



**2014**

**EBU Appeals**

# ENGLISH BRIDGE UNION

2014

## 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:

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

Tel: 01296 317228

From outside UK(replace 0 with +44)

Email: [lecsec@ebu.co.uk](mailto:lecsec@ebu.co.uk)

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

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

Booklet compiled & edited by John Pain

Version 1.1: July 22<sup>nd</sup> 2016

## Commentators

**Jeffrey Allerton** is a tournament player from Surrey, England. He has won many of the main English and British events, including in 2015 the Spring Foursomes and the Brighton Four Stars Teams. He is also a past European and World junior champion. He qualified as a club and county director two decades ago, but no longer directs events. However, he has a keen interest in the application of the Laws of Duplicate Bridge and is an active 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** learned bridge from her parents. Her first trophy was the Portland Bowl representing York University and she has an impressive record since then having won five European Championships including the winning ladies team at the 2016 European Championships and a bronze medal in the Venice Cup. She is a member of the EBU Board and has served as the Chairman of the EBU Selection Committee.

**Richard Fleet** used to compete in a lot of bridge events and represented both England and Great Britain on several occasions. However, he is now retired from tournament bridge and has not played at all for almost two years. He captained the England Camrose team in the March 2016 Camrose weekend.

Over the years he has been heavily involved in bridge administration, having served for lengthy periods on the London Committee, including ten years as Chairman, and the EBU Laws & Ethics and Selection Committees. After a hiatus from administration lasting some nine years, he has recently elected back onto the L & E and volunteered to be one of the contributors to the 2013 Appeals Booklet.

Finally, he is now researching the history of English tournament bridge and hopes that the first instalment, covering the period from 1925 to 1945, will be completed at some point during 2016.

**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 successes being silver at the 2002 Commonwealth Games, and gold at the 2014 Games in Glasgow. Tim is currently Chairman of the Laws and Ethics Committee for England. He works at the Transport Research Laboratory, analysing (and hopefully solving) motorway congestion.

**Ed Reppert** is a retired US Navy officer living in Rochester, NY. He returned to duplicate bridge during his last tour before retirement, an exchange tour with the Royal Navy. After retiring he continued to play, became interested in the laws, and became an ACBL Club director. He ran a small club for a few years. For many years he has, along with David Stevenson, moderated the International Bridge Laws Forum, currently hosted on Bridge Base Online's forum site. In addition to bridge, he enjoys several other games and is a student of taijiquan. He's between cats, but expects that to change soon.

# APPEAL No : 14.001

Tournament Director: Mike Amos

Appeals Committee: Jeremy Dhondy (C), Jeffrey Allerton, Paul Lamford

<p>♠ 10743 ♥ 107543 ♦ Q4 ♣ 84</p> <p>♠ J9                      ♠ AQ85 ♥ J9                      ♥ AQ862 ♦ KJ109753            ♦ A8 ♣ J9                      ♣ KQ</p> <p>♠ K62 ♥ K ♦ 62 ♣ A1076532</p>	<p>Board 33 : Dealer North : Love all</p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td>Pass</td><td>1♥</td><td>3♣ (1)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>3♠</td><td>Dbl</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4♦</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Alerted and explained as diamonds and spades</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>		Pass	1♥	3♣ (1)	Pass	3♠	Dbl	Pass	4♦	All Pass		
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>														
	Pass	1♥	3♣ (1)														
Pass	3♠	Dbl	Pass														
4♦	All Pass																

## Basic systems:

North-South system – *not recorded*

East-West system – *5card majors, weak NT, short 1♣*

Form of Scoring: IMP's to VP's

Result at table: West 4♦ =, -130. Lead ♠10

Director first called: At the end of hand.

## Director's statement of facts:

East/West complained that South's hand did not correspond with description. North had convention card which showed 3♣ as showing ♦ and ♠. South had convention card which stated 'Ghestem' but had no explanation of the 3♣ bid.

TD decided that although there may be misinformation because North/South's agreement is not clearly stated and CCs were not identical that unauthorised information has been given and East/West have been damaged by this.

Director's ruling: 4♠x - 6 by North/South, -1400

## Details of ruling:

When South bids 3♣ she intends it to show a jump overcall in clubs. North/South play this type of bid as weak. South knows she has misbid or North has misunderstood. Law 73C makes clear that she may not seek to take advantage of this.

Appeal lodged by: North/South

Basis of appeal: Penalty is too harsh

## Director's comments:

South did not seem to understand the position. I asked her why she had not supported spades. She said her partner had only bid 3♠ + had weak support. I suggested that after her 3♣ bid a new suit

## APPEAL No : 14.001

must be strong or fit. She had excellent support for spades. She said 3♠ had been doubled. TD thinks she only knows this is penalty because she knows she does not have spades. TD thinks 4♠ is also a logical alternative after 4♦ is followed by two passes. As little as ♠AQxxx + ♣K will give play for 4♠. If 4♠ is bid it will be doubled and neither partner has good reason to remove.

**Comments by North-South:** None

**Comments by East-West:** None

**Appeals Committee decision:**

Director's ruling stands.  
Deposit returned.

**Appeals Committee's comments:**

We believe that quite a lot of Souths of similar ability would pass the double of 3♠ but some would bid 4♠ the next time after 4♦. It would be helpful if the TD had done a poll.

North/South should be asked to complete their card properly.

Richard Fleet

I don't agree with this. North is a passed hand and for South to bid 4♠ is very optimistic (whilst a perfect hand will give you play for 4♠, partner never holds one). Had South bid 4♣ over the double of 3♠ it would be a different matter but, by passing, she indicated that she was not taking advantage of the UI.

Paul Lamford

Sadly another Ghestem mix up leads to a huge penalty. South would probably not bid on the previous round (3♠ was doubled and might be left in), but would surely bid 4♠ on the next round, although Jeffrey Allerton, who knew the South player, did not think she would. I can quite believe this, but, unfortunately, enough peers of South who did not know they had misbid as a result of an alert would do so to make it an LA.

Ed Reppert

Agree with the director and the AC. Sometimes it's hard to explain things to the players. A poll might have helped with that.

Heather Dhondy

The fact that North is a passed hand means that 3♠ is not a strong bid, but is likely to be bid on the basis of a partial club fit. Given this, it seems clear to be bidding on to 4♠ with the South hand given the spade fit and extra club length. I agree with the TDs ruling.

Jeffrey Allerton

It is clear that South has UI and equally clear what the UI suggests. But is 4♠ a logical alternative for South at either her second or third turn to call? A classic situation for a poll, but the TD did not perform one. Is it permissible for an on-site AC to adjourn, perform its own poll and then reconvene

## APPEAL No : 14.001

later? The AC Chairman thought not. Notwithstanding the fact that South has shown ♦, West might choose to compete to 5 ♦ over a 4 ♠ bid from South, so there is a case for including a percentage of 5 ♦ by West in the weighting.

Tim Rees

Partner always seems to be a passed hand in these Ghestem UI cases, which complicates the inferences available from the 3 ♠ bid. Polling can be difficult, as finding peers of the player might be hard. But the ruling looks right.

Robin Barker

The basis of the appeal is given as "Penalty is too harsh": this shows a misunderstanding of the Laws. Firstly the adjustment is not a penalty, instead it is an assessment of the likely outcome once East-West have their misunderstanding. Secondly the TD is not allowed to give a different adjusted score because the adjustment required by law is too severe (Law 12B2); the AC is equally bound by this law.

# APPEAL No : 14.010

Tournament Director: Rob Turner

Appeals Committee: Stephen Gore (C), Vanessa Clark, David Wing

<p>♠ 7 ♥ AKQJ7 ♦ Q5 ♣ 108632</p> <p>♠ 942                      ♠ Q63 ♥ 864                      ♥ 1093 ♦ AK32                     ♦ 109874 ♣ KQ5                      ♣ 94</p> <p>♠ AKJ1085 ♥ 52 ♦ J6 ♣ AJ7</p>	<p>Board 1 : Dealer North : 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></td><td>1♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>1♠</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>2♣</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♦ (1)</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl</td><td>3♣</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♠</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) 2♦ was intended as 'fourth suit forcing' but North did not think it was because the sequence 1♣ 1♦ 1♥ 1♠ isn't. In their system South would have bid 1♣ 1♦ 1♥ 2♠</p> <p>(2) West doubled for a diamond lead but did not ask about 2♦ because he did not want to draw any more attention to it.</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>		1♥	Pass	1♠	Pass	2♣	Pass	2♦ (1)	Dbl	3♣	Pass	4♠	All Pass			
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																		
	1♥	Pass	1♠																		
Pass	2♣	Pass	2♦ (1)																		
Dbl	3♣	Pass	4♠																		
All Pass																					

## Basic systems:

North-South system – *Acol 3 weak 2s*

East-West system – *Acol + Multi*

**Form of Scoring:** Match point pairs.

**Result at table:** South 4♠ + 3, +510; lead ♠4

**Director first called:** After the hand had been played.

## Director's statement of facts:

There were no alerts and South did not inform her opponents that she thought her bid should have been alerted. West did not lead a diamond because he feared a 2-suiter in South's hand, with a diamond void in North. His choice of a spade gave North/South all 13 tricks.

If South had informed West before he made his opening lead that she thought her 2♦ call should have been alerted, West would be much more likely to risk cashing the ♦A.

**Director's ruling:** South 4♠ + 1 = +450

## Details of ruling:

South's failure to inform West that her 2♦ call should have been alerted (in her view) was sufficient to induce a lead which was very damaging to East/West. (Law 47E2(b)).

**Appeal lodged by:** North/South

**Basis of appeal:** None given

**Director's comments:** None

## APPEAL No : 14.010

### Comments by North-South:

1. West was not damaged by the bidding or any failure to alert.
2. He asked no questions about the bidding at any time during the bidding or play. (His query was raised when scores were seen in BridgeMate).
3. He doubled South's 2♦ bid thereby requesting a diamond lead from his partner and showing diamonds.
4. As his partner berated him – if he was good enough to double diamonds and had ♦AK why didn't he play ♦A to look at dummy?
5. With all due respect the claim by West was 'sour grapes' and out of time. He called the TD when we were playing the next board and was provoked by his partner who asked him why he had not lead ♦A to have a look at dummy.

### Comments by East-West: None

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld.  
Deposit returned.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

We felt that although West might well have led a top diamond, there was a doubt and we felt that the TDs decision should be upheld.

We felt that the TD made a reasonable decision in a difficult situation and we saw no reason not to uphold it.

Richard Fleet
---------------

I would have kept the deposit
-------------------------------

Paul Lamford
--------------

Firstly the appeal was in time, as the appellants have until something like 30 minutes from the end of play (it varies by event). Secondly, the AC presumably means that they saw no reason to <b>overturn</b> the TD decision. The failure to correct the lack of alert was the main infraction. I think a top diamond lead is automatic on either auction, but would have polled peers of West. If enough don't lead a diamond when they are told that 2♦ is natural, then I would go with the TD.
--

Ed Reppert
------------

Not sure I understand the AC's comments, since it looks to me like the director awarded the two tricks the defense was likely to get had west led one of his top diamonds. NS's comment #5 is incorrect in law. The TD call was most definitely not "out of time".
--

Heather Dhondy
----------------

I do believe that West should have protected himself and asked about what is a very common artificial sequence, however he would have been given the answer that it was natural and may have
--



## APPEAL No : 14.010

chosen to lead a trump on that basis anyway. South should have pointed out that 2♦ was alertable and this would have resolved the problem, so I agree with the tournament director. The North-South comments are unnecessarily confrontational, especially since they are the ones that caused the problem by their failure to alert or correct.

Jeffrey Allerton

South should have corrected the explanation before the opening lead, but what do we make of West's actions? Without the alert of 2♦, he was worried about leading a♦ in case it was declarer's side suit and yet this concern did not prevent him from doubling 2♦. The EBU Blue Book states:

"2 A 2 It is expected that experienced players will protect themselves in obvious misinformation cases. If such players receive an explanation which is implausible, and they are able to protect themselves by seeking further clarification without putting their side's interests at risk (e.g. by transmitting unauthorised information or alerting the opposition), failure to do so may prejudice their right to redress."

Fourth suit forcing is close to universal. Whilst asking during the auction could have put his side's interests at risk, an enquiry about 2♦ before the opening lead would have been "risk free" so if West wanted to know its meaning, he could and should have asked. The failure to protect himself by asking could be described as "wild".

Thus this could be a rare case where a split score is appropriate. N/S receive an assigned score of +450 (4♠+1), but E/W are denied redress for that part of the damage which is deemed to be self-inflicted (law 12C1b) and are assigned the table score of 4♠+3, -510.

Tim Rees

West could easily have protected himself here, especially after he'd doubled 3♦ so he is not compromising himself. However, South was certainly at fault for not volunteering that her bid should have been alerted.

Robin Barker

I was the TD in-charge for this event. I agree with the AC that the situation was difficult.

# APPEAL No : 14.011

Tournament Director: Nicole Cook

Appeals Committee: Tim Rees (Appeal by referee)

<p>♠ AJ10 ♥ J872 ♦ K9754 ♣ 9</p> <p>♠ Q742      ♠ 5 ♥ AQ6      ♥ K543 ♦ 3      ♦ AQJ1082 ♣ AKJ52      ♣ Q6</p> <p>♠ K9863 ♥ 109 ♦ 6 ♣ 108743</p>	<p>♠ ♥ J ♦ 975 ♣</p> <p>♠ Q742      ♠ ♥      ♥ 5 ♦      ♦ J108 ♣      ♣</p> <p>♠ ♥ not ♦ recorded ♣</p>	<p>Board 37 : Dealer North : North/South vulnerable</p> <p>Bidding not recorded.</p> <p>3NT by West.</p> <p>4-card ending position shown.</p>
--	---	---

## Basic systems:

North-South system – *not recorded*

East-West system – *not recorded*

**Form of Scoring:** Match Points

## Result at table:

None achieved because of a disputed claim

**Director first called:** At trick 9 after play had ceased.

## Director's statement of facts:

I was called to the table to settle a dispute about whether dummy could dispute an agreed claim. At trick 9, declarer was about to lead from dummy when North showed his hand claiming two tricks (4-card ending shown). Declarer agreed this and play finished. When play had ceased and the contract agreed (3NT + 1) dummy noticed that if declarer had led a heart next North would be endplayed and declarer would, in fact, make three, not two, of the tricks. The TD was called.

In establishing the facts the TD spoke to West and North to determine what each knew about each other's hand. Neither had spotted the endplay position, declarer herself stating that it was the end of the event and her mind was focussed on the play, so she did not know what she was going to do next, but was about to play the ♦ J.

