



European Bridge League

Appeals Committee
Decisions
from the
Generali
European Bridge Teams
Championships
Malta, June 1999

Contents

Foreword	4
Statistics of the Appeals Committee	5
Members of the Appeals Committee	5
Appeal No 1.	6
Open Teams Round 1	
Poland v Switzerland	6
Appeal No 2.	8
Open Teams Round 2	
Portugal v France	8
Appeal No 3.	10
Open Teams Round 2	
Denmark v Poland	10
Appeal No 4.	12
Open Teams Round 4	
Finland v Israel	12
Appeal No 5.	16
Open Teams Round 6	
Portugal v Turkey	16
Appeal No 6.	18
Open Teams Round 4	
Great Britain v Poland	18
Appeal No 7.	20
Open Teams Round 3	
San Marino v France	20
Appeal No 8.	22
Open Teams Round 6	
Romania v Slovenia	22
Appeals No 9 and 10.	24
Open Teams Round 6	
Israel v France	24
Appeal No 11.	27
Open Teams Round 8	
Portugal v Russia	27
Appeal No 12.	29
Open Teams Round 12	
Switzerland v the Netherlands	29
Appeal Committee Special Meeting No 1.	32
Open Teams Round 16	
France v Slovenia	32
Appeal No 14.	34
Senior Teams Round 8	
Sweden 1 v Great Britain 2	34
Appeal No 15.	36
Ladies Teams Round 9	
Sweden v the Netherlands	36
Appeal No 16.	38
Senior Teams Round 10	
Ireland v Sweden 3	38
Appeal No 17.	40
Open Teams Round 18	
Monaco v Lebanon	40
Appeal No 18.	43
Open Teams Round 19	
Netherlands v San Marino	43
Appeal No 19.	45
Senior Teams Round 11	

Italy 2 v Great Britain 2	45
Appeal No 20.	47
Open Teams Round 21	
Monaco v Czech Republic	47
Appeal No 21.	49
Open Teams Round 20	
Germany v Monaco	49
Appeal No 22.	52
Open Teams Round 20	
Spain v Slovenia	52
Appeal No 23.	55
Senior Teams Round 17	55
Appeal No 24.	56
Ladies Teams Round 18	
Italy v Belgium	56
Appeal No 25.	58
Open Teams Round 24	
Croatia v Monaco	58
Appeal No 26.	61
Open Teams Round 25	
Ireland v Portugal	61
Appeal No 27.	63
Open Teams Round 27	
France v Hungary	63
Appeal No 28.	66
Ladies Teams Round 16	
Israel v Sweden	66
Appeal No 29.	68
Ladies Teams Round 16	
Denmark v Iceland	68
Appeal No 30.	70
Open Teams Round 29	
Israel v Czech Republic	70
Appeal No 31.	73
Open Teams Round 29	
Portugal v Romania	73
Appeal No 32.	75
Open Teams Round 30	
Poland v Italy	75
Appeal No 33.	77
Open Teams Round 29	
Iceland v Cyprus	77
Appeal No 34.	79
Open Teams Round 31	
Croatia v Bulgaria	79
Appeal No 35.	81
Open Teams Round 28	
Greece v Liechtenstein	81
Appeal No 36.	83
Open Teams Round 33	
France v Cyprus	83
Appeal No 37.	86
Open Teams Round 33	
France v Cyprus	86
Appeal No 38.	88
Open Teams Round 34	
Italy v Ireland	88

Foreword

In Malta in June 1999 the Executive Committee of the European Bridge League decided to publish this special collection of all Appeals Committee decisions, made in the Generali European Championships for Open Teams, Ladies' Teams, Seniors Teams and Ladies' Pairs.

38 decisions were made and all are included in this booklet. Only the most interesting decisions were published in the Daily Bulletin of the championships.

All decisions have since been published on the Internet.

Publishing EBL Appeals Committee decisions is not new, but this booklet is. It is the intention of the EBL Executive Committee that through the publishing of the decisions, the EBL will influence the interpretation of the Laws in the right direction. This should support an internal consistency in the decisions of Tournament Directors and Appeals Committees in Europe and hopefully also in other parts of the World.

I will use this opportunity to thank the members of the Appeals Committee in Malta for their great effort and extend a special thanks to Herman De Wael who scribed all the decisions.

Jens Auken
Member of the EBL Executive Committee
Chairman of the Appeals Committee

Statistics of the Appeals Committee

There were 38 appeals at these championships.

That is a frequency of 0.70 appeals per 1,000 deals played, as compared to 0.58 at the European Pairs Championships at Warsaw earlier this year.

The Open teams took the bulk of the appeals, 30, while the Seniors and Ladies had 4 each.

It should be noted that the Ladies played a Pairs' championship without a single appeal, and then a Teams competition with only 4 appeals. If you then see the close finish, it is notable that none of the teams in contention found reason to lodge any appeal.

In 23 of the 38 cases, the decision of the Tournament Director was upheld without any change.

9 appeals were deemed without merit.

11 different people served on the various Committees, and the size of each Committee was on average 4.6 people.

Herman De Wael
Scribe

Members of the Appeals Committee

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark),
Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium),
Jean-Claude Beineix (France),
Naki Bruni (Italy),
Grattan Endicott (Great Britain),
Peter Lund (Denmark),
Anton Maas (the Netherlands),
Krzysztof Martens (Poland).
Jaap van der Neut (the Netherlands),
Bill Pencharz (Great Britain),
Nissan Rand (Israel).

Appeal No 1.

Hesitation

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Open Teams Round I

Poland v Switzerland

Board 2. Dealer East. North/South Game.

	♠ K J 8		
	♥ 5		
	♦ K 9 6 5 4 2		
	♣ 10 9 7		
♠ Q 6		♠ A 9	
♥ Q 10 8 7 3		♥ K J 6 4 2	
♦ Q 8 3		♦ A J 10 7	
♣ K J 2		♣ 5 4	
	♠ 10 7 6 4 3 2		
	♥ A 9		
	♦ -		
	♣ A Q 8 6 3		
West	North	East	South
<i>Yalcin</i>	<i>Pszczola</i>	<i>Duong</i>	<i>Kwiecien</i>
4♥	Pass	1♥	2♥
Pass	4♠	Pass	Dble
5♥	Dble	All Pass	Pass

Contract: Five Hearts Doubled, played by East

Lead: ♠7

Result: 10 tricks, -100 to East/West

The Facts:

Two Hearts was Spades and another.

The Director was called by West when the tray came back after Four Hearts after some delay.

According to the Polish pair, the delay had been minimal, according to the Swiss, it was at least half a minute.

The Director:

Included the nature of North's hand in his establishment that there had in fact been a hesitation, and decided there had been unauthorised information.

Ruling: Table result changed to Four Hearts making, +420 to East/West.

North/South appealed.

The Players:

North showed the Committee how he had written the explanation (5♠ and 5+♣/♦), which had apparently taken him 7 seconds. He stated he had passed in tempo.

East told the Committee that north had clearly hesitated and even touched the Pass card for some time before taking it out of the Bidding Box. The Swiss captain, who had sat behind East, stated the same.

West stated that the tray had remained on the other side for at least 30 seconds.

South said he had not noticed the hesitation. Two Hearts could have been made on very strong or on weak hands.

The Polish captain added that Four Hearts is not necessarily made.

The Committee:

Agreed with the Director that north did indeed have a problem, and chose to believe that there had been a hesitation. When East notices a delay, South may well have noticed it as well.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld. +420 to East/West.

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A, Law 12C2

Deposit: Returned

Appeal No 2.

Misinformation, Equity

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Open Teams Round 2

Portugal v France

Board 17. Dealer North. Love All.

	♠ Q J 8 6		
	♥ J 9		
	♦ J 9 8 4		
	♣ 8 3 2		
♠ A 9 5 3		♠ -	
♥ 10 4		♥ A K Q 8	
♦ A K 7 3		♦ Q 10 5 2	
♣ K 10 7		♣ A Q 9 6 4	
	♠ K 10 7 4 2		
	♥ 7 6 5 3 2		
	♦ 6		
	♣ J 5		

West

Sa

Dble

2♥

North

Voltaire

Pass

Pass

Pass

East

Barbosa

1♣

2♦

3NT

South

Bitran

1♥

Pass

All Pass

Contract: Three No-Trumps, played by East

Result: 13 tricks, +520 to East/West

The Facts:

One Heart was a transfer to Spades, but North had not alerted this. West had received an alert, but had not asked about the meaning, and intended his double as negative, showing Spades.

The Director:

Decided that after West had not inquired about the meaning of One Heart, East/West were unlikely to get to a better contract.

Ruling: Result Stands, official warning to North/South for their failure to alert.

East/West appealed.

The Players:

West corrected the Director: it was not specifically true that he did not know the meaning, it was more a case of 'I did not care at the time'. He did intend his Double as showing 4 Spades and at least 5 points.

Under those circumstances, Two Diamonds is an ambiguous bid, not necessarily showing values.

North freely admitted he had forgotten the system at the time, and had not alerted as a consequence.

The French captain pointed out that under any circumstances the Pass over Three No-Trumps is not clear.

The Committee:

Decided that North committed a very grave infraction. It is clear that this prevented East from making evident Spade cue-bids, and thus reaching a more rewarding contract. West's error in not inquiring about the meaning of an alerted call compounded the issue, but not enough in the opinion of the Committee.

Under normal circumstances, an adjustment to a grand slam, or some weighted average of grand and small slams would have been in order. After West's mistake, the adjustment to small slam seemed sufficient.

The Committee's decision:

Adjusted Score, Six Diamonds, making 13 tricks, +940 to East/West.
Official Warning to North/South upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, Law 12C3

Deposit: Returned

Appeal No 3.

Misinformation

Appeals Committee:

Jean-Claude Beineix (Chairman, France), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Open Teams Round 2

Denmark v Poland

Board 20. Dealer West. Game All.

	♠ A 10 7 6 4 2		
	♥ A J 7 5 2		
	♦ -		
	♣ A 6		
♠ J 5 3		♠ 8	
♥ 6 4		♥ K 8	
♦ K J 9 8 4		♦ A 7 5 2	
♣ 9 5 4		♣ K Q J 8 7 2	
	♠ K Q 9		
	♥ Q 10 9 3		
	♦ Q 10 6 3		
	♣ 10 3		
West	North	East	South
<i>Andersen</i>	<i>Tuszynski</i>	<i>Christiansen</i>	<i>Jassem</i>
Pass	1♠	2♣	2♠
3♣	3♥	Pass	4♥
Pass	5♣	Pass	6♣
Pass	6♥	All Pass	

Contract: Six Hearts, played by North

Lead: Ace of Diamonds

Result: 12 tricks, +1430 to North/South

The Facts:

Before the lead, East had inquired about the meaning of Six Clubs. It had been explained to him as a cue-bid, showing a control, and either showing a diamond control or having sufficient values to know that partner has it. South stated to the Director that he had intended the bid as 'pick a slam'.

The Director:

Concluded that North's explanation had been correct according to a logical elaboration of their system.

Ruling: No misinformation, Result Stands

East/West appealed.

The Players:

North/South explained that in their Polish Club style, a hand that is not opened One Club, and yet tries for slam, has to be distributional. Thus the meaning that South attributed to Six Clubs ('Pick a slam') has to be incorrect. Six Clubs had to show Club and Diamond control. Five Diamonds would also have shown a diamond control, but without certainty about slam. East explained his lead. It could not be right to lead a club, with both hands showing control of the suit.

The Committee:

Considered that when an explanation does not fit the bidder's hand there needs to be strong evidence that the given explanation is systemically correct. It was the Committee's unanimous decision that North/South had fallen short in this requirement. Therefore, the ruling should be based upon misinformation.

The Committee was less certain that the misinformation caused the bad result, or that East was (perhaps only partly) to blame for the bad result by his chosen lead.

In a majority decision, the Committee decided to award an adjusted score.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to Six Hearts, down One, -100 to North/South.

