

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2008-01	Contested claim	Australian Butler Pairs Championship (Open)
Stage	Round	Date
I	5	2008-07-26
Committee	B. Neill (c), E.H.R., N.F., D.H.	

Board 16
Dealer W
Vul EW
Scoring Butlerimps converted to VPs

North

♠ 732
 ♥ AK753
 ♦ AJ
 ♣ KJ3

West

♠ K65
 ♥ QT94
 ♦ 976
 ♣ A82

East

♠ T94
 ♥ J8
 ♦ Q532
 ♣ QT94

South

♠ AQJ8
 ♥ 62
 ♦ KT84
 ♣ 765

West	North	East	South
Not given – Contract 1NT N			

Trick	West	North	East	South
1	<u>A</u>	x	♣4	x
2	♣8	J	<u>Q</u>	x
3	x	<u>K</u>	♣T	x
4	x	♠x	x	<u>Q</u>
5	X	J	<u>Q</u>	♦x
6	♦x	?	♣9	♥x
North claimed the remainder				

Table result	-
Director's ruling	1NT-1 by N, NS -50
Committee's ruling	1NT-1 by N, NS -50

The position at the point of the claim was:

		North		
		♠ 73		
		♥ AK753		
		♦ A		
		♣ ?		
West				East
♠ K6				♠ T9
♥ QT94	♦ x		♣ 9	♥ J8
♦ 9				♦ 532
♣		♥ x		♣
		South		
		♠ AQ8		
		♥ 6		
		♦ KT8		
		♣		

North to play to trick 6
North-South: 2 tricks; East-West: 3 tricks

The Director: Before playing from his hand at trick 6, North claimed the rest (apart from trick 6) stating the following line: A, K of hearts (pitching S8), unblock the DA, spade to the table. West asked for the hand to be played out, and the Director was called to the table at this point.

North was asked to repeat his statement. When he reached the last part of the above statement, he said that he had not said anything about the spade finesse, and therefore must play the Ace – only eight tricks.

Either North thought the spades were good, or his intention (implied by his claim of the rest of the tricks) was to finesse again in order to make the remaining tricks. In accordance with Law 70A, “any doubtful point as to a claim shall be resolved against the claimer”. The result was therefore adjudicated to be 6 tricks, NS -50.

The appellants: Agreed with the Director’s statement of facts, but not the implication that up to the point where the implication was taken that North intended to take the finesse. North said that his brain had told him the spades were good, and that he was claiming 9 tricks. When West objected, he realised he was now barred from taking the spade finesse and was therefore entitled to only 8 tricks; that is, his incorrect claim prevented him from taking the losing spade finesse.

The respondents: Suggested that if declarer had “missed” the spade king and had thought the spades were high, he would be just as likely to play the jack first as the ace.

The appeals committee: Decided that, in accordance with Law 70A, any doubt as to the order in which declarer would have cashed his “winners” must be resolved in favour of the defence. The director’s ruling was thus upheld, NS -50. The Committee noted the good spirit of all involved.

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2008-02	Unauthorised information	Australian Butler Pairs Championship
Stage	Round	Date
II	11	
Committee	E. Ramshaw (c), J. Ebery, P. Lavings, A.B.	

Board 24
Dealer W
Vul Nil
Scoring

North

♠ AQ53
♥ T732
♦ 953
♣ Q3

West

♠ KJT74
♥ 64
♦ K86
♣ KJ5

East

♠ 982
♥ QJ
♦ AQT742
♣ 42

South

♠ 6
♥ AK983
♦ J
♣ AT9876

West	North	East	South
1S	Pass	2S	3S
Pass	3NT (1)	Pass	4C
Pass	4H	All pass	

(1) Agreed break in tempo

Table result	4H+1 by North, NS +450
Director's ruling	4H+1 by North, NS +450
Committee's ruling	4H+1 by North, NS +450

The Director: Was called at the end of play, with an agreed break in tempo before the 3NT call. The directing staff believed that South's subsequent action in pulling to 4C was one that would be taken by at least 75% of South's peers. Pass was therefore deemed not to be a logical alternative, and the score was allowed to stand, NS +450.

