



**2012**

**EBU Appeals**

# ENGLISH BRIDGE UNION

2012

## APPEALS

All the 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.

Our thanks to the commentators, who have donated their time and their expertise, and to Neil Morley who volunteered to transcribe all the appeals.

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

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

Tel: 01296 317228

From outside UK(replace 0 with +44)

Email: [john@ebu.co.uk](mailto:john@ebu.co.uk)

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

L&EC page: <http://www.ebu.co.uk/lawsandethics/>

Booklet compiled & edited by John Pain

Version 1.1: Dec 11 2015

## Commentators

**Jeffrey Allerton** is a tournament player from Surrey, England. He is a past European and World junior champion, and recently won the Gold Cup and the Camrose. He used to direct club and county competitions, and is a member of the EBU panel of referees.

**Robin Barker** worked for 20 years at National Physical Laboratory as a research computer scientist. He is an EBU National Tournament Director and an EBL Tournament Director. Away from bridge he enjoys walking the coasts and moors of the South-West of England, where he lives. But this has been constrained by medical problems; in particular, periods of wearing an aircast boot, which can be used to stamp his authority when directing.

**Paul Lamford** is the author of a couple of books on bridge, *50 Bridge Puzzles* and *Starting Out in Bridge*, and is a frequent contributor to Bridge magazine and *Metrobridge*. He is a County Director, regular poster on bridge forums, and has been a member of many Appeals Committees.

**Tim Rees** has been playing bridge since school, and has won most of the English and Welsh national titles at some stage. He has represented Wales at Europeans, Olympiads and Commonwealth Games since devolution from Great Britain in 2000, with his greatest successes being silver at the 2002 Commonwealth Games, and gold at the 2014 Games in Glasgow. Tim is currently Chairman of the Laws and Ethics Committee for England. He works at the Transport Research Laboratory, analysing (and hopefully solving) motorway congestion.

**Frances Hinden** is married to Jeffrey Allerton. She has won many British events and has bronze medals from the European Open Championships. She used to direct club and county competitions, is vice-chairman of the Laws & Ethics Committee and a member of the EBU panel of referees.

**Ed Reppert** is a retired US Navy officer living in Rochester, NY. He returned to duplicate bridge during his last tour before retirement, an exchange tour with the Royal Navy. After retiring he continued to play, became interested in the laws, and became an ACBL Club director. He ran a small club for a few years. For many years he has, along with David Stevenson, moderated the International Bridge Laws Forum, currently hosted on Bridge Base Online's forum site. In addition to bridge, he enjoys several other games and is a student of taijiquan. He's between cats, but expects that to change soon.

**Eitan Levy** was a World Bridge Federation accredited TD and Assistant Chief Director of the European Bridge League (EBL). For many years he enjoyed directing at the EBU Summer Congress in Brighton. After the replacement of Appeal Committees by a Review System he was appointed Chief Reviewer of the EBL. As Chairman of the EBL Tournament Directors' Committee he is responsible for the running of the various TD training courses and seminars organized by the EBL.

### **General Comments from Gordon Rainsford, EBU Chief Tournament Director**

It has become routine in these booklets for appeals committees to be criticised for failing to withhold deposits sufficiently often. We also have guidance on the appeals forms telling them when to withhold a deposit, but they still seem very reluctant to do it.

There are a couple of cases here where commentators have talked about the Director in Charge hearing aspects of appeals that relate to the laws and regulations. That is true, but most appeals, including the two in here, have a judgment element that needs to be heard by a committee.

There are also quite a number of comments about incomplete forms. Often they are filled out in a hurry and time is tight so the TD simply puts in what seems to be essential to the case. However there is no reason why we can't go back to the form afterwards and complete them with any further detail that was provided to the committee verbally. Information that might not have seemed vital may nevertheless add to the record of a case.

Similarly it is clear that many commentators would welcome more information to be provided by TDs about the polling and consultation processes that they will routinely have used. I suspect that few TDs consider that the appeals committee itself is not the end of the useful life of the appeals form, and the more we can do to provide complete information on the forms the more use they will be for the L&E committee, for teaching purposes and for any other discussions that refer to these appeals booklets.

### **General Comments from Tim Rees (Chairman of the Laws and Ethics Committee)**

The TDs and ACs have both done well this year. The standard of initial rulings was high, and the ACs have not made any rulings significantly worse. One of the functions of an AC is to provide a means for aggrieved players to have their say to a panel of "experts", which is why the EBU has not followed the European/World model of replacing appeals with reviews. This might partly explain the reluctance of ACs to retain the deposit, as the players themselves will often believe they have a valid case. However, at most events, the EBU provides an Appeals Advisor, who can act as a sounding board and offer advice to players considering an appeal. Although players are not required to use an Advisor, ACs should lower the threshold for retaining deposits when advice was available prior to an appeal.

### **General comments from Jeffrey Allerton**

The ACs have done quite well this year, but too many frivolous appeals are being allowed to proceed without the deposit being retained. Quite a few of the appeals forms are lacking some key details. The TDs/ACs should be encouraged to ensure that the players' systems and the basis of appeal are always recorded.

### **Other general notes**

In many cases there are no written additional comments from the TD or written comments by the North/South or East/West pairs. Some players prefer to have something written down before attending an appeal but in most cases they make their comments to the appeal committee directly and these are not recorded.

# APPEAL No : 12.005

*Tournament Director: Robin Barker*

*Appeals Committee: Frances Hinden (Chairman), Derek Patterson & John Atthey*

<p>♠ 743 ♥ A9 ♦ K109876 ♣ 72</p> <p>♠ Q982                  ♠ AJ5 ♥ K64                    ♥ 10872 ♦ J54                     ♦ A ♣ K93                    ♣ AQJ84</p> <p>♠ K106 ♥ QJ53 ♦ Q32 ♣ 1065</p>	<p><i>Board 2 : Dealer East : NS vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1♣ (A)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>1♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♠</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>3♦</td><td>Dbl (A)</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>No questions asked or explanation given – meaning of 1♣ already known to NS</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>			1♣ (A)	Pass	1♠	Pass	2♠	Pass	Pass	3♦	Dbl (A)	All Pass
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>														
		1♣ (A)	Pass														
1♠	Pass	2♠	Pass														
Pass	3♦	Dbl (A)	All Pass														

### **Basic systems:**

North-South system – not provided  
East-West system – strong NT, 5-card majors

**Form of Scoring:** IMP's to VP's

**Result at table:** 3♦ doubled -2 (-500) by North, lead A♠

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

### **Director's statement of facts:**

Declarer said he was damaged in the play by the Alert of the double. The play was A♠: J♠ to K♠. Small club, 9♣, small, J♣. ♠ to the Q. K♣ to the A. Q♣. High ♥, Q, K, A. K♦

Declarer said that if the double was not alerted (therefore T/O) then he would play trumps differently.

### **Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for both sides: 3♦ x-1 by

### **Details of ruling:**

I presumed mis-explanation rather than mis-bid and that the double was T/O and had it not been alerted declarer would make 8 tricks. I decided there was not enough evidence that the EW agreement was penalty although East was clear this is how they played and West agreed.

**Appeal lodged by:** North-South

### **Basis of appeal:**

1. Systemically double is penalties.
2. Declarer mis-played the hand.

**Director's comments:** No additional comments.

## APPEAL No : 12.005

**Comments by North-South:** None provided.

**Comments by East-West:** None provided.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit returned.

Line taken was poor but not a serious error. There was no evidence as to the meaning of the double.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

(This was a) Very close decision on double; (we) agree majority of players play this as penalties but 'take out' or 'competitive' are also possible and declarer would then get it right 100% of the time.

Jeffrey Allerton

I disagree with the TD/AC here. I would have allowed the table result to stand. The purpose of an alert is to say "please ask if you want to know the meaning of the call." Here the double was alerted, but "no questions were asked or explanations given". Even if West's alert was technically misinformation (which is not clear), then North's failure to ask about the alerted double implies that he did not care about its meaning and that therefore he was not damaged by the alert itself. Interestingly, North should be able to infer from the earlier bidding that East has 3-4 in the majors and, having not rebid or opened 1NT, is very likely to be 3=4=1=5 so the  $\spadesuit K$  was just a poor play. Finally, it would have been useful if the form had recorded meaning of  $1\clubsuit$ .

Tim Rees

The alerting regulations require a double to be alerted if it is competitive, cooperative, optional or penalty (i.e. any meaning other than takeout). Declarer should have a responsibility to ask about any alerts of doubles to clarify the meaning. If he chooses to take a line that assumes trump length with the doubler, he does so at his own risk.

Given that declarer didn't ask, I think the table result should have stood for both sides. This double could well be cooperative, meaning that partner is expected to pass, but doesn't carry the implication of trump length. A description of this double as "he thinks it's going down" would possibly be the most accurate.

Eitan Levy

We are not given sufficient details of the systems (e.g what is  $1\clubsuit$ ). Given the absence of the agreed meaning of the double the ruling looks correct..

Paul Lamford

Not much to add to the AC. If EW had a system card with such doubles explained, then they would be on firmer ground. The Law states that the TD is indeed to presume misexplanation rather than misbid, and declarer would indeed always get the play right if the double was not alerted.

# APPEAL No : 12.015

*Tournament Director: Robin Barker*

*Appeals Committee: Brian Senior (Chairman), Tom Townsend & Anne Catchpole*

<p>♠ AJ9 ♥ QJ84 ♦ AQJ32 ♣ 9</p> <p>♠ Q52            ♠ 10743 ♥ K1072        ♥ 63 ♦ 1075           ♦ 96 ♣ 1076           ♣ AKQJ8</p> <p>♠ K86 ♥ A95 ♦ K84 ♣ 5432</p>	<p><i>Board 20 : Dealer West : All vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Pass</td><td>1♣ (1)</td><td>2♣ (2)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2♥</td><td>3♦ (3)</td><td>Pass</td><td>3NT</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>Dbl</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Alerted 0+ clubs, 15 HCP with a minor suit (2) Alerted (3) Questions asked before bidding.</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>	Pass	1♣ (1)	2♣ (2)	Pass	2♥	3♦ (3)	Pass	3NT	Pass	Pass	Dbl	All Pass
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>														
Pass	1♣ (1)	2♣ (2)	Pass														
2♥	3♦ (3)	Pass	3NT														
Pass	Pass	Dbl	All Pass														

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South play strong ♦  
East-West play – no description*

**Form of Scoring:** *MP Pairs*

**Result at table:** *3NTx -1 by South, lead 10♣*

**Director first called:** At end of round

### **Director's statement of facts:**

1♣ was nebulous as part of a strong diamond system. North asked about 2♣: "over a strong club, 2♣ would be natural; over a 'could be short' club, 2♣ would be Michaels". The double was not alerted but EW mentioned that it was asking for an unusual lead. NS said that if double had been alerted they might have run. West said (the) meaning of 2♣ over a short club was on their card-but it wasn't (perhaps on an old card).

### **Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for both sides: 50% of 3NTx -2, 50% of 5♦ =

### **Details of ruling:**

With a different explanation of 2♣(which West thought was natural), NS might not stand the double. L21B and L12C.

**Appeal lodged by:** East-West

**Basis of appeal:** None provided

### **Director's comments:**

Did consider UI but thought East would not know what suit double would get and so was not suggested over Pass.

## APPEAL No : 12.015

**Comments by North-South:** None written.

**Comments by East-West:** None written.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling amended

Score assigned for both sides (Law 12C1(c)):

50% of 3NT= making by South, NS +600

50% of 3NT+1 by South, NS +630

Deposit returned

### Appeals Committee's comments:

East had UI. East & West both thought that double was for an unusual lead. If East had already shown clubs, double would therefore ask for a non-club lead. She knew she was going to get a major suit lead so doubled, using the UI.

On a 'normal' heart lead, facing a Michaels bid, 3NT is cold, the overtrick requiring declarer to risk the contract by taking the spade finesse. We give him the finesse half the time.

Jeffrey Allerton

Apart from the fact that the weightings should add up to 100% (could be a typo in the write-up), I agree with the AC. No doubt, the TD would have ruled similarly had he been aware that the double of 3NT asked for an unusual lead!

Tim Rees

I agree with the AC, both in determining that there was UI and in allowing declarer to make an overtrick some of the time.

Eitan Levy

Basically a very good decision by the appeal committee. But 50% for the overtrick is overly generous. North knows he is in for a good score with 9 tricks. He had 5 clubs to lose on another lead and would be extremely wary even at MP about endangering his safe 9 tricks.

Paul Lamford

I agree with the removal of the double which uses UI and tells partner that she has misunderstood 2♣. The AC ruling looks fine.

Frances Hinden

The AC spotted what the TD didn't, the double asking for an 'unusual lead' was use of UI. If anything the AC's ruling is generous to EW; depending on their experience I would also consider a PP. However, there's a big difference between the mental commentary 'I have running clubs this is going off, so I double' and 'I have shown the majors but I want a club lead, so I double' and which was present is unknown from the write-up.



# APPEAL No : 12.016

*Tournament Director: Gordon Rainsford*

*Appeals Committee: Graham Osborne (Chairman), David Burn & Colin Simpson*

<p>♠ 8 ♥ J8543 ♦ A7642 ♣ 83 ♠ J107642      ♠ AK9 ♥ 92              ♥ AQ ♦ J98              ♦ Q3 ♣ 62              ♣ AKJ1094  ♠ Q53 ♥ K1076 ♦ K105 ♣ Q75</p>	<p>Board 34 : Dealer East : NS vulnerable</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>Pass</td><td>3♣</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>3♦ (3)</td><td>Pass</td><td>3NT</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Strong (2) Negative (3) Intended as second negative. Not alerted and agreement unclear</p>	West	North	East	South			1♣ (1)	Pass	1♦ (2)	Pass	3♣	Pass	3♦ (3)	Pass	3NT	All Pass
West	North	East	South														
		1♣ (1)	Pass														
1♦ (2)	Pass	3♣	Pass														
3♦ (3)	Pass	3NT	All Pass														

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South play – Not provided.*

*East-West play – Not provided.*

**Form of Scoring:** *IMP's to VP's*

**Result at table:** *3NT making by East +1, lead 6♥*

**Director first called:** When dummy was faced.

### **Director's statement of facts:**

3♦ was not alerted as East wasn't sure they were playing it as second negative. West corrected the non-alert before the opening lead had been faced but South did not ask to change his lead (he may not have known he could). North says that if 3♦ had been alerted he would have doubled. EW say that they would then end in 4♠ via P-P-3♠-P-4♠. East says the double would have clarified that his partner's 3♦ was artificial.

### **Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for both sides:

See below for weighted score.

