

2018 Spring NABC Appeals Casebook



Subject of Appeal:	Played Card	Case:	N1
---------------------------	-------------	--------------	----


Event	Lebhar IMP Pairs	Event DIC	Matt Koltnow
Date	03/10/2018	Session	First Final

Auction

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

1: Game Forcing

Hand Record

Board	2	N	Ahmed Yousry
Dealer	E	♠ A853 ♥ (void) ♦ K8752 ♣ J764	
Vul	N/S		
W	Mark Cohen		
♠	Q10		
♥	QJ86	E	Stasha Cohen
♦	QJ4	♠	K9762
♣	KQ93	♥	AK73
		♦	3
		♣	A85
		S	Ahmed Soliman
		♠	J4
		♥	109542
		♦	A1096
		♣	102

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

Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was called at trick 12. The play of the hand had gone as follows:

- Trick 1: ♥2 won by the 8 in Dummy
- Trick 2: ♠Q won by North with the Ace
- Trick 3: ♦2 won by South with the Ace
- Trick 4: ♥4 won by Declarer with the 7
- Trick 5: ♠K by Declarer
- Trick 6: ♠6 ruffed in Dummy with the Jack (South discarding the ♣10)
- Trick 7: ♣3 won by Declarer with the Ace
- Trick 8: ♠9, ruffed by South, overruffed in Dummy
- Trick 9: ♣K, South discarding a Diamond
- Trick 10: ♣Q, ruffed by South
- Trick 11: ♦9 to the King, ruffed by Declarer with the King

At this point, Declarer held the ♥A and the ♠7. South held the ♥10 and the ♦10, with the cards in the Dummy and North hands being inconsequential. When the Director came to the table, Declarer was holding the Ace in her hand while the seven was exposed on the table. North/South claimed Declarer had dropped the Ace on the floor, but the seven had been played and that South was ruffing in order to set the contract.

East/West stated that Declarer had dropped both cards on the floor, and the seven had just been the first that she picked up. She was always pulling the last trump and then the spade would be good for her tenth trick.

Director Ruling

Per Law 48A, Declarer is not required to play any card dropped accidentally. As the play sequence showed that Declarer was aware of the trump situation and that the seven would only be good after pulling the last trump, her intent was to play the Ace. Therefore, the Director ruled that the ♠7 was not the card played to the twelfth trick and that the result on the board was 4♥ by East, making four, E/W +420.

Director's Ruling	4♥ by E, Made 4, E/W +420
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S requested a review of the ruling. They felt the statement of facts was incorrect and Declarer had actually played a card as opposed to dropping it.

Panel Findings

While N/S contested the ruling, they could not provide any evidence that the facts were different from what the Director had determined. As they brought no new information to the Review process and could not point to an error by the Director in the original ruling, the Panel ruled that the Director's ruling was upheld, 4♥ by East, making four, E/W +420. The Panel deemed the appeal to not have merit, and an AWMW was given.

Panel Decision	4♥ by E, Made 4, E/W +420
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Jenni Carmichael
Member	David Metcalf
Member	Kevin Perkins

Subject of Appeal: Unauthorized Information	Case: N2
--	-----------------

Event Leventritt Silver Ribbon Pairs	Event DIC Ken Horwedel
Date 03/11/2018	Session First Qualifying


Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	1NT ¹	Pass ²
2♣	Pass	2♠	Pass
Pass	3♣	Pass	Pass
3♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 12-15 HCP
2: Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	21	N	Sheila Gabay
Dealer	N	♠ A86 ♥ 3 ♦ Q53 ♣ 987632	
Vul	N/S		
W	Barry Spector		E Randy Thompson
♠	J1097		♠ KQ52
♥	QJ109		♥ 942
♦	K1096		♦ 84
♣	Q		♣ AK104
		S James Keegan	
		♠ 43 ♥ AK765 ♦ AJ72 ♣ J5	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♠ by E	Down 1	N/S +50	♣J

Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was called after the conclusion of play. All four players concurred that South broke tempo "noticeably" after East's 1NT opening. North volunteered that South was thinking about the "unusual" 1NT range.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The Director polled the North hand to three national-caliber players. All three passed at every opportunity. He asked if a break in tempo by South made bidding more attractive, and all three answered in the affirmative.

Director Ruling

The Director determined, based upon the poll, that Pass was a logical alternative, and that the hesitation by South suggested 3♣ was more likely to be successful than passing. So, per Law 16B1a, the 3♣ call was disallowed, and the result adjusted to 2♠ by East, making two, E/W +110.

Director's Ruling	2♠ by E, Made 2, E/W +110
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S requested a review of the ruling. They felt that it was a bad matchpoint decision for North to pass 2♠ in a known fit. Based upon the auction, South was marked with values and at most two spades, so there was an implied N/S fit. North averred she would never pass here, playing matchpoints.

The Reviewer interviewed the appellants. He explained the ruling and the polls on which it was based and asked the appellants where they felt the Director went wrong. North repeated her claim that she would never pass, and that passing was wrong at matchpoints. The Reviewer reminded North of the poll results and asked her to clarify why she felt this did not disallow her action. North insisted that passing was wrong. The Reviewer cautioned the appellants that an appeal which failed to find fault with the ruling was likely to be deemed to lack merit.

