

Appeal No1

Date: 16/01/02

Event: Seniors Teams round 2

Director: L.Kelso

Appeal Panel: I.Dahler Chair
M.Kent
M.Bloom

Dlr:E ♠ ---
E/W vul ♥ x
♦ K9
♣ 9
♠ --- ♠ 9
♥ --- ♥ ---
♦ A7 ♦ J83
♣ Q10 ♣ ---
♠ ---
♥ x
♦ Q106
♣ ---

Bidding: Basic system
S W N E

Alerted bids:
1
2
3

Final Contract and result: 2SW

Play if relevant: Claim

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

Claim made at trick 9 with West (declarer) on lead. West faced his cards and said "I will give you a diamond". Dummy immediately interjected and pointed out that since both clubs were good, declarer could make all four of the last tricks.

Director was then summoned. Declarer admitted that he couldn't remember the club jack appearing earlier, but insisted that he was aware that only one club remained outstanding.

Directing staff awarded defence one of the last four tricks (Law 70).

Appellant's claim

Responder's reply

Appeal committee decision

Appeal unanimously dismissed. Dummy to be advised of proper procedure to be followed in similar cases.

Appeal No.2

Date: 16/1/02

Event: Seniors teams round 3

Director: L.Kelso

Appeal Panel: I.Dahler Chair
M.Bloom

Dlr:W ♠ AKQ107653
All vul ♥ A
♦ 62
♣ 109
♠ 2 ♠ J4
♥ J10654 ♥ KQ97
♦ 9753 ♦ K8
♣ Q72 ♣ AJ865
♠ 98
♥ 832
♦ AQJ104
♣ K43

Bidding: Basic system
S W N E
P 1♣1 1NT2
Dbl P 4♠ All pass

Alerted bids:
1 Strong (bal. or unbal.) OR weak 1NT
2 Explained as minors
3

Final Contract and result:

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

Called at the end of play. E/W were playing "Cappelletti" over a strong club, but were not of the same opinion as to whether it was system "on or off" over this type of 1♣ opening.

N/S maintained that if they had been informed that the 1NT was strong & balanced, they had the mechanism to reach 6♠. South said that over a natural 1NT, South would call 2♦ (positive) and North would key card ask in diamonds via 4♦.

The directing staff ruled that the explanation was an infraction (Law 21 b3), but that no adjustment was warranted.

Appellant's claim

Responder's reply

Appeal committee decision

Unanimously agreed to uphold directors decision on the grounds that even if RKCB was available, there can be no certainty that slam would be reached. There are many possible holdings with one key card where 12 tricks could not be made.

Appeal No.3

Date: 17/01/02

Event: Seniors teams round 3

Director: D.Anderson

Appeal Panel: I.Dahler Chair
N.Francis
M.Prescott
A.Delivera
P.Gue

Dlr: S ♠ Q2
N/S vul ♥ 109532
 ♦ 872
 ♣ QJ2
♠ A75 ♠ K10643
♥ KJ74 ♥ ----
♦ 1063 ♦ KJ954
♣ K63 ♣ A108
 ♠ J98
 ♥ AQ86
 ♦ AQ
 ♣ 9754

Bidding: Basic system
S W N E
1NT P P 2NT1
P 3♣ P 3♦
P 3NT All pass

Alerted bids:
 1 Good 2-suiter
 2
 3

Final Contract and result: 3NTE 10 tricks 430 to E/W

Play if relevant: ♥6 led dummy's jack winning the trick. ♠A wins trick 2, then a small spade allowing North's ♠Q to hold the trick.

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

North was taking some time to decide what to lead, since a heart return may be giving declarer his 9th trick. East commented "they're only fifties". North now led the ♣Q and the contract made (declarer played on diamonds).

Hardly an appropriate comment (Law 74b).

The directing staff felt that it was not clear that North had been damaged and believed that it would be best if it was dealt with by an appeal committee if need be, so no adjustment to the table score but suggested that N/S (non-offenders) should appeal.

The director indicated that East was not prepared to defend the case if it went to appeal.

Appellant's claim

There was uncertainty in the auction about what suits East had, but this was corrected to diamonds and a major before the lead was made.

East's comment led North to believe that East was weaker than the hand he held, so North chose to attack clubs, believing that East's comment meant that declarer had no play for his contract.

Responder's reply

Only North appeared, but East did attend after one of the directors suggested he should.

Appeal committee decision

Were unanimous that if the directing staff had ruled in favour of the non-offending side, there would have been no appeal. The score was adjusted to 3NT down one, 50 to N/S.

Appeal No.4

Date: 22/1/02

Event: NOT Round 6

Director: Richard Bland (NZ)

Appeal Panel: I.Dahler Chair
M.McManus
T.Chadwick
P.Gue
A.Turner (NZ)

Dlr: W	♠ KQ53	Bidding:	Basic system			
E/W vul	♥ K64		S	W	N	E
	♦ A932			1♠	1NT	Pass
	♣ A9			P	2NT2	P
♠ A8642	♠ 97	2♠1		P	Dbl	All pass
♥ A932	♥ QJ105	3♣3				
♦ 865	♦ KJ10					
♣ K	♣ J1084					
	♠ J10	Alerted bids:				
	♥ 87					
	♦ Q74					
	♣ Q76532					

Final Contract and result: 3♣X making 9 tricks 470 to E/W

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

The director was called to the table before the defence started when East believed the final bid was 5♣, which he doubled, not 3♣. The hand was played and 9 tricks were made. The bid was not clearly a "3" but most people consulted read it as 3♣. There is no provision for an adjustment in Law, and the Directors generally believed it was up to East to clarify the bid before doubling. (The contract was played as 3♣ X as East was aware of the intended bid of South before play commenced).

Appellant's claim

East thought South had bid 5♣, and doubled on that basis

Responder's reply

Appeal committee decision

Whilst all the committee felt that "natural justice" would suggest a score of 110, it was a matter that should have a basis in law. A majority decision 3-2 that the score (470 to N/S) to stand (Law 21A).

The dissenting view was that common sense should prevail and the score adjusted to 110 to N/S

Further the committee recommends that the ABF tournament committee consider the introduction of regulations to cover written bidding.

Appeal No.5

Date: 22/01/02

Event: SWPT Round 3

Director: Peter Marley

Appeal Panel: Ivy Dahler Chair
Matthew McManus
Ted Chadwick
Alan Turner
Peter Fordham

Dlr:N ♠ Q64
All vul ♥ K2
♦ K432
♣ AK94
♠ 10 ♠ AKJ83
♥ A5 ♥ J1073
♦ Q98765 ♦ J
♣ J1073 ♣ 862
♠ 9752
♥ Q9864
♦ A10
♣ Q5

Bidding: Basic system
S W N E
2♦ 1 P 1NT P
2♠ 2 3♦ Dbl All pass

Information on bids:
1 alerted - transfer
2 asked by West if forcing,
described by North as non-forcing

Final Contract and result: 3♦ X -1, 200 to N/S

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

The director was called to the table by West at the end of the hand. North had explained 2♠ as non-forcing, whilst South indicated that it was forcing. West claimed that he would not have bid if the sequence was forcing.

The directing staff believed there was an infraction - misexplanation. West would be less inclined to interpose if 2♠ was explained as forcing.

Score adjusted to 2♠ down 2, 200 to E/W

Appellant's claim

West asked if 2♠ was forcing and told incorrectly that it was not. However the bid must clearly have values from North's view to play in 3♥. So I believe that West deserved to go for a number for bidding vulnerable at the 3-level on his modest collection. We believe we would have ended in 2NT probably making, rather than 2♠ two down as awarded by the director.

Responder's reply

Appeal committee decision

Ruled an infraction under Law 40C in that West may not have bid 3♦ with a correct explanation.

