

Appeal Report ANC1

Date: July 2003

Event: Australian Butler Pairs Open stage I

Director: C.Diment

Appeal Panel: B.Neill

D.Beauchamp

K.Crowe-Mai

R.Folkard

K.Moses

Dlr:W ♠ AQ9652

All vul ♥ Q6

♦ KQ9

♣ A9

♠ J87

♠ 4

♥ AJ9832

♥ K1074

♦ 8

♦ 107632

♣ K64

♣ QJ7

♠ K103

♥ 5

♦ AJ54

♣ 108532

Bidding:

Basic system

S	W	N	E
	2♦1	X	2♠2
P	4♥	P	P
P3			

Noted bids:

1 Alerted - multi

2 No alert

3 South asked about 2♠ prior to passing. Now alerted and explained as invitational in hearts

Final Contract and result: 4♥W, making, 620 to E/W

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

There was an infraction. Laws 9B, 21B, 11A

Called at the end of play. At the time the late alert, E/W offered to call the director, N/S declined (9B). Had I been called at this time, North would have had the opportunity to change his call (21B).

Score stands (11A).

Appellant's claim

North would have bid as the nature of the 2♠ bid was known. How can North ask what 2♠ was, when he would be telling partner he had spades. North was clearly damaged by the failure of the alert.

Responder's reply

- 1) No dispute as to facts
- 2) South was asked if they wished to call director prior to end of auction.
- 3) Don't believe North's action is clear cut.
- 4) If they bid 4♠, East will save.

Appeal Committee discussion

Appeal Committee decision

There was an infraction. This was not the cause of the damage as both North and South had opportunities to bid. Result stands

Appeal Report – ANC2

Date: July 2003

Event: ABPC Women's stage 2

Director: I.Dahler

Appeal Panel: B.Neill (chair)

M.Prescott

K.Crow-Mai

P.Reynolds

V.Cummings

Dir:E ♠ KJ953	Bidding:	Basic system		
NS vul ♥ ----				
♦ QJ8	S	W	N	E
♣ Q10652				1♦
♠ 42	P	1♥	2♥	3♥
♥ A97532	3♠	4♥	P	P
♦ K65	4♠	All pass		
♣ K3				
♠ Q876	Noted bids:			
♥ 1064		1		
♦ A9		2		
♣ 9874		3		

Final Contract and result: 4♠S, making, +620 N/S

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

After the bid of 4♥, North passed and then North asked is that 4♥. North stated that she had read the 4♥ as 6♥ (unauthorised information to partner). South now bid 4♠. Both East and West did not believe South had her bid of 4♠.

Under Law 21A I had no recourse but to adjust the score back to 4♥ W, making.

Score adjusted to 4♥W, making, +620 E/W

Appellant's claim

The 4♥ bid was read by me as 6♥. I tender a previous sample of West's handwriting to support this.

When West announce that the contract was 4♥, I was naturally startled. I said "What, 4♥" or something similar. The director was summoned and she stated that it was clearly 4♥.

I very strongly disagree that my surprise implied that I would have bid if I had known that the bid was 4♥. I would not have bid. I have told partner my hand.

Appeal Committee decision

Whilst the committee agrees totally that North had no intention of bidding or passing information to partner, we are also of the firm opinion that South did not act upon North's expression of surprise. However, the committee believes that "pass" is a viable alternative to 4♠ and that it must by Law uphold the directors decision.

Appeal Report – ANC3

Date: July 2003

Event: ABPC Women's stage 2

Director: I.Dahler

Appeal Panel: B.Neill (chair)

M.Prescott

K.Crow-Mai

P.Reynolds

V.Cummings

Dir:E ♠ KJ953	Bidding:	Basic system		
NS vul ♥ ----				
♦ QJ8	S	W	N	E
♣ Q10652				1♦
♠ 42	P	1♥	2♥	3♥
♥ A97532	3♠	4♥	P	P
♦ K65	4♠	All pass		
♣ K3				
♠ Q876	Noted bids:			
♥ 1064		1		
♦ A9		2		
♣ 9874		3		

Final Contract and result: 4♠S, making, +620 N/S

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

After the bid of 4♥, North passed and then North asked is that 4♥. North stated that she had read the 4♥ as 6♥ (unauthorised information to partner). South now bid 4♠. Both East and West did not believe South had her bid of 4♠.

Under Law 21A I had no recourse but to adjust the score back to 4♥ W, making.

Score adjusted to 4♥W, making, +620 E/W

Appellant's claim

The 4♥ bid was read by me as 6♥. I tender a previous sample of West's handwriting to support this.

When West announce that the contract was 4♥, I was naturally startled. I said "What, 4♥" or something similar. The director was summoned and she stated that it was clearly 4♥.

I very strongly disagree that my surprise implied that I would have bid if I had known that the bid was 4♥. I would not have bid. I have told partner my hand.

Appeal Committee decision

Whilst the committee agrees totally that North had no intention of bidding or passing information to partner, we are also of the firm opinion that South did not act upon North's expression of surprise. However, the committee believes that "pass" is a viable alternative to 4♠ and that it must by Law uphold the directors decision.

Appeal Report – ANC4

Date: July 2003

Event: Interstate Teams Open round 7

Director: S.Mullamphy

Appeal Panel: B.Neill (chair)

S.Lusk

M.Scudder

C.Snashall

T.Chadwick

Dlr:E ♠ 43		Bidding:		Basic system	
EWvul ♥ AKQ1097					
♦ 943		S	W	N	E
♣ Q8					1♠
♠ Q109	♠ AKJ7652	2NT	4S	P1	P
♥ J85432	♥ 6	5♣	X	5♦	P
♦ A	♦ QJ10	P	X	All pass	
♣ KJ6	♣ 52				
♠ 8		Noted bids:			
♥ ----		1 Agreed hesitation			
♦ K87652					
♣ A109743					

Final Contract and result: 5♦X by North, down 2 tricks, 300 to EW

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

South is in receipt of unauthorised information. To act at the 5-level opposite a silent partner is not without danger. This is removed by the hesitation. North is highly unlikely to be contemplating doubling 4♠. To bid at the 5-level an initial 4NT may have been made.

Score adjusted to 4♠E, making 11 tricks, 650 to EW.

Appellant's claim

We contend that North's break in tempo does not suggest bidding (nor does it suggest passing) so the conditions to apply Law 16 have not been satisfied.

Pass is not a logical alternative when tripleton support for one minor or doubleton honour support in both suits makes action clearly profitable especially at favourable vulnerability (basic team strategy), and the opponents have a proven fit.

The appealing captain did not consider there was a very long hesitation.

North was not present and nobody was able to say what he was thinking about re:hesitation.

Responder's reply

2NT was never alerted and after West's 4♠ bid it was a very long hesitation from North (up to 2 min.). So with this information it's easy for South to bid since North was thinking of bidding.

We believe the directors ruling to be 100% right.

(Verbally added) Without hesitation, more risk of pushing into slam.