Panel Findings

The Panel considered the Director's poll. They agreed that when all three players polled choose Pass that it demonstrates passing to be a logical alternative; that the choice of pollees was representative of North's peers; and that the Director's polling procedure was sound. The Panel found that the Director's poll established Pass as a logical alternative, while bidding was suggested by the Unauthorized Information. There was no reason to think the play in 2♠ would be particularly different from that in 3♠. In accordance with Law 16B, the Panel therefore upheld the Director's ruling of 2♠ by East, making two, E/W +110. The appeal, since it presented no substantive reason to question the initial ruling, was found to lack merit. An AWMW was issued.

Experts Consulted: Linda Lewis, Becky Rogers and Mark Itabashi

Panel Decision	2♠ by E, Made 2, N/S +110
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	David Metcalf
Member	Jenni Carmichael
Member	Kevin Perkins

Subject of Appeal:	Deceptive Play, Break in Tempo	Case:	N3
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Leventritt Silver Ribbon Pairs	Event DIC	Ken Horwedel
Date	03/11/2018	Session	First Qualifying


Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	1NT ¹
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-17 HCP

Hand Record

Board	9	N	Claire Alpert	E	Pat Galligan
Dealer	N	♠	A105	♠	864
Vul	E/W	♥	9875	♥	432
		♦	Q75	♦	AJ6
		♣	Q108	♣	9752
W	Ashaf El Sadi			S	Sylvie Willard
♠	K93			♠	QJ72
♥	KJ			♥	AQ106
♦	10832			♦	K94
♣	AJ43	♣	K6		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
1NT by S	Made 1	N/S +90	♦2

Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was called at the conclusion of play. The opening lead was the ♦2. Dummy played low, East inserted the Jack and Declarer won her King. Neither East nor Declarer took any extra time after the Dummy appeared to plan the defense or play. At trick two, declarer led the ♠2 to Dummy's 10. The 10 held the trick, but East paused noticeably before playing small. Declarer concluded, based on East's tempo, that the ♠K was offside, and so played the hand accordingly.

The East player stated after the hand that he was thinking about the rest of the hand when he broke tempo. He never said anything like "no problem" during the play.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The Director showed the hand to an expert player, asking whether the hesitation should have affected the Declarer's line of play. The expert did not believe it should but admitted that he was biased by looking at the entire hand. Six additional players with similar masterpoint holdings as South were presented the hand as a single dummy problem, with the play (including the hesitation) up to the relevant decision point. Three repeated the spade finesse, while the three who did not cited the hesitation as the reason behind their decision.

Director Ruling

Law 73E2 states, "If the Director determines that an innocent player has drawn a false inference from a question, remark, manner, tempo, or the like, of an opponent who has no demonstrable bridge reason for the action, and who could have been aware, at the time of the action, that it could work to his benefit, then the Director shall award an adjusted score." East had no demonstrable bridge reason to pause when he did. Based upon the hesitation, Declarer chose to eschew the later spade finesse, which was supported by the poll conducted as being a reasonable inference.

Although East was not attempting to deceive Declarer, this was certainly a situation where East could be aware that a hesitation here could cause Declarer to misplace the cards, which could work to his advantage. Based on 73E2, the Director adjusted the result on the board to 1NT by South, making two, N/S +120.

Director's Ruling

1NT by S, Made 2, N/S +120

The Appeal

E/W requested a review of the ruling. They felt that there was no opportunity for East to think out the defense at trick one, and thus he was entitled to do so at trick two. Holding ♦AJx, East argued that a delayed play at trick one would have disclosed the location of the Ace. Also, finessing the ♠10 seemed a bit odd, and East was not prepared for this play.

Panel Findings

The Reviewer met with all four players. Declarer's line of play was as follows:

- T1: ♦2 to the Jack and King
- T2: ♠2 to the 10
- T3: ♥5 to the 10 and Jack
- T4: ♦10 to the Queen and Ace
- T5: ♦6 to the 9
- T6: ♠7 to the Ace (eschewing the finesse)
- T7: ♥7 to Queen and King

The defense was now entitled to 6 tricks (one spade, two hearts, two diamonds, and the Club Ace), making 1 NT.

The Declarer explained how her line of play was predicated on the ♠K being offside. East insisted that he had a right to think about the hand, and that before playing to trick two was his first opportunity to do so. The Reviewer suggested that it would have been better not to quit his card at trick one, and thus delay the start of trick two, if he needed some time. While East had the right to think in the middle of trick two, there was some jeopardy to that if it caused an innocent declarer to go wrong. He read Law 73 to the player and asked how this law should not apply to this situation. East insisted that he had the right to think, and that he was not trying to mislead Declarer.

The Reviewer discussed the poll with the Director and determined that the Director did not know the South player, who is a well-known foreign player whose ACBL masterpoints do not reflect her accomplishments. As a result, it was possible that the polled players might not be a true representation of South's peers.

The Panel considered East's argument that this was his first chance to think about the hand, and whether this would qualify as a demonstrable bridge reason under Law 73E2. The problem was that it was not his first chance to think about the hand – he could have done so before playing to trick one, or if he felt that might be suggestive, at the end of trick one.

While there are lines of play, even without the spade finesse, which would have led to eight tricks, Declarer's line was certainly quite reasonable (assuming the ♠K was offside). It was also clear to the Panel that without that assumption, Declarer would almost certainly have taken eight tricks. The Director's decision to adjust the result to 1NT, making two, N/S +120, therefore was correct, and the Panel upheld the result.

The Panel then considered whether the appeal had merit. The Director testified that he had explained Law 73E2 to East, and showed him the results of his poll, yet the player had insisted on appealing. The Reviewer had gone over Law 73E2 with E/W and asked them to show how it should not apply, but East had simply reiterated that it was his right to think. The Panel could not see how the appellants had found fault with the Director's ruling, nor that they had brought any new, unconsidered issue or evidence to form a basis for appeal. The appeal was deemed baseless, and an AWMW was issued.