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, Law 12C2

Deposit: Returned

Appeal No 4.

Hesitation

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Peter Lund (Denmark), Jaap van der Neut (the Netherlands).

Open Teams Round 4

Finland v Israel

Board 15. Dealer South. North/South Game.

	♠ -		
	♥ 7 6 4		
	♦ A K 10 9 6 5 2		
	♣ K Q 10		
♠ K Q 9 5 2		♠ 10 8 7 6 3	
♥ A 10		♥ J 9 8 3 2	
♦ 7 3		♦ 8 4	
♣ 8 7 6 3		♣ 5	
	♠ A J 4		
	♥ K Q 5		
	♦ Q J		
	♣ A J 9 4 2		
West	North	East	South
<i>Yadlin</i>	<i>Koistinen</i>	<i>Yadlin</i>	<i>Kiema</i>
			1♣
2♠	3♦	5♣	Dble
Pass	5♦	Pass	6♦
All Pass			

Contract: Six Diamonds, played by North

Result: thirteen tricks, +1390 to North/South

The Facts:

This hand also featured in Appeal no 6, and in several other calls for the Director.

One Club was Precision, Two Spades was weak, and Three Diamonds was positive, eight points or more. Five Clubs was explained by East to North as possibly fit-showing, and lead directing. It was not alerted by West to South, but the problem was not there.

The Director was called by West after the bid of Six Diamonds. West said there had been a pause of 2 to 3 minutes before the tray had come back with Five Diamonds. All four players agreed upon this pause.

The Director:

Asked South why he had bid Six Diamonds. He said that North would normally pass the Double of Five Clubs, therefore Five Diamonds was a strong bid and as he had good working points he found it obvious to bid the slam. Uncertain about the case, the Director decided to rule against the possible offenders.

Ruling: Score adjusted to Five Diamonds, making 13 tricks, +640 to North/South.

North/South appealed.

The Players:

South stated he had never promised any diamonds, but he had two honours in the suit. He had doubled, wanting to defend, but when partner pressed on, it had to be slam going under all circumstances.

He stated it might even have been a grand slam, but that this would have been impossible to find out.

West pointed out the obvious reasons not to allow the bid of Six Diamonds. He also stated that he had not bid Six Spades, a good sacrifice, as he was afraid of being accused of taking a double shot.

The Committee:

First dealt with West's argument about the sacrifice. When at the table, one should always assume that the opponents really have a hand that is worth their bid opposite the hesitation. West could never have been accused of trying to take a double shot in this situation.

Next the Committee tackled the real issue. The Committee read Law 16:

After a player makes available to his partner extraneous information ..., the partner may not choose from among logical alternative actions one that could demonstrably have been suggested over another by the extraneous information.

When deciding about cases of this nature, three questions have to be answered:

- 1) Has there been unauthorised information?
- 2) Did the information suggest one alternative over another?

3) Could the other alternatives be considered logical?

There was no problem about deciding that there had in fact been unauthorised information. It is clear that it was North who had been thinking.

The Committee took some more time in deciding if the hesitation did in fact suggest bidding the slam.

The Committee considered two possible hands for North:

- a light hand, with no intention of going to slam;
- a heavy hand, invitational to slam;

Upon reflection, most members of the Committee concluded that the hesitation had shown a strong hand. North may well have been considering going to slam himself.

One member was not certain that this was 'demonstrably' the case. North may have been considering the auction whatever hand he actually held.

All members agreed that South's hand was strong enough to accept the invitation on any strong hand.

Some members of the Committee were of the opinion that North could not hold a weak hand, since North would then simply choose to accept partner's invitation to defend. Not all members shared that opinion.

The Chairman expressed the view that when confronted with unauthorised information, a player should really lean back and not to use the information.

All members of the Committee fully agreed with that view, but some expressed the opinion that in every situation, there has to be a line drawn somewhere, over which a player's action is clear enough to allow him to take the suggested action even after unauthorised information. It would not be correct to place that line too far, since that would effectively punish thinking.

Since the Committee could not reach a unanimous decision, the case was decided on a vote. The result of the vote was 3-2 in favour of allowing the bid of Six Diamonds.

The Chairman, who was in the minority, had announced before the vote that he would not exercise any authority he might have of overruling a majority.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision overturned, original table result restored. +1390 to North/South.

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A

Deposit: Returned

Committee's note:

The Committee wishes to stress that this is a borderline case. A player should really make certain that in cases of unauthorised information, he does not select a suggested action unless he is certain there are no logical alternatives to it.

It is far better to blame partner for transmitting the information in the first place, than to take your chances with Director and Committee.

The Committee also states that they agree with the Director's decision to rule in favour of the non-offending side.

Appeal No 5.

Hesitation

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Jaap van der Neut (the Netherlands).

Open Teams Round 6

Portugal v Turkey

Board 17. Dealer North. Love All.

	♠ J 8 7		
	♥ Q 9 8 6 4 2		
	♦ A 3		
	♣ J 8		
♠ A Q 5		♠ 10	
♥ K J 10 7		♥ A	
♦ K 7 5		♦ J 10 9 4 2	
♣ 9 7 5		♣ A K Q 10 3 2	
	♠ K 9 6 4 3 2		
	♥ 5 3		
	♦ Q 8 6		
	♣ 6 4		
West	North	East	South
<i>Sa</i>	<i>Kubac</i>	<i>Barbosa</i>	<i>Kilercioglu</i>
	2♥	4♣	Pass
5♣	Pass	6♣	All Pass

Contract: Six Clubs, played by East

Result: twelve tricks, +920 to East/West

The Facts:

Over a weak Two Hearts, four Clubs showed a minor two-suiter. The tray took some two minutes before returning with Five Clubs, after which East raised to Six.

The Director:

Considered passing to be a Logical Alternative.

Ruling: Score adjusted to Five Clubs, making with an overtrick, +420 to East/West.

East/West appealed.

The Players:

East/West explained that over a weak two in Hearts, Four Clubs showed the minors, not forcing, while Four Hearts would be forcing with both Minors. West explained that at first he thought Four Clubs showed the black suits, which is indeed how they defend against a Multi Two Diamonds. He had even considered bidding Four Spades, when he remembered the correct system. He had then considered his next bid for some two minutes more. He stated that he had lost some time in considering whether to bid Five Clubs or Five Diamonds.

East explained that he chose the non-forcing alternative because he did not know there would be a fit, but when partner then raised the Clubs, he considered that partner must have at least the Ace of Spades and a high Diamond honour. If that is the Ace, he is playing at 75%, if it would only be the King of Diamonds, the slam is still at 50%.

East/West were not able to produce written notes about their defensive methods, but thought the explanations were self-evident.

The Committee:

Considered the hesitation proven, including the fact that it must have been a hesitation by West.

The Committee considered the Director' ruling to be correct and did not think the case should have been brought to appeal.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A, Law 12C2

Deposit: Forfeited

Appeal No 6.

Hesitation

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Jaap van der Neut (the Netherlands).

Open Teams Round 4

Great Britain v Poland

Board 15. Dealer South. North/South Game.

	♠ -		
	♥ 7 6 4		
	♦ A K 10 9 6 5 2		
	♣ K Q 10		
♠ K Q 9 5 2		♠ 10 8 7 6 3	
♥ A 10		♥ J 9 8 3 2	
♦ 7 3		♦ 8 4	
♣ 8 7 6 3		♣ 5	
	♠ A J 4		
	♥ K Q 5		
	♦ Q J		
	♣ A J 9 4 2		

West

Jassem

2♠

Pass

Dble

North

G.Tredinnick

3♦

7♦

All Pass

East

Tuszynski

6♠

Pass

South

S.Tredinnick

1♣

Dble

Pass

Contract: Seven Diamonds doubled, played by North.

Lead: Club

Result: Thirteen tricks, +2330 to North/South

The Facts:

This hand also featured in Appeal no 4, and in several other calls for the Director.

One Club was strong, and when the tray came back with a jump to the Six level, South took some time before doubling. East called the Director after the bid of Seven Diamonds.

The Director:

Established that there had been a break in tempo, and considered a Pass by North to be a Logical Alternative.

Ruling: Score adjusted to Six Spades doubled, four down, -800 to East/West.

North/South appealed.

The Players:

East stated that he had told the Director at the table that the tray had taken at least 30 seconds to come back, and that no-one protested at the time. South admitted that he had paused for some 20 seconds. He stated that since the opponents basically told him that a slam was on, he had a problem.

The British captain had three arguments:

Firstly he called the break in tempo a 'pause', not a 'hesitation', which in his opinion carried no information.

Secondly he was of the opinion that the break in tempo should rather suggest passing, not bidding on.

And lastly, he stressed that the bad result was due to East's unfortunate lead, rather than their bidding. He explained in great detail how East should have worked out that a heart lead would defeat the contract.

East countered that last argument by stating that in his opinion the club and heart leads were equal, but that the club lead would also beat Six Diamonds, and that he wanted to win the board in that case.

The Committee:

Found that the situation in this case should not pose any problems for experienced players. They should simply accept that they are outbid and double in tempo. As it is, the hesitation can only suggest some tolerance for diamonds. The Committee considered the club lead to be insufficiently bad to break the link between the infraction and the damage.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld. -800 to East/West.

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A, Law 12C2

Deposit: Returned

Appeal No 7.

Card Played

Appeals Committee:

Anton Maas (Chairman, the Netherlands), Peter Lund (Scribe, Denmark), Naki Bruni (Italy).

Open Teams Round 3

San Marino v France

Board 19. Dealer South. East/West Game.

	♠ A J 8 5		
	♥ A 9 8 7 4		
	♦ 6 2		
	♣ J 2		
♠ K 9 7		♠ 10 4	
♥ K Q 3 2		♥ 10 5	
♦ A 10 9		♦ Q J 8 7 4 3	
♣ K 10 8		♣ 9 6 3	
	♠ Q 6 3 2		
	♥ J 6		
	♦ K 5		
	♣ A Q 7 5 4		
West	North	East	South
<i>Bitran</i>	<i>Pizza</i>	<i>Voltaire</i>	<i>Filippi</i>
			2♣
Pass	2♥	Pass	2♠
Pass	4♠	All Pass	

Contract: Four Spades, played by South

Lead: king of hearts

Result: nine tricks, -50 to North/South

The Facts:

The first trick was taken by the ace, and a heart was played from the table, for the ten, jack, and either the three or the queen.

West stated he had wanted to play the queen, but that the three had dropped out of his hand.

The Director:

Asked the player to show what had happened. He chose to believe West had indeed dropped the three on the table.

Ruling: The played card is the queen of hearts, and the three becomes a minor penalty card.

North/South appealed.

The Players:

Repeated their statements in Committee, and re-enacted the happenings.

The Committee:

Decided that the Director was best placed to make the determination of facts, and found nothing to suggest he had made a mistake.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 50B, Law 45A

Deposit: Returned, but only just.

Appeal No 8.

Unauthorised Information

Appeals Committee:

Anton Maas (Chairman, the Netherlands), Peter Lund (Scribe, Denmark), Naki Bruni (Italy).

Open Teams Round 6

Romania v Slovenia

Board 12. Dealer West. North/South Game.

	♠ A J		
	♥ J 4 3 2		
	♦ 10 8 5 4 2		
	♣ J 7		
♠ Q		♠ K 10 9 8 7 5	
♥ A 10 9 7 5		♥ -	
♦ J 6 3		♦ Q 7	
♣ K 9 8 2		♣ A Q 6 5 3	
	♠ 6 4 3 2		
	♥ K Q 8 6		
	♦ A K 9		
	♣ 10 4		
West	North	East	South
<i>Marina</i>	<i>Šenk</i>	<i>Taciuc</i>	<i>Ambro•</i>
Pass	Pass	1♠	Pass
INT	Pass	2♣	Pass
2♥	Pass	2♠	Pass
3♣	Pass	4♣	Pass
5♣	All Pass		

Contract: Five Clubs, played by East.

