

**2011 Spring NABC
Appeals Casebook**



**NABC National Tournament
Louisville
March 2011**

**Appeals at the
2011 Spring NABC
Louisville, Kentucky**

FOREWORD

The appeal hearings and commentary descriptions are now being compiled and edited by the American Contract Bridge League. They are published on the ACBL web page. This internet publication is intended to be a tool to help improve the abilities of those serving on appeals committees and tournament directors and to communicate decisions and the process to arrive at those decisions to the membership at large.

A total of thirteen (13) cases were heard.

Seven (7) cases were from unrestricted (by masterpoints) North American Bridge Championship Events and were heard by a committee of peers. The names of the players involved are included.

Six (6) cases were from all other events and were heard by panels (committees) of tournament directors. The names of the players involved are included when the event from which the appeal came was a Flight A/X event or was the top bracket of a bracketed knockout event. When the names of the players are not used, the player's masterpoint total is included.

The cases are first presented without commentary. After the official panel of commentators has had an opportunity to provide their commentary (about 4 weeks) and any corrections to the cases, the commentary is added, corrections made and the internet publication is finalized.

Everyone involved in this process is due praise for their efforts. Special thanks to the NABC Appeals Committee and the Tournament Directors serving on the director committees, scribes and commentators. Without their considerable contribution of time and effort, this publication would not exist.

**Appeals at the
2011 Spring NABC
Louisville, Kentucky**

THE EXPERT PANEL

Bart Bramley, was born in 1948 in Poughkeepsie, NY, and grew up in Connecticut. He has lived in Boston, Seattle, and Chicago, and currently lives in Dallas with his wife Judy and their two cats. He graduated from MIT and had careers in programming and options trading before taking his current job as a technical analyst at SCA Promotions in Dallas. His National wins include the Vanderbilt, the Reisinger, the LM Pairs and two Blue Ribbons. In WBF events he has won the Senior Bowl and was second in the World Par Contest. He is a staff member and frequent writer for The Bridge World. He is an avid sports fan, especially baseball and the Yankees, and plays a mediocre game of golf. He enjoys word games and trivia games. He is (was?) a big fan of the Grateful Dead.

Jeff Goldsmith, was born near Schenectady, NY in 1961. He has lived in Pasadena, CA, for the last 20 years. He graduated from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and Caltech. He is a software engineer, focusing on computer graphics and animation and internet programming, all with a heavy mathematical perspective. He created computer animation for JPL for several years including the movie about Voyager's encountering Neptune. He ice dances and plays many other games, particularly German board games. His web site (<http://www.gg.caltech.edu/~jeff>) contains lots of bridge and other material.

Ton Kooijman, was born in the early forties (he wants some guess remaining). His father was a good bridge player whom tried to teach him the game starting in the late fifties. He passed his examination for TD in the Netherlands in the late sixties, some months after he married. Quite soon he started directing in the highest divisions of bridge in the Netherlands. Not much progress in the seventies, though in his private life he became father of a son and a daughter, but at the end of that era he was selected to be TD in the Olympiad in his country in 1980 where he met the international bridge scene with illustrious people like Edgar Kaplan and Kojak, the latter becoming a real example of TD-behavior. In 1987 he was appointed one of the chief TD's in Europe but his job in bridge concentrated around the organization. During the nineties and zeroes, he was operations director for WBF and EBL. But he did not neglect the laws. In the Netherlands, he was chairman of the national appeal committee for many years; and he became a member of the WBF-Laws Committee in 1994. In 1997 he took Edgar Kaplan's place as chairman of this committee. His approach as member of the commentating group will concentrate more on the technical application of the laws than on the question whether a call is acceptable given the available unauthorized information. And since he is European the differences in approach between both continents might draw his attention.

Barry Rigal, was born in London, England in 1958. He currently resides in New York City with his wife, Sue Picus. A bridge writer and analyst, he contributes to many periodicals worldwide and is the author of a dozen books, including *Card Games for Dummies* and *Precision in the Nineties*. He enjoys theater, music, arts and travel. Barry is an outstanding Vugraph commentator, demonstrating an extensive knowledge of bidding systems played by pairs all over the world. He coached the USA I team to the Venice Cup in 1997. He has two North American team titles, but is proudest of his fourth-place finish in the 1990 Geneva World Mixed Pairs and winning the Common Market Mixed Teams in 1998 and the Gold Cup in 1991. He served as chairman of the ACBL National Appeals Committee from 2003-2006.

Matt Smith was born in 1957 in Victoria, B.C. and still lives there with his wife Vicky. He has been an ACBL National Tournament Director since 2002. He has been an assistant tournament director at several WBF Championships. Is a member of the ACBL Laws Commission, and the first working tournament director to have been appointed since Al Sobel. Matt is an avid golfer when not directing.

Adam Wildavsky was born in Ohio in 1960 and grew up in Berkeley and Oakland, CA and London, England. He is a graduate of MIT and since 1986 he has resided in New York City. He works as a senior software engineer for Google, Inc. Mr. Wildavsky has won the Blue Ribbon Pairs twice and the Reisinger BAM Teams once. He won a bronze medal in the 2003 Bermuda Bowl in Monaco. Mr. Wildavsky is chairman of the National Appeals Committee and vice-chair of the National Laws Commission. His interest in the laws is informed by his study of Objectivism, the philosophy of Ayn Rand.

Bobby Wolff, was born in San Antonio in 1932 and is a graduate of Trinity University. He currently resides in Las Vegas. His father, mother, brother and wives, including present wife Judy, all played bridge. Bobby is a member of the ACBL Hall of Fame as well as a Grand Life Master in both the WBF and the ACBL. He is one of the world's great players and has won 11 World titles and is the only player ever to win world championships in five different categories: World Team Olympiad, World Open Pair, World Mixed Teams, World Senior Bowl and seven Bermuda Bowls. He has represented the USA in the following team events: 12 Bermuda Bowls, 5 World Team Olympiads, 3 Senior Teams and 1 Mixed Team. Mr. Wolff has also won numerous NABCs including four straight Spingolds (1993-1996). He served as ACBL president in 1987 and WBF president from 1992-1994. He started the ACBL Recorder system in 1985, has served as tournament recorder at NABCs and is the author of the ACBL active ethics program. Among his pet projects are eliminating convention disruption, encouraging less hesitation disruption, allowing law 12C3 to be used in ACBL events and reducing the impact of politics and bias on appeals committees.

APPEAL	NABC+ ONE
Subject	Unauthorized Information, Break in Tempo
DIC	Kenneth Van Cleve
Event	IMP Pairs
Session	Second Final
Date	03/12/11

BD#	12
VUL	N/S
DLR	W

Richard Budd	
♠	J94
♥	
♦	AK762
♣	AQ1075

Phillip Becker		Spring 2011 Louisville, Kentucky	Pierre Flatowicz	
♠	8632		♠	KQ1075
♥	Q10932		♥	J8764
♦	54		♦	3
♣	43		♣	62

Bill Esberg	
♠	A
♥	AK5
♦	QJ1098
♣	KJ98

West	North	East	South
P	1♦	2♦	2♠
4♥	5♣ ¹	P	7♦
P	P	7♥	P
P	DBL ²	P	7N
P	P	P	

Final Contract	7N by South
Opening Lead	Immaterial
Table Result	Making 7, NS +2220
Director Ruling	7♥ Dbled by West, Down 7, NS +1700
Committee Ruling	7♥ Dbled by West, Down 7, NS +1700

(1)	5C call made after 1-2 seconds rather than 10 seconds as required by regulation.
(2)	Alleged to be slow by EW, disputed by NS

The Facts: The 5♣ call was made after 1 to 2 seconds rather than the approximately 10 seconds required by regulation. The double of 7♥ was alleged to be slow by E-W, but this was disputed by N-S.

The Ruling: North's failure to follow the regulation regarding a skip bid demonstrably suggested to South that bidding 7NT would be successful, so he is judged to have passed 7♥ doubled. The Director found that down seven is the worst result for N-S that was

likely in 7♥ doubled. Therefore, the Director adjusted the score to N-S +1700 based on **Laws 12C1e and 16B2.**

The Appeal: North-South appealed the Director's ruling and North and West attended the hearing.

Appealing Side: West put the STOP card down before making the 4H bid. North had a few seconds to think before the call actually "hit the table."

Non-Appealing Side: East asked about the 2♠ call before bidding 7♥.

The Decision: The Committee Decision hinged on whether a 5-7 second pause on a seven-level decision could constitute a break-in-tempo (BIT). The majority of the Committee was of the opinion that on a highly competitive auction, a 7-second pause was not necessarily a BIT. But, that was not the point here. The double of 7♥ had been made by a player who had taken one second to bid after a "STOP" card warning and therefore, that player had established a fast tempo in a competitive auction. This is true in this case for this player, if not for every player. Seven seconds was a BIT. The Committee considered the infraction of failing to observe the STOP card warning to be as serious as the pause (if any) over 7♥ doubled.

The next question to consider was whether passing 7♥ doubled was a logical alternative. It was determined that passing 7♥ doubled had to be logical alternative for anyone who had passed the first time, regardless of whether bidding 7N looked clearly right to the Committee. The BIT had made the call more attractive to a player for whom the call had not been automatic the first time.

Since the BIT had made the winning action more attractive, and a less successful action was a logical alternative, the Committee upheld the adjusted score. NS +1700 was agreed to be the likely result in 7♥ doubled.

The Committee: Ed Lazarus (Chairman), Ron Gerard, Barry Rigal, Bruce Rogoff, and Bob White.

