

Appeals Report ANC1

Date: July 2006
Event: Women's Butler Stage II

Director: S Mullamphy

Appeal Panel: E Ramshaw (Chair)
C Snashall
M Prescott
N Francis

Dealer: East
Nil Vul

<p>♠QJ1087 ♥J8 ♦K75 ♣Q52</p> <p>♠K954 ♥9762 ♦J4 ♣J84</p> <p>♠3 ♥KQ43 ♦AQ106 ♣AK106</p>	<p>♠A62 ♥A105 ♦9832 ♣973</p>	<p>Bidding:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; width: 25%;">SOUTH</th> <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> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1♣</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>1♠</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2♦¹</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>2♠²</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3H³</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>4♣</td> <td>Pass</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4NT</td> <td>Pass</td> <td>5♣⁴</td> <td>All pass</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Alerted calls</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strong 2. Not 5-6 3. Described as stopper ask 4. 1 or 4 keycards 	SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST	1♣	Pass	1♠	Pass	2♦ ¹	Pass	2♠ ²	Pass	3H ³	Pass	4♣	Pass	4NT	Pass	5♣ ⁴	All pass	
SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST																				
1♣	Pass	1♠	Pass																				
2♦ ¹	Pass	2♠ ²	Pass																				
3H ³	Pass	4♣	Pass																				
4NT	Pass	5♣ ⁴	All pass																				

Final Contract and Result: 5♣S, making +400 N/S

Tournament Directors Report and Decision:

Called after the play of the hand. EW believed that there was a hesitation before the 5♣ response. NS did not object to this. The directing staff believed that the unauthorized information from the out of tempo 5♣ may have suggested that there was something wrong with the 5♣ response (as there was). And that this excluded the left hand opponent of the option of PASS. The score was adjusted to 6♣, down one, -50NS. When I gave the ruling NS disagreed with the break in tempo.

Appellant's Claim:

NS maintained that North did say she made the 5♣ bid in tempo when the directing staff were at the table. In the table discussion EW's major objection was to South passing 5♣ despite North showing one keycard. South passed because she was missing 2 Aces and the Queen of trumps plus North's delayed club support in the auction strongly suggested a 7 card trump fit. The tempo break in this auction occurred when North bid 4♣ after 3♥ by South not before the 5♣ bid.

Respondent's Claim:

North did not bid 5♣ in tempo and indeed did not dispute the tempo break in the presence of the Director. During the tempo break both East and West were privately wondering if North may be contemplating passing 4NT. In the presence of the director (when he returned with his ruling) North stated that it was not unusual in a "club" auction to give an incorrect response to Blackwood.

Appeal Committee Decision:

Appeal's committee accepted the Director's opinion that hesitation occurred. Adjusted score confirmed. -50 NS.

Appeals Report ANC2

Date: July 2006
Event: Open Butler Stage II

Director: C Diment

Appeal Panel: E Ramshaw (Chair)
M Scudder
I Thomson
S Lester

Dealer: West
Nil Vul

♠87643		Bidding:			
♥AQ32		SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
♦A9			Pass	2♥ ¹	Pass
♣95		3♥	Double	Pass	3NT
♠A1095	♠KQ	All Pass			
♥5	♥KJ4				
♦1087	♦J643				
♣KQ762	♣AJ103				
♠J2		Alerted calls			
♥109876		1. Both Majors – weak			
♦KQ52					
♣84					

Final Contract and Result: 3NT making -460 NS

Tournament Directors Report and Decision:

Before passing 2♥, East enquired about its meaning and agreed there was a hesitation. Ruling: Pass was a logical alternative on the West hand. Score adjusted to 3♥X -200 NS.

Appellant's Claim:

West thought he had a normal takeout double as a passed hand. If NS had a known fit, EW would also have a fit. Why should EW have to sell out to 3♥ when we could be making 4 of a minor.

Appeal Committee Decision:

Appeal's committee believes Pass is a logical alternative, therefore the Director's adjustment stands. -200 NS.

