

<b>Appeal #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Event</b>
2007-01	Misinformation	National Women's Teams
<b>Stage</b>	<b>Round</b>	<b>Date</b>
-	1	2007-01
<b>Director</b>	S. Edler	
<b>Committee</b>	E. Ramshaw (c), P. Evans, L. Kalmin, V. Cummings	

**Board** 3  
**Dealer** S  
**Vul** EW  
**Scoring** Imps converted to VPs, teams

**North**

♠ AQ97  
♥ 7543  
♦ 3  
♣ 9873

**West**

♠ KJ  
♥ AQJ2  
♦ K9852  
♣ Q5

**East**

♠ 2  
♥ K986  
♦ AQJT76  
♣ AK

**South**

♠ T86543  
♥ T  
♦ 4  
♣ JT642

**Contract:** 6♦ by West

West	North	East	South
-	-	-	P
1♦	P	2♦ (1)	P
2♥	P	3♠ (2)	P
4♦	P	4NT	P
5♥	P	6♦	All pass

- (1) Inverted minor raise, not alerted  
(2) Not alerted

<b>Table result</b>	6♦= by West, EW +1370
<b>Director's ruling</b>	6♦= by West, EW +1370
<b>Committee's ruling</b>	6♦= by West, EW +1370

**The Director:** Was called at the end of play. West had failed to alert the 2♦ call as required. South claimed that if 2♦ had been alerted, they would have enquired about the meaning of the call, and on finding that 2♦ was strong, they would have bid 4♠, possibly leading to North finding the 6♠ sacrifice.

While South might well bid 4♠, an adjusted score can be awarded only if the Director is satisfied that at least a significant number (25%) of a similar class of players would take that action. After consultation, we are not satisfied that criteria would be met. Thus, the table result stands.

Relevant laws: 40C.

**The appellants:** Made no further submissions.

**The respondents:** Explained that 2♦ was an unlimited raise. 3♠ was forcing, but its meaning obscure.

**The appeals committee:** The appeal was held without written evidence due to time pressure.

The committee determined that the lack of alerts did not cause significant damage, as they agreed with the Director's assessment. East-West must be advised to be more careful with the alert procedure.

The committee determined that the appeal had sufficient merit to avoid a procedural penalty.

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

<b>Table result</b>	4♥-2 by West, EW -200
<b>Director's ruling</b>	4♥-2 by West, EW -200
<b>Committee's ruling</b>	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.

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2007-03	Inadvertent call	South-West Pacific Teams
Stage	Round	Date
-	2	2007-01
Committee	Unknown	

**Board** 13  
**Dealer** N  
**Vul** All  
**Scoring** Imps converted to VPs, teams

**North**

♠ KT752  
 ♥ 975  
 ♦ T3  
 ♣ AJ7

**West**

♠ 984  
 ♥ QT862  
 ♦ 72  
 ♣ 963

**East**

♠ Q  
 ♥ AK3  
 ♦ AKQ864  
 ♣ KQT

**South**

♠ AJ63  
 ♥ J4  
 ♦ J95  
 ♣ 8542

West	North	East	South
-	Pass	2♣ (1)	Pass
Pass (2)	...		

- (1) Alerted; explained as 23+ or 8+ playing tricks, GF  
 (2) Possibly inadvertent

<b>Table result</b>	-
<b>Director's ruling</b>	Table result stands
<b>Committee's ruling</b>	Table result stands

**The Director:** Was called to the table by West, who announced that he had made an inadvertent Pass.

Took West away from the table and asked him what was going through his mind when he passed. He replied that he was intending to pick up his alert card which was lying in front of him with the Pass card on top of it. Ruled that this was an inadvertent call under Law 25A and allowed it to be corrected.

The possibility of appealing was not raised until later by the teammates of the North-South pair.

**The appellants:** Related that East had opened 2♣, alerted by West. South passed, West passed, and North thought, then passed. East then advised his partner that he could call the Director after the bidding had concluded.

