

# 2016 Fall NABC

## Appeals Casebook





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

<b>Event</b> Nail Life Master Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b> Ken Van Cleve
<b>Date</b> 11/25/2016	<b>Session</b> First Qualifying

**Auction**

West	North	East	South
		Pass	Pass
1♣	1♥	Pass	4♥
5♣	Dbl <sup>1</sup>	Pass	5♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	

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

1: Tossed nonchalantly, shrug

**Hand Record**

<b>Board</b> 2	N	Frederick Wills			
<b>Dealer</b> E	♠	KQJ			
	♥	AK1042			
<b>Vul</b> N/S	♦	Q1043			
	♣	5			
W	Michael Polowan		E	Jared Lilienstein	
♠	1043		♠	97	
♥	(void)		♥	Q863	
♦	K75		♦	J82	
	♣	AKQ10943		♣	J762
	S	Betty Parker			
	♠	A8652			
	♥	J975			
	♦	A96			
	♣	8			

<b>Final Contract</b> 5♥ by N	<b>Result of Play</b> Made 5	<b>Score</b> N/S +650	<b>Opening Lead</b> ♣ J
-------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

**Facts Determined at the Table**

West called the director at trick two, when clubs were continued and there was a ruff and discard. West claimed that North tossed the double card to the table with a shrug. He felt it was clear North's hand would have extra values but not a penalty double. Since he felt that Pass was clear by South, he thought that showed South indeed gained from the unauthorized information. North said he didn't think that he doubled any differently from other calls.

**Director Ruling**

The table director discussed the table action with event staff. None found that the alleged toss and shrug demonstrably suggested Pass, so there was no legal basis to adjust the score. Therefore, the table result of 5♥ by North, making 5, N/S +650, was confirmed.

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

**The Review**

E/W requested a review of the ruling. They felt that South was indeed in possession of UI, and that it did indeed demonstrably suggest bidding 5♥, in spite of the table director's determination otherwise.

**Panel Findings**

The reviewer found five players who were playing in a top-bracket regional KO. He gave them the auction and the South hand. They all disagreed with the 4♥ bid, preferring something more constructive. All five of them chose Pass after

North's double. The reviewer then demonstrated the shrug-tossed double card and asked what they thought they'd been suggested to do. Four said they couldn't make out what it meant. The fifth said he thought his partner would want him to think it was a penalty double, so partner wanted him to pass.

The reviewer concluded that this did not meet the standard of a "demonstrable suggestion," so South's action could not be restricted by Law 16B1. The ruling was upheld. The appeal was deemed to have merit, because the TD did not poll actual players.

Experts Consulted: David Gold, David Bakhski, Mustafa Cem Tokay, Alfredo Versace, Antonio Sementa

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

<b>5♥ by N, Made 5, N/S +650</b>
----------------------------------

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
-----------------	--------------

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N2
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Nail Life Master Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Ken Van Cleve
<b>Date</b>	11/25/2016	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifying


### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

Board	1	N	John Kranyak		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠	<b>AKQ1096</b>		
		♥	<b>Q108</b>		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>	♦	<b>42</b>		
		♣	<b>54</b>		
<b>W</b>	Gloria Bart			<b>E</b>	Les Bart
♠	(void)			♠	<b>854</b>
♥	<b>K975</b>			♥	<b>A62</b>
♦	<b>KJ6</b>			♦	<b>AQ7</b>
♣	<b>AKQJ87</b>			♣	<b>10932</b>
		<b>S</b>	Ken Kranyak		
		♠	<b>J732</b>		
		♥	<b>J43</b>		
		♦	<b>109853</b>		
		♣	<b>6</b>		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
<b>6♣ by E</b>	<b>Made 6</b>	<b>E/W +920</b>	<b>♠ A</b>

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the end of the hand. North made a joke after West bid 4♠, and there was a break in the action. There was a dispute as to the length of time East took to bid 5♣. East said he is deliberate and taking medication, so he thought his 3-4 seconds was the normal tempo he uses for all bids. West did not give a specific time, but she did notice a break in tempo; she thought it was related to the distraction from North's joke. North described the length of time as 12-15 seconds. West said she chose 4♠ because she was considering bidding a grand

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The TD gave the West hand to four players from a top-bracket team event. They were all able to agree with or accept West's actions. Over 5♣, two bid 6♣ and two passed. The four players all thought a slow 5♣ showed doubt and that he was considering 6♣.