## Director's ruling:

I consulted the chief TD about a weighted ruling. He advised me this was not a legal rectification and I must assign a result. Sufficiently clear in my mind that declarer did not know the endplay position, I ruled as equitably as I could and awarded two tricks to declarer and two tricks to the defence. i.e. I accepted the original claim/concession statement. (Laws 68D, 69B, 70A, 70B)

**Details of ruling:** West 3NT + 1; -430.

## **APPEAL No : 14.011**

**Appeal lodged by:** East / West

### **Basis of appeal:**

Of principle – Law 69B states that a doubtful point should be resolved against the claimer.

### **Director's comments:**

Event outcome not affected. Players stated they do not want final placings or master points received changed.

### **Comments by North-South:**

I see clearly that I should not claim and that what dummy says is correct. However declarer was clearly doing what I said and clearly accepted the claim before dummy interposed. I thought the general idea of decisions nowadays was as far as possible to let what was happening happen.

### **Comments by East-West:**

Dummy objected to the defensive claim just after declarer accepted it, within one or two seconds. Law 69 states if it is doubted by any player (dummy included) the TD must be called. The TD then has to rule according to Law 70, indeed resolving doubtful points in favour of the non-claimer, which the TD endeavoured to do. However it is not at all relevant what declarer was likely to do, whether she had seen the endplay, whether she was tired etc (all of which were no doubt true). She may well have found the winning line after seeing defenders cards if she had not been interrupted by the claim. But this is not relevant either.

All we need to show is that there is a less successful normal line for the claimer and that is enough to rule only one trick to the claimer. I think the referee can find that!

And neither West nor I said that we did not want the result changed; we do. We stated that we were appealing as a matter of principle, not because it made a significant difference. We did say we did not much care about the master points at stake.

(Later) Declarer had not decided on a line, so it cannot be certain what she would have done if she had not accepted the claim, although that is not so relevant, as Law 69 states either declarer or dummy can object, as I did almost immediately

### **Referee's decision:**

Director's ruling amended.

North can be held to one of the remaining tricks, so East/West are awarded 11 tricks. North/South – 460.

Deposit returned.

North (a defender) claimed two of the last four tricks. Declarer agreed, but dummy objected to the claim. He did this sufficiently quickly for the claim not to have been fully agreed.

### **Referee's comments:**

When either side makes a claim, play ceases and if called, the TD awards a number of tricks using laws 69,70 and 71. The TD has to decide a single result; weighting or splitting the score is not permitted under these laws.

## APPEAL No : 14.011

Law 68D indicates which law should be used to award a score. Law 68D specifically mentions that dummy is allowed to object to a claim, in which case Law 70 applies. Law 70 requires the claimer to state the line(s) by which he will make the stated number of tricks, which will include counters to any line that the opponent might follow. In this case, North can only make two tricks if declarer plays off the top two diamonds; if declarer plays a heart immediately or after cashing one top diamond, then North will only make one trick.

Declarer's intentions are not relevant under Law 70. If dummy had not objected, but declarer had later withdrawn her agreement, then Law 69 would apply, and that refers to the likelihood of taking a trick. In that case, declarer's state of mind would be relevant.

Law 70 refers to 'normal' play. That is only relevant to possible lines of play by the claiming side. The TD should consider whether the claimer can in fact get the tricks claimed in all 'normal' lines that the claimer might follow; if there exists a way to deny him those tricks (that he had not noticed at the time of his claim) then he doesn't get them. It does not matter whether that way involves 'normal' play by the other side.

The players have indicated that they do want the scores adjusted.

Paul Lamford
--------------

This was a poor decision by the original TD, correctly overturned. There was an error in the last sentence, and the scores were indeed corrected on the EBU site.
---

Ed Reppert
------------

Agree with the referee.
-------------------------

Heather Dhondy
----------------

I agree with the referee. Even if declarer cashes the ♦J, she can still effect the endplay, and even though South's cards are not given, it is evident that the position would be double-dummy, South having shown out of both red suits by now.
--

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

A well explained decision by the Referee.
---

Robin Barker
--------------

I was the TD in-charge of the event and was consulted by the TD and therefore contributed to the TD's ruling. The ruling was based on a different interpretation of 'normal' as it applies to plays by the other (non-claiming) side.
---

On an EBL directors course, we were told that, just as 'normal' excludes very poor plays by the claiming side, it also excludes exceptionally good plays by the non-claiming side.
--

But in hindsight, I think that any interpretation of 'normal' should allow the declaring side to lose only one trick.
---

# APPEAL No : 14.014

Tournament Director: Gary Conrad

Appeals Committee: David Burn (C), Graham Osborne, Andy Bowles

<p>♠ AKQ652 ♥ J9532 ♦ - ♣ K6</p> <p>♠ 1087      ♠ 3 ♥ K74      ♥ AQ6 ♦ AKQJ8    ♦ 97542 ♣ 73      ♣ AQJ9</p> <p>♠ J94 ♥ 108 ♦ 1063 ♣ 108542</p>	<p>Board 6 : Dealer East : East/West vulnerable</p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1♦</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4♦</td><td>Dbl</td><td>5♦</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Pass(1)</td><td>5♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>6♦</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) slow</p>	West	North	East	South			1♦	Pass	4♦	Dbl	5♦	Pass	Pass(1)	5♠	Pass	Pass	6♦	All Pass		
West	North	East	South																		
		1♦	Pass																		
4♦	Dbl	5♦	Pass																		
Pass(1)	5♠	Pass	Pass																		
6♦	All Pass																				

## Basic systems:

North-South system – *not recorded*

East-West system – *not recorded*

Form of Scoring: VPs (Swiss Pairs)

Result at table: 6♦ = by East (-1370)

Director first called: At the end of the auction.

## Director's statement of facts:

I was called to the table at the end of the auction. Before the opening lead, West stated that her partner should have alerted the 4♦ bid as it is Roman Key Card Blackwood. East stated that was not their system. After East bid 5♦ (West said this showed one key card) West passed and North bid 5♠; passed to West who bid 6♦, passed out. North claimed that if 4♦ had been alerted, she would have bid 4♠.

## Director's ruling:

Disallowed 6♦ due to unauthorised information. Allowed 5♠ to be doubled.

Appeal lodged by: East / West

Basis of appeal: None given

Director's comments: None

Comments by North-South: None

Comments by East-West:

## APPEAL No : 14.014

West did not have unauthorised information since 5♦ is not a proper answer so maybe a weak opener – hesitated before passing 5♦ as wanted to bid 6. When 5♠ was bid, it was an easy decision to bid the 6♦. Had 5♠ not been bid, North/South would have had a better result.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling amended.

Table result restored.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

West had as much AI (from non-existent 5♦ 'response to KCB' as from unauthorised information (partner did not think 4♦ was RCKB)). In any case 6♦ is not demonstrably suggested by unauthorised information.

Paul Lamford
--------------

I don't think West has any relevant MI from the failure to alert. He does have AI from East's failure to double 5♠, and I agree that 6♦ is not demonstrably suggested by any UI there is.
---

Ed Reppert
------------

I would have liked to see some evidence supporting west's claim that 5♦ showed one key card, and also the AC's claim that 5♦ is "not a proper answer". In other words, what was their actual agreement?
---

Heather Dhondy
----------------

I agree with the Appeals Committee.
-------------------------------------

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

There is a discrepancy between the TD's statement of facts:" East bid 5♦ (West said this showed one key card)" and the AC's comments: "from non-existent 5♦ 'response to KCB' ". If the AC established that the TD's statement of facts was inaccurate, then it should have said so in the "DECISION AND FINDINGS OF FACT BY THE COMMITTEE" section of the Appeals Form.
--

# APPEAL No : 14.015

Tournament Director: Jim Proctor

Appeals Committee: Roy Garthwaite (C), Haydn Dando, Mark Bratley

<p>♠ Q1042 ♥ 7 ♦ AQ103 ♣ Q1085</p> <p>♠ 75                      ♠ 63 ♥ AK832                ♥ J964 ♦ 9764                    ♦ K5 ♣ J7                        ♣ 96432</p> <p>♠ AKJ98 ♥ Q105 ♦ J82 ♣ AK</p>	<p>Board 10 : Dealer East : All vulnerable</p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td>Pass</td><td>1♠</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>3♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♣</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>4♦</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♠</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>5♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>6NT</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>6♠</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table>	West	North	East	South			Pass	1♠	Pass	3♠	Pass	4♣	Pass	4♦	Pass	4♠	Pass	5♠	Pass	6NT				6♠	All Pass			
West	North	East	South																										
		Pass	1♠																										
Pass	3♠	Pass	4♣																										
Pass	4♦	Pass	4♠																										
Pass	5♠	Pass	6NT																										
			6♠																										
All Pass																													

## Basic systems:

North-South system – *not recorded*

East-West system – *not recorded*

Form of Scoring: VPs (Swiss Pairs)

Result at table: 6♠ = by South (+1430)

Director first called: After South's 6NT and a remark by North.

## Director's statement of facts:

After South bid 6NT, North said '6NT' in a surprised and questioning manner. I was called by East/West at this point. South indicated to me that she intended to bid 6♠ and that the bidding cards were stuck together. I ruled that the 6NT was unintended and applied Law 25A. The clause 'no matter how he becomes aware of his error' is relevant. (L&E minutes 11.1.2012; White Book para 8.25.6). South changed her call to 6♠.

Appeal lodged by: East / West

## Basis of appeal:

TD did not fine North/South.

Director's comments: None

Comments by North-South: None

Comments by East-West: None

## Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit returned.

## APPEAL No : 14.015

### Appeals Committee's comments:

We upheld the TDs ruling only because he drew our attention to the White Book 'no matter ... aware of it'.

Had our attention not been drawn to the WB we would have reversed the TD's ruling. We have sympathy with East/West especially when, in this instance, attention was drawn to the 6NT bid by partner. Not for one moment did we believe that North had made the 6NT remark with the intention of getting the 6NT call revised to 6♠, but some players could take advantage of the L&E decision and the WB wording. Reconsider by the L&E??

### L&E Secretary's note:

The clause 'A player is allowed to replace an unintended call if the conditions described in Law 25A are met, no matter how he becomes aware of his error' is from the WBFLC minutes of October 18 2011.

Richard Fleet

North's comment is improper and should have been the subject of a disciplinary penalty. I would have been reluctant to allow South to change his bid (in particular, I would need to be convinced that the "without pause for thought" condition was satisfied). Did the WBFLC intend that "no matter how he becomes aware of his error" could extend to unauthorized information provided via an infraction by partner?

Paul Lamford

It is clear that the Law allows South to correct the call to 6♠. However, that does not mean North was allowed to communicate by making a remark. Just as North would not be allowed to communicate by a long delay to give South a chance to correct her error.

So, the correct procedure is to allow the correction - the law says we must do that. At the end of the hand, if the remark has damaged the non-offending side we adjust. In this case, South might have noticed her mispull without the comment, so we might adjust to something like 50% of 6NT-2, 50% of 6♠=. Presumably all of the former if weighted scores are not allowed.

The TD, AC and L&E wrongly concatenated the correction of the call and the remark and applied one law to both. There is no inconsistency here. If a player is aware of a mispull because of an announcement or alert, then we do not adjust, as the announcement or alert is not an infraction.

Ed Reppert

Interesting basis for appeal, especially considering the AC appears not to have taken it into account. Seems to me the way to stop people from taking advantage of the current interpretation of 25A in this way is to issue a procedural penalty when something like this happens. Note: I'm not saying that I disagree with the AC regarding North's intentions. I don't.

Heather Dhondy

Given the statement in the White Book, it seems that East-West have no case. Their stated reason for appealing, that North-South were not fined, is a bit strange as there is no suggestion of anything intentional. I question the return of the deposit.



## APPEAL No : 14.015

Jeffrey Allerton

The AC was right to be concerned about the implications of this ruling, but it is correct procedure for the AC to defer to the TD to interpret matters of Law and regulation (Law 93B). The TD got this ruling half right in that the L&EC's guidance on the application of Law 25A (as per section 8.25 of the EBU White Book) would appear to allow the South player to change her unintended 6NT call to her intended call of 6♠ at the table. Hence the hand was played out in the contract of 6♠. However, that should not have been the end of the ruling. North's comment (heard and acted on by South) is a clear breach of Laws 73A1 and 73B1. He "could have known" that this comment could work to his advantage (by waking South up before it was too late for South to change her call). Thus, unless the TD judged that South would definitely have noticed the misbid in time to correct anyway, he should have adjusted the score (Law 23 and Law 12) to what might have happened without North's comment. This looks most likely to be 6NT-1 or 6NT-2 by South; it would be entirely appropriate to weight the ruling. Finally, I agree with E/W that a procedural penalty should be awarded to N/S for North's inappropriate comment.

Tim Rees

The footnote to Law 25A is now part of the Law Book, so the change to 6♠ has to be allowed. A procedural penalty would have been appropriate, for North's illegal comment during the auction (Law 73A1).

# APPEAL No : 14.016

**Tournament Director:** Robin Barker

**Appeals Committee:** Tim Rees (C), Norman Selway, David Price

<p>♠ KJ7 ♥ 43 ♦ KQ876 ♣ K73</p> <p>♠ A643                      ♠ 108 ♥ Q1086                    ♥ AKJ752 ♦ J932                      ♦ 4 ♣ 10                        ♣ A954</p> <p>♠ Q952 ♥ 9 ♦ A105 ♣ QJ862</p>	<p>Board 32 : Dealer West : East/West vulnerable</p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Pass</td><td>1♣(1)</td><td>1♥</td><td>Dbl (2)</td></tr><tr><td>3♣ (3)</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♥</td><td>Dbl (4)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>4♠</td><td>Pass (5)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>5♥</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) 2 card suit (2) Spades (3) Mixed raise (4) Take-out (5) Agreed very, very slow</p>	West	North	East	South	Pass	1♣(1)	1♥	Dbl (2)	3♣ (3)	Pass	4♥	Dbl (4)	Pass	4♠	Pass (5)	Pass	5♥	All Pass		
West	North	East	South																		
Pass	1♣(1)	1♥	Dbl (2)																		
3♣ (3)	Pass	4♥	Dbl (4)																		
Pass	4♠	Pass (5)	Pass																		
5♥	All Pass																				

## Basic systems:

North-South system – *not recorded*

East-West system – *not recorded*

**Form of Scoring:** IMPs, Knock out.

**Result at table:** 5♥ = by East (-650)

**Director first called:** After the 5♥ bid during the auction.

## Director's statement of facts:

I was called during the auction. Pass of 4♠ agreed as very, very slow.

