



2017

EBU Appeals

ENGLISH BRIDGE UNION

2017

APPEALS

Selected 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.

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

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

Tel: 01296 317200 From outside UK (replace 0 with +44)

Email: lecsec@ebu.co.uk

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

L&EC page: <https://www.ebu.co.uk/laws-and-ethics>

Booklet compiled & edited by Peter Grice
Version 2.4: 03 SEP 2024

Forms submitted to the EBU are identified by the year in which the event took place and a sequence number. Thus 17.010 was the 10th form received from 2017 events. Forms are triaged by two L&EC members. The "interesting ones" are discussed by L&EC and appear here. Appeal Committee chairs are denoted by an asterisk*. The 2017 Laws came into effect March 2017 and so this booklet will include appeals from events run under both 2007 and 2017 Laws.

A total of 42 appeals/report forms were received from 2017 events.

APPEAL No: 17.015

Tournament Director: Neil Morley

Appeals Committee: Andrew Thompson*, Jeffrey Allerton, Dan Macintosh

Event: Jersey Swiss Pairs

| <p>♠ 8643 ♥ 54 ♦ J1062 ♣ A96</p> <p>♠ J2 ♥ AQ9 ♦ A94 ♣ QJ853</p> <p>♠ A9 ♥ KJ10632 ♦ 753 ♣ 102</p> | <p>♠ KQ1075 ♥ 87 ♦ KQ8 ♣ K74</p> | <p>Board: 11 Dealer: South Vul: None MPs>VP</p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Pass</td><td>2NT (2)</td><td>3♠</td><td>2♥ (1)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass (3)</td><td>Pass</td><td></td><td>Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Weak (2) Alerted; explained as 15-18 (3) Agreed hesitation</p> <p>Lead:</p> | West | North | East | South | Pass | 2NT (2) | 3♠ | 2♥ (1) | Pass (3) | Pass | | Pass |
|--|--|--|--------|-------|------|-------|------|---------|----|--------|----------|------|--|------|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass | 2NT (2) | 3♠ | 2♥ (1) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass (3) | Pass | | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

N/S – No system information given.

E/W – No system information given.

Result at table: 3♠+1E N/S -170

Director first called: After opening lead.

Director's ruling: Result stands.

Director's comments: East asked North (with South away from the table) if the correct explanation of 2NT had been given. Informed that it just shows a feature with no guarantee of HCPs. West knows South has 6+HCPs; he has 14; and is informed North has 15-18 and yet East has overcalled 3♠. West must realise North cannot have 15-18HCP

Appeal lodged by: E/W

Reason for appeal:

Appeal Committee decision: Score adjusted to: 40% 4S= ; 30%3NT+1 and 30% 3NT+2

Appeal Committee comments: E/W were disadvantaged by incorrect explanation. Deposit returned.

L&EC comments: This was considered together with 17.024, since they involved the same principle: On both occasions, the non-offending side had received Misinformation, but had made very poor decisions in the auction which, in the opinion of the TDs they should not have made even given the incorrect explanations. The TDs therefore made no adjustment. The Appeals Committees on both occasions overturned the TD's ruling. The L&E confirmed this position, that the TD should not be examining

whether or not the players 'ought to have got it right' given the incorrect explanation, but should ask 'would they have got it right' with the correct explanation. If there is no doubt that they would get it right, then the TD should adjust, regardless of how poor their decisions were given the wrong explanation.

APPEAL No: 17.024

Tournament Director: Chris Benneworth

Appeals Committee: Frances Hinden

Event: Summer Meeting; Swiss Pairs

| <p>♠ 94 ♥ KJ2 ♦ KJ1052 ♣ 964</p> <p>♠ AQJ83 ♥ A83 ♦ 43 ♣ A53</p> <p>♠ 107 ♥ Q97654 ♦ 7 ♣ KJ108</p> | <p>♠ K652 ♥ 10 ♦ AQ986 ♣ Q72</p> | <p>Board: 19 Dealer: South: Vul: E/W MPs>VP</p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>2♠</td><td>3♦ (2)</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♥ (1)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td></td><td></td><td>Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Weak (2) Non-forcing but not alerted</p> <p>Lead: ♥10</p> | West | North | East | South | 2♠ | 3♦ (2) | Pass | 2♥ (1) | Pass | | | Pass |
|--|--|---|--------|-------|------|-------|----|--------|------|--------|------|--|--|------|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2♠ | 3♦ (2) | Pass | 2♥ (1) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass | | | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

N/S – Benji Acol

E/W – No system information given.