### Director Ruling

The TD agreed with East's assertion that he had showed extra values with his free 4♣ bid, but the poll results revealed that Pass was a logical alternative for West. Therefore, per Laws 16B1, 73C and 12C1c, the score was adjusted to 5♣ by East, making six, E/W +420

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>5♣ by E, Made 6, E/W +420</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

## The Review

E/W requested a review of the ruling. They felt that the break in tempo was not significant, and further that passing 5♣ would have been foolish. The reviewer checked with South (who had not expressed an opinion at the time) as to the length of the break in tempo. He described it as 9-12 seconds. The reviewer concluded that there had indeed been an unmistakable break in tempo. (Law 85)

The reviewer presented the West hand to three players as a bidding problem. All three chose or accepted West's actions. Over 5♣, all three passed, although one said he thought slam was more likely to make than not.

## Panel Findings

West was in possession of UI from the unmistakable break in tempo which demonstrably suggested bidding 6♣. Passing 5♣ was found to be a logical alternative. The table ruling was upheld. The appeal was deemed to have merit only because of the possibility that the table director had not adequately collected all the facts before making his ruling.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>5♣ by E, Made 6, E/W +420</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
-----------------	--------------

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

<b>Event</b>	Nail Life Master Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Ken Van Cleve
<b>Date</b>	11/25/2016	<b>Session</b>	Second Qualifying


### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Natural, 14-20 HCP
2: Spade Raise
3: Relay
4: Two Keycards
5: Slam invitational

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>13</b>	N	Larry Sealy	
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ 87	♥ KQ1094	
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>	♦ Q75	♣ Q94	
W	Gökçen Yilmaz			E
♠ 1094				♠ AQJ532
♥ 72				♥ A65
♦ AK2				♦ J9
♣ K8763			♣ A5	
		S	Jim Foster	
		♠ K6	♥ J83	
		♦ 108643	♣ J109	

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
4♠ by E	Made 5	E/W +650	♥ J

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the end of the hand. N/S had asked about each bid as the auction proceeded. E/W stated that 4♠ showed no extras (values for limit raise only) and no interest in slam. They clarified their system for the TD, stating that 2NT had been a mistaken bid. Their explanation of the auction (confirmed by system notes):

2NT shows a balanced spade raise with an even number of keycards.

3♣ asks for more information.

A 3♦ response would have shown any hand with no keycards; 3♥ showed two keycards and 8-9 points (the minimum for 2NT), whereas 3♠ would have shown two keycards with 10-11 points.

3♠ by East showed slam interest, but 4♠ showed the hand to have nothing extra.

### Director Ruling

The TD found the explanation of the E/W system adequate, and thought West had made a mistaken bid when he bid 2NT. He judged there was no reason to adjust the score.

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

### The Review

N/S requested a review of the ruling. They believed that the TD had received a different explanation of the E/W system from what they heard at the table. What they heard at the table suggested that West gained an advantage from the UI contained in E/W's answers to N/S's questions about their system.

The reviewer obtained the E/W system notes, and he found them to agree with what E/W had told the TD. He spoke to two expert players, who helped him draw a different conclusion from these facts. The specific part of the UI was that East expected one more keycard than West had, which demonstrably suggested not cooperating with a slam try by making a control bid of 4♣ or 4♦. That control bid would likely have led to a slam - East already expects the ♠K and ♦A to be in West's hand. East would have been able to find out about West's minor suit kings and bid to 6♠.

### Panel Findings

West was in possession of UI from the explanations of 2NT and 3♥ as showing two keycards. This information suggested that bidding 4♠ would be more successful than 4♣ or 4♦, which were logical alternatives. Therefore, per Laws 16B1, 73C, and 12C1c, the contract was changed to 6♠ by East, down one, N/S +100. The appeal was deemed to have merit.