West said the question was 'was pass forcing?'

I was recalled at the end of the hand. 5♥ made. West said the pass was forcing so he bid 5♥.

## Director's ruling:

5♥ not allowed. Weighted ruling: 4♠ - 3 50%, 4♠ - 2 50%

## Details of ruling:

Not clear that pass is forcing so pass is a logical alternative. Play in 4♠ is not clear. (Law 16B, 12C2(c))

**Appeal lodged by:** East / West

**Basis of appeal:** None stated

## Director's comments:

No deposit taken but I am sure the appellant would have provided one. Process of finding committee and setting up appeal very frantic.

**Comments by North-South:** None

## APPEAL No : 14.016

Comments by East-West: None

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld  
Deposit returned.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

East/West had no explicit agreement whether the pass over 4♥ was forcing, but felt that at adverse vulnerability, it was normal to play forcing passes. We did not believe that this was sufficiently common for it to be the default agreement for a relatively unfamiliar partnership. Part of East/West's argument was that they had bid game to make, and that the opposition had stopped bidding. That was not the case – South was unlimited and had taken positive action on each of his turns to bid.

The slow pass of 4♥ suggested (given West's spade holding) that East was thinking of bidding 5♥ and therefore made 5♥ from West more attractive. Because of this we agree that 5♥ should be disallowed and that the TD's adjustment should be upheld.

We considered whether West could be allowed to double. We concluded that the unauthorised information did not suggest that double would be more successful than pass, and that it could be allowed. However, West made no reference to doubling in his comments to the committee. His thought were entirely on the fate of 5♥, so we did not feel it appropriate to modify the ruling to award any part of 4♠x in the adjustment.

Richard Fleet
---------------

If it is part of North-South's methods to open 1♣ on hands of this sort (with a reasonable five card suit other than clubs), it ought to be made clear to the opponents.
--

Paul Lamford
--------------

I agree that 5♥ is disallowed, as it is not clear that Pass was forcing. However, I would have included some element of 4♠ x in the corrected score. It is irrelevant whether West made any reference to it in the comments to the committee! It is not his job to assess weighting of the scores that could have occurred without the infraction, especially as he did not believe there was an infraction!
--

Heather Dhondy
----------------

I agree with the TD and AC.
-----------------------------

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

Another good ruling by the TD, upheld and well explained by the AC. It would have been helpful if the form had recorded more details about N/S's system, which was clearly not a traditional system!
--

# APPEAL No : 14.021

Tournament Director: Christine Macfarlane

Appeals Committee: Paul Hackett (C), Richard Jephcott, Heather Dhondy

<p>♠ 10862 ♥ K74 ♦ A72 ♣ J86</p> <p>♠ 75                      ♠ A43 ♥ QJ103                ♥ A ♦ KJ98                   ♦ Q654 ♣ 975                    ♣ AQ1032</p> <p>♠ KQJ9 ♥ 98652 ♦ 103 ♣ K4</p>	<p>Board 19 : Dealer South : East/West vulnerable</p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>1♣</td><td>1♥</td></tr><tr><td>1NT</td><td>2♥</td><td>Pass (H)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>3♣</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table>	West	North	East	South				Pass	Pass	Pass	1♣	1♥	1NT	2♥	Pass (H)	Pass	3♣	All Pass		
West	North	East	South																		
			Pass																		
Pass	Pass	1♣	1♥																		
1NT	2♥	Pass (H)	Pass																		
3♣	All Pass																				

## Basic systems:

North-South system – *not recorded*

East-West system – *not recorded*

Form of Scoring: MPs

Result at table: 3♣ + 1 by West = -130

Director first called: At the end of play.

## Director's statement of facts:

After the 2♥ bid by North, the slow pass by East may have influenced West's 3♣ bid. West had shown his hand with 1NT. Pass was a logical alternative after East's pass.

## Director's ruling:

Adjusted score to 2♥ - 1 by South.

Appeal lodged by: East/West

Basis of appeal: None given

Director's comments: None

Comments by North-South: None

Comments by East-West: None

## Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling confirmed  
Deposit forfeited.

Appeals Committee's comments:

## APPEAL No : 14.021

Reluctantly we believe the appeal to be without merit.

Richard Fleet

I don't understand the "reluctantly". Either the appeal is without merit or it isn't. Since it is hardly ridiculous to play the first heart to the king, should not the adjustment have included a proportion of 2♥ down 2?

Paul Lamford

I agree the appeal is without merit and the deposit is forfeited but I would have also given two PPs. Both to West, one for the 3♣ bid, using UI, and the other for the failure to alert the slow pass which showed a good 3-1-4-5 with uncertainty about the meaning of double 😊

Jeffrey Allerton

I agree with the TD's ruling. I also agree with the AC, with the exception of the use of the word "reluctantly".

Tim Rees

An obvious retention of the deposit.

# APPEAL No : 14.022

**Tournament Director:** Barrie Partridge

**Appeals Committee:** Jeremy Dhondy (C), Jason Hackett, Kath Nelson

<p>                     ♠ K643                      ♥ 9654                      ♦ J9                      ♣ A96                      ♠ 8                      ♥ AKQJ108                      ♦ Q1075                      ♣ K7                      ♠ AJ752                      ♥ 2                      ♦ A642                      ♣ J83                 </p>	<p>Board 6 : Dealer East : East/West vulnerable</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>West</th> <th>North</th> <th>East</th> <th>South</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Pass</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1♥</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>1NT</td> <td>2♠</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3♥</td> <td>3♠</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4♥</td> <td>All Pass</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	West	North	East	South			Pass	Pass	1♥	Pass	1NT	2♠	3♥	3♠	Pass	Pass	4♥	All Pass		
West	North	East	South																		
		Pass	Pass																		
1♥	Pass	1NT	2♠																		
3♥	3♠	Pass	Pass																		
4♥	All Pass																				

**Basic systems:**

North-South system – *not recorded*

East-West system – *not recorded*

**Form of Scoring:** MPs

**Result at table:** None achieved because of a disputed claim.

**Director first called:** After the claim was disputed.

**Director’s statement of facts:**

<p>                     ♦ J                      ♣ 96                      ♦ Q10                      ♣ 7                      ♦ 6                      ♣ J8                 </p>	<p>                     ♦ 8                      ♣ Q10                 </p> <p>I was called after West had claimed/conceded at the 3-card ending shown, with South on lead. The statement was ‘I’ll give you a spade’. South had no spade but would lead a diamond. This gives West a choice of plays.</p>
---	--

**Director’s ruling:**

Declarer is not certain where ♦ J is so may finesse ♦ 10 and would now lose two tricks. Such a play we considered might be argued to be careless or inferior as per Law 70E1 but not beyond such. Thus North/South take two of the last three tricks.

**Details of ruling:** 4♥ - 3 by West = +300

**Appeal lodged by:** East/ West

**Basis of appeal:** Irrational to play ♦ 10.

**Director’s comments:** None

## **APPEAL No : 14.022**

**Comments by North-South:** None

**Comments by East-West:** None

### **Appeals Committee decision:**

Director's ruling upheld  
Deposit forfeited.

### **Appeals Committee's comments:**

The TD had applied the law correctly in our view. The TD had read the law to the players. 70E1 made it clear what should happen which is why the deposit was retained.

### **Appeal to the National Authority**

There followed an appeal by East/West to the EBU as National Authority. The Laws and Ethics Committee considered the appeal and reported as follows:

#### Preliminaries

The L&E Committee considered an appeal to the National Authority from the Corwen Trophy, regarding a declarer's claim ruled according to Law 70E1. For such an appeal to be heard, it must meet one of the following criteria:

- a) A question of principle
- b) An error of tournament direction
- c) An error in the application of law or regulation
- d) A grossly inappropriate value judgement

The appeal submission mentioned three grounds for appeal:

- (i) That it was a grossly inappropriate value judgment to assume an expert declarer would have finessed the ♦10.
- (ii) That the Appeals Committee contained a member who might have been biased in favour of the defenders.
- (iii) That there was an error in procedure because the AC had not provided any written reasons for its ruling.

The L&E considered these grounds. It did not believe that there had been a grossly inappropriate value judgement (this is discussed further below). It did not believe that the AC member had a particularly strong relationship with the defenders nor that he would have allowed personal friendships to affect his ruling. Finally, although AC Chairmen are encouraged to write full reasons for a ruling on the Appeals Form, time pressures often mean that this is not done. A failure to supply written reasons is not grounds for further appeal.

Therefore, the appeal submission did not contain sufficient grounds for appeal. However, some members of the L&E Committee were concerned that there may have been an error in the application of Law. Instead of Law 70E1, they thought that since declarer had tried to concede a spade when there were no more out, then Law 71 (Concession Cancelled) should have been used instead of Law 70E1. On this basis, the L&E felt that the appeal met criteria c) above, and the appeal should be heard.

#### The Appeal

The Committee discussed at length which Law should be used, and how the claim Laws should be interpreted. The Committee took advice from Senior TDs both in England and in the EBL. The conclusion was that Law 71 is intended to cover the withdrawal of agreed concessions. In this case,

## APPEAL No : 14.022

the concession of a spade trick was not agreed, so Law 71 does not apply, and Law 70E1 was the correct Law to use.

It was also argued that declarer had conceded one trick, and therefore claimed two tricks. Some members felt that, with two sure tricks, he should be entitled to two tricks. The Committee decided that this was not the correct interpretation of the law, as declarer's concession of a trick was invalid and he did not specify a line of play, nor which tricks he was taking. If declarer had instead claimed with the statement "I'll take my two queens", that would have been likely to be allowed.

When using Law 70E1, guidance from the WBF and endorsed by the L&E Committee is to follow the claim statement until it breaks down, then determine possible "normal" lines from that point on. In this case, the statement of "I'll concede a spade" broke down immediately, and the TD had to decide "normal" lines on a diamond return.

There are two possible lines for declarer, to play either the Q or 10 of diamonds. Neither of these lines is irrational. While it is acknowledged that declarer is an expert, arguments that declarer has inferences that make it very likely that the remaining diamonds are 1-1 do not apply here. We cannot assume that a declarer who does not know how many spades are out, will necessarily be capable of drawing inferences about diamonds. Both lines are "normal" under the definition of the footnote to Law 70, and Law 70E1 states that "the Director shall not accept from claimer any unstated line of play the success of which depends upon finding one opponent rather than the other with a particular card". The EBU has not specified a default order of play under Law 70E2, so the TD was correct to assign a score based on declarer playing the D10 on the 11<sup>th</sup> trick, which meant declarer took one further trick. Therefore, the TD's and AC's ruling is confirmed.

Because the appeal was heard by the L&E, the deposit for that appeal was returned. The L&E also decided to return the deposit from the original appeal.

Richard Fleet
---------------

In these sorts of cases, I think that it would be helpful to set out the entire play to date.
---

Paul Lamford
--------------

I agree with the L&E ruling that declarer gets the worst normal line after a claim breaks down. It broke down when declarer stated "I will give you a spade", and case law is that this is now treated much as a silent claim. Finessing the ♦10 is a normal but unsuccessful line.
---

Heather Dhondy
----------------

I agree with the TD and AC. I am surprised that the deposit was returned when the L&E decided that no criteria were met, and even more surprised that the original deposit was returned.
--

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

There must be more to this ruling than meets the eye given that it was appealed to the National Authority and the L&EC then felt it necessary to consult with some very senior TDs regarding which Law applied.
---

Tim Rees
----------



## APPEAL No : 14.022

Faulty claims are often difficult to resolve. One principle that comes out of this case is the misconception that once you've claimed, you can't take any finesses. That's not right – if there is a finesse available and you don't specify a line of play, you're not allowed to drop an honour offside either.

Robin Barker

I have already had my go at this ruling. I shall just ask again the question I asked when everything had been decided: what would the ruling be if South did have a spade but objected to claim on the grounds that he might not cash the spade?

If South with ♠2 ♦6 ♣J, were to lead a diamond, then the claim statement “breaks down” and declarer might now play to make the remaining tricks. So declarer finesses in diamonds, finesses on the club return and now South cashes the spade. This gives declarer no tricks, when one might think everyone would give him two tricks.

# APPEAL No : 14.028

Tournament Director: Helen Barr

Appeals Committee: Jason Hackett (C), Steve Ray, Will Roper

<p>♠ A8 ♥ J75 ♦ QJ852 ♣ J93 ♠ KQ6543      ♠ J9 ♥ 103            ♥ KQ982 ♦ K                ♦ 1097 ♣ AK105        ♣ Q42 ♠ 1072 ♥ A64 ♦ A643 ♣ 876</p>	<p>Board 31 : Dealer South : North/South vulnerable</p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>1♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>1NT(A1)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2♣(A2)</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♠(3)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>3♠(H)</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♥</td><td>Dbf</td></tr><tr><td>4♠</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(A1) alerted, forcing (A2) 3 clubs (better minor) (3) min 6 HCP, preference for spades, assuming partner has 5 Spades and 3 clubs</p>	West	North	East	South				Pass	1♠	Pass	1NT(A1)	Pass	2♣(A2)	Pass	2♠(3)	Pass	3♠(H)	Pass	4♥	Dbf	4♠	All Pass		
West	North	East	South																						
			Pass																						
1♠	Pass	1NT(A1)	Pass																						
2♣(A2)	Pass	2♠(3)	Pass																						
3♠(H)	Pass	4♥	Dbf																						
4♠	All Pass																								

## Basic systems:

North-South system – *Precision*

East-West system – *not recorded*

Form of Scoring: MPs to VPs

Result at table: 4♠ = by West = -620

Director first called: At the end of the auction.

## Director's statement of facts:

I was called to the table at the end of the auction and North/South reserved their rights because East had bid on after West's hesitation. I consulted with several players and none would have failed to take action on East's hand.

## Director's ruling:

After polling several players I could not find anyone who would pass. Therefore pass was not a logical alternative (Law 16B1(b))

Details of ruling: Score stands.

Appeal lodged by: North/South

## Basis of appeal:

Questioned opposition's action after the hesitation.

Director's comments: None

Comments by North-South: None

Comments by East-West: None

## APPEAL No : 14.028

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld  
Deposit returned.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

In our view, while the 4♥ bid is not quite 100% clear, the hesitation does not necessarily suggest it. Also the range for a 3♠ bid within a strong club system is so narrow that whilst a pause in this situation often suggests extras that cannot be the case here.

