



**2018**

**EBU Appeals**



# ENGLISH BRIDGE UNION

2018

## 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](mailto: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 1.4: 03 SEP 2024

Forms submitted to the EBU are identified by the year in which the event took place and a sequence number. Thus 18.010 was the 10<sup>th</sup> form received from 2018 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\*

A total of 36 appeals/report forms were received from 2018 events.



APPEAL No: 18.011

**Tournament Director:** Barrie Partridge

**Appeals Committee:** Graham Osborne\*, Steve Auchterlonie, David Kendrick

**Event:** Corwen Trophy

<p>♠ K97 ♥ KJ42 ♦ A8 ♣ 8753</p> <p>♠ J85432      ♠ Q6 ♥ Q9            ♥ A86 ♦ Q10           ♦ J7632 ♣ Q106        ♣ AKJ</p> <p>♠ A10 ♥ 10753 ♦ K954 ♣ 942</p>	<p>Board: 4      Dealer: West:    Vul: Both      MPs</p> <table><thead><tr><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Pass</td><td>1♣ (1)</td><td>Pass (2)</td><td>1♥</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>2♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2♠</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Announced - could be as few as one. (2) Asked about circumstances when 1♣ could be as few as one.</p> <p>Lead: ♥2</p>	West	North	East	South	Pass	1♣ (1)	Pass (2)	1♥	Pass	2♥	Pass	Pass	2♠	All Pass		
West	North	East	South														
Pass	1♣ (1)	Pass (2)	1♥														
Pass	2♥	Pass	Pass														
2♠	All Pass																

**Basic systems:**

N/S – 5-card majors

E/W – No system information given.

**Result at table:** 2♠=W

N/S -110

**Director first called:**

At the end of play.

**Director's ruling:**

Score adjusted to 2♥+1 by S, N/S +140.

**Director's comments:**

1♣ could be as short as 1 in a 4441 hand. TD polled four players who all emphatically passed, thereby establishing Pass as a Logical Alternative to the 2♠ bid. Also considered whether the UI of the enquiry demonstrably suggested action over passing, aware of the fact that East must have some points but on consulting with colleagues it was clear that the enquiry did demonstrably suggest action.

**Appeal lodged by:**

E/W

**Reason for appeal:**

2♠ bid is obvious

**Appeal Committee decision:** Director's ruling upheld.

**Appeal Committee comments:** We decided that there was unauthorised information from the question and that dummy was likely to be at the upper end of expected values. The poll was 4-0 in favour of passing and we saw no reason to overturn this. The poll was conducted entirely with other directors who are likely to know this is a UI situation. Best practice should be to poll other players if possible.

**L&EC comments:**

L&EC observed that it is not always practical to poll enough players, especially in events where they are all playing the same boards. It is acceptable to poll TDs, as long as they are peers of the players concerned, and appropriate questions are asked as if they were players. ["As a player, what would you do?", rather than "as a TD, how would you rule?"]

APPEAL No: 18.014

**Tournament Director:** Christine MacFarlane

**Appeals Committee:** Frances Hinden\*, Mike Bell, Kay Preddy

**Event:** Summer Festival; Swiss Pairs

<p>♠ 5 ♥ ♦ ♣ 8</p> <p>♠ K8 ♥ ♦ ♣</p> <p>♠ A ♥ 7 ♦ ♣</p>	<p>Board: 4    Dealer: West    Vul: Both    VP</p> <p>West    North    East    South</p> <p>Contract 1NT by West</p> <p>Position shown at claim ["one for you and one for me "] by West on lead of ♠5 to trick 12. West has won 5-tricks at this point.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Basic systems:**

N/S – No system information given.

E/W – No system information given.

**Result at table:** 1NT-1 by W    N/S +100

**Director first called:**    At trick-12 to adjudicate disputed claim

**Director's ruling:**    Score adjusted to 1NT-2 by W, N/S +200.

**Director's comments:**    Claim by West 'one for you and one for me' on lead of ♠5 contains an unstated line of play. South wins ♠A and which card will declarer discard? South laid down his cards accepting the claim but North contested the claim saying it depended on which card West discarded on T12. My ruling was based on the lack of clarity when claiming. Both West's cards were winners but he has to discard one. Awarded 2-tricks to defence – unstated line of play upon claiming – L70A.