Result at table: 3♦-4 by N N/S +200

Director first called: At the end of the auction, before the opening lead.

Director's ruling: Result stands.

Director's comments: Before the opening lead North told his opponents that his bid should have been alerted: 3♦ is non-forcing. East called the director and asked if the auction could be unwound to her. I explained that only West was entitled to change his call; he declined. I reminded West not to draw inferences about his partners hand. I was called back to rule in the impact of the misinformation. I showed the hand to 5 good players all of whom chose to bid irrespective of the explanation of the 3♦ bid (no explanation or alerted and explained as non-forcing). I therefore ruled that the result stands: the failure to alert did not damage East.

Appeal lodged by: E/W

Reason for appeal: East damaged by failure to alert: expected to have another chance to call.

Appeal Committee decision: Score adjusted to: 4♠+1 by W

Appeal Committee comments: We established that 3♦ was alertable and adjusted the score. The poll was unhelpful as the TD had the (very difficult) task of finding anyone who would pass a forcing 3♦ bid. A reason to let the score stand might be if we believed East was hoping for a re-opening double but the heart singleton makes that too unlikely. We had a long discussion about whether to include any percentage of 4♠+2. Deposit returned.

L&EC comments: This was considered together with 17.015, since they involved the same principle: On both occasions, the non-offending side had received Misinformation, but had made very poor decisions in the auction which, in the opinion of the TDs they should not have made even given the incorrect explanations. The TDs therefore made no adjustment. The Appeals Committees on both occasions overturned the TD's ruling. The L&E confirmed this position, that the TD should not be examining whether or not the players 'ought to have got it right' given the incorrect explanation, but should ask 'would they have got it right' with the correct explanation. If there is no doubt that they would get it right, then the TD should adjust, regardless of how poor their decisions were given the wrong explanation.

APPEAL No: 17.025

Tournament Director: James Vickers

Appeals Committee: Brian Senior*, Gary Hyatt, Kathy Talbot

Event: Summer Meeting; Seniors' Pairs

| <p>♠ 104 ♥ KQJ543 ♦ 932 ♣ AQ</p> <p>♠ 32 ♥ 9 ♦ KQJ10865 ♣ 954</p> <p>♠ Q95 ♥ A10876 ♦ A7 ♣ KJ7</p> | <p>Board: 1 Dealer: North Vul: None MPs</p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td>1♥</td><td>1♠</td><td>X</td></tr><tr><td>2♦</td><td>2♥</td><td>3♣</td><td>4♥</td></tr><tr><td>Pass (1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♠</td><td>X</td></tr><tr><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Agreed hesitation</p> <p>Lead: ♥A</p> | West | North | East | South | | 1♥ | 1♠ | X | 2♦ | 2♥ | 3♣ | 4♥ | Pass (1) | Pass | 4♠ | X | All Pass | | | |
|--|--|------|-------|------|-------|--|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----------|------|----|---|----------|--|--|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1♥ | 1♠ | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2♦ | 2♥ | 3♣ | 4♥ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass (1) | Pass | 4♠ | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

N/S – No system information given

E/W – No system information given.

Result at table: 4♠X-2 by E N/S +300

Director first called: After the 4♠ bid and again at the end of play.

Director's ruling: Result stands.

Director's comments: N/S called me after the 4♠ bid to reserve their rights. I returned at the end of play. South had led Ace and another heart so East made 8-tricks. I asked some players what actions they would consider with the East hand. Pass, 4♠ and 5C were options but we thought it unlikely that West was considering bidding as he had not supported spades yet. There are LAs, but unlikely that West was considering bidding and if any action suggested by IU it is Pass.

