



**2019**

**EBU Appeals**



# ENGLISH BRIDGE UNION

2019

## 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 1.3: 03 SEP 2024

Forms submitted to the EBU are identified by the year in which the event took place and a sequence number. Thus 19.010 was the 10<sup>th</sup> form received from 2019 events. All 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 24 appeals/report forms were received from 2019 events.



# APPEAL No: 19.010 Keep the Money!

**Tournament Director:** Barrie Partridge

**Appeals Committee:** Frances Hinden\*, Ed Scerri, Derek Oram

**Event:** Corwen Trophy

<p>♠ 1064 ♥ K10 ♦ K108 ♣ Q10432</p> <p>♠ J973                      ♠ KQ82 ♥ J92                        ♥ 876 ♦ 93                         ♦ QJ5 ♣ J875                      ♣ AK6</p> <p>♠ A5 ♥ AQ543 ♦ A7642 ♣ 9</p>	<p>Board: 26    Dealer: East    Vul: Both    MPs</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>2NT (2)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>3NT</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♥</td></tr><tr><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) 3+ clubs, so not announced or alerted (2) not alerted but announced as strong</p> <p>Lead: ♦9</p>	West	North	East	South			1♣ (1)	2NT (2)	Pass	3NT	Pass	4♥	All Pass			
West	North	East	South														
		1♣ (1)	2NT (2)														
Pass	3NT	Pass	4♥														
All Pass																	

## Basic systems:

N/S – No system information given.

E/W – No system information given.

**Result at table:** 4♥=S

N/S +620

**Director first called:**

At the end of play.

**Director's ruling:**

Score adjusted to 3NT-1 by S, N/S -100.

**Director's comments:**

After S had overcalled 2NT, N announced that it was strong but did not otherwise alert. The N/S system card states that 2NT shows the two lowest unbid suits. There was no correction of the misinformation during the Clarification Period and W called me at the end of play thinking that he would not have led the ♦9 at trick 1 with correct information. I asked S why he bid 4♥, and he said it was because he had five hearts and five diamonds, and I suggested that he had already shown this by his 2NT bid, but I had no further reply. It was clear from the discussion that he had been influenced by the UI from the misexplanation.

**Appeal lodged by:**

N/S

**Reason for appeal:**

Did not like the ruling

**Appeal Committee decision:**

Director's ruling upheld.

**Appeal Committee comments:** S cannot make a bid that is suggested by partner not explaining the agreement accurately. Director's ruling upheld. Deposit not kept because N/S obviously have no understanding of the law regarding UI. In any other circumstances this is an obvious deposit-keeper.

**L&EC comments:**

The Committee did not think the reason stated justified the return of the deposit.

APPEAL No: 19.012 MI and UI often travel together

**Tournament Director:** Adrian Goulding

**Appeals Committee:** Jason Hackett\*, Richard Bowdery, Chris Cooper

**Event:** Scarborough Summer Congress; Swiss Pairs

<p>♠ AK97 ♥ J972 ♦ 5 ♣ A1082</p> <p>♠ 432                      ♠ 5 ♥ KQ83                    ♥ 1065 ♦ AQ87                     ♦ J10932 ♣ KQ                        ♣ 9765</p> <p>♠ QJ1086 ♥ A4 ♦ K64 ♣ J43</p>	<p>Board: 5      Dealer: North      Vul: NS      VP</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;">West</th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;">North</th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;">East</th> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;">South</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>Pass</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>1NT (1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>X</td> <td>XX (2)</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>3♣</td> </tr> <tr> <td>X</td> <td>3♥</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>X</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>3♠</td> </tr> <tr> <td>X</td> <td>All pass</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>(1) 12-14</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>(2) transfer to clubs</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Lead: ♥K</p>	West	North	East	South		Pass	Pass	1NT (1)	X	XX (2)	Pass	3♣	X	3♥	Pass	Pass	X	Pass	Pass	3♠	X	All pass				(1) 12-14				(2) transfer to clubs		
West	North	East	South																														
	Pass	Pass	1NT (1)																														
X	XX (2)	Pass	3♣																														
X	3♥	Pass	Pass																														
X	Pass	Pass	3♠																														
X	All pass																																
	(1) 12-14																																
	(2) transfer to clubs																																