**The respondents:** In the previous couple of boards, North-South had explained that an alert card needs to be placed on the bid to be alerted, and the opponent returns the card to acknowledge the alert. This caused some jovial remarks between all at the table.

On this hand, East opened 2♣ and West alerted with a smile and some comment. South laughed and returned the alert card, asking for an explanation. West explained and accepted the card.

West does not remember having made a conscious bid. West noticeably gasped on seeing the pass, and said “sorry”. East suggested that we call the Director; North had not bid. Having explained what happened to the Director (away from the table), he made his ruling, which the opponents accepted.

North-South said the same mistake had happened with them before, and they did not call the Director. The captain of their team accepted the ruling and we scored; later, she sought to raise the event with the directing staff, to which we agreed.

**The appeals committee:** Accepted the Director’s statement of facts and agreed that West’s call was inadvertent. Score stands.

<b>Appeal #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Event</b>
2007-04	Unauthorised information	South-West Pacific Teams
<b>Stage</b>	<b>Round</b>	<b>Date</b>
-	5	2007-01
<b>Committee</b>	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

<b>Table result</b>	5♣-4 by North, NS -400
<b>Director's ruling</b>	4♠x-5 by South, NS -1400
<b>Committee's ruling</b>	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.



<b>Appeal #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Event</b>
2007-05	Unauthorised information	Gold Coast Congress Open Pairs
<b>Stage</b>	<b>Round</b>	<b>Date</b>
Qualifying	1	2007-02-18
<b>Committee</b>	R. Grenside (c), M. Ware, N. Francis, A. Braithwaite	

**Board** 18  
**Dealer** E  
**Vul** NS  
**Scoring** Matchpoint pairs

**North**

♠ T94  
 ♥ KJT974  
 ♦ K74  
 ♣ J

**West**

♠ AKJ52  
 ♥ 653  
 ♦  
 ♣ AK842

**East**

♠ 763  
 ♥ Q82  
 ♦ 82  
 ♣ T9653

**South**

♠ Q8  
 ♥ A  
 ♦ AQJT9653  
 ♣ Q7

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

- (1) Negative free bid  
 (2) Alleged hesitation

<b>Table result</b>	4♠+1 by West, EW +450
<b>Director's ruling</b>	3♦+1 by North, NS +130
<b>Committee's ruling</b>	3♦+1 by North, NS +130 Appeal without merit, maximum fine

**The Director:** Was called at the end of play. North was concerned that East had bid 3♠ following their partner's alleged slow pass (2).

After consulting with other directors, the unanimous decision was reached that Pass was a logical alternative to 3♠ in this situation. Under Laws 73F1 and 12C2, an adjusted score was awarded of 3♦+1, NS +130.

Relevant laws: 12C2, 73F1.

**The appellants:** Did not understand how the decision could be reached given that this was only played at the second table.

Claimed that there was virtually no hesitation by West. Also pointed out that as they were not vulnerable, the auction was not suspicious. After West had passed, North made the comment that he "reserved his rights", and repeated that comment after East bid 3♠. Appellants thought that North's comments could be considered an attempt to dissuade them from bidding further.

**The respondents:** Made no written submissions.

**The appeals committee:** Dismissed the appeal. Having decided that the appeal was without merit, was of the opinion that the maximum fine should be applied.

