clearly an LA, and so the contract should have been adjusted to 1NT.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

Apparently North corrected his alert after having bid 1NT. South can infer from the timing of this that the 1NT may well have been under the apprehension that 1♥ was conventional, and as N/S play 1♥ as conventional by an unpassed hand, South knows that is likely to have been the source of North's mistake. By an unpassed hand, they play 1NT by North as 4-4 in the majors, so the UI suggests to South that North may hold this hand type. Whilst I agree with the AC that bidding 2NT is less suggested by the UI than bidding a major directly, the AC ought to have considered the normal action of passing 1NT. South knows that the partnership is likely to have two major suit fits so if she passes 1NT, she knows that the partnership will be in a sub-optimal contract; if she bids 2NT, she knows that partner is likely to bid hearts (but the correction of the explanation and its timing is UI to South) and that 4♥ might make, particularly if partner is maximum.

So I would have allowed the appeal, adjusting to 1NT by North. With the 2-way finesse in spades, it is unclear how many tricks this contract would make, so a weighted score would be appropriate.

Heather Dhondy's comments:

I agree. It doesn't seem as if anyone has taken advantage of UI, in fact quite the reverse, but N/S have just got lucky as a result. Very unfortunate for East-West.

Paul Lamford's comments:

Agree with the AC. South acted ethically and got lucky.

APPEAL No : 11.064B

Tournament Director: Gordon Rainsford
Appeals Committee: Martin Pool (Referee)

<p>♠ K984 ♥ AK942 ♦ 85 ♣ KQ</p> <p>♠ Q103 ♠ AJ7 ♥ - ♥ Q10 ♦ K10642 ♦ AQJ973 ♣ 87643 ♣ AJ</p> <p>♠ 652 ♥ J87653 ♦ - ♣ 10952</p>	Board 19 : Dealer South : EW vulnerable : IMPS=> VPs			
	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>
Pass	1♥	Dbl	1♠	
2♦	2♠	2NT	4♥	
5♣	5♦	6♦	6♥	
Dbl	All Pass			

Basic systems:

North-South play 4 card majors 15-17 NT in 3rd and 4th.
East-West play Weak NT Acol

Result at table: 6♥x-1 NS-100

Director's statement of facts:

East asked me to record the psyche and was concerned about North's conservative 2♠ bid. His team captain later decided to appeal my classification of the psyche as Green.

Director's ruling: South's 1♠ psyche was not fielded by North's 2♠ raise.

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Comments by North-South:

I bid 2♠ for the following reasons:

We play support doubles so partner knows I have 4 spades, KQ (blank) of clubs devalues the point count. So I am therefore top of my range. The opponents have doubled vulnerable and bid therefore it is highly likely the hearts are not breaking while indeed there is the perfect hand possible opposite there are far many hands where even 3 will go off (of course I would have competed again to 3♠). I believe they gave the hands to top players without stating about support doubles. Players such as Dhondy (both), Burn and Jason & Justin Hackett would have bid 2♠. My partner has never been known to psyche in our partnership.

Comments by East-West:

North's 2♠ bid is very conservative and gives the impression that it may be catering for a psyche in a classic psyching position. His 2♠ bid would typically be 11-13 balanced with 4432 shape. By bidding 2♠ he misses game opposite as little as AQxxx in spades and nothing outside. We have (put) this bidding problem to David Gold, Tony Forrester and Gunnar Hallberg. Two thought 3♠ was automatic, the other two thought 3♠ and 4♠ were the only possible actions. The same North player showed an aggressive style on other boards in the match. With KJ42 A1084 J64 82 he bid 3♠ after the uncontested auction 1♣-1♥-1♠ and he invited game opposite a non vulnerable 14-16NT on A953 A87 10986 J4

PS 5♦ bid appears to be a second psyche on the same hand.

Referee decision: Director's ruling upheld

APPEAL No : 11.064B

Referee's comments:

Decision & findings of fact: The 2♠ bid by North would be made by a significant number of players.

Reasons for decision:

Whilst top of the range 2♠ is seen as reasonable particularly when taking into account the playing of support doubles. Deposit to be returned. The appellants had from their investigations reasonable grounds for making the appeal.

Barry Rigal's comments:

I understand the appeal and agree the final decision. North made a sensible valuation of his hand. Unless the pair had a track record I see no infraction.

Tim Rees' comments:

The TD and Referee have placed a lot of weight on the availability of a support double, so 2♠ guaranteed 4-card support. However, the strong NT, 4-card major style is also relevant, as 2♠ will often be an 8-loser hand, e.g. Kxxx AKxx xxx Qx.