**Appeal lodged by:**    E/W

**Reason for appeal:**    It was obvious that South's last card was a heart.

**Appeal Committee decision:**    Director's ruling upheld.

**Appeal Committee comments:** While we agree that West had an inferential count, that is not enough to give him the trick under L70A; it is easily possible to lose the trick at the table. This was trick 12. If West was confident about the end position he could simply have played the club with no delay to the play.

**L&EC comments:**    L&EC questioned why the deposit was not retained, since it appeared that the appellant had no case in law. The appeal chair reported that there had been extensive discussion by the committee, not reported on the Appeals Form, regarding whether or not the position was obvious to West.

APPEAL No: 18.024

**Tournament Director:** Jonathan Lillycrop

**Referee:** David Burn

**Event:** Mixed Teams Trial (played with screens)

<p>♠ Q65432 ♥ K654 ♦ 5 ♣ A4</p> <p>♠ 1097                      ♠ K ♥ Q3                         ♥ A82 ♦ AK3                        ♦ Q942 ♣ QJ1065                   ♣ K8732</p> <p>♠ AJ8 ♥ J1097 ♦ J10876 ♣ 9</p>	<p>Board: 26    Dealer East:    Vul: Both    IMPS &gt; 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♣ (1)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>1♠ (2)</td><td>X</td><td>2♣</td><td>4♥</td></tr><tr><td>5♣</td><td>Pass (3)</td><td>Pass</td><td>5♦</td></tr><tr><td>X</td><td>5♥</td><td>X</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Could be as short as 2; may contain a 5-card diamond suit. (2) No major. (3) Agreed hesitation.</p>	West	North	East	South			1♣ (1)	Pass	1♠ (2)	X	2♣	4♥	5♣	Pass (3)	Pass	5♦	X	5♥	X	All Pass
West	North	East	South																		
		1♣ (1)	Pass																		
1♠ (2)	X	2♣	4♥																		
5♣	Pass (3)	Pass	5♦																		
X	5♥	X	All Pass																		

**Basic systems:**

N/S – No system information given.

E/W – No system information given.

**Result at table:** 5♥X= by S      N/S +850

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

**Director's ruling:**                Score adjusted to 5♣ -1 by East

**Director's comments:**            At the end of the auction East asked West to call the director. When I arrived at the table West said she didn't know why she called the director and East said there had been a hesitation by North after the 5♣ bid. It was subsequently agreed by all players that there had been a hesitation and that the hesitation had been noticed by South and West on the other side of the screen. I was called back at the end of play and asked for a ruling. South explained at this point that he hadn't seen West's alert of the 1♠ bid and so thought partner's double was for the red suits. West said that South did nod at the time to acknowledge the alert. After polling I found that Pass was a logical alternative to the 5♦ bid and I felt that bidding on was suggested by the hesitation. I therefore disallowed the 5♦ bid and ruled back to 5♣ -1 by East.

I polled 6 players and the TD in charge; my first question was whether they would have bid 4♥ and 6 out of 7 said they would have made a lower bid rather than 4♥. I then asked them what they would do when the bidding came back to them if they had bid 4♥ on the previous round, at this point 5 out of 7 said they would Pass which clearly shows that Pass was a logical alternative. The two who said that they would not Pass were Fiona Brown and Michael Byrne mentioned below.

**Appeal lodged by:**                N/S

**Reason for appeal:**                South did not feel Pass was an LA

**N/S comments:** When chatting about the hand Fiona Brown and Michael Byrne mentioned they had been consulted and had both said they would bid 5♦ on my [South's] hand (under the prevailing circumstances / misunderstanding). After the director's ruling I did a poll of my own. Forrester and Senior were both adamant that Pass on my hand was not any sort of reasonable possibility. Tony said he would double, Brian wanted to bid 5♦ but would never Pass. Derek Oram elected to double with Pass as his second choice. So, I couldn't garner any real support for passing.