Appeal lodged by: N/S

Reason for appeal: None given.

Appeal Committee decision: Director's ruling upheld.

Appeal Committee comments: We do not feel the hesitation suggests bidding on. West may be thinking of a double and is very unlikely to be thinking of bidding spades – he has had two chances to do so already. Deposit returned.

L&EC comments: There was some concern about TDs and ACs arguing that a slow pass in a potential sacrifice situation might suggest that the passer was considering doubling, and therefore that the hesitation might suggest that passing (or doubling) would be more successful than bidding on. In this case, the Committee felt that the slow pass indicated positive action of some sort.

APPEAL No: 17.026

Tournament Director: Richard Banbury

Appeals Committee: Martin Lee*, Simon Richards

Event: Summer Meeting; Swiss Pairs

| <p>♠ QJ5 ♥ A752 ♦ - ♣ J108532</p> <p>♠ A92 ♥ - ♦ QJ983 ♣ AKQ96</p> <p>♠ 1084 ♥ KQ1084 ♦ A72 ♣ 74</p> | <p>♠ K763 ♥ J963 ♦ K10654 ♣ -</p> | Board: 4 Dealer: West Vul: Both MPs > VPs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------|-------|------|-------|----|------|----|------|------|---|------|----|----|----|----------|------|--------|------|----|---|----------|--|--|--|
| | | <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>2♦</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>X</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♥</td></tr><tr><td>3♦</td><td>3♥</td><td>Pass (1)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4♦ (2)</td><td>Pass</td><td>5♦</td><td>X</td></tr><tr><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> | West | North | East | South | 1♦ | Pass | 2♦ | Pass | Pass | X | Pass | 2♥ | 3♦ | 3♥ | Pass (1) | Pass | 4♦ (2) | Pass | 5♦ | X | All Pass | | | |
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1♦ | Pass | 2♦ | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass | X | Pass | 2♥ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3♦ | 3♥ | Pass (1) | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4♦ (2) | Pass | 5♦ | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | (1) Agreed hesitation (2) Acknowledged to opps that there had been a hesitation. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Lead: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

N/S – 5-card major; strong NT

E/W – 5-card major; strong NT

Result at table: 5♦X= by W N/S -750

Director first called: At the end of play.

Director's ruling: Score adjusted to 3♥-1 by S; N/S -100

Director's comments: The players had already agreed the facts when I was called to the table. I polled a number of players asking what calls they would consider as West and what call they would actually make. The results of the poll were split approx. 50/50 between Pass and bidding 4♦ (or 4♣). All those polled commented that they would not have bid the same way as West in the early part of the auction but having done so, some felt they would now Pass while others would bid on even if partner was minimum for his 2♦ bid and despite the vulnerability. Hence the 4♦ bid is disallowed (Pass is a logical alternative) and the score adjusted.

Appeal lodged by: E/W

Reason for appeal: None given.

Appeal Committee decision: Score adjusted to 65% of 4♦+1 by W;35% of 3♥-1 by S

Appeal Committee comments: The committee were split and as such a weighted score is awarded, 65% of the time West will bid 4♣ (not suggested by the hesitation) which East will convert to 4♦. The director's ruling upheld 35% of the time. Deposit returned.

L&EC comments: The committee considered the AC's decision to be a Reveley* ruling. The AC justified a weighted ruling by claiming that 4♣ was not suggested over Pass by the UI. This is clearly not the case and the Committee's view was that the TD's original ruling was correct. *See: [WB 8.16.3](#)

