



Charged Party(ies)
 ACBL #
 Hearing Date

Disciplinary Body Hearing Location

Charging Party ACBL# Complainant ACBL#

COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHO HEARD THE CHARGES

Name	ACBL #	Name	ACBL #
Jan Martel, Chair	K090945		
Chris Moll	K496399		
Julie Smith	J494848		

INDIVIDUALS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE HEARING (excluding committee members)

Name	ACBL#	Via	Capacity	Name	ACBL#	Via	Capacity
Bala Srinivasan	P694164	web conf.	Charged Party			Select One	Select One
Justin Coniglio	Q809461	Select One	Adv-Charging P			Select One	Select One
Jeff Edelstein	O200338	web conf.	Adv-Charging P			Select One	Select One
Ray Yuenger	P913494	web conf.	Advisor			Select One	Select One

EVIDENCE AND ARGUMENTS PRESENTED (Summarize evidence and arguments presented including testimony. If additional space is needed, continue on page 3 of this hearing report.) (Note: provide new documentary evidence introduced during the hearing to the Office of National Recorder)

See attached narrative report pages 1-11 and Appendices A and B on pages 20-24.

COMMITTEE FINDINGS OF FACT (based on the evidence, state the committee's conclusion as to what happened)

See attached narrative report pages 11-19.

DECISION (click on the box next to Not Responsible or Responsible of violating the CDR to add a check mark.)

Not responsible

Responsible

CDR GROUNDS FOR DISCIPLINE Type the section(s) and description(s) found in CDR 3 which led to the discipline).

3.20 Cheating and other Ethical Violations.

CDR effective January 1, 2020

DISCIPLINE (Unless a discipline begins immediately, which requires you to complete a Notice of Immediate Discipline, all begin dates should start at least five days after you submit this hearing Report to the Office of National Recorder.

Disciplined Party is convicted of premeditated or collusive cheating (or has admitted to such action). CDR 401(H) YES NO

	Start Date	End Date	Additional Requirements/Comments
<input type="checkbox"/> REPRIMAND		N/A	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PROBATION	See comments to the right		Probation - Bala: 10 years (11/21/2027-11/20/2037); Pracheth: 10 years (11/21/2024-11/20/2034); Excluded from playing together during probationary period.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SUSPENSION	See comments to the right		Suspension - Bala: 5 years (11/21/2022-11/20/2027); Pracheth: 2 years (11/21/2022-11/20/2024)

Is the disciplined party Suspended because of an Ethical Violation (CDR 401(H))? YES NO

Is the Suspension imposed due to an Ethical Violation more than one year (CDR 401(H))? YES NO

EXPULSION N/A

SUSPENDED SENTENCE (only used in conjunction with an imposed Suspension from above that you have converted to Probation). State the condition of the sentence below

EXCLUSION from Events and Programs (list the exclusions and the dates of the events or activities). CDR 401(F)

REDUCTION OR FORFEITURE of Masterpoints (MP) or Tournament Rank or Disqualification. Please specify below:

Forfeiture of 50% of all Masterpoints held by each Charged Party. Forfeiture of mini-McKenney and Ace of Clubs awards at the national, district, or unit levels for their performance in 2020.

STATE THE OFFENSE(S) FROM APPENDIX B, CHART 1 and/or CHART 2 OF THE CDR

Former E19

The discipline imposed above is within the recommended guidelines of Appendix B, Chart 1 and/or Chart 2. If it is OUTSIDE the guidelines, a reason must be stated below.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED (CHAIR)

/s/ Jan Martel

Date: 11/12/22

Electronic Signature (type name above)

Wet Signature (sign above)

I. Summary of Evidence and Arguments

A. Procedural Overview

On August 24, 2022, Joseph Jones, the Executive Director of the American Contract Bridge League (“ACBL”) filed a Charge Letter alleging that Bala (“Father”) and Pracheth (“Son”) Srinivasan had “shared information about their hands to gain a competitive advantage during ACBL sanctioned games” (p. 4¹) in violation of former section 3.20 of the ACBL’s Code of Disciplinary Regulations (“CDR”).² This Charge Letter was based on a Complaint filed by National Recorder Jeff Edelstein on the same day.

On September 12, the Charging Party filed 79 pages of pre-hearing disclosure as requested by the Chair of the Online Ethical Oversight Committee (“OEOC”) Panel. The disclosure included background information about the Charged Parties. It identified the Co-Advocates representing the Charging Party. Also in the disclosure were hyperlinks to five full 18-board sessions played by the Charged Parties on Bridge Base OnLine (“BBO”) on August 20 and 25, September 19, and October 3 and 6.³ The Charging Party did not question any particular boards from these five sessions. However, the disclosure also included a list of 81 boards from sessions played during the time periods January 28 through February 2 and July 30 through November 24 in which the Charged Parties underled an Ace or King against a suit contract. The list included the date of each questioned lead. This list appears in Appendix A to this report.

The Charging Party’s disclosure also included 68 hand and auction diagrams along with the Advocate’s notes about what appears suspicious about the bidding. This disclosure included links to the BBO “movies” of all these hands, and also included

¹ Unspecified page references are to the 93-page hearing packet distributed to the disciplinary panel in advance of the disciplinary hearing.

² Former section 10.6 of the CDR effective on January 1, 2020 stated in part: “Revisions [of this CDR] regarding (i) what constitutes a violation of the CDR subject to discipline and (ii) penalties to be imposed apply only to offenses which occur on or after the effective date of the revisions.”

Former section 3.20 from that version of the CDR prohibited “Cheating and other Ethical Violations.”

The Charge Letter has alleged that the applicable version of the CDR is that effective on May 29, 2020. (P. 3.) However, the Charging Party has alleged misconduct in honor underleads made on January 28, 30, and 31, 2020. (P. 23.) Accordingly, the January 1, 2020 version of the CDR is the relevant one under section 10.6. We note that 3.20, 10.6, and the relevant Disciplinary Recommendations in Appendix B to the CDR were identical in the January 1 and May 29 versions of the CDR.

³ All boards were played in 2020, so the year will not be mentioned again.

some BBO links to comparable hands that were not separately diagrammed in the disclosure. These boards are said to range from July 30 through September 27. The dates of the diagrammed boards were not provided with the board descriptions. Appendix B to this report lists the BBO links of the 68 diagrammed boards.

The disclosure also included links to 14 more boards allegedly played between July and November that exhibit “questionable opening leads and defenses.” (P. 90.) The disclosure contains no description of either what is suspicious about any particular board or the date it was played.

Finally, the Charging Party has provided a link to a spreadsheet that itself contains links to 1,872 boards, allegedly all boards played by the Charged Parties during 2020. The boards are from the periods January 28 through February 2 and July 30 through November 24. The boards are generally listed in chronological order, except for a number of boards from August 29 being the final ones listed.

On October 3, the Charged Parties filed their two-page disclosure.

On October 10, a 90-minute disciplinary hearing was held via Zoom. The Father, but not the Son, appeared for the Charged Parties.⁴ Panelist Chris Moll disclosed that Father had filled in as a guest in his virtual bridge club, and had possibly played against him, but he was not personally acquainted with him. Neither Party objected to Moll remaining as a Panelist.

There is a procedural twist in this case. Near the conclusion of the hearing, Father asked for the opportunity to present some exculpatory evidence that had not previously been disclosed. It turned out that the Charging Party had sent the Charged Parties a 68-page document that diagrammed four kinds of suspicious boards at one board per page, including groups of: aggressive leads (50 pages), Ace underleads against suit contracts (nine pages), passes of forcing bids (two pages), and “weird” leads (five pages).⁵

The Panel granted Father two days after the hearing to identify and submit exculpatory boards from this collection. What Father actually submitted was his comments on the first five boards in the 68-page document and another nine boards of unknown dates with his comments on them. While these additional boards were outside the permission granted by the Panel, the Charging Party not only did not object to their submission but provided urls for ease of reference. On October 13, the Charged

⁴ We will refer to the Charged Parties as Father and Son for clarity.