We also think 4♠ is an 80-90% action. West could also be thinking about bidding four.

Richard Fleet

I don't understand the AC comments. The 3♠ bid was slow so it is the 4♥ bid which might have been influenced by UI whereas all the comments concern the 4♠ bid. Finally, the AC refer to a strong club system and there is no evidence that East-West were playing one. At best, this is a poor example of form completion.

Paul Lamford

It is not clear what the UI suggests. 3♠ is invitational presumably, showing six spades, and East accepted. I would not have returned this deposit, especially as the TD polled peers.

Ed Reppert

Somebody is confused, possibly just me. NS were playing Precision. Were EW? I agree with the director's ruling.

Heather Dhondy

I think that assuming the TD has asked sufficient players of the right level, and asked the right question, the AC should be reluctant to overturn this. Once East knows his partner has six spades (the 3♠ bid) he also knows his partner has four clubs since otherwise he would not mention these, and the ♣Q becomes a good card. I still do not think it is automatic to raise, but I am doubtful about what the hesitation suggests. I agree with the TD and AC

Jeffrey Allerton

The TD says that she polled "several" players but how many is "several"? That doesn't seem a big enough sample size in order to come to the "no logical alternative" conclusion with much confidence. However, I agree with the ruling for the reason cited by the AC. West could equally have been contemplating passing or bidding game (or maybe making a different invitational bid), so the pause does not demonstrably suggest any particular action.

Tim Rees

It's difficult for a poll to confirm that an action is not an LA, as you need a large sample to be sure. It's a lot easier for an action to be shown to be an LA, as if a few people choose it, that's enough. The AC's determination of the likelihood of East bidding on over 3♠ puts it on the borderline for being an LA, but once they determined that bidding on was not demonstrably suggested by the hesitation, it didn't actually matter.

# APPEAL No : 14.033

Tournament Director: Colin Simcox

Appeals Committee: Malcolm Pryor (C), Tim Rees, Graham Osborne

<p>♠ 105 ♥ QJ3 ♦ AJ5 ♣ AK1073</p> <p>♠ KJ9742      ♠ AQ63 ♥ 105            ♥ A987 ♦ 632            ♦ 10 ♣ Q6            ♣ 9842</p> <p>♠ 8 ♥ K642 ♦ KQ9874 ♣ J5</p>	<p>Board 11 : Dealer South : Love all</p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2 ♦ (A1)</td><td>Dbl (2)</td><td>2 ♠ (A3)</td><td>3 ♦</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>3 ♠ (4)</td><td>4 ♥</td><td>Dbl</td></tr><tr><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>A1            Multi 2            not alerted – 13 to 15 Balanced or 19+ A3           Playable in 3 ♥ 4            not alerted</p>	West	North	East	South				Pass	2 ♦ (A1)	Dbl (2)	2 ♠ (A3)	3 ♦	Pass	3 ♠ (4)	4 ♥	Dbl	All Pass			
West	North	East	South																		
			Pass																		
2 ♦ (A1)	Dbl (2)	2 ♠ (A3)	3 ♦																		
Pass	3 ♠ (4)	4 ♥	Dbl																		
All Pass																					

### Basic systems:

North-South system – *not recorded*

East-West system – *not recorded*

**Form of Scoring:** MP's to VP's (Swiss Pairs)

**Result at table:** 4 ♥ x – 6 by East (North/South + 1400)

**Director first called:** At the end of play.

### Director's statement of facts:

East stated that when 3 ♠ was not alerted, they took it to be a natural suit. Consequently they reasoned that partner's suit must be hearts, and bid 4 ♥. North/South did not have an agreement for the use of 3 ♠ in this situation; North hoped his partner would interpret it as 'asking', whereas South thought it was 'showing'.

### Director's ruling:

The 3 ♠ bid is not alertable as North/South did not have any agreement to use it in an unnatural way. (BB4A1)

**Appeal lodged by:** East West

**Basis of appeal:** None stated

### Director's comments:

It was not clear why West had not bid 3 ♥ over 3 ♦. North reasoned that it must show spades and therefore thought it reasonable that 3 ♠ must be 'asking'. South was not on the same wavelength. Note that the double should be alerted, although this was not relevant. The TD wondered if East might have been able to ask about the 3 ♠ call. Note that East is a very experienced player.

**Comments by North-South:** None

**Comments by East-West:** None

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

## APPEAL No : 14.033

### Appeals Committee's comments:

This appeal threw up a number of issues, worth a review by the L&E in our opinion.

After some debate we concluded that North/South had drawn different inferences from East/West explanations of their unusual treatment of the Multi (East appeared unable in their methods to show support for both majors and therefore appeared in some situations not to be able to become clear on which major partner had); North assuming that West had to have spades, South assuming that it was still possible for West to have hearts. South assumed that because West is allowed to pass 3♦ even when he has six hearts North's 3♠ bid had to show spades (hence no alert); North assumed that West must have spades and was asking for a stop.

North/South got their wires crossed through those different inferences rather than because they had no agreement as to their system methods (in which case per the 2014 revised wording for alerts (see BB 4A6, reproduced after 14.036) South should have alerted North's 3♠ call) or because they had specific agreements here, misexplained.

We noted the new wording could do with better publicity since it is probably not well known even by experienced players. We also concluded (but worth confirming) that South's 3♦ bid was not alertable even when showing values (though 2NT obviously is alertable) and that a Dixon-style initial double probably is technically alertable (though not relevant here, in our view and even though in common use).

**L&E Committee comment:** See after 14.036 (similar problem)

Richard Fleet

I see a difficulty here with the BB2D2 and 4A6 wording: why should South think that North's 3♠ bid is anything other than natural? Why should he think that there is any possibility of ambiguity? As I see it, North's view of the situation turned on bridge logic, not any explicit or implicit agreement.

Paul Lamford

South should have alerted 3♠ as he knew that it was not natural from their defence to a multi (North had not overcalled 2♠ which would have been takeout of hearts). South also KNEW that West had spades from his hand, and therefore he knew that 3♠ was artificial. I would have adjusted here for the failure to alert. Probably some mix of 4♠-1 and 4♦+1.

Jeffrey Allerton

I agree with the TD and the AC. It seems that N/S had no explicit or implicit agreement about the meaning of 3♠. E/W would do better to concentrate on developing their own agreements after their own Multi 2♦ opening rather than relying on the opponents, the TD or the AC to help.

Tim Rees

N/S had no understanding (or had a misunderstanding) about the 3♠ bid. That was caused by them drawing different conclusions about the auction so far. But was that caused by E/W not explaining their methods fully, or by the methods themselves? And was East's 4♥ bid caused by MI about the 3♠ bid, or was it "gambling", in that their methods had no way of finding out West's major? I believe several rulings are possible here: rule in favour of either pair, or give them both a poor score.

## APPEAL No : 14.034

**Tournament Director:** Gordon Rainsford

**Appeals Committee:** Malcolm Pryor (C), Martin Jones, Jason Hackett

<p>♠ AKJ1052 ♥ - ♦ AKQ8 ♣ 753</p> <p>♠ Q86                      ♠ 974 ♥ K652                      ♥ Q873 ♦ J1032                      ♦ 9 ♣ KJ                          ♣ AQ982</p> <p>♠ 3 ♥ AJ1094 ♦ 7654 ♣ 1064</p>	<p>Board 22 : Dealer East : East/West vulnerable</p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>1♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>1NT</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>2♣ (1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl</td><td>3♠</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) 2♣ artificial, forcing, not alerted because South had forgotten.</p>	West	North	East	South			Pass	Pass	Pass	1♠	Pass	1NT	Pass	2♣ (1)	Pass	Pass	Dbl	3♠	All Pass	
West	North	East	South																		
		Pass	Pass																		
Pass	1♠	Pass	1NT																		
Pass	2♣ (1)	Pass	Pass																		
Dbl	3♠	All Pass																			

### Basic systems:

North-South system – *not recorded*

East-West system – *not recorded*

**Form of Scoring:** MPs to VPs (Swiss Pairs)

**Result at table:** 3♠ + 1 by North (+170)

**Director first called:** After the end of the Swiss Pairs match.

**Director's statement of facts:**

**Director's ruling:** 50% of 2♣ - 1; 50% of 2♣ - 2

### Details of ruling:

Had West known that 2♣ was artificial forcing, he would have passed 2♣. This would go one or two off.

**Appeal lodged by:** North / South

**Basis of appeal:** None given

**Director's comments:** None

**Comments by North-South:** None

**Comments by East-West:** None

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling amended.

The weighted score was confirmed but an additional fine of 0.5 VPs on North South.

**Appeals Committee's comments:**

## APPEAL No : 14.034

We agreed with the TD's findings

- 1) West was entitled to an alert re Gazzilli
- 2) And would not have backed in with a double armed with that knowledge
- 3) Therefore some combination of outcomes with 2♣ as the final contract was appropriate.

Had South alerted 2♣ and then passed and West had backed in with a double we felt North should be in a position to go for game in clubs (even 5 to 7 clubs probably only needs a 2-1 club break). We felt therefore that the insistence on spades as the strain was sufficiently extreme example of using unauthorised information to merit a 0.5 VP fine.

The Committee took the following steps:

- 1) Confirmed contract as 2♣ per above, after some debate;
- 2) Looked at weighting of 2♣ - 1 / 2♣ - 2. We felt it was inappropriate for committees to make minor adjustments to such weightings and therefore were happy to leave the weighting as it was (it is very close to the weighting we would have gone for);
- 3) Looked at whether West's double was wild and gambling as opposed to just poor but felt not;
- 4) Debated deposit retention; it was close but we felt we had taken some time to agree with the TD's ruling and some debate. Although not relevant to our decision on deposit retention here it would be helpful for L&E to clarify whether or not the precedent which was in force a few years back is still in force, that where a worse score is awarded to the appellants the deposit is returned (on the basis that the appeal has led to a change)
- 5) Looked at what had happened in the actual auction and concluded that a penalty was appropriate, per above.

### L&E Committee comment:

The L&E Committee considered a case where the on site Appeals Committee gave the appealing side a worse score than that awarded by the TD. The onsite committee asked whether it would have been possible to retain the deposit in such a case and the L&E Committee confirmed that it could have done.

Paul Lamford

An appalling appeal by North-South and I would certainly have kept their deposit, and the L&E were quite correct to confirm that it could have been kept. I would have been ruthless, and "forced" North to splinter with 4♥ over the takeout double, and South would sign off in 5♣, doubled by East, and I would have gone for five off. And there is a certain *je ne sais quoi* about changing the appealing side's -100 to -1100. That might deter NS from making an appeal without merit in future.

Heather Dhondy

I agree with the additional fine. North's 3♠ bid was based on the UI, and to appeal the ruling shows some nerve! I would not have returned the deposit.

Jeffrey Allerton

The AC states that North should consider what he would have done if 2♣ had been alerted, but that it a slight simplification, because even anticipated alerts are UI. It's better for North to imagine that he was playing with screens and in assessing the logical alternatives he would consider the relative probabilities of South having forgotten the system against having decided to pass a forcing bid. I understand the AC's rationale for assessing a procedural penalty on North, but the score adjustment

## APPEAL No : 14.034

is not consistent with this judgement. When producing hypothetical auctions for the purpose of assigning an adjusted score, the TD/AC should consider the unauthorised information as well as misinformation (MI). The TD/AC focused on the MI, but the AC judged that felt "North should be in a position to go for game in clubs". On this basis, West was not damaged by the MI because it is judged that North should have bid 5♣ over West's double and defending 5♣x is obviously better for the non-offending side than defending 2♣, the outcome of adjusting for MI. Thus the logical score adjustment would be a weighting between 5♣x-4 and 5♣x-5.

Tim Rees

An excellent write-up by the AC.



# APPEAL No : 14.035

Tournament Director: Kathy Williams

Appeals Committee: Malcolm Pryor (C), Neil Rosen, David Gold

<p>♠ A108652 ♥ Q ♦ 72 ♣ KQ92</p> <p>♠ 9                      ♠ 74 ♥ 742                    ♥ AK1086 ♦ AK43                  ♦ QJ1096 ♣ J10753                ♣ A</p> <p>♠ KQJ3 ♥ J953 ♦ 85 ♣ 864</p>	<p>Board 16 : Dealer West : East/West vulnerable</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>2♦ (1)</td><td>Dbl (2)</td><td>3♥ (3)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass (4)</td><td>3♠</td><td>4♥</td><td>4♠</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">All Pass</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td colspan="3">Multi</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td colspan="3">shows ♦</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td colspan="3">pass or correct – pre-emptive</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td colspan="3">agreed hesitation</td></tr></tbody></table>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>	Pass	2♦ (1)	Dbl (2)	3♥ (3)	Pass (4)	3♠	4♥	4♠	All Pass				1	Multi			2	shows ♦			3	pass or correct – pre-emptive			4	agreed hesitation		
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																														
Pass	2♦ (1)	Dbl (2)	3♥ (3)																														
Pass (4)	3♠	4♥	4♠																														
All Pass																																	
1	Multi																																
2	shows ♦																																
3	pass or correct – pre-emptive																																
4	agreed hesitation																																

## Basic systems:

North-South system – *Multi 2♦*

East-West system – *Benji Acol*

**Form of Scoring:** MPs to VPs (Swiss Pairs)

**Result at table:** 4♠ - 1 by North (-50)

**Director first called:** At the end of the auction.

## Director's statement of facts:

I was called at the end of the auction by North who asked me to look at East's hand to see if he had a 4♥ bid after his partner had hesitated.

West said he was trying to remember if his partner's double meant take out or diamonds.

**Director's ruling:** Score adjusted to 3♠ = by North (+140)

## Details of ruling:

By hesitating West is showing something and although it doesn't suggest hearts it does suggest points. (Law 16B)

**Appeal lodged by:** East/West

**Basis of appeal:** East thinks he has his bid.

**Director's comments:** None

**Comments by North-South:** None

**Comments by East-West:** None

## Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling amended. Table result reinstated.

## APPEAL No : 14.035

Deposit returned.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

Although there was some dispute as to whether there actually was a hesitation bearing in mind the requirement to pause after a 'stop' bid we felt that the TD would have been better placed than anyone to decide this when called and therefore took the hesitation as established. However we didn't see pass as a logical alternative for East and therefore ruled the score back to that achieved at the table.