APPEAL No: 17.027

Tournament Director: Nicole Cook

Appeals Committee: Neil Rosen*, Heather Dhondy, David Gold

Event: Summer Meeting; Swiss Teams

| <p>♠ 532 ♥ A1076 ♦ 3 ♣ K9852</p> <p>♠ Q97 ♥ 542 ♦ Q962 ♣ Q63</p> <p>♠ K10 ♥ KQJ ♦ J10754 ♣ AJ7</p> | <p>♠ AJ864 ♥ 983 ♦ AK8 ♣ 104</p> | <p>Board: 12 Dealer: West Vul: N/S IMPs>VPs</p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>1♠</td><td>X</td></tr><tr><td>2♠ (1)</td><td>3♥</td><td>3♠</td><td>Pass (2)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>4♣</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♥</td></tr><tr><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Bad raise (2) Hesitation</p> <p>Lead:</p> | West | North | East | South | Pass | Pass | 1♠ | X | 2♠ (1) | 3♥ | 3♠ | Pass (2) | Pass | 4♣ | Pass | 4♥ | All Pass | | | |
|--|--|--|----------|-------|------|-------|------|------|----|---|--------|----|----|----------|------|----|------|----|----------|--|--|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass | Pass | 1♠ | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2♠ (1) | 3♥ | 3♠ | Pass (2) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass | 4♣ | Pass | 4♥ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

N/S – No system information given.

E/W – No system information given.

Result at table: 4♥= by N N/S +620

Director first called: At the end of play.

Director's ruling: Score adjusted to 3♠-3 by E; N/S +150

Director's comments: All agreed that South had paused for thought after East had bid 3♠ and I was asked to rule. North stated he was in possession of new information after E/W showed extra length in spades (probably) and therefore graded his hand as worthy of another call. 6 Players polled considered Pass and 4 players chose to Pass. I ruled there was a Logical Alternative to the action taken at the table and assigned an adjusted score after the 4♣ bid was removed. The merit of adding value to North's spade length was dismissed by all those polled.

Appeal lodged by: N/S

Reason for appeal: None given.

North – South comments: Whilst the 3♠ bid isn't a guarantee of a singleton spade, it substantially increases the chances of being one. Whenever I get 4 clubs and one spade game can be spread with no finesses opposite diamond holdings with no wastage in a minimum t/o double. Even slam is possible with a great fit. I can make game with a stiff spade and wasted ♦ card. I can make game opposite a doubleton spade and a minimum t/o double. I can make 4♣ against a making 3♠ if partner has 3 clubs. My bid shows my shape and I'd rather declare than defend opposite a weak client. I don't think I can Pass when I can make a vulnerable game with such high frequency.

East - West comments: We feel the hesitation infers bidding 4♣ would be a winning action. If the hesitation does not happen to have extra values it will also have club tolerance as would raise to 4♥ usually with extras and a fit. North freely bid once and Pass is a Logical Alternative.

Appeal Committee decision: Table score restored: 4♥= by N; N/S +620

Appeal Committee comments: Our interpretation of the poll was different from the Director's – we spent a lot of time discussing with the Director but felt the initial survey where all 4 would have bid 4♣ together with our unanimous belief that 4♣ was totally self-evident. Thus 4 players polled plus 3 internationals on the Appeals Committee gave good enough reason to overturn the ruling. We had total understanding of why the director ruled the way she did but were completely in agreement as to our decision. Deposit returned.

L&EC comments: There was an apparent discrepancy between the TD's statement of figures in the poll and those quoted by the AC. Part of this discrepancy was based on the TD consulting four players sitting at a table together. Because their views were likely to conform, the TD did not give full weighting to their views. The committee pointed out that this is not recommended practice.

APPEAL No: 17.028

Tournament Director: Kathy Williams

Director in Charge: Gordon Rainsford

Appeals Committee: Gillian Fawcett*, Brian Callaghan, Ian Payn

Event: Summer Meeting; Swiss Teams

| <p>♠ K98 ♥ A543 ♦ AJ ♣ K643</p> <p>♠ QJ62 ♥ QJ1092 ♦ 53 ♣ 108</p> <p>♠ A53 ♥ 86 ♦ K1094 ♣ J752</p> | <p>♠ 1074 ♥ K7 ♦ Q8762 ♣ AQ9</p> | <p>Board: 22 Dealer: East Vul: E/W IMPs>VPs</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♥ (1)</td><td>1NT</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♣</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>2♦</td><td>Pass</td><td>2NT</td></tr><tr><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) System card shows third seat openings could be extremely light.</p> <p>Lead: ♥K</p> | West | North | East | South | | | Pass | Pass | 1♥ (1) | 1NT | Pass | 2♣ | Pass | 2♦ | Pass | 2NT | All Pass | | | |
|--|--|---|-------|-------|------|-------|--|--|------|------|--------|-----|------|----|------|----|------|-----|----------|--|--|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Pass | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1♥ (1) | 1NT | Pass | 2♣ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pass | 2♦ | Pass | 2NT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

N/S – No system information given.

