



2013

EBU Appeals

ENGLISH BRIDGE UNION

2013

APPEALS

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

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

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

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

Tel: 01296 317228

From outside UK(replace 0 with +44)

Email: john@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: April 11 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 four European Championships and, most recently, 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.

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

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.

General Comments from Tim Rees (Chairman of the Laws and Ethics Committee)

The TD rulings were of a high standard this year. There were a couple of rulings that the Appeal Committee made worse, which involved overruling a consultation. If a TD has consulted with a group of players, either on whether there are Logical Alternatives or whether an action was demonstrably suggested, then the Appeal Committee should be careful about overruling the result of the consultation. All they should normally be doing is adding their opinions to the consultation. The AC can overturn a consultation if it feels that the pool of players consulted was of an inappropriate standard. It might also determine that the questions asked by the TD during consultation had not conveyed the full meaning of the situation. If the AC concludes either of these, they should write their reasoning on the form.

General comments from Jeffrey Allerton

The Appeal Committees have got most decisions right this year, but I have found more reason to disagree with individual Appeal Committee decisions than in the previous few years. Frustratingly, a number of (in my opinion) correct TD rulings have been overturned. These days, TDs know to consult and (where appropriate) poll before making judgement rulings. I would urge all Appeal Committees to seek to understand the reasoning behind the TD's decision, before considering the arguments for amending the TD's ruling. Even if they believe that the TD's decision may have been ultimately incorrect, they should still take into account the evidence gathered by the TD during the original ruling process, and use their own opinions to supplement, not replace, that evidence. One improvement I have observed in 2013 is that Appeal Committees have shown more inclination to retain deposits for frivolous appeals, a common complaint made by commentators in previous years' appeals booklets.

APPEAL No : 13.001

Tournament Director: Martin Lee

Appeals Committee: Heather Dhondy (Chairman), Martin Jones & Simon Cope

| | | Board 6 : Dealer East : EW vulnerable | | | |
|--------|---------|---|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| | | West | North | East | South |
| | ♠ K96 | | | 1♣ A(1) | Pass |
| | ♥ 872 | 1NT A(2) | Pass | 2♣ A(3) | Pass |
| | ♦ 97 | 2♦ A(4) | Pass | 2♥ A(5) | Pass |
| | ♣ QJ654 | 2NT A(6) | Pass | 3♥ | Pass |
| ♠ Q32 | | 3NT | Pass | 4♥ H | Pass |
| ♥ Q9 | ♠ AJ105 | 5♣ | Pass | 6♥ | Pass (7) |
| ♦ Q543 | ♥ A653 | 6NT | All Pass | | |
| ♣ AK72 | ♦ AKJ6 | (1) 16+ HCP's | | | |
| | ♣ 10 | (2) Either 12-14 balanced or 12+ with ♠ | | | |
| | ♠ 874 | (3) Enquiry to describe hand | | | |
| | ♥ KJ104 | (4) Balanced | | | |
| | ♦ 1082 | (5) "Tell me more" | | | |
| | ♣ 983 | (6) "I have a 4 card ♥ suit" | | | |
| | | (7) Questions about auction by South | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South system – 5 card majors, 2 over 1 game force & strong NT

East-West system – Strong Club

Form of Scoring: IMP's to VP's

Result at table: 6NT= by West, lead ♦9

Director first called: At the end of play.

Director's statement of facts:

I was called by North as it became apparent that West had misbid his hand at (6). I went through the auction with EW and was told that 2NT (6) would always be alerted as it is always systemic. I am told by West that he bid 6NT (as opposed to passing 6♥) because he knew that East did not have a 5 card ♥ suit from the bidding. The misbid was revealed at (7) when the auction was, in effect, reviewed at that time, prior to the 6NT bid.

Director's ruling:

6♥-1 by East

Details of ruling:

Receipt of Unauthorised Information (UI) L71C
Extraneous Information from Partner L16

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Basis of appeal: No UI used.

APPEAL No : 13.001

Director's comments:

No additional comments (General).

At the moment when West bid 6NT he knows that 'there is a problem' with the auction. Partner's 2♥ bid denied a 5 card heart suit but the subsequent bid of 3♥, 4♥ and 6♥ appear to contradict this. West is now aware that something has gone wrong and the UI tells him that he has made a mistake, therefore Pass is a Logical Alternative to 6NT

Comments by North-South:

South wrote:

East hesitated for an extremely long time (at least a full minute) before bidding 4♥.

At 6♥ I asked for a review of the auction and said 'Thank you' to stop the explanation after a quick explanation of each of the bids. I did not ask 'a lot of questions'.

Comments by East-West:

East wrote:

Over 1NT by West, our agreement is to:

- (a) Bid a 5 card major 2♠ shows spades and 2NT shows hearts or
- (b) Ask for distribution (without a 5+ card major) by bidding 2♥

East has denied a 5 card major by bidding the 2♥ relay. This is documented in our system file at home. West would not wish to play in a 6♥ contract in a 4-2 fit and would bid 6NT without all the questions from South

West wrote:

When East bid 6♥, South seemed surprised and started asking a lot of questions. It became clear to me that 6NT would be a better contract than 6♥.

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling amended.
Deposit returned.

Appeals Committee's comments:

Restored to table score. We are not confident that West knew what the auction meant, so the two things to consider were:

1. The UI which made it clear to remove to 6NT
2. The Authorised Information that South's questions (in a live auction) and body language meant that she believed that 6♥ was not making.

With some misgivings we think that given South's sudden interest, it is not attractive to pass 6♥

| |
|---------------|
| Richard Fleet |
|---------------|

| |
|--|
| I would have upheld the TD ruling. Although West can reasonably infer that something has gone wrong with the auction, that something might well have been that East made the wrong bid on the second round – but West has UI which establishes that this is not the case. Putting it another way, had East said that West's sequence showed a doubleton heart, why would West have wished to |
|--|

APPEAL No : 13.001

remove 6♥ to 6NT?

I put little weight on South's questions and body language since experience suggests that his might mean little. Without reference to her hand, she might have been gathering information so as to whether to call the TD regarding the slow 4♥ and subsequent auction.

Frances Hinden

I find the Appeal Committee's ruling surprising. West has AI that something has gone wrong with the auction (partner has both denied long hearts and then, it appears, shown long hearts). He has UI that partner does not have long hearts, which demonstrably suggests pulling. The Appeal Committee have decided that West had sufficient AI from South that 6♥ wasn't making that he had no logical alternative to bidding 6NT. However, I think the 6NT bid is still a breach of Law 73C and I would not allow it on that basis.

Jeffrey Allerton

It's good to see the TD quoting law references (although there is a typo: it should say 73C, not 71C). It is also good to see that the form was filled in thoroughly. The Appeal Committee's phrase "it is not attractive to pass 6♥" is not answering the right question. They should be deciding whether or not pass is a logical alternative. If they judged that "Passing 6♥ is sufficiently unattractive that it is not a logical alternative" then they should have phrased it in this way.

West observes that East's 2♥ bid systemically denies a 5-card major, but his subsequent heart bids imply that East has violated this particular agreement (or that West has misunderstood the range of hands which might relay with 2♥ here). Why does West conclude that the only plausible explanation of the auction is that he must have got the 2NT bid wrong? Without any inferences from South's line of questioning, I think that the TD's ruling is clearly correct. Whether the apparent interest in doubling 6♥ is sufficiently clear to 'wake up' West is another matter. Having had the opportunity to cross-examine the players, the Appeal Committee should have been in a better position to make this judgement than the commentators in this booklet can hope to be.

Paul Lamford

Even if East could have five hearts, it looks automatic to correct to 6NT. How could 6♥ be any better? Appeal Committee decision correct.

Tim Rees

South is entitled to ask questions when it is her turn to bid, but the fact that she is doing so is AI for the opposition. West was entitled to use that information to remove 6♥ to 6NT. If South had waited until the auction had finished before she asked questions, then the outcome might have been different.

Robin Barker

The Appeal Committee give great weight to the information from South's questions and body language before passing over 6♥, yet West did not mention this information when explaining to the TD why he bid 6NT. Instead West told the TD that it was clear from the auction that East did not have 5♥s. I think that in determining whether Pass was a logical alternative for West, West's peers should be players who gave more weight to the information from the auction and not the information from South's questioning.

APPEAL No : 13.003

Tournament Director: John Haslegrave

Appeals Committee: Frances Hinden (Chairman), Graham Osborne and Alan Kay

| <p>♠ A9 ♥ J104 ♦ 8 ♣ AKQ10764</p> <p>♠ KJ ♠ 1043 ♥ K9752 ♥ A8 ♦ 65 ♦ KQJ10974 ♣ J985 ♣ 3</p> <p>♠ Q87652 ♥ Q63 ♦ A32 ♣ 2</p> | <p>Board 27 : 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>2♦ A(1)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>2NT A</td><td>3♦</td><td>3♠ A(2)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>4♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♠</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>1. Weak only Multi 2. Without interference = good hand with hearts. Not discussed if this still applies over 3♦</p> | West | North | East | South | | | | 2♦ A(1) | Pass | 2NT A | 3♦ | 3♠ A(2) | Pass | 4♥ | Pass | 4♠ | All Pass | | | |
|--|---|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--|--|--|---------|------|-------|----|---------|------|----|------|----|----------|--|--|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 2♦ A(1) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass | 2NT A | 3♦ | 3♠ A(2) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass | 4♥ | Pass | 4♠ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

*North-South play: 15-17 NT
East-West play: Not provided*

Form of Scoring: *X-IMP's, Teams of 8, 4 comparisons converted to VP's*

Result at table:

4♠-1 by South -50, lead ♦6

Director first called: At end of auction

Director's statement of facts:

At the end of the auction it was explained that North thought 3♠ showed hearts. EW called the TD at this point. NS said they had not discussed responses after interference (2♦ - 2NT - 3♠ = hearts on System Card). When asked at the end of the hand NS said hands wanting to play in 4♥ would bid 2♦ - 4♥, not 2♦ - 2NT

Director's ruling: Table result stands

Details of ruling:

Passing 4♥ not a Logical Alternative since it is not to play in North-South methods L16B

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Basis of appeal: Not provided.

Director's comments: None.

Comments by North-South: None.

Comments by East-West: None.

APPEAL No : 13.003

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling amended.

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

50% of 5♣-2 by North, NS -100

50% of 5♠-2 by South, NS -100

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

South has a good hand whether 4♥ is a strong heart hand or a cue bid for spades. He has a 5 minor cue. North now knows a wheel has come off and will pass a 5♣ cue bid or bid 5♠ over 5♦. EW do not seem to have a double.

South was nearly given a Procedural Penalty (PP) for gratuitous use of UI but (we) decided the auction was risky enough not to.

Frances Hinden

The write-up doesn't specify where the UI came from: E/W had asked about the meaning of the 3♠ bid before South bid 4♠, so South had UI that partner thought he had hearts.

South's comment that partner could have bid 4♥ directly over 2♦ doesn't include the possibility that partner has a strong hand with slam interest in hearts.

Jeffrey Allerton

A complicated case (assuming that somebody asked about the meaning of 3♠, otherwise there may not be any relevant UI, given that 3♠ showing a maximum with spades would also be alertable.) From South's point of view, the meaning of North's 4♥ bid is unclear: it seems like a dangerous call to make if wanting to agree spades, so I would interpret 4♥ as a suggested contract. If we accept the (possibly self-serving) comment from N/S that North would have bid 4♥ immediately with no interest in any other strain, then perhaps 2NT followed by 4♥ is suggesting but not insisting on hearts, something like 2-6 in the majors. Thus I believe that pass is a logical alternative for South. It is also the logical alternative least demonstrably suggested by the UI because of its finality. So I prefer an adjustment to 4♥ by North making the requisite number of tricks (weighted if the number of tricks is not clear).

Paul Lamford

I agree that South has UI but Pass of 4♥ must surely be a logical alternative and this is 5 off. I cannot see why that is not included in the weighting.

Tim Rees

I would not consider a PP here. If one or both players are aware that there is no agreement about a sequence, they should have some legal means of recovering to a sensible contract. For example, North should be able to bid 4♦ to try to find out which major South holds, without it necessarily being a slam try. The problem was that North thought there was an agreement, and bid accordingly.

APPEAL No : 13.003

Robin Barker

The Appeal Committee agree that Pass was not a logical alternative but the TD failed to consider whether other bids were logical alternatives to 4♠.

Heather Dhondy

I agree with the appeals committee. The real problem with the auction is not that South bid over 4♥, but that he only bid 4♠ when 4♥ must be a cue bid for ♠. South has controls in both minors which makes signing off absurd.

