



WORLD BRIDGE FEDERATION

Table of Contents, Section 2 Appeals Examples

Example Appeal no. 1	2
Hesitation.....	2
Example Appeal no. 2.....	2
Hesitation.....	2
Example Appeal no. 3.....	3
Hesitation.....	3
Example Appeal No 4.....	4
Hesitation.....	4
Example Appeal No 5.....	5
Hesitation.....	5
Example Appeal No 6.....	6
Hesitation.....	6
Example Appeal no. 7.....	7
Unauthorized information?	7
Example Appeal no. 8.....	8
Unauthorised Information during Play.....	8
Example Appeal No 9.....	9
Psychic Call.....	9
Example Appeal No 10.	10
Claim, Acquiescence.....	10
Example Appeal no. 11.....	12
Claim.....	12
Example Appeal no. 12.....	13
Claim - Evaluation	13
Example Appeal No 13.	14
Procedural Penalty.....	14
Appeal Example No. 14	15
Subject: Miscellaneous.....	15
Appeal Example No. 15	16
Event: Bermuda Bowl Round: Final.....	16

Example Appeal no. 1

Hesitation

Dealer West. Love All.

	♠ 10 8 7 5		
	♥ A 10 9 4		
	♦ Q 9 8 6		
	♣ 4		
♠ K J 9 3 2		♠ Q 4	
♥ J		♥ Q 8	
♦ J 5 3 2		♦ A 10 7	
♣ 9 6 2		♣ A K Q 8 7 5	
	♠ A 6		
	♥ K 7 6 5 3 2		
	♦ K 4		
	♣ J 10 3		

West	North	East	South
Pass	Pass	1♣	1♥
Dble	2♠	3♣	4♥
Pass	Pass	Dble	Pass
5♣	All Pass		

Contract: Five Clubs, played by East.

Result: 10 tricks, -50 to East/West

The Facts:

One Club was strong, and the first Double showed 7 points or more. Two spades was artificial and showed heart support. East's Double came after an agreed hesitation of around 45 seconds.

The Director:

Ruled that a Pass for West was a logical alternative to the suggested action of pulling the slow double.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to Four Hearts doubled, made, +590 to North/South.

East/West appealed

The Players

East/West explained that the pass of Four Hearts was forcing; on this type of sequence they cannot be pre-empted below their own game level (five clubs) and all passes below that are forcing. They were not able to arrive in five clubs more quickly because their methods are to reverse the usual principle that quick arrival indicates no interest in proceeding further. For this pair the delayed arrival is weaker than the quick arrival which would show a mild interest in slam.

North/South did not wish to comment.

The Committee:

Was surprised to hear of the E/W style of bidding and considered it should be mentioned on the convention card. In the absence of such corroborative evidence, and since there was unauthorised information, the Committee decided against the East/West pair.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A, Law 12C2

WBF Comment:

if a partnership uses methods that do not conform to normal, widespread usage, it is essential that they note this on their convention cards. They must not expect a simple assertion to be accepted as sufficient evidence of such an agreement. (Where regulations permit the unexpected treatment calls for an alert of the forcing pass, as also of the bid if instead of passing East had bid 5C.)

Example Appeal no. 2

Hesitation

Dealer North. Love All.

	♠ J 8 7		
	♥ Q 9 8 6 4 2		
	♦ A 3		
	♣ J 8		
♠ A Q 5		♠ 10	
♥ K J 10 7		♥ A	
♦ K 7 5		♦ J 10 9 4 2	
♣ 9 7 5		♣ A K Q 10 3 2	
	♠ K 9 6 4 3 2		
	♥ 5 3		
	♦ Q 8 6		
	♣ 6 4		

West	North	East	South
	2♥	4♣	Pass
5♣	Pass	6♣	All Pass

Contract: Six Clubs, played by East

Result: twelve tricks, +920 to East/West

The Facts:

Over a weak Two Hearts, four Clubs showed a minor two-suiter. The tray took some two minutes before returning with Five Clubs, after which East raised to Six.

The Director:

Ruled that there was unauthorized information and considered passing to be a logical alternative for East.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to Five Clubs, making with an overtrick, +420 to East/West.

East/West appealed.

The Players:

East/West explained that over a weak two in Hearts, Four Clubs showed the minors, not forcing, while Four Hearts would be forcing with both Minors.

West explained that at first he thought Four Clubs showed the black suits, which is indeed how they defend against a Multi Two Diamonds. He had even considered bidding Four Spades, when he remembered the correct system. He had then considered his next bid for some two minutes more. He stated that he had lost some time in considering whether to bid Five Clubs or Five Diamonds.