Commentary:

Bramley: Well-reasoned. I agree that NORMALLY 5-7 seconds is not a BIT in a high-level competitive auction (or in most auctions, for that matter), but that North had abused his privilege by acting too quickly on the previous round. By the way, "The Decision" is the only place where the length of the pause is mentioned. Why isn't it in "The Facts" or the statements by either side? Also, I'd have given an AWMW.

Goldsmith: Good job by the AC except for the failure to award an AWMW. It is reasonable to give N/S a 1/4 board PP for abuse of UI; this was pretty blatant. I agree that there is very little chance of misdefending to get only 6 tricks.

Kooijman: A firm decision, but mainly one in an ideal world. In my country 95% of the players do not wait at all after a stop, 4% wait 3 seconds and none wait 8 to 10 seconds. That is why a long time ago our national appeal committee considered a pause of approximately 8 seconds after a stop as an hesitation and didn't allow the suggested call. Which for this case means that had North obeyed the regulations he would have denied the club Queen, after which not bidding 7♦ could have been an infraction. I understand that the committee accepted the 7♦-bid? But doesn't 7♦ mean that South then legally assumed the club Q to be in the North hand? And does the BIT show the 5th club in the North hand. I find it difficult to follow the committee's reasoning.

Rigal: This case does seem to me to have an important point of principle; I agree with it. Whether or not it will be applied in other cases, I do not know.

Wildavsky: Per the A/C's reasoning, this appeal had not a shred of merit. Where is the AWMW?

The TD's adjustment is incorrect as a matter of law. I suspect the fault lies in the write-up, not the ruling. Every adjustment under 12c1e requires two adjustments, one for the OS and one for the NOS. The criteria for the two sides are only slightly different, so usually the adjustment for both sides is the same. Here the write-up suggests that the TD improperly applied the criteria for the NOS to both sides.

APPEAL	NABC+ TWO
Subject	Unauthorized Information Break in Tempo
DIC	Kenneth Van Cleve
Event	IMP Pairs
Session	Second Final
Date	3/12/11

BD#	22
VUL	E-W
DLR	E

Alan Popkin	
♠	Q32
♥	Q543
♦	KQJ72
♣	4

Matt Cory		Spring 2011 Louisville, Kentucky	Lee Bukstel	
♠	K95		♠	AJT76
♥	A987		♥	KT62
♦	54		♦	T6
♣	AQ65		♣	J2

Nancy Popkin	
♠	84
♥	J
♦	A983
♣	KT9873

West	North	East	South
		P	P
1♦ ¹	P	1♠	P
2♠	P	P	3♣
X	3♦	P	P
X ²	P	3♥	P
P	P		

Final Contract	3♥ by East
Opening Lead	♦ A
Table Result	Made 4, E-W +170
Director Ruling	3♦ Doubled by North, made 3, N-S +470
Committee Ruling	3♦ Doubled by North, made 3, N-S +470

(1)	Could be short
(2)	Break-in-Tempo (BIT) agreed by E-W of 30-45 seconds

The Facts: All players agreed that there was a considered pause before the second double. The Director was called at the end of the hand. The Director asked if both doubles were ostensibly penalty – West indicated that both doubles were intended as penalty. East-West reported that they play Precision with a 14-16 1NT opening.

The Ruling: A quick poll of two players was conducted and both pollees believed that pass was a logical alternative to 3♥ on the above auction. The slow double was believed

to demonstrably suggest pulling the double. Based on the results of the poll, the result was adjusted to 3♦ doubled. It was judged that in the play of 3♦ doubled, it would be reasonably likely for it to make 3. The Director adjusted the result to 3♦ doubled, making 3, for an adjusted score of North-South +470 based on **Laws 16B2 and 12C1e**.

The Appeal:

The Appealing Side: East-West appealed Director's ruling and both E-W players attended the hearing. East argued that it was very unsafe to play 3♦ doubled at IMPs. West thought his double was a "Do Something Intelligent Double."

The Decision: The BIT was stipulated by both sides. The Committee believed that the slow double suggested bidding over passing. Passing is a logical alternative to bidding; some would argue that it is the only alternative. Therefore, the Committee believed that bidding was prohibited by the unauthorized information.

The Committee decided that 3♦ doubled will usually take 9 tricks and ten tricks were not deemed at all probable, so the Committee ruled as the director had. The Committee also decided that the decision was so clear-cut that despite the appellants' inexperience, an Appeal Without Merit Warning (AWMW) was given. The Committee did consider the appellants' inexperience in rejecting a procedural penalty for abuse of unauthorized information, preferring direct education to penalty.

The Committee: Jeff Goldsmith (Chairman), Jeff Aker, Dick Budd, Tom Carmichael, and Jeff Roman.

Commentary:

Bramley: I agree with the decision and the AWMW. I disagree with even contemplating a procedural penalty, which should apply only for egregious acts. This was a "routine" slow-double-and-pull, not a crime against humanity.

Goldsmith: Extremely simple case. We were, perhaps, overly lenient in not awarding a PP.

Kooijman: An obvious decision, EW being lucky to be considered inexperienced.

Rigal: Good decision. Maybe the procedural penalty in addition to the AWM was reasonable – at least one of those two actions was indeed mandatory.

Wildavsky: I agree fully with the AWMW. I'd have assessed a procedural penalty as well. Inexperienced or not, players must understand that when they appeal they risk a worse score than they achieved at the table. In fact they sign a notice to that effect. The fact that E/W appealed shows that they do not understand the law here. Nothing will help their future understanding more than a score penalty would. It also serves as an incentive to others to follow the laws. The laws must apply equally to all.

Wolff: Another excellent ruling based on obvious telltale very questionable ethics. Another C&E committee could be called, but I am not privy to who EW are. In traffic violations there is a mandatory traffic school defensive driving penalty sometimes required. In bridge it also might help somewhat cure the problem, by making the persons involved embarrassed by having to attend it.

APPEAL	NABC+ THREE
Subject	Unauthorized Information, Break in Tempo
DIC	Gary Zeiger
Event	Silver Ribbon Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	03/13/11

BD#	16
VUL	EW
DLR	W

Brian Mason	
♠	KQJ974
♥	54
♦	63
♣	J83

Lew Walter		Spring 2011 Louisville, Kentucky	Irina Levitina	
♠	8652		♠	T3
♥	K96		♥	AQT87
♦	JT54		♦	92
♣	72		♣	T954

Gerri Anne Mason	
♠	A
♥	J32
♦	AKQ87
♣	AKQ6

West	North	East	South
P	2♠	P	2N
P	3♥ ¹	DBL	3N ²
P	4♠	P	P
P			

Final Contract	4♠ by North
Opening Lead	♦9
Table Result	Making 7, N-S +510
Director Ruling	3N by South, Down 1, N-S -50
Committee Ruling	3N by South, Down 1, N-S -50

1	South believed she alerted 3♥ showing a maximum, but did not. North was about to explain the failure to alert but East asked before she could, and received the correct information.
2	South acknowledged a break-in-tempo (BIT) before the 3N bid by South.

The Facts: South believed she alerted 3♥, showing a maximum, but it was agreed that she did not. North said he was about to explain the failure to alert, but East asked before he was able to, getting the correct information. E-W did not call the director at that time. There was an agreed BIT before the 3N bid.

The Ruling: The Director adjusted the score back to 3N by South, down 1, -50 for N-S as a result of the agreed BIT before the 3N call, based on **Law 16B2 and 12C1e**. Furthermore, after the ruling, South brought up new information never mentioned at the table; i.e., (1) 2N shows a spade fit; (2) 3N was not natural, but was asking for a 4-card minor (which was not alerted) although South said E-W asked and got the correct information; and (3) when South did not pass 3♥ doubled, she showed that she did not want to play 3N (asked by East).

The Appeal: North-South appealed the Director's ruling and attended the hearing. East-West did not attend the hearing. At the screening, Matt Smith, the screener, informed the appellants that based on their explanations, he felt it was unlikely the Committee would award them redress and that in fact, it was likely they would receive an Appeal Without Merit Warning (AWMW). Nevertheless, the pair still chose to exercise their right to appeal.

The Decision: The Committee decided as the Director did and ruled that the appeal lacked merit. The basis for that ruling lay in the three transgressions committed by North-South at the table, as follows: (1) North failed to alert South's 3N rebid as artificial either at the time the bid was made or at the conclusion of the bidding; (2) that there was an acknowledged appreciable BIT before the 3N bid was made, which conveyed unauthorized information to North concerning doubt and there was a logical alternative to bidding 4S; and (3) there was no apparent agreement in the explanations by North and South as to pass or correct. Their convention cards did not substantiate the claim that their partnership agreements without the opponents' intervention applied after a lead directing double.

At the screening, the screener informed the appellants that based on their explanations, he felt it was unlikely the Committee would award them any redress and that in fact, it was likely they would receive an Appeal Without Merit Warning. Nevertheless, the pair still chose to exercise their right to appeal. The N-S pair received an Appeal Without Merit Warning.

The Committee: Gail Greenberg (Chairman), Ed Lazarus, Chris Moll, Jim Thurtell, and Tom Peters.

Commentary:

Bramley: This one goes straight to the Chutzpah Hall of Fame. Not only did South hesitate her way to the right contract instead of just bidding it, but N/S made up a series of incredible statements to justify their actions. A mere AWMW seems insufficient.

Goldsmith: Three no-brainers in a row. Good AWMW. Giving North a PP for gross abuse of UI is probably appropriate.

Kooijman: No comment.