E/W – No system information given.

Result at table: 2NT-2 by N N/S -100

Director first called: At the end of play.

Director's ruling: Av+/Av-

Director's comments: Director was asked to look at the West hand along with East's subsequent inaction. The E/W system card indicated that third hand openings could be extremely weak. After discussion with Robin Barker, ruled that E/W had an agreement to open hands that didn't satisfy BB 7A3* and so cancelled the board and awarded Av+/Av-. The team wanted to appeal as it made a difference between them qualifying for the B final or not. Since this was a matter of regulation it was considered (L93A1) by the Director in Charge (DiC). The DiC heard nothing to that indicated an error in the original ruling, although players argued the bid was a psyche, and so upheld the director's ruling. The team asked to appeal this to a committee**.

* BB7A3: A one-level opening bid in a suit, whether forcing or not, must by agreement show 8+ HCP and, in first and second position, follow Rule of 18.

** Note that an appeal of a ruling by a DiC on a matter of Law or Regulation is heard by a committee whose power is limited to advising the DiC to change the ruling – they do not have the power to change the ruling themselves. This was made clear to everyone concerned, both before the initial appeal and before the appeal to the committee.

Appeal lodged by: E/W

Reason for appeal: Made the difference between qualifying or not.

Appeal Committee decision: Director's ruling upheld.

Appeal Committee comments: The evidence is that E/W have an agreement to open hands in third seat that are contrary to BB7A3. We did not consider the opening bid to be a psyche, we considered it to be a deviation from the requirements to hold 8 HCP and we concluded that E/W had an agreement that such bids might be made.

L&EC comments: The appeal was initially heard by the Director in Charge, on the grounds that it was a matter of Law or Regulation. On the request of E/W, this was subsequently referred to a Committee. Both the DiC and AC upheld the director's ruling. The L&E Committee agrees with this decision. The appeal was based on the call being a psyche, but it was suggested that even if that were the case, it should clearly be a Red Psyche, and since this would result in a worse score for the appellants (30/60 rather than 40/60), the deposit should have been kept. No deposit was taken due to the haste in which everything took place and one of the AC members had not been convinced that the 'psyche' had been fielded.

APPEAL No: 17.032

Tournament Director: James Vickers (by phone)

Event: Gold Cup

| | |
|---|--|
| ♠ Qxx ♥ AQJ9x ♦ Qx ♣ 109x ♠ Kxx ♥ xxxx ♦ AJxxxx ♣ - ♠ AJxx ♥ Kx ♦ Kx ♣ Qxxxx | Board: Dealer: Vul: IMP /KO West North East South 2♦ (2) Pass 2♥ 1♣ (1) Pass 3NT All Pass Pass (1) Announced – could be two. (2) Alerted and explained as majors (5+♥, 4+♠), but intended as weak jump overcall. Lead: ♠x |
| | |

Basic systems:

N/S – No system information given.

E/W – No system information given.

Result at table: 3NT= by N

Director first called: Telephone ruling from match played privately.

Director's ruling: 4♥X-6 by E

Director's comments: Note: spot cards were not available and compass directions may not be correct. West had unauthorised information from the alert and explanation. When asked, West had no good reason for his Pass of 2♥ – he said he realised he'd made a mistake. Polled / consulted: votes for 4♣ and 4♥; no one considered Pass; general disbelief at the actual Pass. Adjusted score based on auction (1♣) 2♦-2♥-4♣-4♥-P (X) or (1♣) 2♦-2♥-4♥ (X). Procedural penalty against E/W (-3 IMP) for failing to avoid taking advantage of unauthorised information

L&EC comments: The Committee welcomed the assignment of a PP for blatant use of UI. Some wondered whether a 6 IMP penalty might have been more appropriate. It was noted that 'x's were used for small cards on the form, and that there was a duplication of one of the cards actually specified. It was observed that this was a ruling made by telephone, and that it is often hard for accurate details to be obtained from the competitors.