### **Details of ruling:**

Misinformation. L21B3, L21B1(b) and L12 c1(c)

50% 3NT +1 (table result)

25% 4♠=

25% 4♠-1

Half the time North would double 3♦ leading to a contract of 4♠ made 50% of the time. If North does not double 3♦ the table result would stand.

**Appeal lodged by:** North-South

**Basis of appeal:** Not provided.

## APPEAL No : 12.016

**Comments by North-South:** None.

**Comments by East-West:** None.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling amended

Score assigned for both sides:

25% of 3NT-1; 25% of 3NT+1;; 50% Of 4♠-1;

Deposit returned

### Appeals Committee's comments:

We believe that north will double an alerted 3♦ call 75% of the time and the East will pass ⅔ of the time leading to 4♠-1 by West in a hunt for a diamond lead and that East will bid 3NT ⅓ of the time leading to 3NT-1 on a diamond dead. 25% of the time when North does not double East will make 3NT+1.

Jeffrey Allerton

The end result is not unreasonable, but as the AC chose to amend the TD's combinations of weighted scores, they ought to have explained why one of the TD's scenarios (4♠=) was not included in the weighting. I would expect 4♠ to be made some of the time.

Tim Rees

I could live with either ruling. I prefer the TD's judgement that North would double an alerted 3♦ 50% of the time (that's generous in my opinion), but the AC's judgement that 4♠ wouldn't make.

Paul Lamford

The AC ruling looks fine, and they did a good job in deciding what would have happened without the infraction of the failure to alert 3♦. The TD is to assume mistaken explanation instead of mistaken bid in the absence of evidence, so it is assumed there was a failure to alert.

Frances Hinden

Implicit in both the TD and AC's rulings is the finding of fact that 3♦ was systemically a second negative. This is a reasonable but not obvious ruling and it would be good to know why they came to that conclusion. The AC's weightings are sufficiently different from the TD's that it is reasonable to make the change. Personally I think 4♠ will make more often than the AC but the ruling is biased in favour of the NOS which is fair enough.

Robin Barker

I agree with both the TD and the AC that there was misinformation and to award an adjusted score based on 3♦ being alerted (and explained as "no agreement"). The AC took a different view from the TD on how often North will double 3♦ and whether EW will play 3NT after 3♦ is doubled.

## APPEAL No : 12.020

*Tournament Director: John Pyner*

*Appeals Committee: Jeffrey Allerton (Chairman), Graham Jepson & Miles Cowling*

<p>♠ 862 ♥ 7 ♦ Q87643 ♣ J65</p> <p>♠ J75                      ♠ 9 ♥ K109862                ♥ QJ4 ♦ A105                     ♦ J2 ♣ 8                         ♣ KQ97432</p> <p>♠ AKQ1043 ♥ A53 ♦ K9 ♣ A10</p>	<p><i>Board 15 : Dealer South : NS vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>2♣ (1)</td></tr><tr><td>2♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♣</td><td>4♠</td></tr><tr><td>5♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>DbI</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">All Pass</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">(1) Alerted</td></tr></tbody></table>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>				2♣ (1)	2♥	Pass	4♣	4♠	5♥	Pass	Pass	DbI	All Pass				(1) Alerted			
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																						
			2♣ (1)																						
2♥	Pass	4♣	4♠																						
5♥	Pass	Pass	DbI																						
All Pass																									
(1) Alerted																									

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South play Benji Acol  
East-West system not provided*

**Form of Scoring:** *MP Pairs*

**Result at table:** *5♥x-3 by West, NS +500, lead 2♠*

**Director first called:** *After trick 1*

### **Director's statement of facts:**

Called to the table after trick 1. The auction had proceeded as stated but after South's double, North, before passing, asked what East's 4♣ meant. West replied "I think. it's a Splinter". North said he thought he was damaged. I told him to say nothing more, advised South to ignore what North had said and instructed the players to continue and to re-call me if they needed a ruling. I was called back by NS at the end of play. East had intended 4♣ to be fit-jump but West wasn't sure that jump-fits applied in this situation. North said he would bid 5♠ if he knew the situation. I asked him what he would do if told that EW had no agreement and he said he would probably bid 5♠ also.

### **Director's ruling:**

Table result stands.

### **Details of ruling:**

While there is clearly misinformation, it is not at all clear that 5♠ is the right action opposite a Benji 2♣ opening. It is much more attractive if South opens 2♦

**Appeal lodged by:** North-South

**Basis of appeal:** None given.

**Comments by North-South:** None provided.

## APPEAL No : 12.020

**Comments by East-West:** None provided.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling amended  
Score assigned for both sides:  
80% of 5♥x-3 by West, NS +500  
20% of 5♠= by South, NS +650  
Deposit returned

### Appeals Committee's comments:

North did not bid 5♠ on the previous round. Nevertheless, he did ask at his final turn to call and there is a small chance that he would have bid 5♠ with correct information.

EW convention cards confirm that they play fit jumps after partner's overcalls.

Both sides, and especially the East player, should have called the TD at the point the explanation was corrected. Then the TD could have allowed North to change his final call.

Jeffrey Allerton

The explanation was corrected after the opening lead had been made face down, but the TD was not called until after the play to trick 1. Hence the AC's final paragraph.

Tim Rees

The AC has added a comment that everyone (especially East) should call the TD when the explanation was corrected. This would have allowed North to make a committal decision about whether to bid 5♠ (assuming the TD felt the change in explanation was relevant to his decision). From my reading of the form, the explanation was never corrected, and the TD was called once dummy had been displayed.

This makes East solely responsible for the problem. North's argument for bidding 5♠ was tenuous, but he was deprived of the opportunity to make a (possibly flawed) good decision through no fault of his own. So the AC's adjustment looks about right.

Eitan Levy

There are a number of issues here. There is no information provided on the "class" of the players involved or whether appropriate players were consulted Law 16B 1(b). This information is essential to determine whether the TD ruling or the Appeals committee ruling is the correct one.

With the above caveat, the AC ruling seems reasonable.

Paul Lamford

East should have volunteered a correction before the opening lead, and the TD would then have been called. Whether North would then have bid 5♠ is a value judgement. I would not have done so, but the AC weighted score looks fine.

## APPEAL No : 12.020

Ed Reppert

Law 20F5{b} says that in correcting partner's misexplanation, including failure to alert, the player *must* first call the director. Use of "must" indicates failure to call the director here is "a serious error indeed". I realize that procedural penalties are not given even for these infractions, but I think it rates one.

On the ruling as given, I agree with the committee.

Robin Barker

I agree with the TD that North would bid 5♠ with different information. The small weighting for 5♠= in the AC decision suggests they were not convinced North would bid.

## APPEAL No : 12.022

*Tournament Director: David Stevenson*

*Appeals Committee: Heather Dhondy (Chairman), David Price & Tim Rees*

<p>♠ 1042 ♥ KJ1083 ♦ 42 ♣ 1062</p> <p>♠ Q                      ♠ KJ9765 ♥ A7                      ♥ Q5 ♦ AKQ3                  ♦ 95 ♣ KJ9753                ♣ AQ4</p> <p>♠ A83 ♥ 9642 ♦ J10876 ♣ 8</p>	<p><i>Board 12 : Dealer West : NS vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1♣ (1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>1♥ (2)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2♣ (3)</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♦ (4)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2♥ (5)</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♠ (4)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>3♣ (6)</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♥ (7)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>3NT (8)</td><td>Pass</td><td>5♣ (9)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>6♣ (10)</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Strong</li><li>2. Game Force, usually balanced</li><li>3. Long minor</li><li>4. Asks</li><li>5. 6+ clubs</li><li>6. 4 diamonds</li><li>7. Asks in hearts</li><li>8. Good heart holding</li><li>9. Very slow, asks for heart control for 6♣ [see text]</li><li>10. Hesitation</li></ol>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>	1♣ (1)	Pass	1♥ (2)	Pass	2♣ (3)	Pass	2♦ (4)	Pass	2♥ (5)	Pass	2♠ (4)	Pass	3♣ (6)	Pass	3♥ (7)	Pass	3NT (8)	Pass	5♣ (9)	Pass	6♣ (10)	All Pass		
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																										
1♣ (1)	Pass	1♥ (2)	Pass																										
2♣ (3)	Pass	2♦ (4)	Pass																										
2♥ (5)	Pass	2♠ (4)	Pass																										
3♣ (6)	Pass	3♥ (7)	Pass																										
3NT (8)	Pass	5♣ (9)	Pass																										
6♣ (10)	All Pass																												

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South play natural*

*East-West play strong club with relays*

### **Form of Scoring: IMP's**

**Result at table:** 6♣= by West, NS -920, lead 2♣

**Director first called:** At end of round

The 3♥ bid was a mistake. East meant to bid 3♦ which asks. 3♥ usually means East intends to play in hearts but it is possible that he will not. After his mistake he considered what to do, whether to pass 3NT or bid 5♣.

EW state that the 5♣ means, as shown above, and said they had system notes that showed this. However, the system notes did not say this. There was no real description of 5♣ whatever.

If 5♣ asks for a heart control why did West not bid 6♣ immediately. He said he considered the sequence and checked the meaning mentally. It was the first time this usage had come up. Then bid 6♣.

### **Director's statement of facts:**

The evidence for the meaning of the 5♣ bid is unconvincing. I was told it was in the notes but it was not.

A slow 5♣ on this type of auction usually suggests higher alternatives and may indicate a problem with the sequence. I disallowed 6♣.

## APPEAL No : 12.022

### Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

5♣+1 by West, NS -420

Score assigned for N/S:

Score assigned for E/W:

### Details of ruling:

NS suggested that the slow 5♣ indicated something might have gone wrong and helped West to bid 6♣.

**Appeal lodged by:** East-West

**Basis of appeal:** 6♣ not affected by slow 5♣

**Comments by North-South:** None.

### Comments by East-West:

1♥ shows no singleton, except in one very rare case), rather than balanced.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit returned.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

The only options left to East were to bid 5♣ or 6♣ given others would be showing hearts, therefore West had UI from the tempo of the 5♣ bid. We agree that Pass is a logical alternative – if the distribution of the East hand is slightly altered (5 3 3 2 or 5 2 3 3) slam is much less good.

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

The TD/AC decision seems reasonable to me.
--

Tim Rees
----------

This took us a long time to resolve, as we thought through the implications of complex relay auctions, and what happens when they go wrong.
---

Eitan Levy
------------

Agree with the rulings
------------------------

Paul Lamford
--------------

I wouldn't buy this and would not have returned the deposit. It is clear that the 6♣ bid used UI, especially as EW could not show from the system notes that 5♣ asks for a heart control. It sounds like the final contract to me.
--

## APPEAL No : 12.022

Ed Reppert

I agree with the ruling.

Robin Barker

I don't see any merit in this appeal: the facts and the basis of the ruling were not contested by East-West.

There are some later appeals where the AC have readily (rapidly?) upheld the TD ruling and returned the deposit without comment.



# APPEAL No : 12.023

*Tournament Director: Robin Barker*

*Appeals Committee: Neil Rosen (Chairman), Ian Pagan & Chris Jagger*

<p>♠ 7653 ♥ 4 ♦ KQ964 ♣ 864</p> <p>♠ 9                      ♠ AKQ1082 ♥ KQ83                ♥ AJ1096 ♦ A2                     ♦ 3 ♣ AQJ1093            ♣ 2</p> <p>♠ J4 ♥ 752 ♦ J10875 ♣ K75</p>	<p><i>Board 11 : Dealer South : Love all</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>1♣ (1)</td><td>1♦</td><td>1♥ (2)</td><td>3♦</td></tr><tr><td>3♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>4NT (3)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>5♦ (4)</td><td>Pass</td><td>5♥ (5)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>6♥ (5)</td><td>Pass</td><td>7♥</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>1. Could be ??? 2. = spades 3. RKCB agreeing hearts 4. 0 or 3 5. Hesitation</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>				Pass	1♣ (1)	1♦	1♥ (2)	3♦	3♥	Pass	4NT (3)	Pass	5♦ (4)	Pass	5♥ (5)	Pass	6♥ (5)	Pass	7♥	All Pass
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																						
			Pass																						
1♣ (1)	1♦	1♥ (2)	3♦																						
3♥	Pass	4NT (3)	Pass																						
5♦ (4)	Pass	5♥ (5)	Pass																						
6♥ (5)	Pass	7♥	All Pass																						

**Basic systems:**

*North-South play not provided*

*East-West play not provided*

**Form of Scoring:** IMP's

**Result at table:** 7♥ = by East, NS -1510, lead not provided

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

**Director's statement of facts:**

West said he was thinking about whether to bid 6♦ rather than 6♥. NS wanted a ruling on the 6♥ bid and then the 7♥ bid.

Later I asked West what bids after 5♥ would mean, he said they were un-discussed. He chose 6♥ to avoid a misunderstanding.

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

**Details of ruling:**

Pass is not a logical alternative to 6♥. Slowness of 6♥ does not suggest bidding 7♥

**Appeal lodged by:** North-South

**Basis of appeal:** None given.

**Director's comments:**

6♥ could be slow se he was considering other bids. This does not suggest anything

**Comments by North-South:** None.

**Comments by East-West:** None.

## APPEAL No : 12.023

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld  
Deposit returned

### Appeals Committee's comments:

Whilst West's hesitation creates doubt, East's hand is sufficiently huge to still bid 7♥:

- a. If partner has 5 hearts, huge favourite to make.
- b. If partner has Q♥ will be cold.
- c. Even if no Q♥, still makes a great deal of the time.

Jeffrey Allerton

I agree with the TD and the AC. I can't construct an East hand which might bid RKCB with no key cards and no ♥Q.

Tim Rees

As a general principle, a player who has bid a 0/3 or 1/4 RKCB response on the higher number of aces is expected to bid on over a sign-off, and we allow him to do so even after a slow sign-off. Therefore, if he slowly raises to slam, this should demonstrably suggest extras, as he cannot have been considering passing.

Therefore the TD's ruling, that the UI did not suggest the 7♥ bid, was incorrect. The TD himself has written that West could have been considering other bids. Therefore, he had something he wanted to show; with just the three aces, he'd bid a quick 6♥. But the AC ruled that East passing 6♥ was not an LA. The ruling was upheld, but the reason for it was changed.

Eitan Levy

I'm not very happy about it but I would also tend to allow the 7♥ bid, but would want to know about the meaning of the 5♥ bid and the possible responses thereto. Why didn't east bid 7♥ after the blackwood response? What new info does 6♥ give him? (IMP scoring so looking for 7NT not a reason).

Paul Lamford

Routine 7♥ once West confirms that he has all the key cards. At worst it would be the heart guess, but was much more likely to be cold. Most important the speed of the bids does not demonstrably suggest anything.

Frances Hinden

I would keep the deposit. There seems to be no basis to this appeal other than 'if it hesitates, shoot it'.