I think there's sufficient suspicion here for this not to be classified as Green. The referee's finding that the 2♠ bid would be found by a significant number of players is enough for the psyche not to be classified as Red, but I believe it should be Amber. That would not result in a change of score, but would warn N/S that a repeat in similar circumstances would result in an adjustment.

Paul Lamford's comments:

The criterion for classifying a psyche as fielded is different to the use of UI. Here, all that North has to show is that 2♠ does not cater for the psyche. Had North passed, for example, this would have been fielding, as that would assume partner did not have his bid. I would bid 2♠ or 3♠ depending on many factors. Neither is remotely close to fielding.

Heather Dhondy's comments:

The choices are 2 or 3 spades – 4 is a real overbid. Once 1♥ is doubled, however, the chances of a 4-1 trump break are significantly increased, and 2♠ is a fair choice. I agree with the TD and referee.

Richard Hills' comments:

Whether or not North has "fielded" South's so-called psyche is irrelevant to whether South has perpetrated a legal actual psyche or an illegal undisclosed partnership understanding pseudo-psyche. A so-called "baby psyche" of a 1♠ response after RHO's takeout double is a classic example of an undisclosed implicit partnership understanding. Under Law 40C1, if North has *more reason to be aware of the deviation than have the opponents*, then the "baby psyche" of 1♠ is *part of the partnership's methods and must be disclosed in accordance with the regulations governing disclosure of system*.

APPEAL No : 11.068

Tournament Director: John Haslegrave

Appeals Committee: Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), Pat Davies and Graham Osborne

♠ 8642		Board 8 : Dealer West : Love all : Matchpointed Pairs			
♥ Q83		<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>
♦ 104		Pass	Pass	3♦	3♥
♣ K1093		Pass (H)	Pass	4♣	Pass
♠ KQ3	♠ 1075	4♦	All Pass		
♥ A765	♥ -				
♦ Q98	♦ AKJ652				
♣ 872	♣ QJ64				
♠ AJ9					
♥ KJ10942					
♦ 73					
♣ A5					

Basic systems:

North-South play Blue Club

East-West play Benji Acol

Result at table: 4♦ making by East, NS -130, lead A♠

Director first called: After 4♦ bid

Director's statement of facts:

North called to allege (a) break in tempo at West's second call. E/W agreed that (the) call was not immediate, but pause only a few seconds (East said 2, North said 5). South had paused properly over skip bid (agreed).

Director's ruling: Score assigned for both sides: 3♥-1 by South, NS -50

Details of ruling:

After a proper pause by South this is a break in tempo. Positive action demonstrably suggested over Pass. Pass is a logical alternative. 4♣ bid disallowed, L16B

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Basis of appeal: Was always going to bid 4♣. Has his bid

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld Deposit returned. That West had paused and East had chosen from LA and action suggested by the out of tempo Pass.

Appeals Committee's comments:

We thought the decision clear cut and considered retaining the deposit but had regard to the standard of EW and decided against keeping the deposit for this reason.

Barry Rigal's comments:

I'm not convinced 5 seconds is a pause – I would NEVER call a TD if my opponents paused for five seconds...in my opinion this is the absolutely normal length of pause. Incidentally East has a normal reopening of double not 4♣ –which shows 7-4 or the like.

Since the TD determined there was a BIT I'll accept it and agree with their decision.

APPEAL No : 11.068

Tim Rees' comments:

If this appeal was from an event where an appeals consultant was available, I'd have kept the money whatever E/W's experience level. But if no advice was available, returning the deposit could be OK (just this once!).

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

Another completely obvious ruling and frivolous appeal. Is the standard of E/W a reason for returning the deposit? Were they given an opportunity to speak to an Appeals Advisor? If they were, I'd only be in favour of returning the deposit only in the unlikely event that the Appeals Advisor had advised them that the appeal had any merit (and then I'd be suggesting to the EBUL&E that they review the suitability of this Appeals Advisor!)

Heather Dhondy's comments:

My first reaction was to keep the money, however I think that the AC properly considered this, and I agree with their decision to return it. The appeal is without merit.

Richard Hills' comments:

In my biased (due to my relative poverty) opinion, it should be only to EW pensioners, not to EW novices, that a deposit which would otherwise be forfeited is exceptionally returned. In my parochial Aussie opinion, deposits should not be monetary but instead deposits of matchpoints,imps and/or Victory Points.