**Referee decision:** Director's ruling upheld.

**Referee comments:** I don't see anything wrong with the process or with the conclusion drawn by the Director. If one of the players conducted his own informal poll, he was of course at liberty to do so, but at best all it means is that some other people would not have passed – the number that would have done is still easily large enough for Pass to be considered a logical alternative to 5♦. Deposit returned – certainly OK to ask for a review.

**L&EC comments:** L&EC wondered whether the poll was conducted on the understanding that South thought that partner's double showed the red suits. The Referee confirmed that this was the case. Also wondered whether, had South passed, and this proved more successful than bidding, the opponents might have argued that the hesitation warned off South from bidding. It needs to be clear what the hesitation suggests, and there must be at least one action available to South that is not tainted by UI.



APPEAL No: 18.028

**Tournament Director:** Peter Randall

**Referee:** Tim Rees

**Event:** Premier League Div. 3 (played with screens)

<p>♠ Q9 ♥ 9853 ♦ A1065 ♣ KQ4</p> <p>♠ 1086 ♥ AJ106 ♦ 2 ♣ J9865</p> <p>♠ A3 ♥ KQ7 ♦ KJ74 ♣ A1072</p>	<p>♠ KJ7542 ♥ 42 ♦ Q983 ♣ 3</p>	Board: 19	Dealer: South	Vul: E/W	IMPS > VPs
		<i>West</i>	<i>North</i>	<i>East</i>	<i>South</i>
		Pass	2♣ (2)	Pass	1NT (1)
		Pass	3♥ (4)	Pass	2♦ (3)
		All Pass			3NT
		(1)	15-17 on both sides of the screen		
		(2)	N/E: alerted, not asked about S/W: pointed at, no further explanation, W glanced at system card		
		(3)	N/E: alerted, later explained as min with 5cM S/W: pointed at, no further explanation		
		(4)	N/E: alerted; looking for partners 5cM S/W: alerted; explained as 5♠+4♥		
		Lead: ♣6			

**Basic systems:**

N/S – 15-17 NT; non-promisary Stayman.

E/W – No system information given.

N/S: 1NT - 2♣ - 2♦: Min with 5-card major; continuation “3♣/3♦/3♥/3♠ = Nat (GF)”

**Result at table:** 3NT= by S      N/S +400

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

**Director’s ruling:**      Result stands

**Director’s comments:**      I was called by West & South after the hand was played because it had become apparent that South’s explanation of the auction to West was incorrect and that South’s 2D bid was not in accordance with partnership agreements. West claiming that he would have led a spade had he known that North did not have spades.

Ruled that there was misinformation. However, West is entitled to the correct information, but not the information that there had been a misunderstanding. With the correct explanation of the whole auction, West would conclude that South held the spades, not North, and that therefore the lead would be unaffected.

**Appeal lodged by:**      E/W

**Reason for appeal:**      None given

**Referee decision:**      Director’s ruling upheld.

**Referee comments:** South gave MI to West regarding his methods. This however, did not cause damage and the table result stands. N/S are assessed a standard procedural penalty (1 VP) for failing to provide a properly completed system card. Deposit returned.

**L&EC comments:** The committee concluded that the ruling itself was not incorrect, but that the TD might have erred in determining that North's understanding of the system was correct. The committee felt that it would be more accurate to say that they had no clear understanding, and that the TD should rule on that basis.