## APPEAL No : 12.024

*Tournament Director: Martin Lee*

*Appeals Committee: Phil King (Chairman), Gunnar Hallberg & Nick Forward*

<p>♠ K10972 ♥ A2 ♦ Q84 ♣ A76</p> <p>♠ A3                      ♠ J864 ♥ J10875                ♥ Q9 ♦ K72                     ♦ 10653 ♣ 842                    ♣ Q109</p> <p>♠ Q5 ♥ K643 ♦ AJ9 ♣ KJ53</p>	<p><i>Board 27 : Dealer South : Love all</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1♣ (A)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>1♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>1NT</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>2♦ (A)(1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♥</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>2♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♣</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>3NT</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>1. Game Force</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>				1♣ (A)	Pass	1♠	Pass	1NT	Pass	2♦ (A)(1)	Pass	2♥	Pass	2♠	Pass	3♣	Pass	3NT	All Pass	
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																						
			1♣ (A)																						
Pass	1♠	Pass	1NT																						
Pass	2♦ (A)(1)	Pass	2♥																						
Pass	2♠	Pass	3♣																						
Pass	3NT	All Pass																							

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South play strong NT and 5 card majors and short club  
East-West play strong NT, 2 over 1 Game Force 4 card majors*

**Form of Scoring:** *IMP's to VP's (WBF Scale)*

**Result at table:** *3NT-1 by North, NS -50, lead 5♥*

**Director first called:** At end of board 28

### **Director's statement of facts:**

I was called by South but all four players were still at the table. South explained that this was a part of the play, notably the tempo by West towards the end of the game. After establishing the spades in the North hand, at trick 8 South played them and West had to discard. South stated that West discarded out of tempo a ♦, a ♥, a ♣ (rounds 8, 9 and 10). He had already discarded a club at trick 7 (won by the ♣A). West was known to have as his last three cards (at trick 11) a master heart, diamond and a club. Because of his alleged earlier break in tempo South thought that West was bearing (*sic*) the ♣Q and thus at trick 11 played a club from dummy to ♣K. South contends that West had nothing to think about when discarding clubs.

I spoke with all four players. North contends that West thought before his discard on trick 10 (the club). West said he did not hesitate but was simply following in tempo and East supported West. South stated he called me at the end of board 28 (which had been played quickly) as he had now had time to think about the previous board. West simply contended that he was playing the hand about his hand and thinking about his discards whilst in tempo.

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

### **Details of ruling:**

Any break in tempo by West was not significant enough or long enough to be purposefully deceptive. L73

**Appeal lodged by:** North-South

## APPEAL No : 12.024

**Basis of appeal:** Feel West did not have reason to think.

**Director's comments:** None.

**Comments by North-South:** None

**Comments by East-West:** None.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld  
Deposit returned

### Appeals Committee's comments:

All 3 upheld the Director. 1 vote to keep the deposit, 2 votes – sympathy for South.

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

I agree with the TD ruling and with the AC member who voted to keep the deposit.
--

Tim Rees
----------

We now get TDs to fill in a claim form to enable a better understanding of the end position (and the previous play if relevant).
--

Eitan Levy
------------

Agree with ruling. I see no reason not to accept TD's determination.
--

Paul Lamford
--------------

I would have not returned the deposit. West had a demonstrable bridge reason for the BIT, and declarer draws the inference about what he was thinking about at his peril. The only error made by the TD was the mis-spelling of "b(e)aring", but this had no bearing on the ruling (groan – Ed.)
--

Frances Hinden
----------------

'Sympathy' is not sufficient as a reason to return the deposit. Either the appeal was frivolous or it wasn't.
---

## APPEAL No : 12.025

*Tournament Director: David Stevenson*

*Appeals Committee: Phil King (Chairman), Neil Rosen & Jason Hackett*

<p>♠ A1073 ♥ 6 ♦ K1063 ♣ 9852 ♠ KQ652      ♠ 9 ♥ 98753      ♥ AKQ102 ♦ 5            ♦ Q8 ♣ 106         ♣ KQJ74  ♠ J84 ♥ J4 ♦ AJ9742 ♣ A3</p>	<p><i>Board 31 : Dealer South : NS vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1♦</td></tr><tr><td>2♦ (A)(1)</td><td>2♠ (A)(2)</td><td>4♥</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>5♦</td><td>Dbl</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Majors (2) Good diamond raise.</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>				1♦	2♦ (A)(1)	2♠ (A)(2)	4♥	Pass	Pass	5♦	Dbl	All Pass
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>														
			1♦														
2♦ (A)(1)	2♠ (A)(2)	4♥	Pass														
Pass	5♦	Dbl	All Pass														

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South play Strong NT, 5 card majors and short club which would be opened with any balanced hand including 5332*

*East-West play Natural and Michaels*

**Form of Scoring:** *IMP's to VP's (WBF Scale)*

**Result at table:** *5♦ doubled -1 by South, NS -200, lead K♠*

**Director first called:** After the end of the session

### **Director's statement of facts:**

After 2♠ bid East asked South the meaning of his bid. South asked them to wait for a minute, then paused for a time. East then said not to bother and bid 4♥. The period of time before East said not to bother was estimated at about a minute by EW, no more than 5 seconds by NS. North felt that 5♦ was automatic in view of the fact that South could not be balanced and had not doubled 4♥

### **Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for both sides: 4♥= by East, NS -420

### **Details of ruling:**

The pause before answering the question showed doubt as to whether 2♠ showed a diamond raise which suggested bidding 5♦. L16, L73 & L12

**Appeal lodged by:** North-South

**Basis of appeal:** 5♦ evident.

### **Director's comments:**

The Appeals Committee asked me whether it was legal to allow 5♦ some of the time. I said not.

## APPEAL No : 12.025

**Comments by North-South:** None.

**Comments by East-West:** None.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld. Deposit returned.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

The AC all agreed that North's bid was correct, but because Pass was a somewhat logical alternative and the AC had no choice but to uphold. All three members of the AC would have preferred to give North the benefit of bidding it a percentage of the time (about  $\frac{2}{3}$ ) but this is no longer an option we can do.

Jeffrey Allerton

Did the TD poll peers of North? Without seeing the results of a poll, I would have thought that pass is indeed a logical alternative (North has already shown a good raise), so the ruling is probably correct.

Tim Rees

This show the difficulties TDs and ACs have in determining facts – one person's 5 seconds is 1 minute to another. It would have been somewhere in between...

Eitan Levy

I'm not sure what is a "somewhat" logical alternative. PASS is either a logical alternative or not and this is determined by polling relevant players. If PASS is determined to be a logical alternative then the ruling is correct and the TD is correct in disallowing a weighted score.

Paul Lamford

I agree that Pass is a LA alternative, but is the failure to answer a question promptly UI? It is not listed in Law 16 as such, but that does say "for example". I guess that South conveyed to North that he was uncertain about the meaning of 2♠, and this makes it more attractive to bid 5♦, so I would go with the AC ruling.

Frances Hinden

It has never been an option to allow a percentage of North bidding 5♦. I think the ruling to 4♥ making is absolutely clear given the vulnerability. (I don't understand how 5♦ doubled went off on the ♠K lead as it has an easy 11 tricks.)

Robin Barker

Good decision. The AC describe giving a weighted ruling including a proportion of the action suggested by the unauthorized information as "no longer an option": my understanding is that this has never been an option (in England).

# APPEAL No : 12.028

*Tournament Director: Gordon Rainsford*

*Appeals Committee: Frances Hinden (Chairman), Mike Scoltock & Anne Rosen*

<p>♠ 107653 ♥ 5 ♦ AQ1082 ♣ 84</p> <p>♠ Q9                      ♠ J ♥ AKQ2                    ♥ J109863 ♦ 5                            ♦ J964 ♣ AKQ762                ♣ 105</p> <p>♠ AK842 ♥ 74 ♦ K73 ♣ J93</p>	<p><i>Board 4 : Dealer West : All vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1♣</td><td>Pass</td><td>1♥</td><td>1♠</td></tr><tr><td>3♦ (A)</td><td>4♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl (H)</td><td>Pass</td><td>5♥</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>3♦ Splinter. It became clear at the appeal that the meaning of 3♦ was un-discussed other than showing heart support.</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>	1♣	Pass	1♥	1♠	3♦ (A)	4♠	Pass	Pass	Dbl (H)	Pass	5♥	All Pass
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>														
1♣	Pass	1♥	1♠														
3♦ (A)	4♠	Pass	Pass														
Dbl (H)	Pass	5♥	All Pass														

**Basic systems:**

*North-South not provided*

*East-West not provided*

**Form of Scoring:** *Match Pointed Pairs*

**Result at table:** 5♥= by East, NS -650, lead K♦

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

**Director's statement of facts:**

NS reserved their rights at the end of the auction and asked for a ruling at the end of play. East said he was always going to bid 5♥ but didn't want to bid in front of his partner. NS pointed out that he might not have another chance to bid

**Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for both sides:

4♠ doubled -1 by South, NS -200

**Details of ruling:**

The slow double suggested a willingness for it to be removed. Pass was a logical alternative to 5♥. East had already passed over 4♠ and only bid after his partner's slow double. L16B and L12C

**Appeal lodged by:** East-West

**Basis of appeal:** None given

**Director's comments:** None.

**Comments by North-South:** None.

**Comments by East-West:** None.

## APPEAL No : 12.028

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld  
Deposit returned

### Appeals Committee's comments:

Extremely close. Swayed by:

- TD's call to non-playing colleague.
- East's Pass over 4♠ implying he thought 5♥ was (going) off.

Jeffrey Allerton

I agree with the TD and I am pleased to see that the AC took regard of the evidence that the TD had already gathered when making the original ruling. Again, it would be nice to see the E/W system recorded on the form.

Tim Rees

East makes a decision to defend, then changes his mind when partner says he can defeat the opposition. This is illogical, and when partner shows some doubt about his double, will almost always be disallowed. An appeal is unlikely to be successful, and the deposit really should have been kept.

The AC in these cases can sometimes ask themselves the wrong question: would they have bid 5♥ over 4♠? That's not relevant – this player didn't do so.

Eitan Levy

As with most of the cases presented, we are not given details of "the class of the players" Law 16B(b). In my opinion PASS is definitely a LA. But a TD should not be the one to determine this. Polling relevant players would clear this up.

Paul Lamford

Again all we can do is poll peers, and assuming this was done, I accept that Pass is an LA. I would like to know on an AC how many people were polled and what their choices were.

Frances Hinden

I admit that looking at this now it doesn't seem very close at all.



## APPEAL No : 12.029

*Tournament Director: Andrew Crawford*

*Appeals Committee: Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), Graham Osborne & Prof. Burgess*

<p>♠ 107653 ♥ 5 ♦ AQ1082 ♣ 84</p> <p>♠ Q9                      ♠ J ♥ AKQ2                    ♥ J109863 ♦ 5                            ♦ J964 ♣ AKQ762                ♣ 105</p> <p>♠ AK842 ♥ 74 ♦ K73 ♣ J93</p>	<p><i>Board 4 : Dealer West : All vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1♣</td><td>1♦</td><td>Pass</td><td>1♠</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl</td><td>3♠</td><td>4♥</td><td>4♠</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl (H)</td><td>Pass</td><td>5♥</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>H = Agreed hesitation</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>	1♣	1♦	Pass	1♠	Dbl	3♠	4♥	4♠	Dbl (H)	Pass	5♥	All Pass
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>														
1♣	1♦	Pass	1♠														
Dbl	3♠	4♥	4♠														
Dbl (H)	Pass	5♥	All Pass														

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South play Acol 12-14 NT, Lucas 2's and Multi 2 ♦*

*East-West play Benji*

**Form of Scoring:** Match Pointed Pairs

**Result at table:** 5♥ making +1 by East, NS -680, lead A♠

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

**Director's statement of facts:** None!

### **Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for both sides:

4♠x -1 by South, NS -200

### **Details of ruling:**

I formed the opinion that after West's second double after calling out of tempo that East could not bid 5♥. I therefore cancelled the 5♥ bid and adjusted the score to 4♠x-1

**Appeal lodged by:** East-West

**Basis of appeal:** None given.

**Comments by North-South:** None.

**Comments by East-West:** None.

### **Appeals Committee decision:**

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit returned

## APPEAL No : 12.029

### Appeals Committee's comments:

That West hesitated before the double of 4♠ and thus provided UI to East.

East has not got a clear cut pull of 5♥ if the auction had gone in tempo.

Jeffrey Allerton

Why has the TD's statement of facts not been completed? The TD "formed the opinion.....that East could not bid 5♥", but he should have explained how and why he formed this opinion.

West had doubled 1♠ for take-out so presumably the double of 4♠ showed extra values. Did the AC consider whether pulling to 5♥ could have been demonstrably suggested by the slowness of the double? If so, they ought to have explained this.

Tim Rees

This is the same hand as case 028, but with a different auction. In this auction, East's actions are consistent – he's bid 4♥, then competed to 5♥ at his next turn. The TD and AC have judged that passing was an LA, which is a reasonable judgement, but I have a lot of sympathy with East and would certainly return the deposit.

Eitan Levy

Agree with appeal committee. Rather than deciding that East could not bid 5♥, TD should consider whether pass is a logical alternative. It certainly seems so, but polling players would determine.

Paul Lamford

This one I disagree with. The leopard cannot change its spots, and West doubled 1♠ for takeout to show a good hand, and doubled 4♠ to ask partner to do something sensible. 5♥ looks automatic on the East hand, but I do not know their ability and I would poll peers before deciding.

Frances Hinden

It might be right to bid 5♥ on the East cards, but the slow double just makes things easy. The simple solution is not to double slowly, then you get to keep your table result without needing the TD to intervene.

# APPEAL No : 12.031

**Tournament Director:** Colin Simcox

**Appeals Committee:** Heather Dhondy (Chairman), Brian Senior & Simon Cope

<p>♠ Q754 ♥ A10954 ♦ J1083 ♣ -</p> <p>♠ AKJ                      ♠ 8 ♥ KJ8763                  ♥ Q ♦ A                            ♦ K964 ♣ 854                        ♣ AK109763</p> <p>♠ 109632 ♥ 2 ♦ Q752 ♣ QJ2</p>	<p><i>Board 19 : Dealer South : EW vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>1♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♣</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>3♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♠ (1)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4♦</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♥</td><td>All Pass</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4" style="text-align: center;">(1) Not Alerted</td></tr></tbody></table>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>				Pass	1♥	Pass	2♣	Pass	3♥	Pass	3♠ (1)	Pass	4♦	Pass	4♥	All Pass	(1) Not Alerted			
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																						
			Pass																						
1♥	Pass	2♣	Pass																						
3♥	Pass	3♠ (1)	Pass																						
4♦	Pass	4♥	All Pass																						
(1) Not Alerted																									

### **Basic systems:**

North-South not provided

East-West play Acol 3 weak 2's and weak NT

**Form of Scoring:** Match Pointed Pairs

**Result at table:** 4♥ making by West, NS -620, lead ♠Q

**Director first called:** At end of hand

### **Director's statement of facts:**

West failed to alert the 3♠ bid made by East. NS claim that East had used UI (from the failure to alert) when bidding 4♥ only. East stated:

- (1) 3♠ is a cue bid (first or second round control).
- (2) 3♥ had set the suit and was game forcing.
- (3) (Later) 4♦ did not guarantee the ace (as per 1)
- (4) Poor trump support did not justify a second slam try.