The appellants: Asserted that South's hand, despite holding an extra club, was not sufficiently unusual to pull 3NT. The break in tempo could have suggested that North did not understand the intended meaning of the 3S call (as appeared to be the case).

The South hand had good cards and should not be ashamed to play 3NT. The appellants thought that a significant number of "experts" would pass without the infraction.

[Ed: The break in tempo was not in itself an infraction. The potential infraction arises if South chose an action from among logical alternatives (e.g. bidding 4C or Pass) which was suggested by the unauthorised information.]

The respondents: Could construct North hands where 3NT would be the only making spot, but suggested that these were rare. Most hands would also make 5C (assuming heart shortage and club fit). South's action looked normal with 6-5 shape, given the likely diamond problem.

The appeals committee: Agreed with the directing staff's assertion that 75% of players would bid 4C. As a result, Pass was not a logical alternative, and the Director's ruling was upheld, NS +450.

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2008-03	Unauthorised information	ANC Open Swiss Pairs
Stage	Round	Date
-	10	2013-08-01
Committee	G. Slack-Smith, J. Mottram, M. Wilkinson	

Board 26
Dealer E
Vul All
Scoring Imps converted to VPs, Butler pairs

North

♠ Q985
 ♥ 53
 ♦ AK
 ♣ KJ972

West

♠ AK2
 ♥ AT764
 ♦ Q2
 ♣ 853

East

♠ JT643
 ♥ 82
 ♦ J9875
 ♣ 4

South

♠ 7
 ♥ KQJ9
 ♦ T643
 ♣ AQT6

West	North	East	South
-	-	Pass	Pass
1NT	Pass (1)	2H (2)	X
2S	Pass	Pass (3)	X (4)
Pass	Pass	3D	X (5)
3S	X	All pass	

- (1) Agreed hesitation
- (2) Transfer to spades
- (3) Disputed hesitation
- (4) Takeout
- (5) Penalty

Table result	3Sx-2 by West, NS +500
Director's ruling	3Sx-2 by West, NS +500
Committee's ruling	60% of 3Sx-2 by West, NS +500 40% of 2S-1 by West, NS +100

The Director: Found that the takeout double of 2S was a clear-cut action given that opponents had shown fit* and no game interest. North's values were revealed by the auction.

The Director consulted five experienced players, of whom three voted for "no infraction".

The Director ruled that the score should stand, NS +500, and suggested that East-West consider an appeal.

[Ed: On the appeal form, the word "fit" is crossed out and an annotation, unendorsed and in a different hand, has been made reading "no fit".]*

The appellants: Believed pass was a logical alternative, and queried why South would choose to come in at the 3-level if the hand was not strong enough to open at the 1-level.

The respondents: Regarded all the bids as "normal", and explained that South had not opened due to the rebid problem if partner responded 1S. The respondents claimed that they would always open with shortage in the opponents' suit with a double, even on lesser values.

The appeals committee: Decided that unauthorised information had been received, and that there was some uncertainty about whether South would have doubled 2S without the unauthorised information. The committee adjusted the score to 60% of 3Sx-2 by West, NS +500 and 40% of 2S-1 by West, NS +100.

[Ed: First, having established that there was unauthorised information, the committee had to decide whether doubling 2S rather than passing was an infraction (i.e. whether Pass was a logical alternative demonstrably suggested by the unauthorised information). The Laws do not permit a weighted score based on the likelihood that there was an infraction — if passing 2S was an infraction, no auction including the pass may form part of the adjusted score.]

Second, the Committee calculated 60% of NS +500 and 40% of NS +100 and adjusted the score to NS +340, with a final result of NS -6 imps against the datum of NS +600. While this gave the correct result, the proper approach is to weight the imp results as follows:

*60% of NS + 500 = 60% of NS -3 imps = NS -1.8 imps,
40% of NS +100 = 40% of NS -11 imps = NS -4.4 imps,
Total = NS -6.2 imps, rounded to -6 imps.]*