The only question I have about the committee's decision is how many tricks should be awarded to each contract. 5♣ is probably 3 down on ♥A lead (maybe deemed too unlikely), and 4♠ looks a tough hand to analyse on a ♦ lead, and since nine tricks were made at the table I would expect the weighting of 5♠ to include going 2 down.

APPEAL No : 13.006

Tournament Director: Nicole Cook

Appeals Committee: Steve Eginton (Chairman), Sandy Davis & Alan Wilson

| <p>♠ 92 ♥ K6 ♦ A632 ♣ K10874</p> <p>♠ 3 ♥ AJ10 ♦ J854 ♣ Q9632</p> <p>♠ QJ10 ♥ Q9854 ♦ K97 ♣ AJ</p> | <p>Board 22 : Dealer East : EW 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>3♠</td><td>DbI (1)</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>All Pass</p> <p>1. Slow pause before this bid</p> | <i>West</i> | <i>North</i> | <i>East</i> | <i>South</i> | | | 3♠ | DbI (1) |
|--|---|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--|--|----|---------|
| <i>West</i> | <i>North</i> | <i>East</i> | <i>South</i> | | | | | | |
| | | 3♠ | DbI (1) | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: Not recorded

East-West play: Not recorded

Form of Scoring: *X-IMP's, Pairs.*

Result at table:

3♠ x -1 East, NS +200, lead – not given

Director first called: At end of hand.

Director's statement of facts:

East called me to ask me to consider the hand because an irregularity had occurred during the auction. She explained that South had paused for some time before making her bid. South agreed, stating she had considered her options before electing to double. I asked North about the action he chose and was told it was what he bid or 4NT as this was a game hand because partner must have values. I asked North what had given him this indication and he replied because partner had doubled.

Director's ruling:

25% 4♣-2 (-100),

25% 5♣x-2 (-500)

50% 5♣/5♦ - 3 (-150)

Details of ruling:

Clearly there are Logical Alternatives to Pass. The question was whether the slow double suggested Pass and that the result of my player poll indicated it did.

Score assigned for both sides.

In my poll all the players polled felt partner's consideration before doubling suggested they may have been considering bidding 3NT, and/or were balanced and did not have a classic takeout double.

APPEAL No : 13.006

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: Not provided.

Director's comments: None.

Comments by North-South: None.

Comments by East-West: None.

Appeals Committee decision:

Table score re-instated

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

The unanimous opinion of the committee was that:

- (A) The opponents view that the inference of the out of tempo double did not suggest bidding was an understatement and it actually implied that there was a greater chance that bidding could be more successful (-1 was not a good result and we would expect opposite most takeout doubles).
- (B) All the committee felt that the percentage action, by a considerable margin, opposite a typical takeout is, at this vulnerability, to Pass, notwithstanding the poll results.

We understand the feelings of the beneficiaries of the TD's action, but the initial reaction of all three committee members was that North had a clear cut Pass.

L&E Committee comments:

The committee strongly preferred the TD's ruling. The Appeal Committee had misdirected itself regarding point B above. Even if it felt that passing was the percentage action, there were still logical alternatives, namely 4♣, 4NT and 5♣. The Appeal Committee would still be entitled to reinstate the table score if it felt that the slowness of the double did not suggest passing over any other action. However, this had been the subject of the TD's poll and the Appeal Committee should be wary of substituting their own judgement in place of a poll. The L&E Committee felt that the slow double did suggest that passing would be successful.

The L&E Committee discussed whether it could be appropriate to consider points A and B together, and award some kind of combined probability when deciding whether to allow an action. It concluded that this was an incorrect approach, and the "logical alternatives" and "demonstrably suggested" clauses were completely independent and should be considered separately.

| |
|----------------|
| Frances Hinden |
|----------------|

| |
|---|
| I agree with the L&E comments. Simply thinking that pass is the best call is irrelevant unless you truly believe there are no logical alternatives. |
|---|

| |
|------------------|
| Jeffrey Allerton |
|------------------|

| |
|--|
| I agree with the L&E Committee here. The TD has done an excellent job in conducting a poll and asking exactly the right question. The Appeal Committee should have considered that their job is to review a TD's ruling and not to ignore all of the research which has been performed in determining the ruling and start from scratch. |
|--|

APPEAL No : 13.006

Paul Lamford

I agree with the L&E and the original TD. A slow double says "I am not classic but too good to pass". The UI suggest that North Pass, as a slow double tends to show a maximum weak NT, exactly what South had, surprise, surprise.

Tim Rees

The L&E comment sums it up well. Just because the members of the Appeal Committee would all pass, doesn't make it the only logical alternative. The Appeal Committee might have been biased by their desire to let pass stand, in saying that it wasn't demonstrably suggested by the hesitation. However, the two are completely separate considerations, and the poll indicated that the slow double did suggest that passing would be successful.

Heather Dhondy

I am very surprised by the committee's unanimous view as I would not consider pass to be close to a clear cut action. The committee must believe that there is no other logical alternative to pass in order to rule this way, and that seems an extreme view. I agree with the L&E.

APPEAL No : 13.007

Tournament Director: Robin Barker

Referee: Brian Senior. The names of members of the Committee were not recorded

| <p>♠ 3 ♥ AK6 ♦ J10642 ♣ Q1062 ♠ Q1098754 ♠ KJ6 ♥ Q10432 ♥ 85 ♦ 5 ♦ K97 ♣ - ♣ AK953 ♠ A2 ♥ J97 ♦ AQ83 ♣ J874</p> | <p>Board 29 : 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</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4♦</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♥</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>5♣</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>5♠ (1)</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) With emphasis!</p> | <i>West</i> | <i>North</i> | <i>East</i> | <i>South</i> | | Pass | 1NT | Pass | 4♦ | Pass | 4♥ | Pass | 4♠ | Pass | 5♣ | Pass | 5♠ (1) | All Pass | | |
|--|---|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--|------|-----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|--------|----------|--|--|
| <i>West</i> | <i>North</i> | <i>East</i> | <i>South</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Pass | 1NT | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4♦ | Pass | 4♥ | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4♠ | Pass | 5♣ | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5♠ (1) | All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: Not provided

East-West play: Weak NT

Form of Scoring: IMP's

Result at table:

5♠-2 by West, NS +200, lead ♥A

Director first called:

At end of hand – possibly after they had played other boards.

Director's statement of facts:

I was called by North, East opened a weak NT, West bid 4♦ showing spades, East bid 4♥ - encouraging and cue bid 5♣ over 4♠. 5♠ was made by slapping it on the table in a manner to suggest East should Pass. West did not dispute this. East said he did not notice the manner of the 5♠ bid. East thought 4♦ was a slam try but he thought with only one ace and two small hearts he could not bid slam. North thought that if West had shown a slam try it was clear for East to bid slam.

Director's ruling: Table result stands

Details of ruling:

I ruled that bidding over 5♠ was not a logical alternative so there was no infraction. L18B

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Basis of appeal: None given.

Director's comments: None.

Comments by North-South: None.

APPEAL No : 13.007

Comments by East-West: None.

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

We felt that West would have cue bid 5♦ or 5♥ had he held an ace and a slam try, this just looks routine.

North asserted that slam tries like 4♦ are usually semi-balanced – we do not disagree. North is imposing his own agreement on EW. East made two slam tries – that is enough.

Deposit returned as 2 committee members thought the fact that West admitted to slapping down of 5♠ was sufficient to give the appeal merit.

L&E comment: It would have been appropriate to give West a procedural penalty. The L&E Committee considered the reason for returning the deposit somewhat eccentric. The procedural penalty that might have been given is not relevant to the nature of the appeal.

| |
|---------------|
| Richard Fleet |
|---------------|

| |
|------------------------------------|
| I would have retained the deposit. |
|------------------------------------|

| |
|------------------|
| Jeffrey Allerton |
|------------------|

| |
|---|
| The form does not record the basis of appeal. If N/S appealed because they wanted a score adjustment in their favour, it's hard to see what arguments they could have put forward. On the other hand, if N/S appealed on the basis that West's action deserved a procedural penalty, then the appeal clearly had merit (I believe that a PP is appropriate in this case). |
|---|

| |
|--------------|
| Paul Lamford |
|--------------|

| |
|---|
| If the Appeal Committee might have given a PP that is enough to return the deposit. One can appeal solely on the basis that the TD failed to give a PP when one was merited, as was the case in 13.023. But I agree with the Appeal Committee ruling. |
|---|

| |
|----------|
| Tim Rees |
|----------|

| |
|---|
| A strange reason for returning the deposit (it looks like N/S were the appealing side, not E/W). If West's action was so flagrant, give him a PP (the TD should do this), but don't appeal a clearcut ruling. |
|---|

| |
|----------------|
| Heather Dhondy |
|----------------|

| |
|---|
| West slapping down of 5♠ is outrageous! I find it hard to believe that no procedural penalty was given or even really considered by either the TD or appeals committee. |
|---|

APPEAL No : 13.017

Tournament Director: M R Carey

Appeals Committee: Robert Plumley (Chairman), Mike Fletcher & Brian Stairs

| <p>♠ 872 ♥ AK864 ♦ Q87 ♣ 83</p> <p>♠ AQ65 ♠ 10943 ♥ - ♥ 75 ♦ K942 ♦ J103 ♣ KJ764 ♣ AQ109</p> <p>♠ KJ ♥ QJ10932 ♦ A65 ♣ 52</p> | <p>Board 5 : Dealer North : NS vulnerable</p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♥ (1)</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl</td><td>3♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♠</td><td>Pass H (2)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>4♥</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Weak (2) Agreed hesitation</p> | West | North | East | South | | Pass | Pass | 2♥ (1) | Dbl | 3♥ | Pass | Pass | Dbl | Pass | 3♠ | Pass H (2) | Pass | 4♥ | All Pass | |
|--|--|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--|------|------|--------|-----|----|------|------|-----|------|----|------------|------|----|----------|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Pass | Pass | 2♥ (1) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dbl | 3♥ | Pass | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dbl | Pass | 3♠ | Pass H (2) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass | 4♥ | All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play Benji ACOL

East-West play ACOL, weak NT & 3 weak 2's

Form of Scoring: IMP's to VP's

Result at table:

4♥-1 by South, NS -100, lead ♠A

Director first called: At end of hand.

Director's statement of facts: None written

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

3♠+2 making by East, NS -200

Details of ruling:

After hesitation I ruled Pass was a logical alternative especially after previous bid was 3♥ and not 4♥ and vulnerable. L16

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: None provided.

Director's comments: None.

Comments by North-South:

I was always willing to bid 4♥ unless the opponents allowed us to play in 3

Comments by East-West: None.

APPEAL No : 13.017

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

We support director's ruling

Richard Fleet

Absolutely clear to retain the deposit.

Frances Hinden

Neither the TD nor the Appeal Committee seem prepared to give any basis for the ruling. I find an adjustment to 3♠+2 particularly surprising, as ten tricks seems more normal on a top heart lead.

Jeffrey Allerton

The Appeal Committee ought to have explained on the form why they supported the director's ruling and, given that they did, why they considered that the appeal had merit. If the appeal was not considered to have any merit then the deposit should not have been returned.

Paul Lamford

You might well walk the dog and get to 4♥ slowly. You expect opponents to be cold for 4♠. Partner scuppers your plans by breaking tempo. I would allow the 4♥ bid here as Pass is not demonstrably suggested. Bidding might and should have pushed opponents into a cold 4♠. The BIT does not demonstrably suggest 4♥. North's hand does.

Tim Rees

This looks clear – North could have bid 4♥ directly over West's double if he'd wanted to. Players need to be aware that if they delay an action for a round and partner then provides UI, then an argument of "I was always going to bid" will normally be disregarded.

Robin Barker

It would be good if the Appeal Committee had explained the decision not to allow 4♥, or if they thought that decision was clear, to explain why they did not keep the deposit.

Heather Dhondy

What does a slow pass of 3♠ indicate by a hand that has opened a weak two? I would have guessed an unusual distribution, but that doesn't appear to be the case. Bidding just 3♥ seems eccentric on the North hand, but given it has persuaded the opponents to miss game, perhaps there's something to recommend it. Having succeeded in this, bidding 4♥ is just weird. He must know the opponents have missed game. Even opposite the super-maximum super-defensive weak two bid of partner's, eleven tricks are unbreakable. I would allow the table result to stand because I don't think the hesitation has suggested bidding 4♥ at all.