Lead: ace of diamonds

Result: 10 tricks, -50 to East/West.

The Facts:

South was also scoring the Table. After the first trick was turned over, he asked his partner if it had been the five that had been contributed, to which north agreed.

East called the Director to point out this irregularity, and the director did in fact warn North/South that this should not be done.

After the play, East called the Director again, claiming that South had continued the suit because he now knew from the Director's call, that East did in fact have a second diamond.

The Director:

Established that the five (middle of five) had not conveyed any interesting information (High encouraging, High-Low even), but that South did in fact know which card it was (since he had merely asked for a confirmation) and that it was in fact Declarer who had given opponent extra information.

Ruling: Result Stands

East/West appealed.

The Players:

Confirmed their statements made to the Director.

The Committee:

Agreed with the Director.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 66C, Law 16B

Deposit: Returned, but only just

Appeals No 9 and 10.

Alert Procedure, Misinformation

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands), Jaap van der Neut (the Netherlands).

Open Teams Round 6

Israel v France

Board 10. Dealer East. Game All.

	♠ K J 9 4		
	♥ 5		
	♦ 10 9 3		
	♣ Q 8 6 3 2		
♠ Q 6		♠ A 10 8 7 2	
♥ Q 10 7 6		♥ 2	
♦ A 6 4 2		♦ K Q 7 5	
♣ A J 10		♣ 7 5 4	
	♠ 5 3		
	♥ A K J 9 8 4 3		
	♦ J 8		
	♣ K 9		
West	North	East	South
<i>Greenberg</i>	<i>Bompis</i>	<i>Zohar</i>	<i>de Sainte Marie</i>
Pass	4♥	Pass	4♣
Dble	Pass	4♠	All Pass

Contract: Four Spades, played by East.

Result: nine tricks, -100 to East/West.

The Facts:

East summoned the Director at the end of the hand, complaining he had not received an alert on Four Clubs. Four Clubs was Namyats. It had been correctly alerted and explained by South to West. North stated that he had alerted, but East had not seen. East/West play that a direct double over Four Clubs is take-out over Hearts, whereas the delayed Double would be for penalties. East took the Double to be take-out, which is why he bid Four Spades.

The Director:

Went all the way to the vugraph theatre (this was the open Room of the Rama match) to ask if North had alerted. Some spectators could affirm that North had made a “soft” alert. He had taken the card out of the bidding box, held it in the air and replaced it.

The director also established in the same manner that East had only looked at opponent’s Convention Card at the end of play.

The Director checked the Convention Card of North/South. The meaning of Four Clubs was mentioned among “General Approach and Style”, but not among “Special bids that may require Defence”, and not among the opening bids in the inside of the Card.

The Director judged both pairs to be at fault and applied Law 12CI (no normal result possible) and cancelled the board.

Ruling: Board Cancelled.

Both sides appealed.

The Players:

East/West explained their methods and produced a page from their system notes in the Committee. Although these notes were in Hebrew, they asked the Committee to believe that they in fact played as stated: direct Double is Take-Out, delayed Double would be penalty.

East stated he had looked at inside of the Convention Card immediately after the call of Four Clubs.

North stated that although he had not alerted in the correct fashion, he had been certain that East had noticed it.

The Committee:

Decided on two separate cases:

The Appeal from North/South:

North/South committed two severe infractions: their Convention Card had not been properly filled out and was seriously misleading; and the alert had not been given in the prescribed manner.

The Committee reminds the players of Regulation C2:

The “alert procedure” is as follows:

A player who makes a “conventional call” alerts his screen-mate by placing the alert card over the last call of the screen-mate, in his segment of the

bidding tray; the alerted player must acknowledge by returning the alert card to his opponent.

Given these two infractions, North/South should not benefit from anything that subsequently happens at the table.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to Four Hearts doubled, three down, -800 to North/South. The pair in question is not allowed to play in the next match, and must correct their Convention Card, and give a copy of this to all other teams. Before any match they play afterwards, they shall make certain that their opponents have the corrected version of their card.

Relevant Laws:

Law 40B, Regulation C2

Deposit: Forfeited

The Appeal from East/West:

In the opinion of some members, East/West did not do enough to protect their own interests. East might well have suspected that an auction of 4♣-Pass-4♥ indicated Namyats, and it was not certain that he did check the Convention Card.

However in the end, it was decided that the infractions that were committed by North/South were too severe not to give East/West the benefit of the doubt.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to Four Hearts doubled, three down, -800 to North/South.

Relevant Laws:

Law 40B, Regulation C2

Deposit: Returned

Appeal No 11.

Hesitation

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Open Teams Round 8

Portugal v Russia

Board 4. Dealer West. Game All.

	♠ Q 6 2		
	♥ K Q J 4 3		
	♦ Q J 7		
	♣ 6 2		
♠ J 5 4		♠ A K 7	
♥ 8		♥ A 6 2	
♦ A 8 5 2		♦ K 9	
♣ A J 9 7 3		♣ K Q 8 5 4	
	♠ 10 9 8 3		
	♥ 10 9 7 5		
	♦ 10 6 4 3		
	♣ 10		
West	North	East	South
<i>Silva Santos</i>	<i>Gromov</i>	<i>Santos</i>	<i>Petrinin</i>
Pass	1♥	Dble	3♥
Dble	Pass	4♥	Pass
5♣	Pass	6♣	All Pass

Contract: Six Clubs, played by West.

Result: twelve tricks, +1370 to East/West

The Facts:

West had taken a very long time in bidding Five Clubs. All players agreed to this.

The Director:

Established that the tray had come back to North/West after several minutes. He decided that a Pass by East was a Logical Alternative and that Six Clubs was suggested by the break in tempo.

Ruling: Score adjusted to Five Clubs, making 12 tricks, +620 to East/West.

East/West appealed.

The Players:

West told the Committee that he had a problem and needed to think it over. He was wondering if East did not have five spades and was asking to play Game in that denomination.

East explained his actions. From the pre-empt (according to opponents always promising a 5-4 Heart fit) he knew his partner held a singleton Heart. From the responsive Double, he knew partner would be at least 4-4 in the minors, so Six Clubs was definitely on. By bidding Four Hearts, he committed himself to the slam, because he would also bid Six Clubs if partner had bid Five Diamonds. He was still searching for the grand.

North stated he thought the hesitation helped in bidding the slam. He pointed out East had not asked any questions so he could not be a certain as he said about the 9-card heart fit. He admitted that the Three Hearts bidder would have a four-card suit in 99% of the cases.

The Committee:

Accepted that East, through his bid of Four Hearts, where he could risk a response of Five Diamonds, had proved that he would always be going to at least a small slam, no matter what West would bid.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision overturned, original table result restored. +1370 to East/West

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A

Deposit: Returned

Appeal No 12.

Unauthorised Information during Play

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Jean-Claude Beineix (France), Peter Lund (Denmark).

Herman De Wael joined the Meeting after the start and acted as Scribe.

Open Teams Round 12

Switzerland v the Netherlands

Board 15. Dealer South. North/South Game.

	♠ K 8 6		
	♥ Q 10		
	♦ Q J 9 4		
	♣ A J 10 9		
♠ 10 7 4 3		♠ J 9 5 2	
♥ A J 7 4		♥ K 5 2	
♦ A 8 7 6		♦ 10 2	
♣ 2		♣ K 8 4 3	
	♠ A Q		
	♥ 9 8 6 3		
	♦ K 5 3		
	♣ Q 7 6 5		
West	North	East	South
<i>Zivkovic</i>	<i>de Boer</i>	<i>Levy</i>	<i>Muller</i>
Pass	1♣	Pass	Pass
Pass	1NT	Pass	1♥
Pass	2♦	Pass	2♣
Pass	3NT	All Pass	2NT

Contract: Three No-Trumps, played by North

Lead: two of spades

Play:	W	N	E	S
	♠4	♠x	♠2	♠Q
	♣2	♣9	♣x	♣Q
	♠3	♣J	♣K	♣x
	♠x	♠x	♠5	♠A
	♦x	♣A	♣x	♣x
	♦A	♦J	♦x	♦x
	♥x	...		

Result: eight tricks, -100 to North/South

The Facts:

Two diamonds denied three cards in hearts.

North called the Director after the end of play. East had returned the spade to trick four after a considerable delay. North claimed West had known from the pause not to play spades in trick seven, but rather hearts.

The Director:

Established that East had indeed taken some 20 seconds before leading to trick four, and asked about the signalling. The ♠2 was fourth best, and the ♠4 and ♠3 showed count.

The Director ruled that there had been Unauthorised Information, which suggested the heart return, and that the spade return was a Logical Alternative.

Ruling: Score adjusted to Three No-Trumps, making nine tricks, +600 to North/South.

East/West appealed.

The Players:

West explained his play. He knew from the bidding that North had 2 hearts, and this is why he had returned the suit.

North/South, by way of their captain, told the Committee that in his opinion the hesitation made it a lot easier for West to return hearts.

The Committee:

First of all confirmed that Law 16 applies to plays as well as to calls.

The Committee established that there had been Unauthorised Information, and that the hesitation was very likely to indicate that East did not have the king of spades, and thus suggest the heart return in trick seven. The Committee then made an analysis of the play so far, which showed that a spade return was still a Logical Alternative. Just exchange ♠K and ♥Q for ♠J and ♥K. The

bidding and play would have been the same, but the spade return would have been right.

Since the West player was in the possession of Unauthorised Information that suggested a heart return, he should have returned a spade in stead.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A, Law 12C2

Deposit: Returned

Committee's note:

The Committee wishes to remind the players that Law 16, Unauthorised Information, also applies to plays. Players should be prudent when hesitating during play.

Very frequently during the play, information is exchanged, quite unintentionally, but nevertheless unauthorised. Quite often, the same information is available from authorised sources, and the suggested action can be taken without penalty.

In this case, no such authorised information was available to West, and he must suffer the consequences.

It must be noted that West could have played the ace of hearts at trick seven, on which East could have given a positive signal, thus giving the same information in an authorised manner. In that case, a heart continuation would have been allowed.

Appeal Committee Special Meeting No 1.

Procedural Penalty

Appeals Committee:

Bill Pencharz (Chairman, Great Britain), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Jens Auken (Denmark), Naki Bruni (Italy), Anton Maas (the Netherlands), Krzysztof Martens (Poland).

Open Teams Round 16

France v Slovenia

The Facts:

Around half-time in the match, the Director noticed that there was no-one scoring in the Closed Room of this match. He told the French player in North to score, but the player refused at first. Being told to score by the Chief Tournament Director, he started to do so, but only the boards 10-20 from the match were scored.

The Director:

Referred the matter to the Appeals Committee.

The Players:

The French captain explained that he had asked the reception at both hotels (this match was played in the Rooms at the San Gorg hotel, normally used by the Ladies and Senior Teams), as well as the Chief Tournament Director, to provide a scorer. He then came back to the Radisson hotel to watch the vugraph.

He realised that it was his responsibility, but he never scores himself, because the players do not like that the captain is at the table.

The Committee:

Decided that the French team was at fault. Since the conditions of contest did not prescribe a particular penalty, a list of other penalties was reviewed. In the end, the Committee decided upon a penalty of One Victory Point.

The Committee's decision:

IVP penalty to France.

Relevant Laws:

Regulation B.3.9, G.2.3

Extracts from the Conditions of Contest:

Regulation B.3.9 Recording the matches

...

b. In the Closed Room, the Captain of the Away Team (or his designate to be approved by the Captain of the Home Team and the Tournament Director) shall record the bidding, lead to the first three tricks and the result on the "Recording Form" provided at the table.

Regulation G.2.3 Appeals Committee – Judgment

...

The Appeals Committee may confirm, reverse, vary or modify the findings or decisions of a Tournament Director (except those foreseen by Law 93.B.3.) and remove, increase or vary any penalty which may have been imposed, or substitute a different class of penalty or an adjusted score.

On an investigation made from reasons other than of an appeal the Appeals Committee may impose such penalty on any party or direct that such an adjusted score be entered for any boards as it shall deem proper.