Experts Consulted: Jan Martel, Paul Lewis

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>6♠ by E, Down 1, N/S +100</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

### Committee Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
-----------------	--------------


<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Permissible Convention	<b>Case:</b>	N4
---------------------------	------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Mitchell Open BAM Teams	<b>Event DIC</b>	Candace Kuschner
<b>Date</b>	11/27/2016	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifying

### Auction

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

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	17	N	Ron Pachtman		
<b>Dealer</b>	N	♠	43		
		♥	A108652		
<b>Vul</b>	None	♦	10		
		♣	QJ107		
W	Oleg Rubinchik			E	Igor Milman
♠	K8			♠	Q10652
♥	93			♥	7
♦	AKJ8543			♦	Q7
♣	86			♣	AK942
		S	Piotr Zatorski		
		♠	AJ97		
		♥	KQJ4		
		♦	962		
		♣	53		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Hearts, weak (alerted)
2: Spades & minor

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
5♠ by E	Down 3	N/S +150	

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at trick one. The 2♦ bid is legal in this event, but it requires a pre-Alert and a printed suggested defense. Neither was provided. West intended 5♦ as to play; East thought he was being given a choice between diamonds and spades.

### Director Ruling

E/W were disadvantaged by N/S's failure to pre-Alert and provide a defense to 2♦, as required by ACBL regulation and governed by Laws 40B4 and 40B5. The TD ruled that E/W would not have had the accident if N/S had complied with the regulations and adjusted the score to E/W: Average Plus, N/S: Average Minus, per Law 12C1d. He did not give a procedural penalty for N/S's lack of compliance with regulation.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>N/S: Average- E/W: Average+</b>
--------------------------	--

### The Review

N/S requested a review of the ruling. They thought that the opponents could have called the director at the time of the 2♦ opening if they wanted protection. They used Michaels, a convention they play in other auctions, but East made an error later in the auction, which suggests it was not the lack of a pre-Alert or printed defense (it did not cover this continuation after a 2♥ takeout bid) which caused E/W's damage.



## Panel Findings

The reviewer spoke with the DIC in order to get a better understanding of the application of Laws 40B5 and 40B4, in light of ACBL regulations regarding Mid-Chart conventions. The DIC ruled that ACBL convention regulations should not extend to redressing the damage caused by a pair's misuse of a convention they play regularly. 40B5 provides for potential redress to a damaged side, and it states a penalty may be given to a contestant in breach of regulation concerning permissible conventions.

The reviewer found that N/S were indeed in breach of this regulation, as they did not pre-Alert or provide a written defense, but he also found that E/W's damage was not a result of N/S's use of this agreement. As such, the reviewer restored the table result of 5♠ by East, down 3, N/S +150, and he gave a ¼ board procedural penalty to N/S.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>5♠ by E, Down 3, N/S +150 N/S: ¼ Board Procedural Penalty</b>
-----------------------	--

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Advisor</b>	Steve Bates

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	N5
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Kaplan Blue Ribbon Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Harry Falk
<b>Date</b>	11/29/2016	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifying


### Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	1♥
2♥ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	2♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Spades and a minor

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>13</b>	N	Freida Dohrman		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠	AK85		
		♥	QJ		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>	♦	Q742		
		♣	1043		
W	Larry Cohen			E	Steve Weinstein
♠	QJ1097			♠	432
♥	3			♥	87652
♦	K8			♦	A96
♣	AJ762			♣	K9
		S	Barbara Steffek		
		♠	6		
		♥	AK1094		
		♦	J1053		
		♣	Q85		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
2♠ by E	Made 3	E/W +140	♥ A

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called during the next hand. This is the point where East figured out N/S use upside-down carding. The play had gone: after the ♥A held trick one, South led the ♦J, which declarer won with the ace. Declarer led a trump, and North won. North led another diamond to dummy's king. Declarer led another high trump; North ducked and South discarded a heart. Declarer led a small club to the king; North played the 4, South the 5. Declarer now led a small club toward the jack; South played the 8, North the 3. Declarer looked at North's convention card (he was planning to play this defender for having given true count). The card was marked for no carding agreements, so he assumed they played standard. He ruffed a club and took nine tricks. If he had led trumps instead, he could have taken 10 tricks by playing for clubs to break 3-3, which they did.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The TD polled four players who said they didn't care what the carding agreement was; they would play for clubs 3-3 or 4-2 based on other information available to them. South's convention card had no markings for defensive carding; North's was completely filled-out, including the check box for upside-down count and attitude.