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2007-06	Misinformation	Gold Coast Congress Open Pairs
Stage	Round	Date
Final	2	2007-02-19
Committee	R. Grenside (c), M. Ware, N. Francis, A. Braithwaite	

**Board** 19  
**Dealer** S  
**Vul** EW  
**Scoring** Matchpoint pairs

**North**

♠ QT6532  
 ♥ Q3  
 ♦ 8643  
 ♣ 5

**West**

♠  
 ♥ J7  
 ♦ AKQJ5  
 ♣ KQ9864

**East**

♠ 87  
 ♥ T98642  
 ♦ T2  
 ♣ T73

**South**

♠ AKJ94  
 ♥ AK5  
 ♦ 97  
 ♣ AJ2

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

- (1) Weak major, balanced 21-22, or strong 4441  
 (2) Strong 4441, stiff club

Trick	West	North	East	South
1	♣ <u>x</u>	♠x	x	K
2	♦ <u>A</u>	x	x	x
3	♦ <u>K</u>	x	x	x
4	♦5	x	♣T	♣ <u>J</u>

<b>Table result</b>	5♣x-2 by West, EW -500
<b>Director's ruling</b>	5♣x-2 by West, EW -500
<b>Committee's ruling</b>	75% of 5♣x-2 by West, EW -500 25% of 5♣x-1 by West, EW -200

**The Director:** Was called after the play of the hand. West was concerned that a misexplanation was given of the 3♠ bid. North insisted that the explanation was correct (system notes at home), but South was unsure. West claimed that he would not have bid 4♦ given a different explanation.

After consultation with other directors, the consensus was that 3♠ was a misbid, and the explanation was correct. The score was therefore not adjusted. Any damage was due to an inferior line of play.

**The appellants:** Made no written submissions. During the hearing, agreed with the Director's recitation of facts.

**The respondents:** Made no written submissions.

**The appeals committee:** Questioned West concerning the line of play in 5♣x, who conceded that he misplayed the hand (playing North for ♣Axx and South holding the singleton J), and that on this layout, a small diamond to the ten would have safeguarded against a singleton ace.

Felt that there was no specific agreement after interference over the 2♦ opening. West is entitled under law to a correct explanation of the agreement, namely balanced 21-22, and with the incorrect information stood very little chance of finding the winning line to go only one down. However, the committee felt that West's play was the prime factor contributing to the bad result and may have gone down two even with the correct explanation. Thus the committee adjusted the score to 75% of 5♣x-2, EW-500, and 25% of 5♣x-1, EW -200.

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2007-07	Unauthorised information	Gold Coast Congress Swiss Pairs (Open)
Stage	Round	Date
-	5	2007-02-23
Committee	R. Grenside (c), T. Chadwick, M. Ware, M. Prescott, B. Neill	

**Board** 6  
**Dealer** E  
**Vul** EW  
**Scoring** Imps converted to VPs, Butler pairs

**North**

♠ J32  
 ♥ A  
 ♦ AKT862  
 ♣ 974

**West**

♠ AK854  
 ♥ K872  
 ♦  
 ♣ AK32

**East**

♠ Q76  
 ♥ QJT95  
 ♦ 3  
 ♣ QJT6

**South**

♠ T9  
 ♥ 643  
 ♦ QJ9754  
 ♣ 85

West	North	East	South
-	-	Pass	Pass
2♣ (1)	2♦	2♥	5♦
6♥	Pass (2)	Pass	7♦
X	All pass		

- (1) Alerted  
 (2) Agreed hesitation

<b>Table result</b>	7♦x-4 by North, NS -800
<b>Director's ruling</b>	6♥= by East, EW +1430
<b>Committee's ruling</b>	6♥= by East, EW +1430

**The Director:** Having consulted with the directing staff, believed that Pass instead of 7♦ by South was a logical alternative following the hesitation at (2).

**The appellants:** Made no written submissions.

**The respondents:** Made no written submissions.

**The appeals committee:** By a vote of 4 to 1, concurred with the Director's judgement that Pass was a logical alternative, and thus upheld the adjusted score.