APPEAL No : 13.018

Tournament Director: M R Carey

Appeals Committee: Robert Plumley (Chairman), Jeremy Willans & Brian Stairs

| <p>♠ K985 ♥ J9832 ♦ 6 ♣ Q85</p> <p>♠ AQJ76 ♠ 104 ♥ AK5 ♥ 64 ♦ Q105 ♦ KJ7432 ♣ 64 ♣ A73</p> <p>♠ 32 ♥ Q107 ♦ A98 ♣ KJ1092</p> | <p>Board 18 : Dealer East : NS 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>2♦</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2NT A</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♣ (1)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>3NT</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Not Alerted but asked at time of opening lead (after lead) face down.</p> | West | North | East | South | | | 2♦ | Pass | 2NT A | Pass | 3♣ (1) | Pass | 3NT | All Pass | | |
|---|--|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--|--|----|------|-------|------|--------|------|-----|----------|--|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 2♦ | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2NT A | Pass | 3♣ (1) | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3NT | All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: Not provided

East-West play: Acol, 3 weak 2's

Form of Scoring: IMP's to VP's

Result at table:

3NT= by West, NS -400, lead not given.

Director first called: At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:

3♣ was not alerted during the auction. Explained prior to lead as 'max opening with club feature'. I asked and was told it did not promise 3 cards and could even be a singleton ace. South claimed she would have doubled 3♣ for a lead if it had been alerted.

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

3NT-1 by West, NS +50

Details of ruling:

I ruled that there had been misinformation. L21B

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Basis of appeal: Not provided

Director's comments: None.

Comments by North-South: None

APPEAL No : 13.018

Comments by East-West: None

Appeals Committee decision:

Table score re-instated

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

The non-alert of 3♣ should not preclude South from doubling 3♣ for a lead with the quality of the suit and ♦A.

EW should be advised to alert these responses to 2NT in future.

Richard Fleet

In the absence of an alert, South is entitled to assume that 3♣ is natural and shows a club suit. The failure to alert constitutes misinformation and South's failure to double is not sufficiently gross as to break the link between infraction and damage.

I would have upheld the ruling and retained the deposit.

Frances Hinden

The Appeal Committee have agreed that 3♣ should have been alerted. They might believe that South should have doubled anyway, but I think that South is much more likely to double had 3♣ been alerted. A weighted adjustment reflecting the increased probability of a double would have been fairer.

Jeffrey Allerton

The form really should record the opening lead found at the table, particularly as the opening lead is so crucial to the hand. Like the Appeal Committee members, I would have doubled 3♣ whatever it meant. However, what they or I would have done in a situation which should never have existed is not relevant. Instead the Appeal Committee should consider what this South might have done over an alerted 3♣. In fact the TD has already considered this for them and so they should be looking at adjusted scores based on South doubling 3♣. It is less clear what will happen next. E/W might still get to 3NT (down 1 on a club lead), but it's also possible that they might end up in 4♠, 5♦, or even a ♦ part score. In the circumstances, a weighted ruling incorporating all of these possibilities is indicated.

Paul Lamford

I disagree with the Appeal Committee. It is only relevant what would have happened without the infraction and South would have doubled an alerted 3♣. The TD decision looks correct.

Tim Rees

Effectively, there was no damage since everyone knows what 3♣ might be (it's "always" alertable).

APPEAL No : 13.018

Robin Barker

What South should have done is not the primary consideration; what is relevant is what South would have done if 3♣ had been alerted. Perhaps the Appeal Committee are saying that doubling 3♣ is automatic, so given that South did not double, South would not double even if 3♣ had been alerted. I think we should rule on the basis that there should have been an alert and South would have doubled 3♣, so we should adjust the score – certainly for EW. Is the failure to double a serious error (unrelated to the infraction) or a wild or gambling action? No. (Even if the failure to double is a serious error, can it ever be “unrelated to the infraction” when it is the action that was affected by the misinformation?) So we should adjust the score for both sides.

Heather Dhondy

I agree with the Appeal Committee. It is normal for 3♣ to be some sort of conventional response and double is obvious. It was careless of West not to alert.

APPEAL No : 13.019

Tournament Director: Robin Barker

Appeals Committee: Neil Rosen (Chairman), Brian Senior & Jon Cooke

| <p>♠ 10842 ♥ K10742 ♦ 107 ♣ 54</p> <p>♠ AK9653 ♠ Q ♥ 93 ♥ AJ5 ♦ 543 ♦ A8 ♣ Q3 ♣ AKJ9876</p> <p>♠ J7 ♥ Q86 ♦ KQJ962 ♣ 102</p> | <p>Board 14 : Dealer East : 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>1♣</td><td>2♦</td></tr><tr><td>Dbf</td><td>2♥</td><td>3NT</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>4NT</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>5♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>6♣</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> | West | North | East | South | | | 1♣ | 2♦ | Dbf | 2♥ | 3NT | Pass | 4♠ | Pass | 4NT | Pass | 5♥ | Pass | 6♣ | All Pass |
|---|--|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--|--|----|----|-----|----|-----|------|----|------|-----|------|----|------|----|----------|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1♣ | 2♦ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dbf | 2♥ | 3NT | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4♠ | Pass | 4NT | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5♥ | Pass | 6♣ | All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: Not provided

East-West play: Not provided

Form of Scoring: KO IMP's

Result at table:

Claim 6♣ by East, lead ♦K

Director first called:

After the lead, dummy was tabled and declarer claimed.

Director's statement of facts:

South lead the K♦. Dummy was tabled. Declarer showed her hand, showing A♦, then the clubs and then the rest of the hand, stating something like, 'I have lots of tricks making 12 or 13'.

When I asked, declarer said she thought her line was obvious, she was only claiming 12 tricks. I forgot to say I was drawing trumps

Director's ruling:

11 tricks to declarer, losing two small red cards.

Details of ruling:

There are winning lines but declarer drawing trumps (or just playing a small club to Q♣ at trick 2) is a normal line. L70

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Basis of appeal: None given.

APPEAL No : 13.019

Director's comments:

Declarer never mentioned how she would play spades:

Line 1. ♠Q, ♣A, small ♣ to ♣Q, ♠A, ♠K

Line 2. ♠Q to ♠A, ♠K discarding ♦8, heart to ♥A, small heart, playing to ruff losing heart in dummy.

It was not clear to me that declarer intended to play either of these lines

Comments by North-South: None.

Comments by East-West: None.

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

Whilst the standard of the declarer may have some relevance, the high standard of the event takes precedence. Care should be taken. It appeared to us very careless – perhaps visualising 12 top tricks in NT while actually playing in clubs

| |
|---------------|
| Richard Fleet |
|---------------|

| |
|------------------------------------|
| I would have retained the deposit. |
|------------------------------------|

| |
|------------------|
| Jeffrey Allerton |
|------------------|

| |
|--|
| I agree with the TD/Appeal Committee ruling, although I don't understand the Appeal Committee's comment about the standard of the event taking precedence. |
|--|

| |
|--------------|
| Paul Lamford |
|--------------|

| |
|---|
| Appeal Committee decision routine and I would have kept the deposit. Several careless lines go off, including drawing trumps and not noticing there is no entry to dummy. |
|---|

| |
|----------|
| Tim Rees |
|----------|

| |
|---|
| The fact that East claimed when she did demonstrates that she was being careless (or thought she was in 6NT). There's no reason to suppose she was going to follow either of the TD's lines. A club to the Q at trick 2 looks a "normal" line under the definition of Law 70. |
|---|

| |
|----------------|
| Heather Dhondy |
|----------------|

| |
|--|
| The ruling seems pretty clear to me, and I am surprised that no consideration to keeping the deposit was documented. |
|--|

APPEAL No : 13.022

Tournament Director: Matt Johnson

Appeals Committee: Tim Rees (Chairman), Derek Oram & Simon Cope

| <p>♠ 3 ♥ QJ8 ♦ AK75 ♣ Q10932</p> <p>♠ J96 ♠ KQ875 ♥ A6 ♥ K109742 ♦ QJ63 ♦ 9 ♣ A876 ♣ K</p> <p>♠ A1042 ♥ 53 ♦ 10842 ♣ J54</p> | <p>Board 9 : Dealer North : EW vulnerable</p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td>1♣ (1)</td><td>2♣ (2)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2♠ H</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♠</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4♠</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Could be short (2) Not alerted.</p> | West | North | East | South | | 1♣ (1) | 2♣ (2) | Pass | 2♠ H | Pass | 3♠ | Pass | 4♠ | All Pass | | |
|---|--|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--|--------|--------|------|------|------|----|------|----|----------|--|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1♣ (1) | 2♣ (2) | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2♠ H | Pass | 3♠ | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4♠ | All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: 5 card majors, 2 over 1 Game Force

East-West play: 5 card majors. Michaels over natural 1♣. No system marked over short club

Form of Scoring: MP's

Result at table:

4♠ = by West, NS -620, lead not given

Director first called: At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:

All players agreed 2♠ was out of tempo.

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

2♠+2 making by West North, NS -170

Details of ruling:

After consulting the directing team I decided that the lack of alert and hesitation suggested that West had a better hand with more spades than the weak overcall, therefore 3♠ is suggested over Pass. We also decided that Pass was a logical alternative. Adjusted the score to 2♠+2. L16B

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Basis of appeal: Not given

Director's comments: No further comments.

Comments by North-South: None.

APPEAL No : 13.022

Comments by East-West: None

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld
Deposit forfeited

Appeals Committee's comments:

West's hesitation provided UI

Consultation showed that Pass was a Logical Alternative and would be the bid found by the majority.
The hesitation (and lack of alert) made 3♠ more likely to be successful than Pass

EW did not provide any reason why the TD's ruling was incorrect

| |
|------------------|
| Jeffrey Allerton |
|------------------|

| |
|---|
| Well explained by both the TD and the Appeal Committee. |
|---|

| |
|--------------|
| Paul Lamford |
|--------------|

| |
|--|
| Correct forfeiture of the deposit, and I would have given at least one Procedural Penalty to EW. Maybe two. |
|--|

| |
|--------------|
| Robin Barker |
|--------------|

| |
|------|
| Good |
|------|

| |
|----------------|
| Heather Dhondy |
|----------------|

| |
|------------------------------------|
| I agree with the Appeal Committee. |
|------------------------------------|

APPEAL No : 13.023

Tournament Director: Nicole Cook

Appeals Committee: Frances Hinden (Chairman), Gunnar Hallberg & Paul Hackett

| <p>♠ 8532 ♥ 962 ♦ AJ65 ♣ 106</p> <p>♠ A9 ♠ KQJ ♥ AJ ♥ KQ105 ♦ 72 ♦ Q1098 ♣ AK87543 ♣ Q2</p> <p>♠ 10764 ♥ 8743 ♦ K43 ♣ J9</p> | <p>Board 14 : Dealer East : 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>1NT</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4♣</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♥</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>7NT</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> | West | North | East | South | | | 1NT | Pass | 4♣ | Pass | 4♥ | Pass | 7NT | All Pass | | |
|--|--|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--|--|-----|------|----|------|----|------|-----|----------|--|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1NT | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4♣ | Pass | 4♥ | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7NT | All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: Not given

East-West play: Not given

Form of Scoring: *MP's*

Result at table:

7NT = by East, NS -1520, lead not given

Director first called: At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:

I was called to the table by North at the end of play, who asked me for a ruling "because East did not have an Ace when West said he did". We reviewed the auction together. EW in turn, explained to the opponents that West had correctly explained their method and East had misbid.

I thanked the players for their explanation then went to collect relevant information about the EW pair's method and system via the Convention Card and by asking about implicit agreements in similar situations that could help to determine whether this was a misbid or misexplanation ruling.

I asked East for clarification of his 4♥ bid. He explained to all that he wasn't too sure when he bid what the agreement was. It was probably A or B and 4♥ seemed the best bid to cater. He stated he was sure his partner was right about the agreement. I asked East why he did not say anything before the lead was made. He explained that he did not think he needed to because partner was right and he was wrong

Director's ruling: Table result stands.

Details of ruling:

In consultation with the CTD, I polled a number of players to learn whether the changed explanation would affect the lead decision in any way. Not one player of a poll of a dozen even considered leading a diamond when told there was no agreement.

I determined that there would be no change of score.

APPEAL No : 13.023

When I gave the ruling to NS they asked to appeal because East had not been given a procedural penalty (PP) for not correcting. I explained that while I polled about South's lead decision, I had not determined it was necessary to correct and hence there was no clarity that a PP was appropriate. Further, I explained that it is not my practice to penalise procedurally for a first offence.

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: Failure to impose a Procedural Penalty.

Director's comments: None.

Comments by North-South: None.

Comments by East-West: None.

Appeals Committee decision:

Table score maintained.

Procedural Penalty imposed

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

Nobody leads a diamond on this auction even with the correct disclosure of "No agreement". Score stands.

Procedural Penalty standard amount to EW.

East has no evidence to prove he has misbid. The correct thing for him to do is to correct partner's explanation to "no agreement". It is an irregularity not to do so. Also, West did not give East a chance to explain 4♣ (which might have highlighted the problem).

