

# 2015 Summer NABC

## Appeals Casebook



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N1
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----


<b>Event</b>	von Zedtwitz LM Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Date</b>	08/07/2015	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifying

### Auction

West	North	East	South
		1♦	1♠
3NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention


### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>10</b>	N	Jerry Jackson		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠	K5		
		♥	QJ1076		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>	♦	J5		
		♣	10853		
<b>W</b>	Mickie Chambers			<b>E</b>	Jim Bachelder
♠	Q32			♠	76
♥	95			♥	K8
♦	K84			♦	AQ10632
♣	AKJ74			♣	Q96
		S	Wayne Snider		
		♠	AJ10984		
		♥	A432		
		♦	97		
		♣	2		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
3NT by W	Down 3	N/S +300	♠ K

### Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was summoned after the lead to Trick 2. After the ♠K was led, South fumbled, moving cards around within his hand and finally playing the ♠J. East and West stated that the break in tempo (BIT) took approximately one minute. After the ♠K held, North switched to the ♥Q, resulting in down 3.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Three Flight A players were given this problem. All three stated that while the ♥Q was a possibility, they would have continued spades.

### Director Ruling

Law 16B1 indicates that if a spade continuation is a logical alternative (LA), and the BIT demonstrably suggests another action, the Director must enforce the spade continuation. Per Law 12C1 the result was changed for both sides to 3NT by West, Making 4, E/W +630.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3NT by W, Made 4, E/W +630</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Appeal

North/South appealed, and both attended the hearing. South explained that he was considering whether to overtake the ♠K and knock out the Q versus ducking and giving suit preference. Finally, he decided that his goal was to cash their three tricks. While he was thinking, he pulled out one card and another. He does this often. South said any high

spade would encourage, but that the ♠J was suit preference. He had assumed that the ♠K was singleton, so attitude was not relevant. North/South use standard signals.

## Committee Findings

A spade continuation would be right when South held something like ♠QJTxx. The play of the ♠J, authorized information to North, showed both that South did not hold QJTxx and that South could have afforded to overtake if he judged that it was right to set up the spades.

The AC found that the UI from the slow play to trick one did not demonstrably suggest one action over another. Accordingly it found no reason to adjust the score. The TD ruling was incomplete in that it did not address this point. Had useful UI been present, the AC noted that it could not imagine anyone's not playing the ♥Q after seeing the ♠J, so the AC would not have deemed a spade continuation a LA in any case. The AC restored the table result for both sides, 3N by West, down 3, N/S +300.

The AC encouraged South to refrain from pulling out one card then another while thinking.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>3NT by W, Down 3, N/S +300</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chair</b>	Jeff Goldsmith
<b>Member</b>	Scott Stearns
<b>Member</b>	John Lusky
<b>Member</b>	Abby Heitner
<b>Member</b>	Ray Miller

### Note from the National Appeals Chairman

Had the AC found that the UI did suggest a heart over a spade it would have proceeded to determine whether a spade continuation was a logical alternative. Unfortunately it would have needed to discount the TD's poll results because, contrary to the latest revision to the ACBL Handbook on Appeal Committees, the poll had not been conducted in writing. Accordingly the AC could not be confident as to who was polled or exactly what questions they'd been asked. Fortunately the AC ruling did not require relying on this aspect of the case.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b> Break In Tempo	<b>Case:</b> N2
--	-----------------

<b>Event</b> von Zedtwitz LM Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b> Matt Koltnow
<b>Date</b> 08/07/2015	<b>Session</b> First Qualifying


### Auction

West	North	East	South
		1♦	1♠
2♣	Pass	2♦	2♥
2♠	3♥	3NT	Pass
Pass	4♥	Dbl <sup>1</sup>	Pass
4NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Agreed Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b> 10	N	Li-Chung Chen	
<b>Dealer</b> E	♠ K5	♥ QJ1076	
<b>Vul</b> Both	♦ J5	♣ 10853	
W	Marin Marinov		E
♠ Q32			♠ 76
♥ 95			♥ K8
♦ K84			♦ AQ10632
♣ AKJ74			♣ Q96
	S	Ari Greenberg	
	♠ AJ10984		
	♥ A432		
	♦ 97		
	♣ 2		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
4NT by E	Made 6	E/W +690	♥ 2

### Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was summoned at the end of the hand. The break in tempo (BIT) before East's double was agreed to by both sides; East/West said it was 30-40 second, North/South said it was 1-2 minutes.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Three players were polled and all three were reluctant to take any action after partner's double. Accordingly, pass was determined to be a logical alternative (LA) to bidding 4NT.

### Director Ruling

Under Law 16, the unauthorized information (UI) from the BIT suggested that another action was more likely to be successful. Based upon the poll results, per Law 12C1, the result was adjusted to 4♥X by South, Making 4, N/S +790

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>4♥X by S, Made 4, N/S +790</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Appeal

East/West appealed and all four players attended the hearing. With his ♦K filling in his partner's suit, and a potential source of tricks in his own suit, West thought that 4NT would have a good chance of making. With almost no strength in the majors, the penalty against 4♥X was unlikely to be sufficient to compensate for the vulnerable game so passing the double rated to be accepting an inferior score.

North/South argued that passing the double could easily be the winning action, either by going plus instead of minus or by getting a penalty worth more than the value of the game.

### Committee Findings

East took at least 30-40 seconds before doubling 4♥, which clearly suggested doubt about defending. The Appeals Committee (AC) determined that pass was a LA to the suggested bid of 4NT, since it could easily work out better to defend. West should have recognized at the table that he was constrained by his partner's tempo and should have passed. East/West certainly should not have appealed the Director's ruling.

The AC upheld the Director's ruling for both sides of 4♥X by South, making 4, N/S +790. Additionally, East/West were assigned an appeal without merit warning.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>4♥X by S, Made 4, N/S +790</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

### Committee Members

<b>Chair</b>	Douglas Doub
<b>Member</b>	Ed Lazarus
<b>Member</b>	Eugene Kales
<b>Member</b>	James Thurtell
<b>Member</b>	Fred King



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N3
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	von Zedtwitz LM Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Date</b>	08/08/2015	<b>Session</b>	First Semi-Final


### Auction

West	North	East	South
			1NT <sup>1</sup>
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-17 HCP

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>N</b>	Chris Willenken		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>S</b>	♠	J106		
		♥	9852		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>	♦	10862		
		♣	QJ		
<b>W</b>	Nikolay Demirev			<b>E</b>	Bob Drijver
♠	K987			♠	Q2
♥	J			♥	AQ63
♦	KQ953			♦	J4
♣	962			♣	K10843
		<b>S</b>	Allison Wilson		
		♠	A543		
		♥	K1074		
		♦	A7		
		♣	A75		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
1NT by S	Down 3	E/W +150	♦ K

### Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was summoned at the end of the hand due to a one-minute hesitation at Trick 3 by East. The play proceeded as follows:

- Trick 1: ♦K-♦2-♦4-♦7
- Trick 2: ♦5-♦6-♦J-♦A
- Trick 3: ♣5-♣2-♣J-♣3\* (BIT)
- Trick 4: ♥9-♥3-♥4-♥J
- Trick 5: ♣6-♣Q-♣K-♣A

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Based upon an expert opinion, unless South could be ruled out of holding both the ♣AK, then the play of a spade at Trick 5 was a logical alternative (LA).

### Director Ruling

The break-in-tempo (BIT) effectively showed East to have the ♣K, making a club shift at Trick 5 much more tempting. Per Law 16B1 and Law 12C1, the result for both sides was adjusted to 1NT by South, Down 1, E/W +50.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	1NT by S, Down 1, E/W +50
--------------------------	---------------------------

## The Appeal

East-West appealed the ruling, with West appearing at the hearing. West stated that East's ♣3 was actually suit preference for hearts. Therefore he decided to defend passively at Trick 5, so as not to give up a trick in spades or diamonds, not necessarily to establish club tricks.

### Committee Findings

The Appeals Committee (AC) judged that East's extended hesitation demonstrably suggested the ability to win the trick. East might have been considering which suit preference signal to give, but not for all of a one minute BIT. Therefore, South could not have a hand like Qxx-KTxx- Ax-AKxx, where it would be necessary to switch to spades or diamonds to set up 7 tricks before Declarer could. After either such switch, Declarer could establish an extra trick in the suit led and eventually score the ♥K for down one.

Since not playing a club was a LA that was made less attractive by East's BIT; and since it could not conclude that the table ruling was incorrect, the AC affirmed the adjusted result of 1NT, down 1, for both sides. Because West's analysis was reasonable and the decision was not clear cut, the appeal was held to have merit.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>1NT by S, Down 1, E/W +50</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

### Committee Members

<b>Chair</b>	Ron Gerard
<b>Member</b>	Ray Miller
<b>Member</b>	Eugene Kales
<b>Member</b>	Patty Tucker
<b>Member</b>	Ed Lazarus

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b> Break In Tempo	<b>Case:</b> N4
--	-----------------

<b>Event</b> von Zedtwitz LM Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b> Matt Koltnow
<b>Date</b> 08/09/2015	<b>Session</b> Second Final


### Auction

West	North	East	South
	1NT <sup>1</sup>	Pass	2♣
Pass	2♦	3♣	3♦
Pass	3♥	Pass	3♠
Pass	3NT <sup>2</sup>	Pass	4♦
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-17 HCP
2: Alleged Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>13</b>	N	Jill Meyers
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ A63	
		♥ KJ9	
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>	♦ QJ876	
		♣ K7	
W	Peter Fredin		
♠	104		
♥	A10843		
♦	92		
♣	8643		
		S	Ed Davis
		♠	K852
		♥	Q72
		♦	K10543
		♣	2

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
4♦ by S	Down 1	E/W +100	♦ A

### Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was summoned at the end of the auction when the dummy was tabled. East/West stated that the auction in general was slow, but that the 3NT bid by North was particularly slow. East/West maintained that South's 4♦ bid was made more attractive by the tempo of the 3NT call and that Pass was a logical alternative.