APPEAL No: 18.031

**Tournament Director:** Paul Gibbons

**Appeals Committee:** Heather Dhondy\*, Ian Draper, Sarah Teshome

**Event:** Tollemache Qualifier

<p>♠ Q10762 ♥ 3 ♦ 9 ♣ AJ10973</p> <p>♠ 843 ♥ A972 ♦ A10432 ♣ K</p> <p>♠ J5 ♥ J8654 ♦ 876 ♣ Q82</p>	<p>Board: 17   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>Pass</td><td>1♣(1)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>1♦ (2)</td><td>Pass</td><td>1NT(3)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>3♣(4)</td><td>X</td><td>3♦</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>3♥</td><td>3♠</td><td>4♠</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4NT</td><td>Pass</td><td>?</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>6♦</td><td>All pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Polish (2) Relay (3) 18-20 (4) ♦'s</p> <table><thead><tr><th>Play:</th><th>West</th><th>North</th><th>East</th><th>South</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>T1</td><td>♣K</td><td>♣A</td><td>♣4</td><td>♣2</td></tr><tr><td>T2</td><td>♦<u>2</u></td><td>♣9</td><td>♣5</td><td>♣Q</td></tr><tr><td>T3</td><td>♦3</td><td>♦9</td><td>♦<u>K</u></td><td>♦6</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>Claim: "drawing trumps"</p>	West	North	East	South		Pass	1♣(1)	Pass	1♦ (2)	Pass	1NT(3)	Pass	3♣(4)	X	3♦	Pass	3♥	3♠	4♠	Pass	4NT	Pass	?	Pass	6♦	All pass			Play:	West	North	East	South	T1	♣K	♣A	♣4	♣2	T2	♦ <u>2</u>	♣9	♣5	♣Q	T3	♦3	♦9	♦ <u>K</u>	♦6
West	North	East	South																																														
	Pass	1♣(1)	Pass																																														
1♦ (2)	Pass	1NT(3)	Pass																																														
3♣(4)	X	3♦	Pass																																														
3♥	3♠	4♠	Pass																																														
4NT	Pass	?	Pass																																														
6♦	All pass																																																
Play:	West	North	East	South																																													
T1	♣K	♣A	♣4	♣2																																													
T2	♦ <u>2</u>	♣9	♣5	♣Q																																													
T3	♦3	♦9	♦ <u>K</u>	♦6																																													

**Basic systems:**

N/S – Polish club

E/S – No system information given.

**Result at table:** 6♦-1 by W      N/S 50

**Director first called:**      When West claimed

**Director's ruling:**      6♦-1 by W    N/S 50

**Director's comments:**      Declarer claimed at trick 4 stating only "drawing trumps"  
When asked further, said "I can ruff a heart loser if there is one" When a spade loser was pointed out said "not if the hearts come good" When the heart break was pointed out, 11-tricks was accepted. West never considered the spade loser in any of his statements, and if the intention was to ruff a heart could have played top honours in any order; concession stands.

**Appeal lodged by:**      E/W

**Appeal Committee decision:**    Director's ruling upheld.

**Appeal Committee comments:** Considered the decision to be a close one; declarer would probably have got it right had play actually continued. Deposit returned.

**L&EC comments:**      Less confident that declarer would have got it right and would have kept the deposit.

APPEAL No: 18.032

**Tournament Director:** Jonathan Lillycrop

**Appeal Committee:** Tim Rees\*, M. Pryor

**Event:** Tollemache Qualifier

<p>♠ AQ942 ♥ J2 ♦ 93 ♣ 9652</p> <p>♠ J863 ♥ 10984 ♦ K107 ♣ 74</p> <p>♠ K107 ♥ A5 ♦ AQ86 ♣ KJ108</p>	<p>♠ 5 ♥ KQ763 ♦ J542 ♣ AQ3</p>	<p>Board: 5      Dealer: North      Vul: NS      IMPs &gt; VPs</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>1NT</td></tr><tr><td>2♦ (1)</td><td>X (2)</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2♥</td><td>2♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♠</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>4♠</td><td>All pass</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Single major; heart support or spades (2) Penalties</p> <p>Lead: ♥K</p>	West	North	East	South		Pass	1♥	1NT	2♦ (1)	X (2)	Pass	Pass	2♥	2♠	Pass	3♠	Pass	4♠	All pass	
West	North	East	South																			
	Pass	1♥	1NT																			
2♦ (1)	X (2)	Pass	Pass																			
2♥	2♠	Pass	3♠																			
Pass	4♠	All pass																				

**Basic systems:**

N/S – No system information given.

E/S – No system information given.

