

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2009-01	Unauthorised information	South-West Pacific Teams Championship
Stage	Round	Date
Round robin	10	2009-01-22
CTD	L. Kelso	
Committee	R. Grenside, M. Wilkinson, N. Moses	

Board 20
Dealer W
Vul All
Scoring Teams, imps converted to VPs

North

♠ 3
 ♥ AKT64
 ♦ 43
 ♣ JT975

West

♠ AKQT4
 ♥ Q7
 ♦ Q72
 ♣ 432

East

♠ J7652
 ♥ 8
 ♦ AKJ6
 ♣ K86

South

♠ 98
 ♥ J9532
 ♦ T985
 ♣ AQ

West	North	East	South
1S	2H	4H	Pass (1)
4S	5C	X	5H
P	P	X	All pass

(1) Agreed hesitation

Table result	5Hx= by North, NS +850
Director's ruling	4S= by West, NS -620
Committee's ruling	75% of 4S= by West, NS -420 25% of 5Hx= by North, NS+850

The Director: Was called at end of the auction and at the end of the hand. All players agreed that South's initial pass was out of tempo.

The Director ruled that South's slow pass constituted unauthorised information for North (Law 16B1), that pass was a logical alternative to North's 5C bid, and that 5C was suggested by the unauthorised information (Law 16B3). Under Law 12C, the Director awarded an adjusted score of 4S= by West, NS -620.

The appellants: No statement recorded.

The respondents: No statement recorded.

The appeals committee: Decided that North's bid of 5C was an infraction, Pass being a logical alternative. However, the committee ruled that South might nevertheless bid 5H, and awarded a weighted score to reflect this: 75% of 4S= by West, NS -620, and 25% of 5Hx= by North, NS +850.

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2009-02	Illegal deception	South-West Pacific Teams Championship
Stage	Round	Date
Round robin	14	2009-01-23
CTD	L. Kelso	
Committee	R. Grenside, M. Wilkinson, N. Moses	

Board 10
Dealer E
Vul All
Scoring Teams, imps converted to VPs

North

♠ Q95
 ♥ Q543
 ♦ T4
 ♣ AJ87

West

♠ KJ64
 ♥ KT2
 ♦ AJ653
 ♣ 6

East

♠ T2
 ♥ AJ9876
 ♦ K82
 ♣ QT

South

♠ A873
 ♥ —
 ♦ Q97
 ♣ K95432

West	North	East	South
—	—	1H	Pass
2D	Pass	2H	Pass
4H	All pass		

Table result	<i>[Ed: no result recorded on appeal form]</i>
Director's ruling	Table result stands
Committee's ruling	Table result stands

[Ed: The facts are not clearly stated on the appeals form. It appears that there was a club lead to the ace and a club return, on which declarer hesitated before playing the queen. The form records that the facts were not disputed.]

The Director: Ruled that while declarer had broken tempo at trick 2, the damage to North-South did not result from the break in tempo. The Director allowed the table score to stand.

[Ed: The relevant law is 73F: "...[I]f the Director determines that an innocent player has drawn a false inference from a remark, manner, tempo, or the like, of an opponent who has no demonstrable bridge reason for the action, and who could have known, at the time of the action, that the action could work to his benefit, the Director shall award an adjusted score (see Law 12C)."]

The appellants: After the break in tempo, North-South believed that declarer had more than two clubs. Subsequently, when a spade finesse lost to the queen, North was aware of the potential trump coup. North could have exited with a spade to the ace, and a diamond shift would now defeat the contract — this line was not taken as declarer had to have another club loser.

The respondents: No statement recorded.

The appeals committee: Decided that declarer's break in tempo was not clearly related to the misdefence, as a third club could have been ruffed in dummy as a more effective play. The committee upheld the Director's ruling and allowed the table result to stand.

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2009-03	Misinformation	National Open Teams
Stage	Round	Date
Round of 20	—	2009-01-23
CTD	L. Kelso	
Committee	E. Ramshaw (c), E. Chadwick, A. Turner	

Board 12
Dealer W
Vul NS
Scoring Teams, imps, knockout

North

♠ JT532
♥ K6
♦ Q94
♣ AQ2

West

♠ 6
♥ AQJ942
♦ T8
♣ K987

East

♠ K94
♥ T75
♦ J652
♣ 654

South

♠ AQ87
♥ 83
♦ AK73
♣ JT3

West	North	East	South
1H	1S	2H	3H
X (1)	3S	All pass	

(1) South asked at his second turn to call and was told “game try”

Table result	3S+3 by North, NS +230
Director’s ruling	3S+3 by North, NS +230
Committee’s ruling	3S+3 by North, NS +230

The Director: South claimed that either East did not give a correct explanation of West's double, or East did not agree with the explanation. The system card supported East's explanation in the main.