### Director Ruling

The Director ruled that the tempo of the 3NT bid suggested doubt about the contract and that pass was a logical alternative (LA). Per Laws 12C1 and 16B1, the result was adjusted for both sides to 3NT by North, down 3, E/W +300.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3NT by N, Down 3, E/W +300</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Appeal

North/South appealed the ruling and appeared at the hearing. N/S stated that the entire auction was a little slow after the 1NT opening, not just the 3NT bid. It was apparent from the auction that North did not have two club stoppers because she kept searching for a place to play rather than bidding 3NT immediately over South's 3♦ bid. Since South held a singleton club and his diamonds were not topped by the AK, he felt No Trump would not be a success.

### Committee Findings

The Appeals Committee (AC) judged there was definitely unauthorized information (UI) from the slow rebid of 3NT. The UI demonstrably suggested that 3NT was a doubtful final contract and a different final contract would be better.



The AC reasoned, however, that the auction itself had already revealed that 3NT was a doubtful final contract and that some other final contract would be better. Therefore, the AC did not believe that pass was a LA based on the auction and restored the table result of 4♦ by North, down one, E/W +100.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>4♦ by S, Down 1, E/W +100</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

### Committee Members

<b>Chair</b>	Richard Popper
<b>Member</b>	Eugene Kales
<b>Member</b>	Fred King
<b>Member</b>	James Thurtell
<b>Member</b>	Scott Stearns

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Disputed Claim	<b>Case:</b>	N5
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Spingold Knockout Teams	<b>Event DIC</b>	Matt Smith
<b>Date</b>	08/09/2015	<b>Session</b>	Day One, First Session


### Auction

West	North	East	South
			1NT <sup>1</sup>
Pass	2NT <sup>2</sup>	Pass	3♦ <sup>3</sup>
Pass	3♠ <sup>4</sup>	Pass	4♥ <sup>5</sup>
Pass	5♦	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15 -17 HCP
2: Transfer to ♦
3: 3+ ♦
4: Control cuebid
5: ♥ Control, denied ♣

### Hand Record

Board	19	N	Andy Kaufman		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>S</b>	♠	AQ7		
		♥	9		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>E/W</b>	♦	KJ10643		
		♣	J85		
<b>W</b>	Peter Gill			<b>E</b>	Sartaj Hans
♠	984			♠	K1062
♥	J107			♥	8654
♦	7			♦	952
♣	AQ10432			♣	K6
		<b>S</b>	Michael Cassel		
		♠	J53		
		♥	AKQ32		
		♦	AQ8		
		♣	97		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♦ by S			♣ A

### Facts Determined at the Table

South claimed following the ♣A lead before East had played to the trick, and the Director was summoned. His initial claim statement was that he would pitch two spades on the hearts. When the cards were tabled, he added that he would ruff a heart. The Director left the table to confer with colleagues about the ruling. When they returned, South changed his statement to pitching two spades on hearts and then trumping a club before playing trumps.

### Director Ruling

Under the guidelines established by the ACBL Laws Commission in 1998 with regard to Law 70B3, "When a claim occurs, both opponents have the right to inspect the [claimant]'s cards and confer before they acquiesce. If the non-claiming side can show a line of play, consistent with the claim statement but not irrational, that produces more tricks for their side, the director should award them those tricks. The director should not raise objections on behalf of the players involved."

South's changes to his claim statement showed that there were doubtful aspects to the claim. Per Law 70A, "any doubtful point as to a claim shall be resolved against the claimer." South had not taken into account with his statement how he would play if the defense switched to a spade following the opening club lead. While there was a line of play consistent with the claim statement that would allow him to still come to eleven tricks, there were others that would only allow ten tricks. Based upon this doubt, the director assigned the result of 5♦ by South, down 1, E/W +50.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	5♦ by S, Down 1, E/W +50
--------------------------	--------------------------

## The Appeal

North/South appealed the ruling and all four players attended the hearing. The screening director seemed to favor the appellants' case. They did not explain why they had not changed the ruling, given that they had the power to do so.

South was the only one to speak for the appellants. He noted that play had been going slowly and they had received a warning. East went into a huddle after the opening lead. South presumed he held ♣Kx and was deciding whether to unblock. South became impatient so finally claimed before East had played to the first trick.

East/West countered with the argument that after a spade switch at trick two, declarer would have two more club losers if he pitched spades on hearts per his claim statement and he had not specified how he would deal with them. Were he to draw trump and pitch his spade losers, he would go down.

Declarer and the defenders had engaged in several rounds of questions and answers before the director was called. The two sides did not agree as to some aspects of declarer's claim statement and the subsequent discussion.

## Committee Findings

Law 70D and its explanatory footnote reads, "The director shall not accept from claimer any successful line of play not embraced in the original clarification statement if there is an alternative normal line of play that would be less successful. For the purposes of Laws 70 and 71, 'normal' includes play that would be careless or inferior for the class of player involved." Several lines of play were available to declarer.

After a club continuation at trick two:

Declarer could ruff a club high and throw spades on the hearts per his claim statement. He would be successful on the lie of the cards no matter in which order he did things.

After a spade switch at trick two:

Declarer could win the spade ace, draw trump, pitch two clubs on the hearts, and give up a spade. While this looks like the best line the committee rejected it as inconsistent with declarer's claim statement.

Declarer could duck the spade in dummy and go down on the lie of the cards. The committee also rejected this line as inconsistent with declarer's claim statement.

Declarer could win the spade ace, pitch spades on hearts per his claim statement and then either ruff a heart to set up his 11th winner or duck a club, planning to ruff the third club in his hand. Either would be successful.

Declarer could win the spade ace, draw three rounds of trump, pitch two spades on the hearts, and lose more two club tricks to go down one.

The committee judged that drawing trump and leaving Declarer with two more club losers would not be a normal line of play per Law 70 and so changed the result for both sides to 5♦ by South, making 5, N/S +400.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>5♦ by S, Made 5, N/S +400</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chair</b>	Aaron Silverstein
<b>Member</b>	Curtis Cheek
<b>Member</b>	Mitch Dunitz

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N6
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Truscott Senior Swiss Teams	<b>Event DIC</b>	Tom Marsh
<b>Date</b>	08/11/2015	<b>Session</b>	Second Final


### Auction

West	North	East	South
1NT <sup>1</sup>	Pass	Pass	2♦ <sup>2</sup>
Pass	Pass	Dbi <sup>3</sup>	2♥
Dbi <sup>3</sup>	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 12 -14 HCP
2: Intended as Transfer
3: Penalty

### Hand Record

Board	28	N	Craig Jacobson		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠	Q1098		
		♥	Q9		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>	♦	10862		
		♣	K108		
<b>W</b>	Michael Efraim			<b>E</b>	Hirsh Schnayer
♠	KJ4			♠	A53
♥	A765			♥	43
♦	74			♦	KJ95
♣	AJ52			♣	Q974
		<b>S</b>	Alexander Weiland		
		♠	762		
		♥	KJ1082		
		♦	AQ3		
		♣	63		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
2♥X by S	Made 4	N/S +1070	♠ 4

### Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was summoned at the end of the hand. South's 2♦ bid was intended as a transfer to hearts, but the actual North/South agreement is that in the balancing seat it is natural. East asked about the 2♦ bid prior to doubling. South did not ask the meaning of the double.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Four expert players were polled by being given the South hand without the MI and all four passed after the double by East.

### Director Ruling

East/West received the correct explanation so there was no misinformation (MI). However, South had unauthorized information (UI) when partner failed to alert 2♦. Per Laws 12C1 and 16B1, the Director adjusted the result to 2♦X by South, down 1, E/W +200

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	2♦X by S, Down 1, E/W +200
--------------------------	----------------------------

### The Appeal

North/South appealed the ruling and all four players attended the hearing. South assumed that the double of 2♦ was for penalty without asking. He felt that on that basis there was authorized information that his partner had not interpreted 2♦ as a transfer, since he would have at most four diamonds and not the 6-card suit necessary to fail to accept

the transfer. North said that he passed the double of 2♥ because he was not sure that South had diamonds and hearts and was allowing for a misunderstanding. North/South also questioned whether East/West's defense to 2♥X, allowing two overtricks instead of holding it to two, would affect the result in 2♦X if that were the assigned contract.

### Committee Findings

The Appeals Committee (AC) determined that both the failure to alert and the explanation of "natural" were UI to South. The AC did not agree that North needed 6 diamonds to pass 2♦ if transfers were in effect, especially since 5-card length was apparently acceptable for the real suit. There were holdings such as 3-0-5-5, 4-0-5-4 and perhaps even 4-1-5-3 where North might pass 2♦ rather than bid 2♥. Furthermore, it was entirely possible that East's double was negative, in which case North could have 6 diamonds and would deliberately pass the transfer. By failing to ascertain what East's double meant or what the minimum trump holding would be for a penalty double, South clearly acted on the basis of UI in removing to 2♥. Therefore, the table ruling was affirmed, 2♦X by South, down 1, N/S -200.