The committee considered the likely result if West passed. A ruling was made under Law 12C3.

One down (2♠/2NT), 100 to E/W, with an expectancy of 80%

Making 2NT, 120 to N/S, with an expectancy of 20%. Q: Result adjusted to?

Appeal No.6

Date:22/01/02

Event: SWPT round 4

Director:

Appeal Panel: B.Neill Chair
P. Evans
I. Thomson
N.Francis
P.Fordham

Dlr:	♠ J2	Bidding:	Basic system		
vul	♥ AKQ5				
	♦ J10	S	W	N	E
	♣ KJ1053				Pass
♠ KQ87543	♠ A109	2♦ 1	3♠	Dbl	P
♥ 3	♥ 74	4♥	P	P	4♠ 2
♦ AQ93	♦ 862	P	P	Dbl3	P
♣ 8	♣ Q9764	5♠	Dbl	All pass	
	♠ 6	Notes on bids:			
	♥ J109862	1 2♦ - 5major/4minor			
	♦ K754	2 Hesitation			
	♣ A2	3 Hesitation			

Final Contract and result: 5♠XW, making 10 tricks, 100 to N/S

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

When called to the table, West complained that there had been a long hesitation by North before the double of 4♠. North claimed that this double was optional. The Directing staff ruled the out of tempo double showed doubt. Score adjusted to 4♠X, making, 590 to E/W, under Law 16A, 73C, 12C2

Appellant's claim

Initial double from North is asking to pass with spades, bid hearts otherwise. Indicates some points, length in hearts and shortage in spades. Does not need to be strong. After long pause and raise to 4♠ by East, I (South) passed as the auction is unclear as to who has the balance of points. My partner's second double indicated that we (N/S) had the balance of points. This was confirmed when I inquired East what the style of the 3♠ jump was. This was described as pre-emptive with long ♠. My shortage in spades, additional length in hearts and possession of only one certain defensive trick indicated that either we were making 5♥ or 4♠ was likely to make. Accordingly I raised to 5♥ as insurance.

Responder's reply

West is concerned that the long hesitation by North before doubling 4♠ conveyed the information to her partner that the double was not clear-cut. When the director was first called, North explained that their agreement was that South was to leave the double in with one defensive trick.

Appeal committee decision

Directors adjusted score to stand.

Appeal No.7

Date: 22/01/02

Event:SWPT round 4

Director: Peter Marley

Appeal Panel: I.Dahler Chair
M.Scudder
T.Chadwick
A.Braithwaite
P.Gue

Dlr: W	♠ QJ84			Bidding:	Basic system		
All vul	♥ AJ72			S	W	N	E
	♦ Q6				1♦	Dbl	1♠
	♣ J107			P	1NT	P	2♥
♠ 95		♠ K10732		2♠	P	3♠	
♥ Q63		♥ K1095	P	P	3NT	P	4♠
♦ K543		♦ J2		P1	P	Dbl	All pass
♣ AK62		♣ Q8		Notes on bids:			
	♠ A6			1 Agreed hesitation			
	♥ 84						
	♦ A10987						
	♣ 9543						

Final Contract and result: 4♠X down 2, 500 to N/S

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

North has chosen from among logical alternatives (Pass is logical alternative), one which could demonstrably have been suggested by South's hesitation.

Double removed, 4♠ down two, 200 to N/S, Law 16A2, 12C2

Appellant's claim

I was always doubling this contract. I had doubled previous two on similar hands and bidding. The opponents appeared to be in a 5-2 fit, 4-3 heart fit, Their bidding was an invitational sequence. I gained no knowledge I did not already possess by partner's hesitation. It also appeared to me from RHO's body language that he was not happy with the way the bidding progressed. From 100% certainty of doubling that makes it 110%. This board was our third to last, so I had plenty of knowledge of the opponent's bidding style.

Responder's reply

One of the two previous doubled contracts was made successfully for +590, so our bidding style is not totally off. This player's partner never bid during the auction. A long hesitation by said partner (South) preceded North's double. South held two aces, which resulted in two defensive tricks. The contract went two down. Thus North could not, based on her own hand, defeat the contract. She could not know that her partner had two aces without the hesitation. If anyone should have doubled, it should have been South.

Appeal committee decision

Appeal dismissed, the directors adjusted score to stand.

Even though the bidding seemed to be out of control, and perhaps a penalty double by North could be supported, North must realise that after South's break in tempo, which clearly suggested some of the missing values, it was not a hand that clearly suggested double was the only logical alternative. And so, it is incumbent upon North to accept the director's ruling in situations like this.

The appeal has no merit and the appealing team is fined 1.5 VP to be deducted at the end of round 14.

Appeal No.8

Date:23/01/02

Event:SWPT Round 7

Director: C.Diment

Appeal Panel: I.Dahler Chair
P.Gue
A.Turner
T.Chadwick
M.McManus

Dlr:S	♠ 2	Bidding:	Basic system ACOL			
E/W vul	♥ AK63		S	W	N	E
	♦ Q103		P	2♣1	P	
	♣ A9843	1♠	3♠	P	3NT2	P
♠ J7	♠ K543		P	4♥	P	
♥ QJ542	♥ 107	4♣	6♣	All pass		
♦ K964	♦ J875		Noted bids:			
♣ 76	♣ J102		1 10+hcp, 5+♣			
	♠ AQ10986		2 Break in temp (slow)			
	♥ 98					
	♦ A2					
	♣ KQ5					

Final Contract and result: 6♣ by South, 12 trick, N/S +920

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

Was called to the table at the end of the hand. Agreed hesitation by North before bidding 3NT.

Ruling: Pass is a logical alternative to bidding 4♣. Score adjusted to N/S +430 Law 73F2, 16A2, 12C2

Appellant's claim

After my partner's 3NT response which denied 2-card ♠, I could envision many hands with even a minimum 2♣ call that could have 12/13 tricks in clubs. The only dangerous case would have been if she was 4-4-4-1, in which case she would surely bid 4♠ over my 4♣ reopening. We must have two stoppers in one of the reds, and at least one in the other. Over my 4♣ bid and 4♥ cue, 6♣ was clear cut. What hand with 5♣'s would not have a good play for 6♣. I have three entries to the spades, and even if they guess to lead diamonds, partner must have a diamond card. I could easily see pard taking 4♠ tricks, and 5♣ tricks, and 3 red tricks. Maybe she had 6♣'s, in which case 13 tricks would probably be there. I would like to add that the pause before 3NT does not disclose any useful information. Was she showing extras? Or maybe 2 ♠s, which would make my bidding more dangerous? And, it was a pause, not long thinking. I would like to find a hand with 5♣s and a singleton spade where 6♣ does not have a play, especially after the 4♥ cue.

Responder's reply

The break in tempo was significant, in the range of 15 - 20 sec., before the 3NT bid. As the North hand could have been 9pts (according to the system card), the pause implied extras, I believe. If North had bid a reasonably in-tempo 3NT, would South have bid on?

Appeal Committee decision

The adjusted score to stand Law 16A

The hesitation conveyed to South information that bidding 4♣ may have been more successful, and the committee is unanimous in believing pass a logical, and reasonable, alternative, given the sequence.