Appeal Committee discussion

Law 16 was discussed whether it was relevant, and decided that South had their bid.

Appeal Committee decision

Regardless of any unauthorised information the committee believes it is clear cut for South to bid.
Result restored to table score, 5♦X, down 2 tricks, 300 to EW.

Appeal Report – ANC5

Date: July 2003

Event: Interstate Teams Open round 7

Director: S.Mullamphy

Appeal Panel: B.Neill (chair)

S.Lusk

M.Scudder

C.Snashall

T.Chadwick

Dlr:E ♠ 43		Bidding:		Basic system	
EWvul ♥ AKQ1097					
♦ 943		S	W	N	E
♣ Q8					1♠
♠ Q109	♠ AKJ7652	2NT	4S	P1	P
♥ J85432	♥ 6	5♣	X	5♦	P
♦ A	♦ QJ10	P	X	All pass	
♣ KJ6	♣ 52				
♠ 8		Noted bids:			
♥ ----		1 Agreed hesitation			
♦ K87652					
♣ A109743					

Final Contract and result: 5♦X by North, down 2 tricks, 300 to EW

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

South is in receipt of unauthorised information. To act at the 5-level opposite a silent partner is not without danger. This is removed by the hesitation. North is highly unlikely to be contemplating doubling 4♠. To bid at the 5-level an initial 4NT may have been made.

Score adjusted to 4♠E, making 11 tricks, 650 to EW.

Appellant's claim

We contend that North's break in tempo does not suggest bidding (nor does it suggest passing) so the conditions to apply Law 16 have not been satisfied.

Pass is not a logical alternative when tripleton support for one minor or doubleton honour support in both suits makes action clearly profitable especially at favourable vulnerability (basic team strategy), and the opponents have a proven fit.

The appealing captain did not consider there was a very long hesitation.

North was not present and nobody was able to say what he was thinking about re:hesitation.

Responder's reply

2NT was never alerted and after West's 4♠ bid it was a very long hesitation from North (up to 2 min.). So with this information it's easy for South to bid since North was thinking of bidding.

We believe the directors ruling to be 100% right.

(Verbally added) Without hesitation, more risk of pushing into slam.

Appeal Committee discussion

Law 16 was discussed whether it was relevant, and decided that South had their bid.

Appeal Committee decision

Regardless of any unauthorised information the committee believes it is clear cut for South to bid.

Result restored to table score, 5♦X, down 2 tricks, 300 to EW.

Appeal Report – GNOT1

Date: Nov.2003
Event: GNOT final

Director: E.Ramshaw
Appeal Panel: Z.Nagy
 B.Evans
 N.Hughes

Dir:W ♠ 10842

NS vul ♥ KJ95

♦ A87

♣ K5

♠ 93

♠ AKJ75

♥ Q108432

♥ 76

♦ J653

♦ Q

♣ 6

♣ A10432

♠ Q6

♥ A

♦ K10942

♣ QJ987

Bidding:

Basic system

S	W	N	E
	P	1♦	1♠
2♠	P	2NT	3♣
3♣1			
3NT			

Noted bids:

1 3♣ insufficient bid passed through the screen and then returned.

Screen running NW to SE

Final Contract and result: 3NT N, down one trick, +100 to EW

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

After the insufficient bid of 3♣ was passed through the screen and returned, I ruled under section C (only one side at fault), that the appropriate penalty be applied (law 27) and the hand was completed. The ruling should be under section C (both sides at fault)rectification without penalty....may not be accepted. Consequently (law 82C directors error) I awarded an adjusted score to NS +500.

Appellant's claim

The issue of unauthorised information is moot as the screen rule simply does not recognise the infraction. On this basis the only relevant issue is the size of the adjusted score and we leave it to the hearing to discuss this further.

Responder's reply

In the position of the director ruling at the table, why should the non-offending side be penalised by South being able to change to a double and we believe that 3♠X would make 7 tricks, not 6 tricks, and 3♣ being some sort of cue North has unauthorised information with an artificial bid of 3♣.

Appeal Committee discussion

Appeal Committee decision

It is the unanimous opinion of the panel that:-

- 1) the director made the wrong ruling in law. That under ABF screen regs, both West and South were at fault for passing the tray through without drawing attention to the irregularity. In this case the director should have returned the tray to W/S for rectification.

- 2) If that had happened, in the likely contract of 3♠EX, while +500 is possible, the most favourable NS result that is all likely is 2 off for NS+300.

Score adjusted to NS+300.

Appeal Report – GC 1

Date: Feb.03

Event: Gold Coast Restricted teams round 2

Director: G.Slack-Smith

Appeal Panel: E.Ramshaw
 B.Westwood
 I.McKinnon
 I.Dahler

Dir: W ♠ 93 Nil vul ♥ J852 ♦ KQ63 ♣ AQ8 ♠ AK7 ♠ QJ8642 ♥ AKQ9643 ♥ ---- ♦ 108 ♦ J95 ♣ 3 ♣ K542 ♠ 105 ♥ 107 ♦ A742 ♣ J10976	Bidding: <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">S</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">W</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">N</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">E</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">2♣1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">P</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2♦2</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">X</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2♥</td> <td style="text-align: center;">P</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2♠</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">P</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3♠</td> <td style="text-align: center;">P</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4NT</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">P</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5♣</td> <td style="text-align: center;">P</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6♠</td> </tr> </table> All pass Noted bids: 1 2 3 4	S	W	N	E		2♣1	P	2♦2	X	2♥	P	2♠	P	3♠	P	4NT	P	5♣	P	6♠	Basic system
S	W	N	E																			
	2♣1	P	2♦2																			
X	2♥	P	2♠																			
P	3♠	P	4NT																			
P	5♣	P	6♠																			

Final Contract and result: 6♠E, making, -980

Play if relevant: ♣J lead

Tournament Directors Report and decision: No dispute to the facts, an infraction under law 75C & D. East, after inquiry by South, explains 5♣ as showing “0 or 4”. Incorrect explanation of E/W agreements of 0 or 3. West also fails to correct partner’s explanation. West did not explain to their opponents that 0 or 4 referred to key-cards in spades not just aces. South has been given misinformation as to the number and nature of controls held by West. South’s claim of damage is they reasoned 5♣ showed 4 aces, or 3 aces plus void, as they were looking at one ace themselves, hence did not lead the ♦ ace. Ruled that score for 6♠ making 12 tricks stands. Assumption that 5♣ holds 4-key-cards is not only logical interpretation East may hold 4-key cards himself. Failure of defense to take two or three tricks is not a direct result of the mis-information. After North wins the ♣ ace, return of ♦ K requested by South’s double of 2♦ allows defense to take 3 tricks.

Appellant’s claim

I believe dispute should be judged on the fact that misinformation of having 0 or 4 aces guided me to make a lead which I would not have made if I had been told the correct number of aces. If information had not influenced me I would have led ace of diamonds and after seeing dummy and partner’s returning signal, contract would have gone two down. Dummy did not inform me of wrong information.