The AC judged that the number of tricks taken against 2♥X was not relevant in assigning a score in 2♦X. No favorable result was available for East/West in 2♥X (therefore, the concept of "egregious error" by the non-offending side did not apply) and under Law 12.C the normal result of down one in 2♦X met the standards for both the offending side and the non-offending side. The AC determined that North/South presented no evidence as to why the Director's ruling should be overturned and issued an Appeal without Merit Warning.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>2♦X by S, Down 1, E/W +200</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

### Committee Members

<b>Chair</b>	Ron Gerard
<b>Member</b>	Greg Herman
<b>Member</b>	Scott Stearns
<b>Member</b>	Patty Tucker
<b>Member</b>	Ed Lazarus

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N7
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Truscott Senior Swiss Teams	<b>Event DIC</b>	Tom Marsh
<b>Date</b>	08/11/2015	<b>Session</b>	Second Final


### Auction

West	North	East	South
			1♣
2NT <sup>1</sup>	Db1 <sup>2</sup>	3♦	Db1 <sup>3</sup>
Pass	3NT	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Hearts & diamonds
2: Willingness to defend one
3: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	27	N	Robert Cappelli		
<b>Dealer</b>	S	♠ A109			
		♥ Q10832			
<b>Vul</b>	None	♦ Q			
		♣ AK106			
W	Phillip Becker			E	Pierre Flatowicz
♠	Q2			♠	K7543
♥	K97654			♥	(void)
♦	K9843			♦	10752
♣	(void)			♣	9532
		S	Robert Katz		
		♠	J86		
		♥	AJ		
		♦	AJ6		
		♣	QJ874		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
3NT by N	Made 5	N/S +460	♦ 2

### Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was summoned after North bid 3NT. South's Double over 3♦ had been slow, approximately ten seconds. North/South had the partnership agreement that the Double showed three good diamonds and suggested defending.

### Director Ruling

As North held prime defensive cards and the partnership agreement suggested defending, the director ruled that Pass was a logical alternative to bidding 3NT. Per Laws 16B and 1C2, the Director adjusted the score to 3♦X by East, Down 2, N/S +300.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3♦X by E, Down 2, N/S +300</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Appeal

The North/South players appealed the director's ruling, and South and East attended the committee. N/S are a regular partnership. The double of 2NT showed a desire to penalize at least one of the red suits shown by West. N/S always open 1♦ with 3-3 in the minors and 1♣ with 4-5, unless the clubs are much better than diamonds. North knew the latter was not the case here based upon his own hand. The double of 3♦ showed three good diamond cards, which was the actual South holding, so any Unauthorized Information from the BIT was duplicated by the Authorized Information of the auction.

East believed that the tempo showed doubt, and that North should have passed.

## Committee Findings

It was stipulated that there was a BIT before the double of 3♦. However, it was not clear to the AC that the BIT actually gave North UI, or that the UI demonstrably suggested that bidding would be more successful than passing.

A poll of six players had two taking some action in order to explore for a club slam, with the other four players passing. South's hand matched the partnership agreement for the double, so the slowness does not suggest that bidding 3NT would be more successful than passing. If South does not have good diamonds, then 3NT would be unmakeable and the hesitation would suggest exploring a club contract. North did not pursue a club contract, so he did not use any UI to follow a suggested alternative.

Since the UI did not demonstrably suggest that bidding 3NT would be more successful than passing, and the authorized information from the auction was the same as the UI, the AC decided that there was no cause to overturn the table results. They therefore restored the result to 3NT by North, making 5, N/S +460.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>3NT by N, Made 5, N/S +460</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chair</b>	Richard Popper
<b>Member</b>	Eugene Kales
<b>Member</b>	Chris Moll
<b>Member</b>	Gail Greenberg
<b>Member</b>	Dick Budd

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b> Misinformation	<b>Case:</b> N8
--	-----------------

<b>Event</b> Wernher Open Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b> Candace Kushner
<b>Date</b> 08/12/2015	<b>Session</b> First Qualifying


### Auction

West	North	East	South
1NT <sup>1</sup>	2♦ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	2♠
Dbl	Pass	3♣	Pass
Pass	3♠	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 14-17 HCP
2: Initially explained as Majors

### Hand Record

Board	8	N	Ed Rauch	
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠ K974		
		♥ 96		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>	♦ A87543		
		♣ Q		
<b>W</b>	Alan Osofsky			<b>E</b> Phillip Alder
♠	A8			♠ Q52
♥	QJ1083			♥ A542
♦	Q102			♦ 9
♣	AJ9			♣ 107653
		<b>S</b> Peter Jargowsky		
		♠ J1063		
		♥ K7		
		♦ KJ6		
		♣ K842		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♠ by S	Down 2	E/W +100	♦ 9

### Facts Determined at the Table

Following the 3♣ call, South corrected the explanation of the 2♦ call from showing the majors to the correct partnership agreement of showing Diamonds and a Major. West summoned the Director following the corrected explanation, and stated that he wanted protection later as his Double had been based upon the misinformation. He then passed, which meant the Director could not roll back the auction to offer East the chance to change his bid based upon the corrected explanation (Law 21B1a). Following the conclusion of play, West contended that he would have bid 3♥ over 2♠, rather than Double, if he had received the correct explanation of the opponents' methods.

### Director Ruling

As West had elected to pass over 3♣ instead of bidding when they had the correct information about the opponents' methods, it was deemed unlikely that they would have bid 3♥ over 2♠ with the proper information. Therefore, the table result (3♠ by South, down 2, E/W +100) stood.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3♠ by S, Down 2, E/W +100</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling and attended the Committee hearing. West stated that he would have taken a different action at his second turn to call if he had not been misinformed as to the opponents' methods. West did not believe that he needed to bring hearts into the auction once he received the correct information, which is why he passed following 3♣.



## Committee Findings

West stated that he would have taken a different action if he had received proper information at his second turn to call. However, at his third turn to call, with proper information and little new information, he elected to not take the action he had claimed he wished to have taken at the earlier opportunity. West did not claim that bidding 3♥ at his third turn would have been inconsistent with his initial double as a rationale for passing, despite being given an opportunity to do so. East did not mention a desire to have changed his call when provided with the correct information.

Thus, while the indicated actions by E/W may have happened had the correct information been available from the start, their actual actions at the table were not consistent with that scenario. This suggests that the proposed actions were unlikely. Also, it was considered likely that N/S would have still reached 3♠ even with the heart overcall. Therefore, the table result was confirmed.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>3♠ by S, Down 2, E/W +100</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chair</b>	Chris Moll
<b>Member</b>	James Thurtell
<b>Member</b>	Greg Herman

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N9
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Freeman Mixed BAM Teams	<b>Event DIC</b>	Steve Bates
<b>Date</b>	08/13/2015	<b>Session</b>	Second Final


### Auction

West	North	East	South
1♣ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	1♥ <sup>2</sup>	Pass
1NT <sup>3</sup>	Pass	2♥ <sup>4</sup>	Pass
3♥	Pass	3♠	Pass
4♣	Pass	4♠	Pass
4NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Strong, 15+ HCP
2: 5+ ♠, Game forcing
3: Balanced, Unlimited, <4♠
4: Intended as Re-transfer

### Hand Record

Board	28	N	Ida Groenkvist		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠ (void)			
		♥ 109854			
		♦ J9843			
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>	♣ J95			
<b>W</b>	Kit Woolsey			<b>E</b>	Sally Woolsey
♠	A7			♠	J109832
♥	KQ62			♥	J
♦	A72			♦	KQ6
♣	K876			♣	Q104
		<b>S</b>	Greg Humphreys		
		♠	KQ654		
		♥	A73		
		♦	105		
		♣	A32		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4NT by W	Down 1	N/S +50	

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned at the beginning of the fourth round by North/South. The hand had been played in the second round. East had intended the 2♥ call as a re-transfer to spades, but West had not Alerted. After the auction, East had volunteered the information concerning the failure to Alert, but West said that was not their agreement. When asked if the 3♥ call might have been a super accept, E/W said that they do not use super accepts in game forcing auctions. N/S felt that the Unauthorized Information from the failure to alert might have influenced East's bidding and resulted in damage to them.

### Director Ruling

The failure to Alert did provide East with Unauthorized Information. However, the 3♥ response to the "re-transfer" provided Authorized Information to East that duplicated the UI, as it was impossible under E/W systemic agreements. Accordingly, no adjustment was necessary to the table result.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>4NT by W, Down 1, N/S +50</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Appeal

The North/South players appealed the director's ruling, and North, East and West attended the committee, along with the Captain of the N/S pair's team. In North's opinion, if 2♥ was intended as a re-transfer, but was not alerted, this provided UI to East. If 2H had been alerted, then East would have interpreted 3♥ as a super-accept, 4♣ as a cuebid, and 4NT as Blackwood, resulting in a higher contract that would have gone down more, possibly a lot more. Instead, the UI tipped East that the auction had gone off the rails and enabled her to bail out at the first plausible opportunity.

West argued that from his vantage, with a promising spade fit, he had several alternatives to 1NT at his second turn. He could have raised spades directly to make partner captain, or he could have initiated a relay sequence to get specific information about East's hand. 1NT was more neutral, though still unlimited, and allowed East to describe her hand further.

West interpreted 2♥ as a natural bid, the actual systemic agreement. His 3♥ was a raise, 4♣ was a cuebid, and 4NT was a keycard answer (showing three keycards for hearts) based on West's interpretation of 4♠ as a keycard ask for hearts. East got lucky that the 4NT "response" was a plausible contract that she could pass.

West said that systemically they do not super-accept in game-forcing auctions. Over transfers, they simply accept and await further description, even with very strong hands. West noted that with such a hand, he could have chosen to take control on the previous round. This systemic knowledge was authorized information to East, who knew that something had gone wrong based on the 3♥ bid itself.

### Committee Findings

To the Committee, the major question in the decision was how much authorized information did East have. Even without systemic knowledge about "no super-accepts in game forcing auctions", East could see that 3♥ was a peculiar bid, since it bypassed several lower calls that could have been used to super-accept. Also, East knew that if West had a very strong hand (strong enough to think about slam opposite a hand like East's), he probably would have chosen a relay sequence on the previous round. Thus, 3♥ was a powerful indication that something had gone wrong.