Frances Hinden's comments:

Unless there is any suggestion that the hesitation was disputed, it is obvious to keep the money. Compare this case to 11.042.

Paul Lamford's comments:

I would reopen with a double, but Pass is an LA. Double is demonstrably suggested by the BIT. AC decision seems fine.

APPEAL No : 11.072

Tournament Director: J G Pyner

Appeals Committee: Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), Clive Owen and Celia Oram

<p>♠ 10 ♥ J109873 ♦ 7 ♣ A9865</p> <p>♠ K643 ♠ AJ5 ♥ Q62 ♥ K5 ♦ QJ98 ♦ 6542 ♣ 103 ♣ KQJ4</p> <p>♠ Q9872 ♥ A4 ♦ AK103 ♣ 72</p>	<p>Board 1 : Dealer North : Love all : Matchpointed Pairs</p> <table><thead><tr><th><i>West</i></th><th><i>North</i></th><th><i>East</i></th><th><i>South</i></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td>2♥ (A)</td><td>Dbl</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>Dbl (1)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>3♣</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♥</td></tr><tr><td>3♠ (2)</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>Dbl</td></tr><tr><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>(A)</td><td colspan="3">Weak-Hearts and another 5-5 or better, 5-9</td></tr><tr><td>(1)</td><td colspan="3">Not alerted.</td></tr><tr><td>(2)</td><td colspan="3">Before bidding West asked about South's double. She told me it had been described as 'competitive'.</td></tr></tbody></table>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>		2♥ (A)	Dbl	Pass	2♠	Pass	Pass	Dbl (1)	Pass	3♣	Pass	3♥	3♠ (2)	Pass	Pass	Dbl	All Pass				(A)	Weak-Hearts and another 5-5 or better, 5-9			(1)	Not alerted.			(2)	Before bidding West asked about South's double. She told me it had been described as 'competitive'.		
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																																		
	2♥ (A)	Dbl	Pass																																		
2♠	Pass	Pass	Dbl (1)																																		
Pass	3♣	Pass	3♥																																		
3♠ (2)	Pass	Pass	Dbl																																		
All Pass																																					
(A)	Weak-Hearts and another 5-5 or better, 5-9																																				
(1)	Not alerted.																																				
(2)	Before bidding West asked about South's double. She told me it had been described as 'competitive'.																																				

Result at table: 3♠ doubled -4 by West, NS +800, lead not provided.

Director first called: At end of hand.

Director's statement of facts:

West called me at the end of play. She believed she had been misinformed. North said that NS play protective doubles. Double is take out when a suit is agreed

Director's ruling: Score assigned for both sides: 3♥-1 by South, NS -50

Details of ruling:

South's statement that he hoped North would Pass strongly suggests he intended his double to be penalties. In that case North and South are in disagreement and West has been misinformed. With a correct explanation she would not bid 3♠.

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Appeals Committee decision:

Table score re-instated. Deposit returned. That North had given an accurate description of their methods and no damage resulted from the explanation.

Appeals Committee's comments: That NS should be careful in their description of their doubles.

Tim Rees' comments:

The AC's comments are contradictory. First they say that N gave an accurate description, then they say that N/S should be careful with their description. I don't believe that "competitive" is a good enough description when opener has shown two suits. If he's expected to bid his second suit, then the double should be described as takeout. If he's allowed to pass without length in the suit, then the double is more penalty-orientated. But if the AC investigated the actual agreement and found that the systemic meaning of double was takeout, then there was no damage.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

It would have been helpful for the AC to record what they had concluded the agreed meaning of the double of 2♠ to be. The TD had ruled that E/W had been misinformed, so the AC should explain why they consider this not to be the case.

APPEAL No : 11.072

Robin Barker's comments:

I assume there was evidence that the North/South agreement that South's first double was "competitive". Was the final double alerted? It appears that North/South agreed that his one was not takeout.

Heather Dhondy's comments:

I agree with the TD. It sounds as though North-South were not on the same wavelength about the meaning of the double and as far as can be determined did not provide any evidence to support one meaning over another. Therefore misexplanation should be assumed and an adjusted score given. I guess the AC must have heard some other evidence not given here to reach the decision they did.

Frances Hinden's comments:

I don't understand the AC's comments: either it was an accurate description or it wasn't. If double was 'competitive' that implies South should only pass with spades as his second suit; obviously it was intended as penalties. It's theoretically OK for the AC to decide that the explanation was correct, but given that it is usual to rule misexplanation rather than misbid, it would be helpful to know how they came to that conclusion. With the write-up as given, I prefer the TD's decision.

