

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ THREE
Subject	Establishment of Revoke
DIC	Doug Grove
Event	Mini Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	First Final
Date	November 22, 2006

BD#	20
VUL	Both
DLR	West

3,800 Masterpoints	
♠	J 5 3 2
♥	K Q 2
♦	A 8 3
♣	A K 5

5,000 Masterpoints		Fall 2006 Honolulu, Hawaii	1,600 Masterpoints	
♠	8 7		♠	A T
♥	T 8 6 5 3		♥	9 7
♦	5 2		♦	K Q J 7 4
♣	J T 7 6		♣	Q 8 4 3

2,850 Masterpoints	
♠	K Q 9 6 4
♥	A J 4
♦	T 9 6
♣	9 2

West	North	East	South
Pass	1NT	Pass	2♥
Pass	2♠	Pass	3NT
Pass	4♠	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	4♠ by North
Opening Lead	♦K
Table Result	Down one, N/S -100
Director Ruling	Down one, N/S -100
Panel Ruling	Down one, N/S -100

The Facts: The play was as follows:

- Trick 1: ♦K small ♦small ♦♦A
- Trick 2: Spade to ace.
- Trick 3: ♦Q with all following.
- Trick 4: ♦J with Defenders claiming that Declarer played a club from hand.
- Trick 5: ♦7 was ruffed in Dummy and a claim of the remaining tricks followed.

Declarer's played cards were mixed by the time the director came to the table.

The Ruling: In accordance with laws 65 and 66, a revoke was deemed to have occurred and one trick was transferred to E/W resulting in the contract being set one trick.

The Appeal: Declarer claimed that she followed to trick three with a diamond, and, after the diamond continuation at trick four, ruffed in Dummy and played the ♣5 from hand. Dummy was unable to corroborate the Declarer's sequence of play. Declarer's cards had been mixed by the time the director was called to the table.

West was certain that North hand played the ♣5 to trick four and agreed that partner led a fourth diamond at trick five. West was asked what declarer had done. He said that Declarer had ruffed in dummy with the ♠K and claimed. East was not present at the hearing, but when asked later, he confirmed this information.

The Decision: Under laws 65D and 66D, when a player disturbs the order of his played cards, if the director is unable to ascertain the facts, he shall rule in favor of the other side. Therefore, the table director's decision was upheld resulting in one trick to the defenders, 4♠ down one, N/S minus 100.

No appeal without merit warning (AWMW) was given because it was determined that the table director had not adequately informed the offender of the appropriate laws. If this had been done, the panel would have issued an AWMW.

The Panel: Harry Falk (Reviewer), Patty Holmes and Gary Zeiger

Players Consulted: None.

Commentary:

Goldsmith Good job. Generally on disputed facts cases AWMWs ought not to be awarded. There's another datum that suggests that North did, in fact, revoke. He ruffed the diamond high. If he had not revoked, he could simply have faced his cards the moment a fourth diamond hit the table. This isn't a sure thing, but it suggests the revoke occurred.

Polisner This is a routine case except that it highlights the deficiencies in the director training, which resulted in a frivolous appeal. Had either the table director or the screener, if there was one, advised the players of the basis of the ruling, it is most likely that this appeal would not have been filed.

Rigal In a sense this case is a non-event. It is hard to blame the director too much but it is possible the need for the appeal could have been circumvented with the proper warning...at least the case was rightly decided at all levels. A lesson to us all to keep our played cards in the right order. [Note to self.....]

Smith This declarer could not win this appeal. The fact that dummy could not corroborate his version of the facts did not help, but the laws cited make it all but a routine ruling and panel decision.

Wildavsky This appeal had no merit. The laws ought to have been explained in screening.

Wolff According to the law, since North's discard pile had been mixed, the committee came to the right decision. HOWEVER, I think when the following facts are present:

- (1) The revoke was entirely meaningless with the bridge of the matter - an easy 4♠ making four, +620 N/S.
- (2) Some disagreement as to what cards were played, allowed for in the laws with the stipulation that a mixing of the discard pile would normally be suggestive of deciding against the mixer-upper.
- (3) The equity of the matter is that E/W wanted something for nothing and while that may be barely acceptable at times, the circumstances of this particular case cried out for "No revoke".

To me this case should be decided "No revoke" with an admonition to E/W - "In the future, please do not pursue wanting something for nothing." That decision, at least to me, fits in well with our Zero Tolerance principle extending it to rewarding good sportsmanship and denouncing poor sportsmanship. Second choice would be, in this match point tournament, to award N/S -100 for poor execution but E/W -620 so that the field is protected.