East's 3♠ and 4♠ were normal attempts to slow the auction down, regardless of what was happening. Over 4NT, the UI did not demonstrably suggest that passing was more likely to be successful than it would have been to a player having only authorized information. Therefore, the Committee upheld the director's ruling of letting the table result stand

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>4NT by W, Down 1, N/S +50</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

### Committee Members

<b>Chair</b>	Bart Bramley
<b>Member</b>	Lou Reich
<b>Member</b>	Mike Passell
<b>Member</b>	Ray Miller
<b>Member</b>	Meyer Kotkin

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N10
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	-----

<b>Event</b>	Roth Open Swiss	<b>Event DIC</b>	Gary Zeiger
<b>Date</b>	08/14/2015	<b>Session</b>	Second Final


### Auction

West	North	East	South
	2♠	3♥	4♠
Pass <sup>1</sup>	Pass	4NT	Pass
5♥	5♠	Pass	Pass
6♥	Pass	Pass	6♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo (1 minute)

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>29</b>	N	Ai-Tai Lo		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ Q109xx ♥ (void) ♦ AQ10xx ♣ Qxx			
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>				
<b>W</b>	Rodrigo Garcia Da Rosa			<b>E</b>	Carlos Pellegrini
♠	xxx			♠	x
♥	AQJ10			♥	K8xxxxx
♦	xxx			♦	J
♣	xxx			♣	AK102
		S	Alan Schwartz		
		♠	AKJx		
		♥	xx		
		♦	Kxxx		
		♣	Jxx		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
6♠ by N	Down 1	E/W +100	♣ K

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned at the conclusion of play of the hand. North/South explained that there had been an obvious break in tempo of almost a minute following the 4♠ call by South before West passed. East/West agreed to the BIT.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Four expert players were given the East hand and the auction without the BIT, in order to determine if there was a logical alternative to bidding. Most were in favor of bidding, but agreed that the BIT clearly made the choice easier.

### Director Ruling

While the poll showed that bidding on was certainly a possibility, based solely on the East hand, the BIT clearly suggested that bidding would be more successful than passing. Accordingly, per Laws 16B1 and 12C1e, the results were changed to 4♠ by North, making 5, N/S +650.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>4♠ by N, Made 5, N/S +650</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling, and they along with the North player attended the committee hearing. East felt his hand stood on its own merits, and it was obvious to bid 4NT in order to show a four card minor suit.

## Committee Findings

The AC agreed with the polled players that taking action with the East hand after 4♠ was about a 75% action. However, the lengthy hesitation by West suggested values and that action rather than inaction would probably be the winning call by East. Per Law 16, a player may not choose from amongst logical alternatives one suggested UI. The AC therefore upheld the director ruling that Pass was a logical alternative over 4♠, with the result of making five, N/S +650. As bidding was considered a high percentage action, the appeal was judged to have merit.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>4♠ by N, Made 5, N/S +650</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chair</b>	Gail Greenberg
<b>Member</b>	James Thurtell
<b>Member</b>	Ellen Kent
<b>Member</b>	Scott Stearns
<b>Member</b>	Chris Moll

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information/Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	N11
---------------------------	---	--------------	-----

<b>Event</b>	Spingold Knockout Teams	<b>Event DIC</b>	Matt Smith
<b>Date</b>	08/14/2015	<b>Session</b>	First Session, Quarterfinals

### Auction

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♠	2♥	2♠
3♠	4♠	Pass <sup>1</sup>	Pass
5♥	Pass <sup>2</sup>	Pass	5♠
Pass	Pass	Dbl	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo (3 minutes)
2: Alerted as Forcing

### Hand Record

Board	24	N	Ron Schwartz	
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠	AKJ1096	
		♥	2	
		♦	KQ7	
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>	♣	985	
W	Allan Graves			E
				Richard Schwartz
♠	4			♠
♥	KJ63			♥
♦	1082			♦
♣	A10764			♣
		S	Lotan Fisher	
		♠	Q73	
		♥	87	
		♦	9653	
		♣	KQJ2	
				♠
				♥
				♦
				♣

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
5♠X by N	Down 3	E/W +500	♣ 3

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned after the bidding tray was returned to the South/West side following the 4♠ call. The tray had remained on the North/East side for almost three minutes. Following the play of the hand, North/South expressed concern that the long hesitation had influenced West to bid in the pass out seat.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Ten players were polled as to whether the delay could be ascribed either North or East, based upon the auction and their hands. Some felt it could not be determined, while many thought it was likely the East player. Ten other players were then given the West hand and asked, based upon the auction and the hand, if they would bid following 4♠. Nine of the ten said they would. Based upon this poll, pass was deemed to not be a logical alternative.

### Director Ruling

While the extensive hesitation did create Unauthorized Information that could be attributed to the East player, based upon the player poll conducted, the UI had no effect as there was no logical alternative to West bidding. Therefore, no adjustment to the table results was necessary, 5♠X by North, Down 3, E/W +500.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>5♠X by N, Down 3, E/W +500</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

## The Appeal

The North/South players appealed the director's ruling, and all of the players attended the committee. The North/South pair believed the UI from the long break in tempo heavily influenced the decision by West to bid over 4♠. When asked about the hesitation, East explained that his partner's 3♠ bid had created a forcing situation, and that he had taken some time to decide upon their course of action before making a forcing pass.

N/S at this point raised an additional argument to their appeal. They had not been made aware that East's pass was forcing, and under their agreements, the meaning of North's pass following 5♥ would have changed to non-forcing. South stated he would have passed out the auction if he had received the information that 5♥ had been forced by East's pass.

## Committee Findings

The original charge in the appeal had been to address the possible UI generated by the Break in Tempo by East before passing over 4♠. As the E/W agreement was that this was a forcing pass, West was not acting under the influence of UI as the auction itself gave authorized information that they should make some call. Therefore, there were no grounds to adjust based upon UI.

However, N/S did raise a valid point that they had received MI when they were not informed that East's pass was forcing, as this affected their bidding agreements. The AC consulted with the directing staff as to whether a forcing pass is an Alertable call. While this is not specifically addressed under the Alert Procedures, the bidding regulations when using screens strongly encourage informing the opponents of any calls that may have an unusual or unexpected meaning.

Per Law 40B4, "a side that is damaged as a consequence of its opponents' failure to provide disclosure of the meaning of a call or play as these Laws require is entitled to rectification through the award of an adjusted score." As 5♥ by East will make five, for a score of only E/W +450, compared to the E/W +500 that resulted in 5♠X by North, it was decided that N/S had been damaged as a result of the MI concerning East's pass. Accordingly, the result was adjusted to 5♥ by East.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>5♥ by E, Made 5, E/W +450</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chair</b>	Michael Huston
<b>Member</b>	Lynn Deas
<b>Member</b>	Craig Allen
<b>Member</b>	Joel Wooldridge
<b>Member</b>	Jacob Morgan

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N12
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	-----

<b>Event</b>	Roth Open Swiss	<b>Event DIC</b>	Gary Zeiger
<b>Date</b>	08/15/2015	<b>Session</b>	Second Semi-Final


### Auction

West	North	East	South
1NT <sup>1</sup>	2♦ <sup>2</sup>	2NT <sup>3</sup>	Pass
3♣ <sup>4</sup>	Pass	Pass	3♦
Pass	3♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Explained as 14 -16 HCP
2: Explained ♦ & 4 card Major
3: Lebensohl – puppet to 3♣
4: Pass or correct

### Hand Record

Board	24	N	Cezary Balicki
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠ Q98	
		♥ AK9853	
		♦ 3	
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>	♣ QJ3	
W	Mitch Dunitz		
♠	KJ75		
♥	1074		
♦	AKJ2		
♣	K2	E	Joanna Stansby
		♠	106
		♥	Q
		♦	97654
		♣	A10986
		S	Adam Zmudzinsky
		♠	A432
		♥	J65
		♦	Q108
		♣	754

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♥ by N	Down 1	E/W +50	♠ 10

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned at the conclusion of play of the hand. East had explained that the 1NT opening showed 14 to 16 HCP, when the actual agreement was 13+ to 16. The North/South agreement was that 2♦ showed a major suit over a weak NT (minimum of range under 14 HCP), diamonds and a four card major over a strong NT. North, hearing the incorrect explanation, had Unauthorized Information that suggested pulling from 3♦ to 3♥.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Three players were given the North hand, and polled as to their call over 3♦. All passed.

### Director Ruling

The player poll confirmed that Pass was a logical alternative to bidding. Per Law 16B1, North had UI due to the improper explanation of the systemic agreement, and the UI suggested that bidding would be more successful than passing. Per Law 12C1e, the contract was adjusted to 3♦ by North, Down 7, E/W +350.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3♦ by N, Down 7, E/W +350</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Appeal

The North/South players appealed the director's ruling. North, East, and West were present, as well as Mike Passell, a member of North's team, to help with potential language problems.



North argued that if South had held six or more diamonds headed by the KQJ10 (or similar) he would have bid directly over 2NT. His pass, followed by 3♦ suggested two places to play. Thus, a pass by North of 3♦ was not a logical alternative to the suggested 3♥.

East/West stated that 3♦ was not alerted at the table, nor explained as showing two places to play at any time before the committee took place. If North or South had stated that 3♦ showed two places to play, E/W would not have called the director. E/W believed that South might choose to delay competing over 2NT with many lesser diamond holdings than ♦KQJ10xx where 3♦ would be the best contract for N/S.