EW did not attend so had no way to communicate to the Appeals Committee they had an agreement.

Frances Hinden

The Appeal Committee's ruling may look harsh but I think it is correct, and that more of these penalties should be given. It is sadly far too common to hear partner explain something other than how you understand it, but not to say anything before the opening lead 'because partner is bound to be right'. If you cannot prove that partner's interpretation is correct and yours wrong, and your side is declaring, you are obliged to call attention to this before the opening lead. The E player involved (who of course remains anonymous in this booklet) is both very experienced and knowledgeable and this would have influenced the Appeal Committee in whether he/she ought to have known his/her obligations.

Jeffrey Allerton

The form ought to have recorded the range of 1NT. It appears that the E/W convention card was silent on the meaning of a 4♣ response to 1NT, but it would have been better had this inference been explicitly stated on the appeals form. It is unfortunate that E/W did not attend the appeal and so the Appeal Committee was unable to cross-examine the pair in question. It is interesting that the Appeal Committee adhered to N/S's request to impose a procedural penalty (PP) for the failure to correct an apparent misexplanation at the end of the auction. Does the Laws &

APPEAL No : 13.023

Ethics Committee agree with the Appeal Committee's decision here? If it does then presumably TDs should be awarding PPs routinely for this (relatively common) offence.

Paul Lamford

I completely agree that one can appeal a failure to give a PP and I agree with the Appeal Committee. Interestingly, my partner and I were at the next table, and our opponents had the auction 1NT-2♠*(transfer to clubs)-3♣ (nothing special)-4NT (undiscussed)-5♣-7NT. I did not lead a diamond either, although I think I should have done. My partner thought that East-West might have overheard something from the next table, as the TD was there for a while with some discussion going on about the auction, but the Chief TD's comment at the time, when we called him, was, almost verbatim, "You will need more evidence than that to make such an accusation". Ho ... hum.

Tim Rees

I think the player at fault was West. He should have allowed East to explain the meaning of 4♣, in which case, he'd have said something that suggested either no agreement, or that he'd forgotten. N/S would then have had all of the information they were entitled to. Instead, West explained the entire auction. If East then realises that he'd forgotten the actual agreement, then there is no legal requirement for him to say anything (however, he could not demonstrate that here). But West's actions justify the PP.

Heather Dhondy

I agree with the Appeal Committee. East had a duty to correct to "no agreement" if he was unsure about the agreement and had guessed to do something which his partner had explained as something different. Tough on N/S, but I think a diamond lead is very unlikely. I would consider giving them some proportion of a diamond lead, but not a very high one in truth.

APPEAL No : 13.025

Tournament Director: Sarah Amos

Appeals Committee: Paul Hackett (Chairman), Eddie Lucioni & John Holland

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>♠ 43 ♥ 10753 ♦ QJ983 ♣ J6</p> <p>♠ AK982 ♠ QJ76 ♥ A62 ♥ KQ8 ♦ 10 ♦ A65 ♣ 8752 ♣ A104</p> <p>♠ 105 ♥ J94 ♦ K742 ♣ KQ93</p> | <p>Board 20 : Dealer West : All vulnerable No bidding provided</p> |
|--|--|

Basic systems:

North-South play: Not provided

East-West play: Not provided

Form of Scoring: *MP Pairs*

Result at table:

4 ♠+2 by West, NS -680, lead not given

Director first called: Not given.

Director's statement of facts:

The next round had been called and there was a general hubbub in the room with players waiting to move to this and other tables. West had made 9 tricks and the lead was in dummy. Declarer called for a card and before dummy led, South played ♣Q. This is the point at which I was called to the table. There was a disagreement between South and West about which card had been called for. West said it was ♠Q and South had heard a club. South insisted that he would not have played the ♣Q if a spade had been lead and both East and West insisted that ♠Q had been asked for. South and West could not agree and both made serious accusations about the others ethical standards. I warned them both that their language and behaviour was unacceptable.

South continued to insist that he would not have played his ♣Q on a spade as he knew that it was a master. I asked West which card he had called for and he said ♠Q. to defuse the situation I asked the players to move for the next round and returned to give them my ruling at the end of the evening.

Director's ruling: Table result stands.

Details of ruling:

The facts were not agreed but as West was declarer he is the most likely to know which card he called for and I ruled that it was the ♠Q and that 12 tricks would be made.

South's play of the ♣Q was not unintended and so cannot be changed.

APPEAL No : 13.025

Because dummy had not played the card called for, South's play might technically be considered to be out of rotation and if so it would become a major penalty card.

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: Not provided.

Director's comments: None.

Comments by North-South: None.

Comments by East-West: None.

Appeals Committee decision:

Score assigned for N/S: -650

Score assigned for E/W: +680

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

Due to the noise and in the interest of the spirit of Bridge, although South played before the card was played, we believe that it is unlikely that he would have discarded the ♣Q. However, as technically he was not correct we decided that also EW should get the benefit of the doubt and as such awarded a split score.

L&E comment: This is clearly an illegal decision by the Appeal Committee. Both sides had offended (slow play and arguing) and both sides ended up with a good score. The TD had made the correct ruling.

| |
|----------------|
| Frances Hinden |
|----------------|

| |
|--|
| I hate the Appeal Committee's ruling for two reasons. First the easy one, because it is illegal. But it's not only that. The table was late because the players had been slow. Then South played out of turn, which is an infraction. Then he exchanged sharp words with his opponents, another infraction. Yet in spite of all of this, he gets to escape losing a trick. A properly ethical South, if he had played the ♣Q in identical circumstances, would simply have accepted his -680 and not called the TD. So breaking the rules has been rewarded by the Appeal Committee, which I really object to. |
|--|

| |
|------------------|
| Jeffrey Allerton |
|------------------|

| |
|--|
| The TD had to make a judgement as to which card had been played from dummy and the rest of her ruling followed from there. Appeal Committees are rarely in a position to over-turn the TD on a question of fact and her ruling should probably have been allowed to stand. The actual Appeal Committee decision has no basis in Law. The Appeal Committee ought to have known this, but even if not, shouldn't the TD (or the Chief TD of the event) have advised the Appeal Committee that their decision could not be permitted to stand and asked them to reconsider? |
|--|

APPEAL No : 13.025

Paul Lamford

The Appeal Committee ruling was indeed illegal and the TD's ruling was correct. Perhaps the Appeal Committee needs to go on one of her excellent TD courses.

Tim Rees

This is not what Appeal Committees should do. Both pairs caused a problem, by playing slowly and arguing. Then the Appeal Committee gives them both a good score. Before a ruling giving more than 100% of the match points, someone should consider where the extra points are coming from, as it disadvantages the rest of the field who are behaving themselves.

The TD made a good ruling in a difficult situation.

Robin Barker

There appears to be no legal basis for the Appeal Committee ruling: no law allows the awarding of **assigned** scores which give the two sides in total more than 100% of the match points (or the equivalent at other forms of scoring). The TD determined which cards were played to the disputed trick.

Heather Dhondy

I disagree with everyone! It is ridiculous for declarer to be playing on with two master trumps and a losing club in dummy, especially if they were late finishing, unless I've missed something. I would imagine South was waving the ♣Q to speed up the situation and move on. It seems an obvious 11 tricks.

APPEAL No : 13.026

Tournament Director: Sarah Amos

Appeals Committee: Heather Dhondy (Chairman), Brian Senior & Paul Hackett

| <p>♠ 92 ♥ 652 ♦ A3 ♣ Q107542</p> <p>♠ QJ10875 ♠ A63 ♥ K9 ♥ A104 ♦ 105 ♦ J764 ♣ KJ3 ♣ A86</p> <p>♠ K4 ♥ QJ873 ♦ KQ982 ♣ 9</p> | <p><i>Board 12 : Dealer West : NS vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>2♠ (1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>2NT A(2)</td><td>3♠ A(3)</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl (4)</td><td>4♥</td><td>Pass (5)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Announced as weak. (2) Strong enquiry. (3) Hearts and a minor or asking for a spade stop. (4) No agreement (5) Asked about 3♠ & 4♥. Thought for some time and then passed.</p> | West | North | East | South | 2♠ (1) | Pass | 2NT A(2) | 3♠ A(3) | Dbl (4) | 4♥ | Pass (5) | Pass | Dbl | All Pass | | |
|---|---|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------|------|----------|---------|---------|----|----------|------|-----|----------|--|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2♠ (1) | Pass | 2NT A(2) | 3♠ A(3) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dbl (4) | 4♥ | Pass (5) | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dbl | All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: 12-14 NT and Michaels

East-West play: 11-14 NT, Multi 2♦, 2♥ & 2♠ weak (6-10) but honours and HCP = 10+

Form of Scoring: MP pairs

Result at table:

4♥ x -2 by North, NS -500, lead not given.

Director first called: During the auction.

Director's statement of facts:

I was recalled by South at the end of the hand. She was unhappy about West's final double after questions and a long pause for thought by East. I asked why she had doubled and she said that partner's strong enquiry had shown 15+ points and therefore she knew that NS did not have the values for game.

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

4♠-1 by West, NS 50

Details of ruling:

West has UI from partner's questions and hesitation. Bidding 4♠ is a logical alternative and the UI could demonstrably suggest that doubling 4♥ is likely to be more successful than bidding 4♠. Pass is not a Logical Alternative.

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: Double was not indicated by UI.

Director's comments: None, additionally.

APPEAL No : 13.026

Comments by North-South: None.

Comments by East-West: None.

Appeals Committee decision:

Table score re-instated.

Deposit returned.

Appeals Committee's comments:

We decided that the 2NT bid and the double meant that Pass was not a logical alternative. East's Pass suggests that he is unsure of whether to penalise or go for game and West's outside values makes a penalty more attractive. With, say, KQJxxx in spades, West would now bid 4♠ and East's Pass allows for this choice to be made.

Richard Fleet

I think that pass is a logical alternative. Had East alerted the double of 3♠ and explained it as showing a maximum 2♠ bid, why would West have felt called upon to bid? Unless the double of 3♠ systemically created a force, and the fact that there was no agreement regarding its meaning gives the lie to this suggestion, West is surely allowed to pass.

Frances Hinden

I don't understand the TD's ruling at all; the Appeal Committee makes much more sense. I can see only two possible rulings: either to 4♥ undoubled (if you don't accept that 2NT promised a strong hand) or to 4♥ doubled if you do. Many pairs play that 2NT doesn't promise a strong hand but could be weak with support: in that case, West has UI suggesting acting over passing. However, both the TD and Appeal Committee accepted that 2NT promised strength and thus passing was not a logical alternative for West.

Jeffrey Allerton

I agree with the Appeal Committee. It is hard to see how East's second round actions could suggest double over 4♠.

Paul Lamford

No adjustment. If it had been right to bid 4♠, East would have bid it by now. You are maximum for 2♠ with good defence. Pass must be forcing at these colours where saving will clearly be cheap.

Tim Rees

East's hesitation shows doubt and is UI. However, his pass also shows doubt, and that is AI. There is little difference between the information conveyed by the hesitation and the pass, and West is entitled to use the AI.

APPEAL No : 13.026

Robin Barker

The appeals form allows the TD to answer a number of questions in UI cases, and when the Appeal Committee reach a different decision they are supposed to say which answer they disagree with. It would be good to know if the Appeal Committee disagree that Double was suggested over 4♠ or disagree that 4♠ is a logical alternative (or disagree with both). I think the Appeal Committee are saying that there is no logical alternative to Double because East's Pass is forcing and West has poor spades and outside defensive values.

APPEAL No : 13.034

Tournament Director: Ted Hill

Appeals Committee: David Burn (Chairman), Cath Jagger & John Atthey

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>♠ A108 ♥ K1042 ♦ Q85 ♣ 742</p> <p>♠ 9652 ♠ K74 ♥ 765 ♥ Q983 ♦ K10 ♦ 97632 ♣ K1083 ♣ 9</p> <p>♠ QJ3 ♥ AJ ♦ AJ4 ♣ AQJ65</p> | <p>Board 9 : Dealer North : EW vulnerable</p> <p>Contract 3NT by South</p> |
|--|--|

Basic systems:

North-South play: Not given.

East-West play: Not given.

Form of Scoring: Pachabo

Note by editor: 'Pachabo' is an unusual form a hybrid scoring (partly point a board, partly based on total points) no longer used in England.

