

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2007-02	Unauthorised information	Last Train (Open)
Stage	Round	Date
-	7	2007-01
Committee	E. Ramshaw (c), I. Robinson, P. Marston	

Board 4
Dealer W
Vul All
Scoring Imps converted to VPs, Butler pairs

North

♠ QJ842
 ♥ T7
 ♦ T964
 ♣ K3

West

♠ A
 ♥ AJ653
 ♦ 82
 ♣ AJ876

East

♠ 9753
 ♥ 94
 ♦ AQJ7
 ♣ T92

South

♠ KT6
 ♥ KQ82
 ♦ K53
 ♣ Q54

Contract: 4♥ by West

West	North	East	South
Pass (1)	Pass	1♣ (2)	Pass
2♥ (3)	Pass	2♠	Pass
3♣	Pass	3♥	Pass
4♥	All pass		

- (1) 13+, any shape
- (2) 6-9, any shape
- (3) 5-5 in the majors

Table result	4♥-2 by West, EW -200
Director's ruling	4♥-2 by West, EW -200
Committee's ruling	4♥-2 by West, EW -200

The Director: No questions were asked until the final pass. West had misbid.

North-South were uncomfortable as to what information East had available to him which allowed him to pass 4♥ rather than correct to 4♠. There was some suggestion that this may have happened before or that there was body language.

The Director was not satisfied that there was any proof of this, nor that there was any concealed agreement that would lead South to double. Thus, the score stands.

The appellants: Made no written submissions. At the hearing, claimed that South was inhibited from doubling 4♥ by the possibility of removal to 4♠. Suggested that East must have received some unauthorised information or was acting on a hunch based on previous experience.

The respondents: Made no written submissions. West misbid, and the auction subsequently seemed unlikely, but no hesitation, body language, etc. was available to pass unauthorised information.

The appeals committee: Due to time pressure (the hearing was held between rounds 7 and 8), the appeal was held without written evidence.

The committee established that West's systemic action was either 1♥ (natural) or 3♣ (5/5 in the rounded suits).

The committee agreed with the Director's assessment that no transfer of unauthorised information could be proven and noted that North-South had already received some advantage. The Director's decision was upheld.

Respondents were advised to be more careful to bid correctly when playing a Yellow system, else the "Rule of Coincidence" may apply.