Rigal: Certainly an AWM; I'd ask the pair to produce system notes and if they had a system card but no notes supporting this view I'd go with disciplinary action. That will teach them to XXXX with the committee.

Wildavsky: I fully agree that the appeal lacked merit. I'd have assessed a procedural penalty as well.

I'll note in passing that while the screening director informed N/S that they were at risk for an AWMW, screening directors seldom do so, since they properly do not wish to be seen as discouraging potentially legitimate appeals. When a screener does not discourage a pair from continuing their appeal it is in no way an endorsement of their case, and a TD's admonitions or lack thereof should have no influence on the AC's determination of merit. One exception occurs

when a TD believes his ruling is close enough that he appeals it himself -- in that case he is the appealing party, and neither side is at risk of an AWMW.

Wolff: Another correct ruling against North, magically retreating to the right contract after a BIT by partner. But again, no real lasting impression made on NS because of no embarrassment which accompanied the ruling. If we want to slow down appeals, why not make an effort to at least cause some moral risk to the appellants, in the way of public censure?

APPEAL	NABC+ FOUR
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Michael Flader
Event	Whitehead Women's Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	03/17/11

BD#	12
VUL	NS
DLR	W

Kay Mulford	
♠	QJT4
♥	Q854
♦	AQJ
♣	T3

Kathleen Sulgrove		Spring 2011 Louisville, Kentucky	Brenda Bryant	
♠	2		♠	AK53
♥	AKJT76		♥	932
♦	975		♦	T8642
♣	A42		♣	Q
		A. Netherwood		
		♠	9876	
		♥		
		♦	K3	
		♣	KJ98765	

West	North	East	South
1♥	DBL	2♣ ¹	DBL
2♥	P	P	2♠
3♥	P	P	3♠
P	P	DBL	P
4♥	P	P	P

Final Contract	4♥ by West
Opening Lead	♠Q
Table Result	Making 4, E-W +420
Director Ruling	4♣ Dbled by South, Down 1, E-W +200
Committee Ruling	4♥ by West, Made 4, E-W +420

1	Constructive Heart Raise
---	--------------------------

The Facts: East-West claim to have alerted the 2♣ call. Both North and South claim not to have heard the alert. The table director, who was present at the table during the auction, did not hear the alert. South asserted that she would have bid 3♣ had she heard the alert.

The Ruling: The Director adjusted the score back to 4♣ doubled by South, down 1, -200 for N-S as a result of the failure to alert/misinformation after the 2♣ call, based on **Law 21B3 and 12C1e**. ACBL Regulations require a visual as well as audible notification of the alert. West violated this procedure by failing to make a visual indication of the alert. The Director ruled that North-South were disadvantaged by the failure to alert as required.

The Appeal: East-West appealed the Director's ruling and all four players attended the hearing. East-West argued that even if North-South did not hear alert, South's extreme club length and North's takeout double should have tipped off South that the 2♣ bid was not natural. Therefore, East-West argued that the failure of East-West to properly alert did not damage North-South.

North-South argued that the 2♣ convention used by East-West is not used by players in their home area. South asserted that she would have bid 3♣ had she have been properly alerted.

The Decision: The ACBL requires that in addition to an oral alert, the alert card must be displayed on all alerts and announcements. It is the responsibility of the alerting side to be sure that their opponents are properly informed. Thus, East-West was guilty of misinformation.

However, to adjust the score, there must have been damage. At the table, West chose to bid 4♥ rather than to defend 3♠ doubled with the knowledge at her disposal that East had a constructive raise even though she thought 3♠ doubled would be set. If South competed vigorously in clubs, it would suggest to West that East is likely short in clubs and make it more attractive for West to bid 4♥ than on their actual auction. Thus, the Committee ruled that although North-South were misinformed, the misinformation did not damage North-South. The table result was allowed to stand.

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chairman), Aaron Silverstein, Jacob Morgan, Patty Tucker, and Jeff Goldsmith.

Commentary:

Bramley: I disagree. I prefer the Director's ruling.

The write-up doesn't say exactly when South was going to bid 3♣: Directly over 2♣, or when 2♥ got passed back to her? I assume she meant directly over 2♣. Then we can project the auction continuing 3♥-P-P-3♠-P-P-DBL, over which South might well remove herself to 4♣ rather than play a tenuous doubled contract with four to the nine. Over 4♣, I can't credit West with figuring out to bid 4♥, which would often be a losing decision (look only at the E/W cards). Meanwhile, West has excellent defense against clubs with her partner holding spade defense. 4♣ doubled is quite a likely contract, with down one the clear outcome. I would assign that score for both sides.

Also, I find it curious that West was willing to try to beat 3♠ until her partner announced that she thought it was GOING DOWN. Why should we think that West's judgment will suddenly improve dramatically if South bids 4♣? E/W are the violators here. We shouldn't be giving them every benefit of the doubt.

Goldsmith: Another not-very-difficult case.

Kooijman: The TD-decision is quite acceptable, the committee decision well done.

Rigal: I'm not convinced that E/W are entitled to the table result even if N/S could not prove damage. It seems to me that E/W committed an infraction and there is considerable doubt as to whether all auctions would lead to 4♥. N/S are maybe not due to get more than -420.

Wildavsky: I do not fault the TD for ruling in favor of the NOS. I agree with the AC, though, that here no damage resulted.

Wolff: Possibly West was hesitant to make an alert, because she, also, was unsure of East's meaning to her 2♣ bid. Once there might have been no alert CD has struck and bridge basically has stopped since meanings of the various competitive bids take on stark confusion. Although, if my fear of West's not being sure of what East was trying to tell the table, and consequently did not alert as vigorously as she should have, then perhaps EW should not have received the full +420 for her actions. Also perhaps NS were victimized as well, but who knows since bridge has effectively stopped way back at the 2 club level. While justice was probably done, still certain facts are not known, nor will they ever be, making the adjudication of this hand problematical at best.

An alternate ruling to me would be EW AV+ and NS AV- just because of the normal playing luck (NPL) which dictated against NS cashing their 3 diamond tricks early. At least to me bridge justice should be defined as a combination of 1. The written laws; 2. Judge Roy Bean's law of West of the Pecos; and 3. A dose of protecting the field (PTF) always in the air with matchpoint events and 4. NPL.

APPEAL	NABC+ FIVE
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Millard Nachtway
Event	Silodor Open Pairs
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	03/17/11

BD#	3
VUL	EW
DLR	S

John Lusky	
♠	873
♥	AJ85
♦	QT3
♣	K75

Ron Ashbacher		Spring 2011 Louisville, Kentucky	Loretta Rivers	
♠	AK65		♠	QJ94
♥	K962		♥	Q743
♦	K98		♦	J65
♣	AT		♣	92

Rob Stevens	
♠	T2
♥	T
♦	A742
♣	QJ8643

West	North	East	South
			P
1N¹	P	P	DBL²
P	2♣³	(P) DBL	P
2♥	P	P	P

Final Contract	2♥ by West
Opening Lead	♣5
Table Result	Made 2, E-W +110
Director Ruling	2♥ by West, Made 2, E-W +110
Committee Ruling	2♥ by West, Made 2, E-W +110

1	15-17 HCP
2	Minor One-Suiter (Alert not heard by East)
3	Pass or Correct (Not alerted)

The Facts: The N-S agreement is that the double by South shows a minor one-suiter. After the double by South, North said alert and tapped the bidding box. West inquired as to the meaning of the double when 2♣ was passed back to him. When North explained the double, East said "Isn't that alertable?" The Director ruled that East did not hear the alert and did not recognize the tapping of the bidding box as an alert.

The Ruling: Since West had not yet taken a call, the Director allowed East to change her call based on Law 21B1. East changed her call from pass to double (takeout). The Director ruled that based on the ACBL Alert Regulation and Law 40A1b, It is the responsibility of the alerting side to make sure that the opponents are aware of the alert.

The Appeal: North-South appealed the Director's ruling and all four players attended the hearing. North-South argued that double by a passed hand in this auction should be self-alerting. North felt that his effort to alert visually was sufficient. They also argued that the takeout nature of a double of 2♣ might be unclear. If West doubles 2♣ for takeout, East might bid 2♠, her stronger major. Which would lead to North competing to 3♣; he did not, because he liked his defense against hearts. West was aware of the alert, so East ought to have been. The screening director also determined that 2♣ was not alerted and should have been.

The Decision: The Committee decided that the ruling could follow one of two paths: 1) East was misinformed by the non-obvious alert of the double and the failure to alert 2♣. If so, East-West are +110, since that is the table result; 2) East-West were not misinformed. In that case, West would double and East would bid 2♥, which would also lead to East-West +110.

Therefore, the Appeals Committee decided that the final result would be East-West +110, but disagreed on which rationale was appropriate for the decision. The Committee was unable to form a consensus about the rationale for the decision, but agreed on the final result.

Note that in choice #2 each side is non-offending, but no result other than 2♥ making 2 for +110 was deemed likely. Since the ruling was unclear enough that the Appeals Committee disagreed on the final approach, no Appeal Without Merit Warning was issued.

The Committee: Jeff Goldsmith (Chairman), Aaron Silverstein, Patty Tucker, Jacob Morgan, and Fred King.

Commentary:

Bramley: My kind of case; both sides are offenders. N/S are the nominal offenders for their failure to make a sufficiently noticeable alert of the double and their failure to make any alert of 2♣. E/W are de facto offenders for East's failure to comprehend that a passed-hand double of 1NT is almost certainly artificial, and for her grabbing a second chance to double 2♣ for takeout after her partner started asking questions. What was stopping her from doubling the first time around? Did her hand change?