Responder’s reply

Appeal Committee discussion

Appeal Committee decision

Upholding Director's decision.

Responders to be told that they should give a full explanation of any question. Example; when asked how many aces, should have replied we play key-card.

Appeal Report – GC2

Date: Feb.03

Event: Gold Coast teams round 2

Director: L.Kelso

Appeal Panel: B.Neill (Chair)

I.Dahler

M.Thomson

T.Chadwick

P.Gue

Dir: S ♠ AJ4

All vul ♥ J973

♦ J108762

♣ ----

♠ Q73 ♠ K1086

♥ AQ842 ♥ K105

♦ 9 ♦ Q

♣ K1075 ♣ AQJ93

♠ 952

♥ 6

♦ AK543

♣ 8642

Bidding:

Basic system

S	W	N	E
P	1♥	P	3♦1
P	4♥	All pass	

Noted bids:

1 Splinter bid, not alerted

2

3

4

Final Contract and result: 4♥W, making 11, EW 650

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision: No dispute to facts, an infraction occurred, dealt with Laws 21, 16, and ABF alert regulations.

Systemically 3♦ was a splinter bid – agreeing hearts. South maintained that if 3♦ had been alerted, he would have inquired and then doubled to show diamonds. North would then have been able to raise to 5♦, either buying the contract or ultimately defending 5♥. South, however, also admitted that he was fully aware at the time that 3♦ was not natural. He explained that he had reasoned that it could either be a splinter or a Bergen raise, but elected not to clarify the situation, since if he did inquire and it turned out to be Bergen, he would have had to still pass, and now his partner would have been in receipt of unauthorised information.

Law 16 makes no distinction between the status of U.I. that may arise due to questions asked about either alerted calls or non-alerted calls.

Table score not adjusted.

Appellant's claim

N/S system is to double splinter bids to show good suits, but double of artificial raises are take-out of suit opened. If 3♦ had been alerted, (South) I would have felt much happier about asking and then passing (if appropriate) – any U.I. would have been minimal. Asking about an unalerted bid and then passing would have conveyed lots of U.I.

If South knows 3♦ is a splinter, he will double and North will bid 5♦ - South is known to have a void in hearts. 5♦ will probably be doubled for -200, but should E/W compete to 5♥, North will definitely defend with 3 likely tricks, spade, diamond, and trump – North certainly won't lead a trump, as she did against the actual auction.

Responder's reply

Appeal Committee discussion

Appeal Committee decision

That, in accordance with the ABF tournament regulations relating to alerts, the committee believes that the 3♦ bid was "self-alerting" and that South could have inquired without giving any more unauthorised information, than if it had been alerted.

The director to discuss with West the need to alert.

Appeal dismissed, table score stands.

Appeal Report – GC3

Date: Feb.2003

Event: Gold Coast Teams Round 7

Director: Alan Gibson

Appeal Panel: M.Scudder
 T.Chadwick ?
 P.Fordham

Dir:E ♠ KJ63

All vul ♥ 9643

♦ 953

♣ 108

♠ 10982 ♠ Q754

♥ J87 ♥ Q10

♦ 104 ♦ KQJ8

♣ K632 ♣ A74

♠ A

♥ AK52

♦ A762

♣ QJ95

Bidding:

S	W	N	E
			1NT
X1	2♣2	P	P
X3	P	2♠	P
2NT	All pass		

Basic system: E/W Acol

Noted bids:

1 Penalty

2 explained as ♣+♥

3 T/O

4 After auction, East amended explanation to ♣+♥, or ♣+♠, as they have agreed they have no way of showing ♣+♠, other than via 2♣ first.

Final Contract and result: 2NTS, down 1, 100 to E/W

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

There was an infraction. Laws applicable 75D12, A1, 12C1, 75C, 21B3, 40C.

Director called after play completed. Ruled that East should have made a full disclosure of meaning of 2♣, and if they had, the auction is likely to have been

W	N	E	S
		1NT	X
2♣	P	P	X
P	2H	All pass	

If South had made a T/O double with 1-4 in unbid suits, he would surely have done so with potentially 4/4 in unbid suits. With 4♥ and 4♠ North would have called 2♥. As the offending side, West is deemed not to compete further. 8 tricks available to N/S in 2♥ based on normal defence.

Score adjusted to 2♥N, making, 110 to N/S

Appellant's claim

The explanation after the auction was that we had discussed that there was no convenient way to show ♣+♠ and that we had discussed that maybe a way to do it was to bid 2♣ showing ♣+♥ and possibly correct ♥ to ♠. On this basis it can reasonably be said that some agreement existed.

However, we disagree as have the opponents that no reasonable auction can be constructed whereby the opponents would stop in 2♥.

The N/S score was created by South's decision to make an off-shape T/O double. He did so on the basis that they may be able to penalise or find a playable spot.

Responder's reply

Appeal Committee discussion

Appeal Committee decision

NS -100, most favourable likely

EW -110, most unfavourable

Appeal Report – GC4

Date: Feb.2003

Event: Gold Coast teams round 8

Director: I.Dahler

Appeal Panel: T.Chadwick (Chair)

R.Busch

M. Scudder

P.Fordham

N.Francis

Dlr:	♠ Q	Bidding:		Basic system
vul	♥ KQ98765			
	♦ 542	S	W	N
	♣ 106		P	3♥
♠ J9532	♠ K4	4♥	All pass	P
♥ ----	♥ 1043			
♦ Q983	♦ A1076			
♣ K873	♣ QJ52			
	♠ A10876		Noted bids:	
	♥ AJ2		1	
	♦ KJ		2	
	♣ A94		3	
			4	

Final Contract and result: 4♥N, making 10 tricks

Play if relevant:

- ♠K, ♠A, ♠5, ♠Q;
- ♥2, ♣3, ♥Q/K, ♥4;
- ♦x, ♦6, ♦J, ♦Q;
- ♣7, ♣10*, ♣J, ♣A; * 15 seconds delay
- ♦K, ♦8, x♦, ♦A;
- ♥3, ♥J, ♠2, ♥x;
- ♣4, ♣K

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

I was called to the table after this board had been passed to the next table and cards had been removed from the next hand. West stated that on previous board he had led a small club. North had a change in tempo and had played the 10 of spades (clubs) which was covered by the queen (jack) and ace. Later North had led a small club from dummy and West rose with the king. He stated that had North not hesitated he would have played low. I asked North why did he hesitate and he stated he had fully expected a spade to be returned and when he saw the club he had to change his thinking.

Ruled the table score to stand.

Appellant's claim

Declarer took about 15 seconds to play the ♣10 at (trick) four despite having, in effect xx. West gained the impression that North had something to think about ie. ♣Q10. What else?

If North treated 10x as two small then we submit that he should have played small and decided whether to win the ♣ace after east had played, or stated that "he was not thinking of his current play". The fact that he played the ♣10, and it created the illusion of the Q10, suggests that he could have been aware of the situation.