We asked East to explain his evaluation of his hand and he described it as a strong hand, a view with which we agreed unanimously. It is a hand that those employing Leaping Michaels might express with an original leap to 4♦ and it is a hand which would bid 4♦ over 3♠ if he had only called 2♥ the first time. It would be hard to poll players that play a double of 2♦ to show diamonds since they would be in short supply, but given the methods, the knowledge that the opponents had a 9-card fit and South's pre-emptive action, we felt that pass would not have been a logical alternative after the 3♠ bid, the options including double 4♦ and the chosen 4♥ (all of which we felt would have led to the same score achieved at the table).

This was the appellants first appeal and we took the opportunity to clarify for them what the issues were and why the TD had ruled the way she did.

Richard Fleet

The AC might have considered the fact that the East hand has declined in value once South implies length in hearts. In particular, bidding 2♥ over 2♦ and then hypothetically bidding 4♦ over 3♠ is considerably less risky than doubling 2♦ and then bidding 4♥ over 3♠.

Paul Lamford

Firstly, agree with the TD that passing over 3♠ on the East hand is unbelievably timid. You might resolve to discuss leaping Michaels with partner before the next board, but that does not mean you pass on this one! The methods were poor, but that is irrelevant. East intended to show diamonds and then hearts, and this is what he did. I would return the deposit especially as NS appear to be inexperienced.

*(Editor's note: East is a Life Master and West a National Master)*

Heather Dhondy

I agree with the AC. To simply double to show diamonds and take no further action in the bidding is not beginning to show your hand. Whether or not I was playing double to show diamonds, I would not have started this way, but given where we had got to, it is normal to take another bid.

Jeffrey Allerton

A sensible and well explained ruling by the AC.

Tim Rees

As the AC says, it would be difficult to find suitable players to poll. However, they did a good job of finding out the thought processes of East. Having not shown hearts initially, he's effectively committed to doing so on the next round, and the potential UI makes no difference.

# APPEAL No : 14.036

Tournament Director: David Stevenson

Appeals Committee: Malcolm Pryor (C), Brian Senior, Paul Lamford

<p>♠ K10642 ♥ KQ52 ♦ 92 ♣ QJ</p> <p>♠ -                      ♠ AJ853 ♥ A63                    ♥ 10874 ♦ A87653                ♦ Q104 ♣ A986                   ♣ 7</p> <p>♠ Q97 ♥ J9 ♦ KJ ♣ K105432</p>	<p>Board 12 : Dealer West : North/South vulnerable</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>1♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♠</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>Dbl (1)</td><td>3♣</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl</td><td>3♠</td><td>Dbl</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>1. not alerted</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>	1♦	1♠	Pass	2♠	Pass	Pass	Dbl (1)	3♣	Dbl	3♠	Dbl	All Pass
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>														
1♦	1♠	Pass	2♠														
Pass	Pass	Dbl (1)	3♣														
Dbl	3♠	Dbl	All Pass														

### Basic systems:

North-South system – *Standard American*

East-West system – *Strong NT and 5-card majors*

Form of Scoring: MPs.

Result at table: 3♠ x – 2 by South (-500)

Director first called: At the end of play.

### Director's statement of facts:

North said they were damaged by the lack of alert of the first double. East said they had no agreement but he doubled in hopes partner would pass and with good diamonds if he did not. East said they generally played doubles as takeout by default and no similar sequence had occurred before. I was told they had played quite a few times over the last few months.

### Director's ruling:

No agreement explicit or implicit thus first double not alertable, so no infraction.

Appeal lodged by: North/South

Basis of appeal: East knew they had an agreement

### Director's comments:

There was damage possibly since if South suspects or knows a penalty double he will pass it. In current Blue Book 'no agreement' is tightened so there should be no trace of agreement.

Comments by North-South: None

Comments by East-West: None

Appeals Committee decision:

## APPEAL No : 14.036

Director's ruling upheld.  
Deposit returned.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

We checked the system understandings and general agreements, including looking at the system file, and found strong evidence that the pair played takeout doubles in many situations, including balancing doubles by hands that have not joined in the auction to date. We were comfortable that per system East's double was takeout and therefore not alertable, therefore the table result stands.

West was clear, and our probes (see above) enabled us to concur that per system and general agreements East's double was take out and therefore not alertable and the table result should stand. We felt this passed the test of Blue Book 2D2 (see below). East explained that since he knew opponents had an 8-card spade fit he did not wish to float 2♠ at pairs. He doubled (takeout) hoping that with some hands partner might have enough high cards (and also knowledge from the opponents subsiding in 2♠ that his side had one of two possible trump tricks as well) to float the double; and that with others East/West would play in an 8/9-card diamond fit or 8-card heart fit, or opponents would take another bid, as here.

We were mindful of the revised Blue Book wording of 2D2:

- 2 D 2 Unless a player knows that his partner's call is not alertable (or announceable) he must alert. If the player is unsure when asked for its meaning he may refer the opponents to the system card if it is likely to be on the card. If there is no relevant partnership understanding, he must not say how he intends to interpret his partner's call. *See also 4A6*
- 4 A 6 If there is no alert and no announcement, opponents can assume that the call does not fall within an alertable or announceable category, through either explicit or implicit understanding. *See also 2D2*

### L&E Committee comment (also applies to 14.033)

The L&E Committee considered that in both cases the TD had been incorrect to comment as they had done – **'no agreement' situations ARE alertable**. This is to ensure that the opponents are made aware of the systemic agreements (or lack of them). An unalerted bid can then be assumed to be natural.

The revised Blue Book wording had not been actively publicised to TDs and some were possibly unaware of it. It was agreed the regulation could be better written and revised wording will be considered. In the meantime the Chief TD would raise the issue with all Panel TDs at the forthcoming TD training weekend.

Paul Lamford
--------------

I was on the AC and aware of the requirement to alert if there was "no agreement". However, I was satisfied that the actual agreement was "takeout" and not alertable. East is a top player and West a client. Some play this double as penalties, but the EW system notes showed that almost all doubles up to and including 2♠ are takeout, for simplicity. The write-up might not have fully reflected this.
---

Heather Dhondy
----------------

I am surprised by the TD and AC ruling. East meant his double as for penalty and hoped his partner would interpret it as such. N/S are entitled to assume the double is for take-out if it hasn't been alerted, and bid on that basis. Whether they had an agreement is less certain, but if they did, it
---

## APPEAL No : 14.036

wasn't that the double was for take-out given the evidence of the hand. So if there was no agreement, or if the agreement was that it was for penalties it is alertable in either case.

Jeffrey Allerton

In his comments on the ruling the TD states: "No agreement explicit or implicit thus first double not alertable". He seems to be following the guidance in paragraph 4A6 of the Blue Book and thus I don't understand why the L&E considered the TD's comment to be incorrect. It is nice to see a detailed write-up by the AC, but one thing I would like to know is how regular a partnership E/W were. This would affect the likelihood of E/W possessing any partnership understanding about this or similar situations. If any such (implicit or explicit) partnership understanding did exist and there was a possibility that double here might be anything other than take-out, then West should have alerted the double.

Tim Rees

This boils down to whether E/W had an agreement that the double of 2♠ was takeout, and East did it anyway, or whether they had no agreement.

## APPEAL No : 14.037

Tournament Director: Kathy Williams

Appeals Committee: Graham Osborne (C), Neil Rosen, Heather Dhondy

<p>♠ QJ543 ♥ A763 ♦ Q542 ♣ - ♠ A962      ♠ - ♥ -            ♥ 109842 ♦ J1096      ♦ 3 ♣ KJ763      ♣ AQ98542 ♠ K1087 ♥ KQJ5 ♦ AK87 ♣ 10</p>	<p>Board 13 : Dealer North : All vulnerable</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>Pass</td><td>1♦</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>1♠</td><td>1NT (A1)</td><td>3♣ (2)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass (3)</td><td>3♦</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♠</td></tr><tr><td>4♣</td><td>4♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♠</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass (4)</td><td>Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>1. 5/5 other 2 suits 2. Not alerted 3. West asks what 3♣ means and told natural ('but undiscussed' – not agreed) 4. East asked again about club bid and told natural but undiscussed.</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>		Pass	Pass	1♦	Pass	1♠	1NT (A1)	3♣ (2)	Pass (3)	3♦	Pass	3♠	4♣	4♥	Pass	4♠	Dbl	Pass	Pass (4)	Pass
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																						
	Pass	Pass	1♦																						
Pass	1♠	1NT (A1)	3♣ (2)																						
Pass (3)	3♦	Pass	3♠																						
4♣	4♥	Pass	4♠																						
Dbl	Pass	Pass (4)	Pass																						

### Basic systems:

North-South system – *not recorded*

East-West system – *not recorded*

Form of Scoring: IMP's to VP's,

Result at table: 4♠ x + 1 by North (+990)

Director first called: When dummy first displayed.

### Director's statement of facts:

Called by West when dummy went down to reserve rights. Called again at the end of the hand by West who said had he known the club was not natural he may have done something different. East also said he may have done something different. There is a dispute about point 3 above.

North says she said 'natural but undiscussed'; East/West say she only said natural. I later asked if 1NT shows 5/5 and was told yes. East/West say they may have competed to 6♣. North/South said they would definitely bid over 5♣.

### Director's ruling:

West knows his partner has at least five clubs. He also has five clubs and chooses to double 4♠ rather than bid on.

### Details of ruling:

Table result stands.

Appeal lodged by: East/West

Basis of appeal: None stated.

Comments by North-South: None

## APPEAL No : 14.037

Comments by East-West: None

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld.  
Deposit returned.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

We agree with the ruling made by the TD. West, an experienced player, should have worked out what was going on. We considered withholding the deposit but given the facts could not be entirely agreed, we decided not to.

Richard Fleet
---------------

Was the failure to alert 3♣ ("natural but undiscussed") not a breach of BB2D2?
--

Paul Lamford
--------------

South should have corrected his partner's explanation before the opening lead was faced. The TD should then have been called. East should then have been given his last call back, and might well have bid 5♣. There is an assumption that North gave MI as well by failing to alert. 3♣ clearly was not natural and was some sort of spade raise. I agree with the AC that West should have worked out what was going on, and his double of 4♠ was Wild or Gambling and EW should not get redress for that, but North-South should not get to keep their good result.
--

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

The AC stated that the facts could not be entirely agreed, but did not state which facts were disputed and what relevance they had to the ruling or the decision to return the deposit. Whilst, it is possible that there was misinformation, both West and then could easily infer from partner's bidding that they had at least a 10-card club fit, so the damage was not caused by the misinformation, it was caused by each of them simply not believing their partner. We are told that West was an experienced player and so it is difficult to see why the deposit was returned for such a frivolous appeal.
---

Tim Rees
----------

It was obvious to West that South's 3♣ bid could not have been natural. As he had a clear way to expose the psyche/MI by bidding 5♣, he wasn't damaged. East has seen his partner bid 4♣, so he knows of the big club fit as well.
--

# APPEAL No : 14.038

Tournament Director: Kathy Williams

Appeals Committee: Tim Rees (C), Brian Callaghan, Robert Sheehan

<p>♠ 82 ♥ Q9742 ♦ 82 ♣ J873</p> <p>♠ Q103            ♠ A765 ♥ J853            ♥ A6 ♦ J106            ♦ 9543 ♣ AQ5            ♣ K102</p> <p>♠ KJ94 ♥ K10 ♦ AKQ7 ♣ 964</p>	<p>Board 8 : Dealer West : 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>1♦</td><td>1NT</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl</td><td>2♦ (1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl (2)</td><td>2♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♠</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>3♦</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>1. South's hand went to alert – dithering; finally not alerted 2. West asks what 2♦ means and is told to look at the convention card.</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>	Pass	Pass	1♦	1NT	Dbl	2♦ (1)	Pass	Pass	Dbl (2)	2♥	Pass	Pass	Dbl	Pass	2♠	Pass	3♦	All Pass		
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																						
Pass	Pass	1♦	1NT																						
Dbl	2♦ (1)	Pass	Pass																						
Dbl (2)	2♥	Pass	Pass																						
Dbl	Pass	2♠	Pass																						
3♦	All Pass																								

## Basic systems:

North-South system – *not recorded*

East-West system – *not recorded*

Form of Scoring: IMP's to VP's

Result at table: 3♦ - 2 by East (+100)

Director first called: At the end of play.

## Director's statement of facts:

Called by West who thought North should be playing in 2♦x but with this auction he may not have done anything differently. North/South have no agreement – convention card says HELMIC (diamonds and another suit). North thought this was only over opening 1NTx. South didn't know which system.

## Director's ruling:

Looking at the North hand, pass is not a logical alternative and therefore the table result stands.

Appeal lodged by: East/West

## Basis of appeal:

Would like it ruled back to 2♦x.

Comments by North-South: None

Comments by East-West: None

## Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit returned.



## APPEAL No : 14.038

### Appeals Committee's comments:

North/South both knew they had no agreement about the 2♦ bid. If South had alerted and explained that, we feel that passing on the North cards is not a logical alternative.

Paul Lamford

No LA to 2♥ by North. PP to NS for insufficiently completed system card, particularly as NS told EW to examine it for an explanation. With the correct explanation, West would pass out 2♦ which can at best be a 7 card fit, and I would adjust to 2♦ - 2 by North. There is both UI and MI, and the latter is the relevant one here.

Heather Dhondy

North knows that there has been a misunderstanding when the 2♦ is passed. West had the chance to defend 2♦ but instead gave North a chance to clarify the situation. Table result should stand.

Jeffrey Allerton

This is a case where a "No agreement" call should have been alerted, because N/S had an agreement about an analogous situation, potentially relevant here. Alerting 2♦ here and explaining the agreement in place after a 1NT opening is the best way to ensure that E/W have the same relevant information about the N/S agreements as N/S have themselves.

The TD has judged that there was no logical alternative to 2♦ by "looking at the North hand". An alternative view, with which the AC on 14.034 would probably concur, is that South's pass of 2♦ is consistent with an off-centre 1NT overcall containing a long diamonds suit and perhaps only a singleton heart. For this reason, the TD should have established what was going through North's head when he bid 2♦ (presumably this was intended as a transfer to hearts) and then polled peers of North armed with this information. It is a shame that the basic systems have not been recorded on the appeals form because knowledge of the hand types which might open 1♦ in the E/W style could be relevant to North's decision here.

Tim Rees

West was told that N/S didn't have an agreement, so there couldn't be MI. Regarding possible UI, North seems to have tried a third systemic meaning for 2♦ (transfer, rather than natural or Halmic) that they don't play at all. He knew when he bid it that South would be unlikely to understand, so there was no UI from South's explanation.