Experts Consulted: Six players with 6000-8000 masterpoints each

Panel Decision

1NT by S, Made 2, N/S +120

Panel Members

Reviewer	David Metcalf
Member	Jenni Carmichael
Member	Kevin Perkins

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	N4
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	Leventritt Silver Ribbon Pairs	Event DIC	Ken Horwedel
Date	03/11/2018	Session	First Qualifying


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-17 HCP
2: Spades, no Alert

Hand Record

Board	5	N	Ben Yang		
Dealer	N	♠ (void)			
		♥ J1084			
Vul	N/S	♦ 109842			
		♣ KQ102			
W	Hakan Nilsson			E	Roger Coffman
♠	QJ6			♠	A1054
♥	Q652			♥	AK9
♦	KJ			♦	Q63
♣	J973			♣	A54
		S	Arnold Kritz		
		♠	K98732		
		♥	73		
		♦	A75		
		♣	86		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by E	Made 3	E/W +400	♠7

Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was summoned at the conclusion of play. West stated that had 2♥ been properly Alerted, he would have Doubled (by agreement showing cards), and the final contract would have been 2♠X by South. He explained that a Double of a natural 2♥ would have been for takeout in the partnership methods, so he bid 3NT as his best option. A penalty type sequence was not available to him at the table without an Alert.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The Director polled ten Flight A players from another event. Given the West hand, the methods stated by E/W, and the correct explanation, six out of ten would have Doubled 2♥, with the other four bidding 3NT. Continuing the likely auction following a Double, the six would then either Double 2♠, or make a forcing Pass and then Pass if East Doubled.

Director Ruling

West was given misinformation which affected his choice of calls and thus the final contract. Law 21B stipulates, following a call made by a player influenced by misinformation provided by an opponent, "[w]hen it is too late to change a call and the Director judges that the offending side gained an advantage from the irregularity, he awards an adjusted score." Law 12C1c allows the Director to assign multiple scores weighted by their relative probabilities. Based on his poll, the Director ruled the result as 70% 2♠X by South, down 3, E/W +800, and 30% 3NT by East, making three, E/W +400.

Director's Ruling	70% 2♠X by S, Down 3, E/W +800 30% 3NT by E, Made 3, E/W +400
--------------------------	--

The Appeal

North/South appealed the ruling because they disagreed with the Director's poll-based ruling.

Panel Findings

The Reviewer met with North and asked for clarification of his reason for appealing the decision. North stated that he did not know that the choice of players polled was a valid sample, or that the sample might be insufficient in size, or that the poll might be flawed in other ways. He compared it to political polls which had been shown to be inaccurate. He was also concerned that E/W did not call the Director until after the hand had been completed and scored and felt that this was too late to raise such an objection. He testified that the correct explanation came out at trick one, when North showed out of spades, and that would have been the appropriate time to object. Finally, he questioned whether E/W truly use the methods they claimed.

The Reviewer met separately with South, who claimed that the objection was raised as E/W were leaving the table. He claimed West said, "Well, maybe I would have Doubled," and called the Director.

The Reviewer asked the Director when he had been summoned to the table, who confirmed that he had been summoned at the end of the hand, before the next hand was played.

The Reviewer met briefly with E/W, who confirmed that the Director was called by West at the end of the hand, as the board was being scored. He repeated his methods and restated that a Double of a natural overcall in this sequence was takeout-oriented, but card-showing if the bid were artificial. He did not provide documentation of his methods but claimed that they had been discussed.

The Panel considered the poll taken by the Director. It was felt that ten people was a more than reasonable sample, and if the explanation caused six of the ten to Double, then the misinformation did materially affect the result. The poll assumed two things: first, that a Double of 2♥ would have led inevitably to a contract of 2♠X; and second, that the methods claimed by E/W were in fact their agreements. The Panel felt that these were reasonable assumptions and chose not to test either one further. As such, the Panel accepted the poll results as valid.

The appellant seemed to feel that poll-based rulings were in general not valid or accurate. However, the Panel felt that questioning the methodology the ACBL and the WBF has chosen to trust and use was beyond the scope of this Panel.

The Panel then considered the relevance of the timing of the Director call. Per Law 92B, "the right to request ... a Director's ruling expires thirty minutes after the official score has been made available for inspection...." While the failure to Alert came to light at trick one, the implication on the possible result of the board might not have been clear until after the play of the hand was over, as the full deal came to light. The Director call came well within the time limits allowed by law.

The Panel discussed the allegation that West misstated his partnership agreements, but the agreement stated is quite common (arguably the standard agreement), and there was no reason to question it.

Having considered all of N/S's allegations and found that they had all been either addressed by the Director in his ruling or were too specious to be given serious weight, the Panel upheld the Director's ruling. Furthermore, based upon the diligence of the Director and Reviewer in addressing those concerns, there was no true merit to the appeal. The Panel therefore issued an AWMW.