...

Comparison of Penalties mentioned in the Regulations

Warning - 1st delay line-up

½ VP - 2nd delay line-up
 - 0 to 5 minutes late play
 - looking at a hand with 14 cards or more
 - putting the cards back in the tray at right angles
 - smoking in the playing area or in the toilets

1 VP - 3rd and subsequent delay line-up
 - player not seated at start of play
 - 5 to 10 minutes late play
 - exchanging cards between hands

2 VPs - player more than five minutes late at start of play
 - 10 to 15 minutes late play
 - leaving the Closed Room without permission of the TD (player or scorer)
 - bringing a mobile phone into the playing area

3 VPs - 15 to 20 minutes late play

5 VPs - 20 to 25 minutes late play

Appeal No 14.

Misinformation

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Senior Teams Round 8

Sweden 1 v Great Britain 2

Board 3. Dealer South. East/West Game.

	♠ 9 6		
	♥ A 9 8 6 5		
	♦ 8		
	♣ A 8 7 5 3		
♠ A 2		♠ 10 8 7	
♥ J 10		♥ K Q 7 4	
♦ A K J 5 3		♦ Q 10 7 4	
♣ Q 10 9 2		♣ J 6	
	♠ K Q J 5 4 3		
	♥ 3 2		
	♦ 9 6 2		
	♣ K 4		
West	North	East	South
<i>Alfredsson</i>	<i>Hirst</i>	<i>Ekberg</i>	<i>Semp</i>
Dble	2♠	Pass	2♦
2NT	Pass	3NT	Pass
			All Pass

Contract: Three No-Trumps, played by West

Lead: three of clubs

Result: nine tricks, -600 to East/West

The Facts:

West had explained his bid of Two No-Trumps to South as being for the minors, while East had not alerted and expected it to be natural, invitational. North claimed he would not have led clubs if he had received the explanation that West had given.

The Director:

Agreed with North and awarded an adjusted score.

Ruling: Score adjusted to Three No-Trumps, making six tricks, -300 to East/West.

East/West appealed.

The Players:

East explained their system: the Double was Take-Out, so Two no-Trumps must mean that West has some extra values, and with his points, he was happy to accept the invitation. A direct 2NT over the Multi would have shown 15-17, an indirect 2NT would be for the minors, so this sequence must be something else, but there are no firm agreements about it, as they are not a regular partnership.

South stated that he had called the Director immediately after the lead, and that West had stated at that time “there seems to be a misunderstanding”. East/West’s captain told the Committee that in his opinion the opening lead did the damage, not the explanations.

The Committee:

Decided that the explanation that East had given was very likely to be the correct one. West may well have intended his bid to be invitational, but had explained his hand rather than his agreements.

North therefore had the right explanation before he made his opening lead.

The Committee’s decision:

Director’s decision overturned, original table result restored. +600 to East/West.

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A.

Deposit: Returned

Appeal No 15.

Misbid

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Naki Bruni (Italy), Nissan Rand (Israel).

Ladies Teams Round 9

Sweden v the Netherlands

Board 6. Dealer East. East/West Game.

	♠ Q 7		
	♥ Q 10 6		
	♦ 9 7		
	♣ K Q 9 8 5 2		
♠ 5 3		♠ A K J 8 2	
♥ 9 7		♥ A K 8 5 4 3	
♦ A K Q 5		♦ 8 4	
♣ A J 10 7 4		♣ -	
	♠ 10 9 6 4		
	♥ J 2		
	♦ J 10 6 3 2		
	♣ 6 3		
West	North	East	South
<i>Simons</i>	<i>Andersson</i>	<i>Pasman</i>	<i>Midskog</i>
2♣	Dble	1♥	Pass
3NT	Pass	2♠	Pass
		4♥	All Pass

Contract: Four Hearts, played by East

Result: twelve tricks, +680 to East/West

The Facts:

Two Clubs was alerted on both sides of the screen, but North did not ask what it meant and doubled to show clubs. South did ask what Two Clubs meant, namely natural or heart fit with as little as 2 points. South subsequently explained the double as Take-Out.

West claims she would have bid Two No-Trumps (forcing), if she had known that the Double of Two Clubs showed clubs They might then have reached Six Hearts.

The Director:

Adjusted the score.

Ruling: Score adjusted to Six Hearts, making, +1430 to East/West.

North/South appealed.**The Players:**

West feared that because of the Take-Out Double behind her, the suits would be breaking badly for her, and that was why she had taken a rather conservative action.

The Committee:

Decided that North/South had been lucky in the bidding. North did not ask for the meaning and consequently made a wrong bid. The explanation by South was however correct, and so East/West cannot claim any redress.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision overturned, original table result restored. +680 to East/West

Relevant Laws:

Law 40A

Deposit: Returned

Appeal No 16.

Hesitation

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Senior Teams Round 10

Ireland v Sweden 3

Board 7. Dealer South. Game All.

♠ A K Q J 9 3		
♥ J 9 5		
♦ 4		
♣ K 8 2		
♠ 10 7 5		♠ 8 2
♥ 8 6		♥ Q 7 4 2
♦ K 10 9 7		♦ Q 5
♣ A 10 9 8		♣ Q J 6 5 4
♠ 6 4		
♥ A K 10 3		
♦ A J 8 6 3 2		
♣ 7		

West <i>Jensen</i>	North <i>Dowling</i>	East <i>Troberg</i>	South <i>Hanratty</i>
Pass	1♠	Pass	1♦
Pass	4♣	Pass	3♦
Pass	4NT	Pass	4♥
Pass	5♠	Pass	5♥
Pass	6♠	All Pass	6♦

Contract: Six Spades, played by North

Lead: Two of Hearts

Result: twelve tricks, +1430 to North/South

The Facts:

Five Spades was bid after a substantial pause, and East/West complained about South's subsequent bid of Six Diamonds.

Five Hearts had been Roman Key Card Blackwood, but North/South had been insecure about the meaning of their bidding before that.

South had understood 4♣ to show diamond support and he was surprised at the call of 5♠, perhaps meant as a sign-off to 5NT.

The Director:

Considered that the pause made it easier for South to bid on to the slam level.

Ruling: Score adjusted to Five Spades, making twelve tricks, +680 to North/South.

North/South appealed.

The Players:

North/South admitted to the pause, which was agreed to be long, if maybe not as long as East claimed (2 minutes).

South stated the pause had nothing to do with his bid of Six Diamonds. He had made a mess of the auction, and decided to get back to his trump suit.

According to South, the meaning of the bidding was:

3♦ strong, 4♣ forcing, ongoing, 4♥ showing the Ace, 4NT RKCB agreeing diamonds.

According to North, no trump suit had been agreed and 5♠ was meant as a sign-off.

The Committee:

Believed that North/South were honest, but still considered that Pass was a Logical Alternative, and that Six Diamonds may well have been suggested by the break in tempo. South should not have returned to his own suit.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A, Law 12C2

Deposit: Returned

Appeal No 17.

Misinformation, Self-Protection, Procedural Penalty

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Open Teams Round 18

Monaco v Lebanon

Board 4. Dealer West. Game All.

	♠ A Q		
	♥ K 9 7 6 4		
	♦ 8		
	♣ J 10 8 6 4		
♠ 9 8 3		♠ K 6 2	
♥ A Q J 5 3 2		♥ 10	
♦ 2		♦ Q J 9 5 4 3	
♣ K Q 7		♣ 9 5 3	
	♠ J 10 7 5 4		
	♥ 8		
	♦ A K 10 7 6		
	♣ A 2		

West

Baroudy

1♥

Pass

North

Guglielmi

Pass

5♣

East

Hamdan

INT

All Pass

South

Gavino

2♥

Contract: Five Clubs, played by North

Result: eight tricks, -300 to North/South

The Facts:

Two Hearts was explained by South to West as “any two-suiter”.

North explained it as “Ghestem, clubs and spades” and bid accordingly.

East called the director, claiming he would have doubled with the correct information. While the Director was at the table, North told South under the screen, in French, to state to the Tournament Director that South had made a wrong call. Both opponents and the director heard and understood this remark.

The Director:

Ruled that South had given a wrong explanation of his own bid and considered that West could have doubled with a correct explanation

Ruling: Score adjusted to Five Clubs, doubled, three down, -800 to North/South.

North/South appealed.

The Players:

North/South showed their convention card to prove that they did play Ghestem. They stated that they also played this after 1♥-Pass-INT.

West stated that South had waited a long time before making his final pass. He had even gone into the bidding box and had touched the Six Clubs card. All this influenced him in not doubling.

South agreed that he had thought, and even touched his bidding cards, but that it was Five Diamonds he was thinking off. He did not see very clearly, so he may have touched the 6♣-card.

West also explained his pass by pointing to his club holding. If the Clubs are mainly to his left, he is far less certain of making two tricks in the suit than if they are more evenly distributed.

As regards the remarks made in French when the Director was at the table, North claimed he had said “comme d’habitude tu as oublié le système” (as usual you have forgotten the system). East stated it had been “surtout dis à l’arbitre que tu as oublié le système” (certainly tell the director that you have forgotten the system). The Director confirmed that the second version was what she had heard too.

The Committee:

Found that North/South, by their misbid / misexplanation, had caused damage to East/West. They should receive, in accordance with Law 12C2, the most unfavourable result that is at all probable, which according to the Committee should be -800.

The Committee then turned their attention to West. Several reasons were listed to explain why he had passed. If South’s hesitation had played any part, this was of no consequence, since the Committee did not feel that South had done this deliberately and that any conclusions West drew from this were at his own risk. Finally the Committee gave the most weight to the consideration that West should realise that 5♣ was a very strange bid (North had not bid 2♣ or 4♣ in the first round - 3♣ would have shown a two-suiter). West could have asked South for a more complete explanation, especially since he was

last in hand and any questions he would ask would be of dummy, not of declarer. That might have cleared the situation more for him.

Finally the Committee turned its attention to North's remark to his partner at the table, trying to influence his partner's explanation to the Tournament Director. This was deemed a serious attempt to influence the fact-finding mission of the Director, which the Committee found completely unacceptable. The Committee decided to give North/South a penalty of 2VP for this action.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to:

For North/South: -800

For East/West: +300

2VP penalty to North/South

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, Law 12C2

Law 90A, Law 90B8

Deposit: Returned

Appeal No 18.

Misbid

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Peter Lund (Denmark).

Open Teams Round 19

Netherlands v San Marino

Board 15. Dealer South. North/South Game.

	♠ K 6 5 2		
	♥ 10 5 3		
	♦ J		
	♣ J 10 7 6 3		
♠ Q 9 4 3		♠ 10	
♥ K Q 6		♥ A J 9 7 4 2	
♦ K Q 7 5 4 3		♦ A 8 2	
♣ -		♣ Q 8 4	
	♠ A J 8 7		
	♥ 8		
	♦ 10 9 6		
	♣ A K 9 5 2		
West	North	East	South
<i>de Boer</i>	<i>Fiorini</i>	<i>Muller</i>	<i>Briolini</i>
Pass	1♠	2♥	1♦
4♥	5♣	Pass	2NT
5♦	Dble	5♥	Pass
			All Pass

Contract: Five Hearts, played by East

Result: twelve tricks, +480 to East/West

The Facts:

One Diamond could be short, since North/South play a strong club system. Two No-Trumps was explained by South as showing a spade fit, but by North as showing the minors. When the tray came back with a bid of Five Clubs, South realised he had made a mistake and he corrected the explanation. East/West claim they could have bid the slam if they had received correct information.

The Director:

Found there had been no misinformation, and even no damage.

Ruling: Result Stands

East/West appealed.

The Players:

North/South explained their system: without intervention, 1♦-1♠-2NT would have shown minors, whereas 1♠-2NT shows the spade fit. With intervention, this is basically the same, even if they could not prove this by their convention card. This was the reason South gave for his mistaken bid. When the tray came back, his explanation was “maybe partner thinks I have shown minors”. East explained that he had not bid further than 5♥ because he knew the diamonds could very well be 5-0 and he feared a ruff coming from that suit. This was the same reason he gave for not redoubling, since he already knew the slam would not be made.