Paul Lamford's comments:

The 3♠ bid was poor, but the assumption is that there was misinformation rather than misbid. The correct explanation of South's double appears to be "no agreement". But she should not have bid with the information "competitive" either, so it is not clear that she would have bid differently. I agree with the AC decision, and West's poor 3♠ was to blame for the bad result.

Barry Rigal's comments:

I wonder what kind of proof was disclosed (again enquiring minds need to know!). Unless this precise sequence was in the notes I much prefer TD ruling.

APPEAL No : 11.074

Tournament Director: Robert Sassoon

Appeals Committee: Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), John Holland and Sandy Davies

<p>♠ Q10 ♥ K743 ♦ K83 ♣ J543</p> <p>♠ KJ952 ♠ 864 ♥ QJ109 ♥ A ♦ 6 ♦ AQJ107 ♣ AK2 ♣ Q1097</p> <p>♠ A73 ♥ 8652 ♦ 9542 ♣ 86</p>	<p>Board 3 : Dealer South : EW vulnerable : Swiss Teams</p> <table><thead><tr><th><i>West</i></th><th><i>North</i></th><th><i>East</i></th><th><i>South</i></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>1♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♦</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♠</td><td>Dbl (?)</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">All Pass</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">? = alleged double</td></tr></tbody></table>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>				Pass	1♠	Pass	2♦	Pass	2♥	Pass	4♠	Dbl (?)	All Pass				? = alleged double			
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																						
			Pass																						
1♠	Pass	2♦	Pass																						
2♥	Pass	4♠	Dbl (?)																						
All Pass																									
? = alleged double																									

Basic systems:

North-South play Strong NT, 5 card majors

East-West play Reversed Benji, 4 card majors

Result at table: 4♠ doubled making by West, NS -790, lead 3♣

Director first called: At end of hand.

Director's statement of facts:

I was called to the table by East to consider a dispute in the final contract after the hand had finished. I ascertained that EW both believed South had doubled the final 4♠ contract, whereas NS both insist no double was placed down by South. East, however, did allegedly make a final Pass after South's alleged double. After consultation with colleagues, I felt on the balance of probabilities, a double was probably made, even if inadvertently so and ruled as such.

Director's ruling: Table result stands.

Details of ruling:

Ruling on disputed facts shall be done on the balance of probabilities based on collected evidence. L85A1

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Director's comments: NS had written 4♠ on their cards and EW had written 4♠x on theirs.

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld. Deposit returned. That the TD had applied the correct law and the AC heard no evidence that could lead them to overturn it.

Appeals Committee's comments:

The play did not assist in determining whether the contract was or was not doubled.

It was clear that South would not have intentionally doubled. EW could have chosen to accept South's version of events when they saw his hand but were not obliged to do so.

Barry Rigal's comments:

Agree this is not an appropriate matter for an AC to consider. The TD did an excellent job of determining the facts.

APPEAL No : 11.074

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

An unsatisfactory situation, but the AC had no reason to not accept the TD's best guess of the facts. It seems unlikely that South would have doubled on that hand, but it also seems unlikely that E/W would have claimed South had doubled unless he had actually done so.

Robin Barker's comments:

These rulings (disputed final double) occur from time to time and there is usually not enough evidence to be conclusive.

Heather Dhondy's comments:

In the past when considering these types of rulings, it is normal to look at the hand in question to decide whether a double was likely that South doubled inadvertently to have occurred. Looking at the South hand, it is clear that no double was intended, and the fact that North didn't write down 4♠x also creates doubt in the mind. I would have thought that where two think it was and two think it wasn't, the final decision would come down to the probability from the hand in question.

Richard Hills' comments:

Under Law 25A South's unintentional Double can no longer be retracted once North subsequently Passed.

Frances Hinden's comments:

It's the TD's job to establish the facts and once he had decided that South had doubled, I would not expect the AC to rule any differently unless there was any new evidence.

Paul Lamford's comments:

This is interesting. I would say that based on the balance of probabilities, South did not double. But the TD is responsible for establishing the facts, and I guess we have to go with his view. For there to have been a double we require:

- a) Both of NS to have not realised it occurred and to have entered 4S on the scorecard, and
- b) South to be a member of the Monster Raving Loony Party.

For there to have been no double we require

- a) Both of EW to have thought a double occurred and to have entered 4Sx on the scorecard wrongly.

It would seem that the balance of probabilities is that no double occurred and I would have found differently.