Date: 24/01/02

Event: SWPT Round 10

Director: John McIlraith

Appeal Panel: B.Neill Chair
I.Dahler
I.Thomson
P.Gue
P.Fordham

Dir: W ♠ AJ42

E/W vul ♥ 86

♦ AQ65

♣ A96

♠ KQ986

♠ 5

♥ K10752

♥ Q3

♦ ---

♦ J108

♣ 874

♣ KQJ10532

♠ 1073

♥ AJ94

♦ K97432

♣ ---

Bidding: Basic system

S	W	N	E
	P	1♣1	3♣2
P	3♠	P	4♣
P	P	Db1	All pass

Noted bids:

1 Power, no 5-card suit etc

2 described as Michaels - majors

Final Contract and result: 4♣X making 10 tricks, 710 to E/W

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

Upon enquiry West explained 3♣ as Michaels (both majors). E/W had had a system discussion prior to the match and decided to play, over this power 1♣, 2♣ as natural and 3♣ as Michaels. This being the reverse of their normal system agreement over a natural 1♣. The directing staff ruled that no mis-information was present but East was in receipt of unauthorised information via West's explanation (Law 16A). However pass by East was not a logical alternative. Table result stands - N/S poor result due entirely to North's decision to double final contract.

The directing staff had no evidence to support N/S contention that West's actions constituted any form of infraction under Law 75C.

Appellant's claim

We feel we have been damaged by

- 3♠ was suspicious based upon holding as 4♠/4♥ would be standard, besides the fact that West thought that partner had clubs, and was willing to play 4♣ if partner converted as a pre-emptive bid.
- 4♣ would be a cue bid showing both majors.
- N/S result is inconsequential if N/S has been damaged, as after the 4♣ bid it is obvious that 4♣ was natural to all parties at the table, and it was impossible for N/S to accurately disentangle each other's holdings.

Responder's reply

Michaels at this level should not be strong. There are many ways of showing strong hands. Consequently 4♣ couldn't be a cue-bid. 3♠ from West was reasonable opposite a weak Michaels and can always be corrected to 4-level if N/S get back into the auction. East bids after any response from West at East's peril.

Appeal Committee decision

The committee accept the auction up to West's 3♠, but believe that West should have alerted South to the likelihood of the change of meaning to 3♣, when East bid 4♣.

They are unanimous in believing South has contributed significantly to their bad score by inaction over both 3♣, 4♣, and 4♣X. The committee assign a score of 280 to E/W, being 1/2 of +710 (the table score), and 1/2 of -150 (4♦ making 11 tricks for N/S), but the table score of N/S -710 stands for N/S. Law 12C3

Date: 24/01/02

Event: SWPT round 12

Director: R.Bland

Appeal Panel: E.Chadwick Chair
 M.Scudder
 M.McManus
 C.Snashall
 A.Braithwaite

Dlr:E	♠ Q43	Bidding:	Basic system			
NS vul	♥ K875		S	W	N	E
	♦ J10					2♥1
	♣ 10654					
♠ K1092	♠ 75	Dbl	2S	P	P	
♥ ----	♥ A10942		Dbl2	P	3♣	All pass
♦ Q982	♦ A6543					
♣ KQ872	♣ 9					
	♠ AJ86	Noted bids:				
	♥ QJ63		1 alerted as ♥ and another			
	♦ K7		2 N/S agreement that both doubles T/O			
	♣ AJ3					

Final Contract and result: 3♣ down 3 tricks, 300 to E/W

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

Before making the second double, South asked if East's second suit was spades, and was told yes. E/W seemed to have differing opinions on their system agreements on the 2♠ by West and the following pass by East. The directing staff concluded that the damage was caused by South choosing to make a take-out double holding four cards in each of E/W's suits. Ruled no adjustment.

Appellant's claim

Whatever my decision, and the result, in the current auction is not relevant. The point is that with correct information I would have either have passed 2♠ or bid 2NT. The double was based on partner having a singleton spade (probably), and at least 8 cards in the minors, quite probably a 5-card suit based on East having 5-5 in the majors. With correct information, it is likely partner will either have spades, but little chance of him having two suits in the minors, as East would have a 5-card minor. If the information given is correct, there is little chance of going more than two off in his minor because of his ruffing values in spades, and my ruffing power in diamonds.

Responder's reply

West had proposed a system change that after a double of 2♥ or 2♠, that we would use 2NT as the pass or correct bid. He somehow believed that this was not applicable over a 2♥ bid. East did not alert because he believed it to be natural. E/W had a system stuff-up and got lucky.

Appeal Committee decision

Committee agreed that West's explanation of East's pass of 2♠ (as showing spades) was an infraction.

However, South's decision to move, given East had shown both majors is the cause of N/S's poor score. Therefore N/S's score of -300 will stand.

On the other hand, under the new Appeals Committee (WBF) code of practice, E/W are not allowed to benefit from their opponent's wild, gambling, or irrational actions, subsequent to their own infraction. E/W to score -50.

Appeal No.11

Date: 24/01/02

Event: SWPT Round 12

Director: L.Kelso & S.Edler

Appeal Panel: B.Neill Chair
I.Dahler
P.Fordham
I.Thomson
J.Hoffman

Dlr:N ♠ Q7
All vul ♥ AQ7
♦ A8742
♣ QJ5
♠ J6 ♠ 98542
♥ KJ982 ♥ 4
♦ K965 ♦ 3
♣ 86 ♣ AK9742
♠ AK103
♥ 10653
♦ QJ10
♣ 103

Bidding: Basic system
S W N E
Dbl2 Pass3 Pass 1NT 2♠1
3♣ All pass

Noted bids:
1 spades & minor
2 Penalty
3 Comment and tempo break

Final Contract and result: 3♣E down two, 200 to N/S

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

N/S asked for a ruling at the conclusion of the match. When South doubled 2♠, West made the following gratuitous comment "Oh no, not again". There was also a break in tempo before West passed. The directing staff ruled that East was in receipt of unauthorised information and that pass was a logical alternative to 3♣. Score adjusted to N/S +800 Law 73B1, 16A, 73C

Appellant's claim

The double is blood and explained as penalty. This will usually show 4-card suit. The no-trump bidder has at least 2-cards therefore E/W cannot have a spade fit. This is obvious after the double. As the West player I was ready to bid 3♣ as soon as South started to double. Why should I have to play in 9xxxx not AKxxxx after a hesitation. The notion that this is so is absurd. I cannot imagine a scenario where ♠ will play better than ♣. Why didn't E/W double? Why didn't they defend? Their score is their responsibility and not caused by the hesitation.

Responder's reply

Appeal Committee decision

Committee found that, although the director's ruling was appropriate, they felt that passing 2♠X was not a logical alternative. Therefore 3♣ is allowed. Table result of 3♣ down two, 200 to N/S is restored. Further West to be cautioned that a similar infraction will be subject to a procedural penalty.

Appeal No.12

Date:
Event: NOT round of 16

Director: S.Mullamphy

Appeal Panel: S.Hinge (Chair)
K.Morrison
P.Lavings
D.Yovich
I.Dahler

Screen running NW to SE

Dlr: E ♠ 32
E/W vul ♥ 743
♦ J764
♣ 10853
♠ A106 ♠ KQ954
♥ QJ5 ♥ K62
♦ Q9 ♦ 1085
♣ KQJ76 ♣ A2
♠ J87
♥ A1098
♦ AK32
♣ 94

Bidding: Basic system
S W N E
X XX 2♣ P1
P X All pass

Noted bids:
1 Alerted by West to South but not on other side
2
3

Final Contract and result: 2♣ doubled, down 4, 800 to E/W

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

I was called after play was complete. West had alerted East's pass over 2♣, East had not. The partnership agreement was as described by West. There is an infraction (failure to alert). The directing staff ruled that the correct information was available to South and South was in the position to move from 2♣ doubled. No damage. Result stands

Appellant's claim

This form was completed the following day because it occurred during the round of 16 and it was necessary to hear the appeal immediately and the appellants were not at the venue. The Captain of the appellants stated what was said. 1NT would have been natural. Pass would be for penalties, so he bid the lowest of his 4-card suits.

Responder's reply

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal dismissed.