Had the ♣ been ducked by North (West) then the contract would be defeated by a third trump.

Responder's reply

Appeal Committee discussion

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal dismissed. Directors ruling upheld.

Law 73F(ii) 3rd component not realised

Play of ♣K can never beat the contract given appropriate defensive card count methods.

Appeal Report – GC5

Date: Feb.2003

Event: Gold Coast teams semi-final stanza 1

Director: L.Kelso

Appeal Panel: K.Dyke
 T.Griffin
 B.Goren
 C.Baker
 P.Fordham

Screen from NW to SE

Dlr:E ♠ 1073

All vul ♥ A8

♦ 1092

♣ KJ963

♠ AQ854 ♠ J62

♥ K743 ♥ 652

♦ QJ ♦ A76

♣ 74 ♣ AQ82

♠ K9

♥ QJ109

♦ K8543

♣ 105

Bidding:

S	W	N	E
			1♦
P	1♠	P	1NT
P	2♣1	X	P
2♥	X2	P	2♠
3♦	4♠	All pass	

Noted bids:

1 Alerted by West, no alert by East
 2 Alerted, T/O by East, penalties by West
 3
 4

Final Contract and result: 4♠W, making, +620 to E/W

Play if relevant: ♠7, ♠2, ♠K, ♠A;
 ♦Q, ♦x, ♦x, ♦K;
 ♥Q, ♥x, ♥8, ♥x;
 ♥J, ♥x, ♥A, ♥x;

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

There was an infraction.

Called at the end of hand. North said that if he had known that 2♣ was checkback he would not have doubled. He had assumed that 2♣ was natural (his double was thus showing clubs). If the bid had been alerted and explained as checkback, his double would systemically have been take-out.

I ruled that if his decision was dependent upon the nature of 2♣, then in this fairly common auction he had some responsibility to protect himself and ask (especially behind screens) before taking action.

No adjustment.

Appellant's claim

We believe it is clearly completely East's responsibility to alert, not North's to ask. By asking, North would reveal he had clubs. If North is alerted, N/S would never bid and West would certainly go down in 4♠ by playing a ♥ to the king and ace.

Responder's reply

Appeal Committee discussion

Appeal Committee decision

The committee accept that East's failure to alert the 2♣ was an infraction. However, the committee believes that the play was not materially affected by the failure to alert. Consequently the table result of E/W+620 stands.

The committee further believe that the failure to alert, as an infraction, merits the imposition of a procedural penalty of 2 imps.

Appeal Report – SNOT 1

Date: Nov. 2003

Event: SNOT

Director: C.Diment

Appeal Panel: B.Neill (chair)

C.Snashall

T.Chadwick

A.Braithwaite

P.Gue

Dir:N ♠ J32

Nil vul ♥ Q763

♦ J8763

♣ 7

♠ AQ84 ♠ K965

♥ K2 ♥ 95

♦ K4 ♦ 92

♣ AQ943 ♣ KJ862

♠ 107

♥ AJ1084

♦ AQ105

♣ 105

Bidding:

Basic system

S W N E

P P

1♥ X 3♥1 P2

P 3NT

Noted bids:

1 alerted

2 East asked about 3♥, showed a “normal” 2♥ raise, after some thought, passed

Final Contract and result: 3NT, 11 tricks, +460 EW

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

No dispute as to facts. East asked about the alerted 3♥ bid, then passed

Pass by West is not a logical alternative. No adjustment under Law 16 A2 or 73 F1.

Table result stands.

Appellant's claim

It is evident that West's 3NT bid was influenced by East's questions and interest, over the 3♥ raise.

You may maintain that we are in no position to judge West's normal judgement of West's hand value. We have to look no further than board 18 (auction submitted). There, without interest shown by partner opposite his double, he advanced no further on a far better hand.

Responder's reply

I enquired re meaning of bid – was going to make a responsive double if weak. Described as Truscott “good raise to 2♥” – didn't have the bid of course.

Appeal Committee discussion

Players introduced, EW & S present. The director stated the situation. Called at the end of the hand. No dispute to the facts. The directing staff were unanimous that West would take action, and 3NT was a reasonable action.

The appellants stated that pass may well have been an alternative action.

The captain of the appellant's teams arrived and raised the issue of a later hand.

The respondents asked where an infraction is deemed to have occurred. The law regarding unauthorised information was explained.

East stated his position as at the time of the 3♥ bid.

Questions were asked of West as to what double of 3♥ would be? Not clear, but forward going. East stated that his double would be responsive, and that after the event he felt he should have taken that action.

Questions asked of South as to what 3♥ was. Agreed the North hand was light for the action.

Players left.

Discussion led to full agreement that 3NT is not a bid that should be allowed. Discussion as to whether West should pass. General agreement that some action is likely to be taken (2/3 time), and so; pass 1/3 of time, 3♠ reached 1/3 time (making 11 tricks), 4♠ reached 1/3 time making 11 tricks.

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal upheld.

Adjusted score to	Pass (1/3 time)	3♥ down 1 trick
	3♠ (1/3)	making 11 tricks
	4♠ (1/3)	making 11 tricks;

So, +230 to EW

Appeal Report – VCC1

Date: June 2003

Event: VCC

Director: M.Wilcox

Appeal Panel: B.Thompson (Chair)

A.Mill

D.Beauchamp

Dlr:S	♠ AK64	Bidding:	Basic system		
? vul	♥ K72	S	W	N	E
	♦ J743	1♦	P	1♠	2♣
	♣ Q4	4♠	P	P1	4NT
♠ Q75	♠ 108	P	5♣	X	P
♥ 106	♥ AQJ95	5♦	All pass		
♦ 652	♦ ----	Noted bids:			
♣ J10976	♣ AK8532	1 hesitation			
	♠ J932				
	♥ 843				
	♦ AKQ1098				
	♣ ----				

Final Contract and result: 5♦ down one, +50 EW

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

Score stands

Appellant's claim

South stated that he wasn't sure if he had shown a strong hand or distributional hand when he bid 4♠.

We believe that the hesitation after the 4♠ bid exacerbated this doubt and made it easier to take an "insurance" position in case his partner didn't have a full weight penalty double.

We do not believe that under normal circumstances there is any reason to believe you don't have an easy +500 (two trump tricks, two diamonds). Further we believe the lead against 5♣ doubled is likely to be the ♦ace, so the contract makes 13 tricks.

Responder's reply

I made no claim about confusion about the status of my 4♠ bid. It normally shows an 18+pt hand.

In light of the 4NT bid which must be a 6/5 in clubs/hearts, as with 5/5 he would have overcalled hearts, I judged that I had no defence to 5♣. This was in light of the fact that I had no hcp's in the opponent's suits, the fact that my diamonds were unlikely to cash as the 6/5 hand would be unlikely to have more than one diamond and very likely to be void, and that I had fewer hcp's than promised.