The Committee:

Concluded that North had given the correct information about the agreements. Although East had drawn a correct conclusion, he was not damaged by any misexplanation, but rather by South’s misbid.

The Committee’s decision:

Director’s decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 40A

Deposit: Forfeited

Appeal No 19.

Misinformation - No Damage

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Senior Teams Round 11

Italy 2 v Great Britain 2

Board 18. Dealer East. North/South Game.

	♠ J 8		
	♥ K Q 10 9 7 3		
	♦ J 10 6 5 4		
	♣ -		
♠ K Q 10 9 7 2		♠ A	
♥ J 6		♥ 5	
♦ 7		♦ A Q 8 2	
♣ 10 7 5 2		♣ A K Q 8 6 4 3	
	♠ 6 5 4 3		
	♥ A 8 4 2		
	♦ K 9 3		
	♣ J 9		
West	North	East	South
<i>Silverstone</i>	<i>Longinotti</i>	<i>Waterlow</i>	<i>Resta</i>
		2♣	Pass
2NT	Pass	3♣	Pass
3♥	Pass	4♣	Pass
4♦	Pass	6♣	All Pass

Contract: Six Clubs, played by East

Result: twelve tricks, +920 to East/West

The Facts:

There had been different explanations on either side of the screen.

2♣ was Forcing to Game, and 2NT showed any good six card suit headed by KQJ at least. According to West, 3♣ and 4♣ had been asking relays, and he had shown a spade suit by his bid of 3♥, and only six spades (by his 4♦). According to East, 3♣, 3♥ and 4♣ had been natural, and 4♦ was a cue-bid.

North/South claimed they could have sacrificed in Six Hearts if North had received the explanations West had provided. North would then have doubled 3♥ and South would have bid 4♥.

The Director:

Considered that 6♥ would certainly have been doubled, and probably four down (-1100 to North/South), so he ruled there had been no damage.

Ruling: Result Stands

North/South appealed.**The Players:**

East/West, by way of their captain, explained the misunderstanding. West did play these meanings with another partner, but not in this partnership. North stated he did not ask redress from a possible sacrifice, but from interventions by North/South that might keep East/West out of slam.

The Committee:

Found that a player who did not intervene over 2NT, when holding a 6-5 in the red suits, and some playing strength, would not intervene later either. The Committee found that there was really no reason for North/South to appeal.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A

Deposit: Forfeited

Appeal No 20.

Misinformation - No Damage

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Open Teams Round 21

Monaco v Czech Republic

Board 9. Dealer North. East/West Game.

	♠ A 9 8 2		
	♥ Q 9 6		
	♦ A Q 10 6		
	♣ Q 5		
♠ J 4		♠ 7 6 5	
♥ 8 4 2		♥ A K J 10 5 3	
♦ K J 7 3		♦ 5	
♣ K 9 7 6		♣ J 10 3	
	♠ K Q 10 3		
	♥ 7		
	♦ 9 8 4 2		
	♣ A 8 4 2		

West

Lariviere

2♣

North

Fort

INT

Dble

East

Allavena

2♦

All Pass

South

Jansa

Dble

Contract: Two Spades doubled, played by West

Result: two tricks, -1700 to East/West

The Facts:

West called the director during board 15 of the match. South had intended the double over the Multi as a penalty in diamonds. On the other side, the Double had been explained as penalty over one of the Majors. This difference in explanation was supposedly the reason for the strange final contract. West intended his Spade bid to be “pass or correct”, whereas over a penalty double over Majors, the bid would indicate an independent spade suit.

The Director:

Gathered these facts but found no reason to change the score.

Ruling: Result Stands

East/West appealed.

The Players:

West told the Committee that over a Double over their 2 \diamond , which showed diamonds, they just bid as if there had been no Double. But when the Double would show penalty over one or both Majors, they would bid their own suit, or pass without an own suit.

The Committee:

Asked the pair if they could show this system on paper, but they could not. They did not play exactly the same defence over a Multi-2 \diamond opening, as there would be far less likely that a double in that case would be a penalty for majors.

Since they were deemed unable to provide proof of that their system was as they described it, the Committee found that there was no reason to rule in favour of East/West.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A

Deposit: Returned.

Appeal No 21.

Misinformation - No Damage

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Open Teams Round 20

Germany v Monaco

Board 10. Dealer East. Game All.

	♠ 2		
	♥ -		
	♦ A K Q 7 4 2		
	♣ A 10 9 7 6 4		
♠ A K 10 9		♠ Q J 8 5 4 3	
♥ A J 8 4		♥ Q 6 2	
♦ J 6		♦ 9 5	
♣ K J 5		♣ Q 2	
	♠ 7 6		
	♥ K 10 9 7 5 3		
	♦ 10 8 3		
	♣ 8 3		
West	North	East	South
<i>Guglielmi</i>	<i>Frerichs</i>	<i>Gavino</i>	<i>Wenning</i>
		Pass	Pass
1NT	2NT	3♥	Pass
3NT	Pass	4♠	Pass
Pass	Dble	All Pass	

Contract: Four Spades doubled, played by East.

Lead: ♣8

Result: ten tricks, +790 to East/West.

The Facts:

Two No-Trumps showed any two-suiter, in a good hand. East's 3♥ was intended as a transfer to spades, and explained to North in that way.

When the tray came to the South/West side however, the following sequence of events occurred:

- South waited for an alert, which did not come;
- West asked for the meaning of 2NT;
- South wrote “any good two suiter”
- West read on the paper “4♥+4♠“, which had been an explanation of a few boards earlier.
- South passed
- West bid 3NT
- The tray got passed through, and meanwhile West explained the 3♥ bid as showing a stopper

When the tray later came back with the 4♠ bid, there was first some confusion, after which it became clear that West had read the wrong line. South and West then called the Director, who told them to continue the bidding. After the play, North recalled the Director, claiming that if he had got the information that 3♥ showed a stopper, he would have not have doubled, but defended in Five Diamonds.

The Director:

Did not see there was any link between the misinformation and the possible damage.

Ruling: Result Stands

North/South appealed.

The Players:

West and South explained the happenings at their side of the screen, as set out above. West added that he did in fact alert before South was able to pass, but this was denied by South.

North explained that he had not acted over 3NT, hoping the opponents would play there.

The Committee:

Was sympathetic to West’s mistake. South did in fact receive misinformation, but in the Committee’s view this was not damaging to South.

The Committee further concluded that North had received correct information, and that the bad result was due to his decision to double, and to South’s lead, but not to any form of infraction by East/West.

The Committee’s decision:

Director’s decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A

Deposit: Returned, mainly due to the complexity of the problem in South/
West.

Appeal No 22.

Misinformation - No Damage

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Open Teams Round 20

Spain v Slovenia

Board 10. Dealer East. Game All.

	♠ 2		
	♥ -		
	♦ A K Q 7 4 2		
	♣ A 10 9 7 6 4		
♠ A K 10 9		♠ Q J 8 5 4 3	
♥ A J 8 4		♥ Q 6 2	
♦ J 6		♦ 9 5	
♣ K J 5		♣ Q 2	
	♠ 7 6		
	♥ K 10 9 7 5 3		
	♦ 10 8 3		
	♣ 8 3		

West	North	East	South
<i>Senk</i>	<i>Goded</i>	<i>Ambroz</i>	<i>Lantaron</i>
		Pass	Pass
1NT	2NT	3♦	Pass
3NT	Dble	4♦	Pass
4♠	Dble	All Pass	

Contract: Four Spades doubled, played by West

Result: ten tricks, +790 to East/West

The Facts:

This was the same hand as Appeal 21.

North called the Director at the end of the hand.

Three Diamonds had been explained to him as invitational in Spades, but West had told South it had promised a stopper in Diamonds.

The Director:

Found out that East and West, even after the hand was over, could not agree on the true meaning of Three Diamonds. East said they had recently agreed upon the meaning “invitational in spades”, but West couldn’t recall.

The Director did not see how the different explanation could be the reason for the bad result to North/South.

Ruling: Result Stands

North/South appealed.

The Players:

In the Committee, West stated that East’s explanation had been correct. North said that he had originally planned upon going to 5 or 6 in some minor. But then East had indicated Spades, and West had indicated he lacked spades but was holding a diamond stopper. Therefore North suspected some bad misfits around the table. That was why he had doubled.

North/South told the Committee that there had also been some hesitation in East/West’s bidding. They had not told this to the Director at the table. East/West disputed there had been more than normal breaks in tempo. They had of course alerted and explained their actions, but had not paused for thought in the bidding.

The Committee:

Decided not to consider any breaks in tempo. Since these had not been brought to the attention of the Director at the table, there was now no way to properly establish whether or not there had been unauthorised information.

The Committee would give a ruling on misinformation, since East/West were unable to prove that either explanation was correct.

However, the Committee found the link between the possible misinformation and North’s decision to double too small to warrant giving an adjusted score. North decided to double Four Spades and should live with the consequences. As to East/West, the Committee decided they could be allowed to keep their good score, as they were guilty of nothing worse than incomplete agreements. Often, a bidding misunderstanding leads to a bad score. When occasionally it leads to a good one, the mere fact of the misunderstanding is not enough reason to take the good score away.

The Committee’s decision:

Director’s decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 40A

Deposit: Returned, but only just.

Appeal No 23.

Procedural Penalty

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Senior Teams Round 17

The Facts:

One of the players of this match was 3 minutes late to arrive at the table.

The Director:

Applied the penalty, prescribed in the regulations.

Ruling: IVP Penalty

The Player appealed.

The Player:

Is a well known personality, who had been in an official meeting prior to the match.

He thought it was unfair to his team to punish them for his engagements.

He always plays fast enough and in fact ended the match with almost half an hour to spare.

The Committee:

Noted that the regulations contain automatic penalties for some good reasons.

The Committee did not accept the excuse for being late and did not think that the case should have been put before the Committee.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Regulation B.2.1

Deposit: Forfeited

Appeal No 24.

Misinformation

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Herman De Wael sat in on the meeting to be able to act as Scribe.

Ladies Teams Round 18

Italy v Belgium

Board 6. Dealer East. East/West Game.

	♠ 7 5 4		
	♥ 10 9 6 4		
	♦ J 7 5		
	♣ 9 8 7		
♠ A 2		♠ K J 6 3	
♥ K Q 8 5 3 2		♥ A J 7	
♦ -		♦ A K Q 10 8 4	
♣ K 6 4 3 2		♣ -	
	♠ Q 10 9 8		
	♥ -		
	♦ 9 6 3 2		
	♣ A Q J 10 5		
West	North	East	South
<i>Jeunen C</i>	<i>Rosetta</i>	<i>Hardeman</i>	<i>De Lucchi</i>
		2♣	Pass
2NT	Pass	4NT	Pass
6♥	Pass	7♥	Dble
7NT	Pass	Pass	Dble
All Pass			

Contract: Seven No-Trumps, doubled, played by West.

Lead: Ten of Hearts

Result: thirteen tricks, +2490 to East/West

The Facts:

Two Clubs could show any of three possibilities: weak with 4-4 in the Majors, any Semi-Game-Forcing hand, or a very strong balanced hand (24+).

Two-No-Trumps was a strong forcing relay, showing 14 points or more, but the meaning of rest of the bidding was not clear:

According to West, 4NT showed the strong balanced hand, and 6♥ was natural, with the intention of playing there. According to East, 4NT was Blackwood, and she explained to North that she was uncertain of the situation and that she regarded the call of 6♥ to be natural but that it could also be 2 aces and a heart void.

The Director:

Did not find any damage.

Ruling: Result Stands

North/South appealed.

The Players:

North explained that after the explanation that maybe West held a heart void, South could well have the Ace in that suit, and this is why she led Hearts.

