

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2007-13	Revoke	Australian Swiss Pairs
Stage	Round	Date
-	4	2007-10-06
Committee	E. Ramshaw (c), E. Chadwick, I. Robinson	

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

North

♠ KQ2
 ♥ AKQ754
 ♦ K975
 ♣

West

♠ T3
 ♥ J96
 ♦ A
 ♣ AT87432

East

♠ J854
 ♥ T2
 ♦ T432
 ♣ KJ6

South

♠ A976
 ♥ 83
 ♦ QJ86
 ♣ Q95

Contract: 6♠ by South

Lead: ♦A

West	North	East	South
3♣	X	Pass	4♠
Pass	6♠	All pass	

Trick	West	North	East	South
1	♦ <u>A</u>	x	x	x
2	Hx	<u>A</u>	x	x
3	Revoke	♠ <u>K</u>	x	x
4	Revoke	♠ <u>Q</u>	x	x

Table result	6♠-4 by South, NS -400
Director's ruling	NS +3 IMPs, EW -3 IMPs
Committee's ruling	75% of 6♠= by South, NS +1430 25% of 6♠-1 by South, NS -100 Assigned score of NS +1050

The Director: West's revokes led to declarer making 8 tricks. Equity was not restored by the 2-trick penalty (Laws 63A1 and 64A1), and so Law 64C was applied. Without seeing all 52 cards, it was decided that the winning line of play was not obvious, and that an artificial score would be awarded (Law 12C1): +3 imps to NS, -3 imps to EW.

The appellants: Given the pre-empt and the balance of probabilities being with a 4-2 break, and with West playing the ♠T on the second round of spades, the restricted choice finesse of the ♠9 is the best likely line of play. West has already erred by not switching to a club, which would certainly defeat the contract. It is also not 100% certain that the ♦A is singleton, so West could be 7-2-2-2.

The respondents: West did not play the ♠T on the second round of trumps. West revoked on the second round of trumps and played the ♠3 on the third round of trumps.

The appeals committee: Declarer was not allowed the opportunity to make the contract. The committee decided to award a score based on making 12 tricks 75% of the time and 11 tricks 25% of the time. Assigned a score of NS +1050 to both sides.

[Ed: The committee erred in weighting the total point score of the two contracts, rather than the unit of scoring (imps). The datum on the hand was NS +540. The actual assigned score, NS +1050, was NS +11 imps. The correct weighting would give a result of 75% of 13 imps and 25% of -12 imps, NS +6.75 imps.]