⁵ The Co-Advocate emailed this document to the Advisor during the hearing when its relevance emerged. There are more pages than boards because some pages have section titles without a board diagram.

As it turns out, the first group was said to include 46 “hits” and four “misses” on “aggressive leads” as categorized by computer software. However, the document doesn’t define “miss” or identify which leads were categorized as misses.

Parties submitted revised disclosure including the urls. The Panel has decided to accept this revised disclosure and took the matter under submission on October 13. This revised disclosure is essentially a 15-page augmentation of the hearing packet.⁶

B. The Evidence at the Augmented Disciplinary Hearing

Father and Son joined the ACBL on the same date, June 29, 2018. They live together in Quebec. Father has rapidly collected Masterpoints, becoming a Life Master on September 6, 2020, and progressing to a Ruby Life Master with 2,200 Masterpoints by August 6, 2022. (P. 14.) Father became a club director in August 2022. According to Father, Son stopped playing in late 2020. He is a teenager and has other interests. Father said that in 2021 he won the Ace of Clubs and mini-McKenney at the ACBL level without playing a single game with Son. (P. 92.)

In disclosure, Father said that he asked the ACBL to investigate them because he knew it was suspicious that they were playing from the same household. (P. 92.) At the hearing, Father implied that they were suspended by BBO in November 2020 and said couldn't get an explanation for the suspension.⁷ He said that in November 2021, they received a message from former Recorder Robb Gordon, who said he had decided not to pursue charges.⁸ (P. 92.) In response to a Panelist's question, the current Recorder said that the prior Recorder said he had declined to pursue any charges "at that time," but that this statement did not foreclose further investigation.

Father explained that he was asked to help out by becoming a club director, so he took the course and then took the exam the same day, scoring a 97% because he knows the game of bridge.

The Charging Party asserted: "According to BBO, Bala Srinivasan has used the following handles on BBO: BSMTL, CHAOSPOLY, BALASR, and PREACH22. Pracheth Srinivasan has used the following handles on BBO: CORKP and PACCHU." (P. 15.) We note that all the questioned boards involved BSMTL and CORKP.

BBO reported that they averaged 65.82% on 1,482 boards they played from August 22 through November 24. On 52 IMP hands, they averaged 3.38 IMPs per

⁶ We do not consider the 68-page document produced by the Charging Party during the hearing to be an augmentation of the hearing packet. The Charging Party did not rely on the document as evidence and the Charged Parties incorporated what they wanted of that document into their revised disclosure.

⁷ There is no document in the hearing packet corroborating this implication. BBO discipline does not always appear in the disclosure in ACBL disciplinary cases.

⁸ This document was also not included in the disclosure by either side.

board. (P. 15.) Co-Advocate Jeff Edelstein acknowledged that based on his review of the boards, Father and Son are both fine declarers.⁹

Father explained that he had been playing bridge for 40 years and had equally good results with another partner in face-to-face bridge. Father has been playing “kitchen” bridge for a long time, which involves underleading Aces and aggressive bidding. This was the bridge he taught Son beginning at the age of six or seven.

Heeding the Panel Chair’s advice at the outset of the hearing not to repeat what was presented in disclosure, the Co-Advocate elected to focus his presentation on the bidding of 16 boards. The Panel’s Advisor displayed the boards onscreen in the order requested by the Co-Advocate.¹⁰

The Co-Advocate asserted that the Charged Parties had exhibited a number of traits that are common to pairs who use unauthorized information, such as: “consistently high scores, consistently accurate opening leads, accurate defensive shifts, off-shape doubles that rarely fail, four card overcalls generally land, passing forcing bids with no negative outcomes, compensating overbidding and underbidding, highly accurate high-level decisions, stopping short of game when the hands don’t fit well, driving to game when the hands do fit well, highly accurate penalty doubles, recovering from misclicks, bids/leads that fool opponents but not partner, inconsistent bidding that never fools partner, no rough landings, successfully bidding shorter suits and bypassing majors.” The Co-Advocate acknowledged there wasn’t much evidence of four-card overcalls or misclick recovery in this case. There were a lot of accurate penalty doubles and bypassing of longer suits to find a fit. The Co-Advocate explained that “rough landings” means ending up in a 4-2 or 5-1 fit or ending up in NT without a stopper. While good players, the bidding of the Charged Parties was not sophisticated, and they still avoided rough landings. The Co-Advocate did not see the kind of exculpatory accidents that might be expected from unsophisticated bidding.

1. Underleads of Aces and Kings against suit contracts

Looking at the 81 boards on which the Charged Parties underled an Ace or King against a suit contract, each of the nine times an Ace was underled, partner had the King. When Kings were underled 72 times, each time partner had the Ace or Queen. The Co-Advocate noted that the Charged Parties led fourth best in a suit almost as often as third or fifth or seventh without ever fooling each other. It did not appear that their convention card reflected what they were doing.

While there was a BBO convention card for the Charged Parties in evidence (p. 16), Father admitted in response to a question by the Co-Advocate at the hearing

⁹ “Co-Advocate” in this report will refer to Jeff Edelstein, who made the ACBL’s presentation.

¹⁰ Regrettably the Advisor suffered several brief computer crashes in sharing his Zoom screen which the parties and Panel endured gracefully.

that, after being asked for their convention card online, they just picked out a stock BBO card and didn't really follow it. They did alert the conventions they were using. Father admitted that it was a mistake to not change their card to reflect their agreements.

In response to a Panelist's question, Father acknowledged that they were inconsistent with what they led holding an interior sequence like KJT_x. He said it was kitchen bridge.

2. Bidding shorter suits

The Co-Advocate displayed three boards on which the Charged Parties found a fit by bidding a shorter suit in preference to a longer one, board [8](#) on July 30, board [1](#) on September 9, and board [12](#) on July 30.¹¹ On the first board, Son made an off-shape take-out double of a 1♦ opening and Father responded 1♥ with four♥s and five♠s, making it easy for Son to invite game holding 4♥s and 2♠s. On the other two boards the response to an opening bid was 1♥ instead of 1♠ holding four♥s and five♠s, leading to the Charged Parties finding ♥ games.

Father explained that they were simply bidding up the line, a common practice.

3. Inconsistent bidding

Next the Co-Advocate displayed six boards involving inconsistent bidding with similar hands.