**Basic systems:**

N/S – Acol, 3 weak 2s

E/W – 5-card majors, strong NT

**Result at table:** 3♠X+2 by S      N/S +1130

**Director first called:**                      At the opening lead – tabling of dummy

**Director's ruling:**                              Table score stands.

**Director's comments:**                      S stated she meant to bid 2♣, but bid 3♣ in error. I believe that this was a mechanical error but nothing was done to correct it and the auction continued. E/W were given correct explanations of the N/S system.

**Appeal lodged by:**                              E/W

**Reason for appeal:**                              Damaged by transfer to clubs with 4-cards and subsequent 3♥ bid.

**Appeal Committee decision:**      Score adjusted to:  
For N/S: 60% of 3♣X= by S, N/S +670; 40% of 3♣X-1 by S, N/S -100.  
For E/W: 3♠X+2 by S, N/S +1130 (table score)

**Appeal Committee comments:** N was in receipt of UI as a result of the mechanical error by S, and therefore should expect 4 or 5 clubs for the transfer break and pass of 3♣ doubled. However under Law 12C1(e) we feel that W was guilty of SEWOG (serious error, wild or gambling; L12C1(e)). W has made a string of penalty doubles, those of 3♣ and 3♠ on totally inadequate trump holdings and defensive values. We considered the play: a spade lead beats 3♣X out of hand, a red suit lead lets it in, and on the ♥K lead, declarer can prevail with good play, hence the weighting. We note E/W asked an appeal advisor, so no reason to keep deposit (wouldn't have anyway, although hard to assess as the TD didn't rule on the basis of UI).

**L&EC comments:** A number of issues arise in connection with this appeal:

- a. A TD called to deal with MI should always consider whether there should be an adjustment because of the UI from the explanations given.
- b. Although the AC correctly identified that there was UI, they did not correctly identify the source of the UI, namely the alert and explanation of the redouble when it appears likely that N intended the redouble to show a strong hand (a question which should have been asked of N).
- c. Whilst it appears eminently correct to disallow the 3♥ bid and return the contract to 3♣X, Law 12C1(e) cannot be engaged in relation to the double of 3♣, because that action took place prior to the infraction (the 3♥ bid). The adjusted score assigned to E/W is therefore illegal. Both sides should have received the weighted score for 3♣X.
- d. The AC should not have been told that the appellants had consulted an appeals advisor

APPEAL No: 19.018 Don't mix your cards!

**Tournament Director:** James Vickers

**Appeals Committee:** (No Appeal)

<p>♠ AQ97 ♥ 104 ♦ 943 ♣ KJ93</p> <p>♠ J1082                      ♠ K543 ♥ KQJ6                      ♥ 5 ♦ A76                         ♦ Q1082 ♣ A7                         ♣ Q1082</p> <p>♠ 6 ♥ A98732 ♦ KJ2 ♣ 654</p>	<p>Board: 31    Dealer South:    Vul: NS            IMPS &gt; VPs</p> <p>West            North            East            South</p> <p>Contract: 4♠X by W</p> <p>Lead:            ♥4</p>
--	--

**Basic systems:**

N/S – No system information given.

E/W – No system information given.