As for the Committee's rationale, I'll have to go with their (1), a technical failure to alert remedied by the Director and leading to the actual table result. Still, I can't help thinking that if E/W had gotten a bad result, they would have been the ones appealing. Why settle for two bites at the apple when you can get three?

Goldsmith: I think the director was pretty generous about giving East a second chance. North both said, "alert," and tapped the strip. West confirmed this. Furthermore, a passed hand double of 1NT is obviously not natural. So East was not misinformed. I also think there was a little UI in place---how did West know that East's double of 2♣ was takeout? 2♥ should show the majors there, and LHO's suit could be diamonds. The failure to alert 2♣ was irrelevant---everyone should know that it is not completely natural. Those possible technical violations did not cause damage. But nothing mattered. All roads lead to 2♥. A club is getting led from either side, and it doesn't matter which, so result stands is pretty clear-cut.

Kooijman: Am I right that alerting is done rather lousy over there? Not alerting alertable calls is not unusual in my part of the world but if a player alerts he normally takes the alert card out of the bidding box and places it on the table (a procedure I recommend you to introduce). Which constitutes a more clear yes/no regarding a call being alerted or not. I don't see why the committee couldn't decide that no (proper) alert was given by North. And -110 it is.

Rigal: Seems clear-cut. If East did not see the alert, it is the fault of N/S for not making that clear to him. So the adjustment follows.

Wildavsky: I do not understand the AC's reluctance to rule as the TD did regarding a matter of ACBL policy. How could they have determined otherwise? It was clear that North did not follow correct alert procedure, that he also did not make sure that East was aware of the alert, that East was in fact unaware of the alert, and that East would have taken a different call had she been made aware of the alert. Might the late alert have helped clarify the meaning of the double, takeout versus penalty? Certainly it might have, but that information was authorized for E/W since it arose out of North's infraction. I see no merit to this appeal.

Wolff: A good (and therefore) a proper ruling was made. However, NS should not assume that other players (even so-called experts) would pick up on South's passed hand double in the balancing seat and over a 1NT opening, as an obvious conventional call and because of that, carefully explain (unless the opponent's didn't want an explanation) what the bid meant and its implications. How can any of us automatically think that East's possible double of her RHO's 2♣ bid is for TO instead of penalty. Again a reminder of what happens when possible CD appears. Organized bridge basically stops and confusion (not to mention panic) then usually reigns. However I agree that +110 for EW is a fair ruling, but is it not possible for EW to only take 7 tricks? Of course it is, so again we are applying voodoo to our rulings and in spite of the rule stating "most favorable result or some such" isn't it better for everyone to get an actual result which will lead to what I will eventually be proposing?

APPEAL	NABC+ SIX
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Olin Hubert
Event	Vanderbilt Teams
Session	Quarterfinals
Date	03/17/11

BD#	5
VUL	NS
DLR	N

Shaolin Sun	
♠	K4
♥	96
♦	AKQ72
♣	J874

Tarek Sadek		Spring 2011 Louisville, Kentucky	Walid Elahmady	
♠	Q932		♠	A75
♥	AQT2		♥	J43
♦	9		♦	J863
♣	AKT3		♣	Q96

Meng Kang	
♠	JT86
♥	K875
♦	T54
♣	52

West	North	East	South
	1NT ¹	P	2♣
P	2♦	P	P
DBL	P	P	RDBL
P	P	2♥ ²	P
P	P		

Final Contract	2♥ by East
Opening Lead	♣ 5
Table Result	Made 3, E-W +140
Director Ruling	2♥ by East, Made 3, E-W +140
Committee Ruling	2♥ by East, Made 3, E-W +140

1	13-15 HCP
2	Dispute over the content of the answers to East's questions

The Facts: After 2♦ Redoubled was passed back to East, East asked North several questions. East believed that North had stated that the Redouble was to play. North denied this statement but reported that he said that he wanted to play 2♦ Redoubled.

The Ruling: The Director ruled that the table result of 2♥ making three stands as there is no evidence of misinformation. The Director ruled that there was a simple miscommunication between players – one of the players is Egyptian and the other is Chinese. The Director also ruled that a penalty redouble would be a highly unusual agreement in this sequence.

The Appeal: East-West appealed the Director's ruling and all four players attended the hearing. East-West argued that on one side of the screen South explained to West that the redouble was SOS, but on the other side of the screen North failed to properly explain the redouble as SOS. East explained that he thought it was SOS until North passed the redouble without much thought. East made several inquiries about the redouble, but North failed to properly explain the redouble.

North testified that East never asked him about the redouble. North presented his written notes from the board with lots of notes about the board but nothing asking about the redouble.

The Decision: The Committee first considered whether there was misinformation. If the Committee failed to find misinformation, then the appeal should be dismissed. The testimony showed that South gave one explanation to West, but it was unclear what the North-East conversation and written explanation produced. The Committee felt that it was a case of misunderstanding that may have escalated to misinformation. If the Committee presumes misinformation, was there damage that resulted?

The Committee examined the East hand and the auction. The Committee decided that the auction INT-P-2♣-P-2♦-P-P is made on a number of garbage hand types and therefore South's redouble should be interpreted as SOS. As a result of this analysis, the Committee felt that East should have understood that the redouble was SOS. Therefore, the Committee decided that pursuant to Law 40B4, the damage was not a consequence of the misinformation so the table result was allowed to stand.

The Committee wishes to remind all players that it is best to get explanations in writing when playing behind screens. If a satisfactory answer is not obtained due to language or other issues, then the player should call the Director.

The Committee: Jacob Morgan (Chairman), Chris Moll, and Bob White.

Commentary:

Bramley: How does misunderstanding "escalate" to misinformation? If East failed to make clear what he was asking, is North liable for not answering the question that East THOUGHT he was asking? As in the previous case, I have trouble with both sides. East should have understood what was happening, because it was the only plausible explanation. He didn't have to ask questions. But North should also have understood what was happening, namely that East was confused by North's unlikely pass of an SOS redouble. Apparently North thought that he had indeed explained that he was doing just that, but the message got lost in translation.

I have no sympathy for E/W. This was a blatant attempt by E/W to get something in Committee that they had failed to get when it was served up on a platter at the table. I would have considered an AWMW.

Goldsmith: There was clearly a misunderstanding, but all the hard evidence is in favor of N/S. Good job, AC.

Kooijman: If we follow the prescribed procedures North is right, the pad 'proves' that East didn't ask anything about the redouble. Which makes it possible to close the case. It is reasonable that the committee followed this line.

Rigal: It seems to me that both TD and AC made the right decision here in the absence of written explanations. East should have known what the auction meant and not settled for less than a written explanation in such circumstances.

Wildavsky: I do not understand the TD's and AC's contention that the redouble is commonly played as SOS and so East ought to have interpreted it that way. It is not relevant how common the treatment is, only how N/S play the sequence, and East understood North to have said that the redouble was natural.

That said, with no written evidence of a misexplanation I too would have ruled "score stands." Players understand that when behind screens all questions and answers should be written. I have been guilty of violating this rule myself, but when I do I know better than to expect redress.

Wolff: How personalities change, especially clever ones who adjust to the appeal, by planning the very best things to suggest in order to get a favorable ruling. When East passed 2 diamonds doubled he feared the worse and would be longing for a 1 trick set since he could have no idea his partner's hand was so good. Then when the redouble was made on his left and righty stood for it, he scrambled to try and save what he could but when the dummy was put down and he actually took 9 tricks by running to a 3 card suit he (they) then appealed to try and get at least a 1 trick redoubled set since that was a still higher score than +140. Shouldn't we deal tough with players who seek the moon, take time out of the air, and effort instead of honoring the game and its nuances. I'm not exactly discussing culpability, but rather the negative attitude of using the appeals process as a weapon.

APPEAL	NABC+ SEVEN
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Charles MacCracken
Event	Women's Swiss
Session	First Qualifying
Date	03/19/11

BD#	34
VUL	N/S
DLR	E

Irina Levitina	
♠	J8
♥	K84
♦	JT8
♣	AQT82

Cynthia Balderson		Spring 2011 Louisville, Kentucky	Carole Miner	
♠	T7432		♠	A6
♥	AT32		♥	Q96
♦	52		♦	Q9743
♣	J7		♣	K95

Kerri Sanborn	
♠	KQ95
♥	J75
♦	AK6
♣	643

West	North	East	South
		P	1♣
2♣	2♣ ¹	P	3♦
P	3♥	P	3NT
P	P	P	

Final Contract	3N by South
Opening Lead	♠ 3
Table Result	Making 3, NS +600
Director's Ruling	3N by South, made 3, NS +600
Committee Ruling	3N by South, made 3, NS +600

(1)	Intended by North as a limit raise or better in clubs; Explained by South as a good diamond hand, better than a direct bid of 2♦. The North-South agreement is that 2♣ is a limit raise + in clubs.
-----	---

The Facts: East claimed that she was deterred from bidding 3♥ by her diamond holding after the incorrect explanation. North-South claimed that if East had bid 3♥, they would have doubled instead of bidding 3N. The Director found that there was misinformation as a result of the incorrect explanation of the North-South agreement. The North-South agreement of the 2♣ bid was limit raise or better in clubs.

