

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Seventeen
Subject	Played Card
DIC	Ron Geagley
Event	Stratified Daylight Open Pairs
Session	Second Session
Date	July 25, 2008

BD#	17
VUL	None
DLR	North

2,290 Masterpoints	
♠	T 9 8 3
♥	T 6 5
♦	Q T 4 2
♣	9 3

385 Masterpoints		Summer 2008 Las Vegas, NV	375 Masterpoints	
♠	Q 4		♠	7 5
♥	K 9 4 3 2		♥	Q 7
♦	J 8 7		♦	A K 9 3
♣	Q J 7		♣	A K T 8 5

1,756 Masterpoints	
♠	A K J 6 2
♥	A J 8
♦	6 5
♣	6 4 2

West	North	East	South
	Pass	1♣	Pass
1♥	Pass	2♦	Pass
2♥	Pass	3♥	Pass
4♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	4♥ by West
Opening Lead	♠Ten
Table Result	Down 3, E/W -150
Director Ruling	4♥ W, down 3, E/W -150
Panel Ruling	4♥ W, down 3, E/W -150

The Facts: No one remembers the auction, although all agree East opened 1♣ and reversed into 2♦. South cashed ♠AK and switched to ♦6. Declarer played the ♦J and called “play – no up!” after North played the ♦Q. N/S felt she called “play – no up!” after she saw the ♦Q.

The Ruling: Law 45C4, Play of named card, applies. Although Law 45C4(b) says ... without pause for thought the director felt she changed her mind after seeing the ♦Q and that a small diamond must be played from Dummy. Therefore, the table result of 4♥ by West down three, E/W minus 150 that was the outcome of declarer playing small to the queen was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: Declarer said she always saw that the ♦Q was played. She described the way she called from dummy as “small large.” She was thinking her ♦J was small, but she always meant to play up. She did not change her mind.

N/S thought there was a slight break between declarer’s “small” and “up” (or large). They believe she called small, saw the ♦Q on her left, and then changed her mind to “up.” South said declarer’s eyes were always on the dummy and she never looked to her left. Although the table director was told that West said, “play – up”, all four players at the screening said that she said “small – up.”

The Decision: It seemed very likely to the panel that West at first thought her jack was winning the trick, realized the queen had been played and then changed her mind and wanted to play the king or ace.

Law 45C4(b) clearly states that a card called from the dummy can only be changed “without pause for thought.” The pause doesn’t have to be lengthy if it could have indicated a change of mind by declarer. Table director’s decision is upheld and therefore, the table result of 4♥ by West down three, E/W minus 150 that was the outcome of declarer playing small to the queen was allowed to stand.

The Panel: Jean Molnar (Reviewer) and Tom Marsh.

Commentary:

Rigal For some reason I tend to be more sympathetic on the AWMW issues on the card play problems. Here, though, the director gave the right ruling and West brought no new information to the table. Bad luck and an AWMW to boot.

Smith A good ruling by directors and panel and a very good write-up. There really doesn't seem to be much merit to this appeal.

Wildavsky The ruling seems reasonable, though the write-up ought to state whether the appeal was found to have merit. I don't understand why the panel consisted of a single member.

Wolff To me a very poor ruling, though if taken from the "Laws" it could be called proper. When it is obvious to declarer what to do and when he evidently said, "play, up" within one second or so why not let the bridge of it determine, not some silly rule which is, among other things, hard to implement. It would be hard to me, but maybe not to others, to justify any opponent to want to be able to take that diamond trick when it is so obvious to declarer, and to everyone else, what declarer's intent was. I intend to write a blog on two important changes which we need to make in our laws in favor of equity. The above is one