### **Director's ruling:**

Table result stands

### **Details of ruling:**

3♠ should have been alerted (OB 5E1(a)). Failure to alert gives rise to UI. However, although logical alternatives (to 4♥) may exist, I cannot see how bidding 4♥ was suggested by the UI

**Appeal lodged by:** North-South

**Basis of appeal:** Not provided.

## APPEAL No : 12.031

### Director's comments:

After consultation with other TD's, I remained unconvinced that the UI had suggested the (successful) outcome.

**Comments by North-South:** None.

**Comments by East-West:** None.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld  
Deposit returned

### Appeals Committee's comments:

We agree with the TD. There was a split decision about whether to keep the deposit.

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

As no basis of appeal was provided and I can't see anything wrong with the TD's logic, I would have retained the deposit.
---

Tim Rees
----------

This looks clearcut – there is no way East is worth another slam try with a singleton trump. This is the kind of “something for nothing” appeal that wastes everyone's time and needs to be strongly discouraged. Keeping the deposit would be a good start...
--

Eitan Levy
------------

Good decision (but NS were lucky not to lose the deposit).
--

Paul Lamford
--------------

I would have kept the deposit. How can the lack of an alert of 3♠ make any difference at all?
---

# APPEAL No : 12.035

*Tournament Director: Kathy Williams*

*Appeals Committee: Tim Rees (Chairman), Heather Dhondy & John Holland*

<p>♠ J842 ♥ A65432 ♦ A ♣ K10</p> <p>♠ AKQ107      ♠ 953 ♥ QJ            ♥ K ♦ 5              ♦ 1098763 ♣ A9542       ♣ Q86</p> <p>♠ 6 ♥ 10987 ♦ KQJ42 ♣ J73</p>	<p><i>Board 17 : Dealer North : Love all</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td>1♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♥</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl</td><td>3♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♦</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>4♥</td><td>Pass (1)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4♠</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">(1) Agreed hesitation</td></tr></tbody></table>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>		1♥	Pass	2♥	Dbl	3♥	Pass	4♦	Pass	4♥	Pass (1)	Pass	4♠	All Pass			(1) Agreed hesitation			
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																						
	1♥	Pass	2♥																						
Dbl	3♥	Pass	4♦																						
Pass	4♥	Pass (1)	Pass																						
4♠	All Pass																								
(1) Agreed hesitation																									

**Basic systems:**

*North-South play Benji Acol  
East-West play Acol weak majors*

**Form of Scoring:** *IMP's to VP's*

**Result at table:** *4♠-1 by West, NS +50, lead not given*

**Director first called:** During the auction

**Director's statement of facts:**

North called me to reserve right when West bid 4♠ over his partner's hesitation.

**Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for both sides:  
4♥ making by North, NS +420

**Details of ruling:**

Hesitation may have indicated 4♠ bid there are logical alternatives to 4♠. L16B1 (a & b)

**Appeal lodged by:** East-West

**Basis of appeal:** West says he would always bid

**Director's comments:** None

**Comments by North-South:** None.

**Comments by East-West:** None.

**Appeals Committee decision:**

## APPEAL No : 12.035

Table score re-instated.  
Deposit returned

### Appeals Committee's comments:

East did not hesitate over 3♥ so had no desire to bid. Therefore the hesitation over 4♥ did not suggest any action over another.

Jeffrey Allerton

East's actions (pass over 3♥, slow pass over 4♥ suggest that he was thinking of saving – West's ♥QJ doubleton suggest that it is very unlikely that East has a suitable heart holding for a penalty double). Pass seems to be a logical alternative given that West passed on the previous round. Hence I prefer the TD's ruling to the AC's.

Tim Rees

This and case 036 are the same hand, but with different auctions and different decisions.  
This decision was a bit controversial, and we could have written a bit more on the form at the time. Essentially, E/W were inexperienced, and East stated that he had no intention of bidding over 4♥ and he wasn't sure why he'd hesitated. Because he had shown no desire to bid over 3♥, we believed him and ruled that there was no UI. Therefore, West was allowed to act as he saw fit.

Eitan Levy

I tend to agree with the TD. I'm not sure I understand the Appeal Committee's position that no hesitation over 3♥ cancels the hesitation over 4♥.

Paul Lamford

Given that East did not bid on the previous round, then, if anything, 4♠ is contra-indicated, and legal. I agree with the AC.

Ed Reppert

I don't understand the committee's reasoning here. I think, as the director did, that the pass over 4♥ could have suggested West bid on. I don't think East's pass in tempo on the previous round changes that.

Frances Hinden

I understand the AC's logic, but I would also like to ask West why he didn't bid over 4♦ but did bid over 4♥.

## APPEAL No : 12.035

Robin Barker

I do not agree with the AC comments but I do not object to the conclusion that the slow Pass over 4♥ does not suggest bidding. The fact that East passed in tempo over 3♥ does not mean they cannot “wake up” on the next round and now consider bidding; and the fact that East was not considering bidding does not mean that the hesitation over 4♥ does not suggest any action – it could suggest doubling.

As often happens, the appeal was on the basis that there was no logical alternative to the action taken but the AC allow the table result on the basis that the action was not suggested.

# APPEAL No : 12.036

**Tournament Director:** Colin Simcox

**Appeals Committee:** Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), Ben Green & Malcolm Pryor

<p>♠ J842 ♥ A65432 ♦ A ♣ K10</p> <p>♠ AKQ107      ♠ 953 ♥ QJ            ♥ K ♦ 5              ♦ 1098763 ♣ A9542      ♣ Q86</p> <p>♠ 6 ♥ 10987 ♦ KQJ42 ♣ J73</p>	<p><i>Board 17 : Dealer North : Love all</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td>1♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♥</td></tr><tr><td>Dbf</td><td>4♥</td><td>Pass (H)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>5♥</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>All Pass (H) Agreed hesitation – longer than required by the ‘Stop’ bid.</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>		1♥	Pass	2♥	Dbf	4♥	Pass (H)	Pass	4♠	Pass	Pass	5♥
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>														
	1♥	Pass	2♥														
Dbf	4♥	Pass (H)	Pass														
4♠	Pass	Pass	5♥														

**Basic systems:**

North-South play – Not provided.

East-West play – Not provided

**Form of Scoring:** IMP's to VP's

**Result at table:** 5♥ -1 by North, NS -50, lead ♦10

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

**Director's statement of facts:**

I was called to the table due to West bidding after East had hesitated.

**Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for both sides:

4♥ making North, NS +420

**Details of ruling:**

The hesitation gave rise to UI. A logical alternative exists (Pass). L16B1(a) and 16 B1(b).

**Appeal lodged by:** East-West

**Basis of appeal:** Not given.

**Director's comments:**

After consulting with other TD's I came to the conclusion that 'Pass' is a logical alternative. A significant number (30%+) of North South pairs played the hand in 4♥ (4♠ is not, therefore, automatic)

**Comments by North-South:** None.



## APPEAL No : 12.036

Comments by East-West: None.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit returned.

That there was a logical alternative to 4♠. TD's ruling upheld

### Appeals Committee's comments:

We considered that 4♠ was not sufficiently clear to be allowed.

Jeffrey Allerton

The TD's comments about the results at other tables are not necessarily relevant: the auctions may have started differently at many of them. However, if he had ascertained that the first seven calls of the auction were the same at several other tables, then the actions taken by the West players at these tables would be very useful information in determining whether pass was a logical alternative. The AC stated that there was a logical alternative to 4♠ but it would have been helpful if they had recorded whether this was Pass or Double. If they agreed with the TD that pass was a logical alternative, they should have explained why they considered the appeal to have merit.

Tim Rees

The difference between this and case 035 is that East had not had a previous chance to bid, so his hesitation over 4♥ did constitute UI in this case.

Incidentally, the TD shouldn't have looked at the results on the board before deciding to adjust. The auctions at the other tables could have been completely different.

Eitan Levy

While the ruling seems clear, I don't accept the TD's reasoning based on results at other tables. Bidding may have been different (see previous hand for example) at other tables or other bidding systems may have been used.

Paul Lamford

This is different to the previous appeal, in that East might have been considering bidding, and I would disallow 4♠.

Ed Reppert

This case seems clear cut. I agree with the director and the committee.

Frances Hinden

I agree with the ruling (although I would have been tempted to keep the deposit) but the TD's argument about results at other tables is not valid unless the auction was the same up to the 4♥ bid.

## APPEAL No : 12.036

Robin Barker

Neither the TD nor AC directly addressed the question of what the slow Pass suggests – unlike the previous AC on the same hand. But on this auction, with the hesitation by East one round earlier, it is reasonable to conclude that the slow Pass suggests any action over Pass by West.

## APPEAL No : 12.037

*Tournament Director: Eddie Williams*

*Appeals Committee: Jeremy Dhondy (Chairman), John Holland & Heather Dhondy*

<p>♠ A3 ♥ 10742 ♦ A102 ♣ QJ74</p> <p>♠ KQ765      ♠ J94 ♥ K63          ♥ AQJ9 ♦ 965          ♦ QJ3 ♣ 83            ♣ 1052</p> <p>♠ 1082 ♥ 85 ♦ K874 ♣ AK96</p>	<p><i>Board 28 : Dealer West : NS vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>2♦ (1)(A)</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♠ (A)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>Dbl</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♣</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>All Pass</p> <p>(1) I was called to the table after West's opening bid of 2♦ by West.</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>	2♦ (1)(A)	Pass	2♠ (A)	Pass	Pass	Dbl	Pass	3♣
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>										
2♦ (1)(A)	Pass	2♠ (A)	Pass										
Pass	Dbl	Pass	3♣										

**Basic systems:**

*North-South play – not provided*

*East-West play multi*

**Form of Scoring:** *IMP's to VP's*

**Result at table:** *3♣ making by North, NS +110, lead not provided*

**Director first called:** After West's opening 2♦.

**Director's statement of facts:**

South had picked up West's System Card before North had bid. I explained that South should not look at the opponent's System Card when it was her turn to bid. I stayed at the table while the auction continued. At South's turn to bid she asked questions about both West and East's alerted bids and then passed. At the end of the auction West reserved his rights and called me back at the end of play for a ruling on the basis of South's actions. After studying the hand I decided that North's double was the only logical alternative and therefor allowed the score to stand. UI does not suggest anything on this occasion.

**Director's ruling:**

Table result stands.

**Details of ruling:**

Result stands. No logical alternative to the double by North. L6B1(b)

**Appeal lodged by:** East-West

**Basis of appeal:** There are logical alternatives to double.

**Director's comments:** No additional remarks.

**Comments by North-South:** None.

## APPEAL No : 12.037

Comments by East-West: None.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld  
Deposit returned

### Appeals Committee's comments:

We thought that despite questions from South the double was fairly automatic and did not consider Pass to be a logical alternative.

All players should have exchanged System Cards at the beginning of the round.

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

How did the TD determine that there was no logical alternative to double? If he performed a decent poll, then the appeal had little merit and the AC should have considered retaining the deposit.
--

Tim Rees
----------

South didn't actually have the values suggested by his show of interest. While this isn't technically relevant in determining whether North has LAs to reopening with a double, some TDs and ACs might allow it to tip the balance in close situations (which this appears to be).
--

Eitan Levy
------------

Agree with decision and would recommend forfeiting deposit.
---

Paul Lamford
--------------

Standard double by North for all but the meekest players, and I would have kept the deposit on this one.
--

Robin Barker
--------------

I think that if the Double is "fairly automatic" then there are logical alternatives. Perhaps "fairly automatic" suggests some would seriously consider passing, but perhaps not enough would actually Pass.
--

## APPEAL No : 12.045

*Tournament Director: James Vickers*

*Appeals Committee: Jeff Smith (Chairman), Simon Cope & Brian Callaghan*

<p>♠ KQ7652 ♥ J5 ♦ 10 ♣ Q764</p> <p>♠ -                      ♠ AJ1093 ♥ K1074                ♥ - ♦ J9842                ♦ AKQ65 ♣ KJ93                 ♣ A82</p> <p>♠ 84 ♥ AQ98632 ♦ 73 ♣ 105</p>	<p><i>Board 12 : Dealer West : NS vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Pass</td><td>2♠ (1)</td><td>Pass (H)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♥</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>Dbl</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Weak 2 (H) Agreed hesitation.</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>	Pass	2♠ (1)	Pass (H)	Pass	Dbl	Pass	Pass	3♥	Pass	Pass	Dbl	All Pass
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>														
Pass	2♠ (1)	Pass (H)	Pass														
Dbl	Pass	Pass	3♥														
Pass	Pass	Dbl	All Pass														

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South play – no information provided.*

*East-West play - no information provided.*

**Form of Scoring:** Match Pointed Pairs

**Result at table:** 3♥x -2 by South, NS -500, lead not given.

**Director first called:** Information not provided

### **Director's statement of facts:**

I was called to the table by North after the first double. She wanted to reserve her rights because it was made after a break in tempo (agreed to be longer than required by the 'stop' regulations. Play continued and I was recalled at the end of the hand. North was not concerned about the first double but was unhappy about East's double of 3♥. South, however, didn't think the first double should be allowed after the hesitation.

### **Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for both sides:

2♠-4 by North, NS -400

### **Details of ruling:**

West's double could have been suggested over Pass (a logical alternative call) by East's hesitation. Had West passed, that would have ended the auction. It is difficult to work out how many tricks North would make, perhaps 4 or 5 tricks.

**Appeal lodged by:** East-West

**Basis of appeal:** No information provided

**Director's comments:**

## APPEAL No : 12.045

Although North originally reserved her rights, she withdrew her objection to West's double. South, however, disagreed, so a ruling was given. There can be no legal objection to East's double as East is not in receipt of any UI.

**Comments by North-South:** None.

**Comments by East-West:**

West commented: I think double is a reasonable action by a passed hand, as I have void and good shape. I also think that North is likely to go four down in 2♠.