The Ruling: Based on Law 40B4, the Director determined that East-West were not entitled to an adjustment under the Law because they had an ample opportunity to recover. Six experts were polled and asked what they would bid with the North-South hands after a hypothetical 3♥ bid by East: The three experts given the North hand all bid 3NT. Of the three given the South hand, one bid 4♦ and the other two passed. All three of

the South players consulted would not have passed out 3♥ doubled had that auction occurred. On the subject of East's auction and defense, one expert said that the failure to bid 3♥ even with the misinformation broke the infraction/damage connection. Two experts stated that the failure to double North's 3♥ also broke the infraction/damage connection. All six experts said that East's failure to switch to a heart at trick two broke the connection between the infraction and damage. Four of the six experts reported that they would switch to the ♥Q at trick two.

The Appeal: East-West appealed the Director's ruling and all four players attended the hearing. North called the Director at the end of the auction and East-West were given the correct explanation of North's 2♠ bid and East was given the chance to change her final pass.

Appealing Side: East said that she would have bid 3♥ had she been given the correct information regarding the 2♠ bid. If East bids 3♥, West claimed she would have led a heart against 3NT, which defeats the contract. East claimed that she chose not to double 3♥ because she thought she might prefer a spade lead against 5♣. East-West usually have 5-5 in the majors for a Michaels bid, but opposite a passed partner at favorable vulnerability she wanted to try to mess up North-South's auction.

Non-Appealing Side: East could have suggested a heart lead with less risk by doubling 3♥. North-South also claimed that East could have defeated 3NT by switching to the heart queen at trick two.

The Decision: East-West were given misinformation about the meaning of the 2♠ bid. However, in order to adjust the score, East-West must have been damaged as a direct consequence of the misinformation. From the standpoint of bidding 3♥ or passing over 2♠, East's King of Clubs is a better card for offense if the opponents do not have a good club fit. For purposes of doubling 3♥ or passing, the opponents are more likely to end up in 3NT than 5♣, which makes a heart lead better for the defense, with the wrong information. Therefore, the misinformation made doubling 3♥ more attractive.

Finally, it is extremely difficult to construct a hand where a spade continuation is superior to the shift to the queen of hearts at trick two in defense against 3NT. West could have held ♠QT932 ♥A7532 ♦xx ♣x, but with any change in the major suit cards, the queen of hearts will set 3NT any time a spade continuation would, and often when a spade play would not work. Further had East bid 3♥, the most likely continuation would have been Pass, Pass, 3NT. Assuming that East led a heart on opening lead, she would have had to lead the queen of hearts to defeat the contract.

Thus, although East-West were given misinformation, the Committee judged that they were not damaged by the misinformation. The table result of North-South +600 was allowed to stand. An Appeal without Merit Warning was not assessed.

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chairman), Ed Lazarus, and Tom Peters.

Commentary:

Bramley: Good decision. I agree with the analysis that if East had bid 3♥, the likely result was 3NT by NORTH, which surely would have made. The other likely result was 3♥ doubled going for 800 on the obvious trump lead. I find it strange that East was aggrieved at not having the opportunity to go for a number in a terrible fit with few high cards.

Goldsmith: Good ruling. East could have doubled 3♥. She did not. There is a UI issue from the misexplanation, but North's 3♥ is the right action. Good job, North.

Kooijman: Interesting case considering the ‘serious error’ concept which is in the laws since 2007. This concept was introduced because experience shows that TD’s and appeal committees are reluctant to award non offenders a good score. This case proves it. But neither the committee nor the TD understands what is meant with ‘serious error’. It is not right to follow the procedure we use to find out whether a logical alternative exists: ‘Mr. Expert what would your choice have been?’, which seems to be done. I do not think that any of the choices made by EW are that stupid. Though the switch to a heart in trick two probably would get a majority, the choice for the Q is not that obvious (not in my country) . This infraction asks for redress for the non-offenders. And even if we do not compensate EW, shouldn’t we do something with the NS result? I do not understand this decision. This asks for an approach in which 3NT is made for a certain percentage and goes down for the remaining chance. And I accept that 3NT made still gets the majority percentage.

Rigal: The double-dummy analysis is complex here. But it does seem that East brought pretty much everything on her own head by not doubling 3♥ and misdefending 3NT. I agree that it’s easy to defend with the sight of all 52 cards –and that shift to the ♥Q is a lot tougher than the play of a low heart. But I really don’t see that E/W were damaged here.

Wildavsky: This case highlights two conflicting interpretations of the law. Alas, my colleagues and I on the ACBL Laws Commission have so far reached no consensus as to which is correct. I’ll bring the matter up again. At issue is Law 40B4, the one cited by the TD. It reads:

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.

The question here is whether E/W were damaged by the UI or by their own subsequent actions. I would argue that the UI made a 3♥ call less attractive and that a 3♥ call might well have led to a more favorable result for E/W, so that E/W were damaged as a consequence of the MI. If that were the case then I would adjust the N/S score, and also adjust the E/W score unless we determined that E/W subsequently made a “serious” error per Law 12C1(b).

Under the TD and AC interpretation E/W were damaged not a consequence of the MI but through their own subsequent actions, so no adjustment is warranted for either side.

Under either interpretation we need to determine how likely it is that a 3♥ call would have led to a more favorable result for E/W. It certainly could have. Double-dummy East needs to lead the ♥Q to defeat 3N by North. In practice East would always lead low, but not every declarer would think to play dummy's jack at trick one, so the result would often be five tricks for the defense.

Wolff: At least to me, an awful ruling, but possibly, according to our haphazard laws, a probable correct one. Here there is unquestionably CD on the part of NS. I assume South was a screen mate of East and described partner's 2 spade bid as a forcing diamond bid. What if any of you or I would be sitting East and hear the bidding and what has been told to us, wouldn't we hope that perhaps NS are headed overboard, both from our hand and the obvious terrible diamond break? First I might suggest a heart lead in case South bids 3NT a very likely possibility or maybe once I bid, South may very well pass it around to North and she might try 3NT or perhaps double or raise clubs or whatever. In any event, as far as bridge is concerned it has stopped upon the CD being distributed to me and as far as I know, to my partner. Therefore I am not going to say anymore about this ruling except that instead of giving NS +600 I would give them, at best Average - or more likely a worse result for insulting the game, their opponents, and the event itself by not either learning their conventions or if uncertain, not playing what they cannot remember.

APPEAL	NON-NABC+ ONE
Subject	Unauthorized Information, Break in Tempo
DIC	Candy Kuschner
Event	Stratified Open Pairs
Session	First
Date	03/11/11

BD#	17
VUL	None
DLR	N

3400 MPs	
♠	T7
♥	KJ
♦	T874
♣	AQ842

5050 MPs		Spring 2011 Louisville, Kentucky	8300 MPs	
♠	KQ9862		♠	AJ54
♥	986		♥	43
♦	95		♦	AQ2
♣	75		♣	KJ63

2000 MPs	
♠	3
♥	AQT752
♦	KJ63
♣	T9

West	North	East	South
	P	1N ¹	DBL ²
2♥ ³	P	2♠	3♥
3♠	P ⁴	P	4♥
P	P	P	

Final Contract	4♥ by South
Opening Lead	♠K
Table Result	Making 4, NS +420
Director Ruling	3♠ by East, Made 3, EW +140
Panel Ruling	3♠ by East, Made 3, EW +140

(1)	15-17 HCP
(2)	Alerted and explained as 1-suited hand
(3)	Transfer to Spades
(4)	Agreed BIT

The Facts: The opening lead was the King of Spades and the result was 4♥ by South making four, NS +420. The Director was called first after the auction, and then called back at the end of the hand. All parties agreed that there was a break in tempo by North after the 3♠ bid. NS said that the break in tempo was very short but North did say that she “noticeably” paused over 3♠. At the end of the hand, South stated to the Director that she had no defense to 3♠ and had to bid.

The Ruling: The Director decided that there was a break in tempo prior to the 3♠ bid; that the break suggested possession of values that made bidding more attractive than passing; and that pass was a logical alternative. According to Laws 16 and 12, the score was therefore adjusted to 3♠ by East making three, EW +140.

The Appeal: NS appealed the Director's ruling. All players attended the review. As to the length of the hesitation by North, the players told the reviewer the following: North 3 seconds, South 2 seconds, East and West 3-4 seconds. North explained that she had a problem over 3♠ that led her to take more time than she had over 2♥ on the previous round of the auction. South told the reviewer that she bid 4♥ as a sacrifice since she had no defense to 3♠.

The Decision: Law 16B1(a) states: "After a player makes available to his partner extraneous information that may suggest a call or play, . . . the partner may not choose from among logical alternatives one that could demonstrably have been suggested over another by the extraneous information." The panel first examined the issue of whether North's pass over 3♠ was made after an "unmistakable hesitation". While three or four seconds might not normally be considered such, the panel was persuaded it was in this case by the fact that all players acknowledged that a hesitation was noticed at the time and that North herself agreed that it was out of tempo. As to whether pass was a logical alternative to the 4♥ call selected by South, a peer poll was conducted. Three players were given South's hand as a bidding problem without mention of any unauthorized information. All three agreed with the initial double; two of three agreed with the later 3♥ bid (the third passed); the two who bid 3♥ passed after 3♠ came back around to them. So the panel decided that pass was clearly a logical alternative. Finally, the panel considered the issue of whether the slow pass demonstrably suggested bidding 4♥. Two of the three peers polled were asked what they thought partner's hesitation might suggest. One believed that it probably was based on partner considering bidding 4♥ but it might have been based on partner thinking about doubling 3♠. The other peer believed strongly that partner was thinking about doubling, not bidding 4♥. Three experts were consulted on what they thought this hesitation might suggest. Two believed strongly that it suggested partner was thinking about bidding 4♥. One of those two said that in these situations partner rarely has trouble deciding whether to double but the decision regarding how to bid on is more complicated and likely to take more time. The third expert initially was not sure whether it suggested that partner was considering bidding or doubling, but when he was told that South bid 4♥ he believed that this South correctly worked out what partner's problem was.