The Committee were unanimous that the opponents were not damaged. The opponents could have had a 4-3 fit for the same result. Table score to stand.

Appeal No.13

Date:
Event: NOT round of 16

Director: S.Mullamphy

Appeal Panel: L.Kelso (Chair)
K.Crow-Mei
M.Prescott
J.Scudder
N.Croft

Screen NW to SE

Dlr:N ♠ 2
E/W vul ♥ AQJ964
♦ K53
♣ 832
♠ AK6 ♠ 1093
♥ 8 ♥ 2
♦ AQ10984 ♦ J62
♣ 965 ♣ AKJ1074
♠ QJ8754
♥ K10753
♦ 7
♣ Q

Bidding: Basic system

S	W	N	E
		1♣1	2♣2
3♠3	4♥4	All pass	

Noted bids:

1 4+♥
2 Natural
3 S to W, fit showing; N to E, natural, forcing
4 W to S, cue; E to N, natural

Final Contract and result: 4♥ West, down 8, 800 to N/S.

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

There were different explanations of 3♠. South described the bid as fit showing (♠&♥) and North described it as Natural and forcing. 4♥ now had different meanings to East and West. E/W believe that given the correct explanation the partnership would bid to 5♣. Without assistance from North, South would not necessarily bid 5♥ over 5♣.
Score adjusted to E/W +600.

Appellant's claim

Responder's reply

Appeal Committee decision

The committee found that N/S did not have an explicit agreement in this relatively common situation.
The committee agreed that E/W would arrive in 5♣ without the contrary descriptions of the 3♠ bid.
Given North's impression of South's holding, the committee believed that a final contract of 5♣ doubled was likely.
Score adjusted to E/W +750.

Appeal No.14

Date:
Event: NOT round of 16

Director: I.Dahler

Appeal Panel: L.Kelso (Chair)
K.Crowe-Mai
M.Prescott
J.Scudder
N.Croft

Screen NW to SE

Dlr:N ♠ 2
E/W vul ♥ AQJ964
♦ K53
♣ 832
♠ AK6 ♠ 1093
♥ 8 ♥ 2
♦ AQ10984 ♦ J62
♣ 965 ♣ AKJ1074
♠ QJ8754
♥ K10753
♦ 7
♣ Q

Bidding: Basic system

S	W	N	E
		1♥	2♣1
4♣2	4NT	5♥	5♠
X	6♣	P	P
6♥	All pass		

Noted bids:

1 Natural - denies spade
2 Splinter
3

Final Contract and result: 6♥N doubled, down 2, 300 to E/W (although bidding doesn't show the double!)

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

4NT was described by West to South as ongoing, and interpreted by East as RKC Blackwood. East explained 5♠ as two key cards whilst there was no alert or explanation from West.

South said that had he been aware that 5♠ was a key-card response, he would have not bid 6♥.

Score adjusted to E/W - 100.

Appellant's claim

Responder's reply

Appeal Committee decision

The Committee found that West and South had not been physically alerting their calls. They had simply been writing down explanations without waiting for an inquiry.

The Committee determined that east had mis-bid in calling 5♠ and that systematically the 4NT was not key-card blackwood. South was not entitled to the knowledge that E/W had had a misunderstanding.

The Committee did not accept that South was damaged by West's level of disclosure.

Table result re-instated (N/S -300).

Appeal No.15

Date:
Event: NOT round of 16

Director: S.Mullamphy

Appeal Panel: P.Fordham (Chair)
D.Hoffman
D.Lusk
L.Kelso
I.Dahler

Screen NW to SE

Dlr: E ♠ 1085
Nil vul ♥ J107
♦ A6
♣ K8742
♠ AJ97 ♠ KQ6432
♥ 86 ♥ A43
♦ 98543 ♦ KJ
♣ 105 ♣ J3
♠ ---
♥ KQ952
♦ Q1072
♣ AQ96

Bidding: Basic system

S	W	N	E
		1♠	
X	3♣1	P	4♠
All pass			

Noted bids:

1 W to S no agreement, would be BERGEN without double;
E to N, no agreement, probably fit showing

Final Contract and result: 4♠E, down 1, 50 to N/S

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

Both East and West expressed the fact that they did not have an agreement after the double by South. West said that without the double, 3♣ is Bergenish. East also said there was not a partnership agreement but he expected 3♣ to be a fit showing jump. As both believed there was no partnerships agreement, then there is no infraction, table score stands.

Appellant's claim

Agreed with the directors statement, except that East's first statement was fit showing, but that after the board had been pushed through the screen, East volunteered that he was unsure and felt they had no agreement.

Responder's reply

Agreed with the above facts.

Appeal Committee decision

The committee believed there was an infraction causing damage to North (removed his option of doubling 3♣).

The committee believes that in the absence of an infraction North would double 3♣, leading to a final contract of 5♣.

Score adjusted to 420 to N/S

Questions were asked of West as to his awareness of the meaning of 1♣, restating that he believed it to be treated as an omnibus 1♣. North agreed that she was aware that West may not have fully understood the meaning of 1♣ because he only considered the front of the card. South explained the first double as negative, and North suggested that she would have bid 3♣ over a 2♠ bid from West.

The players left the room.

The committee had three points to consider.

1. Was there an infraction, N/S being remiss in the requirement to inform E/W of the true meaning of 1♣?
2. If there was an infraction, was there damage to E/W?
3. If there was damage, was the adjusted score awarded a reasonable score?

There was discussion as to whether West was correctly informed. There was a belief by a majority of the panel that N/S had infringed by not clearly stating the change of meanings in 3rd/4th seat.

There was then discussion as to whether West had contributed to their bad result. A majority believed that if West had been given the correct information he would not have taken the action he did.

It was unanimous that 3♣ would be a likely contract and that simple play would lead to 9 tricks.

Appeal Committee decision

A majority decision, 3-2, that there was an infraction. A majority decision, 3-2, that the failure to pre-alert the 1♣ opening had led to damage to East/West. A unanimous decision that 3♣ would be the likely final contract and that 3♣ would make 9 tricks.

Score adjusted to 3♣ making, N/S +110.

Appeal Report 2

Date: 19/2/02

Event: Gold Coast Teams round 3

Director: T.Howes

Appeal Panel: I.Dahler Chair
P.Fordham
C.Snashall
P.O. Sundelin
P.Gue

Dlr:W ♠ 52
N/Svul ♥ Q942
♦ K5
♣ AQ1076

♠ KQ86 ♠ J109
♥ K10653 ♥ AJ
♦ 93 ♦ J10874
♣ J8 ♣ K92
♠ A743
♥ 87
♦ AQ62
♣ 543

Bidding: Basic system

S	W	N	E
	2♦ 1	Dbl	2♠
3♦	P	P	P

Noted bids:

1 weak, majors
2
3
4

Final Contract and result: 3♦ S, down 3, N/S -300

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

North called and stated that after the 2♦ call he checked the opponent's system card and saw "majors". He then enquired and was told "majors" by East. Had he been correctly informed he would have bid 3♣. We believe "majors" is an inadequate explanation of the system. When a verbal enquiry is made one would expect a full disclosure ie. point count and shape.

Failure to do this led North to believe 2♦ was either major as is common usage.

We believe this to be an infraction under Law 40 B&C.

Score adjusted to N/S -100 as per Law 12C2 (3♣ down 1).

Appellant's claim

When queried about the 2♦ opening East said "majors". At this point North considered his action and East clarified with "both majors weak". However it was apparent to me (West) that North, not unreasonably, had "switched off" and was still under the impression that we were playing European multi, as N/S were. Whereas I have sympathy for the misunderstanding, I cannot see where lies the infraction. Perhaps "majors" on our card is insufficient but certainly does not suggest "weak 2 in either major".