## APPEAL No : 14.039

Tournament Director: Kathy Williams

Appeals Committee: Tim Rees (C), David Burn, Heather Dhondy

<p>♠ 1043 ♥ K1074 ♦ K105 ♣ 754 ♠ AQ962      ♠ KJ ♥ J              ♥ A632 ♦ J8763        ♦ Q42 ♣ AK            ♣ QJ86 ♠ 875 ♥ Q985 ♦ A9 ♣ 10932</p>	<p>Board 2 : Dealer East : North/South vulnerable</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♥ (A1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>1♠ (A2)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2♥ (3)</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♥</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>3NT (4)</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>1. Transfer to spades 2. Weak NT 3. Natural 4. Stop card put down</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>			1♣	Pass	1♥ (A1)	Pass	1♠ (A2)	Pass	2♥ (3)	Pass	3♥	Pass	3NT (4)	All Pass		
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																		
		1♣	Pass																		
1♥ (A1)	Pass	1♠ (A2)	Pass																		
2♥ (3)	Pass	3♥	Pass																		
3NT (4)	All Pass																				

### Basic systems:

North-South system – *not recorded*

East-West system – *not recorded*

Form of Scoring: IMP's to VP's

Result at table: 3NT + 1 by West (-430)

Director first called: At the end of play.

### Director's statement of facts:

South called asking if I would look to see if the Stop card and then a not jumping 3NT was giving his partner unauthorised information.

### Director's ruling:

Stop card did give unauthorised information to partner and therefore he should bid 4♥. However East will always bid 4♠. Depending on the lead 4♠ will make or go one off. So a weighted ruling was applied.

### Details of ruling:

60% of 4♠ - 1 (+50), 40% or 4♠= (-420)

Appeal lodged by: East/West

Basis of appeal: none given

Comments by North-South: None

Comments by East-West: None

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit returned.

## APPEAL No : 14.039

### Appeals Committee's comments:

West is in receipt of unauthorised information from East's failure to alert 2♥. Without the unauthorised information, he would assume that 3♥ was a transfer break and he would then bid 4♠. The contract is therefore deemed to be 4♠.

To beat 4♠, South would need to lead a heart and then force West. We felt the heart lead would not be obvious and we might have awarded ~40% to it. But as the TD's weightings were reasonable we have upheld the ruling.

Richard Fleet

I think that the AC have assumed too much. Firstly, did East's 1NT bid deny four spades (I would expect it to; the method lacks point if the 1♠ bid can contain four spades)? If this is the case, East cannot suddenly produce a transfer break. Secondly, if East's 3♥ bid *is* a transfer break, I would expect West to at least investigate the possibility of a slam. That is, whatever the system agreement, I do not accept that West "would then bid 4♠". In my view, the TD/AC should have considered higher contracts than 4♠.

Finally, the circumstances of the use of the Stop card should have been considered. Unless West genuinely thought that he was making a skip bid, this was a gross violation and should have been penalized.

Paul Lamford

Poor analysis by both the TD, who does not need to be a strong player, and the seemingly eminent AC who include national champions. Fine as far as the Laws part goes but quite wrong from an analytical point of view. I agree with the adjustment to 4♠, but it is always cold, unless played *misère*. Declarer will win the heart lead, and play a diamond, ruff the next heart and play a second diamond, we will assume getting them wrong. He ruffs the next heart and plays a third diamond. The defence now falls on Morton's fork. If they force yet again, declarer cashes the ♣A K and scores the last four tricks on a high cross-ruff, whether the trumps are 3-3 or not. If they play a trump, then declarer can draw trumps and claim.

Jeffrey Allerton

Did the TD/AC establish the true agreed meaning of West's 2♥ bid? In West's world, was his 2♥ invitational plus, or could it have been included a hand with no game interest wanting to sign off in 2♠? If the latter, it is possible 3♥ is just an impossible bid. Again the 'screens test' is appropriate in assessing the logical alternatives for West: what scenarios would he have considered had East made the 3♥ bid playing with screens?

Tim Rees

Although the complaint and the TD ruling were based on UI from the use of the stop card, the AC felt that the UI from the lack of alert of 2♥ was more relevant.

## APPEAL No : 14.040

Tournament Director: Sarah Amos

Appeals Committee: David Burn (Referee)

<p>♠ J1076 ♥ 953 ♦ A8752 ♣ 5</p> <p>♠ 83                      ♠ K ♥ AKQ1072              ♥ J64 ♦ 103                      ♦ KJ94 ♣ A92                      ♣ KJ1074</p> <p>♠ AQ9542 ♥ 8 ♦ Q6 ♣ Q863</p>	<p>Board 4 : Dealer West : All vulnerable</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>Pass</td><td>4♥</td><td>4♠</td></tr><tr><td>5♥</td><td>5♠</td><td>Dbl</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>	1♥	Pass	4♥	4♠	5♥	5♠	Dbl	All Pass
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>										
1♥	Pass	4♥	4♠										
5♥	5♠	Dbl	All Pass										

### Basic systems:

North-South system – *not recorded*

East-West system – *Precision Club*

Form of Scoring: IMP's to VP's

Result at table: 5♠ x – 1 by South (-200)

Director first called: At the start of the auction.

### Director's statement of facts:

I was called when a player from another team as he was leaving the room remarked loudly 'I was right to go on over 4♠'. As play of Board 4 was just beginning, I told the players that I would allow play of the board but that I could adjust the score later if it was found that play had been affected by the overheard remark. The auction continued and North called me back when South bid 4♠. It was not clear that this was the board being discussed so I allowed play to continue. At the end of the match North/South told me that they felt the outcome may have been influenced by the remark. My ruling was based on the fact that both West and North were compromised by the overheard information so I cancelled the board and awarded Average + (3 IMPs) to both sides. In hindsight it would have been better to stop play of the board when 4♠ was bid. I later discovered that the board being discussed was not Board 4 but I still feel that the outcome was affected.

### Director's ruling:

3 IMPs to both sides

### Details of ruling:

The ruling is based on my view that unauthorised information may have affected the result. (Law 16C2c)

Appeal lodged by: East/West.

Basis of appeal:

## APPEAL No : 14.040

They did not believe bids above 4♠ have been affected by unauthorised information.

**Comments by North-South:** None

**Comments by East-West:** None

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling amended. Table score reinstated.  
Deposit returned.

### Referee's comments:

The table result stands whether or not Law 16 is considered to apply. I don't think the Law actually does apply, and West has pretty clear 5♥ bid anyway.

Law 16C begins: When a player accidentally receives unauthorized information about a board he is playing or has yet to play, as by [...] overhearing calls, results or remarks and I do not see a way to justify ruling under Law 16 or any other against a player who has received no such information.

### L&E Committee comment:

The TD needs to take all reasonable steps to find out what the information relates to and in particular which board. The Committee acknowledged that in some cases that could be difficult if players had left the building.

Paul Lamford
--------------

I agree it is crucial which board the comment referred to and I agree with the referee.
---

Heather Dhondy
----------------

It would have been better if it could be established whether or not the remark related to this board before the auction had begun. The players are placed in an impossible position when they are asked to continue as if they had not heard and I think the board should have been stopped at the 4♠ point. I also think that the identity of the person talking about a board on leaving play should have been established and that person should have been fined.
--

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

The Referee was right to consider the effect of the wording of the Law. This is an unsatisfactory situation because it will often be hard to establish to which board a comment relates. Even if she does tell the players that the comment relates to another board, they might not believe her and will still have the comment in the back of their minds. I just hope that the player who made the comment was given a procedural penalty (Laws 90A and 90B3)
--

Tim Rees
----------

The players had no extraneous information about the board in play, so Law 16 did not apply.
---

# APPEAL No : 14.041

**Tournament Director:** Gordon Rainsford

**Appeals Committee:** Tim Rees (Referee)

<p>♠ K864 ♥ 107642 ♦ J43 ♣ 7</p> <p>♠ J72 ♥ AKJ93 ♦ K962 ♣ 5</p> <p>♠ AQ53 ♥ Q8 ♦ AQ ♣ KQ1093</p> <p>♠ 109 ♥ 5 ♦ 10875 ♣ AJ8642</p>	Board 9 : Dealer North : East/West vulnerable											
	<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>2NT</td><td>3♣</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl (1)</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>1. East/West have no agreement about this auction. At the end of the auction South asked West about their understanding of the meaning of her double and she said something like 'I don't know'.</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>		Pass	2NT	3♣	Dbl (1)	All Pass	
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>									
	Pass	2NT	3♣									
Dbl (1)	All Pass											
	Screens in use											

## Basic systems:

North-South system – not recorded

East-West system – not recorded

**Form of Scoring:** IMP's to VP's; Screens in use.

**Result at table:** 3♣ x – 6 by South (-1400)

**Director first called:** not recorded

## Director's statement of facts:

South did not expect West to have such a clearly takeout type hand for the double and, in playing for her to have something like 10 5 in trumps, lost an extra trump trick.

**Director's ruling:** 70% table result, 30% 3♣ x – 5 (-1100)

## Details of ruling:

Had West given a fuller explanation about general style, South might have lost one fewer trump trick. With sympathetic weighting I have judged that possibility at 30%.

## Note by editor:

There was considerable email evidence submitted before the Referee made his ruling. Only a short extract from both sides is given here.

**Appeal lodged by:** Both sides

**Basis of appeal:** East/West: they have no agreement about the double.

## Comments by North-South:

(extract) West was aware that partner would not take her double as penalty and surprised this was not admitted.

## APPEAL No : 14.041

West had an implicit understanding of the partnership style but chose not to explain this.

### Comments by East-West:

(extract) North suggested that we had an agreement because I (west) had made a take out double and partner left it in. That is in my view absurd. Partner left it in because he had a trump stack.

**Appeals Committee decision:** Director's ruling upheld. Both Deposits returned.

### Referee's comments:

East/West had no agreement regarding the auction 2NT (3♣) dble, and West was not required to tell declarer her hand or intentions. If the issue of the hand was which defender had the trump length, then there would be no adjustment, as it was evident at the critical point in the play that East had length in clubs.

However, part of declarer's thought processes was that West might not have risked a 'no agreement' double with a singleton. Declarer was entitled to a fuller description of East/West's understandings than West's statement of 'I don't know' (given while she was thinking of other things). Comments on general understandings, understandings (or lack thereof) of whether 3♥ would be forcing etc, would have assisted him in narrowing down West's hand types, even if only in a minor way. East/West have suggested that as South was an experienced player, he could have protected himself by asking further questions. However, he had already asked the main question, and it was West's responsibility (also as an experienced player) to provide a full answer.

However, as the play went, at the critical point declarer should have known that East was likely to have five clubs, and therefore that West had one. A fuller description of East/West's methods might have increased the chance of him playing for that, but as finessing the club was at the time an indicated play, declarer does not get full redress.

My view is that the TD made a correct judgement in saying that (with sympathetic weighting) a declarer who played the jack at the table would have played low (with different information) around 30% of the time.

Paul Lamford
--------------

Finding of fact as to whether West gave as full an explanation of their methods as she could is up to the TD and referee. I am happy with the decision reached.
---

Heather Dhondy
----------------

I don't think I would adjust the table score. I believe they had no agreement, although it would seem normal to play it as for take-out, and West doubled on overall strength. The 3♣ bid is a wild action with such an awful suit, and I don't think there should be too much sympathy!
--

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

The form does not say how the play went, so it is hard to comment on the number of tricks which might have been made. However, reading the Referee's comments it seems that the potential misinformation was not the cause of South mis-reading the hand and so it seems to me that N/S were quite lucky to have received an adjustment at all. I suspect that the inadequacy of West's explanation may have persuaded the TD to give a little something to the non-offending side.
---

## APPEAL No : 14.042

**Tournament Director:** Barrie Partridge

**Appeals Committee:** Brian Senior (C), Martin Edge, Ollie Burgess

<p>♠ KJ6 ♥ J1032 ♦ AK93 ♣ 53</p> <p>♠ Q10742      ♠ 9853 ♥ AK94      ♥ 8 ♦ J5      ♦ 1082 ♣ 62      ♣ AKJ84</p> <p>♠ A ♥ Q765 ♦ Q764 ♣ Q1097</p>	<p>Board 35 : Dealer South : East/West vulnerable</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>1NT (1)</td></tr><tr><td>2♣ (A2)</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♦ (A3)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2♠</td><td>DbI (4)</td><td>4♠</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>DbI</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>1. Announced as 9 to 12 2. Asptro – hearts and another 3. 3. Fewer than 3 hearts 4. Intended as penalty not alerted as South thought it was take-out</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>				1NT (1)	2♣ (A2)	Pass	2♦ (A3)	Pass	2♠	DbI (4)	4♠	Pass	Pass	DbI	All Pass	
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																		
			1NT (1)																		
2♣ (A2)	Pass	2♦ (A3)	Pass																		
2♠	DbI (4)	4♠	Pass																		
Pass	DbI	All Pass																			

### Basic systems:

North-South system – 9 to 12 1NT at this vulnerability

East-West system – not recorded, but Asptro defence to 1NT

**Form of Scoring:** MP's to VP's

**Result at table:** 4♠ x – 3 by West (+800)

**Director first called:** At the end of play.

### Director's statement of facts:

Auction and explanation as shown above. I asked South why he opened 1NT as there was no announcement that it may contain a singleton. South said his opening was psychic to obstruct opponents finding a spade contract. There appeared to be no allowance for North for the deviation. The difficulty lay in the double by North over 2♠. Although the North/South convention card shows doubles over interference over 1NT to be for take out up to 3♥, my colleagues and I felt that the actual situation was not covered by the convention card, so I ruled that there had been misexplanation.

### Director's ruling:

3♦ - 1 by South (-50)

### Details of ruling:

If East knows the double of 2♠ is penalty, she will not raise. As South thinks the double is take out, he will take out and a contract of 3♦ will be reached. This is very likely to go one off. (Laws 21B, 12)

**Appeal lodged by:** North/South

**Basis of appeal:** Disagrees with ruling.

**Comments by North-South:** None recorded.

**Comments by East-West:** None recorded.



## APPEAL No : 14.042

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling amended. Table result restored.  
Deposit returned.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

Revert to table result. We believe North/South have no agreement, hence nothing to alert and no infraction.

We were closer to believing that there was an agreement of take out than of penalty – the latter felt highly unlikely.

We felt sorry for East/West. Sometimes life is a b\*tch.

Richard Fleet

Surely the AC ruling is simply wrong: if they believe N-S to have no agreement about the double, South should have alerted since one of the potential meanings was alertable. I consider the final sentence of the AC comment to be inappropriate.