The Panel found the last point to be the most difficult, but it was persuaded on balance that the opinions of the players showed that at least to this player the hesitation demonstrably suggested the 4♥ bid selected. The Director's ruling of 3♠ by East making three was upheld. The appeal was found to have merit.

Panel: Matt Smith (reviewer), Brian Russell, Matt Koltnow

Expert Consultants: Ron Smith, Jeff Roman, Marty Fleisher

Commentary:

Bramley: Awkward. In a vacuum, 4 seconds should never qualify as a break in tempo, certainly not in a competitive auction with new information to absorb. However, since all parties agreed to it, it must have happened. Then, I would say that the hesitation did not demonstrably suggest bidding, because North might well have been thinking of doubling. Couldn't she have had AJ10x of spades instead of East? Note that West bid 3♠ by herself, so she had no assurance of such fine support. However, the hesitation DID suggest doing SOMETHING. On that basis, I would disallow 4♥. South had no business acting a THIRD time on a hand where she had already taken a big risk bidding a SECOND time. Her statement about "no defense" is hard to fathom; she had ace-queen and king-jack behind a strong notrump, which in fact are good for three tricks on this deal. This player has 2000 points?

Indeed, the 4♥ call reeks so badly that I would give N/S an AWMW. They brought no new evidence nor arguments to the Panel. Note that all of the arguments on their behalf were found by the Panel itself. While the Panel does have a responsibility to find such arguments, the perpetrators lose all credibility when they cannot defend themselves in any way.

Goldsmith: No merit, 1/4 board PP to South for abuse of UI.

Kooijman: This case contains two interesting aspects, one of which was discussed by the panel.: should we consider 3 seconds as a hesitation? I would prefer a clear 'no' on this question and that approach could be adopted by inviting players to vary their tempo when bidding, as we propagate when using screens . But when the player involved admits a hesitation herself and such desired approach is not followed there is no choice: hesitation.

The second issue has to do with the application of 'suggested'. Assume that the possibility of North thinking about a double is as likely as thinking about bidding 4♥. Do we still decide that the 4♥-bid was suggested? And if the answer is 'yes' what division do we need to say 'no'? There is not much written about this subject I think. I consider the approach followed by the so called third expert to be strange. He considers thinking about a double evenly likely as thinking about 4♥ and then decides that by bidding 4♥ now South has correctly worked out partner's problem. That does not look as a legal way to solve these problems.

Rigal: I am not sure it is the players' job to be asked what the hesitation might suggest. To my mind, though, the overwhelming fact is that South read the hesitation right –regardless of what it might or might not suggest. Correct ruling and I would have said no merit. The TD ruled one way on a UI case, the panel of consulted players supported that ruling; no merit!

Wildavsky: I do not agree that the appeal had merit. This point is worth bearing in mind: "One of those two (expert consultants) said that in these situations partner rarely has trouble deciding whether to double but the decision regarding how to bid on is more complicated and likely to take more time."

Wolff: On this hand any BIT, even a flicker, is enough for North to now justify his hand as suitable for a Spade raise. For South to now rubber stamp the unethicity with a continued bid to 4♥ should hang him from the highest tree. What should be practiced in the most sophisticated bridge appeals meetings extended itself to the practicality of how bridge should be played. To me, South was on the border of passing out 2♠ or overbidding with his 3♥ competition. He chose to bid and so be it, but for him to now venture another effort reeks from partnership help, and must not only be denied, but rather become seriously censured. To do otherwise would ratify lawyering, biased action and everything bad which goes with allowing devious players great advantage. That practice must be howled at not just denied.

Before we leave this one and go on to one almost as bad, let me say the following for all to try to understand. Conventioneers of many different types of conventions get UI bonus treatment by allowing different nefarious partnerships to hesitate their way to success under the guise of thinking what conventions they are playing which instead should require an extra degree of active ethics from them in deciding to play unusual treatments (under the name of conventions). To do otherwise is to encourage non-compliance with our laws and therefore ethics.

APPEAL	NON-NABC+ TWO
Subject	Break in Tempo
DIC	Candace Kuschner
Event	Stratified Open Pairs
Session	First Session
Date	3/11/11

BD#	17
VUL	None
DLR	N

3,750 Masterpoints	
♠	T7
♥	KJ
♦	T874
♣	AQ842

3,800 Masterpoints		Spring 2011 Louisville, Kentucky	290 Masterpoints	
♠	KQ9862		♠	AJ54
♥	986		♥	43
♦	95		♦	AQ2
♣	75		♣	KJ63

2,300 Masterpoints	
♠	3
♥	AQT752
♦	KJ63
♣	T9

West	North	East	South
	Pass	1N	Dbl ¹
2♥ ²	P	2♠	3♥
Pass	4♥	Pass ³	Pass
4♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	4♠ by East
Opening Lead	♥A
Table Result	4♠ by East Down 1, NS +50
Director Ruling	4♥ by South, Making 4, NS +420
Panel Ruling	4♥ by South, Making 4, NS +420

(1)	Alerted as one suit
(2)	Transfer to spades
(3)	Agreed BIT

The Facts: The Director was called after the auction and after the hand was completed. All parties agree to a break in tempo after the 4♥ call of approximately 15 seconds.

The Ruling: There was an agreed BIT. Although the hand was defined by the 1 notrump opener, it was felt that the BIT demonstrably suggested that East was contemplating bidding over 4♥. In light of West's pass over 3♥, it was felt that this BIT suggested bidding again to West.

Law 16.B. says that a player may not choose an action among the logical alternatives that were demonstrably suggested. Therefore, the result was adjusted to 4♥ making 4 for North/South +420 (Law 12.C.1.e).

The Appeal: East/West appealed the director's ruling of 4♥ making 4.

The Decision: EW appealed the director's ruling. All players attended the review. The players confirmed to the reviewer that East's hesitation was in the 10-15 second range. East said he was considering doubling or bidding 4♠ before deciding to pass. West said he didn't bid 4♠ at his prior turn since the opponents might not bid 4♥, but once they did it was clear to him to sacrifice since he only had five points. He also questioned whether South would make 4♥ since the Deep Finesse analysis showed that only nine tricks should be made.

The Decision: Law 16B1(a) states: "After a player makes available to his partner extraneous information that may suggest a call or play, . . . the partner may not choose from among logical alternatives one that could demonstrably have been suggested over another by the extraneous information." It was clear that there had been an "unmistakable hesitation", so the panel focused on whether that hesitation demonstrably suggested the 4♠ bid and whether pass was a logical alternative.

Four peers were consulted. Two of them would have jumped to game over the double, but they reluctantly accepted the 2♥ bid actually chosen by West. At the next turn, one of them passed (offering that 3♠ there would have been a game invitation), and over 4♥ that peer bid 4♠ when it came around. The other would have bid 3♠ at his second turn (believing it to be competitive) but if forced to pass he would pass 4♥ when it came around.

Two other peers agreed with West's initial 2♥ bid. One of them exactly duplicated the actions of West including his 4♠ bid. The other agreed with pass over 3♥ but he passed when 4♥ came around. Two experts were also consulted. Both would have bid 3♠ over 3♥, but if not they believed that the decision to bid 4♠ at matchpoints was very close. Both mentioned that partner likely has two hearts and he rates to have three spades. Given the auction and that inference, any hesitation by partner is surely based on him considering bidding 4♠.

The panel put more stock in the answers of the two peers who agreed with West's two prior actions (especially the fact that one passed out 4♥), and those opinions added to those of the expert consultants led the panel to conclude that pass was a logical alternative and that the hesitation demonstrably suggested the 4♠ bid chosen by West. The panel also consulted an expert on the play in 4♥. His opinion was that while it could be defeated double dummy, it was very likely to make.

The panel upheld the director's ruling of 4♥ by South making four, NS +420. The appeal was found to have merit.

The Panel: Matt Smith (Chairman), Matt Koltnow, Brian Russell

Expert Consultants: Bart Bramley, Gary Cohler, Michael Becker

Commentary:

Bramley: I guess this hand is so hard that you have to hesitate no matter which side you are on. Again I agree with the Panel, and it is much clearer than their write-up suggests. While West has several close decisions, the hesitation by East strongly suggests bidding 4♠. Defending must be a logical alternative, particularly at matchpoints where saving with half the deck may not be a good score anyway. Besides, half the deck is often enough to produce four tricks. I would have given the AWMW here too. Yes, West did produce an argument on his behalf, but he should have known better than to pursue this case after he had already been ruled against by the Director. I also dislike when the more experienced member of a pair sets a bad example for his partner.

I have no recollection of being consulted on this hand.

Goldsmith: No merit. 1/4 board PP to West for abuse of UI.

Kooijman: Good decision.

Rigal: This time I agree with the merit decision because East in my opinion was more likely to have been thinking of doubling than bidding 4♠. That said, West (again!) read his partner's tempo correctly. I 'only' had five points...our side thus 'only' had half the deck so I had to sacrifice? Give me a break!

Wildavsky: Again, I see no merit in this appeal. How could West believe that bidding 4♠ could be justified after partner's hesitation? It also seems that he was arguing both that that his hand was so weak that 4♥ would surely make and that, given the chance, he would have set it. I learned a useful phrase from Barry Rigal's comments on the Orlando casebook: A la lanterne!