Appeal Committee discussion

Appeal Committee decision

Director's ruling upheld – table score of 5♦ +50 EW stands.

It is too long a bow to suggest that the prior hesitation gives sufficient information to be useful to South. Arguably the unauthorised information might suggest defending.

Appeal Report – VCC2

Date: June 2003

Event: VCC

Director: M.Wicox

Appeal Panel: P.Gue (chair)

P.Marston

C.Snashall

Dlr:E ♠ AQ4	Bidding:	Basic system
Nil vul ♥ J1092	S W N E	
♦ AKJ72		1♠
♣ 7	P 2♣ X	3♣
♠ K85 ♠ J10632	3♥ 3♠ 4♥	P1
♥ 64 ♥ A7	P 4♠ X	All pass
♦ 106 ♦ Q9		
♣ AQ8652 ♣ KJ109	Noted bids:	
♠ 97	1 hesitation	
♥ KQ853		
♦ 8543		
♣ 43		

Final Contract and result: 4♠EX, down two, +300 NS

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

Due to hesitation pass is a logical alternative. Score adjusted to +450NS (Law 16 12 C2).

Appellant's claim

With a double fit and virtually no defence West was always intending to compete to 4♠ over the anticipated 4♥ from North. East's hesitation over 4♥ was irrelevant.

Responder's reply

West had already described his hand.

Appeal Committee discussion

The director was approached at the end of the hand. There was no dispute on the facts. After consideration, adjusted the score.

West stated he knew they had about half the values, hoped to buy the hand in 3♠. When they bid 4♥ he believed that he had a normal 4♠ bid, with little defence.

West felt he was in an awkward position and was always going to be damaged by whatever he did.

Appeal Committee decision

Committee unanimous that there was an alternative action to bidding 4♠ - pass. Further, the appellants should have been aware of the law in regards this matter and find the appeal without merit.

Adjusted score to stand, the appellants fined 0.9 VP, penalty to be imposed at the end of round 10, for an appeal without merit.

Appeal Report – SFBridge 1

Date: Jan 03

Event: National Seniors teams round 6

Director: L.Kelso

Appeal Panel: I.Dahler (Chair)

C.Snashall

G.Ridgway

J.Brockwell

K.Moses

Dir: W ♠AQJ93

Allvul ♥K98

♦Q4

♣J95

♠86

♠54

♥J1063

♥AQ752

♦AJ763

♦105

♣Q7

♣AK32

♠K1072

♥4

♦K982

♣10864

Bidding:

Basic system; NS Std Amer (5M)

S	W	N	E
	P	1♠1	2♥
2♠	4♥	P2	P
4♠	P	P	Dbl
P	P	P	

Noted bids:

1 5-card

2 North made inquiries regarding the auction

Final Contract and result: 4♠XN, down 2, EW+500

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

At North's second turn to call she inquired about the hcp range and strength of East's 2♥ overcall. Questions asked during the auction are one of potential sources of extraneous information itemised in Law 16 (Unauthorised information).

The Directing staff ruled that UI was present and that the 4♠ action was one that could have been demonstrably suggested over the logical alternative of pass by such UI.

Score adjusted to EW+620, 4♥E making.

Appellant's claim

None reported

Responder's reply

None reported

Appeal Committee discussion

Appeal Committee decision

The appeal committee ruling is that the director's ruling be upheld because the situation is clear under law. The committee wishes the appellants be advised that they have an absolute right of appeal and that there is no suggestion that they have done anything wrong. However under the law the final 4♠ bid cannot be allowed.

Appeal Report – SFBridge2

Date: Jan 03

Event: Men's Pairs session 3

Director: D.Hoffman

Players:

Appeal Panel: I.Dahler (Chair)

M.Scudder

M.McManus

C.Snashall

N.Francis

Dir:S ♠J54

NSvul ♥754

♦964

♣K432

♠A863 ♠72

♥QJ108 ♥K3

♦K853 ♦A10

♣8 ♣AJ109765

♠KQ109

♥A962

♦QJ72

♣Q

Bidding:

Basic system

S W N E

1NT 2♣1 P P

Dbl P 2♥ P

P P

Noted bids:

1Both majors,4+, weak

Final Contract and result: 2♥N, down 4, EW+400

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

Score adjusted to 2♣W, making 9 tricks, EW+110

When called to the table NS said they failed to hear the verbal alert. NS contributed that they had been talking which contributed to failure to hear. I informed EW that they should have circled the bid to indicate the alert. After consultation with other directors I adjusted (but failed to inform EW).

At the end of the evening West pointed out that in the main box was an attempt to alert (it existed but nobody indicated when it occurred). I indicated that if this was done along with alert, I would not have adjusted.

Appellant's claim

The ruling was changed to 2♣W making 9 tricks. This ruling was made by the director away from the table with no notification made towards us. We heard of the adjustment after the session had finished due to hearsay from another player. Upon approaching the director he informed me that he in fact changed the score without letting us know. We feel that this has been a wrong ruling and that we are not the offending side.

Our bid was alerted and the opposition failed to acknowledge the alerted bid. My partner paused and alerted the bid during the auction. At this point continued as normal with South doubling for take-out and his partner bid 2♥. The result was four down EW+400. At trick 9 the opposition called the director and claimed the bid wasn't alerted. The director took the bidding slip away with him and made the ruling with no notification. He has now lost the bidding slip and when we went to appeal we were within time and the director had gone home. Again we feel we are not the offending side as we did everything we should have done.

Responder's reply

Appeal Committee discussion

Players introduced, all present.

Director explained what had occurred.

N/S conceded that there was a lot of "chit chat" and that they may not have heard the alert. The director had explained to East that he should have circled the bid.

The director adjusted the score after discussion with other directors, to 2♣ making 9 tricks. He notified NS of the ruling but omitted to let EW know. EW approached the director after play when he indicated that if he had been made aware of the marked bidding pad he may well have considered that as additional information. He was not prepared to reconsider his decision without discussion with all the players and felt that it would be better dealt with by an appeal panel.

There was general discussion and questions of the players and director. The director stated that there was no attention drawn at the table to the marked bidding slip. Question was asked of the director as to his understanding of the alert regulations. He was not clear on the regulations but in the ACT the bid should be circled.

Question of players as to whether they had been aware of the alert and NS said "no".

Questions were asked of NS as to their system over the opponent's 1NT. Often they play 2♣ as artificial.

Asked of NS if it was not sensible to ask about 2♣, North thought it was natural. Asked of North if it was their system style to open 1NT with a singleton. This was not discussed in their partnership.

The players left.

Further questions asked of the director about his action if he had been aware of the marked sheet. He believed he would have left the table score to stand.

The panel felt EW had made an effort to alert and that NS had not been paying full attention.

There was discussion about whether to penalise EW for an incorrect form of alert.

Agreement that the table score to stand and a procedural penalty of 10% of a top for EW's inappropriate alert.