North contends that his bid over 2♦ (majors) is 3♣ which I believe is the directors ruling. But is South going to pass 3♣? I think not - more trouble awaits.

So, in summary I appeal against

1. The directors decision that an infraction had occurred and
2. The resulting adjusted score.

Responder's reply

After opening bid of 2♦ I looked at card which said "majors". Thinking this meant a weak 2 in a major I said "a weak 2 in a major". Exactly what East said I cannot recall but it confirmed that West had a weak major so I doubled. After East bid 2♠ my partner asked for further clarification and East then said he had both majors. Had this been made clear to me I would have overcalled 3♣.

Appeal Committee discussion

The Director stated the situation. The players were asked to explain their cases. E/W disagreed with the director's statement. They claimed that North had asked about the bid and east stated weak, both majors. North did not seem to pay attention. North answered that East had said majors, weak, or weak in majors, and it was only clarified when South asked after East had bid 2♠.

The offending system card was presented and questions asked of N/S about their style of bidding over multi 2♦ etc. West was asked if he believed East's initial explanation to be a "proper explanation". West replied that it was probably not, he might have explained it better initially, but did offer an improved explanation whilst North was thinking, but that North didn't seem to hear.

Further questions were asked of North/South about what their bidding actions if South had bid 3♣. North would have passed, with a stronger hand he would bid 4♣.

The players left

The director was asked about Law 40B - there was a belief that N/S did not get a full explanation. The director had not been made aware that North had been given a further explanation.

Appeal Committee decision

A unanimous decision that there was an infraction.

However it was unanimous that North contributed greatly to their poor table score.

The directors adjusted score to stand for E/W (E/W +100) but the table score to stand for N/S (N/S-300).

Further it was unanimous that the system card for E/W was inadequate and that a penalty of 1.1 VP be imposed against the (E/W team), to be imposed at the end of the Swiss movement for that team (round 10 or 12 as appropriate).

Appeal Report 3

Date: 19/2/02

Event: Gold Coast teams round 4

Director: A.Geursen

Appeal Panel: I.Dahler Chair
P.Fordham
C.Snashall
P.O. Sundelin
P.Gue

Dlr: E ♠ 9
N/S vul ♥ K972
♦ 9863
♣ 9875
♠ AQ752 ♠ KJ64
♥ AQJ10 ♥ 853
♦ AK7 ♦ Q102
♣ Q ♣ K43
♠ 1083
♥ 64
♦ J54
♣ AJ1062

Bidding: Basic system

S	W	N	E
			P
P	2♦ 1	P	2♥ 2
P	2NT	P	3♣ 3
Dbl	3♠ 4	P	5♠
P	6♠	All pass	

Noted bids:

- 1 Strong (GF, 23/24 Bal/semi-bal)
- 2 Waiting or (partial) negative (3-7)
- 3 5-card stayman
- 4 5♠

Final Contract and result: 6♠W, making 12 tricks, N/S -980

Play if relevant: Opening lead: ♣9, ♣3, ♣10, ♣Q

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

I was called after the match was scored. South stated that he had doubled for a club lead. He examined the system card and saw that 2♦ was either GF or 23/24 bal/semi-bal. So he decided to insert the ♣10 at trick 1. Had he been alerted to the fact that semi-balanced could systemically contain a singleton, he would have gone up with the ace. E/W confirmed that they will open NT's with a singleton - in which case we believe that card should state that.

Score adjusted to 6♠ down 1 trick, N/S+50.

Appellant's claim

1. At the start of the match North had asked about the "may be off-shape" comment on our system card as a description of our 1NT opening. It was explained that singleton honours in a semi-balanced hand (4-4-4-1, 5-4-3-1) were acceptable and that this was what I considered semi-balanced.
2. A previous hand in the match had contained such a hand for a 1NT opening.
3. The South player is not guaranteed to get the hand right even if he recalled the pre-match discussion

Responder's reply

1. The discussion referred to above related solely to 1NT opening bids. the 2♦ - 2NT sequence was not discussed in this context.
2. If South goes up with the ♣ace at trick 1 the slam cannot make. South maintains that if the possibility of a singleton honour was known there is no option to taking the ace.

Appeal Committee discussion

The system card was presented. Questions were asked of E/W as to their reasons behind believing semi-balanced could mean having a singleton. They believed that a singleton honour would meet the definition of "semi-balanced" and felt sure there were statements to such in print in some texts. Questions were asked of N/S about their leading arrangements. From 975 they would probably lead the 9.

The players left the room.

Appeal Committee decision

Unanimous that there was an infraction with regards the system explanation and the system card, relating to semi-balanced. There was damage to N/S.

Law 12C2 states clearly that when a director awards an adjusted score, the score for the non-offending side is "the most favourable result likely had the infraction not occurred". That implies 6♠ down 1. The adjusted score to stand.

Appeal Report 4

Date:

Event: Gold Coast Restricted teams Round 9

Director:

Appeal Panel: I.Dahler (Chair)
E.Ramshaw
R.Folkard

Dlr:E	♠ QJ62	Bidding:	Basic system			
E/W vul	♥ 108		S	W	N	E
	♦ AJ7542					Pass
	♣ 8					
♠ A97			Pass	1NT	2♣1	2♥
♥ AQ72	♠ K10854		3♣	3♥	P	3NT
♦ K108	♥ K96		All pass			
♣ A95	♦ 3					
	♣ KJ73	Noted bids:				
	♠ 3		1 not alerted			
	♥ J543		2			
	♦ Q96		3			
	♣ Q10642		4			

Final Contract and result: 3NT down 2, 200 to N/S

Play if relevant: Diamond lead

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

The 2♣ overcall, which was not alerted, was systemic, showing an unspecified single-suiter.

The 2♥ was intended as a Jacoby Transfer, but systemically was not.

I amended the table score to 4SE making 10 tricks, 620 to E/W, since this would be a much preferred final contract by East had the true meaning of 2♣ been given. I awarded 10 tricks because this was the common result And East would probably get the favourable lead of a small club from South.

Appellant's claim

South did believe that North's bid of 2♣ was genuine suit and forgot to alert it. However, if alerted we contend that East would still have bid 2♥ as he had forgotten that transfers were off after intervention. The bidding would still have proceeded in the same manner. East should be able to put his partner with 3♠ on the bidding as he should not open 1NT with two doubletons and if he believed the bidding the most his partner could hold in clubs is 2 cards. His bid of 3NT with a singleton further compounded the problem knowing he had a 5/3 fit for spades and points for distribution to bid 4♠.

Responder's reply

Appeal Committee discussion

Questions were asked of East as to what double of 2♣ (not alerted) would be. Double would mean "I was going to bid 2♣", Stayman. East was further asked what he would have bid over 2♦ (natural), or 2♣ (alerted). East stated he would still bid 2♥ believing this to be a transfer to spades. This was a transfer as far as he was concerned. West said that he did not believe they used transfers over opposition interference and he took 2♥ to be natural.

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal upheld.

The Committee does not believe the damage was caused by the infraction.

Table score (200 to N/S) to stand.

Appeal Report 5

Date:
Event: Gold Coast teams round 10

Director:

Appeal Panel: I.Dahler (Chair)
?
?

Dlr: W ♠ K62
N/Svul ♥ J
♦ AQ92
♣ QJ972
♠ Q1085 ♠ A7 X2
♥ Q7 ♥ A109842
♦ 1065 ♦ KJ83
♣ 10863 ♣ 3
♠ J943
♥ K653
♦ 74
♣ AK4

Bidding: Basic system

S	W	N	E
P	1♦ 1	1♥	
P	2♣ 3	2♥	
P4	P	2♠	All pass

Noted bids:
1 alerted, Precision style 11-16hcp
2 4♠ exactly, 8+hcp
3 alerted, at least 5/4, either way, minors
4 agree hesitation

Final Contract and result: 2♠ making 9 tricks , 140 to N/S

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

Director called by E/W at the end of the auction and later at the end of play to express doubts about North's 2♠ call. The Directing staff felt that the call was a close decision and expressed some doubt as to the 2♠ call.
Score adjusted to E/W +110.

