

The European Bridge League

Appeals Booklet 2001

Including the appeals from:
The European Open & Senior Pairs
Championships, Sorrento

and

The European Teams & Ladies Pairs
Championships, Tenerife

FOREWORD

In Malta during June 1999 the Executive of the European Bridge League decided for the first time to publish a special collection of all the Appeals Committee decisions made in the Generali European Championships for Open Teams, Ladies Teams, Senior Teams and Ladies Pairs. For the same Championships held in Tenerife, Spain June 2001 the EBL has now produced a second publication containing the Appeals from this event

In this booklet the EBL has also included the Decisions from the European Pairs Championships held in Sorrento, Italy 2001. There are 41 decisions from Tenerife and 10 from Sorrento.

The high number of appeals in Tenerife was a slight surprise. Following the introduction of the WBF Code of Practice and its adoption by the EBL, which made it possible for Tournament Directors to make “the right decisions” at the bridgetables in all cases, experience at both WBF and EBL events showed that Appeals declined by more than 50 %. In Tenerife there was no decline at all. The reason for this I don't know, but it could be just a coincidence.

It is the intention of the EBL Executive Committee that, by publishing these decisions, the EBL will influence the interpretation of the bridge laws in the right direction both in Europe and in the rest of the World. EBL also hopes you will find them interesting to read.

I would like to use this opportunity to thank the members of the EBL Appeals Committee for the great effort they made and also to extend my special thanks to Herman De Wael and Grattan Endicott who scribed all the decisions.

JensAuken

**Member of the EBL Executive Committee
Chairman of the Appeals Committee**

Sorrento: Appeal No. I

Hungary v England

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Krzysztof Martens (Poland)

Open Pairs Qualifying 1st session

Board 6. Dealer East. East/West Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Mrs Robson</i>	<i>Gabos</i>	<i>Weir</i>	<i>Harsanyi</i>
		1♦	Pass
1♥	2♦	Dbf	Pass
3♠	Pass	5♥	Pass
6♥	Pass	Pass	Dbf
All Pass			

Comments: 2♦ showed the black suits.

Contract: 6 Hearts Doubled, played by West

Lead: Ace of clubs, followed by a diamond switch

Result: 12 tricks, NS -1660

The Facts:

Three Spades was intended as a splinter, and explained as such by West to South. East explained it as natural, four cards, even despite the two-suiter in North.

North led the Ace of clubs, to which South contributed the five, showing count. North continued with diamonds after which the slam was made. North stated that he would certainly have led a spade if he had known there was a singleton with declarer.

The Director:

Found that North-South were to blame for their poor result, since South should have been able to signal for a spade.

Ruling:

Self-inflicted damage. Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

North/South appealed.

Present:

All players

The Players:

North explained that if declarer really has four spades, the spade return is not necessary to defeat the contract if it can be defeated. But if he knows there is a singleton spade in declarer's hand, the spade switch is easily found.

East explained that they did not have many systemic agreements over the bid of 2 diamonds. West took the view that since the double showed diamonds, so 3♠ ought to show diamond support and spade control. East had not seen it that way but agreed that it was logical and fitting within their system.

The Committee:

Agreed with the director that there had been misinformation.

The Committee investigated North-South's defence and found it very strange that, with a singleton on the table, South did not give suit preference. However, there was no reason to find that North had taken an "Irrational, Wild or Gambling" action, after which redress would have been denied. North may well have played less than optimally, but this should not limit his right to redress. Without the misexplanation, it is likely that the contract would be defeated.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to 6♥, doubled, down one, NS +200.

Deposit:

Returned

Sorrento: Appeal No. 2

Finland v Germany

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Grattan Endicott (England), Krzysztof Martens (Poland)

Senior Pairs Qualifying 1st session

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vulnerable.

	♠ K 10 8 6 4		
	♥ K Q 10 6 5		
	♦ K 10		
	♣ Q		
♠ Q J		♠ A 7 3 2	
♥ A J 7		♥ 3	
♦ A Q J 8 3		♦ 7 6 5 4	
♣ 7 6 5		♣ K 10 9 3	
	♠ 9 5		
	♥ 9 8 4 2		
	♦ 9 2		
	♣ A J 8 4 2		
West	North	East	South
<i>Honkavuori</i>	<i>Princen</i>	<i>Honkavuori</i>	<i>Szedinicsek</i>
INT	2♣	Dble	Pass
Pass	2♥	Pass	Pass
Dble	All Pass		

Comments: INT 13-16, 2♣ Landy

Contract: 2 Hearts Doubled, played by North

Result: 8 tricks, NS +670

The Facts:

2 Clubs was for the Majors, but South had forgotten this. West claimed that she would not have doubled 2 Hearts if she had known this.