**Appeals Committee decision:**

Table score re-instated  
Deposit returned

**Appeals Committee's comments:**

Allow double of 2♠ given West is a passed hand, shape suitable and standard of player in the event.

Jeffrey Allerton

How did the TD determine that Pass was a logical alternative to double over 2♠? Did the AC take into account the evidence the TD had gathered when reviewing the TD's decision? It is possible that double is the only logical alternative for players of the same standard as the eminent members of the AC, but a less clear cut action for the West player at the table. His comment "I think double is a reasonable action" is true but in UI cases like this the question should be "Is double the *only* reasonable action?" My own internet poll suggests that although Pass is a minority action it is still selected by a significant proportion (over 20%) and seriously considered by some of the doublers, so if the respondents are peers of the player at the table, Pass is a logical alternative.

Tim Rees

Did the TD consult any players on West's reopening action? If not, why not? If he did, then the AC should have been told and it would then be unusual for them to overturn the decision.

But with no consultation, the AC has to judge whether peers of this particular West would almost all reopen with a double. If West was a strong, aggressive player, the AC's ruling would seem to be correct.

Eitan Levy

1: The appeal committee decision seems reasonable and I would also re-instate the table score of 3♥ dbl (but perhaps keep the deposit) – except that .....

2: As North had withdrawn her objection to West's double, and as East was not in receipt of any UI, the TD and/or the Appeal Committee should have applied Law 92D1 which requires both members of the partnership to concur in making the appeal, and so the appeal should not have been heard at all.

## APPEAL No : 12.045

Paul Lamford

Routine protective double and agree with AC.

Frances Hinden

This revolves around whether pass is a logical alternative to double of 2♠. An ideal circumstance for a poll, as long as the poll is of peers of the player concerned.

Robin Barker

I think it is close. I remember a similar hand (perhaps 1-4-4-4 with two aces) on the same auction where I polled a number of players and did not find any who would definitely Pass and so ruled to allow the double. In this case a poll of players would have strengthened the TD's case. West commented that Double is a "reasonable action": it needs to more than that to be allowed, the alternatives need not to be reasonable.

## APPEAL No : 12.046

*Tournament Director: Gordon Rainsford*

*Appeals Committee: Paul Lamford (Chairman), David Ewart & Jeff Smith*

<p>♠ AQ974 ♥ J98762 ♦ K ♣ 10</p> <p>♠ K83                      ♠ 652 ♥ K105                     ♥ AQ3 ♦ QJ8                        ♦ 65 ♣ AK74                     ♣ QJ863</p> <p>♠ J10 ♥ 4 ♦ A1097432 ♣ 952</p>	<p><i>Board 8 : Dealer West : Love all</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1NT</td><td>2♦ (1)</td><td>2NT (2)</td><td>3♦</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>3♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♦</td></tr><tr><td>Pass (H)</td><td>Pass</td><td>Dbl</td><td>All Pass</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) For spades + another or six spades (2) Lebensohl – puppet to 3♣</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>	1NT	2♦ (1)	2NT (2)	3♦	Pass	3♥	Pass	4♦	Pass (H)	Pass	Dbl	All Pass
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>														
1NT	2♦ (1)	2NT (2)	3♦														
Pass	3♥	Pass	4♦														
Pass (H)	Pass	Dbl	All Pass														

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South system not disclosed*

*East-West play Strong NT*

**Form of Scoring:** Match Pointed Pairs

**Result at table:** 4♦x -2 by North, NS -300, lead not given.

**Director first called:** Not provided.

### **Director's statement of facts:**

After the 4♦ bid West asked for a full explanation of the auction and considered matters before passing

### **Director's ruling:**

Table result stands

### **Details of ruling:**

Pass is not a logical alternative for East who has a 9 count opposite partners strong NT. It is not clear precisely what West's request for a review of the auction suggests, given that she has already passed a strong NT.

**Appeal lodged by:** North-South

**Basis of appeal:** Information not provided.

**Director's comments:** No further comments.

### **Comments by North-South:**

NS stated they thought the questions and slow Pass has helped East find the final double. East has not doubled 3♥ and had one fewer diamonds.



## APPEAL No : 12.046

**Comments by East-West:** EW had left the venue.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld

Deposit returned.

That no LA to final double for a player of this strength and methods. She has 6 points more than she might have had. Questions did not demonstrably suggest the double.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

Unanimous agreement with findings of learned directors consulting.

Deposit returned. Unanimous but not a frivolous case and some extra points made by NS.

Jeffrey Allerton

The TD is not sure what the hesitation suggests, but it seems clear to me that he must have been considering doubling, given that he doesn't know his partner's long suit. The AC has stated that East has no LA to double over 4♦. However, many people would consider that Pass is not a LA for East on the previous round and yet East *did* pass over 3♥. So we should be considering the subset of players who would have passed on the previous round. In the circumstances, it could be difficult to perform a poll of East's peers, but my feeling is that this particular East might well have passed again had West passed in tempo. Hence I would prefer to adjust the score to 4♦ undoubled by North making the same number of tricks.

Tim Rees

After the hesitation over 4♦, then West can only have been considering doubling, so that does convey UI that suggests East's double.

So the AC was wrong about the questions not suggesting East's double, but they were probably right to conclude that there was no LA to the double.

Paul Lamford

It does not seem to be an LA to pass out 4♦ undoubled despite the UI. East has a nine-count opposite a strong NT and West's questions don't change anything. Close to retaining the deposit, we felt.

Frances Hinden

Returning the deposit is generous.

## APPEAL No : 12.047

*Tournament Director: Kathy Williams*

*Appeals Committee: Jason Hackett (Chairman), Sandy Davies & Mike Bell*

<p>♠ A1072 ♥ 84 ♦ AQJ ♣ J964</p> <p>♠ J95      ♠ 64 ♥ Q653      ♥ AK10972 ♦ 97      ♦ 8643 ♣ K753      ♣ A</p> <p>♠ KQ83 ♥ J ♦ K1052 ♣ Q1082</p>	<p><i>Board 9 : Dealer North : EW vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td>1NT</td><td>Dbl (1)</td><td>Pass (2)(A)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>Rdbl</td><td>2♥</td><td>Dbl (3)</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>All Pass</p> <p>(1) No alert – shows opening values and 6 card club, diamond or heart suit. (2) Asks partner to redouble. (3) Penalty – no alert.</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>		1NT	Dbl (1)	Pass (2)(A)	Pass	Rdbl	2♥	Dbl (3)
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>										
	1NT	Dbl (1)	Pass (2)(A)										
Pass	Rdbl	2♥	Dbl (3)										

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South play Multi 2 ♦*

*East-West play Benji Acol*

**Form of Scoring:** *Match Pointed Pairs*

**Result at table:** 2♥x +1 by East, NS -870, lead ♠K

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

### **Director's statement of facts:**

North called me because West had not alerted the double of 1NT which shows opening values and 6 Clubs. Diamonds or Hearts. West had forgotten the system. I asked South what she would have bid and was told that they had no system and would probably Pass. Over 2♥ she had two choices. Double for penalties or 3♥ (Stayman). She chose the double.

### **Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for both sides:

50% of 2♥x+1 by East and 50% of 3♠+1 by North or South

**Details of ruling:** No further information given

**Appeal lodged by:** North-South

**Basis of appeal:** Information not given

**Director's comments:** None

**Comments by North-South:** None.

**Comments by East-West:** None

## APPEAL No : 12.047

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling amended

Score assigned for both sides:

1NT doubled -1 by North, NS -100

Deposit returned.

Having determined that NS use natural methods over an artificial double, we adjusted as above.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

When asked, South had no bid other than Pass. Had she known the real meaning of the double, we have no reason to believe West or North would remove (West had forgotten the system). While 1NTx can be beaten by 2, this is very difficult defence to find and we feel that clearing the hearts is the likely defence and we cannot allow the offending side to find a razor sharp defence.

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

A well reasoned decision by the AC.
-------------------------------------

Tim Rees
----------

The TD has assumed that with the correct explanation, North would redouble. The AC has assumed that he would pass. I wonder if anyone asked him? He might even have tried something else (2♣?). But if North was non-committal, 1NT*-1 looks the most likely outcome.
---

Eitan Levy
------------

An excellent ruling by the Appeal Committee
---

Paul Lamford
--------------

If South had been told that Double was artificial, she would have passed, as would West. I don't think South should pass, but that is by the by. I agree with the AC that 1NTx-1 is the most likely score. East will not unblock the ace of clubs before playing a third heart.
---

Frances Hinden
----------------

The AC made a better job of the this than the TD and the ruling for EW is fair enough. The AC might have considered whether South's penalty double of 2♥ and a singleton was wild or gambling.
--

Robin Barker
--------------

I think the TD should have included some of 4♠= in the adjustment: if South bids 3♥ over 2♥ there must be a case for North/South to treat this as game-forcing and bid game. But the AC decided that (with the correct explanation) the auction would not get that far.
---

## **APPEAL No : 12.048**

**Tournament Director:** Sarah Amos

**Appeals Committee:** Tom Townsend (Chairman), David S Jones

*Hand not required*

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South play – not relevant*

*East-West play – not relevant*

**Form of Scoring:** Match Pointed Pairs

**Result at table:** Not relevant

**Director first called:** Information not provided

### **Director's statement of facts:**

When the clock had reached the end of round 10 the table had not finished the first board of the round. I stopped play of the second board and awarded 50% to NS and 60% to EW. I had noted that EW were standing waiting to go to the table at the beginning of the round for about 5 minutes. I was also aware that NS had been slow on several of the previous rounds whereas EW had been moving on time whenever possible. I therefore decided that EW were not at fault for the inability to play the board.

### **Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for N/S: 50%

Score assigned for E/W: 60%

### **Details of ruling:**

Director responsible for smooth running of the event. L81

Director has power to assess rectification. L81C

**Appeal lodged by:** North-South

**Basis of appeal:** NS felt not to blame.

**Director's comments:** None

**Comments by North-South:** None.

**Comments by East-West:** None.

### **Appeals Committee decision:**

Director's ruling upheld

Deposit returned

### **Appeals Committee's comments:**

No good reason to overrule the TD. Should have kept the deposit. Bit taken aback by unusual nature of the case.

## APPEAL No : 12.048

Scores should add up to 100% not more except in case of directing error or extraneous issue but that's merely our opinion. TD ruled as saw fit.

Jeffrey Allerton

The TD should have explained why she gave N/S 50%. Based on her description of the facts, it seems that they were at fault for the delay and should have been assigned 40% (Law 12C2(a)). If this had been the basis of appeal, it would have had merit!

Tim Rees

This appeal should have been heard by the Chief TD, as there is no bridge judgement involved. Regarding the ruling, a board was removed and more than 100% was awarded to the table. The majority of the room playing at normal speed gets normal match points; the section playing slowly gets a match point bonus!

Eitan Levy

I cannot understand why the Appeals Committee didn't keep the deposit. TD's ruling is justified by Law 12C1(f) - scores need not add up to 100%

Paul Lamford

I think the correct ruling is 40-60 as NS were responsible for the non-play of the board. I would certainly have kept their deposit when they were awarded 50% even though they were at fault!

Ed Reppert

As did the committee, I see no good reason to overrule the TD. After all, he was there. I do think NS got off lightly, both in the adjustment and in the return of the deposit.

Frances Hinden

It is not immediately clear that this appeal should be heard by an appeals committee, however the appeal was against the judgement of the TD's about the extent to which NS were at fault, which is a judgement rather than a matter of law. I agree with the AC that 60/40 or 50/50 seems a better ruling than the quantitative easing approach taking by the TD, and I also agree that they should have kept the deposit.

Robin Barker

The principle that scores should not add up to more than 100% without an external cause is sound. Here it can be argued that the third pair who had been (repeatedly) slow and caused this table to start late were the external cause: perhaps that pair should have been fined 10% of a top, to balance the excess, even though that pair had not lost a board.

# APPEAL No : 12.049

*Tournament Director: Phil Green*

*Appeals Committee: Michael Byrne (Chairman), Jeff Smith & Jason Hackett*

<p>♠ 643 ♥ A642 ♦ KQJ5 ♣ 82</p> <p>♠ K7                      ♠ Q52 ♥ K9                      ♥ J10753 ♦ A108742                ♦ 3 ♣ KQ4                    ♣ J653</p> <p>♠ AJ1098 ♥ Q8 ♦ 96 ♣ A1097</p>	<p><i>Board 3 : Dealer South : EW vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1♠</td></tr><tr><td>1NT</td><td>Dbl</td><td>Pass (H)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2♦</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♥</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Pass (H)</td><td>Dbl Agreed Hesitation</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>				1♠	1NT	Dbl	Pass (H)	Pass	2♦	Pass	2♥	Pass	Pass (H)	Dbl Agreed Hesitation	All Pass	
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																		
			1♠																		
1NT	Dbl	Pass (H)	Pass																		
2♦	Pass	2♥	Pass																		
Pass (H)	Dbl Agreed Hesitation	All Pass																			

**Basic systems:**

*North-South play – information not provided.*

*East-West play – information not provided.*

**Form of Scoring: IMP's**

**Result at table:** 2♥x -1 by East, NS +200, lead not given

**Director first called:** At end of hand after move had been called

**Director's statement of facts:**

I was called by North with all 4 players at the table. Auction and hesitation were agreed and North wished to query the 2♦ bid. West stated that he had 6 diamonds and so removed the penalty double. After consultation I ruled that West's action was acceptable since Pass was not a logical alternative with the spade stop being a doubleton and the diamond suit likely to need to be set up.

**Director's ruling:**

Table result stands.

**Details of ruling:**

West had not made use of UI (the slow Pass) since there was no logical alternative to 2♦.

**Appeal lodged by:** North-South

**Basis of appeal:** None given.

**Director's comments:**

The 2♦ bid appeared normal since the risk of playing 1NTx vulnerable was too high.

**Comments by North-South:** None.

## APPEAL No : 12.049

Comments by East-West: None.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld  
Deposit returned

### Appeals Committee's comments:

We felt that 2♦ was fairly automatic for the standard of player. Whilst there was UI from the slow Pass, West made a good point when he stated that the form of scoring (total imps) would not reward risky action.