East explained that he chose the non-forcing alternative because he did not know

there would be a fit, but when partner then raised the Clubs, he considered that partner must have at least the Ace of Spades and a high Diamond honour. If that is the Ace, he is playing at 75%, if it would only be the King of Diamonds, the slam is still at 50%.

East/West were not able to produce written notes about their defensive methods, but thought the explanations were self-evident.

The Committee:

Considered the hesitation proven, including the fact that it must have been a hesitation by West.

The Committee considered the Director's ruling to be correct and did not think the case should have been brought to appeal.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A, Law 12C2

WBF Comment:

the methods should be shown on the convention card. In the absence of unauthorized information ('UI') East would be free to use his judgment as to his action. When he has UI that could suggest slam possibilities in a situation like this, he does not have that discretion; partner having set a potential contract East clearly has a logical action in passing.

Example Appeal no. 3

Hesitation

Teams - Round Robin

Dealer West. Game All.

♠ J 5 4	♠ Q 6 2	♠ A K 7
♥ 8	♥ K Q J 4 3	♥ A 6 2
♦ A 8 5 2	♦ Q J 7	♦ K 9
♣ A J 9 7 3	♣ 6 2	♣ K Q 8 5 4
	♠ 10 9 8 3	
	♥ 10 9 7 5	
	♦ 10 6 4 3	
	♣ 10	

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♥	Dble	3♥
Dble	Pass	4♥	Pass
5♣	Pass	6♣	All Pass

Contract: Six Clubs, played by West.

Result: twelve tricks, +1370 to East/West

The Facts:

West had taken a very long time in bidding Five Clubs. This was agreed.

The Director:

Established that the tray had come back to North/West after several minutes.

He decided that a Pass by East was a logical alternative and that Six Clubs was suggested by the break in tempo.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to Five Clubs, making 12 tricks, +620 to East/West.

East/West appealed.

The Players:

West told the Committee that he had a problem and needed to think it over. He was wondering if East did not have five spades and was asking to play game in that denomination.

East explained his actions. From the pre-empt (according to opponents always promising a 5-4 Heart fit) he knew his partner held a singleton Heart. From the responsive Double, he knew partner would be at least 4-4 in the minors, so Six Clubs was definitely on. By bidding Four Hearts, he committed himself to the slam, because he would also bid Six Clubs if partner had

bid Five Diamonds. He was still searching for the grand.

North stated he thought the hesitation helped in bidding the slam. He pointed out East had not asked any questions so he could not be a certain as he said about the 9-card heart fit. He agreed that the Three Hearts bidder would have a four-card suit in 99% of the cases.

The Committee:

Accepted that East, through his bid of Four Hearts, where he could risk a response of Five Diamonds, had proved that he would always be going to at least a small slam, no matter what West bid.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision overturned, original table result restored. +1370 to East/West

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A

Deposit: Returned

WBF Comment:

this case draws attention to the fact that if it is self-evident from the prior action of a player (here East) that he is committed to the contract reached, the existence of unauthorised information available from partner should not weigh against him. Provided the evidence is manifest he should be taken to have no logical alternative action.

Example Appeal No 4

Hesitation

Dealer East. North/South Game.

♠ J 9			
♥ A J 10 9 2			
♦ J 4 3 2			
♣ A 7			
♠ K 10 7 3		♠ A 8 5 4 2	
♥ 8 6 5		♥ K Q 7 4 3	
♦ A K 9 7		♦ 10	
♣ 8 2		♣ 6 3	
	♠ Q 6		
	♥ -		
	♦ Q 8 6 5		
	♣ K Q J 10 9 5 4		

West	North	East	South
		2♣	Pass
2♠	Pass	Pass	3♣
Pass	Pass	Dble	Rdbl
3♠	Dble	Pass	4♣
All Pass			

Contract: Four Clubs, played by South.

Result: seven tricks, -300 to North/South

The Facts:

Two clubs showed 3-10 points, at least 4-4 in the Majors. East's Double over 3♣ was for take-out, showing a maximum opening. North's Double was after a hesitation of more than one minute. West called the Director immediately after the call of Four Clubs.

The Director:

Ruled that there was unauthorized information.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to Three Spades doubled, made, +530 to East/West.

North/South appealed.

The Players:

North admitted his pause for thought which East/West said was 5 minutes long.

North had never seen this auction. First an intervention of 3♣, and then a Redouble. It must mean a good suit, and something more. He was trying to work out how South would interpret his Double and finally came to the conclusion that he could indeed Double, knowing that South would understand it as asking for a spade stopper in order to play 3NT.