East explained that all she had wanted to know after partner had shown 14 points, was the number of Aces. They don't play answers at the six level, so all she did was answer to North: "I don't understand nothing" (sic)

West explained she had bid Seven No-Trumps, because nobody knew about her second suit.

The Committee:

Was quite clear: Life is like that. More often than not, you benefit from opponent's errors.

The Committee felt the appeal basically had no merit but decided not to keep the deposit because of the confusion in the bidding at the high level.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 40A

Deposit: Returned, but only just.

Appeal No 25.

Misinformation - No Damage

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Open Teams Round 24

Croatia v Monaco

Board 16. Dealer West. East/West Game.

	♠ K 10 9 2	
	♥ J 10	
	♦ 3	
	♣ A Q J 6 4 2	
♠ 8 4		♠ Q 6 5 3
♥ Q 8 7 5		♥ A K 9 3
♦ A J 9 7 6 4		♦ 10
♣ 10		♣ 9 7 5 3
	♠ A J 7	
	♥ 6 4 2	
	♦ K Q 8 5 2	
	♣ K 8	

West	North	East	South
<i>Guglielmi</i>	<i>Miladin</i>	<i>Gavino</i>	<i>Diklic</i>
Pass	2♣	Pass	2♦
Pass	2♠	Pass	3♦
Dble	Pass	3♥	3♠
4♥	Pass	Pass	Dble
All Pass			

Contract: Four Hearts, doubled, played by East.

Result: six tricks, -1100 to East/West

The Facts:

Two Clubs showed 11-16, six cards in clubs, Two Diamonds was a relay, and Two Spades showed exactly four cards in spades. Three Diamonds was explained as forcing by South to West, but as non-forcing by North to East.

The Director:

Ruled that there had been misinformation and that West would not open the bidding if he had received the other explanation.

Although he could not tell in which contract North/South would end up, several of them would end up one down.

Ruling: Score adjusted to –50 to North/South

North/South appealed.

The Players:

North/South were unclear about the meaning of Three Diamonds. Their system notes were quite elaborate about the meaning of Two No-Trumps (the next asking relay), but nothing was there about the alternatives.

According to South, West had doubled first, and only later asked about the meaning of Three Diamonds. West denied this.

West explained that over the forcing Three Diamonds, he doubled to show his diamond suit, meanwhile also asking for the lead. When his partner bid a (in his view) free Three Hearts, he felt he should raise this to Four, because he thought that partner had good hearts and something in diamonds.

East explained that since to him Three Diamonds had been explained as non forcing, he interpreted the double to be for Take-Out, so he duly bid his heart suit.

South told the Committee that he had explained his bid of Three Spades also as forcing.

The Committee:

Accepted that the double had been misexplained to West, and would have ruled in favour of East/West in case the auction had ended in Three Hearts doubled.

The Committee found that West - whose partner had not overcalled in hearts, and having been told that both 3♦ and 3♠ were forcing - had produced a bad bid in going for Four Hearts, and that East/West should keep their – 1100 as a result.

The Committee felt that North/South, although they had contributed in the mistake, would be allowed to keep their good score.

The Committee did not find it normal that a pair come to European Championships without an understanding about the second level bidding of a quite normal, uncontested bidding sequence.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision overturned, original table result restored.

North/South fined half a VP for different explanation in a simple auction.

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A

Law 74B I

Deposit: Returned

Appeal No 26.

Hesitation

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Open Teams Round 25

Ireland v Portugal

Board 20. Dealer West. Game All.

	♠ 9 7		
	♥ A K 9 8 7 6 5		
	♦ 8 3		
	♣ 10 2		
♠ K 8 5 4 3 2		♠ A Q 10	
♥ 10 2		♥ Q 3	
♦ J 7		♦ 10 9 5 4 2	
♣ A 9 8		♣ J 7 6	
	♠ J 6		
	♥ J 4		
	♦ A K Q 6		
	♣ K Q 5 4 3		
West	North	East	South
<i>Sa</i>	<i>Keaveney</i>	<i>Barbosa</i>	<i>Timlin</i>
2♠	Pass	3♠	Pass
Pass	4♥	All Pass	

Contract: Four Hearts, played by North

Result: ten tricks, +620 to North/South

The Facts:

Two Spades was weak, and Three Spades was pre-emptive, partner should not bid Four.

The tray had come back from South/West, after a considerable delay. All the players agreed the break in tempo had been of the order of 90 seconds.

The Director:

Found that Four Hearts by North was an action that was suggested by the break in tempo and that Passing would have been a Logical Alternative.

Ruling: Score adjusted to -200 to East/West

North/South appealed.

The Players:

Did not deny the break in tempo.

North explained he was not able to bid Three Hearts in his system, but when he learnt from East that East/West did not have game values, he felt that Four Hearts was a self-evident call.

He had asked about the meaning of 3♠ once again, especially since he was aware of the pause and knew the Director would be called. He explained his decision by counting points. His partner held at least the values of a weak No-Trump opening, and he would always raise that to game on this hand. He thought some 90% of players would bid 4♥ on his hand.

East/West pointed out that the break in tempo makes the call of 4♥ to be less risky.

The Committee:

Found the call of Four Hearts to be quite reasonable, but was not certain that it was the only Logical alternative. A 7222 distribution with 6½ losers is not very good, and two spade losers are very likely. The hesitation took away all doubts that could very well have remained in a substantial minority of players. Ton Kooijman's analysis in a previous article suggests that the definition of a logical alternative in the EBL should be:

A Logical Alternative is any action that would be taken by some of the players' peers, where some has to be interpreted as around 25%.

The Committee felt that Pass was a logical alternative.

The Committee also found that the Director had been wrong in calculating the Adjusted score. If North is deemed to have passed, West will play three Spades and is very likely to make 8 tricks.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision changed, Score adjusted to Three Spades down One, -100 to East/West.

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A, Law 12C2

Deposit: Returned

Appeal No 27.

Claim, Acquiescence

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Grattan Endicott (Scribe, Great Britain), Naki Bruni (Italy), Anton Maas (the Netherlands), Krzysztof Martens (Poland).

Open Teams Round 27

France v Hungary

Board 16. Dealer West. East/West Game.

	♠ K Q J 5		
	♥ K J 6 5		
	♦ 8		
	♣ 8 6 5 3		
♠ 8 6 3 2		♠ A 7 4	
♥ 8 4		♥ Q 10 9 2	
♦ K 5		♦ Q 7 6	
♣ A K Q 10 4		♣ J 9 7	
	♠ 10 9		
	♥ A 7 3		
	♦ A J 10 9 4 3 2		
	♣ 2		

West

Bitran

1♣

Dble

North

Szalay

Pass

All Pass

East

Voltaire

1♦

South

Szilagyi

4♦

Contract: Four Diamonds, played by South.

Lead: Ace of Clubs

Play:	West	North	East	South
	♣A	♣3	♣7	♣2
	♥8	♥5	♥9	♥A
	♦5	♦8	♦6	♦A
	♦K	xx	♦7	♦J

Result: claimed for nine tricks by South, -100 to North/South

The Facts:

One Diamond showed hearts.

The Director had earlier been called to this table, during the auction of this deal, by South, who complained that when he had asked about the meaning of the Double, West had responded in a loud voice “punitif!”.

That had however nothing to do with the later ruling, or with this appeal. After trick four, South claimed the remainder of the tricks, minus the queen of diamonds and the ace of spades, that is a total of nine tricks. A score of -100 was entered on the score form.

27 minutes after the end of the match, the defenders came to the Director, wishing to withdraw acquiescence to the claim. When West returns a heart in trick five, there is no way the defence can avoid going two down.

The Director:

Applied Law 69B, which says that a trick is transferred only when all normal lines of play result in a different outcome. He considered a club or spade return also as normal.

Ruling: Result Stands

East/West appealed.

The Players:

East showed the Committee that he was quite aware of how the play had gone so far.

South admitted that he had improperly claimed before West had the chance to return the Heart.

East/West stated they had acquiesced in the claim, counting on the good intentions of South, and because of time pressure.

The Committee:

Read Law 69B:

Within the correction period established in accordance with Law 79C, a contestant may withdraw acquiescence in an opponent’s claim, but only if he has acquiesced in the loss of a trick his side has actually won, or in the loss of trick that could not, in the Director’s judgement, be lost by any normal play of the remaining cards. The board is rescored with such trick awarded to the acquiescing side.

and the footnote which defines the word “normal”:

For the Purposes of Laws 69, 70 and 71, “normal” includes play that would be careless or inferior for the class of player involved, but not irrational.

The withdrawal of the acquiescence was within the correction period, so the Director, and now the Committee, had to decide whether or not there were

normal lines that lead to nine tricks. If any of those lines could be found, the claim had to stand.

The Committee noted that in the definition of the word “normal”, there is a reference to the class of player, which was in this case very high.

The Committee came to a first conclusion that said that if West returns a Heart, no normal line will then lead to anything more than eight tricks.

So the Committee had to decide on the normality of some other return than a heart at trick five.

The Committee regretted that South had claimed at precisely this moment.

The Committee accepted that it would be irrational for a player of West’s ability to do anything other than continue with the hearts. He had already shown, by discontinuing his Club start at trick two, that he had read East’s length signal on trick one, and he is able to recognize that there is no imperative to lead a Spade – the trick cannot disappear. Furthermore, his partner’s nine was very helpful. A player of his quality will not get it wrong.

The Committee’s decision:

Score adjusted to eight tricks, -300 to North South

Relevant Laws:

Law 69B

Deposit: Returned

Separate decision of **The Committee:**

The Committee took note of the happenings earlier on the board and found the alleged events disturbing. The Committee asked the Director to investigate, giving the ruling he had not given at the time, and applying a penalty if this appeared appropriate.

(The Director subsequently held his investigation and decided to give a warning but no penalty)

Appeal No 28.

Misexplanation - No Damage

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Grattan Endicott (Great Britain), Anton Maas (the Netherlands), Krzysztof Martens (Poland).

Ladies Teams Round 16

Israel v Sweden

Board 10. Dealer East. Game All.

	♠ 10 9 6 4		
	♥ J 7 4 2		
	♦ Q 9 6		
	♣ 8 2		
♠ 2		♠ Q J 8 5	
♥ Q 5		♥ K 10 6 3	
♦ J 10 8 2		♦ K 7	
♣ A K J 9 7 5		♣ Q 4 3	
	♠ A K 7 3		
	♥ A 9 8		
	♦ A 5 4 3		
	♣ 10 6		
West	North	East	South
<i>Goldberg</i>	<i>Zur-Campanile</i>	<i>Gronkvist</i>	<i>Levit-Porat</i>
		I♥	INT
Dble	All Pass		

Contract: One No-Trump, doubled, played by South

Result: five tricks, -500 to North/South

The Facts:

This is the same hand as on appeal 29.

West had intended her double as penalty, and had not alerted it. East explained the double to be Take-Out. North called the Director, saying that if she had known East could pass the double, she would have bid Two Clubs, waited for the Double, and Redouble for SOS to finally find the Spade contract.

The Director:

Accepted that it was a case of misexplanation but judged all other possible results to be equal to –500.

Ruling: No Damage - Result Stands

North/South appealed.

The Players:

North explained that she had written on a piece of paper “is it penalty or take-out”, to which West had answered by underlining take-out. That paper was available at the hearing.

East stated she had at first tried to explain that the Double showed either four cards in spades and the other suits, or some good hand. She had also written 8+ on a paper, but this paper was no longer to be found. She agreed that she had answered Take-Out by underlining this, but stressed that the Take-Out double promises 8+ HCP.

West stated that the double showed 8+, nothing else.

East explained why she had passed the double if she did not believe it to be for penalties, by stating that she had no other suit to run to and wanted to defend.

North claimed that it was not certain that they would end up in Two Spades doubled. The opponents might have bid on. They might decide not to double. She might go less than two down.

The Committee:

Decided that the Director had ruled correctly. There had indeed been misinformation. However, there was no reason to believe that any alternative contract to one No-Trump doubled would not be at least two down doubled, which made the appeal without merit.