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

I agree with the decision to allow the table result to stand, but my reasoning would have been different: the slow pass could not demonstrably suggest pulling to 2♦. If East was considering redoubling or pulling to any other suit, that does not make 2♦ more attractive on the West hand.
--

Tim Rees
----------

This looks clear-cut. The hesitation does not bar West from bidding.
--

Eitan Levy
------------

Agree with AC ruling and reasoning.
-------------------------------------

Paul Lamford
--------------

2♦ automatic with an undisclosed six-card suit, and I would have kept this deposit too.
---

# APPEAL No : 12.050

Tournament Director: Phil Green

Appeals Committee: Michael Byrne (Chairman), Jeff Smith & Jason Hackett

<p>♠ 109752 ♥ K5 ♦ 72 ♣ AKQ8</p> <p>♠ Q4                      ♠ A83 ♥ QJ4                     ♥ 1098762 ♦ AQJ4                    ♦ 105 ♣ J1073                   ♣ 65</p> <p>♠ KJ6 ♥ A3 ♦ K9863 ♣ 942</p>	<p>Board 21 : Dealer North : NS vulnerable</p>
--	--

### Basic systems:

North-South play 2 over 1, 5 card majors

East-West play reverse carding

Form of Scoring: IMP's

Result at table: Not noted

Director first called: After North had led 9♠ to trick 10

### Director's statement of facts:

The cards below were remaining for the last 4 tricks. North had led 9♠, West has shown North 10♣ saying "I will keep this one". There was discussion at the table involving all four players. I ruled that West's action constituted a claim (L68A) and I ruled that EW would not discard their diamonds. Therefore 4♠ would be -2

<p>♠ 975 ♥ ♦ 7 ♣ 8</p> <p>♠ ♥ Q                      ♠ ♦ QJ                     ♥ 876 ♣ 10                      ♦ 10 ♣</p> <p>♠ ♥ ♦ 9863 ♣</p>	<p>Board 21 : Dealer North : NS vulnerable</p>
--	--

### Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

4♠ -2 by East West North South, NS -200



## APPEAL No : 12.050

### Details of ruling:

Claim made by defence. L68A  
Play ceased. L68D  
Two tricks awarded to defence. L70

**Appeal lodged by:** North-South

**Basis of appeal:** Not provided.

**Director's comments:** None.

**Comments by North-South:** None.

**Comments by East-West:** None.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling amended  
Score assigned for both sides:  
4♠-1 by East West North South, NS -100  
Deposit returned

### Appeals Committee's comments:

We ruled that it was logical for East to discard the 10♦. At this point it would be careless but not irrational for West to throw the 2♦. We therefore adjusted the score to 4♠-1. Subsequently we were asked why 9 tricks as dummy had long diamonds and it would either be 8 tricks or 10 tricks and thus 9 was an impossible number. We have not had a chance to reconvene since we (I) was made aware of this.

(Written two days later). Subsequently we have conferred and adjusted the score to 4♠ making 10 tricks for +620

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

It would be very helpful if the form had stated the contract, declarer and the play to date! Although I could guess, it's hard to comment on the adjudication of the claim without knowing. However, I admire the AC for taking the time to reconsider their ruling when they realised that their original conclusion may have been incorrect.
--

Tim Rees
----------

It's always struck me that the first part of Law 70 ("the Director adjudicates the result of the board as equitably as possible to both sides") is given no weight, as even the tiniest doubt is resolved in favour of the non-claimers.
--

I suppose West deserves a bad score for miscounting the hand, but we might end up with no claims, and play slowing down even more.
--

Paul Lamford
--------------

Clear to award all the tricks to declarer as there is a careless but normal line which fails for the
--

## APPEAL No : 12.050

claimer.

Ed Reppert

Agree with making 4. Benefit of the doubt goes to NS.

Frances Hinden

The TD and AC's rulings are both sensible but it impossible to know which is better without seeing the play up to the point of the comment by West.

Robin Barker

In the claim diagram I assume dummy is ♠9x, ♥-, ♦x, ♣x. There is an extra spade and therefore 5 cards.

It would also be good if the write-up stated that the contract was 4♠ by North and how many tricks declarer had made before trick 10: presumably won 6 and lost 3 (♠A, ♠Q, ♦A).

Once West made his statement, without saying how many tricks and without saying they would keep diamonds, the rest seems to follow inevitably – all the way to declarer taking the rest.

## APPEAL No : 12.052

**Tournament Director:** James Vickers

**Appeals Committee:** Jeff Smith (Chairman), Dan McIntosh & Paul Lamford

<p>♠ 9 ♥ AK976 ♦ A9 ♣ AJ762</p> <p>♠ AK6                      ♠ 10542 ♥ Q42                      ♥ 108 ♦ K1074                    ♦ J6532 ♣ 954                      ♣ K3</p> <p>♠ QJ873 ♥ J53 ♦ Q8 ♣ Q108</p>	<p><i>Board 18 : Dealer East : NS vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>1NT (1)</td><td>Dbl (2)</td><td>Pass (3)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Rdbl (4)</td><td>Pass</td><td>2♦ (5)</td><td>2♠</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>3♣</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♦ (6)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>3NT</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) 11-14 (2) Penalties (3) Alerted, forces redouble. (4) Forced (5) Alerted ♦ + ♠ (6) Assumed by South to be a cue bid, by North to be natural.</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>			Pass	Pass	1NT (1)	Dbl (2)	Pass (3)	Pass	Rdbl (4)	Pass	2♦ (5)	2♠	Pass	3♣	Pass	3♦ (6)	Pass	3NT	All Pass	
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																						
		Pass	Pass																						
1NT (1)	Dbl (2)	Pass (3)	Pass																						
Rdbl (4)	Pass	2♦ (5)	2♠																						
Pass	3♣	Pass	3♦ (6)																						
Pass	3NT	All Pass																							

### **Basic systems:**

North-South play Acol 12-14 NT  
East-West play not provided

**Form of Scoring:** IMP's to VP's

**Result at table:** 3NT +1 by North, NS +630, lead ♥10

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

### **Director's statement of facts:**

East asked before leading whether the suit bids by NS were natural some of the time and was told by North that they were.

West claimed he might have doubled 3♦ had he known it was artificial. East said she was going to lead a diamond until told South had shown the suit.

### **Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for both sides:  
50% of 3NT by North -3, NS-300  
25% of 4♥ by North -1, NS -100  
25% of 4♥ by North =, NS +620

### **Details of ruling:**

West will still pass an alerted 3♦ some of the time. East would lead a diamond and 3NT would go three off. If West doubles 3♦, North will bid hearts and reach game which may make or may go off. L12B, L12C1(a)(c), L40A1(b), L21B3.

**Appeal lodged by:** East-West

**Basis of appeal:** Not provided.

## APPEAL No : 12.052

**Director's comments:** None.

**Comments by North-South:** None.

**Comments by East-West:** None.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling amended.

Score assigned for both sides:

20% of 3NT+1 by North, NS +630

20% of 3NT -3 by North, NS -300

20% of 4♥= by North, NS +620

20% of 4♥-1 by North, NS -100

20% of 4♣-1 by North, NS -100

Deposit returned.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

Award slightly generous to EW

We believe despite the failure to alert 3NT will make some of the time. We also think that 4♥ will make slightly less often.

Jeffrey Allerton

West's failure to double 3♦ caused the problem. When his partner has shown 4(+)♦, double is equally safe and correct whether South's 3♦ is natural or not. Hence the failure to alert did not cause any damage. In auctions such as these a cue bid of an opponent's suit is usually played as artificial, so if West really only wanted to double 3♦ if it was artificial, he could and should have protected himself by asking.

I would have allowed the table result to stand.

Tim Rees

Was South's 3♦ conventional? If it was actually natural, there would be no offence and the table score would stand.

But assuming that 3♦ was (or might have been) conventional, then there have been two offences. The TD and AC have focused on the first (North failing to alert) and have tried to guess what would have happened if 3♦ had been alerted. But the second offence (South failing to correct the MI before the opening lead) has had a far clearer effect. If South had volunteered a correction (as required by Law 20F5b), then East would have led a diamond, leading to 3NT-3. That result should have been awarded to both sides. Any other ruling rewards South for failing to follow the Laws.

Eitan Levy

"East asked before leading whether the suit bids by NS were natural some of the time and was told by North that they were." (my emphasis). A strange question, but if this is correct, then South's bids were natural "some of the time" (50%). East could protect himself and ask which bids were natural –

## APPEAL No : 12.052

he didn't do so, so table score should stand.

Paul Lamford

A much discussed hand where the opinion of people on IBLF was that West should double anyway and they would not lead a diamond on the East hand when West had not doubled. They would have allowed the table result to stand, but the L&E wrote to the AC stating that they thought a higher percentage of a diamond lead should have been given.

Frances Hinden

The AC have had so much fun with adjusting the weightings that they haven't thought about the basis for the ruling. South's intentions seem to have been to bid spades naturally and diamonds artificially which implies that NS have no agreement as to whether these bids are natural or artificial. The ruling should be on the basis that North explains they have not discussed this auction. I am also somewhat dubious that West would have doubled a 'no agreement' 3♦ given that at the table he failed to double a 3-level bid in a suit that his partner had shown 4+ cards in.

Robin Barker

I think South should have corrected North's explanation that all their bids were natural, since South assumed 3♦ was a "cue bid" and appeared to be showing only a half stop in diamonds. If this had happened at the table then I think East would lead a diamond. South should have been admonished for his failure to correct.

East is only entitled to an adjustment based on an uncertain explanation of 3♦ (e.g. "no agreement"), but even that sounds as if it would be enough for East to lead diamonds. I am also not clear why North/South should be allowed to avoid 3NT once West doubles 3♦: they are not entitled to know that they have a disagreement over the meaning of 3♦, so it would seem to both North and South that they have enough in diamonds and that if anyone lacks diamonds it is East (East may have been forced by their methods to show a non-existent suit).

## APPEAL No : 12.055

*Tournament Director: Gary Conrad*

*Appeals Committee: Brian Senior (Chairman), Tim Rees & Jason Hackett*

<p>♠ A7 ♥ 98765 ♦ 95 ♣ Q943</p> <p>♠ QJ                      ♠ 10965 ♥ AK42                    ♥ J103 ♦ KQ                        ♦ J1042 ♣ KJ1072                ♣ 65</p> <p>♠ K8432 ♥ Q ♦ A8763 ♣ A8</p>	<p><i>Board 24 : Dealer West : Love all</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1♣ (A)</td><td>Pass</td><td>1♥ (A?)</td><td>1♠</td></tr><tr><td>2♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♦</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>3♠</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(A) Alert</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>	1♣ (A)	Pass	1♥ (A?)	1♠	2♥	Pass	Pass	3♦	Pass	3♠	All Pass	
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>														
1♣ (A)	Pass	1♥ (A?)	1♠														
2♥	Pass	Pass	3♦														
Pass	3♠	All Pass															

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South system not given.*

*East-West play 5 card majors and transfer responses.*

**Form of Scoring:** *IMP's to VP's*

**Result at table:** *3♠-4 by South, NS -200, lead not given.*

**Director first called:** At end of hand

### **Director's statement of facts:**

I was called by South at the end of the hand. Both North and South claimed that the alert by West of the 1♥ bid had not been made. South claims that if he had seen the Alert he would never have bid 1♠ but would have passed awaiting developments. After consulting with colleagues I ruled that West had a responsibility to ensure both players had seen the Alert (OB5B7) and therefore would make an adjustment. I considered that if South Passes West would still bid 2♥ and that would end the auction.

### **Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for both sides:

2♥-1 by East, NS +50

### **Details of ruling:**

Lack of positive Alert. OB 5B7

**Appeal lodged by:** East-West

### **Basis of appeal:**

EW think that West would bid 1NT not 2♥ which is a make.

## APPEAL No : 12.055

### Director's comments:

The ruling was given at 23.30. The players approached me at 01.15! and asked to appeal. I advised them to get their Captain to appeal. The appeal time was confirmed as the beginning of Match 2, Session 2.

**Comments by North-South:** None.

**Comments by East-West:** None.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld

Deposit returned

We accept that the alert was not made sufficiently clear by West so NS were damaged

### Appeals Committee's comments:

West might have bid differently, ie 1NT instead of 2♥ but do not see that the different situations make a bid difference. West has two spade honours and East has shown 4+ hearts so a NT rebid looks very tempting even after the overcall.

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

The AC's decision is not unreasonable, but did they consider the possibilities of South overcalling 2♦ and/or protecting with a double when 2♥ is passed round to him?
--

Tim Rees
----------

E/W are the offending side, so don't get the benefit of any doubt in what might have happened. We might have given a weighted ruling with a small proportion of 1NT, but we felt that as the distinction between the two auctions was not great, this type of small adjustment would be more likely to be given to a non-offending side.
--

Eitan Levy
------------

What was meaning of 1♣? Agree that as far as NS are concerned, the 1♥ bid was not alerted. But what is its systemic meaning? Hearts? Spades? It looks like it shows spades ("transfer response" and should be alerted) but west "supported" hearts (shouldn't be alerted?). Without information on the system I can't give an opinion on South's spade bid.
---

Paul Lamford
--------------

It is the duty on EW to make absolutely sure that their opponents have seen an alert, ideally by placing the alert card in the middle of the table and leaving it there for a short time. I agree with the AC ruling.
---

## APPEAL No : 12.064

*Tournament Director: Jonathan Lillycrop*

*Appeals Committee: Paul Hackett (Chairman), David Gold & Celia Oram*

<p>♠ A764 ♥ AQ6 ♦ A9754 ♣ A</p> <p>♠ 10852      ♠ Q93 ♥ 10953      ♥ K74 ♦ J8            ♦ 62 ♣ K76        ♣ 108532</p> <p>♠ KJ ♥ J82 ♦ KQ103 ♣ QJ94</p>	<p><i>Board 10 : Dealer East : All vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td>Pass</td><td>1NT (12-14)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>2NT (1)</td><td>Pass</td><td>3♦ (2)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>3♠</td><td>Pass</td><td>3NT (3)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>4♣</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♦</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>4♥</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♠</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>5♣</td><td>Pass</td><td>6♦</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>All Pass</p> <p>(1) Shows diamonds. Alerted (2) Honour third or better. Alerted (3) Hesitation.</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>			Pass	1NT (12-14)	Pass	2NT (1)	Pass	3♦ (2)	Pass	3♠	Pass	3NT (3)	Pass	4♣	Pass	4♦	Pass	4♥	Pass	4♠	Pass	5♣	Pass	6♦
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																										
		Pass	1NT (12-14)																										
Pass	2NT (1)	Pass	3♦ (2)																										
Pass	3♠	Pass	3NT (3)																										
Pass	4♣	Pass	4♦																										
Pass	4♥	Pass	4♠																										
Pass	5♣	Pass	6♦																										

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South play Weak NT*

*East-West system not provided.*

**Form of Scoring:** *Match Pointed Pairs*

**Result at table:** *6♦ making by South, NS +1370, lead not given*

**Director first called:** When dummy was faced.

### **Director's statement of facts:**

West called me after dummy was put down to reserve his rights because of North bidding on after the slow 3NT bid. I asked them to play the hand and call me back at the end (of play) if they wanted me to look at it. The contract made and I was re-called to make a ruling. I consulted and everyone was bidding on over 3NT and getting to slam. I ruled the result stood and told EW they had the right to appeal.