<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: 40px; margin: 0 auto;"> <div style="background-color: red; color: white; padding: 2px; text-align: center;">D</div> <div style="font-size: 24pt; font-weight: bold; text-align: center;">13</div> </div>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">N</th> <th colspan="4" style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">bsmtl</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♠ 8</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♥ 10</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♦ AQ84</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♣ KJ98532</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	N	bsmtl				♠ 8	♥ 10	♦ AQ84	♣ KJ98532		<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">W</th> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">N</th> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">E</th> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">1♠ P</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">3♣ P</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">4♦ P</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">6♣ P</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">1♥ P</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">4♣ P</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">4♠ P</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">P</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	W	N	E	S	1♠ P	3♣ P	4♦ P	6♣ P	1♥ P	4♣ P	4♠ P	P	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">D</th> <th colspan="4" style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">bsmtl</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0; text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♠ 73</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♥ KJ109</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♦</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♣ KQJ10532</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	D	bsmtl				1	♠ 73	♥ KJ109	♦	♣ KQJ10532	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">W</th> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">N</th> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">E</th> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">1♣ P</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">1NT P</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">X</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">3NT P</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">P</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">P</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">P</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">P</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	W	N	E	S	1♣ P	1NT P	X	3NT P	P	P	P	P
N	bsmtl																																															
♠ 8	♥ 10	♦ AQ84	♣ KJ98532																																													
W	N	E	S																																													
1♠ P	3♣ P	4♦ P	6♣ P																																													
1♥ P	4♣ P	4♠ P	P																																													
D	bsmtl																																															
1	♠ 73	♥ KJ109	♦	♣ KQJ10532																																												
W	N	E	S																																													
1♣ P	1NT P	X	3NT P																																													
P	P	P	P																																													
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">W</th> <th colspan="3" style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">Slybert</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♠ KQJ5</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♥ 643</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♦ 10975</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♣ 107</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	W	Slybert			♠ KQJ5	♥ 643	♦ 10975	♣ 107	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">E</th> <th colspan="3" style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">jo315</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♠ 10973</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♥ K9875</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♦ KJ2</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♣ 4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	E	jo315			♠ 10973	♥ K9875	♦ KJ2	♣ 4	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">W</th> <th colspan="3" style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">Ishapka</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♠ KQJ102</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♥ AQ</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♦ K754</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♣ 64</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	W	Ishapka			♠ KQJ102	♥ AQ	♦ K754	♣ 64	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">E</th> <th colspan="3" style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">CIRCBR</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♠ 4</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♥ 876532</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♦ QJ96</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♣ 98</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	E	CIRCBR			♠ 4	♥ 876532	♦ QJ96	♣ 98													
W	Slybert																																															
♠ KQJ5	♥ 643	♦ 10975	♣ 107																																													
E	jo315																																															
♠ 10973	♥ K9875	♦ KJ2	♣ 4																																													
W	Ishapka																																															
♠ KQJ102	♥ AQ	♦ K754	♣ 64																																													
E	CIRCBR																																															
♠ 4	♥ 876532	♦ QJ96	♣ 98																																													
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">S</th> <th colspan="3" style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">corkp</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♠ A642</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♥ AQJ2</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♦ 63</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♣ AQ6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	S	corkp			♠ A642	♥ AQJ2	♦ 63	♣ AQ6	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">S</th> <th colspan="3" style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">corkp</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♠ A9865</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♥ 4</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♦ A10832</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♣ A7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	S	corkp			♠ A9865	♥ 4	♦ A10832	♣ A7	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">S</th> <th colspan="3" style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">corkp</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♠ A9865</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♥ 4</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♦ A10832</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♣ A7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	S	corkp			♠ A9865	♥ 4	♦ A10832	♣ A7	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">S</th> <th colspan="3" style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">corkp</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♠ A9865</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♥ 4</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♦ A10832</td> <td style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">♣ A7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	S	corkp			♠ A9865	♥ 4	♦ A10832	♣ A7													
S	corkp																																															
♠ A642	♥ AQJ2	♦ 63	♣ AQ6																																													
S	corkp																																															
♠ A9865	♥ 4	♦ A10832	♣ A7																																													
S	corkp																																															
♠ A9865	♥ 4	♦ A10832	♣ A7																																													
S	corkp																																															
♠ A9865	♥ 4	♦ A10832	♣ A7																																													

On board [13](#) on August 2, Father elected to jump rebid his broken seven-card ♣ suit with 10 HCP, finding Son with the missing ♣ honors and paving an easy path to a ♣ slam. On board [1](#) on August 25, with a better 7-card ♣ suit, Father elected to rebid 1NT with a ♦ void and no promise by Son of ♦s. This made it easy for Son to raise to 3NT.

The Panel Chair asked Father to explain his bidding on this boards. He evaluated board 13 as having five losers, which is why he jump rebid on board 13. He intended to play in one of his minors. He admitted that his hand was equally good on

¹¹ This report will include hyperlinks for each board discussed. Hand and auction diagrams will be provided later in the Panel's findings for those boards the Panel has found to be the most probative.

board 1. He said that once Son bid 1 ♠, he was interested in playing in NT with his running ♣s. He said it was like a gambling 3NT.

D 4	N bsmtl	W N E S
	♠ 98 ♥ J95 ♦ A10 ♣ AKQ983	P 1♣ 1♦ 2♣ 3♦ P P 4♣ P P P
W donadams69	S corkp	E rp1grady
♠ AJ4 ♥ K1084 ♦ Q762 ♣ J10		♠ K107 ♥ AQ6 ♦ J9843 ♣ 76
	♠ Q6532 ♥ 732 ♦ K5 ♣ 542	4♠ N NS: 0 EW: 0

On board 4 (above) on August 5, Father opened a good six-card ♣ suit and never rebid it in competition, instead leaving it to Son to compete to 2 and then 4 ♣s with three-card support and 5 HCP instead of bidding his five-card ♠ suit .

D 3	N bsmtl	W N E S
	♠ Q6 ♥ Q8 ♦ KJ10876 ♣ 1053	P 3♠ P 2NT P 4♦ P 3NT P 5♣ P 6♦
W scorpio777	S corkp	E joycebprop
♠ J73 ♥ J10954 ♦ 3 ♣ KQ92		♠ A10542 ♥ 6 ♦ 95 ♣ J8764
	♠ K98 ♥ AK732 ♦ AQ42 ♣ A	6♦ N NS: 0 EW: 0

D 11	N bsmtl	W N E S
	♠ 1097 ♥ 962 ♦ J1097632 ♣	P 3♠ P 2NT P 4♦ P 3NT P
W rahaolcom	S corkp	E marlidcom
♠ AKJ ♥ J874 ♦ 54 ♣ 10943		♠ 6432 ♥ 5 ♦ KQ ♣ KQ8652
	♠ Q85 ♥ AKQ103 ♦ A8 ♣ AJ7	4♦ N NS: 0 EW: 0

On board 3 (above) on September 22, the 3 ♠ bid was alerted as “Minor + stayman.” 3NT was alerted as “Tell+your+minor+.” 4 ♦ was not alerted. 5 ♣ was alerted as “1430.” On board 11 on September 30, 3 ♠ was again alerted as “Minor+stayman.” 3NT was again alerted as “Pick+your+minor.+” 4 ♦ in this auction was alerted as “Diamond. + Weak” and was passed by opener.

Father said this convention of using 3 ♠ for the minors was one he had recently learned from a mentor.

As a final example of inconsistent bidding, the Co-Advocate displayed board [15](#) from September 23.

15	N Naelsm	W N E S
	♠ 84 ♥ A853 ♦ KQ97 ♣ J52	12-17 P P P 1NT P P P P
W corkp	♥ 7	E bsmtl
♠ AJ1063 ♥ 972 ♦ 1064 ♣ KQ		♠ 97 ♥ K64 ♦ AJ85 ♣ A1094
	S walt46	
	♠ KQ52 ♥ QJ10 ♦ 32 ♣ 8763	1NTE NS: 0 EW: 0

In the pass-out seat, Father opened 1NT and announced his range as 12-17. The Co-Advocate pointed out that the Charged Parties routinely open 15-17 NTs. Somehow Son, with a game-forcing hand opposite a normal strong NT opener, determined to pass, not even transferring to ♠s. At the hearing, Father admitted he didn't know such a wide opening range was illegal. He couldn't explain how Son knew to pass.

4. Other suspicious bidding

The Co-Advocate moved on to display and discuss seven more boards alleged to involve suspicious bidding.