Both North and South had the opportunity to bid 4S.

The Director ruled that there was no infraction, and thus allowed the table score to stand, 3S+3 by North, NS +230.

The appellants: No statement recorded.

The respondents: No statement recorded.

The appeals committee: The appeal was dismissed. The committee considered that the appeal had little merit, but no penalty was applied.

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2009-04	Misinformation	National Open Teams
Stage	Round	Date
Semi-final	1	2009-01-25
CTD	L. Kelso	
Committee	E. Ramshaw, A. Mill, P. Gue, B. Scott	

Board 6
Dealer E
Vul EW
Scoring Teams, imps, knockout
Screen From NW to SE

North

♠ 96
 ♥ 92
 ♦ Q9864
 ♣ A984

West

♠ A52
 ♥ AQJ
 ♦ AKJ32
 ♣ 63

East

♠ QT
 ♥ T863
 ♦ 7
 ♣ QJT752

South

♠ KJ8743
 ♥ K754
 ♦ T5
 ♣ K

West	North	East	South
—	—	Pass	2C (1)
X (2)	Pass	Pass	2S (2)
X	Pass	3C	Pass
3NT	All pass		



- (1) Weak both majors or Acol two
- (2) 13-15 or strong
- (3) Systemically an Acol two in spades

Table result	3NT-5 by West, NS +500
Director's ruling	3NT-5 by West, NS +500
Committee's ruling	3S-2 by South, NS -100

The Director: Was called by South after West's second double but before the tray was passed. South asked if he could change his bid as he had made a misbid. He was told that no change was allowed, after which he returned to the table and pushed the tray through.

South then corrected his earlier explanation of 2S (to West, behind screens), from "weak with longer spades" to "2S may have shown a strong hand with spades". West did not call the Director at this point.

At the end of the hand, West called and stated that had he been given the correct explanation, he would have passed 2S instead of making his second double. The directing staff polled six players of a similar standard regarding the action they would have taken given only the correct systemic explanation. None considered Pass to be a logical alternative.

The Director ruled that there had been no damage due to the misinformation, and allowed the table result to stand, 3NT-5 by West, NS +500.

The appellants: No statement recorded.

The respondents: No statement recorded.

The appeals committee: West was told by South that "bids could not be changed" before he was given the correct explanation. The committee accepted that West might have passed, and that North may have raised the "Acol 2 in spades" to 3S.

The committee therefore adjusted the score to 3S-2 by South, NS -100.

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2009-05	Misinformation	Australian Mixed Teams
Stage	Round	Date
—	1	2009-01-24
Committee	N. Francis (c), P. Carter, J. Atkinson, J. Brockwell	

Board 12
Dealer W
Vul NS
Scoring Teams, imps converted to VPs

North

♠ KQT65
 ♥ J54
 ♦ T
 ♣ AQJ5

West

♠ 82
 ♥ AKT872
 ♦ 743
 ♣ 63

East

♠ J43
 ♥ Q9
 ♦ J65
 ♣ T8742

South

♠ A97
 ♥ 63
 ♦ AKQ982
 ♣ K9

West	North	East	South
2H	2S	Pass	3D
Pass	3H (1)	Pass	4C
Pass	5C	Pass	6S
All pass			

(1) Stopper ask (probe for NT)

Table result	6S= by North, NS +1430
Director's ruling	6S= by North, NS +1430
Committee's ruling	6S= by North, NS +1430

The Director: Was approached after the conclusion of the match by East, who requested a late ruling. He was concerned about South's 4C bid; when he had asked for an explanation of the auction, 4C had been described as a "second suit". East subsequently led a club against 6S, allowing the contract to make.

The directing staff ruled that South had misbid (intending 4C as Gerber), and that North's explanation had been systemically correct. There had thus been no infraction (Law 75C), and the table result was allowed to stand, 6S= by North, NS +1430.

The appellants: Submitted that South was required to correct the explanation of the 4C bid prior to the opening lead. The only logic behind East's lead was that North-South held the remaining eight clubs between them. Otherwise, a heart lead was clear.

The respondents: No statement recorded.

The appeals committee: Were of the opinion that the reasoning which led East to lead a club was flawed. South should not have corrected the explanation given before the opening lead (as contended by East-West): she believed that her partner's explanations were systemically correct.

The committee agreed that the explanations were in accordance with North-South's system, and thus allowed the score to stand, 6S= by North, NS +1430.