Paul Lamford

The system card stating that double is takeout up to 3♥ when they bid over 1NT seems clear enough to me, so this was a misbid and I agree no adjustment. Just tough. If South thought it was undiscussed, then it should have been alerted.

Heather Dhondy

I disagree with the AC. This is similar to 14.036. If there is no agreement, the double should be alerted, otherwise the opponents are entitled to assume that it is for take-out. There appears to be no agreement as one thought it was for penalties and one for take-out, and there is nothing conclusive on the card. I assume that it was N/S and not E/W who lodged the appeal.

Jeffrey Allerton

Misunderstandings over the meaning of doubles seems to be a recurring theme this year! In this case, my reading of the TD's statement of facts is that North and South each thought that they knew the meaning of the double; they just happened to think differently. On this basis, if the statement on the convention card is considered to not cover sequences like this, the TD's ruling looks correct to me as Law 21B1(b) instructs the TD to presume mistaken explanation in the absence of evidence to the contrary. As the AC has concluded some different entirely, that there was no agreement at all, the form ought to explaining the AC's reasoning. The key to this case is ascertaining why North believed double to be penalties.

Tim Rees

Contrary to what the AC has written, the double is alertable. The AC felt sorry for E/W (presumably because they had no reason to suspect the double might have been intended as penalties) – that's precisely why the alerting regulation was changed.

With the correct information of "no agreement", East would have to decide whether to raise, which therefore means a weighted ruling would have been appropriate.

## APPEAL No : 14.043

Tournament Director: Maggie Pyner

Appeals Committee: Chris Dixon (C), Rob Lawy, Gunnar Hallberg

<p>♠ 9 ♥ 83 ♦ AKQ965 ♣ KJ63</p> <p>♠ AK532      ♠ 84 ♥ 7              ♥ AJ109542 ♦ 432            ♦ 10 ♣ 10874        ♣ AQ5</p> <p>♠ QJ1076 ♥ KQ6 ♦ J87 ♣ 92</p>	<p>Board 20 : Dealer West : All vulnerable</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>1♦ (1)</td><td>3♥</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>DbI (H)</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>The double by North was slow and this was agreed by all players at the table.</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>	Pass	1♦ (1)	3♥	Pass	Pass	DbI (H)	All Pass	
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>										
Pass	1♦ (1)	3♥	Pass										
Pass	DbI (H)	All Pass											

### Basic systems:

North-South system – *Polish Club*

East-West system – *Modern Acol*

Form of Scoring: MP Pairs

Result at table: 3♥x – 2 by East (+500)

Director first called: not recorded

### Director's statement of facts:

Both sides were asked about the 3♥ jump overcall and agreed that when South asked questions before his final pass he was told it was weak. I then asked South why he had chosen to pass the double.

He stated that if he bid 3♠ he would be playing there. He felt 4♠ was a too high push on the hand and he felt at pairs +200 would get a good score on the board. His judgement made was that 3♥ would be going at least one off. (It actually can make on the board but went down as declarer was not expecting a singleton in North's hand).

It was also stated by South that he didn't double the 3♥ bid originally which would have shown four spades only. He could have bid 3♠ immediately over 3♥ but was always considering defending the hand.

### Director's ruling:

Table result stands.

### Details of ruling:

After consultation with other TDs it was deemed to let the table result stand. The general feeling was that:

No specific action is suggested by the hesitation

No poll was made on the hand as all TDs consulted (four) had a similar view (Laws 16B1a,b and 73)

### Note by editor:

## APPEAL No : 14.043

There was a considerable amount of email correspondence following the appeal held at the venue. Comments made at the time are included below.

**Appeal lodged by:** East/West

**Basis of appeal:** None stated

### Comments by North-South:

Did not bid over 3♥. No negative double. Passed smoothly hoping for a re-opening double. There was hesitation. Pass normal.

Worried that no jump in spades? Didn't double. More likely to have penalty pass. Considered other bidding.

Did not think of 3NT. I just fancied defending.

### Comments by East-West:

Normal short in suit and have spades. Pause suggests not normal expected classic shape. South feels that 3♠ may become risky. Hesitation by North agreed by all sides.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling amended. 4♦ - 2 by North  
Deposit returned.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

3♠ is a logical alternative and pass is suggested by the unauthorised information.

### L&E Committee comments:

The Committee considered the appeal and extra correspondence from this event. Other individuals had given their opinions regarding the ruling as they were entitled to do. A comment from one member of the appeal committee regarding a particular bid had caused some offence. However, it is expected that Appeal Committees will be drawn from a wide experience which may include top class players as well as those well versed in the laws of the game.

Richard Fleet
---------------

Firstly, I do not believe that 3♠ is a logical alternative; with vulnerable opponents and MP scoring, the options are Pass, 3NT and 4♠ – 3♠ is a “nothing bid”. Secondly, even if 3♠ is a logical alternative, I do not see how the slowness of the double has made the pass more attractive.
---

Paul Lamford
--------------

Clear to adjust. PP to NS for blatant use of UI in that North's slow double suggests spade shortage and an unsuitable hand. Although not relevant, how on earth did East go off in 3♥ losing more than one diamond, two hearts and one club? Double of 3♥ looks normal, and 3♠ looks normal now. We need to poll peers, if we can find any, to see what would happen next. 4♦ - 2 looks sensible.
---

Heather Dhondy
----------------

I agree with the TD. A slow double does not suggest defending will be more successful than bidding
--

## APPEAL No : 14.043

3♠. Playing for 200 at pairs when a game seems unlikely looks a good shot to me regardless of the tempo of the double.

Jeffrey Allerton

I agree with the AC's comments as far as they go, but I think that the putative auction to 4♦ ought to have been explained on the form. Double followed by 4♦ is consistent with a maximum 3=1=6=3 hand; many would play that this sequence implies 3 spades and encourages a correction to 4♠ with a reasonable 5-card suit. South still needs to consider what calls are demonstrably suggested by the UI on the next round of the auction. This could mean that the assigned score ought to be 4♠ by South, down several.

Tim Rees

The TD should have polled players (not solely TDs) to determine what is suggested by the slow double. The consensus view is that it suggests imperfect shape, in particular a lack of spades. Therefore, pass and 3NT are suggested over 3♠/4♠.

Although this particular South may have intended passing a double, that is not clear from the auction itself. An on-line poll had many respondents passing initially then bidding over a double.

East could have made 3♥\*, but that does not affect the ruling.

## APPEAL No : 14.044

Tournament Director: John Pyner

Appeals Committee: Paul Hackett (C), Eddie Lucioni, Roger Sweet

<p>♠ 10984 ♥ Q10 ♦ 986 ♣ 10872</p> <p>♠ QJ3                      ♠ 62 ♥ J852                      ♥ K974 ♦ 5                             ♦ AK7432 ♣ KQJ95                    ♣ 3</p> <p>♠ AK75 ♥ A63 ♦ QJ10 ♣ A64</p>	<p>Board 5 : Dealer North : North/South vulnerable</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>1♦</td><td>Dbl</td></tr><tr><td>Rdbl</td><td>1♠</td><td>2♦</td><td>2♠</td></tr><tr><td>Pass (1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♦</td><td>3♠</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Agreed hesitation</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>		Pass	1♦	Dbl	Rdbl	1♠	2♦	2♠	Pass (1)	Pass	3♦	3♠	Dbl	All Pass		
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																		
	Pass	1♦	Dbl																		
Rdbl	1♠	2♦	2♠																		
Pass (1)	Pass	3♦	3♠																		
Dbl	All Pass																				

### Basic systems:

North-South system – *natural*

East-West system – *natural*

Form of Scoring: MP pairs

Result at table: 3♠x – 1 by North, -200.

Director first called: When West doubled 3♠.

### Director's statement of facts:

Called by North, who wished to draw my attention to the auction. In particular when East bid 3♦. Having established the facts to date I directed auction to continue and asked the players to call me back at the end of the hand. (I was recalled almost immediately when West led ♣K out of turn). At the end of play I asked East why he had bid 3♦: his reply was that he knew East/West had the balance of points and felt that his hand was worth further action.

### Director's ruling:

3♦ disallowed, restored to 2♠ making.

### Details of ruling:

East has unauthorised information from the hesitation. Poll showed that while some East's might consider 3♦ not all would certainly bid it, and all polled gave serious consideration to pass. Pass therefore was a logical alternative and 3♦ was disallowed. Consideration was given to a weighted ruling in that East/West might defend 2♠ undoubled differently from 3♠x, but very often the defence will go ♦A, ♦K followed by a McKenny ♦7 asking for a heart. A heart switch from West lets 8 tricks make when declarer plays the 10, as most would.

Appeal lodged by: East/West

### Basis of appeal:

It was clear to bid 3♦.

## APPEAL No : 14.044

### Director's comments:

East/West somewhat surprised that as few as 20-25% of peers is sufficient to constitute a logical alternative.

**Comments by North-South:** None.

**Comments by East-West:** None

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling amended.  
Deposit returned.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

Contract 2♠ upheld. Result 75% of 2♠ making, 25% of 2♠-1, as we believe after 3 rounds of diamonds defender may switch to ♣K.

Richard Fleet

75% of 2♠ making seems far too generous. Given the spade position on view in dummy, West knows that there is no point at all in playing a heart and that a club is absolutely safe. The AC's comment "may switch to ♣K" is a massive understatement: once a weighted score has been decided upon, the weighting should have been in favour of 2♠ - 1.

Paul Lamford

I agree with the adjustment to 2♠, but not with the weighting. After the obvious start of ace, king and another diamond, how can it ever be right to switch to a heart, whatever partner's signal, when you are looking at ♣KQJxx? I would have given 100% of 2♠ - 1.

Heather Dhondy

I agree that the 3♦ bid should be disallowed, and if the sole basis of the appeal was that 3♦ was evident, I would give thought to keeping the money. However, I am not sure what may have been discussed at the appeal about the defence. It seems a little strange to me that the offending side are allowed some proportion of defending more successfully than they did at the table, although I accept that it was a different contract. I would be inclined to let the table result stand.

Jeffrey Allerton

The TD has established via his poll that Pass is a logical alternative, but neither he nor the AC has explained why bidding 3♦ could demonstrably have been suggested over passing by the UI. West has already shown his values with the redouble and it's hard to imagine that he was considering competing to 3♦ on his actual hand, for example.

I agree with the AC that West might well switch to ♣K; in fact I believe that West would do this most of the time. The TD mentions in passing that there was a lead out of turn in 3♠x, without explaining what option was selected by declarer and how the play went. Should it be assumed that the same

## APPEAL No : 14.044

lead out of turn might have been made against 2♠? Or if the lead out of turn cost the defence a trick, this should be categorized as a serious error unrelated to the (UI) infraction and a split score is appropriate. The offending side receives the (weighted) adjustment above but the non-offending side is denied redress for that part of the damage which is deemed to be self-inflicted. Section 4.1.3 of the EBU White Book explains how to calculate the scores in this scenario.

Tim Rees

We're not told the defence at the table, but I don't see why the defence to 2♠ would be any different to the defence to 3♠\*.

If the lead out of turn was relevant, that is an error unrelated to the infraction and shouldn't be adjusted for.

# APPEAL No : 14.046

**Tournament Director:** Jonathan Lillycrop

**Appeals Committee:** Malcolm Pryor (C), Tom Townsend, Bill Hirst

<p>♠ AK8753 ♥ 109 ♦ 6 ♣ Q543</p> <p>♠ QJ                      ♠ 2 ♥ KQJ32                ♥ 87654 ♦ J75                     ♦ KQ982 ♣ AK7                    ♣ 92</p> <p>♠ 10964 ♥ A ♦ A1043 ♣ J1086</p>	<p>Board 24 : Dealer West : Love all</p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1♥</td><td>2♠ (1)</td><td>4♥</td><td>4♠</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl (2)</td><td>Pass</td><td>5♥</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>1) Explained as weak 2) Double was slightly slow, agreed by all 4 players.</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>	1♥	2♠ (1)	4♥	4♠	Dbl (2)	Pass	5♥	All Pass
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>										
1♥	2♠ (1)	4♥	4♠										
Dbl (2)	Pass	5♥	All Pass										

## Basic systems:

North-South system – *not recorded*

East-West system – *Acol*

**Form of Scoring:** MPs converted to VPs

**Result at table:** 5♥ - 2 by West, +100

**Director first called:** After the 5♥ bid.

## Director's statement of facts:

I was called to the table by South after the 5♥ bid had been made because he wanted to register that 5♥ had been bid after a slow double. I asked the other players and it was agreed that there had been a short hesitation before the double. I told them to ..... (statement unfinished)

**Director's ruling:** 80% of 4♠x + 1 plus 20% of 4♠x =.

## Details of ruling:

5♥ cancelled under Law 16B1a because double was slow and pass was a logical alternative instead of bidding 5♥. 4♠ would make 11 tricks unless there was a club ruff. After further consultation I felt East was much more likely to lead a heart or diamond and so would not score the ruff.

I gave a weighted ruling of 80% of 4♠x + 1 plus 20% of 4♠x =.

**Appeal lodged by:** East/West

## Basis of appeal:

Felt it was normal to bid 5♥

**Comments by North-South:** none

**Comments by East-West:** none



## APPEAL No : 14.046

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld.  
Deposit retained.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

The Appeal Committee reached almost instant unanimity that pass here was indeed a logical alternative (especially in the context of a 4-card major, weak NT structure, where opener could have a strong NT with four hearts). The Appeal Committee applied a number of tests to the appeal and concluded that the deposit should be kept:

- 1) Committee had been able to agree with the TDs approach and conclusions swiftly and with little discussion
- 2) Appellants were very experienced players
- 3) Little substantive explanation was provided by the appellants of the logic for the 5♥ bid actually found after the unauthorised information.