APPEAL No: 17.033

Tournament Director: Sarah Amos
Referee: Frances Hinden (by e-mail)
Event: Premier League; Div. 3

| <p>♠ KJ976 ♥ 8754 ♦ 102 ♣ 92</p> <p>♠ A53 ♠ 104 ♥ Q96 ♥ AKJ1032 ♦ QJ ♦ A ♣ AKQ53 ♣ 8764</p> <p>♠ Q82 ♥ - ♦ K9876543 ♣ J10</p> | <p>Board: 10 Dealer: East Vul: Both IMPs > VPs</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>3♦</td></tr><tr><td>4♦ (1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♥ (2)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4NT</td><td>Pass</td><td>5♦</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>6♥</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Alerted; no one asked; no agreement (2) Agreed hesitation.</p> <p>Lead: ♣J</p> | West | North | East | South | | | 1♥ | 3♦ | 4♦ (1) | Pass | 4♥ (2) | Pass | 4NT | Pass | 5♦ | Pass | 6♥ | All Pass | | |
|--|--|--------|-------|------|-------|--|--|----|----|--------|------|--------|------|-----|------|----|------|----|----------|--|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1♥ | 3♦ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4♦ (1) | Pass | 4♥ (2) | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4NT | Pass | 5♦ | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6♥ | All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

N/S – No system information given
E/W – 5-card majors

Result at table: 6♥+1 by E N/S -1460

Director first called: At the end of play.

Director's ruling: Table result stands.

Director's comments: I was asked to consider the 4NT bid in the light of the slow 4♥ bid. East said his hand was huge and was happy to play at the 5-level missing 2 aces. I was concerned about polling as almost all of the players would have seen the hand but I polled 8 players at Wimbledon and did not find any that would Pass. Actions considered were 4NT and 4♠; both of which would lead to a 6♥ contract. At the request of N/S some Div.2 players (who would not have encountered the board) were polled; none of them chose Pass at the time in question.

Appeal lodged by: N/S

Reason for appeal: N/S believe that both Pass and 4♠ are LAs.

North – South comments: Pass is a logical alternative with no diamond control. We polled 7 players in Div. 1, 6 of whom thought Pass was a LA.

Referee decision: The director's ruling is upheld.

Referee comments: There is no dispute that the 4♥ bid was slow. It is clear that the slow 4♥ bid "demonstrably suggests" not passing (this is the new standard in the 2017 Laws), which is also what the TD determined. The relevant point is whether passing is a logical alternative (LA), where I also agree with the TD that it is not. The deposit is forfeited. The TD understood the issue, followed the correct process and polled a sufficiently large number of players of the right standard

L&EC comments: Appeal based on players being told by other peers advising “pass is a logical alternative”. Referee observed that this is not the same as saying some players would actually have passed, which is the true test. Further players were consulted by the Referee, none of whom would choose to pass. Also noted that, together with 17.036, this was the first time the deposit had been retained, including a score adjustment as part of the deposit, since the latter had come into regulation over a year ago.

APPEAL No: 17.035

Tournament Director: Kathy Williams

Appeals Committee: Robert Plumley*, Janet Latham, Rhona Goldenfield

Event: Guernsey Swiss Teams

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| <p>♠ Q7 ♥ AK6 ♦ AJ ♣ AKQJ106</p> <p>♠ K64 ♠ A103 ♥ 10843 ♥ 97 ♦ 852 ♦ Q10764 ♣ 872 ♣ 943</p> <p>♠ J9852 ♥ QJ52 ♦ K93 ♣ 5</p> | Board: 1 | Dealer: North | Vul: None | IMPs > VPs |
| | <p>West</p> <p>Pass</p> <p>Pass</p> <p>Pass</p> <p>Pass</p> | <p>North</p> <p>2♣ (1)</p> <p>2NT (3)</p> <p>3♥</p> <p>5♣</p> <p>6NT</p> | <p>East</p> <p>Pass</p> <p>Pass</p> <p>Pass</p> <p>Pass</p> <p>All Pass</p> | <p>South</p> <p>2♦ (2)</p> <p>3♣ (4)</p> <p>4♥</p> <p>5♠</p> |
| | | (1) Game force | | |
| | | (2) Waiting bid | | |
| | | (3) Announced as 20-21 | | |
| | | (4) Shows 5/4 majors | | |
| | Lead: ♦6 | | | |

Basic systems:

N/S – No system information given.