Result at table:

Lead ♠6. Claim made and ruled upon

Director first called:

At the point at which the claim was made.

| | W | N | E | S |
|----|----|-----|----|----|
| 1 | ♠6 | ♠8 | ♠K | ♠3 |
| 2 | ♦K | ♦5 | ♦2 | ♦J |
| 3 | ♠5 | ♠10 | ♠4 | ♠J |
| 4 | | | | |
| 5 | | | | |
| 6 | | | | |
| 7 | | | | |
| 8 | | | | |
| 9 | | | | |
| 10 | | | | |
| 11 | | | | |
| 12 | | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>♠ A108 ♥ K1042 ♦ Q85 ♣ 742</p> <p>♠ 9652 ♠ K74 ♥ 765 ♥ Q983 ♦ K10 ♦ 97632 ♣ K1083 ♣ 9</p> <p>♠ QJ3 ♥ AJ ♦ AJ4 ♣ AQJ65</p> | <p>Board 9 : Dealer North : EW vulnerable</p> <p>Trick 1 Trick 2 Trick 3</p> |
|--|--|

A claim was made at this stage. Subsequently, West wished to withdraw his concession saying there was no normal line of play to make (the contract).

APPEAL No : 13.034

Director's statement of facts:

The claim (see above) was accepted and later withdrawn claiming that there was no normal line of play that would succeed.

I ruled that declarer would recognise that the clubs needed to break or the heart finesse to succeed. He could enter dummy with the ♦Q and lead towards ♥J and finesse. He can then cash ♥A etc. he could use ♠A to get back to the ♥K and would find that the clubs do break

Director's ruling:

I ruled the above play 'normal' and allowed the original claim. L71

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Basis of appeal: None given but see comments from players, below.

Director's comments: No further comments.

Comments by North-South:

The other normal line of play is to test the clubs then play A♥ and J♥ losing to West who is known to have 4 spades in any event.

Comments by East-West:

The claim was flawed. I was about to clear the spades when declarer claimed 10 tricks. This unsettled me and I accepted the revised claim of 9 tricks.

However, I had led 2nd highest spade so the location of the 13th spade was unknown. Declarer has, therefore, two lines that are reasonable and the TD has ruled that he will guess the correct one.

Appeals Committee decision:

Score assigned for both sides:

3NT-1 by South, NS -50

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

After consultation with the Chief TD, we find that the appropriate Law is 69B2 and not 71. We consider that since declarer revised his claim from 10 to 9 tricks on finding that West had a club stop, there is sufficient likelihood that he would have conceded both a club and a long spade in actual play.

The TD's ruling was perfectly correct under L71, but clear deliberation we felt compelled to reject it. This should be referred to L&E committee

L&E Comment: Good effort by the Appeal Committee. There are three levels of contested claim/concession. Law 71 (a withdrawn concession) is the hardest to get a trick back from. Law 70 (contested claim) is the normal one – any doubt is resolved against the claimer. In Law 69 (withdrawal of agreement), there is less doubt – the non claimer only gets a trick he 'would likely have won had play continued'. Our reading of that is that it needs to be more than 50%. It's not clear the Appeal Committee used 50% as a benchmark – they refer to 'sufficient likelihood' which sounds more like a Law 70 ruling. However, the final ruling of 8 tricks was correct.

APPEAL No : 13.034

Jeffrey Allerton

The Appeal Committee followed the correct procedure here. After reviewing the case, the Appeal Committee determined that the TD might have made a mistake in Law. Rather than automatically ruling on the basis that the original ruling had used the wrong Law, the Appeal Committee explained the problem to the Chief TD who was himself able to confirm whether the wrong Law had been applied. Law 93B3 states that the Appeal Committee may not over-rule the Chief TD on a matter of Law or regulation.

Paul Lamford

Good effort by the eminent Appeal Committee to get the right decision of 3NT-1

Tim Rees

My interpretation of Law 69B2 is that both sides are at least partially at fault, so tricks are assigned based on overall likelihood of what might have happened.

Robin Barker

I was the Chief TD. The point of divergence between the Appeal Committee and TD is that once one side claims, they are the claiming side. If there is disagreement and the other side propose a different number of tricks, this counter-proposal is not a claim/concession. When a number of tricks is agreed and the other (non-claiming) side subsequently want more tricks, this is "agreement withdrawn" (Law 69B) not "concession cancelled" (Law 71).

Heather Dhondy

I agree with the Appeal Committee. There is no particular reason to guess the hearts right and in practice he is quite likely to go down.

APPEAL No : 13.036

Tournament Director: Matt Johnson

Appeals Committee: Brian Senior (Chairman), Gary Hyatt and Celia Oram

| <p>♠ 543 ♥ 7542 ♦ 54 ♣ Q742</p> <p>♠ J987 ♠ AQ ♥ AKQJ ♥ 1086 ♦ Q ♦ KJ10832 ♣ AK93 ♣ J10</p> <p>♠ K1062 ♥ 93 ♦ A976 ♣ 865</p> | <p><i>Board 17 : Dealer North : Love all</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td>Pass</td><td>1♦</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2NT (1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>3NT (2)</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) 16+ balanced (2) Minimum</p> | West | North | East | South | | Pass | 1♦ | Pass | 2NT (1) | Pass | 3NT (2) | All Pass |
|--|---|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--|------|----|------|---------|------|---------|----------|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Pass | 1♦ | Pass | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2NT (1) | Pass | 3NT (2) | All Pass | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: Benji Acol, weak NT

East-West play: Acol, 4 card majors, weak NT

Form of Scoring: IMP's

Result at table:

3NT +2 by West, NS -460, lead ♣2

Director first called: Before play.

Director's statement of facts:

I was called by West before the board to say she had heard "It goes off on a club lead". I directed that they play the board (L16C2(c)). After the match the opposing team asked for a ruling because they thought that the Pass of 3NT was affected by the Extraneous Information (extraneous information)

Director's ruling: Average 60/60 assigned for both sides.

Details of ruling:

I felt that the board could have been affected by the extraneous information and therefore ruled it unplayable and awarded average + to both sides

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Basis of appeal: None written

Director's comments: None.

Comments by North-South: None.

Comments by East-West: None.

APPEAL No : 13.036

Appeals Committee decision:

Table score re-instated.
Deposit returned.

Appeals Committee's comments:

West did what she was required to do when she called the TD. We are very unhappy with EW being allowed to play on but when they then have a 'good' result having it taken away. Presumably, had they had a 'bad' result they would have been stuck with it. There is no justice in such a situation. We believe West to be worth a raise to 4NT which East would Pass. But we are unhappy with West's arguments as to why she passed. She is clearly an honest but weak player.

L&E Comment: The Chief TD noted that (in a change from the 1997 laws) under the 2007 Laws, the action taken by the TD was legal (16C2(c)) – to allow the board to be played and be standing ready to award an adjusted score if he judges that unauthorized information has affected the result. The Chief TD said that in general this law change has been a beneficial one.

However, this can lead to situations like the current one, where the Appeal Committee felt that it was unfair to take away a good result from EW. The Appeal Committee didn't consider NS, who were stuck with a bad result, potentially as a result of the extraneous information heard by West. This extraneous information could have affected West's decision over 3NT (even if only subconsciously). The L&E Committee felt that the TD's ruling was correct.

| |
|----------------|
| Frances Hinden |
|----------------|

| |
|--|
| The form of scoring is given as IMPs; if this was a teams event the TD should also have ascertained the result at the other table in case Law 86d was needed. I note that this was a proper Appeal Committee hearing, as the appeal was against the TD's judgement that the UI had affected the result, not against the application of Law itself. |
|--|

| |
|------------------|
| Jeffrey Allerton |
|------------------|

| |
|---|
| The Appeal Committee has not explained why, in Law, the TD's ruling should be overturned. |
|---|

| |
|--------------|
| Paul Lamford |
|--------------|

| |
|---|
| West would have assumed that it was a slam that went off on a club lead, not 3NT, and therefore she had extraneous information which made it more attractive to pass 3NT. I would judge that extraneous information did affect the result, and award 60/60. |
|---|

| |
|----------|
| Tim Rees |
|----------|

| |
|--|
| Law 16C2c allows the completion of the board, but requires the TD to be standing ready to award an adjusted score if he judges that the extraneous information may have affected the result. He shouldn't need to wait for the opposition to raise the issue. I think it would have been best for the TD to stop the board after East bid 3NT (or after West passed it). West's decision at that point must have been influenced (if only subconsciously) by the extraneous information. |
|--|

APPEAL No : 13.036

Robin Barker

Law 16C2(c) allows for the players to continue to play a hand rather than get an artificial score, but in being allowed to play the players are non-offending yet under constraint of not taking advantage of the extraneous information. As noted by the Appeal Committee and L&E, it is often preferable to not allow play to continue, at least when the overheard remark is likely to be accurate.

Heather Dhondy

I wonder if the overheard comment was referring to this board since there appears to be no contract that is lead critical. 6NT goes down on any sensible lead from either side, and 6♦ is unbreakable. However this is perhaps irrelevant if the comment, however spurious, was deemed to have put West off bidding. The Appeal Committee refer to West's arguments as to why she passed, which we do not have, but judging from their comments I would judge that the extraneous information was part of her argument, in which case I agree with the TD's ruling.

APPEAL No : 13.039

Tournament Director: Janet Hempson

Appeals Committee: Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), Clive Owen & Brian Senior

| <p>♠ 4 ♥ J10983 ♦ AKJ5 ♣ AJ8 ♠ AK97 ♠ J82 ♥ A7642 ♥ 5 ♦ 72 ♦ 8643 ♣ Q10 ♣ K7652 ♠ Q10653 ♥ KQ ♦ Q109 ♣ 943</p> | <p><i>Board 32 : Dealer West : EW vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>1♠</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>2NT A (1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♠</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>3NT</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Alerted, no one asked and no explanation given.</p> | West | North | East | South | 1♥ | Pass | Pass | 1♠ | Pass | 2NT A (1) | Pass | 3♠ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass | |
|--|---|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|----|------|------|----|------|-----------|------|----|------|-----|----------|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1♥ | Pass | Pass | 1♠ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass | 2NT A (1) | Pass | 3♠ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: 5 card majors

East-West play: 4 card majors and variable NT

Form of Scoring: MP's

Result at table:

3NT+1 by North, NS +430, lead ♣5

Director first called: At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:

South said she understood North's 2NT bid to show a 4 card raise in spades. North meant 2NT as a natural bid.

East was concerned about the bid of 3NT, in view of there being an alert. The problem was not misinformation but a question of UI

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

60% of 3♠-2,

20% of 4♠-3

20% of 4♠x-3

Details of ruling:

I ruled that the alert of North's 2NT bid had given UI to North which he used to remove the 3♠ bid and bid 3NT. I gave a weighted adjusted score to reflect several potential results. Law 16, Law 12C1(c)

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: Not given

APPEAL No : 13.039

Director's comments: No further comments

Comments by North-South: None.

Comments by East-West:

3NT looks unlikely if 2NT had not been alerted.

Appeals Committee decision:

Score assigned for both sides:

3♠-2 by South, NS -100

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

The score is adjusted to 3♠-2.

We believed that North had used UI to bid 3NT (he said 2NT showed 14-15). He was in this range and had no fit for spades. As his 3NT bid was disallowed we did not feel any results including 4♠ should be considered.

Jeffrey Allerton

The form does not specify, but I'd be interested to know the basis on which the TD judged that there were several potential results. I suspect that she followed the correct procedure of polling peers of North and discovered that, although pass was most common, a minority raised to 4♠ (not too surprising given that 4♠ could easily be making opposite various hands with short hearts). If this happened, the Appeal Committee was wrong to remove 4♠ contracts from consideration. The fact that (presumably) none of the Appeal Committee members would themselves have bid 4♠ is not relevant. The job of an Appeal Committee is to review a TD's ruling, taking into account all of the evidence that was gathered by the TD. The Appeal Committee should *not* start from scratch with their own ruling. N/S's basis of appeal is not recorded, but if it was "I would always pass 3♠" then my response would be "you had the opportunity to demonstrate that by passing 3♠ at the table".

Paul Lamford

Agree with Appeal Committee. Standard misuse of UI.

Tim Rees

I assume the TD and Appeal Committee investigated what South's 3♠ would mean over a natural 2NT. In the direct overcalling position, it would normally show a hand stronger than 2♠ immediately and would logically be forcing. In the protective position, it might have shown a weaker hand.

Robin Barker

The TD appears to have erred by including the possibility of NS reaching 4♠, but the possible auctions to 4♠ involve South not passing over 3♠ and any bid by South is suggested over Pass. As the Appeal Committee ruled, the only legal action by North is Pass, so the only adjustment is to a contact of 3♠.

APPEAL No : 13.039

Heather Dhondy

I agree with the Appeals committee. I don't understand why there was any weighting of 4♠ since North has no action over the 3♠ bid, having invited game with 2NT and holding no fit for spades.