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal upheld. Table score to stand (2♥N -400) and a procedural penalty of 10% of a top against EW for an inappropriate form of alert.

Appeal Report SFBridge3

Date: Jan.03

Event: Australian Open Pairs Round 1

Director: D.Anderson

Appeal Panel: P.Markey

M.Ware

S.Hinge

K.Crow-Mai

L.Kelso

Dir:E ♠1082

EWvul ♥87543

♦654

♣J10

♠AQ65 ♠K93

♥J ♥1092

♦983 ♦AJ72

♣A8763 ♣954

♠J74

♥AKQ6

♦KQ10

♣KQ2

Bidding: Basic system

S W N E

Not pertinent

Noted bids:

Final Contract and result: 3♥S, making, NS+140

Play if relevant:

South was declarer in 3♥. Trumps had been drawn, the club ace had been taken and a spade discarded on South's club winner. Declarer claimed, conceding two more tricks.

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

South was declarer in 3♥. Trumps had been drawn, the club ace had been taken. Declarer claimed, conceding two more tricks, started to show his hand and then realised that he had made a mistake.

I was called and ruled that he could continue with his claim statement.

He thought for some time and finally announced "taking the diamond finesse. I'm down if it fails". It worked so contract.

This rule was made in accordance with 68C (clarification of claim) and 68A (claim defined) rather than under law 70 – contested claim.

Appellant's claim

After declarer explained his line (without talking about a finesse) my partner replaced his hand and claimed one off. Declarer then reconsidered and announced "taking the diamond finesse to make, or go one off".

We contend that declarer cannot alter his line, especially if it incorporates a finesse. We claim 3♥ down one.

Responder's reply

I started to make a claim (I had not shown my cards) when I said I better play. They called the director and said play should cease, so I completed my claim.

Fair enough I can be stopped from playing but surely I cannot be prevented from stating my claim.

Appeal Committee discussion

It was established that South has stated that he would concede one spade and one diamond before East claimed one down. Declarer maintained that East had interjected before he had completed his statement of clarification.

EW argued that South's statement was complete before East disputed the claim and that declarer's later words about the diamond finesse amounted to an alternate or new line of play.

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal dismissed. Directors adjusted score (3♥ making, NS+140) to stand.

In a majority decision the committee ruled that declarer's reference to the diamond finesse was simply an amplification of his initial statement and not a new line of play.

Appeal Report SFBridge 4

Date: Jan.03

Event: SWPT round 5

Director: P.Marley

Appeal Panel: J.Wignall (Chair)

P.Crittle

A.Braithwaite

M.McManus

P.Gue

Dir:W ♠AJ8542

NSvul ♥KJ10

♦K109

♣K

♠ Immaterial ♠

♥ ♥

♦ ♦

♣ ♣

♠----

♥A76432

♦AQ643

♣Q7

Bidding:

Basic system

S	W	N	E
---	---	---	---

	P	1♠	P
--	---	----	---

2♥	P	4♣	P
----	---	----	---

4♦	P	4♠	P
----	---	----	---

5♥1	P	6♥	P
-----	---	----	---

P	P		
---	---	--	--

Noted bids:

1 agreed long think

Final Contract and result: 6♥S, making, NS+1430

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

Law 16A2. North has chosen to bid on when a logical alternative (pass) was available.

Score adjusted to 5♥S, making 12 tricks, NS+680

Appellant's claim

According to our bidding methods, 4♣ is a splinter, 4♦ is first round cue – showing slam interest, 4♠ is cue (the strongest possible bid), 5♥ is a trump quality ask, 6♥ is good quality trumps.

The auction was explained as above before the play of the hand.

After declarer made the slam, East called the director claiming South hesitated before making the 5♥ bid. We have no opinion about the claimed hesitation – the bid may indeed have been out of tempo, although many of South's bids are slow.

We believe the director who made the ruling may not have been aware of 1) all the facts 2) our bidding methods.

Responder's reply

The facts are not in dispute. However NS, especially South had an extremely slow (completely different to any of South's other hesitations/slow bids) prior to bidding 5♥.

It was specifically asked at the time how they could sign off in 5H and NS stated the only way they could is if 5♥ is passed. The director asked the same question.

Given that South bid 4♦ and should have known that North would cue the ♠ace, the hesitation before bidding 5♥ conveys extra information and the North's action becomes easier. This would not have presented any issues if the auction had been: 1♠ - 2♥;4♣ - 5♥ which seems to ask the direct question about heart quality. By hesitating prior to bidding 5♥, South let North know they were interested in slam and North moved, in spite of holding only 3 tricks.

Appeal Committee discussion

The players were introduced, North, South, and East present.

The director explained that he was called to the table, and with advice from other directors (which Ivy Dahler withdrew from), made the ruling.

Ivy Dahler withdrew her chair of the appeal committee in favour of John Wignall who had just arrived.

North felt that the director was not aware of all the facts relating to the hand and their system.

Questions were asked of NS about their system. There was no written evidence to support their system agreement. NS insist that 5♥ is a trump ask. Questions of NS as to how they would sign-off in 5♥. General belief that they would use 4NT (RKC) then 5♥.

The players left.

The committee discussed the hand and felt the North hand was only borderline for its actions to 5♥ opposite a 2♥ response, and so it was not a clear raise to 6♥ and that the break in tempo made it easier to bid 6♥.

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal dismissed.

The committee were unanimous that there were alternative actions available to North over 5♥ (Pass).

Advice to the NS players that if they presented written system evidence to support their argument then they may have had a stronger argument.

Appeal Report – S FBridge5

Date: Jan.2003

Event: SWPT round 7

Director: D.Anderson

Appeal Panel: I.Dahler (Chair)

M.Prescott

P.Gill

P.Reynolds

P.Gue

Dir:S ♠Q9762

EWvul ♥AJ985

♦Q104

♣-----

♠543

♠AKJ108

♥K3

♥4

♦A63

♦KJ85

♣AKQJ3

♣1097

♠-----

♥Q10762

♦972

♣86542

Bidding:

Basic system

S	W	N	E
2♦1	Dbl	4♣2	P
4♦3	P4	4♥	5♥
P	6♣	6♥	Dbl
P	P	P	

Noted bids:

- 1 weak 2 in a major
- 2 transfer into a major
- 3 showing hearts
- 4 after hesitation

Final Contract and result: 6♥XN, down 4 tricks, EW+800

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

The hesitation (acknowledged) over 4♦ can only be described as encouraging East, showing either extra values or a diamond holding. East has two clear alternatives over the 4♥ call. He can bid 4♠ or 5♥.

5♥ is an aggressive call, particularly since they would seem to have a guaranteed heart loser, while partner has only promised 15hcp, some of which may be wasted in the heart suit.

Accordingly I imposed the more conservative call of 4♠, making 10 tricks with careful play.

Score adjusted to 4♠E, making 10 tricks, EW+620.

Regards the 2♦ opening. NS are overseas visitors who are not a regular partnership, who did not know of the opening points regulations. When I questioned them as to the range of the opening, I was told the upper limit was 10hcp, the lower limit undiscussed.