### Director Ruling

The TD ruled that the misinformation did not cause the damage, so he could not adjust the score per Laws 21C3 and 40B4.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	2♠ by E, Made 3, E/W +140
--------------------------	---------------------------

## The Review

E/W requested a review of the ruling. East said that he had every reason to expect North would give true count, and she did. The only reason he went wrong was that he was misinformed as to the N/S carding agreement. He said a poll of players was irrelevant. The reviewer spoke to six national and world champions to ask what they would do if they picked up a convention card and saw no markings for defensive carding. All of them said they would either look for the other defender's convention card or ask a question. When asked whether it was reasonable to assume the opponents were using standard carding methods, all six said it was not.

## Panel Findings

N/S were in violation of regulations and conditions of contest which require two completely filled-out convention cards. At the same time, the Alert procedures require players to protect themselves. East did not protect himself adequately; he would have received the correct information with a question or by looking at a filled-out convention card. The table ruling was upheld. The appeal was deemed to have merit. While the appellants' argument was not successful, they accurately described the flaw in the table director's ruling - he had not polled the correct element of the ruling.

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

<b>2♠ by E, Made 3, E/W +140</b>
----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
-----------------	--------------

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b> Misinformation	<b>Case:</b> N6
--	-----------------

<b>Event</b> Whitehead Women's Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b> Brian Russell
<b>Date</b> 11/29/2016	<b>Session</b> Second Qualifying


### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-17 HCP
2: Clubs (no alert)
3: Auction reopened

### Hand Record

Board	19	N	Susan Jackowitz		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>S</b>	♠	8542		
		♥	A8		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>E/W</b>	♦	AKQ5		
		♣	A43		
<b>W</b>	Marjorie Michelin			<b>E</b>	Ellen Anten
♠	K10			♠	A76
♥	J10742			♥	K96
♦	7			♦	9843
♣	KQ962			♣	J107
		<b>S</b>	Kari Nolletti		
		♠	QJ93		
		♥	Q53		
		♦	J1062		
		♣	85		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
3♣ by E	Made 3	E/W +110	

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after 2♣ was passed out. West explained that double should have been alerted as showing clubs. The director reopened the auction, allowing North to change her final Pass to a different call. Once the auction concluded, the director instructed the players to summon him after play if they believed that any damage had not been sufficiently addressed.

Following play, North summoned the director back. Her view was that, with proper information, she would have taken direct action over the double, resulting in a different outcome in the auction.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The TD polled several players, giving them the North hand. Most bid 2♦ directly with the information that double showed clubs. A projected auction continued 2♦-P-P-2♥. Some pollees now chose 2♠. A 3♣ bid was assigned to East, after either Pass or 2♠ by North. In the auctions where North bid 2♠, the TD now polled players with the South hand; all competed to 3♠.

### Director Ruling

Per Laws 21C and 12C1c, the result was changed to 30% of 3♠ by North, making 3, N/S +140, and 70% of 3♣ by East, making 3, E/W +110.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>30% 3♠ by N, Made 3, N/S +140</b> <b>70% 3♣ by E, Made 3, E/W +110</b>
--------------------------	--

## The Review

E/W requested a review of the ruling. They believed that North did nothing to protect herself - if she had wanted to know what a passed-hand double of 1NT was, all she had to do was ask.

## Panel Findings

The reviewer agreed that the double was practically self-alerting. In an event of this caliber, North was expected to ask a question if she wanted to know the meaning of double in this auction. Once the auction had been reopened, North had had the opportunity to show her spade suit in addition to her diamond suit and had elected not to do so. Therefore, the supposition about a spade contract was not supported by an indication from the player that she had considered advancing the suit in the actual auction. The reviewer overturned the director's ruling and restored the table result of 3♣ by East, making 3, E/W +110, to both sides. The appeal was deemed to have merit.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>3♣ by E, Made 3, E/W +110</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
-----------------	--------------

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	N7
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Kaplan Blue Ribbon Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Harry Falk
<b>Date</b>	11/29/2016	<b>Session</b>	Second Qualifying


### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 14+ - 17 HCP

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>4</b>	N	Jason Feldman		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠	A964		
		♥	72		
		♦	Q104		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>	♣	AKJ7		
W	Larry Robbins			E	Maurizio Di Sacco
♠	10732			♠	Q8
♥	103			♥	AQJ95
♦	AJ3			♦	952
♣	9543			♣	1062
		S	Mark Feldman		
		♠	KJ5		
		♥	K864		
		♦	K876		
		♣	Q8		

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

### Facts Determined at the Table

North called the director at the completion of play. Following the opening lead, North asked E/W about their leads and carding. He was told they play Rusinow leads and coded 9s and 10s. Since the ♥K was in dummy, he asked what combinations the queen could be from. Specifically, he asked about AQJ and was told from that combination, East would lead the jack, which is what was marked on the convention card. North played the king at trick one, hoping to break communication between the defenders. When it turned out that East had led from AQJ95, the defense was able to score a diamond and four hearts for down one.

### Director Ruling

The director determined that North had been given a correct explanation of the E/W lead agreements. East had simply not followed them. Therefore, there were no legal grounds to adjust the score.

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

### The Review

N/S requested a review of the ruling. South maintained that North's play was correct based on the information he had, but that it would have been right to duck if he had known that East was leading from AQJxx. He was playing for a combination such as QJ10 alone in the East hand.

East said he did not think that Rusinow applied to AQJ, so he thought their agreement was to lead the Queen from this combination. West thought it did, and that they lead the jack, which is what the E/W convention card said.

## Panel Findings

The reviewer found several groups of experts in order to help him determine whether the information North received about the E/W lead agreements caused the damage. There were some different card combinations where experts differed on whether the king at trick one would be correct, but the combination which was common to all the expert testimony was that it would always be correct to play the king at trick one if the lead had been from QJ alone. The experts unanimously felt it was extremely unlikely a defender had led from QJ alone in this auction, so they all determined the opening lead had been from another combination where holding up was correct. The panel's analysis of the appellants' statements and the expert consultants led them to conclude that the description given did not cause the damage, and the table result was allowed to stand.

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

## Panel Members

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

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

<b>Event</b>	Kaplan Blue Ribbon Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Harry Falk
<b>Date</b>	11/29/2016	<b>Session</b>	Second qualifying


**Auction**

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

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

1: 16-18 HCP


**Hand Record**

<b>Board</b>	21	N	Carl Berenbaum		
<b>Dealer</b>	N	♠	Q95		
		♥	10642		
<b>Vul</b>	N/S	♦	64		
		♣	QJ64		
W	Merril Hirsh			E	Monique Smith
♠	J76			♠	AK832
♥	A7			♥	J8
♦	AKQ9			♦	852
♣	A1053			♣	982
		S	Barbara Kepple		
		♠	104		
		♥	KQ953		
		♦	J1073		
		♣	K7		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
4♠ by E	Made 4	E/W +420	♥ K

**Facts Determined at the Table**

The director was called at the completion of play. N/S alleged that East broke tempo at trick eight. East said she "reacted" but did not think it was significant. The play had gone: opening lead of the ♥K was won by the ace. Declarer played the ace and king of spades; everyone followed. Declarer played the ace, king, queen of diamonds, with North trumping the last with the ♠Q. North continued with a club to the king and ace. Declarer now led the ♥7 from dummy, North played the 10, Declarer allegedly hesitated before playing the jack, then South won with the queen. South played a club, won by North's queen, leaving:



North returned a heart, giving declarer a ruff and sluff.



## Director Ruling

The director determined that North was an innocent player who had been damaged by East's break in tempo when she had no demonstrable bridge reason for that action. Per Law 73F, he adjusted to the score which would have been achieved had North played his last club, 4♠ by East, down one, E/W -50

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

## The Review

E/W requested a review of the ruling. They did not think the hesitation was significant. Further, they stated that North's play could never be right. Declarer is known to have three remaining trumps. Since dummy has no hearts remaining, the play of a heart will lead to a cross-ruff and no tricks for the defense.