### Committee Findings

The committee agreed with the director that pass was a logical alternative to the demonstrably suggested bid of 3♥. N/S's failure to alert 3♦ or explain their agreement regarding 3♦ as showing two places to play significantly weakened their argument that they had a clear partnership understanding of the meaning of 3♦. Thus, the committee upheld the director's ruling, 3♦ by South, down 7, E/W +350. The appeal was found to have substantial merit.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>3♦ by N, Down 7, E/W +350</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

### Committee Members

<b>Chair</b>	Douglas Doub
<b>Member</b>	James Thurtell
<b>Member</b>	David Caprera
<b>Member</b>	Marc Rabinowitz
<b>Member</b>	Ed Lazarus

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	N13
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----

<b>Event</b>	Spingold Knockout Teams	<b>Event DIC</b>	Matt Smith
<b>Date</b>	08/16/2015	<b>Session</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Session, Finals


### Auction

West	North	East	South
		Pass	1♠
Pass	2♣ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	2♠
Pass	2NT <sup>2</sup>	Pass	3♥ <sup>3</sup>
Pass	4♠	Pass	4NT <sup>5</sup>
Pass	5♥ <sup>5</sup>	Dbl	6♣
Pass	6♠	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 2+ ♣, Game Forcing
2: Relay
3: 6+ ♠
4: Keycard
5: Two Keys, no ♠Q

### Hand Record

Board	2	N	Pierre Zimmermann
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠ A6	
		♥ J982	
		♦ Q97	
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>	♣ AJ52	
<b>W</b>	Alfredo Versace		
♠	1094		
♥	7654		
♦	1052		
♣	1073		
		<b>S</b>	Franck Multon
		♠	KQ8732
		♥	K
		♦	AK8
		♣	K98

**E** Lorenzo Lauria

♠ J5  
♥ AQ103  
♦ J643  
♣ Q64

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♠ by S	Made 7	N/S +1460	♥ 5

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned at the conclusion of play of the hand. When the bidding tray returned to the North/East side of the screen following the 3♥ call, East asked for an explanation of the Alerted bid. North wrote "6♠=3♥" on his pad. East took this to mean that South held six spades and three hearts. He tried to clarify this verbally upon receiving the note, but did not receive any additional explanation. The VuGraph operator did not notice the incident and could not provide any evidence. East felt they were damaged by the incorrect explanation.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Eight players were polled as to their interpretation of the notation North had provided East. Most understood it to mean that the 3♥ call showed that South held six spades. Those who were unsure said they would have asked for additional clarification. One of the players was asked about the play of the ♥10 to the first trick, and believed it to be a good play.

### Director Ruling

Based upon the player poll and Law 40B4, the director ruled that the table result would stand. East was not damaged by misinformation but rather by his own misunderstanding.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	6♠ by S, Made 7, N/S +1460
--------------------------	----------------------------

## The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling, and all players, as well as the E/W team captain attended the committee. The screening director noted that the TD staff had applied the spirit of the ACBL regulation that "Players who, by experience or expertise, recognize that their opponents have neglected to Alert a special agreement will be expected to protect themselves."

East believed he had been informed that South showed six spades and three hearts. He presumed the South hand was something like:

♠ KQxxxx  
♥ K76  
♦ A  
♣ Kxx

with or without the ♠10.

He played the ♥10 in order to make it more difficult for declarer to read the distribution. East also noted that the E/W partnership rarely double cuebids because they have found that it tends to provide an advantage to the opponents and that he did so here only because he knew that declarer held three hearts. He explained that he had asked about the auction twice. East then asked the committee rhetorically how many times they were expected to ask their opponent to repeat information that had already been given.

North explained that, in response to East's question about the 3♥ bid, he wrote "6♠", then in an attempt to clarify added the "= 3♥". He noted that, in the N/S methods, the 2♣ bidder cannot hold as many as five hearts, so it would not make sense for South to be able to show three hearts. North explained that all of the communications with his screen mate were written, as his partner (properly) objects whenever he gives an oral explanation.

South suggested that with the hand East was playing him to hold, with 15 HCP, he would not have been strong enough to use Blackwood over 4♠. On the S/W side of the screen, South had written the explanation "3♥ = 6♠".

6♠ could be made with any trick one play, by ruffing out the ♥Q10. The likelihood of this was a separate matter, and would depend on whether East chose to double 5♥.

## Committee Findings

The committee was shown the explanation written by North in a "blind preview" before seeing the deal and before the players arrived. Some members judged that it likely meant that the 3♥ call showed six spades, others that it showed six spades and three hearts.

After hearing the testimony and deliberating, a 3-2 majority of the AC members judged that North had provided accurate information, and that if it was ambiguous, East needed to request a written clarification. While East was clearly convinced within his own mind, he needed to do more to protect himself in order to receive redress. If there was no MI, there could be no reason to adjust the score, so the AC upheld the director's ruling.

The appeal was found to have substantial merit.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>6♠ by S, Made 7, N/S +1460</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chair</b>	Gail Greenberg
<b>Member</b>	Danny Sprung
<b>Member</b>	Chris Moll
<b>Member</b>	Jan Jansma
<b>Member</b>	Kit Woolsey



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b> Misinformation	<b>Case:</b> R1
--	-----------------

<b>Event</b>	Grand National Teams, Flight B	<b>Event DIC</b>	Ken Van Cleve
<b>Date</b>	08/05/2015	<b>Session</b>	Qualifying Swiss, Match 2


### Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	1♣ <sup>1</sup>
1NT <sup>2</sup>	2♦ <sup>3</sup>	Pass	2♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Strong, Artificial, Forcing
2: Explained - Natural, Strong
3: 5 -8 HCP, Natural

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	17	N	2100 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	N	♠ 3	♥ 743		
<b>Vul</b>	None	♦ KQ976	♣ J743		
W	2230 MPS			E	2000 MPS
♠ 2				♠ AJ9765	
♥ J102				♥ 9865	
♦ J8				♦ 104	
♣ AKQ10862			♣ 9		
		S	1900 MPS		
		♠ KQ1084			
		♥ AKQ			
		♦ A532			
		♣ 5			

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
2♠ by S	Made 2	N/S +110	♣ A

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the end of the hand. South asked about the 1NT overcall at his turn and was told it was natural and strong. He likely suspected this was not the actual agreement but did not seek further clarification. Both opponent convention cards were marked "DONT v. strong 1♣", with the actual agreement being a one suited hand.

### Director Ruling

Law 40B4 states that, "a side that is damaged as a consequence of its opponents' failure to provide disclosure of a call or play as these Laws require is entitled to an adjusted score." While N/S received misinformation, it was their lack of understanding about 2♠ that caused the damage. South clearly intended 2♠ as forcing holding Axxx of diamonds; North chose not to bid again. This was the source of damage, therefore no adjustment.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>2♠ by S, Made 2, N/S +110</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Appeal

N/S appealed the director's ruling. All players attended the review. N/S confirmed that 1♣ promised 16+ HCP. The reviewer confirmed what the table director saw on the E/W convention cards. Both East and West said that by prior agreement the notation of "DONT" meant 1NT promised a one-suiter. East said she simply forgot the agreement. There was no mention by East of the required point count for what she described as a strong 1NT overcall.

N/S said the explanation prevented them from bidding a making game. When asked what they thought of the explanation of 1NT, they said they were suspicious of it. When asked why, if they were suspicious, they did not investigate further by looking at a convention card, North said they thought it would be rude to do so after hearing East answer a

direct question about it. South said they didn't believe they had to investigate further even in light of their doubts about the information they were given. They said they thought they only needed to investigate further if the answer was ambiguous, and this answer was not.

N/S were asked about their agreements regarding whether 2♠ was forcing. South said he believed it was; North obviously thought it was not. They said that the ostensibly unusual meaning of the 1NT bid caused them to have a misunderstanding that would not have occurred if they were given correct information. When asked if a rebid by opener in a different but analogous auction would be forcing (1♣-1♠-2♦-P-2♥), they did not seem to have a firm agreement. They did mention that the auction was different than the one presented to them at the table since the proposed auction would have a cuebid available as a force.

N/S were concerned that East's failure to bid at their turn was evidence that they were not sure of the agreement they described. East said they did not bid since they were not sure whether transfers applied or not, and did not want to risk an accident.

### Panel Findings

The panel considered whether the damage to N/S was a consequence of the misinformation or mainly the result of a N/S bidding misunderstanding. Three Precision players were polled. One with 2700 points said he would have bid 3♣ with the North hand over 2♠. When asked if 2♠ was forcing to him, he said he was not sure since the N/S methods were not his own. An 1800 point player said he was very suspicious of the explanation of 1NT as strong. He thought 2♠ was probably not forcing, but also said the N/S methods were not his own. A third player with 200 points thought 2♠ was forcing, and said he believed the explanation of 1NT given at the table. All polled players said they would have an agreement about whether a new suit bid in this situation was forcing in their own partnerships. An expert expressed the same opinion when asked.

Although the panel had some sympathy with what happened to N/S, it believed the results of the polling indicated that the damage was the result of not having an agreement about whether 2♠ was forcing more than a result of the misinformation. Law 40B4 was not satisfied, so the director's ruling was upheld.