Wolff: East's slow pass should have overruled West's ability to even consider now bidding 4♠, especially when he did not even conjure up a 3♠ competitive bid at his previous turn. Hands like this are a main reason why making use of UI should be consistently punished until players start to consider that the next degree of punishment is to be forced to wear a scarlet U (for unethical) on their chest, while playing competitive tournament bridge.

APPEAL	NON-NABC+ THREE
Subject	Break in Tempo
DIC	Harry Falk
Event	Daylight Pairs
Session	First Session
Date	3/14/11

BD#	11
VUL	None
DLR	S

1,032 Masterpoints	
♠	QJ82
♥	K65
♦	52
♣	K987

144 MPs + Int'l Experience		Spring 2011 Louisville, Kentucky	144 MPs + Int'l Experience	
♠	AK7		♠	T9643
♥	QT		♥	A2
♦	QT74		♦	J96
♣	Q643		♣	AJ2

3,266 Masterpoints	
♠	5
♥	J98743
♦	AK83
♣	T5

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1N ¹	Pass	2♥ ²	Dbl
2♠	Pass ³	Pass	3♥
Pass	Pass	3♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	3♠ by West
Opening Lead	♥5
Table Result	Down 2, NS +100
Director Ruling	2♠ by West, Making 2, EW +110
Panel Ruling	2♠ by West, Down 1, NS +50

(1)	12 – 14
(2)	Transfer to spades
(3)	Agreed BIT

The Facts: The Director was called before East bid 3♠ and he determined that North broke tempo before passing over 2♠. South thought that bidding 3♥ was obvious.

The Ruling: The directing staff felt that South was in possession of unauthorized information (UI) from North's break in tempo and that the UI demonstrably suggested bidding on. Pass was found to be a logical alternative, so by Laws 16B and 12C1, an initial ruling was delivered to North-South of 2♠ West, down one, NS +50. When the

director delivered the ruling to East-West, East indicated that partner would likely have made 2♠. The director questioned West about the play in 3♠. After viewing other results on the board, he decided that since declarer had successfully played low on an opening heart lead that even though declarer had misplayed 3♠ and took only seven tricks, that in a contract of 2♠ a result of eight tricks was likely. As such, he delivered a corrected ruling of 2♠ West, making 2, North/South -110. North/South appealed the ruling.

The Appeal: North, South, and East attended the hearing.

The reviewer presented the facts of the case, including a player poll he had done of the South hand. Four players with between 3000 and 3750 points were polled. Three passed 2♠, one bid 3♦.

The appealing side presented the argument that declarer had made a poor play in 3♠. after winning the opening lead in hand, Declarer drew two rounds of trumps, and led the ♣Q at trick four toward dummy. The ♣Q was covered by North and Declarer followed with two more rounds of clubs at tricks five and six. There was no evidence that a contract of 2♠ rather than 3♠ would have been played differently. When asked, they indicated that to them, the probability that declarer would have taken eight tricks in 2♠ was remote.

The non-appealing side was represented only by dummy who indicated that declarer was upset by the director call. As such, declarer misplayed 3♠, a situation which would never have occurred had she been in 2♠.

The Decision: The Panel met and determined from the player poll that passing 2♠ was a logical alternative, so the play in a contract of 2♠ was all the Panel considered. They concluded that declarer's goal in a contract of 2♠ or 3♠ was to take as many tricks as possible. Further, the lead of the ♣Q at trick four was not a play which would, for instance, have been necessary in a contract of 3♠ but not in 2♠.

The legal basis for adjusting East/West's score is to adjust to the “most unfavorable result that was at all probable had the irregularity not occurred.” Players were not consulted regarding the declarer's choice of plays in 3♠ as it was not determined to be a matter of bridge judgment. The Panel felt that the chance declarer would have taken eight tricks was less than “at all probable” so the contract and result were changed to 2♠ West, down one, North/South +50.

Four players with between 3000 and 3750 masterpoints were consulted regarding the bidding of the South hand.

The appeal was considered to have merit.

The Panel: Matt Koltnow (Chairman), Matt Smith, Gary Zeiger

Commentary:

Bramley: Good analysis. While it seems harsh to force declarer to go down in a cold contract, the evidence from the play in 3♠ was that THIS declarer was very unlikely to vary her play in the lower contract, where the necessity of starting diamonds is LESS obvious than it was in 3♠.

Goldsmith: Looks right. 1/4 board PP to South for abuse of UI. If South had bid 3♦ or doubled 2♠, then I would not give a PP, because I think most would act here. 3♥, however, was clearly taking advantage of UI, and South needs to do better.

Kooijman: I do not understand the facts. NS is the offending side so EW should get the most favourable result likely and NS the most unfavourable result at all probable. The panel choose a wrong approach. I do not like not allowing 2♠ to make, but for sure NS should have received the opposite of that score. This in my opinion is a nice case demonstrating that using weighted scores is superior to the pre-2007 approach. Give both sides, half of 2♠ made and half of 2♠ one off, or somewhat nicer for the non-offenders: make it 2/3 making and 1/3 one off.

Rigal: Correct TD ruling to adjust the contract but not the trick count. One can take 'most favorable' too far, and here is an example. Correct panel adjustment.

Wildavsky: The Director's contention that E/W would likely have taken 8 tricks in spades is strange. That was indeed likely a priori, but absent conditions related to level such as safety plays the best indication of the number of tricks declarer would take in a denomination is the number of tricks he did in fact take. With no bridge reason for declarer to play differently in 2♠ than in 3♠, I agree with the panel's adjustment, NS +50 for both sides.

I would further have considered a procedural penalty against N/S after South took an action that could have been suggested by UI from his partner. There may be other ways to provide an incentive to follow the laws in the future, but this seems the most effective. That said, it could be considered unduly harsh since South might have judged 3♥ automatic. I would be more sympathetic, if he had stated that he did not want to defend 2♠ with a heart lead, but he made no such argument, nor did he bid 3♦.

Wolff: A perfect ruling all around and by everyone concerned and for that I say, CONGRATULATIONS!

APPEAL	NON-NABC+ FOUR
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Jenni Carmichael
Event	Stratified Open Pairs
Session	First
Date	03/16/11

BD#	27
VUL	None
DLR	S

1628 MPs	
♠	AK76
♥	943
♦	AT743
♣	8

851 MPs		Spring 2011 Louisville, Kentucky	663 MPs	
♠	T5		♠	J98
♥	AK		♥	Q8762
♦	J95		♦	82
♣	QT9643		♣	J72

1490 MPs	
♠	Q432
♥	JT5
♦	KQ6
♣	AK5

West	North	East	South
			1♣
P	1♦	P	1♠
P	2♠	P	P
3♣	4♠	P	P
P			

Final Contract	4♠ by South
Opening Lead	♥A
Table Result	Making 5, NS +450
Director Ruling	2♠ by South, Made 5, NS +200
Panel Ruling	2♠ by South, Made 5, NS +200

The Facts: At the end of the hand, North informed East-West that 2♠ was forcing in the above auction. At that point, West called the Director. West reported that she balanced in the above auction with 3♣ after being told that the 2♠ bid showed 8 or 9 points. West also asked South if they played "Walsh." South explained that even though they bypass longer diamonds to bid a major, North had other bids available at his second turn to call that were forcing.

The Ruling: The Director ruled pursuant to Law 40B.1, that East-West had been misinformed by the failure to alert 2♠ and incorrect answers to West's questions. As a result of the misinformation, the Director adjusted the North/South score to 2♠ making five for +200 North-South.

The Appeal: North-South appealed and all four players attended the hearing. The Screening Director determined that the North-South Convention Card indicates that

the pair plays Fourth Suit Forcing. In addition, the Screening Director determined that North-South are a long time partnership but only play once per year.

Appealing Side: South reported that 2♠ could not possibly be forcing because North had other ways to create a forcing auction. South reported that he intended to speak further with North at dinner about the meaning of 2♠ in this auction. North reported that since he bid 1♦ first and promised four spades with his 2♠ bid, he could not possibly be weak.

Non-Appealing Side: West knew of the possible implications of her question, which is why she asked if North-South played “Walsh.” West only decided to bid after being informed by South that 2♠ indicated 8-9 points.

The Decision: North-South’s statements during the review made it clear that this partnership had no agreement about 2♠. South’s statements about the meaning of 2♠ constituted misinformation. He should have said, “undiscussed or we have no agreement.” The Reviewer determined by polling an expert that both approaches were possible, and subject to partnership agreement.

While it was possible that West would have balanced if told no agreement, she might well have chosen the more conservative route. Therefore Laws 40B1 and 40B4 were violated. Based on Law 12C.1.e, the Panel decided that the score should be adjusted on the board to 2♠ by North-South, making 5, +200 North-South. This was deemed to be the “most favorable result that was likely” for East-West and the “most unfavorable result that was at all probable” for North-South.

The Panel: Gary Zeiger (Chairman), Bernie Gorkin, and Jay Albright.

Commentary:

Bramley: I disagree. Regardless of North’s opinion of 2♠, we would be hard-pressed to find another player who thought the bid was forcing. If South had said “no agreement” that would have been equivalent to saying “not forcing”. In the Walsh style North could still have had many hands that would fit his auction, including hands with six diamonds, or hands with five strong diamonds and weak spades, or hands with only three spades. West was unlucky to hold a hand that would give North a chance to recover from his aberration. This was rub of the green, not a violation.