Appellant's claim

North had to choose between the following logical alternatives based on his side having the balance of high card points, a singleton in the overcalled suit, and 3-card support to an honour in partner's known 4-card spade suit:- 1) 2♠, 2) 3♣ (showing longer clubs than diamonds), 3) Pass

We consider 1) is the stand out action at this level and the table result (+140) to stand.

Responder's reply

Appeal Committee discussion

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal upheld

The Committee considers that in a smooth auction, 2♠ by North was a 75% action. Therefore no infraction.
Table score to stand (140 to N/S).

Date:

Event: Open Playoff round 9

Director: S.Mullamphy

Appeal Panel: I.Dahler (Chair)
 D.Stern
 P.Buchen
 A.Wilsmore
 D.Appleton

Screen NW to SE

Dir:E ♠ 76432

N/S vul ♥ K

♦ 54

♣ A7632

♠ A9 ♠ K10

♥ AQ86432 ♥ J10

♦ 7 ♦ KQ8632

♣ KQJ ♣ 1054

♠ QJ85

♥ 975

♦ AJ109

♣ 98

Bidding: Basic system

S	W	N	E	
		P		
P	1♣1	1♥2	3♣3	
P	3♦4	P	3♥5	
P	4♦6	P	4♥	All pass

Noted bids:

1 15+

2 2-suits same colour

3 E to N diamonds single suiter (6-3-2-2)

4 relay

5. E to N 2263, W to S 2254

6. puppet to 4♥

Final Contract and result: 4♥E, making 10 tricks, EW +420

Phil there's a problem here ... bidding suggests it should be 4H by N ... clearly wrong but needs fixing

Final Contract and result: 4♥E, making 10 tricks, EW +420

Play if relevant: ♠Q lead

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

The director was called by N/S after the match. They explained that there had been different explanations on each side of the screen.

Law 75c. South and North were given different explanations of East's call. South, on lead, had the incorrect systemic explanation of these calls. With two clubs and the information that East had a 4-card club suit and partner holding 4+clubs, he reasoned that a club ruff was unlikely and led a spade. Given the correct information South contends that he would lead a club and now declarer must guess the heart suit correctly to avoid the ruff by South.

Score adjusted to N/S +50.

Appellant's claim

- 1) The club lead is not automatic (could have been right on the existing hand if N is 5♠ 4♣ for example)
- 2) Declarer much more concerned about a ♣ ruff on opening ♣ lead; play trumps from the top (and now make 11 tricks if this is relevant).
- 3) Finesse gains against Kxx, loses to K and Kx offside.

Responder's reply

South believed West to be short in clubs, given East as 2254, so not clear to lead a club, if given the correct explanation, the club lead is clear. North knows that South has a doubleton so ducking is automatic. There was an infraction, certainly South has been damaged and that the most favourable likely result to N/S is +50 one down in 4♥, as East's claim of cashing the ace will lose whenever South has Kxx or Kxxx.

Appeal Committee discussion

The director explained the circumstances.

East thought that the winning defence is not clear. If it might be, then ♥ace and another heart is a viable play.

South stated that ace and another heart is not clear because North is short in hearts. South did not lead a club as they are likely to be 5-4-2-2 around the table, so the ♠Q was the only other choice.

The players left.

The committee agreed there had been an infraction and South would likely lead a club. There was belief that a club lead was likely about 70% of the time. It was also stated that the ♥ace play was not so clear. Agreement that a club lead is almost no chance after the misexplanation. With a correct explanation a club lead is likely.

Appeal Committee decision

There was an infraction and South has been damaged

The committee assigned a score of 150 to E/W to take into account the chance of a club lead and the possibility of ♥ace and another. We assign 150 to E/W to reflect the infraction of a mis-explanation

Appeal Report 2

Date:
Event: Women Playoff round 14

Director: S.Mullamphy

Appeal Panel: I.Dahler (Chair)
K.McDonald
G.Kosakos
K.Morrison
D.Stern

Screen NW to SE

Dlr: N ♠ AK10854

Nil vul ♥ 652

♦ J7

♣ J5

♠ 96 ♠ Q2

♥ K87 ♥ AQ9

♦ AQ102 ♦ K64

♣ A1062 ♣ KQ843

♠ J73

♥ J1043

♦ 9853

♣ 97

Bidding: Basic system

S	W	N	E
		2♦ 1	X2
P	P	2♠	P3
P	3NT4	All pass	

Noted bids:

1 multi 2

2 T/O of spades

3 not alerted on either side

4 W to S Lebensohl, not alerted by E

Final Contract and result: 3NT W, making 13 tricks, 520 to E/W

Play if relevant: ♠ 8 led

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

3NT was alerted by West as Lebensohl, not alerted by East.

North did not lead a high spade and 3NT made. It was clear to me that 3NT was a mis-bid.

Score adjusted to 3NT down 2 tricks, 100 to N/S

Appellant's claim

There was no systemic agreement the 3NT was Lebensohl. So North was in receipt of correct information. North's choice of lead damaged their side.

Responder's reply

If North had received the information that it was Lebensohl (suggesting no spade stopper) they may have led a high spade.

Appeal Committee discussion

Questions were asked of E/W. They produced their system notes to show that Lebensohl did not apply in this position. West had given South the wrong information, but North had the correct information. Questions were asked of South what pass meant, and what 2♥ and 2♠ would have meant. South believed that a bid of 2♥ or 2♠ would show a better hand. That pass said nothing to say.

The players left.

The committee believed that South might have helped their side by taking some action over the double. They also believed that it was by no means clear for North to lead a high spade.

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal upheld.

The table score to stand, 520 to EW.

Appeal Report 1

Date:

Event: Adelaide Autumn Teams 2002

Director: W.Hooper

Appeal Panel: P.Gue (Chair)

I.De'l Monte

G. Sargent

T.Brown

K.Morrison

Dlr: S ♠ K106542
E/W vul ♥ 652
 ♦ 7
 ♣ 932
 ♠ AQ7 ♠ 83
 ♥ QJ ♥ A874
 ♦ A63 ♦ K1054
 ♣ AK876 ♣ J54
 ♠ J9
 ♥ K1093
 ♦ QJ982
 ♣ Q10

Bidding: Basic system

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

Noted bids:

- 1 Alerted and explained weak 2 in either major
- 2 Pass/Correct
- 3 Hesitation, alerted (transfer to ♠)
- 4

Final Contract and result: 3NT by West making 11 tricks

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

There was unauthorised information. West has an easy 4♠ bid with 3 spades and a doubleton heart. Score adjusted to 4♠ by West, down 3 tricks, 300 to N/S

Appellant's claim

2♦ was alerted and explained by East as a weak 2 in major. West's bid of 2NT was to show a balanced 20-22. East's bid of 3♥ was taken as a transfer to spades which was bid by West. East's bid of 3NT was considered by East as a very weak 5-card spade suit. West therefore passed 3NT. At no time did West believe that 3♥ was not a transfer to spades. When East was taking so long to bid at the 3-level, West thought East was possibly looking for 6 of something. However, 3NT was a shut out. There was hesitation but no body language that indicated that 3♥ was not a transfer.