## Panel Findings

The reviewer agreed with E/W's assertions. Law 73F could not apply - no damage resulted from the false inference North drew. North chose a play which could never have been correct. Law 73D1 further states that players draw inferences from unintentional variations in their opponents' tempo at their own risk. The table result of 4♠ by East, making four, E/W +420, was restored.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>4♠ by E, Made 4, E/W +420</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
-----------------	--------------

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	R1
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	10K Swiss Teams	<b>Event DIC</b>	Peter Wilke
<b>Date</b>	11/26/2016	<b>Session</b>	Second Qualifying


### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, four ♠, Limit Raise

### Hand Record

Board	9	N	1140 MP		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ KJ			
		♥ 42			
<b>Vul</b>	<b>E/W</b>	♦ 854			
		♣ AK9432			
<b>W</b>	7480 MP			<b>E</b>	3840 MP
♠	A10985			♠	Q2
♥	AQ7			♥	J98
♦	106			♦	AQJ3
♣	1076			♣	QJ85
		<b>S</b>	9050 MP		
		♠	7643		
		♥	K10653		
		♦	K972		
		♣	(void)		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by E	Made 3	E/W +600	♦ 2

### Facts Determined at the Table

This was the fifth board of a seven board match. The director was approached after the match had been compared and reported. He was asked to consider whether East's 3NT bid was legal in light of hearing West's explanation that his 2NT bid was a four card limit raise. East told the director that at the point he bid 2NT he forgot that his agreement was as West described.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled three players with East's hand without mentioning the alert or explanation of 2NT. All three players passed 3♠. Additional players were polled who confirmed the explanation suggested bidding rather than passing.

### Director Ruling

According to law and regulations pursuant to it, the request for a ruling was timely since it was requested within 30 minutes of the scores being made available for inspection (Law 92B). Based upon the player polls, the director determined that pass was a logical alternative to bidding 3NT, and further decided that the unauthorized information from the explanation suggested not passing 3♠. The score was changed to 3♠ by West, down one, N/S +100, per Laws 12 & 16B.

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

## The Review

E/W appealed the director's ruling. East and North attended the review, as did the entire director panel. E/W's written reason for the appeal was: "We think that the 3NT call was not made because of the alert of 2NT, but because it was likely that South had a shapely hand and could get a ruff." During the review, East added that 3NT rated to be as likely to make as 3♠ since partner did not make a weak jump overcall of 2♠ at his first turn so he rated to have a good hand.

The panel confirmed with East that at the point he bid 2NT he had forgotten his methods and his bid was intended as natural and invitational. The actual agreement was that 2NT was a spade raise.

The reviewer explained the law, how the director arrived at the ruling, and the appeal process to East and asked him what errors he thought were made or what was wrong with the ruling. He said he did not find any error in what the director did, but believed that bridge logic dictated that 3NT was the correct bid. When the reviewer explained that the ruling assumed that the unauthorized information suggested not passing 3♠, East did not rebut that assumption.

The panel asked about the play to 3NT and was told that the diamond lead went to declarer's jack; the ♠Q was led and lost to North's king; a high club was cashed after which North switched to a heart won in dummy; declarer cashed the ♠A from dummy dropping North's jack.

## Panel Findings

The panel found that East had not offered any relevant arguments as to why the director's ruling was erroneous. The panel confirmed that the director had asked appropriate questions of appropriate peers, the process easily established pass as a logical alternative, and the secondary conducted poll confirmed that the unauthorized information suggested not passing 3♠. The panel considered that the director's assignment of eight tricks in 3♠ seemed correct, but did not poll that point. The director's ruling of 3♠ by East, down one, N/S +100, was therefore upheld. Since E/W essentially brought nothing new to the hearing, E/W and the team captain were assessed an Appeal without Merit Warning.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>3NT by N, Made 6, N/S +690</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Smith
<b>Member</b>	Eric Bell
<b>Member</b>	Gary Zeiger

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

<b>Event</b>	Sunday Daylight Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Terry Lavender
<b>Date</b>	11/27/2016	<b>Session</b>	Second Session


**Auction**

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

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

1: 15-17 HCP
2: Transfer to ♥


**Hand Record**

<b>Board</b>	10	N	1100 MP		
<b>Dealer</b>	E	♠	A10		
		♥	762		
<b>Vul</b>	Both	♦	QJ9		
		♣	Q6542		
W	1600 MP			E	50 MP
♠	9865			♠	QJ74
♥	Q10985			♥	A4
♦	84			♦	A1072
♣	KJ			♣	A87
		S	700 MP		
		♠	K32		
		♥	KJ3		
		♦	K653		
		♣	1093		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
2♥ by E			♣ 10