Tim Rees' comments:

This had to be decided on balance of probabilities – not satisfactory for the “losing” side, but there's not much else that can be done. It's likely that South doubled inadvertently.

APPEAL No : 11.075

Tournament Director: Mike Amos

Appeals Referee: Martin Pool

<p>♠ - ♥ KJ964 ♦ K10853 ♣ 853</p> <p>♠ J9532 ♠ AQ108 ♥ A3 ♥ Q107 ♦ A72 ♦ QJ ♣ KQ6 ♣ A1094</p> <p>♠ K764 ♥ 852 ♦ 964 ♣ J72</p>	Board 11 : Dealer South : Love all : IMPs => VPs			
	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>
			Pass	
1NT	Pass	2♦ (A)	Pass	
2♥ (A)	Pass	2♠ (A) (1)	Pass	
3♠ (A) (2)	Pass	4♣ (A) (3)	Pass	
4♦ (A) (3)	Pass	4♠ (4)	Pass	
4NT (5)	All Pass			
(1)	Baron			
(2)	Max with spades on suit 4333 or 5332			
(3)	Cue (bid)			
(4)	Sign off			
(5)	RKCB			

Basic systems: East-West play 4 card majors

Result at table: 4NT making +1 by West, NS -460, lead not provided

Director first called: At end of auction by North East – slowness of passing the tray

Director's statement of facts:

It was agreed that the tray had been slow on South-West side of the screen. East agreed that he had passed RKCB. He argued that he had already done too much probably and the partnership was not making slam unless partner was going to bid more after 4♠ or 4♥. He wrote as examples of hands where partner would already upgrade with a 5 card spade suit.

Kxxxx	or	Kxxxx
AJx		Kxx
Axx		Ax
Kx		KQx

Director's ruling: Score assigned for both sides: 6♠-1 by East, NS +50

Details of ruling:

TD believed that slow nature of 4NT of suggested Pass might be more successful and that bidding was a logical alternative. We ruled 6♠-1. L16B and 12C

Appeal lodged by: East West

Director's comments:

EW appeal on the grounds that East argues his actions are based on the hand and auction and that his decision to Pass is clear. West argues that he would Pass 5♠.

Comments by East-West:

West. I was thinking if I should go on over 4♠ as I had overbid my hand with a 14 count and I had showed a maximum 16 count with 3♠. Partner denied a heart control so they would lead a heart. I needed partner to have 3 key cards before they got in and cashed a heart. AQ♠ is not enough. It is on the finesse at best – that's if partner has 10♠

East. As East I knew partner as 15-16 with precisely 4333 or 15 with 5332, I had already pushed the boat out with 4♣ and because my QJ stiff of diamonds was known to be facing 2 or 3 diamonds. I do not want to play slam

APPEAL No : 11.075

opposite any 4333 16 count I could not and cannot construct a 4333 16 count where slam is going to make. I was only interested in slam where partner could drive slam himself over 4♣ as I need a fitting club holding for slam to be playable plus a 5th spade. A 4333 16 is much more likely and I must therefore pass as there is too big a danger of partner bidding a no play 6.

Referee's decision: Director's ruling upheld. Deposit returned.

Referee's comments:

4NT slow. LA to Pass = normal response to RKCB = 5♠

Don't agree that it is normal to stop in 5♠ after RKCB

Barry Rigal's comments:

I would have ruled the other way as TD or AC. East already knows from the auction (AI) that West's failure to bid 4NT over 4♣ means slam can't be good.

What is the NT range? 14-16 or 15-17 or...? Again write-ups just don't cut it here.

Tim Rees' comments:

What does a slow Blackwood bid demonstrably suggest? Sometimes, a slow 4NT can provide UI about whether it's intended as Blackwood or natural, but this one is clearly Blackwood.

This is the first time I've seen a "known" Blackwood bid passed. I suppose that because a grand is out of the question (both hands are limited), any tempo break by West must be because he was considering a weaker action than Blackwood, and so the UI suggests that slam won't be making.

What constitutes a tempo break here? This is the critical time of the auction – opener has to evaluate and decide between pass/slam try/slam force. I wouldn't expect many players to find a bid over 4♠ in less than 30 seconds. If West had bid 5♣ (say) after a long think, I don't think there would have been any UI. But because he's selected his strongest action after a think, that could (does?) suggest he might not have his bid.

Heather Dhondy's comments:

I agree with the TD and referee. A tempo-driven auction. If East-West didn't want to be in a slam, why did they keep bidding as if they did? Slam isn't that terrible anyway, it just happens to fail.