<b>Appeal #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Event</b>
2007-08	Unauthorised information	Gold Coast Congress Swiss Pairs (Open)
<b>Stage</b>	<b>Round</b>	<b>Date</b>
-	7	2007-02-24
<b>Committee</b>	T.C., R.G., and one other	

**Board** 3  
**Dealer** S  
**Vul** EW  
**Scoring** Imps converted to VPs, Butler pairs

**North**

♠ KT7652

♥

♦ AJT7

♣ 982

**West**

♠ J98

♥ AKQ94

♦ 9

♣ AK64

**East**

♠ AQ3

♥ JT653

♦ 3

♣ JT53

**South**

♠ 4

♥ 872

♦ KQ86542

♣ Q7

West	North	East	South
-	-	-	3♦
X	6♦	X (1)	Pass
6♥	All pass		

(1) Agreed hesitation (up to 1 min)

<b>Table result</b>	6♥= by West, EW +1430
<b>Director's ruling</b>	6♦x-2 by South, NS -300
<b>Committee's ruling</b>	6♥= by West, EW +1430

**The Director:** Found that there was an agreed hesitation before the double at (1) of considerable length (up to one minute). Consulted other directors and senior players, and decided that West had logical alternatives to bidding 6♥, including Pass. Assigned an adjusted score of 6♦x-2 by South, NS -300.

**The appellants:** Played takeout doubles throughout, not penalty, and suggests bidding. Pass would be “nothing to say”.

**The respondents:** Made no written submissions.

**The appeals committee:** Was of the opinion that the hesitation did not suggest bidding over passing – if anything, the hesitation suggested passing over bidding. Restored the table result.



Appeal #	Issue	Event
2007-09	Misinformation	Australian Playoffs (Women's)
Stage	Round	Date
RR2	2	2007-03
Committee	D. Stern (c), I. Del'Monte, A. Wilsmore	

**Board** 4  
**Dealer** W  
**Vul** All  
**Screens** NE/SW  
**Scoring** Imps converted to VPs, Butler pairs

**North**

♠ KJT8  
 ♥ 76  
 ♦ AJ6  
 ♣ AJ92

**West**

♠ 9632  
 ♥ J5  
 ♦ QT9743  
 ♣ 5

**East**

♠  
 ♥ AKQ842  
 ♦ K82  
 ♣ KT64

**South**

♠ AQ754  
 ♥ T93  
 ♦ 5  
 ♣ Q873

**Contract:** 4♥x by East  
**Lead:** ♦5

West	North	East	South
-	1NT	2♥ (1)	Pass
2♠	Pass	4♥	X
All pass			

(1) East to North: Natural; West to South: hearts and spades with longer hearts

<b>Table result</b>	4♥x+1 by East, EW +990
<b>Director's ruling</b>	4♥+1 by East, EW +650
<b>Committee's ruling</b>	NS: 3♠= by South, NS+ 140 EW: 4♠x-1 by South, EW +200 3 IMP penalty to EW for misinformation

**The Director:** Different explanations of the 2♥ call were given by East and West, with East's explanation the systemically correct one. South led the ♦5, which North won with the ace. At this point, North switched to a heart, and the contract made 11 tricks. A diamond return would have defeated the contract.

North has no misinformation. The directing staff believed that North-South are in the most favourable contract for their side and should have taken advantage of this. South said that given the correct explanation of 2♥ he would not have doubled 4♥. Adjusted the score to 4♥ undoubled by East making 11 tricks, EW +650.

**The appellants:** Because of the misinformation, South did not bid 2♠. North would then invite with 3♠, and this would lead to North-South playing in 4♠. This may well make, depending on the defence; 10 tricks were made in spades [*Ed: in 3♠*] at the other table.

**The respondents:** Agreed that South was misinformed; 2♥ is natural by agreement. However, there are numerous leads to beat 4♥, including the diamond lead that was found, and the contract would have been easily defeated if North returned a diamond at trick 2.

After the director was called, North-South said they would not have doubled 4♥. There was no mention of bidding 4♠ as an alternative contract. The defence to beat 4♠ is easy to find.

**The appeals committee:** Believed that with the correct explanation, South would bid 2♠ (natural, non-forcing), and could play 3♠ or 4♠.