### **Director's ruling:**

Table result stands.

### **Details of ruling:**

Pass was not felt to be a logical alternative over 3NT. L16

**Appeal lodged by:** East-West

**Basis of appeal:** Felt Pass was a logical alternative.

**Comments by North-South:** None.

**Comments by East-West:** None.

**Appeals Committee decision:**



## APPEAL No : 12.064

Director's ruling upheld  
Deposit returned

### Appeals Committee's comments:

Director's ruling unanimous. The major discussion was whether to forfeit the deposit. We asked the TD to inform the appellants that it was a close decision.

Jeffrey Allerton

The appealing side does not seem to have presented any evidence to suggest why the TD's ruling might be incorrect. As the major discussion was whether to forfeit the deposit, it seems that the AC did not consider the appeal to have any merit (I agree). This means that the deposit should have been forfeited.

Tim Rees

I agree with the TD and AC.

Eitan levy

The continuation after 3NT is obvious, and so should be the forfeiting of the deposit. The appeal is just a waste of time.

Paul Lamford

When I was asked about this hand originally, I thought Pass of 3NT was a clear LA, and I still think the same. The slow 3NT expressed doubt, and a fast 3NT would be more consistent with Qxx KJx Kxx KJxx, when slam is about 0%. I actually thought this was one of the worst AC rulings for quite some time, and was staggered to learn from its chairman that the AC considered keeping the deposit. I did a simulation with South having KJx(x) in hearts and KQx(x) in clubs, and slam was very poor indeed, under 40%. In addition only a quarter of the field reached slam, including this pair who did so using UI. The only ruling in the set I feel strongly about.

Frances Hinden

No reason to return the deposit. North has an 18-count and a known diamond fit.

# APPEAL No : 12.066

*Tournament Director: Gordon Rainsford*

*Appeals Committee: Pat Davies (Chairman), Sandy Davies & Alan Nelson*

<p>♠ K98432 ♥ A ♦ AKQ75 ♣ 7</p> <p>♠ Q7                      ♠ AJ65 ♥ Q1085                ♥ KJ764 ♦ 9                        ♦ 832 ♣ AKJ985              ♣ 3</p> <p>♠ 10 ♥ 932 ♦ J1064 ♣ Q10642</p>	<p><i>Board 14 : Dealer East : Love all</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>2♣ (1)</td><td>2♠</td><td>Dbl (2)</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>3♥</td><td>4♦</td><td>4♥</td><td>Pass (3)</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>4♠</td><td>Dbl</td><td>5♦</td></tr><tr><td>Dbl</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>(1) Intermediate – announced (2) Negative (3) Hesitation</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>			Pass	Pass	2♣ (1)	2♠	Dbl (2)	Pass	3♥	4♦	4♥	Pass (3)	Pass	4♠	Dbl	5♦	Dbl	All Pass		
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																						
		Pass	Pass																						
2♣ (1)	2♠	Dbl (2)	Pass																						
3♥	4♦	4♥	Pass (3)																						
Pass	4♠	Dbl	5♦																						
Dbl	All Pass																								

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South system not given.*

*East-West play Strong Club*

**Form of Scoring:** *Match Pointed Pairs*

**Result at table:** *5♦x making by North, NS +550, lead not provided.*

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

### **Director's statement of facts:**

I was told that it had been agreed during the auction that there had been a hesitation before South's Pass over 4♥. I was asked to consider North's 4♠ bid in the light of this. My discussion/polling among my TD colleagues established clearly that Pass was a logical alternative to North's 4♠ bid and so I assigned a contract of 4♥ by West.

### **Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for both sides:  
60% Of -420 and 40% of -450

### **Details of ruling:**

Hesitation suggests bidding rather than passing. Pass is a logical alternative so a contract of 4♥ was assigned. It was noted that when North is on lead, which was the case here, he might not lead a spade at trick one or two and so EW might make 11 tricks. In contrast, had South been on lead a spade lead would have been automatic leading routinely to ten tricks.

**Appeal lodged by:** North-South

**Basis of appeal:** Not provided.

**Director's comments:** None.

## APPEAL No : 12.066

**Comments by North-South:** None.

**Comments by East-West:** None.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Table score re-instated.

Deposit returned

.

### Appeals Committee's comments:

The committee would all have bid 4♠ without the hesitation. The 6<sup>th</sup> spade is critical as North has only shown a strong 5-5 to date. The committee believes that players of this standard would bid 4♠.

Jeffrey Allerton

The fact that the three AC members would all have bid 4♠ does not necessarily mean that it is the only logical alternative. The TD had already consulted and judged that "pass is clearly a logical alternative". The AC should make use of all of the evidence gathered by the TD and, if coming to a different conclusion, should explain why they believe the TD to have erred.

Tim Rees

If the AC is intending to overturn a decision about there being a logical alternative, it should ask for more details about the consultation. Just because all three of the AC would have made the disputed bid, does not make it the only logical alternative. From the write-up, it appears that the AC ignored the consultation and substituted its own judgement. If the persons consulted were of equivalent standard to the North player (or of equivalent standard to the AC), then this is an improper approach by the AC.

Eitan Levy

Totally agree with AC ruling. TD should where possible consult suitable players, not other TDs.

Paul Lamford

I agree with the AC. Besides, 4♦ surely forced to game, and South's slow pass told him little.

Ed Reppert

The TD polled his colleagues, the AC polled themselves. The rulings then applied were, correctly, a direct consequence of the result of those polls, and completely opposite one another. I find this troubling, though I find nothing wrong with either ruling, given the respective poll results.

Frances Hinden

I don't understand the TD giving any percentage of 4♥ making exactly as no-one with the North cards would lead or switch to a spade; South's putative lead is irrelevant as hearts were being declared by West. I am surprised by the AC's ruling as I would have given 100% of 4♥. While 4♠ might be the correct call, it is much easier to make when partner hesitates over 4♥. Where was the

## APPEAL No : 12.066

TD's poll?

Robin Barker

On this hand and a number of the later cases, I was consulted by the TD at the time and prefer the TD ruling to the AC. On this hand, a poll of players might have made a stronger case to the AC.

## APPEAL No : 12.067

*Tournament Director: John Pyner*

*Appeals Committee: Alan Kay (Chairman), Derek Oram & Kath Nelson*

<p>♠ 52 ♥ Q986 ♦ 108742 ♣ J3</p> <p>♠ AKQJ93      ♠ 1064 ♥ 7              ♥ A10 ♦ K5             ♦ QJ963 ♣ 10642        ♣ A85</p> <p>♠ 87 ♥ KJ5432 ♦ A ♣ KQ97</p>	<p><i>Board 10 : Dealer East : All vulnerable</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td>1♦</td><td>1♥</td></tr><tr><td>2♠</td><td>3♥</td><td>3♠</td><td>4♥</td></tr><tr><td>4♠</td><td>All Pass</td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>EW methods are that 2♠ is non-forcing and shows an intermediate hand with 6/7 cards in the suit. East did not alert as she thought it was not alertable.</p>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>			1♦	1♥	2♠	3♥	3♠	4♥	4♠	All Pass		
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>														
		1♦	1♥														
2♠	3♥	3♠	4♥														
4♠	All Pass																

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South system not provided*

*East-West system not provided.*

**Form of Scoring:** *Match Pointed Pairs*

**Result at table:** 4♠ making by West, NS -620, lead ♣K

**Director first called:** At end of hand.

### **Director's statement of facts:**

North called at the end of the hand. He said that if the 2♠ had been alerted would not have bid 3♥ and he did not think that EW would reach 4♠. I asked East why she had not alerted and he reply was that she did not think jump overcalls were alertable. She added that she would still bid 3♠ even if North passed.

### **Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for both sides:

Weighted score. See below.

### **Details of ruling:**

2♠ is alertable because it is non-forcing. In that case it is very likely that North will Pass. Following this, East would not necessarily be raising spades all the time. Weighted score awarded of 60% Of 2♠+2 and 40% of 4♠=

**Appeal lodged by:** North-South

**Basis of appeal:** Not given.

**Director's comments:** None.

**Comments by North-South:**

## APPEAL No : 12.067

The initial description of 2♠ was weak to intermediate and non-forcing. We believe that passing 2♠ is a logical alternative the majority of the time as East has a weakfish opening bid

**Comments by East-West:** None.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld  
Deposit returned

### Appeals Committee's comments:

We agree with the TD's decision.

We think that East would not always bid 3♠ if North passed.

Jeffrey Allerton

Given that North chose to act at the table on such a weak hand, it's not clear that North would always pass if told that 2♠ showed a weaker hand. More importantly, if 2♠ is passed round to South, it looks fairly obvious for South (who will not be aware of the E/W misunderstanding) to protect with this 6/4 hand. Now West will bid 4♠ anyway. This gets back to the contract at the table via a different route, although it would not be unreasonable to assign a weighted score including a proportion of 5♥x-2 by South, as North might now just now elect to bid 5♥ over 4♠.

Tim Rees

Why should North pass if he's told 2♠ was non-forcing? It looks to me that it would be the other way round. I suspect what North was actually claiming was that he'd pass if he knew the opposition were having a misunderstanding, and he's not entitled to know that.

The TD and AC have awarded 100% of North passing with the correct explanation, and that can't be right. I think some TDs and ACs get confused with Reveley rulings, where the table action can't be included in any weighting, but those only relate to UI cases. In MI cases, it should be relatively common to include the table action (by the non-offending side) in the weightings.

Eitan Levy

Seems like a reasonable ruling.

Paul Lamford

Not that clear why North would not bid over a NF 2♠, but did over a forcing 2♠, but I agree that East would not always raise. The AC decision is probably right if they believe North.

Frances Hinden

I don't understand why North would pass if 2♠ was alerted as weak to intermediate and non-forcing rather than showing the fit, not least as 4♥ was making for NS. It is also very unlikely that South would pass out 2♠ (although there may then be a MI ruling to be made) and I would not have had any percentage of 2♠ ending the auction.

# APPEAL No : 12.068

*Tournament Director: Mike Amos*

*Referee: Chris Dixon*

<p>♠ AJ82 ♥ K106 ♦ J1043 ♣ 93</p> <p>♠ Q65 ♥ Q9 ♦ AQ62 ♣ Q654</p> <p>♠ 94 ♥ 5432 ♦ K987 ♣ K102</p>	<p>♠ K1073 ♥ AJ87 ♦ 5 ♣ AJ87</p>	<i>Board 20 : Dealer West : All vulnerable</i>			
		<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
		1♦	Pass	1♥	Pass
		1NT	Pass	2♦	Pass
		2NT	Pass	Pass/3NT	All Pass
		1NT Weak NT			
		2♦ GF Relay/Enquiry			
		(Screens in use)			

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South system not given*

*East-West system not given*

**Form of Scoring:** *IMP's to VP's*

**Result at table:** *2NT making +2 by West, NS -180, lead 8♠*

**Director first called:** After East changed Pass to 3NT

### **Director's statement of facts:**

When the tray passed through the screen North passed and East passed quite quickly. He then replaced the Pass with 3NT. I was called by East whom I took away from the table. He explained that 2♦ was GF and that he had intended to bid 3NT but somehow had put the Pass card on the tray.

### **Director's ruling:**

Table result stands

### **Details of ruling:**

I did not allow East's change of call under Law 25A – the Auction was completed by South's final Pass. Result 2NT+2. The TD does not believe that it is clear that the Pass was unintended as Law 25A requires although he is content that the other conditions are met. L25A

**Appeal lodged by:** East-West

**Basis of appeal:** None given.

### **Comments by North-South:**

I was North. I passed in tempo as if the auction had ended. When he saw that he had passed 2NT he immediately put 3NT on the tray.

## APPEAL No : 12.068

### Comments by East-West:

I was East and did not intend to Pass 2NT. A common reason for people passing by accident is that they think partner has bid 3NT but this was not the case here as 3NT is not a possible response in our system.

I realised immediately and wanted to change it. I don't see how the TD can claim that Pass was intended when I have stated repeatedly it was not.

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld  
Deposit returned

### Referee's comments:

After taking advice on the Laws from the Chief Tournament Director about the interpretation of 'intentional' and 'inadvertent' bids I judge that East had intended to pick up and place the Pass card possibly in a moment of distraction. Even if he then immediately realised that this is not what he intended to bid, this does not come within the accepted range of unintentional actions and for this reason I judge that the Director's ruling be upheld.

Jeffrey Allerton

This is a straightforward interpretation of Law 25A which the TD has got right. As the appeal seems to have been a matter of law, shouldn't the appeal have been heard by the Chief TD? East's pass was absent-minded and so although "unintended" in one sense, it was not "unintended" in the Law 25A sense: the call he was trying to make at the point his hand reached into the bidding box. When screens are in use, a call is not considered as made until it has been released on to the tray, so if East had intended to bid 3NT, he would have had the opportunity to swap the pass card for this bid in the unlikely event that he had put his hand in the wrong part of the bidding box. I would have been tempted to keep the deposit: why does the East player think that he knows the Law and screen regulations better than the TD?

Tim Rees

East here was trying it on. He knows he's not allowed to change his mind, and the TD's told him he couldn't change his bid, so why appeal? There's no reason to give him his money back.

Eitan Levy

The TD was 100% correct. East may have "wanted" to bid 3NT but his PASS card was not a "mispull", it was intentionally pulled out.

Paul Lamford

This is a matter of Law, and it is almost impossible to pass instead of bidding 3NT as an "inadvertent" choice. If the TD had explained this to East, I would have kept the deposit.



# APPEAL No : 12.069

*Tournament Director: Gordon Rainsford*

*Referee: Chris Dixon*

<p>♠ KQJ8 ♥ 764 ♦ 852 ♣ 543</p> <p>♠ A107 ♥ AQ10982 ♦ Q10 ♣ Q7</p> <p>♠ 953 ♥ J ♦ KJ764 ♣ K1086</p>	<p>♠ 642 ♥ K53 ♦ A93 ♣ AJ92</p>	<i>Board 6 : Dealer East : EW vulnerable</i>			
		<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
			1♣ (1)	1♠ (2)	
2♥	3♠	4♥		4♠	
5♥	All Pass				
	(1) Short club				
	(2) Overcall in either minor				
	(Screens in use)				

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South system not provided*

*East-West system not provided*

**Form of Scoring:** *IMP's to VP's*

**Result at table:** 5♥-1 by West, NS +100, lead K♠

**Director first called:** At end of hand.

### **Director's statement of facts:**

I was called to the table after the hand had finished because North had been told that 1♠ was natural, while South had told West that it showed an overcall in either minor. It was established that South had given the correct explanation. East said he would not have bid 4♥ with the correct explanation.