16	N bsmtl	W N E S
	♠ A83 ♥ KQ87 ♦ Q107 ♣ K76	1NT P P X P P P
W cajarvinen	♥ 7	E mochima
♠ KQ106 ♥ 96 ♦ A65 ♣ AQ82		♠ J75 ♥ 1043 ♦ KJ943 ♣ 54
	S corkp	
	♠ 942 ♥ AJ52 ♦ 82 ♣ J1093	1NTx W NS: 0 EW: 0

On board [16](#) on October 20, Son found a double with a flat 6 count. Father converted the double to penalty and found a ♥ lead to Son's best suit. Son won the ♥ Ace and shifted to the ♣ Jack, so they eventually collected 4 ♥s, 2 ♣s, and the ♠ Ace.

Two boards showed Son opening light in third seat and Father not responding with a decent hand, namely board [10](#) on September 27 and board [21](#) on August 22. On

two more boards (below), Son overcalled light and Father didn't act with great support, namely board [17](#) on September 14 and board [9](#) on September 21.

17 D	N Queensjack ♠ 2 ♥ AJ1083 ♦ Q952 ♣ A98	W N E S 1♥ P 2♥ 2♣ P P P	9 D	N RAF52 ♠ A6 ♥ 108 ♦ Q108543 ♣ J65	W N E S 2♦ P 2NT 3♣ X P 4♦ P P P
	W corkp ♠ J10654 ♥ Q ♦ K108 ♣ Q643	E bsmtl ♠ KQ83 ♥ K654 ♦ 3 ♣ K1072		W corkp ♠ Q108753 ♥ 43 ♦ K7 ♣ K42	E bsmtl ♠ J42 ♥ KQ96 ♦ 6 ♣ A10973
	S jwalsh1229 ♠ A97 ♥ 972 ♦ AJ764 ♣ J5	2♠ W NS: 0 EW: 0		S Bridgemin5 ♠ K9 ♥ AJ752 ♦ AJ92 ♣ Q8	4♥ N NS: 0 EW: 0

The final two boards were consecutive boards played on August 18 against different opponents. On board [16](#), Father made an off-shape double of a vulnerable 1 ♠ opening with a 3-4-4-2 16 count. With ♠ A62 ♥ 32 ♦ 532 ♣ AQ983, Son elected to pass as though knowing Father was short in ♣s and held a ♠ honor, which he did. On board [15](#) (below), Father chose to rebid his ♦ suit instead of bidding 2 ♥s, and it turned out Son didn't have 4 ♥s for his negative double.

15 D	N bsmtl ♠ Q8 ♥ K976 ♦ AQJ73 ♣ 96	W N E S P 1♦ 1♠ X P 2♦ 2♣ P P P
	W rayleandra ♠ K4 ♥ 10432 ♦ 1086 ♣ K1084	E dickensonh ♠ AJ9763 ♥ AJ ♦ 954 ♣ Q2
	S corkp ♠ 1052 ♥ Q85 ♦ K2 ♣ AJ753	2♣ E NS: 0 EW: 0

The Co-Advocate closed his evidentiary presentation by asserting that Father and Son in 2020 primarily played for free as substitutes in virtual clubs, never playing in their home club. Both of them did very well in the mini-McKenney competitions that year.

Father pointed out that substitutes are only allowed in games by request of the director. Directors presumably would not have allowed the Charged Parties to play if they were suspected of cheating.

Neither Father nor any Panelist had questions for the Co-Advocate.

The Panel Chair questioned Father's statement that he didn't have time to review the boards to find exculpatory boards on which their aggression backfired. Father said there were several such boards in an initial list of boards he had received. He did not provide them in disclosure because he didn't understand the disciplinary hearing procedure or negotiated resolutions, despite telephone conversations with the Compliance Coordinator and despite receiving a form document that provides tips for Charged Parties. The Co-Advocate volunteered to and did send this initial list to the Advisor during the hearing.¹² He explained that it differed from the hearing presentation because the initial list was compiled by the EDGAR computer system, while the hearing presentation was crafted by the Co-Advocates.

5. Exculpatory boards

As noted above, the Charged Parties have been allowed to disclose boards they consider exculpatory after the hearing. They admittedly did not look for what the ACBL computer considered their four "misses" out of 50 aggressive leads, instead making comments on the first five boards listed, which were boards [11](#) on January 28, [5](#) and [9](#) on January 30, [14](#) on July 30, and [4](#) on August 2.

Boards 5 and 14 involved King underleads finding Aces in suits unsupported by partner. Board 11 involved a King underlead in a suit unbid by partner that found the AQJ. Father asserts that the defense on 14 was suboptimal because he could have obtained an immediate ruff by returning a different suit. However, that would have been a ruff with a natural trump trick. Father also asserts that it is exculpatory that they didn't double the 3♥ contract on board 4.¹³

Of the nine augmented boards, Father identifies five of them as aggressive overbidding, namely [8](#) on October 10, [7](#) on October 29, [7](#) on November 3, [3](#) on November 9, and [7](#) on November 10. Without setting out all five of these diagrams, we agree that all exhibit aggressive bidding that left them overboard on final contracts.¹⁴

¹² As noted above in the procedural overview, this led to the Panel granting the Charged Parties time after the hearing to provide additional disclosure.

¹³ Reviewing the play of that board shows that the opponent misplayed it to go down three, when they should have gone down one.

¹⁴ Displaying hand and auction diagrams along with accompanying discussion sometimes leaves white space in hearing reports.

However, we note that the final board [7](#) (below) on November 10 would have been a good sacrifice if played optimally to go down one.

7 D	N ibroder	W N E S
	♠ A1096 ♥ K72 ♦ AK42 ♣ K2	1♣ 1NT 2♥ P P P
W corkp	E bsmtl	
♠ QJ73 ♥ Q985 ♦ J ♣ AQ76	♠ K8 ♥ J643 ♦ 10876 ♣ 985	
	S LMG1953	
	♠ 542 ♥ A10 ♦ Q953 ♣ J1043	2♥ E NS: 0 EW: 0

We also note that this auction involved quite a bold 2♥ call vulnerable with a balanced four-count that just happened to find partner's four-card support.

Another board, [13](#) from September 30, does show the Charged Parties missing a major fit.

13 D	N jetty2	W N E S
	♠ A1095 ♥ Q6 ♦ 964 ♣ J975	P 1♣ P 1NT P P P
W corkp	E bsmtl	
♠ Q2 ♥ KJ103 ♦ J10873 ♣ Q2	♠ KJ763 ♥ A985 ♦ Q2 ♣ A8	
	S kim+McCune	
	♠ 84 ♥ 742 ♦ AK5 ♣ K10643	1NT W NS: 0 EW: 0

Father is also correct in noting that on board [19](#) on November 9, Son's lead against 3 NT did not find Father's best suit. On board [13](#) on October 3, a penalty double of 5♥s in a competitive auction backfired when the opponents had two voids. On board [11](#) on November 18, another penalty double backfired when Son arguably returned the wrong card while providing a ruff, leading Father to return the wrong suit to get another ruff and allowing the doubled 3♠ bid to make.

C. Argument

The Co-Advocate asserted that the Charging Parties cheated on every hand. It bothered him on behalf of the victims that the Charged Parties cheated in virtual club games when they were invited to play as substitutes. He recommended expulsion for this premeditated conduct and also that their mini-McKenney titles and awards be

forfeited. Short of expulsion, the Co-Advocate proposed a five-year suspension followed by a ten-year probation during which they cannot play with each other, also forfeiture of their titles and awards and all Masterpoints earned as a partnership.

Father said they did what they thought was right playing their version of kitchen bridge after recently joining the ACBL. They are good players. While their actions appear to have always worked in their favor, in fact there were bad boards.

II. Panel's Findings of Fact and Conclusions

The factual question for the Panel to resolve is whether the Charged Parties cheated in violation of former section 3.20 of the CDR by sharing unauthorized information about their hands during online play. For partners to intentionally provide and use unauthorized information about each other's hands is a violation of Laws 16B1, 72B, and 73C1 of Duplicate Bridge.¹⁵ Whatever the definition of "cheating" was in former section 3.20, it must include telling your partner your hand.