Panel Decision	70% 2♠X by S, Down 3, E/W +800 30% 3NT by E, Made 3, E/W +400
-----------------------	--

Panel Members

Reviewer	David Metcalf
Member	Jenni Carmichael
Member	Kevin Perkins

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	N5
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	Leventritt Silver Ribbon Pairs	Event DIC	Ken Horwedel
Date	03/11/2018	Session	First Qualifying


Auction

West	North	East	South
			1♣ ¹
Pass	1♦ ²	Pass	1NT ³
Pass	2♦ ⁴	Pass	3♥ ⁵
Pass	4♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Strong, Artificial, Forcing
2: Artificial, 0-7 HCP
3: 18-19 HCP, Balanced
4: Transfer to ♥
5: Super Accept

Hand Record

Board	15	N	Bryan Howard		
Dealer	S	♠	Q84		
		♥	QJ1092		
Vul	N/S	♦	32		
		♣	976		
W	Stuart Goodgold			E	Buddhadeb Biswas
♠	10752			♠	KJ3
♥	85			♥	73
♦	AQ965			♦	J874
♣	J3			♣	A542
		S	Jim Foster		
		♠	A96		
		♥	AK64		
		♦	K10		
		♣	KQ108		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♥ by S	Down 2	E/W +200	♠5

Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was summoned at the end of the play. Following the opening lead, Declarer asked East as to their opening lead agreements. East said, "Standard. No, third and fifth." Declarer stated that he did not hear the correction in the explanation, as he is hard of hearing. He called for the ♠Q from Dummy, covered by the King and Ace. He subsequently lost two spade tricks, two diamond tricks and a club trick for down two.

Declarer contended after the hand that if he knew the lead was 3rd or 5th best, he would have played low from dummy. This would have made it impossible for East to continue the suit and give Declarer time to set up a club for a spade discard.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The Director investigated Declarer's claim to hearing difficulties and confirmed that he is known to not hear well. The Director then polled three players concerning the play of the hand as a double dummy problem. All three said it was always correct to play low from Dummy if the lead was third or fifth, but it might be right to play the Queen to try and win the trick when the lead was fourth best. All conceded that it was unlikely that West held the ♠K, but they all gave serious consideration to playing the Queen with one believing he would likely play the Queen if told the opponents played Standard leads. None of the players would play the Queen given the correct partnership agreement.

Director Ruling

As Declarer only heard the initial explanation of Standard leads, not the correction to third and fifth, misinformation did exist. Per the ACBL Alert Procedures, it is the obligation of players to make sure that their opponent

has correctly heard their explanation of their methods. As the poll showed that with correct information no one would play the Queen, the Director ruled to adjust the score to 4♥ by South, down 1, E/W +100, per Laws 47E2b and 12C1.

Director's Ruling

4♥ by S, Down 1, E/W +100

The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling. They argued that Declarer did not mention his hearing difficulties until the Director left the table. He claimed to have only heard "Standard" but not the immediate correction to "Third and Fifth". East had immediately corrected the MI, and it was only Declarer's lack of concentration (and selective hearing) that was responsible for his poor result. E/W pointed out that West could have been leading from 1075 or J75 instead of 10752. Finally, they stated that if Declarer truly believed that West held the ♠K, then the 100% play for two tricks from the spade holding is to play low from Dummy on the first trick.

Panel Findings

The Reviewer met with E/W first. He told them that it was their responsibility to ensure that an explanation (or Alert) was heard by their opponents, and if it was not, it is legally deemed not to have been given. They felt that the play of the Queen could never be right, no matter what the lead.

The Reviewer discussed the Director's poll with the E/W. He pointed out that the poll showed that the Queen was found to be more attractive when the lead was 4th best than when it was 3rd/5th.

The Reviewer met separately with N/S. South claimed that he thought about the hand and the opening lead for several seconds before deciding that his play was dependent on what the lead was. He then asked his question. Once he heard the answer, he was ready to play, and did not hear, nor had any reason to expect, East's correction. North said he heard the correction, but East was soft spoken, and there was a pause before he added, "Umm, 3rd and 5th leads."

The Panel started with the question of whether Declarer's hearing the first part of the explanation but not the second part was the responsibility of the Declarer or the explainer. The ACBL Alert Procedures state, in capital letters, "IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE ALERTER OR ANNOUNCER TO ENSURE THAT THE OPPONENTS ARE AWARE THAT AN ALERT HAS BEEN MADE." While this was not an Alert, the principle extends to explanations as well. Thus, it is the general responsibility of the explainer to ensure that his opponents hear and understand his explanations. While the defenders may not have been aware of Declarer's hearing problem, they still need to ensure that their message was received. Accordingly, the Panel upheld the Director's ruling, 4♥ by South, down 1, E/W +100.

Panel Decision

4♥ by S, Down 1, E/W +100

Panel Members

Reviewer	David Metcalf
Member	Jenni Carmichael
Member	Kevin Perkins

Subject of Appeal:	Unauthorized Information	Case:	N6
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Leventritt Silver Ribbon Pairs	Event DIC	Ken Horwedel
Date	03/11/2018	Session	Second Qualifying


Auction

West	North	East	South
1♠	Pass	3♦ ¹	Pass
3♠	Pass	4♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, explained as weak/ constructive four card spade raise

Hand Record

Board	20	N	Joe Quinn		
Dealer	W	♠ J3			
		♥ AJ2			
Vul	Both	♦ 762			
		♣ K10732			
W	Sanford Robbins			E	Lucy Tillman
♠	Q9854			♠	A1072
♥	3			♥	Q54
♦	A1065			♦	KJ3
♣	AJ5			♣	Q94
		S	Ira Hessel		
		♠	K6		
		♥	K109876		
		♦	Q94		
		♣	86		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♠ by W	Made 4	E/W +620	

Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was summoned when Dummy's hand was displayed after the opening lead. East/West were a first-time partnership, filling out the movement for the second session, who had agreed to play "Reverse Bergen" prior to the beginning of the session when they filled out their convention card. East had forgotten the agreement, as it had not come up in the first seven rounds of the session. The Director instructed the pairs to complete play on the board, and for North/South to call at the conclusion of play if they felt they had been damaged. The Director confirmed that E/W did have other agreements in place to show a game forcing raise.