Appellant's claim

West's initial double shows 15 plus. East must take some action over 4♥. He has 12hcp, no wasted values plus a singleton in hearts (likelihood that partner has no wasted values in hearts). North has shown tolerance for both majors so the spade finesse looks promising.

5♥ showed prepared to play 5♠ or 6-minor. Double would have been penalties.

Because of the above factors we believe the directors ruling putting the score back to 4♠ making, is unjust.

As an aside, we consider that the opening bid by South constitutes an illegal bid and NS should not be seeking redress.

Responder's reply

Appeal Committee discussion

All players were present and their arguments heard. Questions were asked of both NS and EW about their system, in particular what would double of 4♥ be – penalty.

The players left.

There was general discussion in the committee about what action East could take over 4♥. There was a consensus that the East hand was worth more than a 4♠ bid. Questions were asked of the chief tournament director regarding split, or “averaged” scores. It was suggested that if there was no infraction, then no split scoring or similar could be awarded, and that if there was an infraction (UI) then there was no need to award split or “averaged” scores.

Appeal Committee decision

In a majority decision, with one dissent, it was believed that there was no infraction.

Appeal upheld, the table score of 6♥X -4, EW+800 re-instated.

The committee request the CTD to discuss system regulations with NS. This had no bearing on the appeal decision.

Appeal Report S F Bridge 6

Date: Jan.2003

Event: SWPT round 9

Director: D.Anderson

Appeal Panel: M.McManus (Chair)

P.Crittles

J.Hoffman

B.Neill

C.Snashall

Dlr:	♠83	Bidding:	Basic system		
vul	♥10				
	♦AKQ86542	S	W	N	E
	♣KQ			1♦	P
♠KQJ92	♠107654	1♥	1♠	3♦	4♠
♥Q7	♥J832	Dbl	P	5♦1	P
♦1093	♦7	6♦	P	P	P
♣1083	♣A64				
	♠A	Noted bids:			
	♥AK9654		1 agreed hesitation		
	♦J				
	♣J9752				

Final Contract and result: 6♦N, making, NS+920

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

EW asked that the 6♦ bid be cancelled since North hesitated before bidding 5♦.

The directing staff felt that the hesitation provided no additional information that the bid itself did not convey. North had already jump bid to show extra values and long diamonds, while the additional diamond length and strength was now shown by the 5♦ rebid.

In fact, an immediate 5♦ rebid, rather than a considered one, would have been more encouraging to South.

Unfortunately East doesn't seem to understand this.

No infraction, table score to stand.

Appellant's claim

After 4♠ was doubled by South, North considered her bid for an extended period of time prior to bidding 5♦. It is my belief that the hesitation prior to pulling the penalty double allows South to bid 6♦ as he is able to surmise that his stiff ♦J and three controls, including the ♠A are working cards as North must have extra diamonds in order to pull the double of 4♠.

North stated at the time that she was considering whether 5♦ would be a better spot than 4♠X. Given the South hand had yet to support diamonds and held a broken 5-card suit outside his bid suit, I believe that the consideration given to 5♦ made it easier for South to bid 6♦ with the holding he held.

Responder's reply

Appeal Committee discussion

The players were presented, East and South present, as well as the captain of the defending side.

The director explained his ruling and actions.

East argued that North had shown her hand, the hesitation showing extra diamond length.

Questions were asked of the NS system. They restated that the 3♦ bid had shown extra strength and length, and the pull at the 5-level to 5♦ showed extra length, the hesitation giving no additional information. The players left.

There was discussion about the fact that the hesitation may have conveyed information not to bid 6♦, rather than bidding 6♦.

There was discussion that the appeal lacked merit. It was suggested that EW had not had a chance to defend themselves on that point. It was further suggested that a warning be issued, rather than a penalty.

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal dismissed.

It was the decision of the committee that the information conveyed by the break in tempo did not suggest that South's action in bidding 6♦ would be more successful. It was therefor ruled that there had been no infraction and the directors ruling upheld.

The committee considered the basis of the appeal and ruled that it was an appeal without merit. Under the appeals regulations in force, a penalty of 1.5VP to be applied against the appealing side.

Appeal Report

Date: Jan 2003

Event: Swiss Pairs

Director: J.McIlrath

Appeal Panel: C.Snashall

P.Fordham and others

Dir:E ♠ 1076

Nil vul ♥ J1085

♦ J65

♣ K95

♠ A983 ♠ J54

♥ A3 ♥ 74

♦ K42 ♦ A9873

♣ AJ108 ♣ 432

♠ KQ2

♥ KQ962

♦ Q10

♣ Q76

Bidding:

Basic system

S	W	N	E
			P
1♥	Dbl	3♥	4♦
4♥	All pass		

Noted bids:

Final Contract and result: 4♥ BY South down 3 tricks

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

East inquired about the North 3♥ bid and was told forcing – East now bid on to 4♦. At the end of the auction, North advised of the possible error in explanation (law 75 D2). North advised that 3♥ was weak over the double. E/W believed they were damaged. The directing staff did not believe that West's decision to double or not was materially affected by the misexplanation.

Appellant's claim

Based on the fact North's bid was forcing, East does not promise values but rather offers different contract if E/W should be sacking over 4♥, given that 3♥ was forcing.

West believes that N/S have the values for game and that East does not have any tricks. This makes the double unattractive as East cannot hold any useful cards for the defending side.

If the 3♥ is known to be weak, West has an easy double after the 4♦ bid by East. The comment by the director that South would have passed 3♥ if she knew it was weak is irrelevant to any ruling.

Responder's reply

Appeal Committee discussion

All present. No disputing facts - 3♥ weak.

East would not bid 4♦ if 3♥ is known as weak. East would double with values but would pass with actual hand. E/W contend that their agreement is in accordance with action taken.

E/W agreed that double from West would be T/O and East contended he would leave it in.

Appeal Committee decision

The committee considered there was not sufficient evidence that damage was caused by the system disruption and given a normal auction based on E/W agreements there was not a substantial chance of a better score being achieved.

Directors ruling upheld. No action to be taken against N/S.

Appeal Report – SF Bridge 8

Date: Jan 2003

Event: SWPT (Hyatt) Round 10

Director: Simon Edler

Appeal Panel: I.Dahler (Chair)

T.Chadwick

I.Thomson

P.Marston

P.Gue

Dir:W ♠ 9653

Nil vul ♥ A2

♦ K

♣ AQJ985

♠ AJ72

♥ K10963

♦ 108

♣ K2

♠ 4

♥ QJ

♦ QJ976542

♣ 76

♠ KQ108

♥ 8754

♦ A3

♣ 1043

Bidding:

S	W	N	E
---	---	---	---

	1♥	2♣	2NT1
--	----	----	------

4♦	P	5♣	P
----	---	----	---

5♦	All pass		
----	----------	--	--

Basic system

Noted bids:

1 Cue-raise, 4+ trumps, 10+hcp

Final Contract and result: 5♦ South, +400 N/S

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

After North's 5♣ call, East asked North what South had shown in the bidding and was told that 4♦ was a splinter. I was called to the table at the end of the auction at which point the facts were established. I was recalled at the end of the hand by E/W who were concerned that South's 5♦ call may have been influenced by North's answer of "splinter" to East's inquiry during the bidding.