**Result at table:** 4♠= by N      N/S +620

**Director first called:**      At the end of the match

**Director's ruling:**      Score adjusted to 60% of 4♠-1; 40% of 4♠= by N

**Director's comments:**      E/W spoke to me after the match. They felt damaged because the X of 2♦ had been described as Penalties and North only had 2 low diamonds. They felt that with correct information the defence would have gone differently and asked me to look at the hand. The play at the table went: ♥K won by Ace. ♠K then ♠7 to Q. Club lead from North: at this point East went up with ♣A based on the explanation he thought declarer had length in diamonds and shortness in clubs. East cashed ♥Q and played a diamond. West won ♦K and returned a diamond. Declarer played ♠10, ruffed a diamond, drew the last trump and took the club finesse. East stated that with the correct explanation he would probably play low on the first round of clubs which would make it considerably more difficult for declarer as East could give partner a ruff if he got in again before trumps were drawn. After discussion with a colleague I felt the defence had been impacted by the misexplanation and that there was a reasonable chance of the contract being defeated with the correct explanation. I therefore adjusted to 60% of 4♠-1 and 40% of 4♠=.

**Appeal lodged by:**      N/S

**Reason for appeal:**      Felt that E/W had not been misinformed

**East - West comments:**      The double of 2♦ was described as penalties at the table. N/S must prove that this is in their system.

**Appeal Committee decision:**      Director's ruling upheld.

**Appeal Committee comments:** Committee agree with the director's ruling; North should have corrected the misinformation

**L&EC comments:** It was not clear what the actual agreement was, and on what basis the TD (& A/C) made the ruling. A/C chair clarified that N/S said they had no agreement and were unaware that a correction should be offered when they didn't have an agreement.

APPEAL No: 18.035

**Tournament Director:** Phil Green

**Appeal Committee:** Jason Hackett\*, Paul Lamford, Celia Oram

**Event:** London Year-End; Swiss Teams

<p>♠ AJ7 ♥ A9654 ♦ Q3 ♣ J108</p> <p>♠ KQ1053      ♠ 95 ♥ 103            ♥ J72 ♦ 74              ♦ A1082 ♣ K532          ♣ AQ87</p> <p>♠ 842 ♥ KQ8 ♦ KJ965 ♣ 65</p>	<p>Board: 21    Dealer: North:    Vul: NS            IMPs &gt; VPs</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>Pass</td><td>3♣ (1)</td></tr><tr><td>3♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♠</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>X</td><td>All pass</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Alerted and explained as invitational with four hearts; agreement is invitational with 3-card support.</p> <p>Lead:</p>	West	North	East	South		1♥	Pass	3♣ (1)	3♠	Pass	4♠	Pass	Pass	X	All pass	
West	North	East	South														
	1♥	Pass	3♣ (1)														
3♠	Pass	4♠	Pass														
Pass	X	All pass															

**Basic systems:**

N/S – Strong NT, 5cM, 2/1

E/S – No system information given.

**Result at table:** 4♠X-3 by S      N/S +500

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

**Director's ruling:**                Table result stands

**Director's comments:**          West said he would have not bid 3♠ had he known that South could have only 3 hearts. Damage did not arise from misexplanation.

**Appeal lodged by:**                E/W

**Reason for appeal:**                Dispute ruling

**East - West comments:**          3♠ was pushing the boat out pretty far but with a known 9-card fit I thought they could be making. Law of Total Tricks is changed if it is only an 8-card fit.

**North - South comments:**        Despite the misexplanation, East didn't have to raise.

**Appeal Committee decision:**      Score adjusted to 50% 3♠-1 by W and 50% 3♥-1 by N

**Appeal Committee comments:** Very important for East and West to know whether 3- or 4-card support has been shown. N/S gave wrong information. West might not bid if given correct information. Deposit returned.

**L&EC comments:**                This was considered to be a poor decision by the TD, only partially redressed by the A/C, & cites this as a positive reason for retaining the system of appeals (as opposed to the review system adopted in many international events, which only addresses the methodology of the TD decision making, rather than the judgement)