The Charging Party has pointed out boards from the time periods January 28 through February 2 and July 30 through November 24 of 2020 that exhibit either suspicious bidding or leads or both, specifically 81 instances of underleads of Aces or Kings against suit contracts and 68 auctions allegedly indicating some awareness of a feature of partner's hand that was not revealed in the auction.

At the hearing, the Charged Parties offered explanations for some of the questioned auctions and admitted being unable to explain others. The Charged Parties were allowed to submit revised disclosure after the hearing which included boards they considered exculpatory. They provided nine boards not previously discussed by the Charging Party and commented on another five that were cited as instances of aggressive leads.

This Panel has reviewed the testimony at the hearing and all the boards cited in disclosure by the Charging Party as incriminatory and by the Charged Parties as exculpatory. We will now state our findings and conclusions about the evidence.

A. Questioned Actions

1. Underleads of Aces and Kings against suit contracts

Underleading an Ace against a suit contract may be a highly risky maneuver if the opponents have a singleton King in that suit. Underleading an Ace is less risky if

¹⁵ "(a) A player may not choose a call or play that is demonstrably suggested over another by unauthorized information {from partner} if the other call or play is a logical alternative." (Law 16B1.) "A player must not infringe a law intentionally, even if there is a prescribed rectification he is willing to accept." (Law 72B1.) "When a player has available to him unauthorized information from his partner, such as from a remark, question, explanation, gesture, mannerism, undue emphasis, inflection, haste or hesitation, an unexpected alert or failure to alert, he must carefully avoid taking any advantage from that unauthorized information [see Law 16B1(a)]." (Law 73C1.)

partner has bid or raised that suit. The Charging Party's list of such underleads in Appendix A reveals that each of the nine times the Charging Parties underled an Ace, partner had the King. A closer look reveals that on three occasions (August 22, September 21 and 24), partner had bid the suit, but that leaves six occasions where the successful underlead was blind.¹⁶

One of the most spectacular Ace underleads was against a small slam on board [2](#) on September 2. Son underled his Ace and found Father with the King.

<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;">2</div>	N bsmtl ♠ 104 ♥ J6 ♦ 95432 ♣ K982	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>W</th> <th>N</th> <th>E</th> <th>S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1♠</td> <td>P</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>2♥</td> <td>P</td> <td>3♣</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>4♣</td> <td>P</td> <td>4NT</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>5♥</td> <td>P</td> <td>6♣</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	W	N	E	S			1♠	P		2♥	P	3♣		4♣	P	4NT		5♥	P	6♣
	W	N	E	S																		
			1♠	P																		
		2♥	P	3♣																		
	4♣	P	4NT																			
	5♥	P	6♣																			
W Kjelberg ♠ 96 ♥ A10532 ♦ AQ ♣ Q643	♣ J	E 2nemeč ♠ AKQJ732 ♥ Q84 ♦ KJ ♣ 7																				
S corkp ♠ 85 ♥ K97 ♦ 10876 ♣ AJ105																						
		6♣ E NS: 0 EW: 0																				

Another successful Ace underlead was on board [8](#) from January 28.

<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;">8</div>	N needtricks ♠ KQ1095 ♥ 952 ♦ 42 ♣ 1065	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>W</th> <th>N</th> <th>E</th> <th>S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1♣</td> <td>P</td> <td>1♥</td> <td>2♦</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2♥</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> <td>3♦</td> </tr> <tr> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	W	N	E	S	1♣	P	1♥	2♦	2♥	P	P	3♦	P	P	P	
	W	N	E	S														
	1♣	P	1♥	2♦														
	2♥	P	P	3♦														
P	P	P																
W bsmtl ♠ J6 ♥ KQ83 ♦ J5 ♣ AJ843	♣ 3	E corkp ♠ 87432 ♥ J1074 ♦ 109 ♣ K7																
S carolecopl ♠ A ♥ A6 ♦ AKQ8763 ♣ Q92																		
		3♦ S NS: 0 EW: 0																

¹⁶ The Charging Party might have presented an even more compelling case by showing boards where an Ace wasn't underled and partner didn't have the King, but that apparently wasn't an objective of their search.

Father led fifth best of his own suit, finding Son's doubleton K. Son continued ♣s.

Looking at the 72 underleads of Kings, the Charging Party has demonstrated in Appendix A that partner had the Ace or Queen on each occasion.¹⁷ We note that on 27 of those occasions, the suit was either bid or raised or subjected to a lead-directing double. It might be considered suspicious if a King was not underled in such circumstances. That still leaves an unbelievable success rate of 45 out of 45. Among the most notable was board [12](#) on August 29.

D 12	N corkp	W N E S
	♠ 1087632 ♥ 9 ♦ 754 ♣ AQ7	P P 1♥ P 2♥ 2♣ 3♥ P P P
W deka103	E thecoltons	
♠ Q95 ♥ 8543 ♦ AQJ ♣ 983	♠ A4 ♥ AKQ107 ♦ 1096 ♣ 1065	
	S bsmtl	
	♠ KJ ♥ J62 ♦ K832 ♣ KJ42	
		3♥ E NS: 0 EW: 0

Despite holding honors in Son's bid suit, Father instead underled a King in Son's best unbid suit. Following the BBO movie, they carefully cashed their three ♣ tricks, Ace, King, and Queen, ending in Son's hand, allowing him to lead a ♠ at trick 4 to Father's honors.

¹⁷ We observe that the Charging Party apparently didn't search for boards where a King was not underled and partner didn't have the Ace or Queen.

Another example of a King underlead was board [12](#) from September 24.

12	N bsmtl	W N E S
	♠ KQ976 ♥ 973 ♦ K4 ♣ 1082	P P 1♦ 2♣ 2♥ P P P
W KKondalski	♠ 7	E maurerp
♠ 84 ♥ QJ862 ♦ 652 ♣ AK9		♠ 10532 ♥ AK105 ♦ AQ9 ♣ J6
	S corkp	
	♠ AJ ♥ 4 ♦ J10873 ♣ Q7543	2♥ W NS: 0 EW: 0

Fourth best is a standard lead, but not so much when able to force a trick by leading the King from KQ. However, when partner holds the other honors in your suit, leading fourth best is perfectly safe.

We are not required to determine whether the evidence of honor underleads alone would compel a conclusion of cheating. As we have noted, some of those boards are more probative than others, and there is also evidence of questionable bidding, to which we now turn.

2. Inconsistent bidding

The inconsistency in bidding similar hands is compelling evidence that the bidder had extra information.

While the following two boards have already been displayed and discussed above (in part I.B.3), we think it is worth emphasizing them.

13	N bsmtl	W N E S
	♠ 8 ♥ 10 ♦ AQ84 ♣ KJ98532	1♣ P 1♥ P 3♣ P 4♣ P 4♦ P 4♣ P 6♣ P P
W Slybert	E jo315	
♠ KQJ5 ♥ 643 ♦ 10975 ♣ 107	♠ 10973 ♥ K9875 ♦ KJ2 ♣ 4	
	S corkp	
	♠ A642 ♥ AQJ2 ♦ 63 ♣ AQ6	6♣ N NS: 0 EW: 0

1	N bsmtl	W N E S
	♠ 73 ♥ KJ109 ♦ KQJ10532	1♣ P 1♣ P 1NT P 3NT X P P P
W Ishapka	E CIRCBR	
♠ KQJ102 ♥ AQ ♦ K754 ♣ 64	♠ 4 ♥ 876532 ♦ QJ96 ♣ 98	
	S corkp	
	♠ A9865 ♥ 4 ♦ A10832 ♣ A7	3NTx N NS: 0 EW: 0

We reiterate that, on board [13](#) on August 2, Father elected to jump rebid his broken seven-card ♣ suit with 10 HCP, finding Son with the missing ♣ honors and paving an

easy path to a ♣ slam. He said that he evaluated that hand as having five losers and he wanted to play in one of his minors. On board [1](#) on August 25, with a better 7-card ♣ suit, Father elected to rebid 1NT with a ♦ void and no promise by Son of ♦s. He admitted that it was also a five-loser hand, but said he was interested in playing NT despite his ♦ void when Son responded 1 ♠. We find that Father's inconsistent bidding is much better explained by Son's hands than by his stated explanations. In other words, we do not find these explanations credible.