<b>Panel Decision</b>
-----------------------

<b>2♠ by S, Made 2, N/S +110</b>
----------------------------------

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Smith
<b>Member</b>	Harry Falk
<b>Member</b>	Jeanne van den Meiracker

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b> Misinformation	<b>Case:</b> R2
--	-----------------

<b>Event</b> Grand National Teams, Flight C	<b>Event DIC</b> Ken Van Cleve
<b>Date</b> 08/06/2015	<b>Session</b> Round of 16, First Session


### Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1♦ <sup>1</sup>	2♦ <sup>2</sup>	2♠ <sup>3</sup>	3♥
Pass	Pass	3♠	Pass
3NT	Pass	4♠	Pass
5♦	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 11-15 HCP, could be short
2: Explained as Majors
3: Explained as ♦ Raise

### Hand Record

Board	7	N	440 MPS
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>S</b>	♠ 10	
		♥ A952	
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>	♦ AJ1072	
		♣ Q109	
W	200 MPS s		
♠	852		
♥	KJ64		
♦	KQ9		
♣	KJ5		
		S	450 MPS
		♠	643
		♥	Q1073
		♦	63
		♣	A832
		E	260 MPS
		♠	AKQJ97
		♥	8
		♦	854
		♣	764

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♦ by W	Down 4	N/S +400	♠ 10

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned at the conclusion of play of the hand. North/South did not have a clear agreement about 2♦ over a Precision 1♦ opening. Therefore, the explanation that 2♦ showed the majors was misinformation

### Director Ruling

Law 40B4 states that for a score to be adjusted the damage must be a consequence of the misinformation; here the damage was a result of the E/W bidding misunderstanding. Law 40B4 was not satisfied, so the director did not adjust the score.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>5♦ by W, Down 4, N/S +400</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Appeal

E/W appealed the director's ruling, and all of the players attended the review. N/S said they had not firmed up any agreements about whether 2♦ in this situation should be Michaels or not since they had not encountered this kind of 1♦ opening often before.

E/W said they believed the damage to them was the result of the erroneous explanation of the 2♦ bid. East bid 2♠ and only asked about the meaning of 2♦ after he did so (at his LHO's turn to call). West explained that he believed his partner's 2♠ bid showed a diamond raise; that his partner's 3♠ bid was probably a stopper ask for 3NT; and that 4♠ showed a spade void. Neither East nor West told the reviewer they did not believe the Michaels explanation.

## Panel Findings

The panel considered whether the damage to E/W was a consequence of the misinformation or mainly a result of its own bidding misunderstanding. First of all, the panel noted that E/W were not entitled to an alert to 2♦ if it was Michaels in this auction. East bid 2♠ intending it as natural apparently before he knew 2♦ was Michaels, and he made no subsequent attempt to call the director for relief if he believed he was misinformed at the point he made that choice. The fact that he did not follow correct procedure by asking about the 2♦ bid at LHO's turn actually gave him a chance to recover before it was too late. The path to the E/W misunderstanding was therefore initially completely unrelated to any misinformation. All subsequent actions and misunderstandings flowed from that. In addition to the first misunderstanding about the 2♠ bid, E/W had two more bidding misunderstandings thereafter.

The panel was therefore of the opinion that the damage to E/W was not primarily a consequence of any misinformation and upheld the director's ruling. Polling players did not seem to be a useful exercise in this case. It was noted that East had unauthorized information from his partner's explanation of 2♠ as a diamond raise, but that point became irrelevant to the ruling given the table result. As well, the unauthorized information North received from his partner's explanation of his bid as the majors did not seem to play a part in the outcome.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>5♦ by W, Down 4, N/S +400</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Smith
<b>Member</b>	Kevin Perkins
<b>Member</b>	Jeanne van den Meiracker

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Disputed Claim	<b>Case:</b>	R3
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----


<b>Event</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Friday AX Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Terry Lavender
<b>Date</b>	08/07/2015	<b>Session</b>	Evening

**Auction**

West	North	East	South
N/A			

**Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention**


**Hand Record**

<b>Board</b>	19	N	110 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	S	♠	KQ8		
		♥	J1052		
<b>Vul</b>	E/W	♦	QJ94		
		♣	J8		
W	4460 MPS			E	5850 MPS
♠	63			♠	1095
♥	AQ763			♥	K4
♦	AK53			♦	62
♣	97			♣	AKQ653
		S	200+ MPS		
		♠	AJ742		
		♥	98		
		♦	1087		
		♣	1042		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
4♥ by W			

**Facts Determined at the Table**

The Declarer claimed after trick nine, having lost two tricks previously. They had won trick nine in hand, and made the statement, "I have the rest of the tricks." The opponents objected and called the director. The remaining cards were:

♠ —	♠ —
♥ 10	♥ —
♦ Q	♦ —
♣ J 8	♣ A K Q 6
♠ —	
♥ 7	
♦ 5	
♣ 9 7	
♠ 7	
♥ —	
♦ —	
♣ 10 4 2	

**Director Ruling**

The table director ruled that declarer would play Dummy's clubs from the top, discarding their losing diamond on the third round while North ruffed. Declarer would then win the last trick with their remaining trump. The score was adjudicated as 4♥ by West, making 4, E/W +620.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	4♥ by W, Made 4, E/W +620
--------------------------	---------------------------



## The Appeal

North/South appealed the ruling and were the only players to attend the review. North said that after they had called the director, West had expressed confusion about what the problem was. East said, "There's another trump out," to which West replied "No, there's not!" To N/S this indicated clear evidence that West did not have a count on the hand. They argued that, since West had gotten confused about the outstanding trump, they might well have led their last trump first or thought their remaining diamond was high. Had declarer played either of those cards, the defense would have gotten two tricks and set 4♥.

## Panel Findings

The panel decided it was unlikely that West would have led another trump, given that 1) their statement clearly indicated they thought the trump were all gone; 2) if there was another trump it was unlikely that the ♥7 was high enough to pick up any outstanding trump. The panel judged that while West might have thought their diamond was good, it fell below the standard of "careless or inferior" specified in the footnote to Law 70 to require declarer to play a possibly good diamond with the ♠AKQ available. Thus the panel allowed the director's ruling of E/W +620 to stand. Because the problem presented by East's statement and West's reply were not addressed by the table director, the panel deemed the appeal to have merit.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>4♥ by W, Made 4, E/W +620</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Eric Bell
<b>Member</b>	Ken Van Cleve
<b>Member</b>	Jenni Carmichael

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	R4
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> Thursday Fast Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Charles MacCracken
<b>Date</b>	08/11/2015	<b>Session</b>	First


### Auction

West	North	East	South
	1♥	Pass	1NT <sup>1</sup>
Dbl	3♥ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Forcing
2: Alerted – Very Good Hand

### Hand Record

Board	1	N	4130 MPS	E	7550 MPS
Dealer	N	♠ 8	KQJ10653	♠ J972	
Vul	None	♥	AQ32	♥ 7	
		♦	3	♦ 10876	
		♣		♣ K842	
W	7250 MPS			S	6940 MPS
♠ AK105		♠	Q643	♠	
♥ A9		♥	842	♥	
♦ K54		♦	J9	♦	
♣ AJ109		♣	Q765	♣	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♥ by N	Made 3	N/S +140	♠ 2

### Facts Determined at the Table

East/West called the Director at the end of play and stated they had been misinformed. The North hand was not nearly as strong as they had been led to believe. They had been told that the 3♥ rebid showed a very good hand, not quite as strong as a 2♣ opener. If West had known the North hand could have been this weak, they would have doubled again.

### Director Ruling

The table result stands. The North hand is a 4/5 loser hand, less than a 2♣ opener, but a very good hand, thus E/W had not been misinformed.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3♥ by N, Made 3, N/S +140</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Appeal

All four players attended the review. North/South had these agreements.

- 1) An opening 2♦ bid is 18-19 HCP, with no singleton or void.
- 2) They have two ways of showing a standard 1M-1NT-3M type hand, with shortness.
  - a. 1♥-1NT-2NT-3?-3♥ shows a weaker version of a standard 3♥ rebid.
  - b. 1♥-1NT-3♥ shows the top end of their range.

North judged that the trick taking power of this hand put it in the upper range.

E/W said they were told North would have at least 15-16 HCP. If West had known the HCP could be lowered with compensating tricks, he would have reopened with a double. N/S did not dispute that South's explanation had included 15-16 HCP.

### Panel Findings

Six of West's peers were polled. They were given a precise explanation of the N/S agreements, and all doubled again. They were then given the explanation given at the table.

Three said they would still double, but were less optimistic about the hand. Two said they didn't care about the explanation. One peer actually changed the call to a pass.

Based on this input, the Panel decided that MI was present, and that E/W had been damaged by the MI. Three peers were polled about South's action if West had reopened with a double, and East had bid 3♠. Two would have passed, citing ♠Qxxx as useless on offense, but valuable on defense. The Panel adjusted the contract to 3♠ by East, making 3, E/W +140.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>3♠ by E, Made 3, E/W +140</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Gary Zeiger
<b>Member</b>	David Metcalf
<b>Member</b>	Kevin Perkins

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	R5
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Mini-Spangold II	<b>Event DIC</b>	Terry Lavender
<b>Date</b>	08/12/2015	<b>Session</b>	Second Session, Quarterfinals


### Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	1♥
Pass	1♠	1NT <sup>1</sup>	Dbl <sup>2</sup>
Pass	Pass	2♣	Dbl
2♦	Dbl <sup>3</sup>	Pass	2♠
Pass	4♠	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Both Minors
2: Support Double, no Alert
3: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

Board	5	N	680 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ A10864			
		♥ Q54			
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>	♦ QJ63			
		♣ 2			
<b>W</b>	200 MPS			<b>E</b>	260 MPS
♠ K53				♠ J9	
♥ 10986				♥ 2	
♦ K97				♦ A10842	
♣ 974				♣ KQ863	
		<b>S</b>	1130 MPS		
		♠ Q72			
		♥ AKJ73			
		♦ 5			
		♣ AJ105			

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♠ by N	Made 4	N/S +620	♣ K

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned at the end of the auction. South thought their double showed three spades, a convention that would have been alerted had North recognized it. Further, there was an agreed hesitation before North doubled 2♦. Both of these were sources of unauthorized information to South. The lack of an Alert of the double suggested that North did not recognize it as showing three spades. The out-of-tempo double of 2♦ suggested doubt about whether defending 2♦X was correct.