The Committee’s decision:

Director’s decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, Law 12C2

Deposit: Forfeited

Appeal No 29.

Inference from Opponent's Action

Appeals Committee:

Anton Maas (Chairman, the Netherlands), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Grattan Endicott (Great Britain), , Krzysztof Martens (Poland).

Ladies Teams Round 16

Denmark v Iceland

Board 10. Dealer East. Game All.

	♠ 10 9 6 4		
	♥ J 7 4 2		
	♦ Q 9 6		
	♣ 8 2		
♠ 2		♠ Q J 8 5	
♥ Q 5		♥ K 10 6 3	
♦ J 10 8 2		♦ K 7	
♣ A K J 9 7 5		♣ Q 4 3	
	♠ A K 7 3		
	♥ A 9 8		
	♦ A 5 4 3		
	♣ 10 6		

West
Cilleborg

North
Esther

East
Kofoed
Pass

South
Ljosbra
INT

All Pass

Contract: One No-Trump, played by South

Result: four tricks, -300 to North/South

The Facts:

This appeal was on the same hand as appeal 28.

North took some time to pass over One No-Trump and this influenced East into inaction.

At the end of the play, East called the Director. She claimed she would have reopened the bidding with a Double, which West would have left in.

The Director:

Asked North to confirm the nature and length of the pause. She had indeed showed a slight hesitation, thinking of bidding Two Clubs, which was non-forcing Stayman.

The Director ruled that North had had a bridge reason for her actions and that therefore East had drawn inferences at her own risk.

Ruling: Result Stands

East/West appealed.

The Players:

North explained that she had indeed thought about initiating a non-forcing Stayman sequence. She may have shown this to East. South stated that at that side the hesitation was not noticed.

The Committee:

Decided that the Director had ruled correctly.

Law 73F2 says:

if the Director determines that an innocent player has drawn a false inference from a remark, manner, tempo, or the like, of an opponent who has no demonstrable bridge reason for the action, and who could have known, at the time of the action, that the action could work to his benefit, the Director shall award an adjusted score (see Law 12C)

The Committee decided that North did have a bridge reason for her slight pause, and that therefore the inference that East took was completely at her own risk.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 73F2, Law 73D1

Deposit: Returned, but only just

Appeal No 30.

Hesitation

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (Great Britain), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Open Teams Round 29

Israel v Czech Republic

Board 5. Dealer North. North/South Game.

	♠ 9		
	♥ J 8		
	♦ K Q 10 7 4 3 2		
	♣ Q 8 5		
♠ 8 5 3		♠ A K Q 6 4	
♥ A K 4 3 2		♥ Q 5	
♦ 6		♦ A J 9 8	
♣ J 10 4 3		♣ A 6	
	♠ J 10 7 2		
	♥ 10 9 7 6		
	♦ 5		
	♣ K 9 7 2		
West	North	East	South
<i>Svoboda</i>	<i>Tur</i>	<i>Kurka</i>	<i>Greenberg</i>
	3♦	Pass	Pass
Dble	All Pass		

Contract: Three Diamond doubled, played by North

Result: six trick, -800 to North/South.

The Facts:

This board also featured in appeal 33.

North called the Director when the dummy came down. He told the Director that East had been thinking for a long time before passing, and that this might have influenced West in doubling. Neither South, nor his Captain, who was scoring at his side, had called the Director. South had even gone to the toilet immediately after spreading his hand.

The Director:

Found that since South did apparently not remark the hesitation it is not clear that there had in fact been unauthorised information for West, who was therefore free to double.

The Director also pointed out that North was dealer, and that a pause is therefore less clearly attributable to East.

Ruling: Result Stands

East/West appealed.

The Players:

East admitted that he had thought for about one minute. North had been very quick in bidding Three Diamonds, and he had to work out what was best for him. First he thought of bidding 3NT, but in the end, he chose to take the certain route to +300 or +400 by passing.

North stated that he could not call the Director any earlier than he did.

South stated that he did remark the break in tempo, and even checked the board to see who was dealer.

West said he did not remark the hesitation, since it was the first round of bidding.

The Committee:

Was unanimous in deciding that West should have passed if he had been in the possession of unauthorised information.

The Committee was divided in its determination of this unauthorised information.

All the members agreed that in the first round of bidding, it is unwise to stick to a strict application of the 15 second rule (note).

A majority in the Committee felt that the pause of 1 minute is for sure enough to be considered unauthorised information.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to Three Diamonds, not doubled, down three, -300 to North/South

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A, Law 12C2

Deposit: Returned

Minority Opinion: by Peter Lund and Herman De Wael

We are strongly of the opinion that it should be the partner at the side of the screen opposite the hesitation (in this case South), who should call in some way attention to the perceived hesitation, and thus prove that the unauthorised information reached the other side. We feel that South did exactly the opposite, by leaving the table after tabling his dummy. In the absence of proof that West was in the possession of unauthorised information, we feel that the result should have stood.

Note:

“the 15 second rule”

In the Conditions of Contest, in use in Malta, there was a regulation :

C.1.3 The International Code of Duplicate Laws is in effect except as specified below:

...

LAW 73D:

...

A delay of the bidding tray on one side of the screen of up to 15 seconds (at any time during the auction and whether or not out of tempo) shall not give rise to any inference of unauthorized information. Players are advised to vary the time the tray is passed so that pauses of up to 15 seconds can be considered normal.

Appeal No 31.

Psychic Call

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (Great Britain), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Open Teams Round 29

Portugal v Romania

Board 15. Dealer South. North/South Game.

	♠ K Q 10 4		
	♥ A Q 5 3		
	♦ 10		
	♣ K 6 5 4		
♠ J 9 6 2		♠ 7 5 3	
♥ 10 9		♥ J 8 2	
♦ Q J 7 4 2		♦ A K 8 6 5	
♣ 10 2		♣ A 7	
	♠ A 8		
	♥ K 7 6 4		
	♦ 9 3		
	♣ Q J 9 8 3		
West	North	East	South
<i>Popescu</i>	<i>Diegues</i>	<i>Feber</i>	<i>Castanheira</i>
Pass	1♣	1♦	Pass
1♥	2♦	Pass	Dble
All Pass			3♣

Contract: Three Clubs, played by North

Result: 11 tricks, +150 to North/South

The Facts:

One Heart was a psychic call.

The Director:

Applied Law 40A, and found no evidence of anything wrong in East/West.

Ruling: Result Stands

North/South appealed.

The Players:

North/South felt that East should have bid 2♥ or even 3♥. They have 8 cards in hearts (or that is what East should believe), so why did they let North/South play 2♦ or 3♣?

West stated that with a hand like this, he would try a psyche of this nature even in an individual tournament. There can be no question of illegal partnership understanding. One partner lives in Paris, the other in Romania. They had met only once in the past 12 years, and the Romanian federation decided to align them in partnership only two weeks before the tournament. Since then, they had played with each other for 50 boards over the Internet, and of course a few hundred boards here.

East stated he did not find it right to raise to Two Hearts when South had made a negative Double and North had made the strong bid of Two Diamonds.

West found the usage of the words “controlled psyche” by opponents inappropriate.

The Committee:

Found that the Director had done enough to ascertain that East/West were not guilty of anything untoward.

This was a psyche, as permitted by Law 40A.

A player may make any call or play (including an intentionally misleading call — such as a psychic bid — or a call or play that departs from commonly accepted, or previously announced, use of a convention), without prior announcement, provided that such call or play is not based on a partnership understanding.

The Committee was of the opinion that this case should not have been brought to the Committee.

The Committee’s decision:

Director’s decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 40A

Deposit: Forfeited

Appeal No 32.

Hesitation

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Grattan Endicott (Great Britain), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands).

Open Teams Round 30

Poland v Italy

Board 2. Dealer East. North/South Game.

	♠ J 9		
	♥ A J 10 9 2		
	♦ J 4 3 2		
	♣ A 7		
♠ K 10 7 3		♠ A 8 5 4 2	
♥ 8 6 5		♥ K Q 7 4 3	
♦ A K 9 7		♦ 10	
♣ 8 2		♣ 6 3	
	♠ Q 6		
	♥ -		
	♦ Q 8 6 5		
	♣ K Q J 10 9 5 4		
West	North	East	South
<i>Duboin</i>	<i>Tuszynski</i>	<i>Bocchi</i>	<i>Jassem</i>
2♠	Pass	2♣	Pass
Pass	Pass	Pass	3♣
3♠	Dble	Dble	Redble
All Pass		Pass	4♣

Contract: Four Clubs, played by South.

Result: seven tricks, -300 to North/South

The Facts:

Two clubs showed 3-10 points, at least 4-4 in the Majors. East's Double over 3♣ was for take-out, showing a maximum opening. North's Double was after a hesitation of more than one minute. West called the Director immediately after the call of Four Clubs.

The Director:

Changed the result

Ruling: Score adjusted to Three Spades doubled, made, +530 to East/West.

North/South appealed.**The Players:**

North admitted his pause for thought. East/West told it was 5 minutes long. North had never seen this auction. First an intervention of 3♣, and then a Redouble. It must mean a good suit, and something more. He was trying to work out how South would interpret his Double and finally came to the conclusion that he could indeed Double, knowing that South would understand it as asking for a spade stopper in order to play 3NT.

South explained that his Redouble would normally show some offensive values.

West pointed out that it was clear that North/South had not discussed this sequence, but that by thinking for 5 minutes North transferred the meaning that the Double was not for penalties.

The Committee:

Considered the hesitation to be proven.

The Committee concluded that the answers to three questions were all that was needed, and that these were surprisingly easy:

- 1) was there unauthorised information? Yes
- 2) did the unauthorised information suggest bidding? Yes
- 3) is Pass a logical alternative? Yes

The decision was then so straightforward that the Committee was close to keeping the money.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A, Law 12C2

Deposit: Returned, but only just

Appeal No 33.

Prior Disclosure of System

Appeals Committee:

Anton Maas (Chairman, the Netherlands), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Peter Lund (Denmark).

Open Teams Round 29

Iceland v Cyprus

Board 5. Dealer North. North/South Game.

	♠ 9		
	♥ J 8		
	♦ K Q 10 7 4 3 2		
	♣ Q 8 5		
♠ 8 5 3		♠ A K Q 6 4	
♥ A K 4 3 2		♥ Q 5	
♦ 6		♦ A J 9 8	
♣ J 10 4 3		♣ A 6	
	♠ J 10 7 2		
	♥ 10 9 7 6		
	♦ 5		
	♣ K 9 7 2		
West	North	East	South
<i>Daverona</i>	<i>Magnus</i>	<i>Christofides</i>	<i>Throstur</i>
	3♦	Dble	All Pass

Contract: Three Diamonds doubled, played by North

Result: six tricks, -800 to North/South

The Facts:

This hand also appeared in Appeal 30.

Before the match, North/South presented East/West with a convention card that contained a few changes. East/West agreed to play.

After this hand, North complained to the Director that one of the changes was from Take-Out Doubles over pre-empts to Fishbein (penalty doubles).

North claimed he would not have opened 3♦ if he had known this in advance.

The Director:

Decided that North/South had agree to play, that the change was clearly marked, and that in any case the hand was worth a pre-emptive opening.

Ruling: Result Stands

IVP penalty to East/West for changing their system without the approval of the Appeal Committee.

North/South appealed.

The Players:

East, also the Captain, explained that he had sent in a convention card some weeks before the tournament, and that they had made some alterations during the last weeks of coaching. He had come with a changed convention card to the line-up desk, and apparently they had not told him what to do. He had played the same convention card throughout the tournament and nobody had complained.

North told the Committee that he had strict orders from his captain not to open in his usual aggressive style against penalty doublers.

The Captain told the Committee that Fishbein was one of the conventions he looked for in the opponent's cards, and he told his players before the match. When asked, he could provide the names of at least one pair in the championship that played penalty doubles over pre-empts.