The Director:

Found that West had no reason to double whatever the explanation. She could have asked the meaning of 2 Clubs and should not have believed the non-alert.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 40C

4

East/West appealed.

Present: All players

The Players:

South stated that he had been “ganz weg” (totally gone).

East explained that he had intended his double to show the Minors, but West had interpreted it as showing values.

The Committee:

Found that North-South did not deserve the good score that they received. South should at least have realized after the call of 2 Hearts that 2 Clubs had shown the Majors.

However, West had no-one to blame for their bad result but herself.

The Committee’s decision:

Score adjusted to

North/South receive:

2♥ made (NS +110)

East/West receive:

2♥ doubled made (NS +670)

Deposit: Returned

Sorrento: Appeal No. 3

Italy v France

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), David Birman (Israel)

Open Pairs Qualifying 3rd session

Board 25. Dealer North. East/West Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Brunet</i>	<i>Gergati</i>	<i>Ancassy</i>	<i>Terenzi</i>
	INT	Pass	2♣
Pass	2♥	Pass	Pass
2♠	Pass	Pass	Dble
Pass	Pass	2NT	Pass
3♣	All Pass		

Comments: INT=11-14

Contract: Three Clubs, played by West

Result: 7 tricks, NS +200

The Facts:

North originally explained Two Clubs as either normal “strong”, or weak with at least 4-4 in the majors. She corrected this after the bidding, stating that it could be 4-3 when weak. South explained his double as take-out, while North had suggested it was penalty.

The Director:

Found there had been misexplanation by North to East, and that this had resulted in damage to East-West, but was unable to find what would have happened with correct information. Two Spades Doubled making would have been a Top, while other adjustments would not give East-West any compensation.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to 60% for East-West, 40% for North-South.

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C, I2C3, Code of Practice enabling Tournament Director to award Adjusted Scores under Law I2C3.

North/South appealed.

Present: All players

The Players:

North said that she had not given “penalty” as an explanation about the Double. Apparently the players had been using French at the table, and East stated that he had asked “Punitif?” to which he had received a positive reply. She had not alerted the double of South.

East stated that from the explanations he had received, he was certain that South held four spades.

West revealed that he had tried to play for one off, not believing that Spades could be 3-3.

The Committee:

Concluded that North had indeed been guilty of misinformation. She had certainly implied that South held four spades and was willing to defend. It was clear that East did not have the correct information, and that his decision to run to the minors was a consequence of this.

However, it is far from clear how many tricks East will make in Two Spades Doubled, and a weighted score is advisable. Rather than going into the difficult problem of trying to quantify the probability of making eight tricks, the Committee decided to follow the Director in expressing the Adjustment directly into a percentage.

The Committee’s decision:

Director’s ruling upheld.

Deposit: Returned

Committee’s Note:

Making 2♠X would earn East-West 99.3%, while down one would be 7.6%. The adjustment would be equal to one of giving East-West 57% of the making contract.

Sorrento: Appeal No. 4

Israel v Latvia

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (England), Krzysztof Martens (Poland)

Open Pairs Semi-Final "A" 1st session

Board 12. Dealer West. North/South Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
Friedlander	Gonca	Soffer	Alfejeva
INT	Pass	2♣	Dble
Redble	2♠	Dble	2NT
Dble	Pass	Pass	3♣
Dble	3♦	Pass	Pass
Dble	All Pass		

Contract: Three Diamonds Doubled, played by North

Result: 9 tricks, NS +670

The Facts:

West called the Director, explaining that Two No-trump had not been alerted. He claimed that he would not have doubled 3♦, but bid 3♥, if he had known that South was showing both minors by bidding 2NT.

South said that before the last pass, she had indeed told West that she also held diamonds.

The Director:

Did not see any misinformation.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 40A

East/West appealed.

Present: All players except West

The Players:

South explained that she had intended 2NT as "to play, unless doubled". She thought that, since she had already shown clubs, she must now also have been showing diamonds.

East stated that North should not have run from clubs to diamonds, if 2NT was only "to play".

When asked what he would have done after 2♠x in the South position, he reluctantly agreed that 2NT might well be a good call.