After consideration and consultation, I determined that:-

- 1) There had been an infraction because, even though North believed 4♦ to be a splinter, the partnership agreement is that this is not the case in this situation (therefore a breach of law 75 C).
- 2) South was therefore in receipt of unauthorized information, and a pass of 5♣ was determined to be a logical alternative. I ruled that South chose an alternative that could have been suggested by the unauthorized information (law 16 A2).
- 3) Under law 12 C2, I adjusted the score to 5♣ North making 9 tricks, NS -100.

Appellant's claim

The bid of 4♦ was (systemically) a splinter. North had interpreted South's bid correctly and had followed the system. North's information had alerted South to his mistake in bidding 4♦ as natural. Although South was in receipt of unauthorised information, his 5♦ bid was 100% what he would have always bid over 5♣ - he had 8 diamonds after all. After 5♦ everyone at the table realised what had happened – North could hardly have believed South had a diamond void and E/W had 12 diamonds unbid. North's pass was now clear.

Responder's reply

Appeal Committee discussion

Players introduced. N/S present along with their captain.

The director explained that he was called at the end of the auction after E/W were concerned at the explanation of the 4♦ bid and further bidding. Discussion centred on whether 4♦ was a splinter according to N/S system. It was ascertained that 4♦ was a splinter and that South had misbid.

The players left.

After some discussion, the committee agreed that 4♦ had described the South hand and that pass was a logical alternative.

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal dismissed.

The committee feels that 4♦ had described the length and strength of the South hand and so pass of 5♣ was a logical alternative.

Appeal Report

Date: Jan. 2003

Event: SWPT (round 12)

Director: L.Kelso

Appeal Panel: I.Dahler (chair)

S.Bird

I.Robinson

T.Chadwick

P.Gue

Dlr:S ♠ K4	Bidding:	Basic system		
EW vul♥ Q109				
♦ J63	S	W	N	E
♣ AQ984	1♦	P	2♣	2♠
♠ J73	3♦	3♠	3NT	P
♥ K872	P	Dbl	P1	P
♦ K8	4♦	All pass		
♣ J1053				
♠ 52	Noted bids:			
♥ AJ6	1 Hesitation			
♦ A109752				
♣ K6				

Final Contract and result: 4♦ South, down one, +50 E/W

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

Director called at time of hesitation (fact established). Called again at the end of the hand.

EW were concerned that South had elected to remove 3NTX to 4♦ after North's hesitation.

The directing staff ruled that North's break in tempo suggested doubt about the safety of 3NTX and that South's bid of 4♦ was an action among logical alternatives suggested by the hesitation.

Score adjusted to NS – 500 (a likely result of 3NTX).

Appellant's claim

1♦ opening = 4+♦, 12-17 hcp. After partner's 2♣ and opponents 2♠, South bid 3♦ showing a 6-card suit. After West's 3♠ bid, North bid 3NT, which was doubled by West. From South's position, double was absolutely clear that West had a diamond stopper (eg Kx, QJx) and after a spade lead 3NT must go down. Furthermore, North would have redoubled with a double spade stopper and a good diamond fit. South, looking at a poor diamond suit, missing 3 honours, and no spade stopper, has a clear-cut removal of 3NTX to 4♦, regardless of whether or not partner was thinking.

Responder's reply

Appeal Committee discussion

Players presented, NS & W present.

Director explained when he had been called to the table.

South explained that he was aware that 3NT was failing because of the double and partner did not redouble, and from a bridge experience he would bid 4♦. If the law says that he cannot bid 4♦ so be it, but any experienced bridge player would do the same.

Questions were asked of North as to 2♣ - natural. To South, what would redouble mean? – a good spade stopper.

The players left.

Discussion as to whether 4♦ was a clear action. A unanimous decision that pass was a logical alternative.

Further discussion as to the merit of the appeal. A majority decision that the appeal had merit.

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal dismissed.

A unanimous decision that pass is a logical alternative to 4♦. Directors adjusted score to stand.

A majority decision that the appeal had merit.

Appeal Report SF Bridge 10

Date: Jan 2003
Event: NOT final

Director: S.Mullamphy

Appeal Panel: I. Dahler
J. Hoffman
P.Reynolds
I.Thomson
J.Ashworth

Dir:W ♠ KQ5

All vul ♥ KQJ2

♦ 942

♣ A53

♠ 104 ♠ J763

♥ 9 ♥ A865

♦ AQ73 ♦ K86

♣ KQJ842 ♣ 97

♠ A982

♥ 10743

♦ J105

♣ 106

Bidding:

S	W	N	E
	1♠1	X	2♦2
X	3♣	3♥	P
3♠	P	4♥	X
P	P	4♠	X

All pass

Noted bids:

1 diamonds

2 alerted by West ♥ ? ♦ ?

Basic system

Screen running NW to SE

Final Contract and result: 4♠ NX down 3 tricks +800 to EW

Play if relevant:

Tournament Directors Report and decision:

I was called to the table by West. He was unsure of his agreement of the 2♦ bid in the current auction. I informed him that once the auction had started his partner was not allowed to communicate with the opposite side of the screen. Only he could give South the system agreement of any call. He indicated that 2♦ without the double showed 5♥ and believed that with the double the agreement had not changed. The auction continued, NS reaching 4♠ X – 800.

When the play was completed an explanation was given by East that in this auction 2♦ was natural. I ruled misinformation (21B3) and adjusted the score to NS – 100. This was the result of South passing the 3♥ bid by North, the likely result had the irregularity not occurred.

South had not passed 3♥ as it would have been a no-trump probe if 2♦ had promised hearts.

Appellant's claim

The system as on the card is that 2♦ is a transfer without the double. However, our agreement is that we ignore double. So the bid showed 5♥.

I explained maybe only diamonds because the bid had not come up before and I suspected East may have forgotten.

Responder's reply

3♥ would not have been available to North as a natural bid if 2♦ had been described as hearts. If doubt had been expressed, as was on the SW side of the screen, a possible continuation over 3♣ would be X by North, 3♦ by South, the explanation of this call consistent with our agreements, could only be both majors.

Appeal Committee discussion

The director was called to the SW side of the screen during the auction at the stage of 1♠ X 2♦. 2♦ was described differently on either side of the screen.

During the appeal it was established that the infraction most likely to have occurred was on the NE side of the screen.

If correct information was provided that 2♦ showed hearts then North would more than likely pass 3♣.

Appeal Committee decision

The committee adjusts the result to 3♣ West, making 10 tricks, +130 EW.