Frances Hinden's comments:

The whole auction is strange, but I simply don't see why a slow 4NT bid demonstrably suggests passing. The referee's write-up does not address this – obviously responding to RKCB is a LA to pass but that isn't the question at issue. West could have been thinking of cuebidding again, or simply jumping to slam. There's no question of doubt as the meaning of 4NT. I would have allowed the table result to stand.

Paul Lamford's comments:

Agree with TD and Referee. A tempo-driven auction.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

The notes to the auction and basic system do not show the range of the 1NT opening, which is unfortunate as the agreed range is extremely relevant to this case! As I happen to know the identity of E/W, I know that their 1NT range is basically 14-16, but if they hold a 5-card suit the high card point range tends to be 13-15.

No doubt, East was regretting his 4♣ bid, but it's not really consistent to pass 4NT. Partner's 4NT bid implies that he is driving slam opposite sufficient key cards, and East might well not have thought of passing a "quick" 4NT bid. On balance, I agree with the TD and the Referee.

APPEAL No : 11.077

Tournament Director: Barrie Partridge

Appeals Committee: Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), Clive Owen and Willie Whittaker

<p>♠ KJ742 ♥ 4 ♦ 1064 ♣ K1062</p> <p>♠ - ♠ A65 ♥ J10653 ♥ 982 ♦ 875 ♦ KQJ3 ♣ AQ954 ♣ J73</p> <p>♠ Q10983 ♥ AKQ7 ♦ A92 ♣ 8</p>	<p>Board 25 : Dealer North : EW vulnerable : Cross-IMPs=> VPS</p> <table><thead><tr><th><i>West</i></th><th><i>North</i></th><th><i>East</i></th><th><i>South</i></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td>2♦ (A) (1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♣ (2)</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl (3)</td><td>4♥ (4)</td><td>4♠ (5)</td><td>Dbl</td></tr><tr><td>5♣</td><td>Dbl</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Alerted and explained as a weak two in either major 0-7 HCP (2) See TD Statement of Facts (3) Intended as lead directing (4) See TD Statement of Facts (5) Asked about 4♣ bid before bidding 4♠</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>		2♦ (A) (1)	Pass	4♣ (2)	Dbl (3)	4♥ (4)	4♠ (5)	Dbl	5♣	Dbl	All Pass	
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>														
	2♦ (A) (1)	Pass	4♣ (2)														
Dbl (3)	4♥ (4)	4♠ (5)	Dbl														
5♣	Dbl	All Pass															

Basic systems:

North-South play that a 2♦ opening shows weak two in either major

Result at table: 5♣ doubled -4 by West, NS +1100, lead not provided

Director first called: At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:

Before bidding 4♠ East asked for an explanation of the 4♣ bid. North described the bid as asking her to transfer to the major she held and East assumed that the 4♥ bid showed hearts. She also took her partner's double as take out and bid 4♠. She also said that had she understood North to have held spades she would not have bid at the 5 level.

Director's ruling: Table result stands for EW only. Score assigned for N/S: +450

Details of ruling:

For NS their explanation was unclear and likely to mislead and did mislead. Their score adjusted to 4♠+1 for +450 while for EW there was a misunderstanding of the double of 4♣ leading to a serious error unrelated to the infraction. Their score stands.

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: Did not agree with the ruling

Appeals Committee decision:

Table score re-instated for both sides. Deposit returned. The explanation given by NS was clear and accurate.

Appeals Committee's comments:

That the explanation was adequate and the word "transfer" might have prompted a further question from East had she been interested. Shame EW did not appear to enable us to check why they misunderstood.

Tim Rees' comments:

I don't see how the description of 4♣ could be classed as misleading. Anyway, it couldn't have affected the decision to double, as no question was asked at that stage. So E/W were already having a misunderstanding prior to the explanation, and therefore I agree with the AC.

APPEAL No : 11.077

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

This case caused a lot of debate when it was discussed on the internet. The majority view was to agree with the AC that the explanation was as clear as it possibly could be (though I suspect that many of these people had come across this convention before). However a sizeable minority came to the same conclusion as the TD, interpreting "asking her to transfer to the major she held" as asking her to *bid* the major she held. The word "transfer" seems to mean different things to different people. Was East acting on her own misunderstanding (in which case no rectification is due – see Law 21A) or was she damaged by a misexplanation (in which case rectification is due under Law 21B3)?