South explained that his Redouble would normally show some offensive values.

West pointed out that it was clear that North/South had not discussed this sequence, but that by thinking for 5 minutes North transferred the meaning that the Double was not for penalties.

The Committee:

Considered the hesitation to be proven.

The Committee concluded that the answers to three questions were all that was needed, and that these were surprisingly easy:

was there unauthorised information?
Yes

did the unauthorised information suggest bidding?
Yes

is Pass a logical alternative?
Yes

The decision was then so straightforward that the Committee was close to keeping the money.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A, Law 12C2

WBF Comment:

the committee's account of its deliberations is a model for such cases. The Director is also entitled to credit.

Example Appeal No 5.

Hesitation

Teams - Round Robin
Dealer West. Game All.

♠ 9 7
♥ A K 9 8 7 6 5
♦ 8 3
♣ 10 2
♠ K 8 5 4 3 2
♥ 10 2
♦ J 7
♣ A 9 8
♠ A Q 10
♥ Q 3
♦ 10 9 5 4 2
♣ J 7 6
♠ J 6
♥ J 4
♦ A K Q 6
♣ K Q 5 4 3

West	North	East	South
2♠	Pass	3♠	Pass
Pass	4♥	All Pass	

Contract: Four Hearts, played by North

Result: ten tricks, +620 to North/South

The Facts:

Two Spades was weak, and Three Spades was pre-emptive, partner should not bid Four.

The tray had come back from South/West, after a considerable delay. All the players agreed the break in tempo had been of the order of 90 seconds.

The Director:

Found that Four Hearts by North was an action suggested by the break in tempo and that Passing would have been a logical alternative.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to -200 to East/West North/South appealed.

The Players:

Did not deny the break in tempo.

North explained he was not able to bid Three Hearts in his system, but when he learnt from East that East/West did not have game values, he felt that Four Hearts was a self-evident call.

He had asked about the meaning of 3♠ once again, especially since he was aware of the pause and knew the Director would be called. He explained his decision by counting points. His partner held at least the values of a weak No-Trump opening,

and he would always raise that to game on this hand. He thought some 90% of players would bid 4♥ on his hand.

East/West pointed out that the break in tempo makes the call of 4♥ to be less risky.

The Committee:

Found the call of Four Hearts to be quite reasonable, but was not satisfied that it was the only logical alternative. A 7222 distribution with 6½ losers is not very good, and two spade losers are very likely. The hesitation took away all doubts that could very well have remained in a substantial minority of players.

The Committee felt that Pass was a logical alternative.

The Committee also found that the Director had been wrong in calculating the Adjusted score. If North is deemed to have passed, West will play three Spades and is very likely to make 8 tricks.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision overturned; score adjusted to Three Spades minus one, +100 to North/South

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A, Law 12C2

Deposit: Returned

WBF Comment:

We repeat for convenience the definition of 'logical alternative' that is given in the Code of Practice:

"A 'logical alternative' is a different action that, amongst the class of players in question and using the methods of the partnership, would be given serious consideration by a significant proportion of such players, of whom it is reasonable to think some might adopt it."

Example Appeal No 6.

Hesitation

Teams - Round Robin

Board 2. Dealer East. North/South Game.

	♠ K J 8		
	♥ 5		
	♦ K 9 6 5 4 2		
	♣ 10 9 7		
♠ Q 6		♠ A 9	
♥ Q 10 8 7 3		♥ K J 6 4 2	
♦ Q 8 3		♦ A J 10 7	
♣ K J 2		♣ 5 4	
	♠ 10 7 6 4 3 2		
	♥ A 9		
	♦ -		
	♣ A Q 8 6 3		

West	North	East	South
		1♥	2♥
4♥	Pass	Pass	Dble
Pass	4♠	Pass	Pass
5♥	Dble	All Pass	

Contract: Five Hearts Doubled, played by East

Lead: ♠7

Result: 10 tricks, -100 to East/West

The Facts:

Two Hearts was Spades and another.

The Director was called by West when the tray came back after Four Hearts after some delay.

According to the East/West pair, the delay had been minimal, according to the North/South, it was at least half a minute.

The Director:

Included the nature of North's hand in his establishment that there had in fact been a hesitation, and decided there had been unauthorised information.

Ruling:

Table result changed to Four Hearts making, +420 to East/West.

North/South appealed.

The Players:

North showed the Committee how he had written the explanation (5♠ and 5+♣/♦), which had apparently taken him 7 seconds. He stated he had passed in tempo.