**Result at table:** 4♠X-2 by W      N/S +300

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

**Director's ruling:**                      Score adjusted to 4♠X-1, as if N had revoked (Laws 65D, 66D and 72B3).

**Director's comments:**                I was called by E (dummy) who said that he has asked to see N's last two cards, but N had mixed them without showing them. He (E) thought that N had revoked at some point. I asked E/W to tell me how the play had gone:

T1: ♥4 to the A

T2: ♥ to the K (diamond discard from dummy)

T3: ♠J to Q and K

T4: ♠ to 10 and A

T5: ♦ to Q, K and A

T6: ♥Q (♣ from N, ♦ from dummy)

T7: ♥J (♣ from N, ♦ from dummy)

T8: ♦ ruff

T9: ♣ to A (dropping N's K)

T10: ♦ ruffed by N with the 7

At this point N claimed his high trump and conceded the last trick without showing his cards. E said that he had seen N pull the ♦9 out of his hand earlier in the play and put it

back. He knew the card was still in N's hand, as it hadn't been played. Score adjusted to 4♠X-1, as if N had revoked (Laws 65D, 66D and 72B3).

Note – at the time of the ruling, it was not clear how the play had gone. According to W, N had won no tricks after the revoke trick, so one trick was transferred. Had the play really gone as described above, the penalty should have been two tricks.

*Further Note [added in proof] – the play record is inconsistent, it appears that at the end of T8 North still has ♣KJ and hence the ♣K will not drop at trick 9.*

**Appeal lodged by:** No Appeal

**L&EC comments:** It is unacceptable for a player to mix his cards when it is clear that his opponents are asking about a possible revoke. This was a highly experienced player and a substantial procedural penalty should have been imposed. If it were possible that the revoke had been deliberate, that would be an extremely serious matter indeed.

# APPEAL No: 19.019 No really, Keep the Money!

**Tournament Director:** Mags Pyner

**Appeals Committee:** Rob Lawy\*, John Salisbury, Ron Davis

**Event:** Weston-Super-Mare; Swiss Pairs

<p>♠ AK9764 ♥ 84 ♦ KJ ♣ 543</p> <p>♠ J2 ♥ QJ3 ♦ Q10976 ♣ K82</p> <p>♠ Q1085 ♥ A109652 ♦ 52 ♣ 9</p>	<p>♠ 3 ♥ K7 ♦ A843 ♣ AQJ1076</p>	<p>Board : 12    Dealer West:    NS vul:    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♠</td><td>2♣</td><td>3♠ (1)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass (2)</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♣</td><td>All pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Stop card used (2) Questions asked by W as to the 3♠ bid. Explanation given by N was that it was a raise to 2½. 2NT would be the good raise to 3♠.</p>	West	North	East	South	Pass	1♠	2♣	3♠ (1)	Pass (2)	Pass	4♣	All pass
West	North	East	South											
Pass	1♠	2♣	3♠ (1)											
Pass (2)	Pass	4♣	All pass											

## Basic systems:

N/S – 4Card majors, weak NT.

E/S – No system information given.

**Result at table:** 4♣= by E      N/S -130

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

**Director's ruling:**      Score adjusted to 3♠+1 by N, N/S +170.

**Director's comments:**      I was called to the table by N who was not happy that W had asked questions and E had bid 4♣. I consulted other directors and polled players. Of the 6 players I polled (from the middle of the field), 3 stated that they would have passed. The reasons given by 2 of these were that they did not want to push N/S into a vulnerable game. The other 3 players who bid 4♣ gave Pass serious consideration. I ruled that Pass was a logical alternative and adjusted the score to 3♠+1 by N, N/S +170.

**Appeal lodged by:**      E/W

**North – South comments:**      I agree with the director's comments. I'd also like to point out that the E/W partnership did not have a convention card – merely a few notes jotted down. Finally, on the next hand E was very rude and sarcastic to me

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

**Appeal Committee comments:** 4♣ is not an automatic bid and the final bid was inappropriate given the questioning by W. Director's ruling upheld. Money refunded because 3 people polled did bid 4♣.

**L&EC comments:**      The fact that half the poll sample chose the table action is not a justification for return of the deposit. The poll was conclusive that Pass was a logical alternative, and the deposit should have been forfeited to discourage meritless appeals of clear and obvious rulings.