

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2007-04	Unauthorised information	South-West Pacific Teams
Stage	Round	Date
-	5	2007-01
Committee	P. Gue (c), B. Neill, J. Ebery, E. Ramshaw	

Board 20
Dealer W
Vul All
Scoring Imps converted to VPs, teams

North

♠ T
 ♥ KT872
 ♦ 63
 ♣ KQJT4

West

♠ AQJ
 ♥ A653
 ♦ KQJ4
 ♣ 93

East

♠ 8732
 ♥ 4
 ♦ A9875
 ♣ 652

South

♠ K9654
 ♥ QJ9
 ♦ T2
 ♣ A87

West	North	East	South
1♦ (1)	2♦ (1)	3♦	4♠
X	5♣	All pass	

(1) Alerted

Table result	5♣-4 by North, NS -400
Director's ruling	4♠x-5 by South, NS -1400
Committee's ruling	4♠x-5 by South, NS -1400 Appeal without merit, 2 VP fine

The Director: Before bidding 3♦, East asked about the 2♦ bid. South correctly explained this as showing both majors. North believed his bid showed clubs and hearts and was in receipt of unauthorised information. (His correct bid was 2NT.)

The directing staff believed that after showing his shape, Pass was a logical alternative to bidding 5♣. Thus the score was adjusted to 4♠x-5 by North, NS -1400.

Relevant laws: 16A2.

The appellants: Claimed that North knew that he had misbid immediately, before South alerted 2♦. One might view 2♦ as “inadvertent”, in which case North was not subsequently in receipt of unauthorised information.

East-West could have doubled 5♣ for +1100. Instead, they called the Director only after 5♣ had gone down 4 tricks, which appears to be a double shot.

The respondents: Without the unauthorised information, South’s 4♠ bid could show a long spade suit. If so, North has no reason to pull to 5♣.

East-West do not have a clear double of 5♣. There did not seem to be a reason to call the Director until the North hand was revealed.

North may have worked out the misbid, but there is no evidence of this. Hearing the UI makes the 5♣ bid an action much more likely to gain.

The appeals committee: Unanimously rejected the appeal. Director’s ruling upheld.

Further, whilst the committee accepted North’s assertion that he had remembered his system, he should have accepted that the unauthorised information barred him from acting over 4♠x. Thus, the committee was unanimous in finding that the appeal was without merit, and fined the appellants 2 VPs.