I strongly disagree with the TD's assertion that the misunderstanding of the double of 4♣ led to a "serious error unrelated to the infraction". First of all, having a misunderstanding in an obscure undiscussed sequence is not a serious error, and secondly, the 4♠ bid was related to the alleged infraction: if East had realised that North had shown spades, she would not have bid 4♠. If the TD had judged the 4♠ bid on to be 'wild or gambling' and denied redress to E/W on the basis, I'd have understood.

Of course this problem should never have occurred. If England had retained the sensible alerting rules in place until 2006, North's 4♥ bid would have been alerted and East would have known to the ask about its meaning.

Robin Barker's comments:

I would have ruled the same way as the AC because I have heard this explanation before and understood it. But it appears that many do not understand the explanation and perhaps the TD is right. It would be good if the form of words "asks me to transfer to my major" was avoided by players in giving explanations – "asks me to bid the suit below my major" instead.

Heather Dhondy's comments:

I can sort of see how the misunderstanding arose, however the meaning should be clear – "asking me to transfer into my suit" means just that, as opposed to "asking me to bid my suit". The 4♠ bid is a pretty questionable action in any case (and that's being polite!). I agree with the AC.

Richard Hills' comments:

North did not say "bid" the major or "correct to" the major, instead North said "transfer to" the major. And in the half-century since Oswald Jacoby invented his device, the word "transfer" has become General Knowledge.

Frances Hinden's comments:

I hate this case because I don't know what the right answer is. The E/W bidding was dreadful, but obviously East would not have bid 4♠ had he understood that North was showing spades. On the simple basis that it is N/S's responsibility to explain their methods accurately, that implies a ruling in favour of E/W. However, I also think the N/S explanation was completely clear – and this was in a representative event so everyone there has been selected to play for their county. Somewhere there has to be a distinction between giving an unclear explanation and a good explanation being misunderstood. The AC have decided that this case lies on one side of that line, but I don't think it's totally obvious. On that basis it's correct to return the deposit.

Paul Lamford's comments:

The explanation "transfer" to her partner's major was clear. If 4♣ was asking North to bid her major, the word "bid" would have been used instead of "transfer". East should look up a glossary of terms and the incorrect return of the deposit will allow her to buy one of the many bridge dictionaries on the market.

Barry Rigal's comments:

I'll say! The AC righted a TD incomprehensible wrong. Well done them.

APPEAL No : 11.078

Tournament Director: Matthew Johnson

Appeals Committee: Brian Senior (Chairman), Jeffrey Allerton and Andy Bowles

♠ 842		Board 7 : Dealer South : All vulnerable : Matchpoint Pairs			
♥ AK		<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>
♦ Q85					1♠
♣ KJ742		Pass	2♣	Pass	4NT (1)
♠ 93	♠ 7	Pass	5♥ (2)	Pass	5♠ (H)
♥ Q10876	♥ 9542	Pass	6♠	All Pass	
♦ 10732	♦ AKJ94	(1)	RKCB for clubs		
♣ Q6	♣ 1083	(2)	2 without the Q		
♠ AKQJ1065					
♥ J3					
♦ 6					
♣ A95					

Result at table:

6♠ making by South, NS +1430, lead not provided.

Director first called: At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:

EW reserved their rights after 6♠ with no objection from NS. EW feel North should not bid 6♠. All agree 5♠ was bid after some consideration but not a lengthy hesitation. I consulted with colleagues about logical alternatives and length of the hesitation.

Director's ruling: Score assigned for both sides: 5♠+1 making by South, NS +680

Details of ruling:

Break in tempo agreed. Pass is a LA. 6♠ is suggested over Pass by the break in tempo. Ruled the score back to 5♠+1. L16B1(a)

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: Bid does not suggest 6♠

Comments by North-South:

The alleged delay in bidding 5♠ was no more than partner working out the implications of my response – mental mathematics not a 'hesitation'.

On the sequence 1♠-2♣-4NT I cannot believe partner can have a hand that does not give a play for slam. I am aware I am rolling the dice but with such an undisclosed strength (♥AK, 3 card spade support) I believe it to be a high percentage action. I don't think I have any UI from partner's actions and that EW are appealing to get the best of both ends.

Comments by East-West: None.

Appeals Committee decision: Director's ruling upheld. Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments: The hesitation makes it easier for North to bid 6♠. While hesitation is disputed by NS, at the time the TD judged that there had indeed been a hesitation and we heard no compelling evidence to the contrary. Hence, the initial ruling was correct.