Appeals Report ANC3

Date: July 2006
Event: Open Butler Stage II

Director: S Mullamphy

Appeal Panel: E Ramshaw (Chair)
B Neill
E Chadwick
N Francis

Dealer: West
Nil Vul

♠6	
♥A854	
♦J962	
♣J1096	
♠8	♠KJ1075432
♥K1073	♥-
♦KQ873	♦4
♣A2	♣K874
♠AQ9	
♥QJ962	
♦A5	
♣Q53	

Bidding:	WEST	NORTH	EAST
SOUTH	1♦ ¹	Pass	1♥ ²
1NT ³	2♥	2NT ⁴	All Pass

Alerted calls
1. Natural 12-17
2. 1H = 7+
3. 15-18. Described as a 2 suiter
4. Forcing. Asking for clarification

Final Contract and Result: 2NT Making +150 NS

Tournament Directors Report and Decision:

There was a mis-explanation of the 1NT call. Described as a 2-suiter (System Card stated Natural). East asked the meaning of the 2NT and was told "asking for clarification". South passed following East's questions. East maintained that given the correct explanation of the auction he would have bid 4♠. Score adjustment to +420 EW.

Appellant's Claim:

Over their relay of 1♥, 1NT was meant as strong and balanced, but explained as a two-suiter. South passed 2NT knowing East wanted to take some action. Failure to bid an 8 card suit was the reason for their poor result and their artificial system.

Respondent's Claim:

South's explanation of 2NT was Asking as I recall. I waited to double any bid by South or North thereafter. If South had explained North's bid to be non-forcing I would have immediately hopped 4♠. I didn't open 4♠ because I'm not allowed to by partner.

Appeal Committee Decision:

The committee felt that South's pass of 2NT could just as easily be attributed to North's mis-explanation as to East's table mannerisms. Director's ruling upheld. -420 NS

Appeals Report ANC4

Date: July 2006
Event: Women's Butler Stage III

Director: S Mullamphy

Appeal Panel: E Ramshaw (Chair)
P Reynolds
S Lester
M Prescott

Dealer: South
Nil Vul

♠K1098654	
♥1096	
♦98	
♣3	
♠2	♠AQJ
♥AK85	♥432
♦K75432	♦QJ106
♣84	♣J97
♠73	
♥QJ7	
♦A	
♣AKQ10652	

Bidding:	WEST	NORTH	EAST
SOUTH			
1♣	1♦	2♠ ¹	3♦
3♥	4♦	Pass	5♦
All Pass			

Alerted calls
1. Weak jump shift. Described as non-forcing.

Final Contract and Result: 5♦W Down 2 +100 NS

Tournament Directors Report and Decision:

I was called after 4♦, Pass, Pass, 2♠ was now described as weak jump shift as opposed to non-forcing. East now changed their pass to 5♦. This failed by 2 tricks. East when I was called, said given the correct explanation of 2♠ originally, would have bid 3♠ (good raise) and West would now have bid only 4♦. The directing staff reviewed the deal and could not see that EW would not still reach 5♦. Score stands.

Appellant's Claim:

In the course of the bidding when 2♠ was bid by North it was alerted and explained as "natural and non-forcing". As East, I took this as a constructive bid. I bid 3♦. South bid 3♥ which appears to be a strong bid, West bid 4♦, Pass from North and Pass from me. South passed, but re-alerted 2♠ as a weak bid. The Director was called and said I could take back my pass and bid again. That meant I had to guess where the contract should be and bid 5♦. However, if 2♠ had been described correctly originally, I would have bid 3♠, showing 10+ points and a good diamond raise. West would place the contract at 4♦.

Respondent's Claim:

(South's corrected explanation prior to her pass). EW bid to 5♦ knowing that North had a "weak" hand. West's bid of 4♦ over the 3♥ bid (when East had only bid 3♦) must show a good hand, one that would have bid game over a 3♠ 10+ good raise. It is inconceivable that 5♦ would not be bid over a strong diamond raise.

Appeal Committee Decision:

East's final bid caused the damage. Score stands. +100 NS