I.D. enquired as to the speed of play at trick 1, when North won the ace of diamonds.

North believed the double showed trumps or values. West asserted that South should have known there was a problem since they held five spades, dummy had four, and their partner had opened 1NT. East did not realise there had been a problem until the discussion after the hand.

I.D. raised the issue of North's actions being guided by her belief of the type of hand their partner had for their actions.

Although 4♠-1 was possible, the misinformation created an impossible situation for North-South. Thus, the committee adjusted the score to NS +140 for North-South, being the likely table result. For East-West, the committee adjusted to 4♠x-1, EW +200, a likely table result, and applied a 3-imp penalty for misinformation.

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2007-10	Unauthorised information	Barrier Reef Congress Swiss Teams
Stage	Round	Date
-	4	2007-06
Committee	A. Braithwaite, and two others	

**Board** 27  
**Dealer** S  
**Vul** Nil  
**Scoring** Imps converted to VPs, teams

**North**

♠ 3  
 ♥ AKT3  
 ♦ K954  
 ♣ QJ54

**West**

♠ 982  
 ♥ 87  
 ♦ AQJ82  
 ♣ T93

**East**

♠ AQ654  
 ♥ J654  
 ♦ T76  
 ♣ K

**South**

♠ KJT7  
 ♥ Q92  
 ♦ 3  
 ♣ A8762

**Contract:** 2♠x by East

**Lead:** ♦3

West	North	East	South
-	-	-	Pass
Pass	1♦ (1)	1♠	Pass (2)
2♠	X	All pass	

(1) Precision 1♦: artificial 11-15, 1+ diamonds

(2) Disputed break in tempo

<b>Table result</b>	2♠x-3 by East, EW -500
<b>Director's ruling</b>	3♣+1 by North, NS +130
<b>Committee's ruling</b>	3♣+1 by North, NS +130

**The Director:** Was called at the end of play by West. West maintained that over 1♠, South had thought for a noticeable period of time before passing. This was disputed by South (and North).

North argued that his double was automatic given his shape. When questioned, South said that even if North had passed, she herself would double with the South hand (however, North said he believed any double by South would still be takeout).

The directing staff ruled on the balance of probabilities (Law 85) that a break in tempo had occurred, and thus North was in possession of unauthorised information. Furthermore, Pass (rather than Double) was the non-suggested logical alternative action for North. Score adjusted to NS +130, commensurate with a contract of 3♣ making 10 tricks.

Relevant laws: 16A, 73C, 85.

**The appellants:** Claimed that there was no hesitation, as agreed by three people at the table. Also said that North's double was systemic – a mandatory reopening double.

**The respondents:** Made no written submissions.

**The appeals committee:** Felt that a hesitation probably did occur, and therefore North's choice to double was not clearcut (as it was a live auction). Director's ruling upheld.

<b>Appeal #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Event</b>
2007-11	Misinformation	ANC Women's Teams
<b>Stage</b>	<b>Round</b>	<b>Date</b>
RR2	4	2007-07
<b>Committee</b>	E. Ramshaw (c), B. Folkard, M. Abraham	

**Board** 21  
**Dealer** N  
**Vul** NS  
**Scoring** Imps, capped, teams

**North**

♠ 654  
 ♥ JT84  
 ♦ K3  
 ♣ 9732

**West**

♠ AKQT82  
 ♥ 6  
 ♦ AJ75  
 ♣ Q4

**East**

♠ 3  
 ♥ 97532  
 ♦ Q9642  
 ♣ 85

**South**

♠ J97  
 ♥ AKQ  
 ♦ T8  
 ♣ AKJT6

West	North	East	South
-	Pass	Pass	1NT
X	2♥ (1)	Pass	2♠
Pass	Pass	3♦	Pass
4♠	Pass	5♦	All pass

(1) Described as a transfer to spades; South then withdrew the explanation in favour of "not sure" while bidding 2♠

<b>Table result</b>	5♦-2 by East, EW -100
<b>Director's ruling</b>	4♠-1 by West, EW -50
<b>Committee's ruling</b>	4♠-1 by West, EW -50

**The Director:** When called to the table, informed East that if she had been given misinformation and the auction was passed out, the correct explanation would be given and East would be allowed to retract the final pass in favour of an alternate call. In any case, if the misinformation had damaged East-West earlier in the auction, the result would be reviewed. East chose to call, eventually reaching 5♦-2.