East told the Committee that North had clearly hesitated and even touched the Pass card for some time before taking it out of

the Bidding Box. The E-W captain, who had sat behind East, stated the same.

West stated that the tray had remained on the other side for at least 30 seconds.

South said he had not noticed the hesitation. Two Hearts could have been made on very strong or on weak hands.

The N-S captain added that Four Hearts is not necessarily made.

The Committee:

Agreed with the Director that North did indeed have a problem, and chose to believe that there had been a hesitation. When East notices a delay, South may well have noticed it as well.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld. +420 to East/West.

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A, Law 12C2

Deposit: Returned

WBF Comment:

The suggestion that four Hearts might go down – via a Spade, a Heart, a ruff in Diamonds, and the Club Ace – has not occasioned a response from the committee. A weighted adjustment is should perhaps have been considered.

Example Appeal no. 7
Unauthorized information?

Dealer S : Love all.

♠	A 8 4		
♥	K J 9 5 3		
♦	10		
♣	Q 5 4 3		
♠	7 6	♠	K 10 9 5
♥	Q 10 8 7 4	♥	A 2
♦	7 5 4 3	♦	K Q 9 8 6
♣	8 6	♣	10 7
		♠	Q J 3 2
		♥	6
		♦	A 5 2
		♣	A K J 9 2

West	North	East	South
			1♣
Pass	1♥	Dbl	Rdbl
2♦	4♥	Pass	Pass
Dbl	Pass	Pass	4NT
Pass		5♣	All Pass.

After the 4♥ bid East enquired about the redouble and it was explained as showing three-card support. Five clubs made eleven tricks.

The Director ruled that South possessed unauthorized information when he bid 4NT, that Pass was a logical alternative to this, and that the score be adjusted to NS – 300 in 4♥ doubled.

NS appealed and suggested that the enquiry about the redouble had no relevance to East's hand. The effect of the question and the ruling was that East had prevented NS recovering from a systemic failure.

Appeals Committee: the committee amended the assigned adjusted score to NS +150. They attributed their decision to the restoration of equity under Law 12C3.

WBF Comment:

The law requires the Appeals Committee to determine whether South's removal from 4♥ to 4NT is permissible. If not, the Director has ruled correctly,

except that a weighted adjustment under 12C3 might allow of this making a different number of tricks some of the time. It is open to South to persuade the committee, if he can, that his intention in passing Four Hearts was to remove the double when it came; if the committee were convinced of this then there would be no logical alternative to his 4NT bid and the table result stands.

The committee's adjustment of +150 is difficult to understand. This is not, in our opinion, a case for a 12C3 adjustment (except as we have already indicated). Even if it were, this unexplained figure smacks of some of the arbitrary adjustments that were occasionally made in earlier times. If there is some suggestion of a weighted score, it is good practice to set the percentages of frequency for each result to be included, and leave the Director to calculate each element in imps/matchpoints before joining them into a single score to be awarded. It is also helpful if the Appeals Committee summarizes briefly the manner in which it arrives at an adjustment.

The suggestion that EW had an ulterior motive for asking the question is highly speculative. Neither the Director nor the committee could be expected to act upon it. We would note, however, that if the answer could not affect East's action on the round it would be desirable to defer the question, probably until the auction is completed. This would avoid any possibility of conveying unauthorized information to West, and also the suspicions engendered in the North-South players.

Example Appeal no. 8
Unauthorised Information during Play

Board 15. Dealer South. North/South Game.

	♠ K 8 6		
	♥ Q 10		
	♦ Q J 9 4		
	♣ A J 10 9		
♠ 10 7 4 3		♠ J 9 5 2	
♥ A J 7 4		♥ K 5 2	
♦ A 8 7 6		♦ 10 2	
♣ 2		♣ K 8 4 3	
	♠ A Q		
	♥ 9 8 6 3		
	♦ K 5 3		
	♣ Q 7 6 5		

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♣	Pass	1♥
Pass	1NT	Pass	2♣
Pass	2♦	Pass	2NT
Pass	3NT	All Pass	

Contract: Three No-Trumps, played by North

Lead: two of spades

Play:

West	North	East	South
♠4	♠x	♠2	♠Q
♣2	♣9	♣x	♣Q
♠3	♣J	♣K	♣x
♠x	♠x	♠5	♠A
♦x	♣A	♣x	♣x
♦A	♦J	♦x	♦x
♥x	...		

Result: eight tricks, North/South - 100.

The Facts:

Two diamonds denied three cards in hearts.

North called the Director after the end of play. East had returned the spade to trick four after a considerable delay. North claimed West had known from the pause not to play spades at trick seven, but rather hearts.