Responder's reply

When the alert of 3♥ was made East was extremely uncomfortable, as she was throughout the whole auction. The Director was not called immediately, as we wanted to check he had 3 spades. If he didn't then we would have considered there to be no case. As the match was strained, we didn't want to add to this if we didn't have to. Both North and South felt she had hearts and no idea what was happening in the auction, as she admitted at the end of the hand "when I knew we were in trouble I just had to keep bidding".

Appeal Committee discussion

Questions were asked of E/W and it was discovered that this was their first major tournament together, their partnership being very inexperienced.

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal upheld. The committee felt that the E/W partnership, being an inexperienced one, should not be penalised to the fullest.

But, we do believe there would be a reasonable expectation of bidding 4♠ 50% of the time.

Score adjusted to 180 to E/W, being 3NT +2 tricks 50%, and 4♠ - 3 tricks 50%.

Appeal Report 2

Date:
Event: Autumn Teams 2002

Director: M.Wilcox

Appeal Panel: P.Gue (Chair)
I.Del'Monte
G. Sargent
T.Brown
K.Morrison

Dlr:W ♠ AKQ108
Nil vul ♥ K975
♦ ---
♣ AQJ3
♠ 64 ♠ J7532
♥ A8 ♥ QJ32
♦ KQ8532 ♦ 964
♣ 1087 ♣ K
♠ 9
♥ 1064
♦ AJ107
♣ 96542

Bidding: Basic system

S	W	N	E
	1♦	Db1	1♠
P	2♦	Db1	3♦
P	P	4♦	P
4♥1	P	P	Db1
P	P	4♠	Db1
5♣	Db1	All pass	

Noted bids

1 Agreed break in tempo

Final Contract and result: 5♣X making 12 tricks

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

Score adjusted to 4♥X down 3 tricks, 500 to E/W. Laws 16A2, 12C2

Appellant's claim

4♥ will make on normal lead (any lead) and normal play (with consideration to the opponents bidding). West has opened and rebid ♦ (10-15). East has responded, competed to the 3-level and doubled 4♥ (6-10pt). There are 16 pt outstanding, reconciling this difference requires that opener has 9/10pt and responder 6/7. East has responded 1♠ to 1♦, competed to 3♦ and penalised 4♥ with only 6/7 pt, 5431. This is consistent with West 1♦/2♦ with 2263.

On the ♦ K lead declarer may ruff (to protect ♦ position), return to hand the only way ♠ A, ruff a spade, and proceed to try to draw trumps. Even if the ♥ A is offside this is correct because the ♣ K is now guaranteed to be onside.

If East holds 4 hearts to the AQ or AJ, or AQJ (almost impossible) then 4 heart losers are inevitable and drawing trumps is still correct. When the ♥ A is onside declarer has no choice but to drop the ♣ K offside, West cannot have it.

Could declarer have worked this out at the table? They did. In 5♣X the ♣ K was dropped despite being penalty doubled by the hand with 3 small.

Although looking at the hand single dummy 4♥ appears unlikely, E/W have only themselves to blame. West has opened on a 9 count and taken a free bid at 5-level. East has responded on an aceless 7 pt with a stiff king, taken a free bid at the 3-level and made a penalty double at the 4-level. They have described their only possible hands to declarer and have not only opened light, responded light, but doubled two making contracts (one with overtricks). They deserve nothing.

There is no disagreement as to the removing of 5♣X back to 4♥X.

Responder's reply

Appeal Committee discussion

Discussion occurred about the likely number of defensive tricks in 4♥. It was considered that it should not fail by more than one trick with reasonable declarer play, on any defence, and could make.

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal upheld. We agree that 4♥ can be made but under Law 12C2 "for offending side, the most unfavourable result at all probable" leads the committee to believe that 4♥X down 1 trick is this, believing that a club finesse at trick 2 on the ♦ K lead is not unlikely, and the defence were not given the opportunity not to lead the ♦ K.

Score adjusted to 4♥SX down 1 trick, 100 to E/W

Appeal Report 3

Date:
Event: Autumn Teams

Appeal Panel: P.Gue (Chair)
I.Del'Monte
G. Sargent
T.Brown
K.Morrison

Dlr:W ♠ AKQ108
Nil vul ♥ K975
♦ ---
♣ AQJ3
♠ 64 ♠ J7532
♥ A8 ♥ QJ32
♦ KQ8532 ♦ 964
♣ 1087 ♣ K
♠ 9
♥ 1064
♦ AJ107
♣ 96542

Bidding:		Basic system	
S	W	N	E
	P	1♣1	1♦2
2♣	P	2♠	P
2NT	P	5♣	All Pass

Noted bids
1 Precision
2 Not alerted, agreement that it shows spades

Final Contract and result: 5♣ N, down 1 trick, 50 to E/W

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

East's 1♦ bid (showing spades) was not alerted. North claims that had the 1♦ bid been alerted she would have bid 3NT rather than 5♣.

Score adjusted to N/S +400, Laws 40C, 12C2

Appellant's claim

Even though I made the procedural error of not alerting 1♦ as spades, I do not feel that N/S can get 3NT. Even when South bid 2NT, North bid 5♣. North's possible bid is 4♦, splinter, interest in slam. The only player who could have been damaged was North as South was aware of the bid and noted this at the end of the auction. My opinion is that the failure to alert did not affect the final contract, if anything an alert would make 5♣ more likely. 6♣ is cold opposite a hand of ♠x♥xxx♦xxx♣K10xxxx.

Responder's reply

I believe we were damaged as a result of West's failure to alert, as

- 1) the auction would be entirely different with the information available to North.
- 2) North was looking for an obvious +score and was not thinking of 6♣ as evident from the bidding. With 5 supposed club tricks and 3 spades + 1 heart, she would go for the NT game.

Appeal Committee discussion

Questions were asked of N/S. South admitted to knowing that 1♦ showed spades, in fact had made declarer aware of it at the end of the auction by asking East to confirm that 1♦ showed spades. Discussion concerned the likelihood of North preferring 3NT to 5♣.

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal upheld. It was a belief of the committee that the failure to alert had not encouraged North to bid 5♣, as against 3NT, rather the bid was based on her hand, opposite a positive with 5+clubs. Table score, 5CN, down 1 trick, 50 to E/W, to stand.

Appeal Report 4

Date:
Event: Autumn Teams

Director: C.Diment

Appeal Panel: P.Gue (Chair)
P.Reynolds
G.Sargent
C.Snashall

Dlr:N	♠ Q532	Bidding:	Basic system			
All vul	♥ K543		S	W	N	E
	♦ 4				P	P
	♣ K832				3♦ 1	P
♠ 1098	♠ 6		1♠	P	4♠	All pass
♥ J9	♥ A1076		3NT	P		
♦ AK732	♦ Q109865					
♣ 654	♣ A9					
	♠ AKJ74	Noted bids:	1 South believed it natural, North a splinter			
	♥ Q82					
	♦ J					
	♣ QJ107					

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

Play if relevant: Trump lead, 3 rounds of trumps, then ♣Q taken by the ace. Then two rounds of diamonds.

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

Explanation corrected before the opening lead. No mention of any damage in auction at this stage of time or at the end of play of the hand. A ruling was requested at the end of the match. No adjustment, score stands.

Appellant's claim

The 3♦ bid was explained to East by South as natural. East decided not to bid after this explanation. If it had been explained as a splinter, East would have doubled or bid 4♦ and we believe E/W would have reached 5♦ (1 down). We agree that 4♠ can be beaten but west has been damaged by the situation, never able to read East to have a 6-card diamond suit. But, this aspect is not the basis of the appeal.

Responder's reply

If 3♦ is alerted as a splinter, an unfavourable 4♦ is suicidal and double is ludicrous as, with 2 aces outside, a diamond lead is hardly desirable.