APPEAL No : 11.078

Tim Rees' comments:

Why can't people plan their subsequent actions prior to bidding Blackwood? The presumption has to be to disallow dubious actions after hesitation Blackwood.

Robin Barker's comments:

The AC do not explicitly discuss logical alternatives – the statement “The hesitation makes it easier for North to bid 6♠.” means that 6♠ is suggested over Pass, not that Pass is a logical alternative. However, the 6♠ advance and testimony “I am aware I am rolling the dice” makes it clear that Pass was a logical alternative for me.

Heather Dhondy's comments:

Why give the money back? I don't like the comments of North-South and I don't like the hesitation Blackwood.

Richard Hills' comments:

The deposit really really should have been forfeited. It is easy to construct deals where North-South are missing two aces, or where the ♦AK cash (South's red suit distribution could have been switched). The only justification for bidding on over Hesitation Blackwood is when North has an unexpected useful void.

Frances Hinden's comments:

Why return the deposit ?

Paul Lamford's comments:

Standard hesitation Blackwood sequence. North knows South does not have ♠AKQJx ♥QJ ♦KJ ♣Q10xx from the speed of the 5S bid. A PP for North for the 6S advance and retention of the deposit for me.

Barry Rigal's comments:

Agreed. North's continuation was not permissible in the circumstances of a BIT as established by the TD.

APPEAL No : 11.082

Tournament Director: Matthew Johnson

Appeals Committee: Heather Dhondy (Chairman), Richard Bowdery and Simon Cope

<p>♠ 10 ♥ 1042 ♦ KJ942 ♣ KJ93</p> <p>♠ Q ♠ AKJ962 ♥ AQ9853 ♥ J7 ♦ A875 ♦ 3 ♣ 102 ♣ AQ54</p> <p>♠ 87543 ♥ K6 ♦ Q106 ♣ 876</p>	<p>Board 11 : Dealer South : Love all : Swiss Pairs (Matchpoints => VPs) Auction not relevant for claim. Contract is 6♠ by East +1</p>
--	---

Result at table: 6♠ making +1 by East, NS +1010, lead not recorded

Director first called: After the boards in the set were completed.

Director's statement of facts:

I was called to the table after the cards had been returned to the board. Declarer had claimed with a trump outstanding but with a master trump. I was told that no claim statement had been made but this had been the norm for the match. Initially, North had agreed all 5 tricks to declarer but after returning the cards and some discussion South disagreed. When asked, East said she had not forgotten a trump but did not know why she claimed then and not when trumps fell save that she didn't tend to claim early. Both sides had been claiming without statements. When asked declarer said she knew she could draw trumps and had good hearts on table with A♦ entry.

Director's ruling: Table result stands

Details of ruling:

Because of the claims in the rest of the match and that I was called late, I thought East had not had the opportunity to state a claim or clarification statement and on balance I believe she had not forgotten and therefore ruled that 6♠+1 is scored.

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: East might have miscounted trumps.

Appeals Committee decision:

Score assigned for both sides: 6♠-1 by East, NS +50 Deposit returned

APPEAL No : 11.082

<p>♠ ♥ ♦ KJ9 ♣ J9</p> <p>♠ 92 ♥ ♦ 3 ♣ 54</p> <p>♠ 8 ♥ ♦ Q106 ♣ 6</p>	<p>Board 11 : Dealer South : Love all Auction not relevant for claim. Contract is 6♠ by East +1 Cards at point of claim.</p>
--	--

Appeals Committee's comments:

The relevant Law is 70C. In our view the fact that 4 trumps were drawn followed by a claim without stating that the 5th trump would be drawn gives sufficient doubt that declarer was aware of the outstanding trump. If declarer believes that all the trumps are drawn, a ♦ to the A followed by a top heart is a normal play resulting in down 1.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

I agree with the AC.

Robin Barker's comments:

East was not denied the opportunity to make a clarification statement – he chose not to make one.

Paul Lamford's comments:

Agree with the AC. Careless to miscount trumps, especially with exactly one out at the time of the claim. Probably a retained deposit again.

Tim Rees' comments:

Assuming that this was the last board of the round, I agree. If not, and the TD was called after “after all boards completed”, then the AC Law reference is incorrect. Law 69A & B apply, not Law 70. This changes the likelihood criteria for the defence getting a trick. Even then, the timing of the claim seems to make it “likely” that declarer has forgotten the last trump.

Barry Rigal's comments:

On the facts I guess I agree. I cant say I like it but it seems likely to be the right decision.