### **Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for both sides:

90% of 5♥-1 +100 (table score)

10% of 4♠x-5 -1100

### **Details of ruling:**

90% of 5♥-1 +100 (table score) and 10% of 4♠x-5 -1100. L21B3 and L12C1c

**Appeal lodged by:** East-West

**Basis of appeal:** None provided.

**Director's comments:**

## APPEAL No : 12.069

EW noted that NS didn't have this defence written on their system card but it was established that they had been informed before the start of the stanza and had discussed how they would deal with it.

### Comments by North-South:

South: I agree entirely with the director. I apologise for the confusion but, in truth, we were lucky. East would surely bid 4♥ over 3♠ given 3 key and three small spades and West would 'judge' to go to 5♥.

### Comments by East-West:

East:

- (1) With the information I had at the table I considered the decision close whether to bid 4♥ or not. If I had received the correct explanation then spades are marked on my right and three small is the worst possible holding. Any spade holding partner has will be poorly placed. If I had known that spades were on my right then Pass would be automatic.
- (2) From West's perspective, if partner had passed then double of 4♠ is an automatic action. 5♥ is not guaranteed, even if partner is short in spades, he doesn't have to have three hearts. He could easily be 4-7 in the minors.

### Referee's decision:

Director's ruling amended.

50% of 5♥-1 +100 (table score) and

50% of 4♠x-5 -1100.

Deposit returned

### Appeals Committee's comments:

I accept that on this case East was given misinformation. The issue of damage hinges on whether East's bid of 4♥ is more or less likely after the misinformation. I decided to seek the opinion of two further experts one of whom felt that the bid of 4♥ was far more likely if East considered that North was raising South's natural spade bid than if East had been given the correct explanation. Another player thought that they would Pass in either event but was slightly less likely to Pass if the correct explanation had been given.

Taking this in conjunction with the Director's research, I judged that it was appropriate to rule on the basis of East bidding 4♥ 50% of the time on the correct explanation. As far as West's probable action had East passed and the bidding had continued with 4♠ by South. I accept that East's contention that a double would now have been automatic and I therefore rule that the director's ruling be adjusted as follows:

50% of 5♥-1 +100 (table score) and 50% of 4♠x-5 -1100.

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

Nice work by the Referee, using his own research to supplement, not replace, the findings of the TD. Some other ACs (e.g. 12.066) should take note.
---

## APPEAL No : 12.069

Tim Rees

The AC has taken the right approach here. East was able to say why he thought the MI affected his bid, and this reasoning was confirmed by one of the consultants. Others felt the difference in explanations didn't have much effect on the decision, so the 50/50 weighting looks about right.

Eitan Levy

Considering the opinion of the experts consulted the Referee's ruling is reasonable. (As NS was the offending pair I would have weighted the results slightly more in favour of EW, say 60-65% of 5♥ and 35%-40% of 4♠ dbl)

Paul Lamford

The AC did a good job of assessing damage and deciding what would have happened without the infraction, erring in favour of the non-offenders.

# APPEAL No : 12.070

*Tournament Director: Gordon Rainsford*

*Referee: Chris Dixon*

<p>♠ AKJ1063 ♥ AJ9 ♦ 10 ♣ K92</p> <p>♠ 875 ♥ K7632 ♦ 862 ♣ Q7</p> <p>♠ 2 ♥ Q1085 ♦ AQ943 ♣ 543</p>		<i>Board 20 : Dealer West : All vulnerable</i>			
		<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
		Pass	1♠	Pass	1NT
		Pass	2♥ (1)	Pass	2♠
		Pass	3♥ (2)	Pass	4♦
		Pass	4♠	All Pass	
		(1) = transfer to 2♠			
		(2) 3♥ described by South to West as shortage. System notes do not support this and North thought it showed a fragment			
		(Screens in use)			

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South system not provided*

*East-West system not provided*

**Form of Scoring:** *IMP's to VP's*

**Result at table:** 4♠+1 by South, NS +650, lead 4♥

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

### **Director's statement of facts:**

West had been told by South that North's 3♥ bid showed a shortage and when declarer played the Q♥ from dummy at trick one he covered it with the K♥. although NS system notes do not cover this auction 1♠-1NT-2♥-2NT-3♥, where 3♥ is defined as a fragment. So I ruled that South's description of 3♥ as showing shortage was misinformation. West says he would not have covered the Q♥ had he not believed declarer to have a singleton.

If West does not cover at trick one, declarer is in dummy and the normal play would be to finesse the spade next. To eschew the finesse could, on other leads, lead to the contract going off when it is cold. When in with the Q♠ East would be expected to lead a diamond which declarer would successfully finesse. With the cards as they lay, either line would fail.

### **Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for both sides:

4♠-1 by North, NS -100

### **Details of ruling:**

South's misinformation to West caused him to mis-defend. Had he not covered the heart at trick one the contract would have failed by one trick whenever South finessed in trumps next which would be the normal play.

**Appeal lodged by:** North-South

## APPEAL No : 12.070

**Basis of appeal:** Not provided.

### Director's comments:

I thought all the facts had been agreed at the time, though it seems from the players' comments that there is now some dispute.

### Comments by North-South:

South: Explained as shortage is too strong, the auction was very similar to the previous one with EW having six spades. When the 3♥ bid appeared West said "sounds like what we play", or similar, and I questioned whether this was true. I replied hesitantly that I thought this to be the case. When dummy appeared and declarer played the Q♥, I was questioned again. I said it now appeared unlikely and was perhaps a fragment.

### Comments by East-West:

West: I asked specifically and was explained as a shortage hence 4♦ bid which is consistent with that belief. Had South expressed doubt, I would not cover Q♥. He was clear. Further, when Q♥ played, I re-asked and South confirmed previous comment about shortage. It was quite possible East had underled ♥Axx, so K♥ was necessary in that case.

### Referee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld  
Deposit returned

### Referee's comments:

Although there is some question about the facts on this case and precisely what was explained to West by South about the meaning the 3♥ bid it does seem clear that the explanation was not sufficiently precise and therefore it is accepted that misinformation existed.

The question then remains as to whether West was damaged by this misinformation. I accept that an opening lead of a low heart from A94 is entirely possible especially from a pair of this class and for that reason and for that reason West's play of the K♥ at trick one would be necessary.

I therefore rule that West was damaged and that the contract would be defeated on a normal play if the Q♥ had been ducked.

Jeffrey Allerton

I'm not sure about this one. Would East really underlead ♥A when dummy hasn't bid 3NT? It sounds as though West was fairly sure from the dummy/opening lead that declarer did not have a heart shortage, but chose to play for this anyway. Could this fall into the category of a 'gambling' ('double shot') defence, where a split score is appropriate: 4♠-1 for N/S, with E/W keeping the table score because the damage is deemed to be self-inflicted?

Tim Rees

Without screens, North would have corrected South's explanation before the opening lead was made, and there would then have been no damage during the play. However, with screens, North does not know of the incorrect explanation, so damage can still occur to the defence.

## APPEAL No : 12.070

Paul Lamford

The TD assumes misinformation in the absence of evidence to the contrary. Putting up the ♥K is not a serious error or wild or gambling action, so both sides get 4♠-1. I think that some percentage of 4♠= might be appropriate, however, as declarer may make the hand after the heart is ducked.

Frances Hinden

The rules state that questions and explanations must be written (the hand was played with screens). If W/S had followed the written regulations the argument over what exactly had been said would not have arisen and the ruling would have been much easier.

# APPEAL No : 12.071

**Tournament Director:** Hugh Williams

**Appeals Committee:** Jeffrey Allerton (Chairman), Paul Lamford & Alan Mould

<p>♠ AQJ86 ♥ QJ109 ♦ A65 ♣ Q</p> <p>♠ K105            ♠ 7 ♥ 852             ♥ K ♦ KJ                ♦ Q108732 ♣ K9653           ♣ AJ1084</p> <p>♠ 9432 ♥ A7643 ♦ 94 ♣ 72</p>	<p><i>Board 11 : Dealer South : Love all</i></p> <table><thead><tr><th><b>West</b></th><th><b>North</b></th><th><b>East</b></th><th><b>South</b></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>1♠</td><td>2NT (1)</td><td>Pass (2)</td></tr><tr><td>3♠ (3)</td><td>Dbl</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>4♣</td><td>Dbl</td><td>Pass</td><td>4♠</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">All Pass</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">(1) Both minors</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">(2) After slight hesitation</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">(3) UCB showing one minor</td></tr></tbody></table>	<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>				Pass	Pass	1♠	2NT (1)	Pass (2)	3♠ (3)	Dbl	Pass	Pass	4♣	Dbl	Pass	4♠	All Pass				(1) Both minors				(2) After slight hesitation				(3) UCB showing one minor			
<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>																																		
			Pass																																		
Pass	1♠	2NT (1)	Pass (2)																																		
3♠ (3)	Dbl	Pass	Pass																																		
4♣	Dbl	Pass	4♠																																		
All Pass																																					
(1) Both minors																																					
(2) After slight hesitation																																					
(3) UCB showing one minor																																					

### **Basic systems:**

North-South play strong NT and 5 card majors.

East-West play strong NT and 5 card majors.

**Form of Scoring:** Cross IMP's to VP's

**Result at table:** 4♠ making by North, NS +420, lead not provided

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

### **Director's statement of facts:**

Short hesitation by South after East's 2NT

### **Director's ruling:**

Score assigned for both sides:

Weighted ruling:

20% of 4♠ =

40% of 5♣-1

40% of 5♣x-1

### **Details of ruling:**

North's double of 4♣ disallowed because of hesitation. L16B1a. South will bid on to 4♠ voluntarily. When this was explained to EW, West said immediately that he would bid 5♣. I made a weighted ruling. L12C1c

**Appeal lodged by:** North-South

**Basis of appeal:** Not provided.

**Director's comments:** None

**Comments by North-South:** None.

## APPEAL No : 12.071

Comments by East-West: None

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling amended  
Score assigned for both sides (Law 12C1(c)):  
50% of 4♠= by North, +420  
50% of 4♣= by West, -130  
Deposit returned

### Appeals Committee's comments:

Double of 4♣ disallowed. When 4♣ comes round to South, we think she will bid 4♠ about half the time. We do not believe West would bid 5♣ given that he failed to do so on the auction at the table.

Jeffrey Allerton

I agree with the AC! North has considerable extra values for his opening bid, so the double of 3♠ seemed normal to us (Pass not a LA at that stage) , but there was no need to show the hand again by doubling 4♣.

Tim Rees

I prefer the AC's ruling to the TD's. South won't necessarily bid 4♠ if North doesn't double, and West didn't bid 5♣ on the actual auction, so can't claim he would have done on a very similar auction.

Eitan Levy

I disagree with both the TD ruling and the AC ruling. First of all, it is not noted whether east used the stop card. If he didn't this is in itself an infringement and should receive a warning. Secondly, whether the stop card was used or not South is entitled – even required - to pause for about 10 seconds, and certainly a slight hesitation after a jump bid should not be considered a hesitation that could aid partner to double 4C. My ruling: Table result stands. (see Blue Book 3Z B).

Paul Lamford

As I was on the AC, I agree with its decision.

Frances Hinden

Why does a 'short hesitation' over 2NT suggest that North double 4♣?

Robin Barker

I prefer the AC assessment of likely auction after North passes 4♣.



# APPEAL No : 12.072

*Tournament Director: Robin Barker*

*Appeals Committee: Neil Rosen (Chairman), Barry Myers & Jeff Smith*

♠ Q7		<i>Board 6 : Dealer East : EW vulnerable</i>			
♥ AJ2		<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
♦ AKQJ8				Pass	1 ♠
♣ QJ2		Pass	2 ♦ (H)	Pass	3 ♣
♠ 10862	♠ K4	Pass	3 ♥ (A)	Pass	3NT
♥ K109	♥ 7653	Pass	4 ♣	Pass	4 ♠
♦ 10965	♦ 743	Pass	4NT	Pass	5 ♦ (1)
♣ 64	♣ 10985	Pass	5 ♥	Pass	5 ♠ (2)
	♠ AJ953	Pass	7NT	All Pass	
	♥ Q84		(1) 0 or 3		
	♦ 2		(2) Intended as nothing more to show.		
	♣ AK73				

### **Basic systems:**

*North-South play Weak NT and 4 card majors and 2 over 1 = 10 pts  
East-West system not given.*

**Form of Scoring:** *Cross IMP's to VP's*

**Result at table:** *7NT making by South, NS +1520, lead ♦5*

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

### **Director's statement of facts:**

I was called by EW and asked whether the 3 ♣ bid should be permitted after a slow 2 ♦. They thought 3 ♣ an unusual bid. Afterwards, I asked South about the 3 ♣ and said he thought he was borderline between 2 ♠ and 3 ♣.

### **Director's ruling:**

Table result stands

### **Details of ruling:**

A slow 2 ♦ could be a hand not quite good enough for 2 ♦ or a strong that does not know how to develop the hand. The former is more likely. As such, a slow 2 ♦ does not suggest overbidding.

**Appeal lodged by:** North-South.

### **Basis of appeal:**

Obvious that slow 2 ♦ was strong.

**Comments by North-South:** None.

**Comments by East-West:** None.

## APPEAL No : 12.072

### Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld.  
Deposit returned

### Appeals Committee's comments:

Totally unanimous. Not really affected by slow 2♦, could be weak or strong. Key to reaching 7NT was later misunderstanding ie 5♠ bid NOT South's 3♣ bid.

Deposit returned after some consideration due to North bidding 2♦ very slowly.

Jeffrey Allerton
------------------

I agree with the TD and AC. E/W appealed because they got a bad result, but from a legal perspective the appeal had no merit and the deposit should have been retained.
---

Tim Rees
----------

Another frivolous appeal. E/W have already tried their luck with the TD for an adjusted score, and taking it to appeal is too much.
---

Eitan Levy
------------

Completely agree with the ruling. That the hesitation before the 2♦ bid indicated strength was only apparent after South had bid 3♣ and thereafter South's bidding was fully consistent with his hand. And as the AC pointed out, the misunderstanding of the 5♠ bid was the reason for the grand slam.
---

Paul Lamford
--------------

The decision is easy, but the reasons for returning the deposit are wrong. It is not a "speeding fine" imposed on North for bidding slowly. It is a penalty for a frivolous appeal, which this was.
---

Frances Hinden
----------------

I do not understand returning the deposit. Even if it was 'obvious' that 2♦ was strong, there is no reason given why that suggests an under-strength 3♣ bid.
--



© Copyright The English Bridge Union 2015

Published by the English Bridge Union, Broadfields,  
Bicester Road, Aylesbury HP19 8AZ

☎ 01296 317200

<http://www.ebu.co.uk/laws-and-ethics/appeals>