The Director:

Established that East had indeed taken some 20 seconds before leading to trick four, and asked about the signalling. The ♠2 was fourth best, and the ♠4 and ♠3 showed count.

The Director ruled that there had been Unauthorized Information, which suggested the heart return, and that the spade return was a Logical Alternative.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to Three No-Trumps, making nine tricks, +600 to North/South.

East/West appealed.

The Players:

West explained his play. He knew from the bidding that North had two hearts, and this is why he had returned the suit.

North/South, by way of their captain, told the Committee that in his opinion the hesitation made it a lot easier for West to return hearts.

The Committee:

First of all recorded its agreement that Law 16 applies to plays as well as to calls. The Committee established that there had been Unauthorised Information, and that the hesitation was very likely to indicate that East did not have the king of spades, and thus suggest the heart return in trick seven. The Committee then made an analysis of the play so far, which showed that a spade return was still a Logical Alternative. Just exchange ♠K and ♥Q for ♠J and ♥K. The bidding and play would have been the same, but the spade return would have been right. Since the West player was in the possession of Unauthorised Information that suggested a Heart return, he should have returned a Spade instead.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A, Law 12C2

WBF Comment:

It is important to understand that in the play unauthorized information ('UI') may no more be used than in the auction. Here the tempo of the second lead of Spades is very revealing, since otherwise the decision to lead a Spade at that time could suggest a real interest in the suit. One may think that the second Spade lead is perhaps a defensive error on the part of East, not to be recovered by way of Unauthorized Information.

Example Appeal No 9.

Psychic Call

Teams - Round Robin

Board 15. Dealer South. North/South Game.

	♠	K Q 10 4		
	♥	A Q 5 3		
	♦	10		
	♣	K 6 5 4		
♠	J 9 6 2		♠	7 5 3
♥	10 9		♥	J 8 2
♦	Q J 7 4 2		♦	A K 8 6 5
♣	10 2		♣	A 7
	♠	A 8		
	♥	K 7 6 4		
	♦	9 3		
	♣	Q J 9 8 3		

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♣	1♦	Pass
1♥	2♦	Pass	3♣
All Pass			

Contract: Three Clubs, played by North

Result: 11 tricks, +150 to North/South

The Facts:

One Heart was a psychic call.

The Director:

Applied Law 40A, and found no evidence of anything wrong in East/West.

Ruling:

Result Stands

North/South appealed.

The Players:

North/South felt that East should have bid 2♥ or even 3♥. They have 8 cards in hearts (or that is what East should believe), so why did they let North/South play 2♦ or 3♣?

West stated that with a hand like this, he would try a psyche of this nature even in an individual tournament. There can be no question of illegal partnership understanding. One partner lives in Western Europe, the other in Eastern Europe. They had met only once in the past 12 years, and their Federation decided to align them in partnership only two weeks before the tournament. Since then, they had played with each other for 50 boards over the Internet, and of course a few hundred boards in the current tournament.

East stated he did not find it right to raise to Two Hearts when South had made a negative Double and North had made the strong bid of Two Diamonds.

West suggested it was inappropriate for opponents to use the words “controlled psyche”.

The Committee:

Found that the Director had done enough to ascertain that East/West were not guilty of anything untoward. This was a psyche, as permitted by Law 40A.

“A player may make any call or play (including an intentionally misleading call — such as a psychic bid — or a call or play that departs from commonly accepted, or previously announced, use of a convention), without prior announcement, provided that such call or play is not based on a partnership understanding.”

The Committee was of the opinion that this case should not have been brought to the Committee.

The Committee’s decision:

Director’s decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 40A

Deposit: Forfeited

WBF Comment:

There is little to add. It is not clear that West has necessarily shown five cards in Hearts; this is something that the Director will no doubt have explored.

Example Appeal No 10.

Claim, Acquiescence

Teams - Round Robin

Dealer West. East/West Game.

♠	K Q J 5		
♥	K J 6 5		
♦	8		
♣	8 6 5 3		
♠	8 6 3 2	♠	A 7 4
♥	8 4	♥	Q 10 9 2
♦	K 5	♦	Q 7 6
♣	A K Q 10 4	♣	J 9 7
	♠ 10 9		
	♥ A 7 3		
	♦ A J 10 9 4 3 2		
	♣ 2		

West	North	East	South
1♣	Pass	1♦	4♦
Dble	All Pass		

Contract: Four Diamonds doubled, played by South.

Lead: Ace of Clubs

Play:

West	North	East	South
♣A	♣3	♣7	♣2
♥8	♥5	♥9	♥A
♦5	♦8	♦6	♦A
♦K	xx	♦7	♦J

Result: claimed for nine tricks by South, -100 to North/South

The Facts:

One Diamond showed hearts.