Determined that the misinformation had damaged East-West in the later part of the auction, and adjusted the score to 4♠-1, EW -50.

**The appellants:** East needed to know whether or not 2♥ was a transfer – she would certainly pass if it showed spades, and would be inclined to bid otherwise (since partner had doubled the strong 1NT opening for penalties).

The director's offer of a pass with a correction if the bid was not a transfer was not appropriate, as East only wanted to bid if 2♥ was a transfer. In fact, it showed both majors. On the proper information, South would have played in 3♠, going down four for NS -400.

**The respondents:** Made no written submissions.

**The appeals committee:** Felt that the East-West actions were doubtful, but the auction was not forcing. Decided that East's 3♦ bid broke the nexus between the misinformation infraction and the potential damage. Director's decision upheld.

<b>Appeal #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Event</b>
2007-12	Unauthorised information	ANC Butler Pairs (Open)
<b>Stage</b>	<b>Round</b>	<b>Date</b>
II	7	2007-07
<b>Committee</b>	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

<b>Table result</b>	6♦= by West, EW +1370
<b>Director's ruling</b>	5♦+1 by West, EW +620
<b>Committee's ruling</b>	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.



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

<b>Table result</b>	6♠-4 by South, NS -400
<b>Director's ruling</b>	NS +3 IMPs, EW -3 IMPs
<b>Committee's ruling</b>	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.]*

<b>Appeal #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Event</b>
2007-14	Unauthorised information	Australian Swiss Pairs
<b>Stage</b>	<b>Round</b>	<b>Date</b>
-	7	2007-10-07
<b>Committee</b>	E. Ramshaw (c), C. Snashall, J. Bailey	

**Board** 9  
**Dealer** N  
**Vul** EW  
**Scoring** Imps converted to VPs, Butler pairs

**North**

♠ AK52  
 ♥ J98643  
 ♦ 2  
 ♣ 96

**West**

♠ J8  
 ♥ AKQ  
 ♦ A64  
 ♣ AT532

**East**

♠ T4  
 ♥ 75  
 ♦ KQT983  
 ♣ KJ4

**South**

♠ Q9763  
 ♥ T2  
 ♦ J75  
 ♣ Q87

**Contract:** 5♦ by East

**Lead:** ♥T

West	North	East	South
-	2♥	Pass (1)	Pass
X	Pass	3♦ (2)	Pass
3♥	Pass	4♦ (2)	Pass
5♦	All pass		

- (1) According to appellants, East examined the opponents' system card
- (2) Allegedly made in a confident manner

<b>Table result</b>	5♦= by East, EW +600
<b>Director's ruling</b>	5♦= by East, EW +600
<b>Committee's ruling</b>	5♦= by East, EW +600

**The Director:** Made no written submissions. Ruled that the table result stood.

**The appellants:** Thought that the auction was highly suspicious. East had not promised values at any point, yet West nevertheless forced to game opposite potentially  $\spadesuit$ Qxxxx and out. Suggested that East's examination of the system card before passing  $2\heartsuit$  or the confidence with which the  $3\spadesuit$  and  $4\spadesuit$  bids were made might have provided UI to West.

**The respondents:** Made no written submissions.

**The appeals committee:** Heard that the Director had investigated, and South had said that he did not believe there was a break in tempo. Found that EW did not play Lebensohl, and that they had no alternative actions available to them. Decided that there was no obvious transmission of UI, and so upheld the Director's ruling.