Director Ruling

The unauthorized information based on partner's announcement that the 3♦ bid was constructive (rather than limit) assisted East in choosing her raise to game in the face of partner's signoff. Based on Law 16B1, the Director ruled that the 4♠ bid was disallowed, and the contract reverted to 3♠ by West, making 4, E/W +170.

Director's Ruling	3♠ by W, Made 4, E/W +170
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling. West argued that this was their first game playing together, and the first time this bid had come into play during the session. East had simply forgotten the agreement and did not want to want to use Jacoby 2NT since she only had 12 points.

Panel Findings

The Reviewer confirmed that East had thought that her 3♦ bid showed a limit raise, and that 3♣ would have been constructive. Nevertheless, she insisted she would have bid game in any case. Two expert players were consulted to determine whether it was reasonable to treat the East hand as a “game forcing invitation.” The feeling from the experts consulted was otherwise - if this hand were to be considered invitational, then the player should respect a signoff by Opener.

Pass was clearly a logical alternative (indeed, the experts would have chosen that action), and Responder was very likely “woken up” by partner’s explanation of their call. Partner’s misunderstanding of the bid made bidding game decidedly more attractive, so Law 16B requires the score to be adjusted. The Director’s ruling, 3♣ by West, making 4, E/W +170, was upheld.

Experts Consulted: Linda Lewis and Becky Rogers

Panel Decision	3♣ by W, Made 4, E/W +170
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	David Metcalf
Member	Jenni Carmichael
Member	Kevin Perkins

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	N7
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	Vanderbilt Knockout Teams	Event DIC	Matt Smith
Date	03/16/2018	Session	Quarterfinals, Third Quarter


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: S to W - 8+ HCP, 0-3 ♠
N to E - 5+ spades
2: S to W - Exclusion for Clubs
N to E - Shortness
3: S to W - Exclusion response
N to E - Natural

Hand Record

Board	12	N	Dennis Bilde		
Dealer	W	♠ AK92			
		♥ 10			
Vul	N/S	♦ K532			
		♣ AQ54			
W	Michal Kwiecien			E	Marcin Lesniewski
♠	QJ43			♠	865
♥	876			♥	K5432
♦	AJ8			♦	9
♣	762			♣	K1093
		S	Augustin Madala		
		♠	107		
		♥	AQJ9		
		♦	Q10764		
		♣	J8		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4NT by S	Made 4	N/S +630	♥8

Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was called after the hand was over. West said he would not have doubled 4♠ had he known that N/S did not have an agreement about the meaning of the 1♠ response. West said he doubled 4♠ to keep his partner from leading a heart against a club contract.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The Director polled four players as to what call they would make over 4♠ with correct information as to the N/S agreements. None of the four would have doubled if informed that there was no agreement in place as to the meaning of 1♠.

Director Ruling

Based upon the player poll, the Director concluded that West's Double was based upon the information he received from South. Had West heard North's description of the auction, he would not have assumed clubs would be trumps and that the auction would continue past 4♠. As such, the Director ruled that N/S gained an advantage from the misinformation, and per Laws 21B3 & 12C1, adjusted the score to 4♠ by South, down one, E/W +100.

Director's Ruling	4♠ by S, Down 1, E/W +100
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S requested a review of the ruling. All four players attended the review. N/S stated that this is a new partnership. They felt that 1♠ was just a mistaken bid by South, as nothing on their convention card said they were using the method South described. They also felt that the Director call was taking multiple chances at a good score. If N/S had made 4♠x, E/W would have claimed misinformation and gotten to say they would not double 4♠; in this case, since pulling to 4NT was correct, now they get to say they would not double 4♠. If 4♠x had gone down, then there would not have been a problem. Lastly, N/S said that a spade lead against a club contract could have been disastrous.

Panel Findings

The Reviewer spoke to four additional players. All four would have doubled or considered doubling 4♠ with the information South provided; none would have doubled 4♠ had they known there was no agreement about 1♠. The Reviewer brought this data and the appellants' other arguments to the Panel he convened. They could not find flaws in the original ruling, nor did they see that any additional evidence collected supported the appellant's argument. The table ruling was ruled to stand. The appeal was deemed to have merit, primarily because the ruling was delivered at the end of the fourth quarter. The players did not have time to make a measured decision as to whether to proceed with an appeal.

Panel Decision

4♠ by S, Down 1, E/W +100

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Koltnow
Member	David Metcalf
Member	Kevin Perkins

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo, Unauthorized Information	Case:	N8
---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Jacoby Open Swiss	Event DIC	Ken Van Cleve
Date	03/17/2018	Session	First Qualifying


Auction

West	North	East	South
	2♦	3♣	3NT
Pass ¹	Pass	4♣	Dbl
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Agreed Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	21	N	Richard Popper		
Dealer	N	♠ J107			
		♥ 1082			
Vul	N/S	♦ KQ10965			
		♣ J			
W	Serge Aronovitch			E	Marianne Aronovitch
♠	86543			♠	A
♥	9753			♥	KJ4
♦	3			♦	742
♣	543			♣	AQ10762
		S	Chris Moll		
		♠	KQ92		
		♥	AQ6		
		♦	AJ8		
		♣	K98		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♣X by E	Made 4	E/W +510	♦A

Facts Determined at the Table

All players agreed that there had been a break in tempo by the West player

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Six top players were polled. All six said they would pass over 3NT. Two considered doubling. None of the players polled even mentioned 4♣ as a possible choice. Three 2000-5000 point players were also polled. All three chose pass. One considered a 4♣ bid, but chose pass.