### Director Ruling

As South was in possession of UI that demonstrably suggested 2♠ might be more successful than passing, and since Pass was deemed to be a logical alternative to bidding 2♠, the contract and result were adjusted to 2♦X by West, making two, E/W +180, per Laws 16B1, 12C1e, and 73C.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>2♦X by W, Made 2, E/W +180</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Appeal

The North/South players appealed the director's ruling. All four players attended the hearing and agreed to the facts. When N/S were asked what staff had gotten wrong in the ruling, South asserted that they would never have passed 2♦X. South was reminded that the Law restricted their options after they were in possession of UI, but South offered no other argument. South was asked specifically why they bid 2♠ to play in a potential 4-3 fit, since their partner would likely have competed in spades if their partnership had an eight-card spade fit. Their only comment was that they would never pass. E/W did not contribute substantially to the hearing as they indicated they believed the ruling to be correct.

## Panel Findings

The panel concluded that the director's ruling was correct, with the caveat that there was no evidence of polling by the director. As such, they instructed the screener to conduct a poll to ascertain what this player's peers would do in this situation.

The screener found five players with between 200 and 800 masterpoints. They were given the hand as a bidding problem. All five opened 1♥. All five either chose a support double as their initial action or were familiar enough with support doubles that they chose it when they learned it to be a method used by this partnership. Two of the five bid 2♠, one bid 2♥, and two passed 2♦X. Passing was therefore deemed to be a logical alternative, and the director's ruling was upheld.

While the appeal did not have much merit, no Appeal without Merit Warning was issued as the director did not do any polling. Had those facts been presented, the appellants might well have understood the ruling and not chosen to appeal.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>3NT by E, Down 1, N/S +100</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Member</b>	Bernie Gorkin
<b>Member</b>	Mike Roberts

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Disputed Claim	<b>Case:</b>	R6
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----


<b>Event</b>	Young LM Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Mike Roberts
<b>Date</b>	08/09/2015	<b>Session</b>	First Final

**Auction**

West	North	East	South
			Pass
Pass	1♣	Pass	1♥
Pass	2♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

**Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention**


**Hand Record**

<b>Board</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>N</b>	970 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>S</b>	♠	K65		
		♥	AK97		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>E/W</b>	♦	74		
		♣	Q1086		
<b>W</b>	630 MPS			<b>E</b>	1120 MPS
♠	1073			♠	J98
♥	QJ10			♥	43
♦	KQ652			♦	A103
♣	K9			♣	AJ743
		<b>S</b>	1000 MPS		
		♠	AQ42		
		♥	8652		
		♦	J98		
		♣	52		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
2♥ by S			♠ 7

**Facts Determined at the Table**

The Director was summoned at Trick Nine. The Declarer had claimed, with East on lead. They made the statement that they were "taking the top two spades then crossruffing". The remaining cards at this point were:

	♠ K 6	
	♥ 9	
	♦ —	
	♣ Q 8	
♠ 10 3		♠ 9 8
♥ —		♥ —
♦ K 5 2		♦ 10
♣ —		♣ A 7
	♠ Q 4 2	
	♥ 8	
	♦ 8	
	♣ —	

**Director Ruling**

The director ruled that the defense would get one additional trick, resulting in the contract failing by on trick. If East were to exit with a spade, it would be inferior, not irrational, to ruff the 13<sup>th</sup> spade, according to Law 70D1

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	2♥ by S, Down 1, E/W +50
--------------------------	--------------------------

## The Appeal

The line of play in 2♥ was as follows:

- Trick one: ♠7 led, won by South's ♠A
- Trick two: ♥A cashed
- Trick three: ♥K cashed
- Trick four: ♦4 led from dummy to South's ♦J and West's ♦Q
- Trick five: ♥Q cashed by West, East discarding the ♣3 (encouraging)
- Trick six: ♣K cashed
- Trick seven: ♣9, ♣10 from dummy, won by E with ♣J
- Trick eight: ♦A cashed by East

Declarer claimed after trick eight, in the position given above (with East on lead). South affirmed that they said they would take the two top spades [they said the AK, but clearly intended the KQ], and then crossruff. However, they argued, "The diamond is always a loser. It would be illogical to trump a spade when the 100% loser is better," even if they had not been bothering to count the spades.

## Panel Findings

Clearly the claim was invalid, and at the time of the claim, declarer had not considered that they would need to trump twice in the dummy, with only one trump. It is simply a question of when declarer would "wake up", and whether they were allowed to count the spades while they were cashing them.

The panel ruled it was more likely than not that declarer would have gotten this right had play continued, but Law 70D1 requires a higher standard - the director shall impose a "normal" unsuccessful line of play on declarer, even if that line would qualify as "careless or inferior". Declarer's statement started with cashing the spade winners. If their original intent was to trump the third spade, they might (carelessly) not pay close attention to the spade count. After that, if declarer were still not to wake up, ruffing a spade is a normal line of play within the definitions of 70D1.

The panel decided that this was a close decision, and, even though the appeal did not bring anything new beyond the director's decision, they believed it was worth of closer examination. As such, the appeal was found to have merit.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>2♥ by S, Down 1, E/W +50</b>
-----------------------	---------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	David Metcalf
<b>Member</b>	Eric Bell
<b>Member</b>	Matt Koltnow

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Disputed Claim	<b>Case:</b>	R7
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----


<b>Event</b>	10K Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Ken Horwedel
<b>Date</b>	08/09/2015	<b>Session</b>	First Final

### Auction

West	North	East	South
		Pass	Pass
3♦	Dbl	Pass	3♥
Pass	4♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention


### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>N</b>	8000 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠	KQ84		
		♥	AQ32		
		♦	8		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>	♣	A953		
<b>W</b>	6000 MPS			<b>E</b>	7000 MPS
♠	75			♠	J10932
♥	864			♥	K
♦	AKQ10653			♦	J4
♣	2			♣	KJ1074
		<b>S</b>	1800 MPS		
		♠	A6		
		♥	J10975		
		♦	972		
		♣	Q86		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
4♥ by S	Down 1	E/W +50	♦ A

### Facts Determined at the Table

Declarer claimed after playing the ♥A, dropping the king, without stating a line of play. East asked his partner about an outstanding trump. They scored the board as down one and put the cards away. After East/West left the table, North then called the director. North reconstructed Declarer's and Dummy's hands and stated that his partner had claimed with a trump out. The director initially ruled that E/W got a trick. North later explained that his partner had just dropped the ♥K, right before showing her hand. When asked later why they had not said anything about any outstanding trump, South said that their hearts were all high, and they just did not say anything about pulling the last trump.

### Director Ruling

After confirming the play up to the point of the claim, the director ruled that declarer was able to continue drawing trump. Law 70A states that directors should be as equitable as possible to both sides, and the ACBL Tech File guidelines for Claims say that a safety check with a high trump is considered a normal line of play. The result was changed to 4♥ by South, making 4, N/S +420.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	4♥ by S, Made 4, N/S +420
--------------------------	---------------------------

### The Appeal

The East/West players appealed the director's ruling, and North, South, and West appeared at the screening session. All confirmed that play had gone ♦A, followed by the ♣2 to the King. A Club was returned and trumped by West. The ♦K was led and trumped in Dummy, and then the ♥A was led, dropping the King. Declarer then claimed without stating a line of play (with a trump outstanding in the West hand).



At the table, East asked their partner if they had a trump (after a pause, according to East; immediately, according to North). When they said they did, the North player slammed his cards back into the board and conceded down one. South said nothing.

According to North, after East/West left the table for the next round, South asked their partner why they had to lose another trick, claiming that they were aware that there was another trump outstanding. At this point, North called the director and explained the situation. South remained silent.

At screening, when South was asked why they had not said anything, South shrugged, and repeated that they just said nothing.

### Panel Findings

Law 70A states that a doubtful point to a claim shall be resolved against the claimer, and Law 70C postulates that an outstanding trump cannot be drawn if “it is at all likely” that the claimer, at the time of his claim, was unaware that a trump remained in an opponent’s hand. However, the timing of a claim is often indicative of the state of declarer’s mind at the time.

For example, when declarer starts drawing trump, learns that they break and can be drawn successfully, then claims, it can be assumed that declarer’s intent was to finish drawing trump. Here, the claim was precipitated not by the trump breaking, but by the relevant honor falling. The panel, despite serious concerns about declarer’s lack of a statement at any point, decided that declarer had to be aware of the outstanding trump, and it did not meet the requirements of Law 70C2 that “it is at all likely that claimer ... was unaware that a trump remained in an opponent’s hand.” Declarer’s claim was accepted, and the result of ten tricks by declarer was upheld.

While the ruling matched that of the table director, the committee’s reasoning did not. If the director’s ruling was based on the idea that declarer was allowed a “safety check” in trump, then that would be a valid basis for appeal. The laws do mandate a high bar regarding claims with an outstanding trump that was not mentioned by declarer, and the panel believed that this decision was close. Thus, the appeal was found to have merit.

<b>Panel Decision</b>
-----------------------

<b>4♥ by S, Made 4, N/S +420</b>
----------------------------------

### Committee Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	David Metcalf
<b>Member</b>	Eric Bell
<b>Member</b>	Matt Koltnow

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Played Card	<b>Case:</b>	R8
---------------------------	-------------	--------------	----


<b>Event</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> Saturday Flight A Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Candace Kuschner
<b>Date</b>	08/15/2015	<b>Session</b>	First

### Auction

West	North	East	South
N/A			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention


### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	21	N	24,270 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	N	♠ J4 ♥ 102 ♦ AK632 ♣ 10875			
<b>Vul</b>	N/S				
W	2540 MPS			E	1820 MPS s
♠	AK5			♠	732
♥	QJ943			♥	876
♦	85			♦	J74
♣	QJ2			♣	9643
		S	4950 MPS		
		♠	Q10986		
		♥	AK5		
		♦	Q109		
		♣	AK		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
3NT by S	Down 1	E/W +100	N/A

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned with four cards remaining in the play. Declarer was on lead and held the ♥5 and the ♦Q109. Dummy had the ♦AK63. According to the defenders, the declarer led the ♥5 and then tried to replace it with the ♦9. Declarer stated that he actually played the two cards simultaneously and that he intended to play the diamond. The table director received no statement from the dummy. When the table director arrived at the table, the only card on the table was the ♥5.