Paul Lamford
--------------

I agree with the AC and the retention of the deposit. I would have given 50% at most of the defence finding the club ruff, with 50% of a doubled overtrick.
---

Heather Dhondy
----------------

I agree with this. A slow double makes it more attractive to remove, and pass is certainly a logical alternative so the 5♥ bid is disallowed.
---

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

I agree with the AC, including the decision to retain the deposit. The TD was kind to E/W to give them as much as 20% of a club lead, given that such a lead is a complete stab in the dark and that weightings should be "sympathetic" towards the non-offending side. However, I cannot fault the AC in this regard, as ACs are advised not to make small adjustments to weightings assigned by the TD.
---

## APPEAL No : 14.050

**Tournament Director:** James Vickers

**Appeals Committee:** Graham Osborne (C), David Price, Paul Lamford

<p>♠ 82 ♥ AK6 ♦ Q109542 ♣ QJ ♠ KJ1094      ♠ 76 ♥ QJ73      ♥ 952 ♦ -      ♦ K76 ♣ A753      ♣ K10842 ♠ AQ53 ♥ 1084 ♦ AJ83 ♣ 96</p>	<p>Board 10 : Dealer East : All vulnerable</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>Pass</td><td>1♣ (1)</td></tr><tr><td>1♠</td><td>1NT (2)</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♦ (3)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>3♦ (4)</td><td>Pass</td><td>3NT</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>1) 11-13 balanced + 4-cd major or any 16+ 2) 5+♦, usually 8+ pts 3) 11-13 balanced 4) Natural, invitational (agreed hesitation)</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>			Pass	1♣ (1)	1♠	1NT (2)	Pass	2♦ (3)	Pass	3♦ (4)	Pass	3NT	All Pass			
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>																		
		Pass	1♣ (1)																		
1♠	1NT (2)	Pass	2♦ (3)																		
Pass	3♦ (4)	Pass	3NT																		
All Pass																					

### Basic systems:

North-South system – 2- way club

East-West system – not recorded

**Form of Scoring:** Teams of 8 XIMPs

**Result at table:** 3NT = by North, lead ♠7, +600

**Director first called:** At the end of play.

### Director's statement of facts:

East/West called me to query the 3NT bid after the slow 3♦ with a minimum hand. South said he had a huge undisclosed diamond fit for partner's obviously good suit and he couldn't conceive of passing. In any case he disputed that the hesitation 'demonstrably suggested' bidding 3NT, even if pass were a logical alternative.

I gave a number of players who I thought would understand the North/South auction the South hand and asked what they would bid over 3♦. Two thought pass was clear, one thought 3NT was clear, one would bid 3NT but considered passing, another would pass but considered other options. Those who thought they had options thought that bidding 3NT was suggested by the hesitation. If there is doubt about what to do, there's more to gain from bidding 3NT if it's right than there is to lose if it is wrong.

### Director's ruling:

Score adjusted to 3♦ = by South.

### Details of ruling:

Pass is a logical alternative to 3NT and 3NT is suggested over passing.

**Appeal lodged by:** North/South

**Basis of appeal:** None given

## APPEAL No : 14.050

**Comments by North-South:** none

**Comments by East-West:** none

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit returned.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

We gave due weight to the poll conducted by the TD and considered that hesitations tend to show extra values rather than marginal values. We considered pass an alternative with two unstopped suits and given a spade lead would be through the AQ.

Paul Lamford
--------------

As David Burn commented on a forum. You have a bare minimum 11 count with the ♠Q not working properly, and pass is automatic.
---

Heather Dhondy
----------------

I agree completely with the AC, and that there is enough merit in the appeal to return the deposit.
---

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

The TD's poll established that Pass is a logical alternative, but did the UI demonstrably suggest bidding over passing? The TD only seems to have asked two people about this question and I have to say that I disagree. North could have been considering passing 2♦ (which he later claimed to be his thought process at the table and this claim seems to be consistent with the actual hand) or making a different invitational call so I would not conclude from the slowness that he was considering making a game forcing call. I would have permitted the table result to stand.
---

Tim Rees
----------

An excellent write-up by the TD, including the results of his polls.
--

# APPEAL No : 14.051

Tournament Director: Kathy Williams

Appeals Committee: Heather Dhondy (C), Brian Senior, Alan Kay

<p>♠ KQJ105 ♥ K10 ♦ J842 ♣ K6</p> <p>♠ A9                      ♠ 8742 ♥ QJ5                      ♥ A876 ♦ AK7                      ♦ Q10 ♣ 108743                  ♣ AQJ</p> <p>♠ 63 ♥ 9432 ♦ 9653 ♣ 952</p>	<p>Board 1 : Dealer North : 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></td><td>1♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>1NT (1)</td><td>Pass (2)</td><td>2♣ (3)</td><td>2♠</td></tr><tr><td>3♣</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass (4)</td><td>Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>1) 11-14 2) Hesitation, not agreed 3) Stayman 4) Slow pass</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>		1♠	Pass	Pass	1NT (1)	Pass (2)	2♣ (3)	2♠	3♣	Pass	Pass (4)	Pass
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>														
	1♠	Pass	Pass														
1NT (1)	Pass (2)	2♣ (3)	2♠														
3♣	Pass	Pass (4)	Pass														

## Basic systems:

North-South system – 5-card majors

East-West system – not recorded

Form of Scoring: IMP's to VP's

Result at table: 3♣ + 3 by East, -170

Director first called: At the end of play.

## Director's statement of facts:

I was called by East because of the hesitation and pass by North. North/South were adamant that North did not hesitate and East/West equally adamant they did. All through my trying to get the facts South kept saying that East/West had not complained during the auction about a hesitation in fact so much I could only assume that North had hesitated. East hesitated before his final pass thinking South had a few points and game was not there. Had South passed the auction would have been 2♦ (no major), 2NT – invitational, 3NT. I have no reason to doubt this.

## Director's ruling:

Score adjusted to 3NT + 2, -460

## Details of ruling:

I polled 2 players who both said they would pass.

Pass is a logical alternative to 2♠. (Law 16B)

Appeal lodged by: North/South

## Basis of appeal:

Can't see anything wrong with her bid.

Comments by North-South: none

Comments by East-West: none

## APPEAL No : 14.051

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling amended.  
Deposit returned.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

Ruling adjusted to 75% of -430, 25% of -460.

We agree with the TDs findings, however we do not think 11 tricks are all that likely.

Richard Fleet
---------------

I disagree with the ruling: wild horses would not persuade me to bid 2♠ on the South collection of junk and I do not see that a hesitation from North makes this action any more attractive.
--

Paul Lamford
--------------

I agree with the AC. PP for South for the 2♠ bid which clearly used UI. The weighting seems reasonable. Declarer is unlikely to risk the heart finesse.
---

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

The TD cites Law 16B but the mere fact that Pass is a logical alternative does not by itself justify a score adjustment. Another necessary condition for score adjustment is that the chosen action could demonstrably have been suggested by the unauthorised information. Although South's 2♠ bid would not have occurred to many players, it is hard to see how North's alleged hesitation would make bidding 2♠ more attractive on a Yarborough lacking spade support. Hence I would have allowed the table result to stand.
--

Tim Rees
----------

N/S were lucky to get their deposit back. It was only because the AC adjusted the score in their favour, on an issue unrelated to the grounds for appeal.
---

## APPEAL No : 14.052

**Tournament Director:** Gary Conrad

**Appeals Committee:** Graham Osborne (C), Heather Dhondy, Brian Senior

<p>♠ 942 ♥ KJ43 ♦ KJ1085 ♣ 10</p> <p>♠ 10                      ♠ AKQ6 ♥ Q9                        ♥ 10765 ♦ AQ9742                ♦ 63 ♣ J842                    ♣ A53</p> <p>♠ J8753 ♥ A82 ♦ - ♣ KQ976</p>	<p>Board 13 : Dealer North : All vulnerable</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>1NT (1)</td><td>2♣ (A)</td></tr><tr><td>2♦ (A)</td><td>Pass (2)</td><td>2♥ (3)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2NT</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>1) 12-14 2) Q:What is 2♦? A: transfer to hearts 3) Q: what is 2♣? A: majors. Followed by hesitation</p>	<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>		Pass	1NT (1)	2♣ (A)	2♦ (A)	Pass (2)	2♥ (3)	Pass	2NT	All Pass		
<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>														
	Pass	1NT (1)	2♣ (A)														
2♦ (A)	Pass (2)	2♥ (3)	Pass														
2NT	All Pass																

### Basic systems:

North-South system – 2♣ over 1NT shows both majors

East-West system – 1NT opening may contain a 5-card major.

**Form of Scoring:** MPs to VPs.

**Result at table:** 2NT – 1 by East, +100

**Director first called:** At the end of play.

### Director's statement of facts:

I was called to the table after the end of the hand. North/South thought that West had bid 2NT using the unauthorised information of the alert and explanation of his 2♦ bid.

I wanted to establish logical alternatives. I polled 6 players – 3 said they would pass, 3 said they would bid 3♦. I first thought that 2♥ would go off two, but East/West gave a case that they would make seven tricks which I accepted.

### Director's ruling:

I ruled 2♥ - 1 for the same score

### Details of ruling:

At the time both sides accepted the ruling, but my event Chief TD later over-ruled my ruling and adjusted to 2♥ - 2, +200 on the grounds that only 6 tricks can be made in normal play.

**Appeal lodged by:** East/West

**Basis of appeal:** Appealed on the basis of the Chief TDs revised ruling.

**Comments by North-South:** none

**Comments by East-West:** none

**Appeals Committee decision:** Chief TDs revised ruling upheld. Chief TD waived the deposit.

## APPEAL No : 14.052

### Appeals Committee's comments:

We upheld the amended TD decision on the basis of the poll and 2NT was suggested by the unauthorised information. We have given the non-offending side the benefit of the doubt in the play and are happy that six tricks for East/West is a fair result.

Richard Fleet

It is unclear to me that the Chief TD at an event has the power to overrule a ruling given by a TD merely because he disagrees with an aspect of the bridge judgement.

Paul Lamford

Very interesting. If East had not alerted 2♦, his 2♥ bid would have been onward going, either showing a heart stop or asking for one. 2NT by West is ludicrous of course, and he might bid 3♣, or just 3♦. Whichever he does will confirm to East that West has hearts, and South has probably misbid with Landy. He will have an obvious jump to 4♥. North will double this on the way out and it goes four off, and unlikely to trouble the scorers at MPs. I don't think the AC looked deeply enough into this one.

Jeffrey Allerton

This appeals form raises more questions than it answers. The ruling concentrates on West's bidding when in receipt of unauthorised information, but there is also the issue of misinformation, potentially from both sides. South showed both majors when holding a 5=3=0=5 shape, then West apparently showed long hearts when holding long diamonds. The form records the explanations given at the table, but what were determined to be the true N/S and E/W agreements? Then the TD performed a poll and apparently half of the respondents chose to play in a minority fit in a suit shown by the opponents when they had a known 8-card fit in another suit available! Were all the respondents made aware that South had shown both majors? If West has UI telling him that he has shown hearts, why is passing 2♥ the least demonstrably suggested action? This is a convenient way to prevent partner from bidding 3♥ or 4♥ and possibly attracting a double.

Did anybody ask East why he passed 2NT? This doesn't make sense (and should have been classified as a fielded misbid based on the regulations in force during 2014) if East believed that 2♦ showed hearts, but maybe it was just a poorly worded explanation: there have been cases in the past where the phrase "transfer to" has been intended to mean "asking me to bid" without necessarily showing the suit in question.

Without knowing the answers to this many unknown questions, it's hard to be sure what the correct ruling should be.

Tim Rees

West's 2NT deserves a PP. Also, why didn't the TD or AC consider what would have happened after a 3♦ bid by West? Perhaps 4♥\*-4 would have been a better adjustment.

Finally, why did neither the TD nor the AC give a weighting for the number of tricks in 2♥? The TD's effort in particular is poor, awarding first 7 tricks, then 6.

# APPEAL No : 14.053

Tournament Director: Kathy Williams

Appeals Committee: Tim Rees (C), Simon Cope, Phil King

<p>♠ K97 ♥ K10842 ♦ Q2 ♣ K103</p> <p>♠ 862                      ♠ Q10 ♥ Q                            ♥ A9 ♦ AK98                      ♦ 1076543 ♣ 98542                      ♣ A76</p> <p>♠ AJ543 ♥ J7653 ♦ J ♣ QJ</p>	<p>Board 1 : Dealer North : Love all</p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♣ (1)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass (2)</td><td>2♦ (3)</td><td>Pass (4)</td><td>2♥ (5)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass (6)</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♦</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>3♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4♦</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>1) Either weak in ♦, 5-5 majors weak or Game force 2) Asked about the bid 3) Relay 4) Asked about the bid 5) 5-5 majors weak 6) Asked about the bid</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>		Pass	Pass	2♣ (1)	Pass (2)	2♦ (3)	Pass (4)	2♥ (5)	Pass (6)	Pass	3♦	Pass	Pass	3♥	Pass	Pass	4♦	All Pass		
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																						
	Pass	Pass	2♣ (1)																						
Pass (2)	2♦ (3)	Pass (4)	2♥ (5)																						
Pass (6)	Pass	3♦	Pass																						
Pass	3♥	Pass	Pass																						
4♦	All Pass																								

### Basic systems:

North-South system – *multi 3 ways*

East-West system – *not recorded.*

Form of Scoring: MPs.

Result at table: 4♦ - 1 by East, +50

Director first called: At the end of the auction to reserve rights.

### Director's statement of facts:

I was called back at the end of play by North who was unhappy about the 3♦ bid as a lot of questions were asked during the auction. I asked North/South how weak their 5-5 could be: 5 to 9.

I asked East why she bid 3♦ - told that good sacrifice if they can make 2♥ with South's hand shape. Also East knows North originally passed and South is weak.

### Director's ruling:

Score stands

### Details of ruling:

I agree with East. Pass is not a logical alternative.

Appeal lodged by: North/South

Basis of appeal: None given.

Comments by North-South: none

Comments by East-West: none

### Appeals Committee decision:

TD ruling upheld.



## APPEAL No : 14.053

Deposit returned.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

East/West are known to be compulsive askers. Also, if North/South play such a complex method, they need to allow the opposition a lot of leeway in asking questions. Therefore we believe there was no unauthorised information and therefore the result stands.

The deposit is returned as the basis of the appeal was regarding whether pass as a logical alternative – we felt this close enough for the appeal to have merit, even though we would not have overturned the TD ruling on this basis either.

Richard Fleet
---------------

Whilst agreeing with the ruling, particularly the comment about the complexity of the North-South methods, I do not see that the fact that East-West may be “compulsive askers” is remotely relevant.
---

Paul Lamford
--------------

If you always ask, then you cannot give UI by asking. No need to go into any other aspect of the hand.
--

Heather Dhondy
----------------

I agree with the ruling, although I'm not sure that the fact that E/W are “compulsive askers” is any mitigation. I agree that when N/S are playing a system of such complexity it is reasonable from the opponents to have some idea of what is going on without prejudicing their side from protecting. When one opponent is a passed hand, and the other opens a weak bid in third seat, you should not want them to buy the contract at the 2-level unless you hold their suit. Given that East has a 6-card suit to balance with, it's a no-brainer. I think it is lot closer to keeping the deposit than the AC apparently did.
--

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

I agree with the AC's ruling and comments.
--