On the above two boards, similar holdings by Father led to different auctions and final contracts. In the following two boards that we will repeat from above, identical auctions led to different contracts.

3 D	N bsmtl ♠ Q6 ♥ Q8 ♦ KJ10876 ♣ 1053	W N E S P 3♣ P 2NT P 4♦ P 4NT P 5♣ P 6♦	11 D	N bsmtl ♠ 1097 ♥ 962 ♦ J1097632 ♣	W N E S P 3♣ P 2NT P 4♦ P 3NT P P
	W scorpio777 ♠ J73 ♥ J10954 ♦ 3 ♣ KQ92	E joycebprop ♠ A10542 ♥ 6 ♦ 95 ♣ J8764		W rahaolcom ♠ AKJ ♥ J874 ♦ 54 ♣ 10943	E marlidcom ♠ 6432 ♥ 5 ♦ KQ ♣ KQ8652
	S corkp ♠ K98 ♥ AK732 ♦ AQ42 ♣ A			S corkp ♠ Q85 ♥ AKQ103 ♦ A8 ♣ AJ7	
	6♦ N NS: 0 EW: 0			4♦ N NS: 0 EW: 0	

As explained above (in part 1.B.3), both 3 ♠ bids were alerted as minor suit Stayman. Both 3NT responses were alerted essentially as show your minor. The only difference in the auctions was that in the second one, board [11](#) on September 30, Father's 4 ♦ was alerted as "weak" and Son dutifully passed. In the first auction, board [3](#) on September 22, there was no alert of the 4 ♦ bid and Son drove to a ♦ slam, finding Father with a stronger hand opposite a 2NT opener.

Another remarkable auction was board [15](#) from September 23.

15 D	N Naelsm ♠ 84 ♥ A853 ♦ KQ97 ♣ J52	W N E S P P 12-17 P P P 1NT P
	W corkp ♠ AJ1063 ♥ 972 ♦ 1064 ♣ KQ	E bsmtl ♠ 97 ♥ K64 ♦ AJ85 ♣ A1094
	S walt46 ♠ KQ52 ♥ QJ10 ♦ 32 ♣ 8763	
		1NT E NS: 0 EW: 0

Father explained that he couldn't think of a better bid in the pass-out seat and so opened 1NT with a 13-count, even though their NT opening was typically 15-17. He even announced his range to the opponents as 12 to 17, not realizing that such a wide range is illegal.¹⁸ This deviation from their agreement isn't the biggest problem. What is that Son somehow knew Father didn't have the normal minimum 15 HCP and neither bid game nor even transferred to ♠s when Father had only two ♠s.

3. Other suspicious bidding

As noted above, Father and Son found fits by responding in their shorter major.

D 1 N bsmtl ♠ A953 ♥ AK7643 ♦ A75 ♣ A75		W N E S 1♦ P 1♥ P 3♥ P 4♥ P P P		D 12 N bsmtl ♠ 109865 ♥ 10873 ♦ K ♣ KQ7		W N E S P P P 1♦ P 1♥ P 4♥ P P P	
W ChicoV ♠ QJ5 ♥ K107 ♦ QJ105 ♣ KQ6		E njm22 ♠ A7643 ♥ J6 ♦ 982 ♣ 1084		W shakesbake ♠ 74 ♥ QJ6 ♦ QJ5 ♣ AJ952		E shaerr37 ♠ QJ32 ♥ 54 ♦ 109872 ♣ 43	
S corkp ♠ K10982 ♥ Q842 ♦ ♣ J932		4♥ S NS: 0 EW: 0		S corkp ♠ AK ♥ AK92 ♦ A643 ♣ 1086		4♥ N NS: 0 EW: 0	

On board 1 on September 9 and board 12 on July 30, Father responded with shorter ♥s to Son's minor opening and found four-card support each time.

On another board from July 30, 8, Father again found a ♥ fit by responding to a takeout double with his shorter major.

D 8 N bsmtl ♠ J9763 ♥ Q1086 ♦ K103 ♣ 7		W N E S P P 1♦ X P 1♥ P 3♥ P 4♥ P P P	
W wjsublette ♠ A82 ♥ 542 ♦ 762 ♣ J652		E GEZ123 ♠ K104 ♥ K7 ♦ Q9854 ♣ A83	
S corkp ♠ Q5 ♥ AJ93 ♦ AJ ♣ KQ1094		4♥ N NS: 0 EW: 0	

Father explained that they were simply bidding up the line, but this explanation strains credulity.

¹⁸ Even the ACBL's Open + Chart prohibits "A Natural 1NT opening bid that has a Range greater than 5 HCP."

Without setting out more hand and auction diagrams, we also note the two boards discussed above (in part 1.B.4) on which Son opened very light vulnerable in third seat, namely a 5-count on board [10](#) on September 27 and an 8-count on board [21](#) on August 22, and Father never bid in competitive auctions. On another two boards, Father passed with great support for Son's higher level competitive bids. On board [17](#) on September 14, Son, holding ♠ JT654 ♥ Q ♦ KT8 ♣ Q643, bid 2 ♠ after the auction 1 ♥ -P- 2 ♥ and Father didn't raise with ♠ KQ83 ♥ K654 ♦ 3 ♣ KT72. On board [9](#) on September 21, after the auction 2 ♦ - Pass- 2NT Son bid a vulnerable 3 ♠ holding ♠ QT8753 ♥ 43 ♦ K2 ♣ K42 and Father didn't bid with a limit raise.

B. Panel Conclusions

The exculpatory boards eventually produced by the Charged Parties undermine the Charging Party's assertion that the Charged Parties were cheating on every board. But it was not the Charging Party's burden to prove cheating on every board. Cheating on any board violates the CDR.

This Panel is unanimously comfortably satisfied that Father Bala Srinivasan and Son Pracheth Srinivasan regularly shared information about each other's hands in violation of former CDR section 3.20. While Father presented himself respectfully at the hearing and he tried to explain their finding fits by bidding shorter suits and their many perfectly accurate leads, considering all the evidence, we do not find his explanations credible.

C. Discipline

This is a rare case in which the ACBL has requested expulsion to be the discipline imposed. While the scenario of showing up as a substitute, an invited guest, in a local online club and then cheating is worth condemnation, this Panel does not believe that the evidence here warrants expulsion. We note that the evidence is somewhat stale, with Charges filed on August 24, 2022 based on conduct that ended on November 24, 2020. Former section 5.2.2 stated in part, "An initial Charge, based upon a Complaint, must be brought expeditiously by the Charging Party of the organization having jurisdiction." We also note that neither Party has a disciplinary record.¹⁹

The CDR applicable to misconduct in early 2020 included an Appendix B that recommended discipline for different listed ethical violations. Expulsion was the only recommended discipline for an "E16" violation, described as "Prearranged partnership collusion by means of signaling to exchange information (CDR 3.1, 3.2 and 3.7)." However, "90 days Suspension up to Expulsion" was the discipline recommended for an "E19" violation, described as "Cheating and other Ethical Violations not specifically cited by other sections of this Appendix (CDR 3.20). The OEOC has learned from the

¹⁹ While there was an implication that the Charged Parties have been suspended from playing on BBO, the ACBL's prior disciplinary record, which is relevant to imposing discipline (former section 5.2.7), does not include club discipline.

