

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2007-12	Unauthorised information	ANC Butler Pairs (Open)
Stage	Round	Date
II	7	2007-07
Committee	R. Grenside (c), A. Braithwaite, B. Neill	

Board 10
Dealer E
Vul All
Scoring Imps converted to VPs, Butler pairs

North

♠ 9532
 ♥ J743
 ♦ K
 ♣ KJ85

West

♠ 764
 ♥ A852
 ♦ AJT74
 ♣ 2

East

♠ AKQT8
 ♥
 ♦ Q532
 ♣ AT64

South

♠ J
 ♥ KQT96
 ♦ 986
 ♣ Q973

West	North	East	South
-	-	1♠	Pass
2♦	Pass	4♣ (1)	Pass
4♠	Pass	5♦ (2)	Pass
6♦	All pass		

- (1) Fragment, ♦ support
 (2) After some hesitation

Table result	6♦= by West, EW +1370
Director's ruling	5♦+1 by West, EW +620
Committee's ruling	5♦+1 by West, EW +620 Appeal without merit, 1 VP fine

The Director: East chose not to cuebid the ♣A following West's 4♠ call, instead bidding 5♦ after some delay. In the auction, East has not shown good spades, diamonds, or the ♣A, but after the hesitation clearly has values not shown in the bidding. From West's perspective, East could easily have two losers between spades, diamonds, and clubs; this possibility is reduced by the delay in bidding 5♦.

Relevant laws: 12, 16.

The appellants: 4♣ was a fragment bid showing heart shortage and a strong hand. 4♠ was bid to show some spade support.

East could have passed 4♠, but chose to bid 5♦, showing slam interest. With the singleton club and the ♥A, West chose to bid 6♦, not having been influenced by the hesitation as it showed nothing. As an aside, claimed that 13 tricks were made at the table, not 12. Felt that 6♦ was justified; it was the last board of the session.

The respondents: 4♣ was explained as setting diamonds as trumps, so 5♦ could not have been a slam try. The hesitation was at least a minute, and East was clearly reluctant to bid just 5♦.

After the hand, West said 4♠ was to play, and so had no aspirations until the hesitation.

The appeals committee: As West was prepared to play in 4♠, the pause by East before bidding 5♦ could have influenced the 6♦ bid. Director's ruling upheld. Appeal found to be without merit, 1 VP fine applied.