The Director had earlier been called to this table, during the auction of this deal, by South, who complained that when he had asked about the meaning of the Double, West had responded in a loud voice "punitiff!".

That had however nothing to do with the later ruling, or with this appeal.

After trick four, South claimed the remainder of the tricks, minus the queen of diamonds and the ace of spades, that is a total of nine tricks. A score of -100 was entered on the score form. 27 minutes after the end of the match, the defenders came to the Director, wishing to withdraw acquiescence to the claim. When West returns a heart in trick five, there is no way the defence can avoid going two down.

The Director:

Applied Law 69B, which says that a trick is transferred only when all normal lines of play result in a different outcome. He considered a club or spade return also as normal.

Ruling: Result Stands

East/West appealed.

The Players:

East showed the Committee that he was quite aware of how the play had gone so far.

South agreed that he had claimed before West had the chance to return the Heart.

East/West stated they had acquiesced in the claim, relying on the good intentions of South, and because of time pressure.

The Committee:

Noted Law 69B:

'Within the correction period established in accordance with Law 79C, a contestant may withdraw acquiescence in an opponent's claim, but only if he has acquiesced in the loss of a trick his side has actually won, or in the loss of trick that could not, in the Director's judgement, be lost by any normal play of the remaining cards. The board is rescored with such trick awarded to the acquiescing side' and the footnote which defines the word "normal":

'For the Purposes of Laws 69, 70 and 71, "normal" includes play that would be careless or inferior, but not irrational, for the class of player involved.'

The withdrawal of the acquiescence was within the correction period, so the Director, and now the Committee, had to decide whether or not there were normal lines that lead to nine tricks. If any of those lines could be found, the claim had to stand.

The Committee noted that in the definition of the word "normal", there is a reference to the class of player, which was in this case very high.

The Committee came to a first conclusion that said that if West returns a Heart, no normal line will then lead to anything more than eight tricks.

So the Committee had to decide on the normality of some other return than a heart at trick five.

The Committee regretted that South had claimed at precisely this moment.

The Committee accepted that it would be irrational for a player of West's ability to do anything other than continue with the hearts. He had already shown, by discontinuing his Club start at trick two, that he had read East's length signal on trick one, and he is able to recognize that there is no imperative to lead a Spade – the trick cannot disappear. Furthermore, his partner's nine was very helpful. A player of his quality will not get it wrong.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to eight tricks, -300 to North South

Relevant Laws:

Law 69B

Deposit: Returned

Separate decision of The Committee:

The Committee took note of the happenings earlier on the board and found the alleged events disturbing. The Committee asked the Director to investigate, giving the ruling he had not given at the time, and applying a penalty if this appeared appropriate.

(The Director subsequently held his investigation and decided to give a warning but no penalty)

WBF Comment:

this case is quoted in order to illustrate that a player of advanced skills should not be prevented from making what is, for him, an 'open book' play. The ability of a player is something the Director, and crucially the appeals committee, must assess.

Example Appeal no. 11

Claim

Open Pairs

Dealer: West E/W game

♠	8 2		
♥	Q 8 7 5 4		
♦	A 6 5 3		
♣	K 6		
♠	7 6 4	♠	K 5 3
♥	J 10 9 3 2	♥	A K
♦	4	♦	Q J 10 9 8 2
♣	8 7 3 2	♣	A Q
	♠	A Q J 10 9	
	♥	6	
	♦	K 7	
	♣	J 10 9 5 4	

West	North	East	South
Pass	Pass	1♦	1♠
Pass	1NT	2♦	3♣
Pass	3♠	All Pass	

The Facts: The play proceeded as indicated below (the lead to each trick is underlined)

West	North	East	South
<u>♦4</u>	♦A	♦2	♦7
♠4	<u>♠8</u>	♠3	♠J
♣3	♣6	♣Q	<u>♣4</u>
<u>♠6</u>	♦3	<u>♦10</u>	♦K
<u>♥9</u>	♥4	♥A	♥6
♥2	♦5	♦9	♠9
♣2	♣K	♣A	<u>♣5</u>
♥3	♦6	♦8	♠10
<u>♠7</u>	♠2	♠5	<u>♠A</u>

resulting in the diagrammed position below

♠	—		
♥	Q 8 7 5		
♦	—		
♣	—		
♠	—	♠	K
♥	J 10	♥	K
♦	—	♦	Q J
♣	8 7	♣	—
	♠	J	
	♥	—	
	♦	—	
	♣	J 10 9	

South faced her cards and said "I'm up." East did not acquiesce and South started to amend her claim to say "except for the high trump." East/West called the Director.