Appeals and Charges Committee's [Kent decision](#) of February 7, 2021 that E16 has a narrow scope, so we conclude there was an E19 violation in this case.

We have further concluded that the Charged Parties should be subject to different disciplinary sanctions. We note that Son was a teenager during the year in question, and Father explained that he had taught Son bridge. It is a reasonable assumption that Son was following Father's guidance, and if Son learned that it was okay to share information about his hand, he learned it from Father. Accordingly, Father is suspended for five years and Son is suspended for two years. Following their suspensions, each of them is on probation for ten years, with a condition that they are prohibited from playing together.

The discipline guidelines also provided for forfeiture of "0-100% of Disciplined Person's total masterpoint holding" for an E19 violation. The Panel imposes a forfeiture of 50% of each Charged Party's total masterpoint holding.

Additional discipline is available under former section 4.1.8 of the CDR, which is applicable here.

"(b) Any participant(s) in an ACBL sanctioned event suspended because of Ethical Violations, other than those set forth in CDR 4.1.8(a), shall forfeit any masterpoints and titles won in the event in which the offense(s) occurred. Further:

". . .

"(2) When a Suspension of one (1) year or longer has been imposed, the committee must remove at a minimum all masterpoints, titles or other ACBL related awards theretofore earned within the twelve (12) calendar months preceding the date of the offense(s). The committee may remove additional masterpoints, titles and/or ACBL status ranks or other ACBL related awards previously earned by said participants through participation in all ACBL events as it deems appropriate."

In this case, the Charging Party has asked for forfeiture of any mini-McKenney titles that were awarded to either Charged Party. However, the Charging Party did not provide any evidence about what specific titles either Charged Party had been awarded.

It might be assumed that forfeiture of a chunk of masterpoints would lead automatically to a recalculation of awards based on masterpoints, but to avoid doubt this Panel orders the forfeiture of any mini-McKenney and Ace of Clubs awards given Father and Son at the national, district, or unit levels for their performance in 2020.

It would also make sense that elimination of a person who was given a performance-based award would result in the lower places moving up, but that doesn't seem to be what the former CDR provided in section 4.1.8 (or indeed what is provided in almost identically worded current 404(F)).

"(d) Titles forfeited pursuant to CDR 4.1.8(a), (b) or (c) shall remain vacant and there shall be no change in rankings or awarding of masterpoints for other contestants. First place awards for Unit masterpoint races forfeited pursuant to CDR 4.1.8 (a), (b), or (c) shall not

remain vacant. The second-place awardee shall move up to first place and lower ranked awards will be filled by a relevant change in rankings for other lower-ranked contestants. Awards for other than first place forfeited pursuant to CDR 4.1.8 (a), (b), or (c) shall remain vacant and there shall be no change in rankings for other contestants.”

Read literally, 4.1.8(d) only calls for lower places moving up in “Unit masterpoint races,” not District or national races. However, if this Panel cannot order that lower placed finishers be moved up in all masterpoint races involving the Charged Parties, the Panel requests such action by the ACBL.

Appendix A

All 81 underleads of Kings and Aces against suit contracts.²⁰

Date	Lead	From	To	BBO movie link
1/28/22	♣3	♣AJ843	♣K7	http://tinyurl.com/ycjvhqcp
1/28	♦3	♦K63	♦AQJ8	http://tinyurl.com/ycxlugwv
1/30	♦4	♦KJ98764	♦A	http://tinyurl.com/y7rkjzor
1/30	♦2	♦KT942	♦QJ5	http://tinyurl.com/y7l2s33e
1/31	♣2	♣KJ852	♣QT97	http://tinyurl.com/y92pn7wc
7/30	♠2	♠KT972	♠A	http://tinyurl.com/y38w79w3
7/31	♣4	♣KT4	♣Q972	http://tinyurl.com/y3hz5afq
8/5	♦2	♦K82	♦AT963	http://tinyurl.com/y8aduon2
8/5	♦3	♦KJ32	♦AQT987	http://tinyurl.com/yb95ensk
8/15	♦4	♦K842	♦AQJT97	http://tinyurl.com/yaho27zw
8/22	♣8	♣AT8	♣KJ62	http://tinyurl.com/ycvawj6x
8/29	♣4	♣KJ42	♣AQ7	http://tinyurl.com/y7g8qm3s
8/29	♦J	♦KJT	♦Q8	http://tinyurl.com/y7pnycp
8/29	♥2	♥KJ82	♥AT4	http://tinyurl.com/yc3xrrpg
8/31	♥8	♥K98	♥AJT	http://tinyurl.com/y8clahnj
8/31	♠J	♠KJT4	♠A9732	http://tinyurl.com/yaftyust
9/2	♣J	♣AJT5	♣K982	http://tinyurl.com/yxhmvegg
9/4	♣6	♣K763	♣AQ98	http://tinyurl.com/y54t4fhk
9/7	♣5	♣KT765	♣Q92	http://tinyurl.com/y2xws9f8
9/7	♥7	♥KT75	♥AQ82	http://tinyurl.com/y6pybvso
9/8	♣2	♣K42	♣QJ83	http://tinyurl.com/y39j3qp9
9/9	♣7	♣KJ73	♣A98	http://tinyurl.com/y6jifette
9/9	♥6	♥KJ63	♥AT542	http://tinyurl.com/y2ry9fhn
9/10	♣4	♣KT84	♣QJ75	http://tinyurl.com/yy6tyw6j

²⁰ All underleads are listed for completeness with no implication the Panel found them equally probative.

9/10	♣4	♣KT974	♣Q	http://tinyurl.com/y37x7nac
9/15	♠5	♠KQ652	♠A9	http://tinyurl.com/y2msbm9w
9/15	♠4	♠KT4	♠AQ5	http://tinyurl.com/y5mppg5s
9/21	♠6	♠AJ86	♠K94	http://tinyurl.com/y4lbthwc
9/21	♠7	♠K87	♠AJT63	http://tinyurl.com/y3dpykxx
9/21	♥7	♥K973	♥AJT	http://tinyurl.com/y33fh66c
9/21	♥6	♥KJ6	♥AQT92	http://tinyurl.com/y4hdkbef
9/22	♦6	♦K976	♦AQJ3	http://tinyurl.com/yyv3cyew
9/22	♣J	♣KJT6	♣A954	http://tinyurl.com/y2moqvps
9/23	♥T	♥KT98	♥AJ53	http://tinyurl.com/y3vz4u44
9/24	♠4	♠KJ7643	♠A8	http://tinyurl.com/yy7h98aa
9/24	♠7	♠KQ976	♠AJ	http://tinyurl.com/y562ya7v
9/24	♦4	♦A942	♦KJ83	http://tinyurl.com/y4jb95pl
9/24	♣5	♣K953	♣AJ6	http://tinyurl.com/y3pp5e3j
9/26	♥9	♥KJ97	♥Q6432	http://tinyurl.com/yy395sq
9/29	♣J	♣KJT96	♣Q2	http://tinyurl.com/y2qzc8n5
9/29	♦5	♦K98652	♦QJ	http://tinyurl.com/y47z7pna
9/30	♥4	♥K764	♥AQ83	http://tinyurl.com/y6otyjtz
10/6	♦J	♦KJT75	♦Q63	http://tinyurl.com/y249k6lw
10/7	♠6	♠K86	♠QJ753	http://tinyurl.com/y3rnneaq
10/7	♥6	♥K965	♥QJ42	http://tinyurl.com/y6s5qqq9
10/8	♥6	♥K96	♥AQJ852	http://tinyurl.com/y3x99wgp
10/10	♠6	♠K965	♠AT74	http://tinyurl.com/yxvncktb
10/10	♦7	♦KJ7	♦Q64	http://tinyurl.com/y5wk8txw
10/10	♦7	♦AQ73	♦KT4	http://tinyurl.com/y6sb3t2f
10/12	♦6	♦K863	♦QT	http://tinyurl.com/y3r7q7g8
10/14	♣T	♣KT98654	♣Q3	http://tinyurl.com/y5br4kcf
10/14	♣6	♣KJ763	♣A9	http://tinyurl.com/y5qd4huv
10/17	♣3	♣AQ432	♣KJT	http://tinyurl.com/y5omz4lx