Goldsmith: Could go either way. My experience is that those who play 1D denies a 4-card major without game forcing values play that 2♠ here is a 3-card raise, 3451 or the like. I suspect that North’s opinion that 2♠ was forcing had no basis in partnership agreement; I think North thought that it was a direct consequence of playing Walsh, but had not discussed it with partner, so it was a misbid. In that case, result stands. L75D, however, strongly encourages us to assume MI, so it is reasonable to rule as the directors did. But I would not. I think there is enough evidence from the testimony to judge that North was on his own here.

Kooijman: No INT-opening! Though I am not an expert in systems, North reasoning sounds logical to me. Which makes the ruling easy: misinformation. I would have given an AWMW to NS.

Rigal: A harsh ruling against the offenders but I can approximately see where North was coming from. I have never heard of playing this auction as forcing (as opposed to 9-11 and three spades) but it does make sense in a perverted fashion. I would have been more inclined to suspect misbid than misinformation, but North dug a pit for himself and can become a paid up member of the 'I'd rather be right than president' club. So probably the right decision all round.

Wildavsky: A tricky case. The TD and panel rulings look right to me. I agree that the appeal had merit.

Wolff: Just maybe North may have been "hoisted by his own petard". Possibly, in his effort to be thought of as a knowledgeable bridge player, he volunteered that 2 spades was supposedly forcing after the hand was over. His thirst for ego acceptance punished him to lose this hand to the laws. Pity, but probably an equitable result and, if I am correct, vanity has been vanquished, although along a different path than usual.

APPEAL	NON-NABC+ FIVE
Subject	Break in Tempo
DIC	Matt Smith
Event	NAP Flight C
Session	First Qualifying
Date	3/19/11

BD#	8
VUL	None
DLR	W

316 Masterpoints	
♠	752
♥	AQT742
♦	K8
♣	J7

163 Masterpoints		Spring 2011 Louisville, Kentucky	220 Masterpoints	
♠	AJT		♠	KQ943
♥	J9		♥	K3
♦	T963		♦	A7542
♣	KQ32		♣	6

327 Masterpoints	
♠	86
♥	865
♦	QJ
♣	AT9854

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

Final Contract	4♠ by East
Opening Lead	♥8
Table Result	4♠ by East Making 4, NS -420
Director Ruling	4♥ by North, Down 2, NS +100
Panel Ruling	4♥ by North, Down 2, NS +100

(1)	Alerted as Intermediate, 10-14 HCP, 6 hearts
(2)	Alerted as Michaels
(3)	Agreed BIT

The Facts: There was an agreed to break in tempo by West over the 4♥ call.

The Ruling: Per Law 16.B the score was adjusted to 4♥ by North, down 2, North/South -100.

The Appeal: Break in tempo was to determine what partner's 3♥ bid meant. East felt his hand counted to 15+ points with ♥K behind the heart suit.

North/South contended that 4♠ would not have been bid without the BIT.

The Decision: Player polling indicated that four players would pass 4♥ with the East cards. Some commented that “I’ve shown my hand”. 4♠ would have been a logical alternative to at least two players, but not one they would truly consider choosing.

This meets Law 16.2.B.1.a criteria, making 4♠ an unallowable option. The BIT does show values, which demonstrably suggests to East that bidding on would be more successful than passing.

The table director ruled in accordance with the above, and the ruling was therefore upheld.

Due to the relative inexperience of the East/West pair an AWMW was not given.

The Panel: William Michael (Chairman), Nancy Boyd, Bernie Gorkin.

Commentary:

Bramley: Give the AWMW. Failure to give it should happen only with compelling extenuating circumstances. Being inexperienced is not one of them. If you are experienced enough to appeal, then you are experienced enough to get an AWMW. The E/W case is laughably poor, and that point should be driven home.

Goldsmith: Clearly the appeal had no merit and 4♠ was an abuse of UI. E/W were non-LMs. I'm OK with buying into non-LMs' not getting AWMWs. I'd like to see some sort of formal guideline here---what's the limit below which someone doesn't get them? ACBL masterpoints for domestic players is an adequate measure of experience for this sort of thing. Some argue that if one is experienced enough to appeal, one is experienced enough to get an AWMW and a PP. I think that there should be a grace period in which a player can appeal without danger, but it's not very long. LM seems like a good dividing line to me.

Kooijman: Obvious decision. I am not sure that inexperience is a good reason not to award an AWMW. And certainly not if the TD has explained the procedure.

Rigal: No, no, no! The relative inexperience of the appellants can be handled at screening – the case was screened right? This is a textbook AWMW and the offenders will acquire experience in the process.

Wildavsky: Experienced enough to file an appeal is experienced enough to receive an AWMW. One could argue that inexperience is more of a reason to assess an AWMW. These players are by definition in need of education, I know of no form that is more effective.

As regards the ruling, I have two criticisms of the panel’s method. The first is that the question to determine is not whether 4♠ is a logical alternative, but rather whether Pass is.

The second is that we poll players for their bridge judgment, not for their knowledge of the laws or legal terms. The proper questions to ask are, after providing the player with only the authorized information from the auction, “What calls would you seriously consider? Of those, which one would you choose?”

Wolff: Again a perfect ruling and for all the right reasons.

APPEAL	NON-NABC+ SIX
Subject	Revoke
DIC	Matt Smith
Event	NAP – Flight C
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	3/19/11

BD#	17
VUL	None
DLR	N

109 Masterpoints	
♠	K74
♥	832
♦	T95
♣	JT96

391 Masterpoints		Spring 2011 Louisville, Kentucky	422 Masterpoints	
♠	982		♠	AT653
♥	KT64		♥	AQJ5
♦	AKQ32		♦	8
♣	Q		♣	A82

99 Masterpoints	
♠	QJ
♥	97
♦	J764
♣	K7543

West	North	East	South

Final Contract	6♥ by East
Opening Lead	♦4
Table Result	6♥ by East, Down 2, NS +100
Director Ruling	6♥ by East, Down 2, NS +100
Panel Ruling	6♥ by East, Making 6, NS -980

The Facts: As the East/West pair left the table, they told the director there was a revoke on the first board. He went over the hand with East/West at the break and it did appear that North had revoked.

When the director went over the hand later with North/South, they disagreed about how the last five tricks were played. The director later got all four players together and there was no agreement about the play. If East/West was down one, the revoke makes sense. The score was entered as down 2. That is not possible, even with a revoke, given the line of play East stated.

The Ruling: Score on board was not changed as equity could not be established.

The Appeal: The screening director stated that the non-appellants were not located before screening. The table result was apparently not fully agreed to by the players at the end of the hand. The North player claimed a trick with the 8♥ at the end.

Some discussion ensued, but because the table was extremely late, they decided to table the discussion and move on to the next board instead of resolving the issue at that time.

The Decision: The play to the first nine tricks was verified by the table director and by both sides:

- Tr. 1: ♦4 led by South, ♦A from Dummy.
- Tr. 2: ♦K from Dummy, ♠3 discarded by Declarer.
- Tr. 3: ♦Q from Dummy, ♠5 discarded by Declarer.
- Tr. 4: ♦2 from Dummy, ♠4 discarded by North, ruffed with the ♥J by Declarer.
- Tr. 5: ♣A from Declarer.
- Tr. 6: ♣2 from Declarer, ruffed in Dummy with the ♥4.
- Tr. 7: ♠9 from Dummy, ducked around to South's ♠Q.
- Tr. 8: ♠J from South, to North's ♠K and Declarer's ♠A.
- Tr. 9: ♣8 from Declarer, ruffed in Dummy with ♥6.

East/West claimed that Declarer led the ♥K then another heart to hand, drew the last trump, and should have captured the last trick with the ♠T.

The North/South pair said that the ♥8 took the ♥5, and they were due that trick. They were unclear as to the sequence of plays to tricks ten through thirteen. The table director originally ruled six hearts making, but revised the scores and saw that six hearts down two was entered. Because of this the director readjusted the score to six hearts down two.

The defense allowed 6♥ to make when North pitched a spade, causing the ♠J and ♠K to crash, promoting the ten. The play was pretty obvious and automatic to make six hearts in the four card ending.

Per Law 85.A.1, the Panel felt the facts were indeterminate. The most probable outcome would be that declarer would draw the remaining trump, and take the last four tricks. The Panel felt that “the balance of probabilities” led to six hearts making six, North/South -980.

The Panel: William Michael (Chairman), Matt Koltnow, Jean Molnar

Commentary:

Bramley: If North pitched a spade on the fourth diamond then the contract should make. Everything else is beyond my comprehension. For us to figure out what happened when the players themselves have no clue is an exercise in frustration.

Goldsmith: I am glad I do not have to rule. No one knows the answer to these cases.

Kooijman: Strange. How can EW agree on down 2 if they are sure to have made the contract? NS were not internationals I guess? In such case, it is mandatory to call for the TD even if the table is late. I do not like procedural penalties but this case asks for one, to be given to EW. Not too bad if they also get the slam, which seems the right thing to do.

Rigal: No opinion; if forced to give one it would be 'A plague on both your houses' and 6♥ making. The line of play followed earned a minus score but maybe the revoke counters that.

Wildavsky: The panel ruling looks right to me.

Wolff: If the 9 tricks played were official and, of course, correctly enumerated, yes, declarer would and should score up 6 hearts bid and made, especially if he did draw North's eight of hearts as that record shows. If there is almost any doubt, then I would be inclined to give both sides an Average minus on this pair hand, simple it appears that both sides contributed to the chaos by causing so much doubt to remain by their behavior.