The Committee:

Reached a split decision.

The majority found that North, in accepting to play, had forfeited his rights to prior knowledge of opponent's system. The changes were clearly marked and if North had asked the Director for some extra time, he would have got it. That would have been ample time to agree on the aggressiveness of the pre-empts.

One member of the Committee wanted to be more strict. The system of prior lodging of systems exists to enable captains to prepare their players. The players should not be asked to do their captain's work at the table. It is a very rare occurrence to find that a team is actually damaged through failure to lodge systems, but when it does happen, the Committee should be extremely severe in giving the benefit of the doubt to the non-offenders.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 40E1, Regulation A.6.2

Deposit: Returned

Committee's note:

It is prohibited to play any change in one's Convention Card before the changes have been approved by the chairman of the Appeals Committee.

Appeal No 34.

Hesitation

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Grattan Endicott (Scribe, Great Britain), Krzysztof Martens (Poland).

Open Teams Round 31

Croatia v Bulgaria

Board 8. Dealer West. Love All.

	♠ 10 8 7 5		
	♥ A 10 9 4		
	♦ Q 9 8 6		
	♣ 4		
♠ K J 9 3 2		♠ Q 4	
♥ J		♥ Q 8	
♦ J 5 3 2		♦ A 10 7	
♣ 9 6 2		♣ A K Q 8 7 5	
	♠ A 6		
	♥ K 7 6 5 3 2		
	♦ K 4		
	♣ J 10 3		
West	North	East	South
<i>Miladin</i>	<i>Karaivanov</i>	<i>Diklic</i>	<i>Trendafilov</i>
Pass	Pass	1♣	1♥
Dble	2♠	3♣	4♥
Pass	Pass	Dble	Pass
5♣	All Pass		

Contract: Five Clubs, played by East.

Result: 10 tricks, -50 to East/West

The Facts:

One Club was strong, and the first Double showed 7 points or more. Two spades was artificial and showed heart support. East's Double came after an agreed hesitation of around 45 seconds.

The Director:

Ruled that a Pass for West was a logical alternative to the suggested action of pulling the slow double.

Ruling: Score adjusted to Four Hearts doubled, made, +590 to North/South.

East/West appealed

The Players

East/West explained that the pass of Four Hearts was forcing; on this type of sequence they cannot be pre-empted below their own game level (five clubs) and all passes below that are forcing. They were not able to arrive in five clubs more quickly because their methods are to reverse the usual principle that quick arrival indicates no interest in proceeding further. For this pair the delayed arrival is weaker than the quick arrival which would show a mild interest in slam.

North/South did not wish to comment.

The Committee:

Was surprised to hear of the E/W style of bidding and considered it should be mentioned on the convention card. In the absence of such corroborative evidence, and since there was unauthorised information, the Committee decided against the East/West pair.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A, Law 12C2

Deposit: Returned

Appeal No 35.

Misinformation - No Damage

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Grattan Endicott (Scribe, Great Britain), Krzysztof Martens (Poland).

Open Teams Round 28

Greece v Liechtenstein

Board 13. Dealer North. Game All.

	♠ Q		
	♥ 10 8		
	♦ A 9 8 5 3		
	♣ 10 9 6 5 4		
♠ A J 7 5		♠ 9 8 6 4 3 2	
♥ A K Q J 7 2		♥ 5	
♦ 2		♦ J 7 6 4	
♣ J 8		♣ A Q	
	♠ K 10		
	♥ 9 6 4 3		
	♦ K Q 10		
	♣ K 7 3 2		
West	North	East	South
<i>Cesana</i>	<i>Filios</i>	<i>Zucchini</i>	<i>Papakyriakopoulos</i>
	Pass	Pass	Pass
1♥	Pass	1♠	Pass
4♦	Pass	4NT	Pass
6♠	All Pass		

Contract: Six Spades, played by East

Lead: small Club

Result: 12 tricks, +1430 to East/West

The Facts:

Four Diamonds was alerted by East to North and explained as Splinter, but West explained it to South as a cue-bid.

South claimed he would have led a diamond if he had received the explanation that Four Diamonds was a splinter.

The Director:

Considered the lead of a diamond to be normal whatever the explanation.

Ruling: No Damage - Result Stands

North/South appealed.

The Players:

South stated that, having been informed that the Four Diamond bid was a cue, he assumed the hand lacked a control in Clubs. If not able to take Ace and King, he hoped to find the Queen at least with partner. East and West admitted they had given different explanations of the bid either side of the screen.

The Committee:

Found that there was misinformation but also that there was no damage to North/South in consequence of the misinformation.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A

Deposit: Forfeited

Appeal No 36.

Disputed Facts, Misinformation, Equity

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (Great Britain), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands), Krzysztof Martens (Poland).

Open Teams Round 33

France v Cyprus

Board 5. Dealer North. North/South Game.

	♠ A J 10 8 7 6		
	♥ A		
	♦ K 9 6 4		
	♣ 7 3		
♠ 5 2		♠ 3	
♥ 10 5 4 2		♥ Q 9 8	
♦ A 10 8 7		♦ Q J 5 3 2	
♣ K J 10		♣ A 9 5 4	
	♠ K Q 9 4		
	♥ K J 7 6 3		
	♦ -		
	♣ Q 8 6 2		
West	North	East	South
<i>Multon</i>	<i>Koumas</i>	<i>Mari</i>	<i>Politis</i>
	1♠	Pass	4♦
Pass	5♦	Pass	5♠
Pass	6♠	All Pass	

Contract: Six Spades, played by North

Lead: queen of diamonds

Result: 12 tricks, +1430 to North/South

The Facts:

Four Diamonds was explained on both sides as Splinter, but there was some disagreement about how and when this was done.

According to West who asked about the meaning of 4♦ when the tray came back with 5♦, South said “Splinter” and only wrote it when West insisted.

According to South, he had never said anything, and only written the response.

East stated he had heard South, on the other side of the screen, say “Splinter”, and North immediately thereafter said “of course 4♦ is splinter” before he bid 6♠.

North stated he had alerted 4♦, East had asked nothing and North said he had heard nothing.

The Director:

Applied Law 85B:

If the Director is unable to determine the facts to his satisfaction, he shall make a ruling that will permit play to continue, and notify the players of their right to appeal

He ruled there had been no unauthorised information.

Ruling: Result Stands

East/West appealed.

The Players:

Repeated their statements to the Director. East/West maintained that South had spoken, North/South denied this.

North called his decision to go to slam a gamble, and he explained his decision to bypass naming the Heart control in the same manner: he did not want to tell the opponents.

East tried to explain why he had led a diamond. He was certain from the bidding that North controlled the clubs and the hearts.

During the explanations, it became obvious that North/South had a different definition of “Splinter” than what is the general understanding. When asked, both North and South explained that to them, a splinter showed trump agreement and a first round control, Ace or void.

The Committee:

Found that there was no clear evidence that North had used unauthorised information in bidding the slam.

There had however been misexplanation towards East, and the Committee decided to take away the diamond lead from East.

The Committee was not certain that East would always find a club lead, and decided to use Law 12C3:

An appeals committee may vary an assigned adjusted score in order to do equity.

The Committee decided to award the lead of clubs, and the slam going down, in 70% of the cases.

The Committee’s decision:

Score adjusted to the weighted average of:

70% of Six Spades going one down, -100 to North/South

30% of Six Spades making, +1430 to North/South

The same score should go to both sides.

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, Law 12C3

Deposit: Returned

Final result of the match:

The result at the other table was +680 to North/South.

The balance is then:

$70\% \text{ of } (-100-680 = -13\text{IMPs}) + 30\% \text{ of } (+1430-680 = +13\text{IMPs}) = -5.2 \text{ IMPs}$,
rounded in favour of the non-offending side, so 6 IMPs in favour of the team
of East/West at this table (France).

Appeal No 37.

Inference from Opponent's Action

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (Great Britain), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands), Krzysztof Martens (Poland).

Open Teams Round 33

France v Cyprus

Board 20. Dealer West. Game All.

	♠ -	
	♥ J 4	
	♦ K Q J 8 6 5 3	
	♣ Q J 8 7	
♠ A J 4 2		♠ 9 8 7 5 3
♥ A K 10 8 2		♥ Q 9 7 5
♦ 10 9 2		♦ A
♣ K		♣ 9 6 4
	♠ K Q 10 6	
	♥ 6 3	
	♦ 7 4	
	♣ A 10 5 3 2	

West	North	East	South
<i>Multon</i>	<i>Koumas</i>	<i>Mari</i>	<i>Politis</i>
1♥	2♦	3♥	Pass
4♥	Pass	Pass	Dble
All Pass			

Contract: Four Hearts doubled, played by West.

Result: 9 tricks, -200 to East/West

The Facts:

Three Hearts was a limit bid.

South asked about the meaning of Three Hearts before passing.

North thought before his pass, and this hesitation was not denied.

West thought to conclude from South's actions that the trumps might be 0-4, and so he played a spade from the table at trick two. When this was ruffed by North, there was no way he could avoid going one down.

The Director:

Ruled that South did indeed have a bridge problem, which makes that West takes the conclusions from South's hesitations at his own risk

Ruling: Result Stands

East/West appealed.

The Players:

West took the view that South should not double without four trumps, after the hesitation by North. He explained that his plan was logical given these considerations.

The Committee:

Decided that the Director had ruled correctly when he let the score stand. West could easily well have concluded that South's hesitation after 3♥ may well have been an indication that South held four spades. There was clearly no damage to East/West.

The Committee's decision:

Director's decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 73D1

Deposit: Forfeited

Appeal No 38.

Card Played

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Grattan Endicott (Great Britain), Peter Lund (Denmark), Anton Maas (the Netherlands), Krzysztof Martens (Poland).

Open Teams Round 34

Italy v Ireland

Board 15. Dealer South. North/South Game.

	♠ Q 10 7		
	♥ Q 10 8		
	♦ K Q 7		
	♣ 7 6 5 3		
♠ 8 6 5 4		♠ A J 9	
♥ J 9 5 3 2		♥ K 6	
♦ A 8 3		♦ J 10 9 4	
♣ 4		♣ A K J 4	
	♠ K 3 2		
	♥ A 7 4		
	♦ 6 5 2		
	♣ Q 10 8 2		
West	North	East	South
<i>Timlin</i>	<i>De Falco</i>	<i>Keaveney</i>	<i>Ferraro</i>
Pass	Pass	1NT	Pass
2♣	Pass	2♦	Pass
2♥	Pass	2NT	All Pass

Contract: Two No-Trumps

Lead: two of spades

Result: eight tricks, +120 to East/West

The Facts:

After six tricks, this was what was left:

	♠ -	
	♥ Q	
	♦ K 7	
	♣ 7 6 5 3	
♠ 8		♠ -
♥ J 9 5		♥ -
♦ A 8		♦ J 9 4
♣ 4		♣ A K J 4
	♠ -	
	♥ 7	
	♦ 5 2	
	♣ Q 10 8 2	

Declarer East now played small diamond to dummy and called for the eight. North thought he heard the “ace” and played the seven.

The Director:

Established that the eight had been called for, and ruled that the seven was played. The eight made the trick.

Ruling: trick seven to dummy with the eight.

North/South appealed.

The Players:

North admitted that he had played before the dummy had touched the card that was called for. He pointed out that declarer spoke in a very strange accent.

East also related the story, during which several members of the Committee had to ask whether he said “eight” or “ace”, since both sounded something like “aitch”.

When West related the story, the same similarity in pronunciation was noticeable.

The Committee:

Found that the Director had ruled correctly.

Dummy had played the card that declarer had called out. North should not have played too soon.

The Committee’s decision:

Director’s decision upheld.

Relevant Laws:

Law 45B

Deposit: Returned, because the Committee had experienced first hand the same language difficulties that North had faced.



Anton Maas, Naki Bruni, Peter Lund, Jens Auken and Herman De Wael, who sat on more than 80% of the Appeals Committees in Malta.