**Facts Determined at the Table**

At trick 12, with North on lead, South claimed the last tricks. E/W called the director. The end position was:



**Director Ruling**

The director ruled that South's claim with partner on lead gave North extraneous information that the lead of the trump would be more beneficial to their side than a club. Law 70D2 states: "The Director shall not accept any part of a defender's claim that depends on his partner's selecting a particular play from among alternative normal plays." "Normal" is defined as including "play that would be careless or inferior for the class of player involved." The director assigned the result of 2♥ by East, making two, E/W +110.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	2♥ by E, Made 2, E/W +110
--------------------------	---------------------------

## The Review

N/S said that North's lead under any circumstances based on the past tricks would be the heart. N/S said that the play of the hand had shown North that he was the only one to still hold clubs. Clubs had been played three times with a ruff in dummy. North had held five clubs so all the clubs had been accounted for. A club lead would result in a ruff and sluff, which would be illogical.

N/S also testified that they had been behind for the previous several rounds, and South claimed to help catch the partnership up.

E/W stated that without the comment by South, North could not know South had two trumps or that South had the high trump

## Panel Findings

After hearing N/S, the panel was satisfied that North knew that the club was the last club and leading it would give a ruff and sluff. The Panel accepted that leading the club could never win, and thus it could never be the right choice. Therefore, the panel ruled that the play of the club was not a "normal" play per Law 70D2, so N/S was awarded the last two tricks. The result changed to 2♥ by East, down one, N/S +100.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>2♥ by E, Down 1, N/S +100</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Jeff Jacob
<b>Member</b>	Mike Roberts
<b>Member</b>	John Gram

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b> Improper Designation	<b>Case:</b> R3
--	-----------------

<b>Event</b>	Mini-Blue Ribbon Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Terry Lavender
<b>Date</b>	11/29/2016	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifying


### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: RKC 1430
2: One or Four Key Cards

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>26</b>	N	1600 MP		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠ J72	♥ 10874		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>	♦ (void)	♣ KJ8754		
W	3000 MP			E	2500 MP
♠	Q95			♠	AK63
♥	Q96			♥	A52
♦	AJ972			♦	KQ543
♣	32			♣	A
		S	2000 MP		
		♠	1084		
		♥	KJ3		
		♦	1086		
		♣	Q1096		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
6♦ by W			♣ 7

### Facts Determined at the Table

The opening lead of a club was won in dummy. Declarer played a diamond to the ace in her hand, then a small diamond towards dummy and called for a diamond. Dummy claimed declarer was pointing up indicating a high diamond, confirmed by declarer but disputed at the table. The opponents both claimed that dummy queried "diamond?" before declarer pointed upward to indicate playing a high card. The table director asked dummy if that fact was accurate. Dummy confirmed but later modified her statement to include that declarer was indicating a high card as she was asking the question.

### Director Ruling

The table director applied law 46B2: if a suit is designated, but no rank specified, declarer is deemed to have called for the lowest card of the suit indicated (except when declarer's different intention is incontrovertible). Based on the evidence presented, he was not satisfied that declarer's different intention was incontrovertible, so he ruled a low diamond played from dummy. The table result was 6♦ by West, down one, N/S +100.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>6♦ by W, Down 1, N/S +100</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Review

E/W appealed the ruling. The table director had indicated that both appellants were agitated during the ruling process. This was a first session appeal which was not addressed until after the break. When the appellants were interviewed by the reviewer, both believed that the opponents had dominated the table discussion. Dummy asserted that her statements to the director were consistent, an opinion forcefully shared by declarer.

## Panel Findings

The panel decided that if East had time to query partner about which diamond she wanted played from dummy, that was enough evidence to suggest pause for thought and that declarer's intention was therefore not incontrovertible to play a high diamond from dummy. The table ruling was upheld.

The panel did not award an Appeal without Merit Warning. E/W believed they had not been heard during the initial ruling. It was determined that the director handled the ruling correctly and spent extra time with the appellants, but they genuinely believed they had not been heard.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>6♦ by W, Down 1, N/S +100</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Marc Labovitz
<b>Member</b>	Bernie Gorkin
<b>Member</b>	Mike Roberts
<b>Member</b>	David Metcalf