### Director Ruling

Pursuant to Law 45C2, the declarer must play a card from his hand if it is touching or nearly touching the table; or maintained in such position as to indicate that it has been played. Although it was clear that it was not declarer's intent to play the heart, in the absence of any evidence that the diamond and heart were played simultaneously, the heart was the played card. Therefore, the result of 3NT by South, Down 1, E/W +100, stood.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3NT by S, Down 1, E/W +100</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Appeal

The North/South players appealed the director's ruling, and both pairs were consulted by the Reviewer. Since there was no statement from the dummy in the table director's fact statement, the Reviewer asked the dummy whether he had a statement regarding the four-card ending. He did, but his statement was consistent with the defenders: that the declarer played the ♥5 and quickly tried to replace it with the diamond. The Reviewer then followed up with the declarer,

who said he agreed with the dummy that the cards were not played simultaneously, but that he accidentally played the heart first and quickly tried to replace it with the diamond.

The Reviewer asked each player to demonstrate what happened. While the demonstrations were not identical, they were substantially similar. In each demonstration, the heart was played and quickly replaced by the diamond. There was not one demonstration in which the cards were played simultaneously. Declarer asked if his intent matters. The Reviewer cited the relevant rule, read it to him and indicated that there was no statement regarding intent in Law 45C2.

### **Panel Findings**

At the time the notice of appeal was provided, the only issue appeared to be whether the diamond and heart were played simultaneously. Based on the evidence the table director had at the time, he determined that the heart was the sole card played and that there was no simultaneous play of the heart and the diamond. By the time the Reviewer had collected the facts, there was general agreement among all four players (based on their statements and their demonstrations) that only the heart was played and the diamond was not played simultaneously with the heart. Therefore, the table director correctly ascertained the facts and applied Law 45C2A correctly. As a result, the panel upheld the table director's ruling.

The panel considered whether the appeal had merit. The declarer abandoned his original statement regarding simultaneous play and ultimately agreed with the facts as described by the defenders. Based on the declarer's last question to the reviewer regarding intent, the Reviewer inferred that the intent argument was his only basis for the appeal. Based on the table director's write-up, that issue was raised by the declarer to the table director, and the table director's write-up suggests that the intent argument was responded to completely and accurately. Therefore, there was nothing remaining to the appeal that had merit. Thus, an Appeal without Merit Warning was issued to South.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>3NT by S, Down 1, E/W +100</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

### **Panel Members**

<b>Reviewer</b>	Scott Humphrey
<b>Member</b>	Matt Smith
<b>Member</b>	Gary Zeiger

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	R9
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Sunday Fast Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Charlie MacCracken
<b>Date</b>	08/16/2015	<b>Session</b>	First Session


### Auction

West	North	East	South
	1NT <sup>1</sup>	Pass	2♣
Pass	2♠	Pass	3♦ <sup>2</sup>
Pass	3♥ <sup>3</sup>	Pass	4♥ <sup>4</sup>
Pass	4NT <sup>5</sup>	Pass	5♦ <sup>6</sup>
Pass	6♦	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15 -17 HCP
2: Natural & Forcing
3: Different Interpretations
4: Different Interpretations
5: 0 or 3 Key Cards
6: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>13</b>	N	5300 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ AQ63			
		♥ A6			
		♦ J1084			
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>	♣ AQ8			
<b>W</b>	1130 MPS			<b>E</b>	540 MPS
♠	9854			♠	1072
♥	9754			♥	K32
♦	75			♦	K3
♣	1097			♣	K6543
		S	6170 MPS		
		♠	KJ		
		♥	QJ108		
		♦	AQ962		
		♣	J2		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♦ by S	Made 6	N/S +1370	♣ 10

### Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was called to the table at the end of the hand. The heart bids had been interpreted differently by the North/South pair. North believed 3♥ was a control cuebid, and 4♥ was Keycard for diamonds, while South thought North was showing three hearts with 3♥ and raised to game. There was an agreed break in tempo prior to the 5♦ bid, but North maintained that with three Aces, a maximum hand and four trumps, he should go on to six.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

In the presence of East/West, the Director gave the hand to a Flight A player. The player who was polled stated that with three Key Cards, he felt obligated to continue to six (with zero, he would pass).

### Director Ruling

Based upon the expert opinion, and pursuant to Law 16, the director ruled that North made his bid using only authorized information. Accordingly, the table result stood.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	6♦ by S, Made 6, N/S +1370
--------------------------	----------------------------

### The Appeal

E/W disagreed with the analysis by the player who was polled. They both maintained that there should be no doubt that South knew North had three Key Cards and that South is the one who was in the position to know whether to

carry on to six. North maintained his previous position: that he was never planning to stop below six holding three Aces, a maximum and four trumps.

### Panel Findings

Since North had the extraneous information (BIT by South), and the issue is whether pass was a logical alternative to bidding 6♦, the Reviewer gave North's hand to three Flight A players. Given the meaning of 3♦, they all agreed with North's 3♥ cue bid in support of diamonds. Those who were polled were told that 4♥ was RKC and that 4NT showed 0 or 3 key cards. When told that South responded 5♦, all three players immediately and unequivocally passed.

The Reviewer further inquired as to why they would not continue since they had three key cards. All three players pointed out that South has to know North has three key cards since he cue bid 3♥ immediately over 3♦ (thereby eliminating the prospect that North could have zero). One player said he bid it as strongly as he possibly can and he must trust his partner. Another player noted that South may be off one Key card and some side Kings. Without any Kings, five may be all that South can make. The Reviewer asked those polled if South breaks tempo before bidding 5♦, whether they could infer anything from the hesitation. All three players inferred that South was considering a jump to 6♦.

Based on the polling, the panel concluded that pass was a logical alternative to North's raise of 6♦. Furthermore, South's hesitation suggested that bidding 6♦ may be a better contract. Pursuant to Law 16B1(a), North may not choose among logical alternatives one suggested by the unauthorized information. Therefore, the panel adjusted the result to 5♦ by the South, making 6, N/S +620.

<b>Panel Decision</b>
-----------------------

<b>5♦ by S, Made 6, N/S +620</b>
----------------------------------

### Committee Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Scott Humphrey
<b>Member</b>	Kevin Perkins
<b>Member</b>	Eric Bell

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b> Misinformation	<b>Case:</b> R10
--	------------------

<b>Event</b> 10K Swiss Teams	<b>Event DIC</b> Harry Falk
<b>Date</b> 08/16/2015	<b>Session</b> Second Final


### Auction

West	North	East	South
		1♠	Pass
2♠	2NT <sup>1</sup>	4♠	Dbl
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Explained as two suits

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b> 18	N	7710 MPS	
<b>Dealer</b> E	♠	J9	
	♥	J53	
<b>Vul</b> N/S	♦	K976543	
	♣	7	
W	8480 MPS		E
♠	9432		9950 MPS
♥	K109		♠ AKQ85
♦	J102		♥ A642
♣	Q1042		♦ 8
			♣ AJ5
	S	450 MPS	
	♠	1076	
	♥	Q87	
	♦	AQ	
	♣	K9863	

<b>Final Contract</b> 4♠X by E	<b>Result of Play</b> Down 1	<b>Score</b> N/S +100	<b>Opening Lead</b> ♥ 7
--------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called by East/West at the end of the hand, as it had become apparent that North's hand did not conform to the explanation given by South. The Heart lead was won by East, capturing the Jack. Declarer led a Diamond, losing to South's Queen, who then led the Ace, ruffed by Declarer in hand. A Heart was led, successfully finessing South's Queen. Declarer next finessed in Clubs, losing to South, who lead back a Club, ruffed by North. North then led a Diamond, Declarer pitching a Club, ruffed by South. Declarer then won the rest of the tricks.

### Director Ruling

When the director arrived, North/South dominated the conversation with the director, insisting that North had sorted their hand improperly, and thought they had both red suits. The director accepted this, and ruled that there had been a mistaken bid, and not misinformation, and therefore, per Law 75C, the table result was allowed to stand.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>4♠X by E, Down 1, N/S +100</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Appeal

East/West were a foreign pair, and there were language issues. They tried to tell the table director that North had insisted that her 2NT bid did not show two suits, but showed a one suited hand, weaker than a direct bid. The table director would not address this, merely saying that North had misbid, and so there was no MI. They were told they could fill out a player memo. They wanted to appeal the ruling, and finally were directed to the reviewer.

## Panel Findings

When this issue was finally addressed, the event was over, and the North/South pair was no longer present. The issue of whether or not they had the agreement of 2NT showing two suits, one suit, or no agreement was not addressed properly at the table.

Attempts to contact them were initially unsuccessful, and East/West deserved redress if there was MI, so an initial decision was made to adjust the score to 4♠X making. This was the likely result if East had been given the explanation of no agreement, as East would not assume during the play that North had both minors.

Attempts to contact North/South finally proved successful, and after conversations with North and South separately, the actual N/S agreement was determined to indeed be a two suited hand. In light of this, the table ruling of no adjustment was upheld.

<b>Panel Decision</b>
-----------------------

<b>4♠X by E, Down 1, N/S +100</b>
-----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>
-----------------

Kevin Perkins
---------------