Director Ruling

Under Law 16, West's break in tempo represents unauthorized information, and East chose an option that may have been suggested by the UI, based upon the player poll. The score was adjusted to 3NT by South, making 3, N/S +600.

Director's Ruling	3NT by S, Made 3, N/S +600
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

E/W requested a review of the ruling. They believed the polled players were unfamiliar with their systemic methods.

East's 3♣ bid was not forcing, showing approximately 10 HCP. East's hand was stronger than what she had showed. The opponents' 3NT contract would obviously make, based on diamond tricks and the ♣K stopper. Given the vulnerability, 4♣ prevent 3NT from being the final contract, and showed a full opener (including the singleton ♠A) and a six-card suit.

The Reviewer confirmed with E/W that there had been a pause for consideration by West, but that East felt it had not influenced her choice of action. E/W are married, and a regular partnership of some years.

The Reviewer attempted to explain the relevant Law to the appellants, but they insisted that East's bid was right, and dismissed the Reviewer's attempts to see the situation from a different light.

Panel Findings

The Panel felt that the acknowledged break in tempo by West did constitute unauthorized information; that it did demonstrate an interest in action by West, and so demonstrably suggested further bidding by East. Pass was a Logical Alternative with the East hand, as demonstrated by the Director's poll. The Director's ruling was in accordance with Law 16, and so was upheld.

The Panel discussed the Reviewer's conversation with the appellants, and their dismissal of his attempts to get them to understand the relevant Law. It was felt that the appellants did not bring up any substantive issues in the appeal that were not addressed in the initial ruling, nor could they do so when screened by the Reviewer. As such, it was felt that the appeal lacked merit, and an AWMW was issued.

Experts consulted: Linda Lewis, Becky Rogers

Panel Decision	3NT by S, Made 3, N/S +600
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	David Metcalf
Member	Jenni Carmichael
Member	Kevin Perkins

Subject of Appeal: Misinformation	Case: N9
--	-----------------

Event Jacoby Open Swiss	Event DIC Ken Van Cleve
Date 03/17/2018	Session First Qualifying


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 4 card limit raise, not Alerted

Hand Record

Board	23	N	Stephanie Austin
Dealer	S	♠ KQ642	
		♥ K	
		♦ J10	
Vul	Both	♣ Q10852	
W	Kit Woolsey		
♠	AJ		
♥	107543		
♦	K9542		
♣	3	E	Arline Fulton
		♠	105
		♥	AQ986
		♦	AQ83
		♣	74
		S	Tina Bayer
		♠	9873
		♥	J2
		♦	76
		♣	AKJ96

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♠ by N	Down 1	E/W +100	

Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was summoned after the auction, but before the opening lead. Away from the table, West said that he would have doubled the 2♦ bid had he been told that it was artificial. When East was taken away from the table, she said she would have doubled the 3♣ bid for takeout, if she had known what 2♦ was. After the conclusion of the hand, E/W felt they would have gotten to their heart game with correct information.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Four players were polled with the West hand. All passed 2♦ with no alert. They also all passed when told what 2♦ was. None thought the information made Double more attractive, one labeling it "insane", and another as "you couldn't pay me enough."

Seven players were polled with the East hand. Of the four who were willing to pass over 1♠ (three were not), none would have taken action over 3♣, with or without the alert.

Director Ruling

Though there was certainly misinformation, the Director found no reason to believe that E/W were damaged by that misinformation. The table result was allowed to stand, since Law 40B3a did not apply.

Director's Ruling	4♠ by N, Down 1, E/W +100
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling. West did not believe that four competent players could honestly say that the misinformation didn't make doubling less attractive. He had asked several players, and while not all doubled, it was unanimous that with the correct information doubling was more attractive.

Furthermore, West believed the poll was flawed. The proper polling question should have been, "what would the hand do with the correct information?" not what they would do with the wrong information. By asking the wrong question first, a bias was created.

Panel Findings

The Reviewer first repeated the poll of the West hand after 2♦, with the correct explanation of the 2♦ bid. Of the six players polled, none doubled. However, three of them chose to bid 2♠, an action not considered by the West player at the table. If the 2♦ bid had not been alerted, however, all six players would have passed without asking about the call.

The Reviewer then polled the East hand, with the correct explanation of the 2♦ bid. All those who passed over 1♠, also passed over 3♣. The pollees were then asked what they would do if West had doubled 2♦. Two of the four now chose a 3♦ bid. The others continued to pass.

The Panel first considered West's actions. Neither the Director's poll nor the Reviewer's found support for Double by West, given correct information. However, the Reviewer's poll did find support for a different action.

Then East's actions were reviewed. East certainly could have bid initially over 1♠, as many of the pollees did. However, once having passed, there was no support for later unilateral action, assuming West passed over 2♦. If West were allowed to Double 2♦, then there was reason to accept a diamond bid from East. However, that did not seem likely to propel them into hearts.