The Director:

did not doubt that declarer could place the ♠K with East, but did believe that South

could have forgotten for the moment that ♠K had not been played.

Ruling: that the last four tricks belonged to E/W (Law 70C2) and that the contract was ♠3 down four. N/S -200.

N/S appealed

The Players:

South stated that the Director call had come in the middle of her statement and that she was not given enough time to complete her claim which was that the clubs were good and she was going to play them until East ruffed with the high trump. South was asked why her statement wasn't "Conceding the high trump" rather than "I'm up"? South stated, "I'm a smoker and was in a hurry."

The Committee Decision:

The Committee decided that the statement "I'm up" indicated that all four tricks were hers. Therefore, playing the ♦J would not be irrational and declarer would lose the last four tricks. The Director's ruling was upheld.

WBF Comment:

statements clarifying a claim should be made with care. In this case there is a lesson that such words as "I'm up" may be taken to reflect a belief that all the remaining cards are high.

Example Appeal no. 12

Claim - Evaluation

KO Teams

<p>♠ 8 4 ♥ — ♦ 9 4 3 ♣ 9 5</p> <p>♠ 9 ♥ — ♦ 7 ♣ A K Q 7 4</p>	<p>♠ J 6 ♥ A Q ♦ A J ♣ J</p> <p>♠ 10 ♥ — ♦ K 10 ♣ 10 8 6 2</p>
---	--

The Facts:

East was declarer in a 6♥ contract and claimed in the diagrammed seven-card ending. East (arguably, see below) stated she had the ace-jack of diamonds and a club to get to dummy. Declarer had lost one trick at the time of the claim.

The Director:

awarded N/S a trick with the ♦K (Law 70E). The board was rescored as

6♥ down one, N/S +100.

E/W appealed the Director's ruling.

The Players:

disputed the phraseology of the claim, with N/S contending that declarer began with "I have the ace and jack of diamonds..." whilst E/W contended that declarer said "I have the ♦A and the jack..." , the latter referring to the ♠J. Declarer had cashed the ♠AKQ immediately before making the claim statement. The appellants raised other issues, such as which defender disputed the claim.

The Committee :

did not consider germane the question of which defender disputed the claim. It could not ascertain the exact parsing of declarer's claim statement, but decided that her intent was sufficiently clear to award her the rest of the tricks.

Decision:

The Committee allowed the claim. The board was scored as N/S – 1430.

Note:

After disclosure of the decision, one of the appeals screening Directors stated that informal guidelines for Directors' rulings in

claim situations indicated that the floor Director should have allowed the claim. Had N/S appealed a ruling in which E/W's claim was allowed, the committee would have discussed the merit of such an appeal.

WBF Comment:

This case from an ACBL tournament is included in order to make the point that with their extended powers it is appropriate for Directors to cure any obvious ills before the appeal committee becomes involved. If the Chief Director has guidelines which have not been followed in a ruling by one of his assistants, or in a ruling he has given, he has powers under Law 82C to put things right. Every opportunity should be taken to put a squeeze on the number of matters that come to committees.

Example Appeal No 13.

Procedural Penalty

Teams - Round Robin

The Facts:

One of the players of this match was 3 minutes late to arrive at the table.

The Director:

Applied the penalty, prescribed in the regulations.

Ruling:

IVP Penalty

The Player appealed.

The Player:

Is a well known personality who had been in an official meeting prior to the match. He suggested it was unfair to his team to punish them for his engagements. He commented always plays fast enough and in fact ended the match with almost half an hour to spare.

The Committee:

Noted that the regulations contain automatic penalties for some good reasons. The Committee did not accept the excuse for being late and did not think that the case should have been brought to the Committee.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Regulation B.2.1

Deposit: Forfeited

WBF Comment:

the player, or his captain, seems to have acted with little foresight.

Appeal Example No. 14

Subject: Miscellaneous

Teams

Dealer: North Vul None

♠ 4	
♥ A Q 10 9 6 3 2	
♦ 10 5	
♣ A 5 3	
♠ Q J 9 6 2	♠ K 8 5 3
♥ J 7	♥ K 8
♦ 6	♦ A Q J 9 8 7
♣ K 10 8 7 6	♣ 2
	♠ A 10 7
	♥ 5 4
	♦ K 4 3 2
	♣ Q J 9 4

West	North	East	South
—	1♥	INT	3NT
4♠	5♠	All Pass	

Result: 5♥ went down one, +50 for East-West

Facts:

East-West were playing a convention (the INT over-call) not shown on the convention card. North-South had no opportunity to prepare a defense. The players assured the Director that careful explanations were given and referred to a different convention card for that purpose. Their approved convention card did not show their methods correctly. The card had been made out in a hurry by a third party. They found when they arrived at the tournament that the card sent by their National Bridge Organization had not been received.