APPEAL No : 13.049

Tournament Director: Kathy Williams

Appeals Committee: Brian Senior (Chairman), David Gold and Simon Cope

| <p>♠ J ♥ AK83 ♦ K753 ♣ A1086</p> <p>♠ K8 ♠ 10765 ♥ Q5 ♥ 742 ♦ AQJ1062 ♦ 94 ♣ Q95 ♣ J432</p> <p>♠ AQ9432 ♥ J1096 ♦ 8 ♣ K7</p> | <p><i>Board 5 : Dealer North : NS vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td>1♦ (1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>1♠</td></tr><tr><td>2♦ A (2)</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♣</td><td>3♠</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>3NT</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Announced may be 2 (2) Alerted showing hearts and clubs</p> | West | North | East | South | | 1♦ (1) | Pass | 1♠ | 2♦ A (2) | Pass | 3♣ | 3♠ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass | |
|--|--|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--|--------|------|----|----------|------|----|----|------|-----|----------|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1♦ (1) | Pass | 1♠ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2♦ A (2) | Pass | 3♣ | 3♠ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: strong club 14-16 NT

East-West play: strong club 10-12 or 14-16 NT

Form of Scoring: MP's

Result at table:

3NT making by North, NS+600, lead ♣2

Director first called: At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:

North called for two reasons:

- 1 He thought West might have UI because after the club lead, as soon as West got in he switched to a diamond and
- 2 He felt they would find their heart fit with the correct information.

EW had no written evidence of what 2♦ showed. System card shows x for take out (ie treat as natural). EW say 2♦ was Michaels after 2 bids.

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

4♥+1, NS +650

Details of ruling:

Misinformation. If North had been given the correct information then 2♥ would show 4 hearts and 13-15 points and they would get to a 4♥ contract

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Basis of appeal: Feel they have evidence of bid showing hearts and clubs.

APPEAL No : 13.049

Director's comments: No further comments.

Comments by North-South: None.

Comments by East-West: None.

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld
Deposit forfeited

Appeals Committee's comments:

The appellants could not give any convincing proof of their agreement. At the table, it is clear that they saw the situation in two different ways. No agreement means misinformation.

Frances Hinden

The TD and the Appeal Committee have this basically right, but why no percentage of 4♥+2? Eleven tricks may be the most common result, but there are ways to get to twelve.

Jeffrey Allerton

Was the correct explanation deemed to be showing a 2-suiter or "no agreement"? Either way, it's not clear to me why North would bid 2♥ given a correct explanation; this seems to be gambling on partner having 4-card support. However, I believe that South might well double 3♣ for take-out enabling N/S to find their heart fit that way. E/W suggested that West's defence against 3NT may have been affected by UI but it is difficult to comment on that without knowing how the play went at the table.

Nobody seems to have considered the UI during the auction. If 2♦ was natural (as West thought), then 3♣ is presumably showing East's own suit and tolerance/support for diamonds. Given this information, it is at least a logical alternative for West to compete to 5 of a minor at favourable vulnerability over N/S's 4♥ contract. On this basis I'd have adjusted the score to a weighting of 5♦ doubled -5 and 5♦ doubled -6.

Paul Lamford

Agree with Appeal Committee and forfeited deposit.

Tim Rees

OK, as long as the TD and Appeal Committee are sure that 2♥ from North would show this hand type.

Robin Barker

EW should have known they were not going to win the appeal, if the basis of the appeal was that they *feel* they have evidence. To have a chance they needed clear evidence of an agreement that 2 of a minor showed the remaining suits, even when 1 of a minor could be (as short as) two.

APPEAL No : 13.049

Heather Dhondy

The ruling seems pretty straight-forward and I am comfortable with the forfeiting of the deposit. The only thing I would query is the number of tricks assigned to 4♥. Surely they will make 12 tricks at least some proportion of the time with the favourable trump lie. It doesn't look that unlikely to me.

APPEAL No : 13.050

Tournament Director: James Vickers

Appeals Committee: Heather Dhondy (Chairman), Tom Townsend and Gunnar Hallberg

| <p>♠ 6 ♥ K84 ♦ AJ6 ♣ J87543</p> <p>♠ J94 ♠ 32 ♥ A10 ♥ QJ9632 ♦ 109853 ♦ KQ2 ♣ KQ10 ♣ A2</p> <p>♠ AKQ10875 ♥ 75 ♦ 74 ♣ 96</p> | <p><i>Board 19 : Dealer South : EW vulnerable</i></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>3♠</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♥</td><td>Pass H</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>4♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>5♥</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>H hesitation alleged by East, not explicitly agreed by NS, although South admitted he had thought for the "normal amount of time" after the bid on his right.</p> | West | North | East | South | | | | 3♠ | Pass | Pass | 4♥ | Pass H | Pass | 4♠ | Pass | Pass | 5♥ | All Pass | | |
|--|--|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--|--|--|----|------|------|----|--------|------|----|------|------|----|----------|--|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 3♠ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass | Pass | 4♥ | Pass H | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass | 4♠ | Pass | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5♥ | All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: Acol within limits, 5 card majors, 14-16 NT

East-West play: Strong NT, 5 card majors.

Form of Scoring: MP's

Result at table:

5♥-2 by East, NS +200, lead ♠A

Director first called: After the 4♠ bid by North.

Director's statement of facts:

Although there was some dispute, I decided that there had been a break in tempo as EW claimed. South admitted thinking and North claimed his partner was a habitually slow player. South is, by his own admission, inexperienced. (Master)

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

4♥-1 by East, NS +100

Details of ruling:

North has UI from the hesitation which suggest that bidding 4♠ would be more successful. Pass is a logical alternative. I considered whether West's 5♥ could be a gambling action but decided it wasn't.

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: Not given.

Director's comments: None.

APPEAL No : 13.050

Comments by North-South: None.

Comments by East-West: None.

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

We found that there had been a hesitation by South following some questions.

Deposit returned due to the inexperience of the NS pair. The 4♠ is suggested by the hesitation and therefore disallowed.

| |
|------------------|
| Jeffrey Allerton |
|------------------|

| |
|---|
| Were N/S offered the opportunity to speak to an 'appeals consultant' about the ruling? If not, it's fair enough to return the deposit to an inexperienced pair, who plainly did not understand the UI Laws. |
|---|

| |
|--------------|
| Paul Lamford |
|--------------|

| |
|---|
| Agree with the Appeal Committee and agree with the return of the deposit for the inexperienced pair, but would have asked the TD to tell them that next time they might not get their money back! |
|---|

| |
|----------|
| Tim Rees |
|----------|

| |
|--|
| Although 4♠ was in theory an unsuccessful action (4♥ and 4♠ are both going down), it gained at the table and therefore has to be disallowed once North is in receipt of UI. East/West continued to play bridge (5♥ was neither wild nor gambling), so they get the benefit of an adjusted score as well. |
|--|

| |
|--------------|
| Robin Barker |
|--------------|

| |
|---|
| This appeal appears to have been a waste of everyone's time: we take deposits for appeals to try to prevent this. |
|---|

APPEAL No : 13.054

Tournament Director: Sarah Amos

Appeals Committee: Brian Senior (Chairman), Michael Byrne and Malcolm Pryor

| <p>♠ 853 ♥ AKQJ10 ♦ AK2 ♣ 85</p> <p>♠ AKQ10942 ♠ J76 ♥ 4 ♥ 53 ♦ J7 ♦ 109543 ♣ Q102 ♣ AKJ</p> <p>♠ - ♥ 98762 ♦ Q86 ♣ 97643</p> | <p><i>Board 22 : Dealer East : EW vulnerable</i></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>1♠</td><td>2♥</td><td>2♠</td><td>4♥</td></tr><tr><td>4♠</td><td>Pass H</td><td>Pass</td><td>5♥</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>Dbl</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>There was an agreed hesitation by North before passing.</p> | West | North | East | South | | | Pass | Pass | 1♠ | 2♥ | 2♠ | 4♥ | 4♠ | Pass H | Pass | 5♥ | Pass | Pass | Dbl | All Pass |
|---|---|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--|--|------|------|----|----|----|----|----|--------|------|----|------|------|-----|----------|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Pass | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1♠ | 2♥ | 2♠ | 4♥ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4♠ | Pass H | Pass | 5♥ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass | Pass | Dbl | All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: Not given

East-West play: Not given.

Form of Scoring: *Total IMP's*

Result at table:

5♥ x making by North, NS +650, lead not given

Director first called: After South bid 5♥

Director's statement of facts:

I was called after the 5♥ bid and the hesitation was agreed by all the players. I told EW to call me back if they felt they had been damaged. I was recalled at the end of the hand. I asked South why he had bid 5♥ and he cited favourable vulnerability, his spade void and partner's failure to double 4♠.

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

4♠ making by West, NS -620

Details of ruling:

South has UI from partner's hesitation and chose an alternative which could have been suggested by the UI. L16 B1a

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: Not provided.

Director's comments: No further comments

APPEAL No : 13.054

Comments by North-South: None.

Comments by East-West: None.

Appeals Committee decision:

Table score re-instated

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

1. The break in tempo does NOT suggest bidding on – It is just as likely that North is considering a penalty double as she is of bidding 5♥.
2. We consider the 5♥ bid to be completely automatic for the reasons given by South.

TD's need to consult with players in the peer group of the player concerned not just other TD's.

| |
|---------------|
| Richard Fleet |
|---------------|

| |
|---|
| This could be cited as the clearest possible example of a hand where a player is entitled to bid on after a hesitant pass by his partner. |
|---|

| |
|----------------|
| Frances Hinden |
|----------------|

| |
|--|
| The TD's ruling does not mention any poll at all. This is clearly an obvious poll problem: it is a reasonable argument that pass over 4♠ is not a logical alternative, and that is something a poll would help to clarify. |
|--|

| |
|--------------|
| Paul Lamford |
|--------------|

| |
|--|
| Agree with the Appeal Committee. I was polled at the time and bid 5♥ very quickly. |
|--|

| |
|----------|
| Tim Rees |
|----------|

| |
|--|
| The Appeal Committee's comment that North might be considering a penalty double is correct in theory but in practice slow passes are almost always about bidding on. I don't think people pass slowly when they might make a penalty double, they pass slowly when they want to bid. The likelihood of North considering bidding is sufficient to satisfy the "demonstrably suggested" requirement of Law 16B1a. However, the Appeal Committee concluded that there were no logical alternatives to South's 5♥ bid, and on that basis, the bid would be allowed. |
|--|

| |
|----------------|
| Heather Dhondy |
|----------------|

| |
|--|
| South is indeed in receipt of UI, however there appears to be no other logical alternative once partner has failed to double 4♠. If partner can't double it, it's certainly making, and 5♥ is obviously going to be cheap. I agree with the Appeals Committee. |
|--|

APPEAL No : 13.060

Tournament Director: Mike Amos

Appeals Committee: Jeff Smith (Referee)

| <p>♠ J107642 ♥ 6 ♦ 10974 ♣ 102</p> <p>♠ KQ9 ♠ - ♥ A5 ♥ KQJ87 ♦ K3 ♦ AQJ2 ♣ AKQ943 ♣ 8765</p> <p>♠ A853 ♥ 109432 ♦ 865 ♣ J</p> <p>Screens in use</p> | <p>Board 16 : Dealer West : EW vulnerable</p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>2♣ (1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♥ (2)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4♣ (3)</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♦ (4)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4NT (5)</td><td>Pass</td><td>5♦ (6)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>6NT (7)</td><td>Pass</td><td>7♣</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) GF or nearly GF or 2♦ weak (2) 16+ asks. (3) GF/near GF with clubs (4) ♦ or ♦ cue for clubs (5) KCB (6) 1430 if ♦ 3041 if ♣ (7) Agreed slow</p> | | | | West | North | East | South | 2♣ (1) | Pass | 2♥ (2) | Pass | 4♣ (3) | Pass | 4♦ (4) | Pass | 4NT (5) | Pass | 5♦ (6) | Pass | 6NT (7) | Pass | 7♣ | All Pass |
|---|---|--------|----------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|---------|------|--------|------|---------|------|----|----------|
| | West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2♣ (1) | Pass | 2♥ (2) | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4♣ (3) | Pass | 4♦ (4) | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4NT (5) | Pass | 5♦ (6) | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6NT (7) | Pass | 7♣ | All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: not given

East-West play: 15-17 NT, 2♣ strong or weak ♦, 2 over 1 GF 5 card majors.

Form of Scoring: IMP's to VP's

Result at table:

7♣= by West, lead ♠J

Director first called: At end of hand.

Director's statement of facts:

TD called by North. East had agreed that the tray had been on SW side of the screen for some time on the round where West bid 6NT. West agreed that he had thought for some time about the 5♦ response and which suit was agreed. It only made sense if 4♦ cue not suit.