The Panel then returned to West. They decided that they could not allow West to choose an action which he had not considered at the table, nor in ensuing discussion, so they would not entertain a 2♠ bid from West. The appellant had made the point that the correct information made doubling more attractive. The Panel agreed that it did, but "more attractive" does not equate to "would have chosen the action." And neither the Director's poll nor the Reviewer's found anyone who thought Double was reasonable. As such, a Double by West did not reach the standard of Logical Alternative.

Finally, they discussed the Director's poll (and polls in general). Did the order in which the questions were asked bias the poll? It was certainly felt that this could happen. However, while there was no way to tell for sure, the certitude of the respondents made it seem somewhat less likely in this particular case. The Reviewer's poll seemed to bear that out.

The Panel thus could not find any reason to reverse the Director's ruling, and thus it was upheld. However, it was felt the appeal had brought up some valid issues that bore further investigation and more careful consideration, and so had merit.

Experts consulted: Chris Compton, Robb Gordon, David Grainger, Greg Hinze, Kelley Hwang, Jan Jansma, Daniel Korbel, Linda Lewis, Mike Lipkin, Chris Moll, Barry Rigal, Jeff Roman, Michael Rosenberg, David Sabourin, Danny Sprung, JoAnn Sprung

Panel Decision	4♠ by N, Down 1, E/W +100
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	David Metcalf
Member	Jenni Carmichael
Member	Kevin Perkins

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	N10
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----

Event	Jacoby Open Swiss	Event DIC	Ken Van Cleve
Date	03/18/2018	Session	First Final


Auction

West	North	East	South
	1♣	Pass	Pass
Dbl	Pass	1♦ ¹	Pass
2NT	Pass	3♦ ²	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Intended as "Negative", No Alert
2: Intended as Transfer to ♥, No Alert

Hand Record

Board	13	N	Jonathan Fleischmann	
Dealer	N	♠ Kx ♥ xx ♦ Q10x ♣ AQJxxx		
Vul	Both			
W	Jacek Pszczola		E	Jacek Kalita
♠ AQJ9 ♥ AKQ ♦ AJx ♣ Kxx			♠ 8xx ♥ J109xxx ♦ 9xx ♣ x	
		S	Kelley Hwang	
		♠ 10xxx ♥ xx ♦ Kxxx ♣ 109x		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♦ by E	Down 2	N/S +200	♣10

Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was called after the round was over, and the teams had compared scores. The board in question had already been shuffled when the Director tried to retrieve it. N/S felt they should have been told about West's failures to Alert 1♦ and 3♦ before dummy was exposed. They said they would have led a diamond with the right information.

Director Ruling

Per Law 20F5b, East was required to call the Director before the opening lead and tell the opponents that in his opinion, his partner's (lack of) explanation about his bids was incorrect. Three experts were given the hand as a single-dummy play problem after a diamond lead. Each of them took four tricks, so the score was adjusted to 3♦ by East, down five, N/S +500, per Law 12C1.

Director's Ruling	3♦ by E, Down 5, N/S +500
--------------------------	---------------------------

The Appeal

E/W requested a review of the ruling. They said that they are not an established partnership; their partnership this week was an emergency arrangement due to a teammate's illness. East hoped West would treat this auction as analogous to a common treatment against a Polish Club. In that treatment, 1♣-X-P-1♦ is negative and artificial, and transfers apply after the Doubler's notrump rebid. They also objected to the Director having polled the play problem after a diamond lead, as they felt a club lead more likely. Lastly, they thought the line of play imposed on them was ridiculous, as it would be automatic to duck the second diamond which would allow Declarer to endplay North later.

They also felt that the ruling was piling on. East had already carefully avoided taking advantage of the UI by bidding 3♦, which he suspected might get passed; he felt it was greedy to suggest that he now be required to tell the opponents what his hand was.

Panel Findings

The Reviewer spoke to two pairs who play (and play against) Polish Club frequently. He sought to find out whether the treatment East used was common. One pair said that they use this treatment after a Polish Club, but not in the auction E/W had. The other pair said that they use this treatment after a Polish Club, but they could easily see a Polish pair have a misunderstanding about this treatment if they had not played as much outside Poland (where nearly all pairs play Polish Club, which is forcing and artificial, making this auction much rarer). In fact, this pair did use the treatment in this sequence, responding to a balancing double. This data suggested that East used a treatment that was known to peers playing a system such as his, but that its application in this particular sequence was not universal. There was not enough evidence to suggest that West should have recognized this treatment as an implied agreement based on E/W's system and experience.

The Reviewer brought his findings back to a Panel to determine whether E/W had an agreement about this sequence that East needed to disclose. They concluded that the pair simply had not discussed this sequence. East hoped West would recognize this sequence as equivalent to a common treatment, but he did not. While both members of this partnership have experience in North America, they are not regular partners, and it is understandable that they did not discuss this sequence.

The Panel felt that East was not of the opinion that his partner had given erroneous information (by not Alerting); he had given no information. As such, the requirement to correct misinformation by Law 20F5b did not apply. West's failure to alert 1♦ in effect announced that there was no unusual agreement about the bid, and that was indeed the case. The table result of 3♦ by East, down two, N/S +200, was restored.