Director's Ruling:

When the Director was called, he cancelled the result and awarded three IMPs to North-South. An earlier board against a different pair in the same match was identified during which the same unregistered convention was used. That board was also cancelled and three IMPs awarded.

Committee Decision:

The Committee noted that the pair was extremely experienced and should have been expected to know their responsibilities. They should not have been excused for the grave breach of the conditions of contest. This pair had to play the methods on the convention card officially registered. They were barred

from playing in the final segment of the semi-final of the Rosenblum Cup Teams. The score of three IMPs to North-South on each of the two boards was confirmed.

WBF Comment:

two prominent bridge personalities found this decision harsh, one suggesting that all that mattered was whether the non-offending side had been damaged. The fact was that in a major international event a well-known partnership was in direct contravention of the Conditions of Contest. Opponents must not be required to suffer results obtained by methods that are illegally employed in violation of the regulation

Appeal Example No. 15

Event: Bermuda Bowl Round: Final

Appeals Committee: J. Auken (Chair), J Damiani, G Endicott, A. Maas, J-P Meyer.

Teams USA I versus Italy

Board 32 . Dealer West EW Vul.

<p>♠ J 10 ♥ 5 4 2 ♦ A 7 ♣ K 10 7 6 4 2</p>	<p>♠ 2 ♥ A J 9 3 ♦ K Q 10 9 8 6 5 ♣ 5</p>
<p>♠ A 6 5 4 3 ♥ K Q 10 8 6 ♦ 4 2 ♣ A</p>	<p>♠ K Q 9 8 7 ♥ 7 ♦ J 3 ♣ Q J 9 8 3</p>

West	North	East	South
<i>Hamman</i>	<i>Lauria</i>	<i>Soloway</i>	<i>Versace</i>
Pass	1♦	2♦	Dbl
2♥	3♦	Pass	Pass
3♥	5♦	Dbl	All Pass

The first five tricks are won by Club Ace, Heart Ace, ruff with Diamond 3, ruff with Diamond 8, ruff with Diamond J. Declarer then leads Spade K to the Ace. The position is as follows:

<p>♠ 10 ♥ - ♦ A 6 ♣ K 10 7 6</p>	<p>♠ - ♥ J ♦ K Q 10 9 6 5 ♣ -</p>
<p>♠ Q 9 8 7 ♥ - ♦ - ♣ Q J 9</p>	<p>♠ 6 5 4 ♥ Q 10 ♦ 4 2 ♣ -</p>

The Facts:

At this point North is two down if East cashes Heart Q. But East leads a low Spade.

Dummy has left the table and declarer is playing dummy himself. He touches the Spade 7, the vu-graph caller says '7 of Spades' and West plays the 10. Declarer says he was playing the Queen. The Director is called.

The Director: The Director enquired of declarer as to his actions and he said that he was covering up the King with the seven.. (The King had been played to the previous trick and, because dummy was absent, was still face-up on the table.) The director considered the Spade 7 played.

Ruling:

5Dx – 2. NS –300.

Appellants:

NS appealed.

Present:

All four players and both Captains.

The Players:

North said that he had picked up the small Spade to "cover the King" and demonstrated his meaning. His intention was to play the Queen. East said he had heard the seven named and both East and West had seen declarer touch the seven of Spades, West playing the ten. Declarer had protested that he was playing the Queen.

The Committee:

Enquired of declarer whether he had named the card he was playing and he said he had not. Indeed it seems unlikely he would be instructing dummy who is not at the table and it is reasonable to believe the naming of the card was by the vu-graph caller. Requested the Chief Director to explain the law to them, which he did by reading from the law book.. The relevant law says:

" 45C3 A card in the dummy must be played if it has been deliberately touched by declarer except for the purpose of arranging dummy's cards, or of reaching a card above or below the card or cards touched."

The Committee's Decision:

Declarer had touched the seven and it was not evident to the committee that declarer had touched the card for the purpose either of adjusting dummy's cards or of reaching for the Queen.(By the above law picking up the card in order to place it on top of a played card commits North to playing the card.) The Committee had not heard anything in the evidence that persuaded it the Director's ruling was incorrect. Accordingly the director's ruling was upheld.

Deposit:

returned.