E/W – No system information given.

Result at table: 6NT+1 by N N/S +1020

Director first called: At the end of play

Director's ruling: Table result stands

Director's comments: I was called at the end of play by East who thought North had taken advantage of South's announcement of the 2NT bid because of his 24 points. N/S system is that this bid shows 20-21. East also said he may have led AS had he known the strength of North's hand. E/W have had correct explanations for all bids. Although South has announced 20-21 unnecessarily, North can't know that 6NT would be the best contract.

Appeal lodged by: E/W

Reason for appeal: Think UI affected the 6NT bid.

Appeal Committee decision: Score adjusted to: 4♥+3 by N

Appeal Committee comments: If we understood correctly 3♥ showed clubs (not alerted) and further UI was held by North (announcement of 20-21).

L&EC comments: The committee congratulated the AC on a good decision to overturn what appeared to be a poor ruling by the TD.

APPEAL No: 17.036

Tournament Director: Phil Godfrey

Referee: Tim Rees

Event: Premier League Div. 1 (played with screens)

| <p>♠ AK1073 ♥ J1084 ♦ A104 ♣ 4</p> <p>♠ J65 ♠ Q94 ♥ K6 ♥ 73 ♦ KQ83 ♦ 65 ♣ K1072 ♣ QJ9865</p> <p>♠ 82 ♥ AQ952 ♦ J972 ♣ A3</p> | <p>Board: 12 Dealer: West Vul: N/S IMPs > VPs</p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1♣</td><td>1♠</td><td>3♣ (1)</td><td>X</td></tr><tr><td>3♥ (2)</td><td>X</td><td>4♣</td><td>5♦</td></tr><tr><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Pre-emptive (2) W to S; nat E to N; nat / semi-nat</p> <p>Lead: ♣6</p> | West | North | East | South | 1♣ | 1♠ | 3♣ (1) | X | 3♥ (2) | X | 4♣ | 5♦ | All Pass | | | |
|---|---|--------|-------|------|-------|----|----|--------|---|--------|---|----|----|----------|--|--|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1♣ | 1♠ | 3♣ (1) | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3♥ (2) | X | 4♣ | 5♦ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

N/S – No system information given.

E/W – Strong NT, 5cM, 2/1; 1C = nat or weak balanced, could be short

Result at table: 5♦-4 by S N/S -400

Director first called: At the end of the round

Director's ruling: Table result stands

Director's comments: South asked for a ruling as he believed a different explanation had been given at either side of the table to the 3♥ bid. North also asked if it might be a psyche – East observing “I've not known him to do it in this position before, but who knows?” When pressed about length South says West said 4-cards – West does not recall saying this. South explained that when the bid is 4 cards he will take North's X as take-out; if shorter he would take it as showing hearts. There is a disagreement over exactly what was said at the table, the players have been reprimanded for breaking procedure and not using the pads provided. Since explanations on both sides of the screen are essentially the same and give the same information no adjustment is made.

Appeal lodged by: E/W

Reason for appeal: Explanations different

North – South comments: My recollection of West's comments on his 3♥ bid are that initially he said his bid was 'natural' and seeing my quizzical reaction added 'a suit, 4-cards' Our rules on doubles state that following a take-out double, the second double is also take-out but any subsequent double is penalty. This situation was not clear to me and I decided that double of a trial bid should be penalty and of a genuine suit should be take-out. Partner (North) considered his double to be penalty. I'm confident that if the 3♥ bid had been described as 'semi-natural' I would have disregarded it and bid 4♥ (as, frankly, I should have anyway).