Appeal Committee discussion

Questions were asked of N/S and it was ascertained that there was no agreement as to the meaning of 3♦. Questions were asked of E/W about their 2-level openings, and their signalling methods.

Appeal Committee decision

The committee was unanimous that there was no infraction, therefore no need to consider the appeal. Further they were unanimous that the appeal had little merit, but a majority felt that N/S had contributed somewhat to the confusion at the table. That majority were inclined not to impose a penalty on E/W.

Date:
Event:VCC

Director: R. Geyer

Appeal Panel: P.Gue (Chair)
D.Stern
C.Chua

Dlr:E ♠ A9
All vul ♥ K5
♦ Q10632
♣ 10743
♠ Q632 ♠ KJ1084
♥ AQ64 ♥ 1083
♦ J ♦ ----
♣ KQ86 ♣ AJ952
♠ 75
♥ J972
♦ AK98754
♣ ----

Bidding: Basic system

S	W	N	E
			P
1♦	Db1	1NT1	4♠
P2	P	5♦	Db1
All pass			

Noted bids:

1 8+hcp, may have 4 hearts
2 agreed hesitation

Final Contract and result: 5♦ X, making, 750 to N/S

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

Score adjusted to 620 to E/W. Unauthorised information from the hesitation. Pass is a logical option on the North hand. Laws 73F1, 16A2, 12C2

Appellant's claim

North bid 1NT over the double as 3♦ would be too weak and 4♦ may cut out 3NT. Partner did not know about the diamond support, believed North may have 4 hearts. After the 4♠ bid it was obvious to North that 5♦ was the correct contract.

Responder's reply

The hesitation over 4♠ clearly suggests bidding over other alternatives. Note the 5♦ hand has a fair defensive hand.

Appeal Committee discussion

Questions were asked of N/S about their system. 1♦ was at least 4♦'s. The appellants explained that the hesitation was only slight, and North felt she had to show her diamonds.

The players left and the committee agreed that pass was certainly an alternative action on the North hand.

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal dismissed. A unanimous decision that the appeal lacked merit, but believed the lack of experience of the N/S players leads the panel NOT to impose a penalty for an appeal without merit. The director to discuss with them that they should be aware of their responsibility to consider appeals.

Appeal Report 2

Date:
Event: VCC round 5

Director: ?

Appeal Panel: C.Snashall (Chair) ?
?

Dir: E		Bidding:		Basic system	
All vul	♠ A106	S	W	N	E
	♥ K2				P
	♦ A96	2♠	Dbl	4♠	All pass
	♣ AQ1086				
♠ 5	♠ Q74				
♥ A976	♥ Q1054				
♦ KQJ743	♦ 85				
♣ 93	♣ K542				
	♠ KJ9832			Noted bids:	
	♥ J83			1	
	♦ 102			2	
	♣ J7			3	
				4	

Final Contract and result: 4♠S, down 1, N/S -100

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

Director called at the end of the hand. South claimed that when he played the spade ace from dummy, West contributed a slow 4 at her turn to play. E/W dispute that there was any break in tempo (East claiming that her partner is always slow).
Score adjusted to N/S +620, Law 73F2

Appellant's claim

This incident was approximately half-way through the match. By then the opponents were well aware that West plays at a deliberate consistently even tempo. We completely refute the suggestion that there was any untoward hesitation. It should be noted that the opponent's claim was not made at the time of play but only when they entered the score of one off. The bidding of West's double already suggests shortage in spades.

Responder's reply

I believe that the break in tempo was in the order of approximately two seconds, sufficient for me to initially believe that spades were 4-0 and the contract was going to easily make.

Appeal Committee discussion

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal upheld, table score to stand, N/S -100.

The committee felt there was not absolute evidence of a break in tempo., and also that any inference drawn by South should not have affected the play.

Appeal Report 3

Date:
Event: VCC

Director: R.Geyer

Appeal Panel: B.Thompson (Chair)
B.Richman
M.McManus

Dir:E ♠ A87
N/S vul ♥ 975
♦ 843
♣ 8654

♠ 1095432 ♠ KQ
♥ 106 ♥ KQ4
♦ 7 ♦ AQJ10
♣ QJ109 ♣ AK32
♠ J6
♥ AJ832
♦ K9652
♣ 7

P

Bidding: Basic system

S	W	N	E
			2♣1
P	2♥2	P	2NT
P	3♥3	P	4NT
P	5♣	P	5♥

5♠ All pass

Noted bids:

1 GF

2 described as semi-pos. with hearts, system card say negative
3 meant as transfer, not alerted

Final Contract and result: 5♠, 11 tricks, 450 to E/W

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:

Bids 2 & 3 not alerted. After the auction had finished a description asked for and 2♥ was described as semi-positive with hearts. I was called to the table and asked to look at the sequence. N/S said that the 5♣ response by West was out of tempo. After discussion with the directing staff, the table score to stand.

Appellant's claim

Our opponents have clearly had a serious bidding misunderstanding. West was aware of the problem in that his partner had failed to alert his 2♥ & 3♥ bids. He was therefore in possession of unauthorised information. However, we are not suggesting that he illegally made use of the information, because the correction to 5♠ was appropriate. East, however must have been confused by the exceedingly slow 5♣ response to his partner's RKC (for hearts) and the significantly easy 5♠ bid over the 5♥ sign-off. Perhaps this could be a spade void, but because of the tempo variation, East may have become aware of the possibility of the problem. Had 5♣ & 5♠ been made in the same tempo, then perhaps the final contract would have been 6♥ or 6♠, from a correction from 6♥.

Responder's reply

Any possibility that 5♠ shows a hand with a heart suit and spade suit is absurd. Partner knows we are missing 2 key-cards my sign-off in 5♥, impossible to show a void trying for 7. Partner did not bid a second suit over 2NT. Where could a void come from? Partner's slightly slow (not exceedingly) 5♣ is meaningless. More likely he is trying to remember whether 0314 or 1430. 5♠ rings a huge bell that I've forgotten the system, a thousand more times likely than any other possibility.

Appeal Committee discussion

Appeal Committee decision

Directors ruling upheld. The slow 5♣ does not demonstrably suggest one action over another. Passing 5♠ is a logical alternative – it is indeed most likely that 5♠ is natural.

Appeal Report 4

Date:
Event:VCC

Director: ?

Appeal Panel: E.Chadwick (Chair)
P.Gue
K.Morrison

Dlr: E ♠ AQ
N/S vul ♥ K52
 ♦ J10532
 ♣ Q83
♠ KJ9863 ♠ 1074
♥ 1087 ♥ Q4
♦ 6 ♦ AQ9874
♣ J106 ♣ K4
 ♠ 52
 ♥ AJ963
 ♦ K
 ♣ A9752

Bidding: Basic system E/W ACOL

S	W	N	E
			1NT
2♥	2♠	4♥	P1
P	4♠	Dbl	All pass

Noted bids:
1 agreed hesitation

Final Contract and result: 4♠XW, down two tricks, 300 to N/S

Play if relevant:

Tournament Director's Report and decision:
Corrected to 4♥S, making, 620 to N/S

Appellant's claim
Nothing in writing

Responder's reply
Nothing in writing

Appeal Committee discussion

The players spoke to their argument. West argued that he was always going to bid 4♠. N/S argued that pass was a logical alternative. The players left. The committee agreed that pass was a logical alternative. They discussed the fact that the laws were clear on actions that gain, after hesitations, when alternative actions are logical.

Appeal Committee decision

Appeal dismissed. Adjusted score to stand.

The committee believe that West's 4♠ bid was amongst a selection of alternatives (ie pass) that could have been suggested by partner's break in tempo.

Only the consultation of the appellant with an appeals adviser had saved the appellants from a penalty for an appeal without merit.