Experts consulted: Michal Klukowski, Piotr Gawrys

Panel Decision	3♦ by E, Down 2, N/S +200
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Koltnow
Member	Gary Zeiger
Member	Matt Smith

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	R1
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	North American Pairs, Flight C	Event DIC	Doug Rankin
Date	03/11/2018	Session	Second Qualifying


Auction

West	North	East	South
		Pass	1♦
Pass	1♠	Pass	2♣
Pass	2♥ ¹	Pass	3NT
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 4 th suit forcing, not Alerted

Hand Record

Board	14	N	140 MPS		
Dealer	E	♠	K9753		
		♥	AQ865		
		♦	K		
Vul	None	♣	J9		
W	280 MPS			E	300 MPS
♠	42			♠	AQ86
♥	2			♥	KJ973
♦	1097432			♦	85
♣	8764			♣	102
		S	380 MPS		
		♠	J10		
		♥	104		
		♦	AQJ6		
		♣	AKQ53		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by S	Made 6	N/S +490	♦10

Facts Determined at the Table

North called the Director after the auction was complete and corrected South's failure to Alert the 2♥ bid. Away from the table, East said she would have doubled 2♥ if it had been Alerted as fourth-suit forcing.

Against 3NT, West led the ten of diamonds and declarer won and cashed nine minor-suit winners, dummy coming down to Kx AQ -- -. East, down to AQ KJ9, discarded the queen of spades on trick 9. Declarer then led a spade through dummy, forcing East to lead a heart into the AQ. Declarer made 12 tricks, N/S +490.

East/West called the Director after the hand and stated that West would have led a heart if his partner had doubled the 2♥ bid.

Director Ruling

The Director ruled that West would have led a heart in response to the double if East had doubled 2♥. He adjusted the score to 3NT by South, making 4, N/S +430.

Director's Ruling	3NT by S, Made 4, N/S +430
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

North/South appealed the ruling and were the only players to meet with the Reviewer. They felt that East had a Double of 2♥ even if 2♥ were not fourth suit forcing by agreement. They also stated that the poor result was not caused by the failure to Double but by East's errant discard of the spade queen.

Panel Findings

The Director had not ascertained whether or not the East/West pair played fourth suit forcing themselves, so the Panel felt it was not clear whether East/West should have protected themselves by asking about the 2♥ bid.

The Panel considered whether the auction would proceed the same way if East had doubled 2♥. The Reviewer polled four peers with the South hand who opened 1♦ and rebid 2♣. All four players passed after East doubled 2♥. The Reviewer then polled six players with the North hand after East doubled 2♥ and it was passed around to them. Four players passed out 2♥X, and two redoubled if it was confirmed that redouble would have been for business. Since 2♥X rated to make, that did not lead to a better score for East/West than the table result.

The Panel therefore felt that although East/West had been given misinformation, this did not lead to damage to their side and that therefore Law 40B3a did not apply. They therefore restored the table result of 3NT making 6, N/S +490.

Panel Decision

3NT by S, Made 6, N/S +490

Panel Members

Reviewer	Eric Bell
Member	Matt Koltnow
Member	Kevin Perkins

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo, Unauthorized Information	Case:	R2
---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Second Friday Open Pairs	Event DIC	Arleen Harvey
Date	03/16/2018	Session	First


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Natural, Forcing
2: Agreed Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	24	N	10,300 MPS	
Dealer	W	♠ 72 ♥ A7 ♦ KJ7543 ♣ J92		
Vul	None			
W	550 MPS		E	1700 MPS
♠ QJ96543 ♥ 54 ♦ 10 ♣ 1054			♠ A ♥ QJ10863 ♦ A8 ♣ AQ76	
	S		7100 MPS	
	♠ K108 ♥ K92 ♦ Q962 ♣ K83			

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♠ by W	Made 4	E/W +420	♦7

Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was called at the end of the auction and called back at the end of play. The BIT was agreed by all players, though its length was somewhat in dispute. N/S believed they were damaged by West's 4♠ bid after the agreed BIT by East.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The Director polled six players ranging from 550 to 5000 masterpoints regarding West's action after 3NT. Three of the six players passed 3NT.

Director Ruling

The Director ruled that there was UI that demonstrably suggested pulling 3NT and Pass was a logical alternative. The 4♠ bid was disallowed and the contract was adjusted to 3NT by East, down 4, after a diamond lead by South, per Laws 16B1 & 12C1.

Director's Ruling	3NT by E, Down 4, N/S +200
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

E/W appealed the table ruling. North, East, and West attended a brief review prior to the beginning of the second session. The facts were agreed. West said his 2♠ bid was non-systemic, so his partner couldn't possibly play him for the

hand he held. Their agreement on weak two bids was 5-11 HCP, and specifically a six-card suit. E/W suspected that the players who were polled might not actually have been their peers. Each had taken years off from bridge for jobs and family and felt that they were stronger players than their masterpoint holdings might suggest. A Tournament Director familiar with the pair confirmed this suggestion. North thought the poll results showed the ruling to be correct.

Panel Findings

Based on input from the above referenced Director, the Reviewer polled 26 players in the 2000-4000 masterpoint range. The large number of pollees was due to the difficulty in finding players who would even consider opening 2♠ with the West hand. Ultimately, the Reviewer could find only two players who would both open 2♠ with the West hand and rebid 3♠. Both of these players were adamant that they would never consider passing 3NT. One player bid 4♥; the other bid 4♠. They voiced the same sentiment that the hand had some value in a suit contract but was worthless in No Trump.

In doing his research, the Reviewer discovered that the table Director gave the pollees the full auction up to the 3NT bid. This suggested that E/W's concern that the poll results did not accurately reflect the views of players who would actually open 2♠ was warranted. Therefore, the Panel decided that for a player who would actually open 2♠ with the West hand, that passing 3NT was not a logical alternative. The table result of 4♠ by West, making 4, E/W +420, was restored.

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

Panel Members

Reviewer	Gary Zeiger
Member	Matt Koltnow
Member	Kevin Perkins