East – West comments: I described the 3♥ bid as natural because it was. I can't be 18-19 bal as we open those 1♦ and 12-14 bal passes, I didn't because I was psyching. I wasn't asked how many cards 3♥ showed and I certainly didn't say 4, although I did say my bidding showed real clubs. There was no infraction and no damage other than South not understanding what his partner's double was.

Referee decision: Director's ruling upheld.

Referee comments: There a disagreement in the facts regarding what was said on the South/West side of the screen. However, we do not feel that either version of the facts support a score adjustment. Even if South's version of the facts is correct the description provided by West was materially accurate. He was trying to explain his methods without referring to the possibility of a psyche. We feel that the damage arose from N/S's agreements or their interpretation of them. Deposit forfeited.

L&EC comments: It was suggested that there should have been a PP for not following correct procedures with regard to written explanations.

APPEAL No: 17.042

Tournament Director: Gary Conrad

Appeals Committee: Frances Hinden*, David Burn, Jason Hackett

Event: London Year End Swiss Pairs

| <p>♠ K109653 ♥ 1086 ♦ 10986 ♣ -</p> <p>♠ AQJ2 ♠ 7 ♥ - ♥ AQ972 ♦ AJ752 ♦ 4 ♣ KJ105 ♣ AQ8762</p> <p>♠ 84 ♥ KJ543 ♦ KQ3 ♣ 943</p> | <p>Board: 15 Dealer: South Vul: N/S MPs > VP</p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>1♦</td><td>2♠</td><td>2NT (1)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>3♣</td><td>Pass</td><td>5NT</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>6♣</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Invitational with clubs</p> <p>Lead: ♥6</p> | West | North | East | South | | | | Pass | 1♦ | 2♠ | 2NT (1) | Pass | 3♣ | Pass | 5NT | Pass | 6♣ | All Pass | | |
|--|--|---------|-------|------|-------|--|--|--|------|----|----|---------|------|----|------|-----|------|----|----------|--|--|
| West | North | East | South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1♦ | 2♠ | 2NT (1) | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3♣ | Pass | 5NT | Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6♣ | All Pass | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Basic systems:

N/S – No system information given.

E/W – No system information given.

Result at table: 6♣-1 by W N/S +50

Director first called: At the end of the round

Director's ruling: Score adjusted; 6♣= by W; N/S -920

Director's comments: I was approached sometime after the end of play. South played ♦K to trick 3 (the second diamond) and declarer remarked "That's fun!" Play continued until the end of Trick 7 when declarer went in to an extended period of thought. During this, North remarked "it doesn't matter" South claims to have immediately remarked "yes, it does matter" Declarer denies South made this remark. I concluded South's remark was irrelevant and that declarer was already disturbed by all this. Declarer claims that she now chose a different line of play to her thought process and went off. Adjusted score to 6♣= by W [L73E2]

Appeal lodged by: N/S

Reason for appeal:

North - South comments: Declarers remark led North to conclude declarer held AQJxxx of diamonds. Dropping the K when missing Q109 doesn't directly help so is not correlated to the comment. North losing 100% of the contract for his remark while declarer loses nothing seems incongruous. Isn't North's comment a claim in that it suggests play be curtailed? Declarers comment came first; without this, North can't say anything.

East – West comments: Standard of players; N/S are one of the strongest pairs in the field; West is newer to the game and had no reason to distrust North.

Appeal Committee decision: Director's ruling upheld; deposit returned.

Appeal Committee comments: North knows that declarer can't have this 4063 hand because she would have played a trump, not ruffed a heart. The comment was enough to break declarers concentration.

L&EC comments: Questions were raised (on the appeal form) as to whether North's comments constituted a claim. The committee's view was that the comment was a suggestion that play be sped up, not curtailed. Otherwise, a claim relates to specific tricks, or to a specific number of tricks. The committee noted that any extraneous remarks (not intended as a claim) should be strongly discouraged. The case bears similarities to other cases recently discussed, in that declarer's chosen line was extremely poor; but if it is likely that declarer would have chosen a winning line had he/she not been misled, then it was correct to adjust. The committee also noted that declarer was a much less experienced player than the other three at the table