I asked East why he bid 7♣ - he said 6NT showed that partner had ♥A because he held ♥KQJ. This meant that it was likely that ♠A was missing key card. (EW pointed out it might be ♣A (or ♣K)). When responding to 4NT (before any hesitation) East had shown North 7♣ suggesting he had thought about bidding this directly.

Director's ruling: Table result stands

Details of ruling:

Result stands. While Pass may be a logical alternative, slow 6NT does not suggest that 7♣ is more likely to succeed than Pass.

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: Think slow 6NT suggests 7♣

APPEAL No : 13.060

Director's comments:

This depends on what is suggested by a slow 6NT. TD believes that 6NT shows a key card is missing but slowness does not indicate which key card it is. 6NT suggests West has ♥A.

Comments by North-South:

We think a fast 6NT would confirm a missing key card and a slow one suggests they actually have them all.

Having shown 16+ with 2♥, this hand isn't in a position to overrule partner.

Comments by East-West: None.

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld.
Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

The salient point is whether the slow 6NT bid suggests that bidding 7♣ would be more successful than Pass. I consulted with several good players and there was a split of opinion whether to Pass 6NT as partner "knows what he is doing" or bidding 7♣ "partner is most likely protecting his ♠K". On balance I decided that the slow 6NT does not influence the choice of whether to bid 7♣, hence it is allowed.

Frances Hinden

I think this is a deposit keeper. North South have not managed to come up with any good reason why the slow 6NT suggests bidding on. Personally, I also do not think there is any UI from a slow 6NT bid in this auction to start with – it is unclear what suit has been agreed, and (at IMPs) West has now decided to choose to play in NT unilaterally when he partner has not been able to define his hand. I would be surprised if any 6NT bid in such an auction were not very slow.

Jeffrey Allerton

I agree with the TD/Appeal Committee ruling. I reject N/S's claim that a slow 6NT suggests all of the key cards. Why wouldn't such a hand bid 5♠ or 5NT to let partner (who is unlimited) into the secret?

Paul Lamford

The Referee was wrong in Law. When he consulted and found there was a split opinion whether to Pass 6NT or bid 7♣, then he should have imposed the former. It is an logical alternative and bidding 7♣ is demonstrably suggested as partner is much less likely to have the ♠A.

Tim Rees

I like this ruling – the slowness of 6NT does not suggest anything in particular. It does not indicate which key card might be missing.

APPEAL No : 13.060

Heather Dhondy

I don't believe that a slow 6NT makes bidding 7♣ more or less likely to be right so agree with the ruling. I don't accept that a slow 6NT suggests all keycards are present since the East hand is unlimited, therefore West would certainly consult further about a grand if all keycards were present. East took a gamble that the missing keycard was the ♠A which doesn't seem unreasonable after partner's jump to 4♣ and knowing that he held ♥A.

APPEAL No : 13.061

Tournament Director: Gordon Rainsford

Appeals Committee: Jeff Smith (Referee)

| <p>♠ KJ10642 ♥ AQ ♦ 10953 ♣ 4</p> <p>♠ A ♥ J98632 ♦ J7 ♣ AK32</p> <p>♠ 753 ♥ 7 ♦ A642 ♣ QJ1095</p> | <p><i>Board 12 : Dealer West : NS vulnerable</i></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>2NT (1)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4♥</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Heart raise – alerted by East but not to South by West.</p> <p>Screens in use</p> | <i>West</i> | <i>North</i> | <i>East</i> | <i>South</i> | 1♥ | 1♠ | 2NT (1) | Pass | 4♥ | All Pass | | |
|--|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----|----|---------|------|----|----------|--|--|
| | <i>West</i> | <i>North</i> | <i>East</i> | <i>South</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| 1♥ | 1♠ | 2NT (1) | Pass | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4♥ | All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: Not given

East-West play: Not given

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

Result at table:

4♥ making by West, NS -420, lead ♦10

Director first called: When dummy went down

Director's statement of facts:

East's 2NT was systematically a heart raise but South was not alerted to this. He said that he would have doubled it for takeout had it been alerted and this would have meant that his partner would be more likely to lead a club rather than a diamond.

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

50% of 4♥-1 by West and 50% of 4♥= by West.

Details of ruling:

Misinformation. With the correct information I am happy to accept that South would make a takeout double. He says he would do this in preference to raising spades as he has three low and his values are in the minors. A double would make it more likely for North to lead a club rather than a diamond. With sympathetic weighting to the non-offending side, I gave them 50% of the outcome if they had led a club and defended properly thereafter. L12C1c and L21B3

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Basis of appeal: Not given.

APPEAL No : 13.061

Director's comments: None.

Comments by North-South: None.

Comments by East-West: None.

Appeals Committee decision:

Table score re-instated

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

Having discussed with another player, along with my own strong view that doubling the 2NT makes it less clear (rather than more) likely to lead a club. Along with some doubt on whether a double would be made (rather than 3♠), leading a club is more likely damage partner's club holding especially since holding AQ♥ it doesn't appear you want a club ruff. For these reasons I feel strongly the table score should stand.

Note by editor:

Appeals from the Premier League have traditionally been done by a referee either by phone or on site. The pool of available referees is considerably reduced as many of the appeal referees are playing in the event. The Selection Committee will make its own regulations for appeals for next season.

| |
|---|
| Richard Fleet |
| I agree with the TD's ruling. I don't follow the Referee's rationale that the double of 2NT makes a club lead less attractive. North has no idea whether or not he wants a club ruff and will not find out until he discovers the location of HK. |

| |
|---|
| Jeffrey Allerton |
| I prefer the Referee's ruling to the TD's. It also occurs to me that if South did choose to take positive action over an alerted 2NT, that might well persuade North to compete to 4♠, which would be doubled for -500. As this score is worse than the table result for the non-offending side, this would be another way to conclude no damage. |

| |
|---|
| Paul Lamford |
| I prefer the TD ruling. South would double for takeout, and North is then MORE likely to lead a club. If partner has something like ♣ KJ and ♦ A, we might well need a club lead first. |

| |
|--|
| Tim Rees |
| The TD carried out a consultation, then the Referee substituted his own judgement. The Appeal Committee/Referee has to be careful not to act as if they are hearing the case from scratch, e.g. ignoring any consultation that the TD has done, and replacing it with their own opinion. All they should be doing is adding to the consultation already carried out. |

APPEAL No : 13.061

Robin Barker

In misinformation cases, the TD will tend to believe the non-offending side when they say they would do the right thing with different information. The Appeal Committee can be more skeptical and are less likely to be generous to the non-offending side.

Heather Dhondy

I agree with the referee. I fail to see the correlation between the double and the lead. It's also worth noting that it was South who suggested the lead would be more likely if he had doubled, but we didn't hear anything from North.

APPEAL No : 13.064

Tournament Director: Gordon Rainsford

Appeals Committee: Graham Kirby, (consulted with Steve Barnfield)

| | | | | |
|--|---|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| <p>♠ AQJ104 ♥ A1085 ♦ QJ ♣ A10</p> <p>♠ K9653 ♠ 8 ♥ 72 ♥ KQ94 ♦ A932 ♦ 5 ♣ K2 ♣ QJ76543</p> <p>♠ 72 ♥ J63 ♦ K108764 ♣ 98</p> | <i>Board 18 : Dealer East : NS vulnerable</i> | | | |
| | West | North | East | South |
| | | Pass | Pass | |
| 1♠ | Dbl | 2♣ (1) | 3♦ (2) | |
| Pass | 3NT | 4♣ | Pass | |
| Pass | 4NT | All Pass | | |
| <p>(1) Alerted by West to South (without absolute certainty) as Drury. South looked at the system card which confirmed explicitly that this is, indeed, the case, even over a double. East failed to alert this because he had forgotten the system, but confirmed afterwards that this is the system.</p> <p>(2) South said that his 3♦ weaker because of the opponents fit.</p> <p>Screens in use.</p> | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: Not given

East-West play: Not given

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

Result at table:

4NT-5 by North, NS -500, lead ♠8

Director first called: At end of hand.

Director's statement of facts:

South initially argued that he would not have bid 3♦ which he said was weaker when the opponents have shown a fit. When it became clear that he had not been misinformed, he said that the opponents had fielded a misbid. Neither I nor the three people I consulted thought this was the case. North then argued that he would be less likely to bid 4NT because he would know that his partner was weaker. Again, we were not persuaded by the argument.

Director's ruling: Table result stands.

Details of ruling:

Table result stands. South was not misinformed and I was not persuaded by North's argument that he would not have bid in the same way if he had been told that 2♣ was Drury.

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: Believe North would not have bid 4NT.

Director's comments: None.

APPEAL No : 13.064

Comments by North-South:

Our first contention is that, on the Drury auction, 3♦ is preparing partner for a decision over 4♠. As such, it is based more on shape than high cards. (Although the bid seems wild on 2-3-6-2 given that the opponents appear to have a 10 or 9 card spade fit as little as:

♠6
♥KQ10x
♦Axxx
♣Axxx

makes 4♠ cold and 5♦ only one off if they find best defence).

More significant, however, is North's perception of the East hand over 4♣. Passing then bidding this way marks East with 7 clubs and 4 hearts leaving North with little defence to 4♣ and a genuine chance to shut East out in NT with clubs 7-2-2-2 around the table. North believed pass to be forcing. If North receives the correct explanation, he will place East with 3 spades and 6 clubs, which gives him many more tricks in 4♣ and makes it look like clubs are 6-3, making 4NT hopeless.

Comments by East-West: None.

Appeals Committee decision:

Score assigned for both sides:

NS +130

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

Given that 4NT is plausible and we do not believe it would have happened had North had the right explanation, we agreed it should be struck out.

Possible results then are 3♦+1, 4♦=, 4♣-2 or 4♣x-2. But as North says he mightn't have doubled 4♣ and he has said to me that he thought he didn't have much defence (fair enough, give West J♥ and it would make) we're happy to exclude that. Then as 100 from 4♣ is scarcely different from 130 from diamonds, we propose the score is adjusted to NS +130

You might also tell West and East that I'm sure that's what they'd do in a European – my memory is of Appeal Committees being quite hard on not knowing the system.

Richard Fleet

I think that the TD was right and that the Referee was over-generous to North-South. The main reason for the poor result was South's dubious 3♦ bid: the argument that South is "preparing partner for a decision over 4♠" (when the opponents are forced no higher than 2♠ and South holds a load of rubbish with a poor spade holding) is specious and self-serving.

Frances Hinden

I think NS got out lightly here. The Appeal Committee's ruling doesn't entirely makes sense, because North did not suggest at any point that he would have passed 3♦, and even if he does East is not going to pass it out (given that East bid over 3NT at the table). Thus 3♦ is not a possible score. I also don't see anything in the write-up that suggests North was going to bid 4♦ either. That leaves us with the 4♣-2 suggested by write-up but mysteriously not assigned.

APPEAL No : 13.064

Jeffrey Allerton

It would have been useful if the basic systems had been recorded. Did South have a weak 2♦ opener available? On balance, I agree with the TD. I would be very surprised if N/S had agreed a different strength for 3♦ depending on the meaning of 2♣; they did not seem able to provide the TD with any evidence to support this assertion. . 4NT looks equally optimistic whatever the meaning of 2♣.

Paul Lamford

Good logic by the Referee, and I prefer his argument to the TD here.

Tim Rees

The Referee has taken a bit of a short cut by assigning a score, rather than weighting a selection of contracts. But as he says, it doesn't make much difference to the result.

Heather Dhondy

I agree with the TD. The 3♦ bid seems weird to me whichever explanation he receives and I remain unconvinced as to why it should be weaker in one situation over the other.

APPEAL No : 13.068

Tournament Director: John Haslegrave

Appeals Committee: Clive Owen (Chairman), Celia Oram and Peter Randall

| <p>♠J6 ♥K1093 ♦4 ♣K109764</p> <p>♠973 ♠K ♥J64 ♥Q875 ♦KQJ32 ♦A1098 ♣53 ♣AQJ8</p> <p>♠AQ108542 ♥A2 ♦765 ♣2</p> | <p><i>Board 6 : Dealer East : EW vulnerable</i></p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">West</th> <th style="text-align: left;">North</th> <th style="text-align: left;">East</th> <th style="text-align: left;">South</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1♥</td> <td>1♠</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2♥</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>2♠ A</td> <td>3♠</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">All Pass</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | West | North | East | South | | | 1♥ | 1♠ | 2♥ | Pass | 2♠ A | 3♠ | All Pass | | | |
|--|--|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--|--|----|----|----|------|------|----|----------|--|--|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1♥ | 1♠ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2♥ | Pass | 2♠ A | 3♠ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: Not given.

East-West play: Not given

Form of Scoring: MP's

Result at table:

3♠-1 by South, NS -50, lead ♣5

Director first called: Before 3♠ bid.