10/19	♥J	♥KJT86	♥AQ94	http://tinyurl.com/y5xmagds
10/20	♥5	♥K652	♥AJ973	http://tinyurl.com/y4o4z282
10/20	♣2	♣K62	♣AJ9	http://tinyurl.com/y2dd7pp9
10/23	♠4	♠K754	♠Q932	http://tinyurl.com/y3gro35g
10/23	♣6	♣KJ965	♣AQT32	http://tinyurl.com/y437t32e
10/24	♥3	♥K9632	♥Q74	http://tinyurl.com/y5f4pnf7
10/28	♦2	♦K962	♦Q874	http://tinyurl.com/yx8tyrch
10/28	♥T	♥AJT6	♥K4	http://tinyurl.com/y5fpwwzv
10/29	♦5	♦KJ9853	♦Q4	http://tinyurl.com/y6fc5l9g
11/1	♣5	♣K875	♣QT4	http://tinyurl.com/y782pbst
11/5	♦J	♦KJT8	♦A9542	http://tinyurl.com/y4bpnkwb
11/5	♦7	♦KJ73	♦A964	http://tinyurl.com/y5f3m7se
11/7	♠3	♠KT43	♠AQ865	http://tinyurl.com/y3wpjqsp
11/8	♦4	♦KT64	♦AQ75	http://tinyurl.com/y3jqlj33
11/9	♦4	♦KJ84	♦AT2	http://tinyurl.com/y4jqw2te
11/9	♦5	♦KJ952	♦AT83	http://tinyurl.com/yxmpox7g
11/9	♦2	♦K732	♦AQJT	http://tinyurl.com/y5cvuwgx
11/9	♥5	♥K65	♥A942	http://tinyurl.com/y68yzndp
11/10	♦2	♦K932	♦QJT874	http://tinyurl.com/y2aq86nj
11/11	♦5	♦K875	♦QJT6	http://tinyurl.com/y6p6eoe5
11/12	♣5	♣K865	♣A3	http://tinyurl.com/y3bepwkl
11/14	♥3	♥K963	♥QJT872	http://tinyurl.com/yyesapks
11/17	♥4	♥AT4	♥KJ5	http://tinyurl.com/y2l9syzf
11/17	♠5	♠K953	♠QJT764	http://tinyurl.com/y35eo2zs
11/17	♦J	♦KJT42	♦A985	http://tinyurl.com/y6mkzkw8
11/18	♣7	♣K973	♣QJT84	http://tinyurl.com/y3jm7mmv
11/22	♥4	♥KJ64	♥AQ75	http://tinyurl.com/y44mddsa
11/23	♠5	♠K985	♠AQT642	http://tinyurl.com/yyybrdg9

Appendix B

All diagrammed questioned bids with board numbers.²¹

#	Board	BBO movie link
1	8	http://tinyurl.com/y66x4srn
2	1	http://tinyurl.com/y6afcy8
3	12	http://tinyurl.com/yxplwvhx
4	17	http://tinyurl.com/yxnvdz72
5	2	http://tinyurl.com/yau5atpy
6	3	http://tinyurl.com/y8h99btr
7	6	http://tinyurl.com/ybzjmeh9
8	13	http://tinyurl.com/yarmwgr8
9	1	http://tinyurl.com/yaxepa5e
10	15	http://tinyurl.com/ybjwln8s
11	17	http://tinyurl.com/y8hqvuge
12	10	http://tinyurl.com/yas44bto
13	13	http://tinyurl.com/ybhococa
14	1	http://tinyurl.com/y7xlpdmn
15	4	http://tinyurl.com/y74v7tez
16	7	http://tinyurl.com/ya8dc7ee
17	16	http://tinyurl.com/y8t9d6xd
18	2	http://tinyurl.com/y8c4h5xx
19	4	http://tinyurl.com/y8ds3z9v
20	6	http://tinyurl.com/ybn37cac
21	9	http://tinyurl.com/y8obnd4r
22	15	http://tinyurl.com/yc9qwgpm
23	15	http://tinyurl.com/y8qgelh8
24	16	http://tinyurl.com/yaplpvvy
25	5	http://tinyurl.com/yb9yxrff
26	16	http://tinyurl.com/y9kus3b9
27	5	http://tinyurl.com/y8i9jnt3
28	6	http://tinyurl.com/ycvawj6x
29	7	http://tinyurl.com/y93pw2at
30	19	http://tinyurl.com/ycpp2h6n
31	20	http://tinyurl.com/yactxwbq

²¹ Dates of the boards aren't included because they were not provided.

This list includes links for all 68 boards that the Charging Party diagrammed, but not all the links the Charging Party provided to compare to some of the diagrammed boards. This list is provided for completeness without an implication that the Panel found each board probative.

32 3 <http://tinyurl.com/yactxwbq>
33 21 <http://tinyurl.com/y72bfk3k>
34 22 <http://tinyurl.com/y9bqbbbv>
35 6 <http://tinyurl.com/yctdaorr>
36 9 <http://tinyurl.com/yawqshsy>
37 18 <http://tinyurl.com/yayv99e4>
38 7 <http://tinyurl.com/yyxpfbkm>
39 18 <http://tinyurl.com/y34sgeuv>
40 15 <http://tinyurl.com/y4goabjx>
41 20 <http://tinyurl.com/y5g8yxhf>
42 6 <http://tinyurl.com/y8nmdryg>
43 7 <http://tinyurl.com/yyxzcuje>
44 13 <http://tinyurl.com/y6smk6gs>
45 3 <http://tinyurl.com/y2o4q7he>
46 5 <http://tinyurl.com/yyzwngr9>
47 18 <http://tinyurl.com/yytncpnd>
48 5 <http://tinyurl.com/yyuzmfsc>
49 14 <http://tinyurl.com/yxoxkqdl>
50 9 <http://tinyurl.com/yczuxhfz>
51 11 <http://tinyurl.com/y5mbkl3c>
52 17 <http://tinyurl.com/yy3tyxm6>
53 11 <http://tinyurl.com/yxd2sqq9>
54 9 <http://tinyurl.com/yygvgvvw>
55 3 <http://tinyurl.com/y4bkksdu>
56 11 <http://tinyurl.com/yynq9epc>
57 18 <http://tinyurl.com/y2moqvps>
58 15 <http://tinyurl.com/y6xgepyw>
59 5 <http://tinyurl.com/yy7h98aa>
60 8 <http://tinyurl.com/y6tec64n>
61 10 <http://tinyurl.com/y2q5wpc0>
62 22 <http://tinyurl.com/y4ndm8g8>
63 2 <http://tinyurl.com/y4jb95pl>
64 8 <http://tinyurl.com/yyhqgm3v>
65 15 <http://tinyurl.com/y28ctf8k>
66 10 <http://tinyurl.com/yxolrphc>
67 2 <http://tinyurl.com/y243dvqp>
68 16 <http://tinyurl.com/y2grdj5>