Director's statement of facts:

I was called during the auction for unrelated issues. About 10 minutes after the end of the session South approached me saying she thought there had been a revoke. She thought the play started as follows:

| West | North | East | South |
|------|-------|------|-------|
| ♣5 | ♣10 | ♣J | ♣2 |
| ♠3 | ♠6 | ♠K | ♠A |
| ♦J | ♦4 | ♦9 | ♦6 |
| ♠7 | ♠J | ♥x | ♠2 |
| ♠9 | ♣4 | ♣8 | ♠4 |

I spoke to EW who agreed the first two tricks but were not sure about the play after that. West thought she had led a second club after getting the lead.

Director's ruling: Table result stands.

Details of ruling: We felt that it was not sufficiently certain that a revoke had occurred. It is too late for a revoke penalty but we could still restore equity if a revoke was deemed to have occurred.

APPEAL No : 13.068

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: None given

Director's comments:

South was convinced a spade was returned and then logically, 9 tricks are made. Although the defenders suggested an alternative that would have resulted in 10 tricks, we are unanimous that the score should adjust to 9 tricks.

Comments by North-South:

I disagree about the second lead from West. She definitely wanted to stop me ruffing diamonds in dummy, hence the second lead of a trump to take out any ruffing of diamonds. I led a small club from the table, ruffed and surprisingly, over ruffed!! I said to my left hand opponent "Having no clubs?" She did not answer and played two winning diamonds. After that, I claimed but we were behind and catching up so I did not look at her hand. Later, I realised that she had revoked on the second club at trick 5. The par contract is 3♠ making.

Comments by East-West:

I am not aware that my partner revoked.

Appeals Committee decision:

Score assigned for both sides:

3♠ making by South, NS +140

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

Thought that there had been a revoke. Score adjusted to 3♠=

| |
|---|
| Richard Fleet |
| Given that the contract made eight tricks, it seems overwhelmingly likely that West did indeed revoke. Otherwise, nine tricks would have been very straightforward. |

| |
|---|
| Frances Hinden |
| The Appeal Committee got this right, and I am surprised at the TD's ruling. South (i) had no way to discover the revoke before seeing the hand records, (ii) had 9 obvious tricks after the play to tricks one and two and (iii) was confident about how the play had gone. East/West could not remember the play after trick two and could not say how declarer had managed to go off. The TD's comment 'we are unanimous that the score should adjust to 9 tricks' doesn't make sense when combined with the ruling that 'table result stands'. |

| |
|---|
| Jeffrey Allerton |
| I agree with the Appeal Committee. It's hard to see how declarer could have been restricted to 8 tricks unless there had been a revoke. |

APPEAL No : 13.068

Paul Lamford

The TD is assumed to be correct on establishing the facts, and I would accept the TD ruling. I would give little credence to the claim of a revoke 10 minutes after the session.

Tim Rees

Making 9 tricks in spades looks normal. If declarer made fewer than that, then that suggests that he was overruffed, and did not get a diamond ruff in dummy. Therefore, it is very likely that a revoke occurred. It's unusual for an Appeal Committee to overrule the TD on a finding of fact, but here the TD seems to have ruled "no revoke" when the two sides could not agree what had happened, without considering the evidence of the number of tricks made.

Robin Barker

I think the TD did not need to be nearly certain there had been a revoke to award an adjusted score. The evidence that TD records under "Director's comments" is sufficient, especially when the defenders cannot say which five tricks they took to defeat 3♠. I agree with the Appeal Committee.

Heather Dhondy

It doesn't seem possible for the contract to go down unless the play went as described, therefore it seems logical that the revoke occurred.

APPEAL No : 13.074

Tournament Director: Rob Sassoon

Appeals Committee: Tim Rees (Chairman), David Burn and Richard Bowdery

| <p>♠ AJ6 ♥ K ♦ K852 ♣ AQ1075 ♠ 832 ♠ K1075 ♥ Q1087 ♥ 632 ♦ AJ96 ♦ 1043 ♣ K4 ♣ 862 ♠ Q94 ♥ AJ954 ♦ Q7 ♣ J93</p> | <p><i>Board 19 : Dealer South : EW vulnerable</i></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>1♣</td><td>Pass</td><td>1♥</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>1NT (1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♣ (2)</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl (3)</td><td>3♣</td><td>Pass</td><td>3NT</td></tr><tr><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) 15-17 (2) Asked and told 'natural' – not alerted (3) Takeout.</p> | West | North | East | South | | | | Pass | Pass | 1♣ | Pass | 1♥ | Pass | 1NT (1) | Pass | 2♣ (2) | Dbl (3) | 3♣ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass | | | |
|--|---|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--|--|--|------|------|----|------|----|------|---------|------|--------|---------|----|------|-----|----------|--|--|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass | 1♣ | Pass | 1♥ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass | 1NT (1) | Pass | 2♣ (2) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dbl (3) | 3♣ | Pass | 3NT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: Benji but not checkback

East-West play: SAYC

Form of Scoring: X-IMP's, Teams of 8, 4 comparisons converted to VP's

Result at table:

3NT +1 by North, NS +430, lead not given

Director first called: At end of auction.

Director's statement of facts:

I was called to the table by West at the end of the auction after South incorrectly attempted to correct his partner's explanation of 2♣ as being checkback. I ascertained that it was not checkback which was not on their system card. West felt that North should be passing 2♣ which he claimed he would not have doubled had he been given the correct explanation of 'No Agreement'. After consultation the ruling was given as indicated. We felt that any UI given was irrelevant.

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

50% of table score and 50% of 2♣+3

Details of ruling:

(UI) (L73C)

Misinformation. L75B

Appeal lodged by: East-West

Basis of appeal: Unhappy with the ruling

Director's comments: None.

APPEAL No : 13.074

Comments by North-South: None.

Comments by East-West: None.

Appeals Committee decision:

Score assigned for both sides:

2♣+3 by North South, NS +150

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

If West was given an explanation of 'No Understanding', we believe that he would not double.

North has stated that he would have passed 2♣, so the score is adjusted to 2♣+3

Frances Hinden

I don't understand the TD's ruling at all. The write-up implies that the correct agreement about 2♣ was 'natural', not 'no agreement' in which case the table result should stand. I see no justification for a weighted result, nor for only assigning 9 tricks in 2♣. The Appeal Committee have determined that the agreement is 'no understanding'. That's a sensible ruling (and a more sensible adjustment to 11 tricks in 2♣) but on the evidence only given in the write-up, it appears to me that the agreement was 'natural' but South had forgotten.

Jeffrey Allerton

I was West. It is not true to say under comments by N/S and E/W "none", as comments were made verbally at the appeals hearing, so it would be more accurate to say "none written on the form". West's verbal comments were that (i) doubling a conventional 2♣ would show clubs, (ii) as 2♣ is most commonly played as conventional here, he would assume double of a "no agreement" 2♣ to have the same meaning and it would be very dangerous to hope partner interpret such a double as take-out, so (iii) he attempted to protect himself by asking about the unalerted call and (iv) he only doubled 2♣ for T/O because he was assured that the bid was natural and weak. Naturally, I agree with the Appeal Committee's decision!

Paul Lamford

Agree with the Appeal Committee, and not sure why it took so long for the TD to come up with the wrong ruling!

Tim Rees

We didn't write as much in the Appeal Committee Comments section as we might have done, as the event had finished and everyone had gone home. N/S tried to claim that 2♣ was systemically natural, as checkback was not mentioned anywhere on their convention card. However, the Appeal Committee determined that they did play checkback after partner had opened 1♦, and that wasn't on the card either. So we felt that "no agreement" was the correct explanation for the meaning of 2♣ in this auction.

Heather Dhondy

I agree with the Appeal Committee. There is no way that West would have doubled unless he believed that 2♣ was to play, and that would have ended the auction.

APPEAL No : 13.077

Tournament Director: Gordon Rainsford

Appeals Committee: Heather Dhondy (Chairman), Jeffrey Allerton and Hugh McGann

| <p>♠ AJ92 ♥ A62 ♦ AK10 ♣ Q93 ♠ KQ64 ♠ - ♥ 4 ♥ KQJ7 ♦ QJ986 ♦ 7532 ♣ A74 ♣ KJ1082 ♠ 108753 ♥ 109853 ♦ 4 ♣ 65</p> | <p><i>Board 22 : Dealer East : EW vulnerable</i></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>2♣ A</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2♦ A</td><td>2NT A</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♥ A</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl</td><td>3♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♥</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>5♣</td><td>Dbl</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>2♣ and 2♦ were precision bids. 2NT was described as weak with both majors or strong balanced. 3♥ was alerted but not asked.</p> | West | North | East | South | | | 2♣ A | Pass | 2♦ A | 2NT A | Pass | 3♥ A | Dbl | 3♠ | Pass | Pass | Dbl | Pass | 4♥ | Pass | 5♣ | Dbl | All Pass | |
|---|---|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--|--|------|------|------|-------|------|------|-----|----|------|------|-----|------|----|------|----|-----|----------|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 2♣ A | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2♦ A | 2NT A | Pass | 3♥ A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dbl | 3♠ | Pass | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dbl | Pass | 4♥ | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5♣ | Dbl | All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

North-South play: Not given.

East-West play: Precision

Form of Scoring: *X-IMP's, Teams of 8, 4 comparisons converted to VP's*

Result at table:

5♣ x-2 by East, NS +500, lead not given

Director first called: At end of hand.

Director's statement of facts:

NS said their description of 2NT was correct. EW said that South clearly did not believe it was because he made a 3♥ transfer bid. I consulted with a colleague and we felt that that if South wanted to make a transfer, regardless then he could because he had no UI.

EW persisted that I did not understand the problem and so I consulted with the Chief TD. He spoke to both pairs separately and told me to score 50% of 3♠-1 by North and 50% of 4♦-1 by West. He felt that EW had not been fully informed.

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides: 50% of 3♠-1 by North and 50% of 4♦-1 by West.

Details of ruling:

Misinformation due to incomplete disclosure. Blue Book 2A1

Appeal lodged by: North-South

Basis of appeal: Not given.

Director's comments: Not given

APPEAL No : 13.077

Comments by North-South: None.

Comments by East-West: None.

Appeals Committee decision:

Table score re-instated.

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

Although the explanation caused problems for EW, West should have protected himself by asking the meaning of 3♥ if it affected the meaning of his call.

Richard Fleet

I don't understand the statement "EW had not been fully informed" since there is no evidence at all that the NS agreement is other than has been set out above (the fact that this particular agreement is totally unplayable and borderline-insane is neither here nor there).

The poor EW score is entirely attributable to the actions taken by the pair.

Frances Hinden

Again neither the TD nor the Appeal Committee have explained the reasons for their ruling. The TD has not given an auction that ends in 4♦ – given that West's 2♦ bid was artificial, I cannot see a sensible auction to play in diamonds. Nor do I see why West's double of 3♠ was based on misinformation: if there was going to be an misinformation ruling, that the score should be adjusted to 3♠ doubled off one. For a ruling based on misinformation, EW have to explain why they were damaged by the misinformation and all I can see in the write-up was a comment that the TD 'did not understand the problem'. West seems to have doubled an alerted 3♥ for take-out, and an unalerted 3♠ for penalties, while East has interpreted the double of 3♥ as showing hearts and the double of 3♠ as take-out of spades. That misunderstanding is not related to the misinformation – it cannot be, as West did not ask about the meaning of 3♥ so cannot say what misinformation he has been given.

Jeffrey Allerton

E/W seem to have had a bidding misunderstanding but we could not see why this was caused by any alleged misinformation.

Paul Lamford

I agree that West should have asked the meaning of 3♥, which was alerted. He would not then have doubled, which caused EW's problem. I agree with the Appeal Committee.

Tim Rees

This is all very unclear. The Chief TD and the Appeal Committee seem to have determined that the explanation was incomplete and/or unclear, but without saying why. South's actions are consistent with him playing partner for strong balanced, so it's not clear where any misinformation would have come from. The TD has also failed to say how and why West would get to 4♦. But if West decided to double without asking what 3♥ meant, then it's his own fault and the Appeal Committee gave the correct ruling.

APPEAL No : 13.077

Robin Barker

Gordon Rainsford is named as the TD but he was not the TD called to the table; it was the table TD who completed the form (and appeared before the Appeal Committee). Instead Gordon Rainsford was the Chief TD referred to on the form.

We are missing the information that the Chief TD learnt from talking to both pairs separately. In particular, it would be good to know what the North-South agreements are in responding to the two-way 2NT overcall and how the overcaller distinguishes the weak and strong options. It is possible that (on this auction) 3♠ showed the strong balanced option and that East-West were entitled to know this.