The Committee:

Considered that South had done more than she should. It is not clear that 2NT would by agreement show diamonds, but it did show them by deduction. She was under no obligation to reveal this to West, and yet she did.

The Committee felt that the Appeal lacked all merit.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Forfeited

Sorrento: Appeal No. 5

England v Czech Republic

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Krzysztof Martens (Poland)

Open Pairs Semi-Final "A" 4th session

Board 13. Dealer North. All Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
Sandqvist	Kurka	Burn	Vozabal
	Pass	1♦	2♦
Dble	3♠	Pass	4♠
Dble	All Pass		

Comments: Two Diamonds showed Clubs and a Major

Contract: Four Spades Doubled, played by North

Result: 11 tricks, NS +990

The Facts:

Two Diamonds was explained on both sides of the screen as "Michaels". Apparently that is the name that is used in Eastern Europe to indicate Clubs and a Major.

When South subsequently alerted Three Spades, and before West made his final Double, the erroneous explanation was discovered.

West stated that he could have bid Two Spades indicating a good raise in diamonds.

The Director:

Did not believe the different explanation would lead to a different final contract.

Ruling:

EBL Appeals Book, 2001

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

East/West appealed.

Present: All players

The Players:

West explained that with correct information, he would have been able to show a good diamond raise. The auction would then have been different and there would have been less (or no) reason to double Four Spades.

When asked why he doubled given the information that it was Majors, he told the Committee that he did not want to lose the option of opponents reaching a Heart contract, which he could double.

The Committee:

Consulted the convention booklet, which states :

If you use ANY of the (two-suited) conventions, YOU MAY NOT SIMPLY ENTER THE NAME. A proper entry includes the SPECIFIC SUIT(S) shown and could profitably leave out the name altogether.

However, under MICHAELS it shows

(1m)-2m: ♥+♠ (54+)

East-West had indeed misinformed their opponents.

However, the correct explanation would have been "Clubs and a Major", not "Clubs and Spades". In that case, the same argument still existed that West should be doubling, so as not to lose the option of the Heart penalty, with the added option even of discovering a fit there themselves!

It was the Committee's opinion that East-West had not been damaged by the misinformation.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Returned

Sorrento: Appeal No. 6

France v England

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), David Birman (Israel), Naki Bruni (Italy), Herman De Wael (Belgium) assisted in part of the hearing and acted as Scribe.

Open Pairs Semi-Final "B" 3rd session

Board 3. Dealer South. East/West Vul.

	♠ A K 4 2		
	♥ K 9 7 5		
	♦ 10 5 4		
	♣ 8 2		
♠ J 10		♠ 9 8 7	
♥ A Q 8 3		♥ J 6 2	
♦ A J 3		♦ 8 7 6 2	
♣ A 10 6 4		♣ 9 5 3	
	♠ Q 6 5 3		
	♥ 10 4		
	♦ K Q 9		
	♣ K Q J 7		
West	North	East	South
Saporta	Simon	Zimmermann	Lipton
			INT
Dble	Pass	2♣	Pass
3♣	All Pass		

Contract: Three Clubs, played by East

Result: 5 tricks, NS +400

The Facts:

The Double had been explained by West to South as "normal", but East told North it showed 5 of a Minor, 4 of a Major, 8^{HCP}. North now intended her Pass to show "nothing specific", whereas South interpreted it as "weak or strong". Two clubs was "pass or correct".

North stated that she was now afraid of a distributional hand but that with the correct information she would have doubled Three Clubs.

The Director:

Ruled that there had been misinformation from East to North and that North-South had suffered damage from this.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to Three Clubs Doubled, four down, NS +1100

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C, 12C2

East/West appealed.

Present: All players

The Players:

North said that she had no conventional bids against a "Take-out Double" of INT, and that she did not know the meaning of Redouble; but she admitted that redoubling logically would have shown strength. She passed because she knew that she would get another opportunity to bid.

The Committee:

Agreed with the Director in deciding that North had been misinformed. North showed poor judgment however, in not Redoubling at her first turn, and not Doubling at her second. It was felt quite possible that North would have made the same mistakes with the correct information, and so the Committee decided to weight the scores.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to

Both sides receive:

50% of 3♣X-4 by East (NS +1100) plus

50% of 3♣-4 by East (NS +400)

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C, 12C3

Deposit: Returned

Committee's Note:

The score for +1100 was 150.95 MP, out of a top of 154. +400 would have scored 73.92, and so the result for this table was $50\% \times 150.95 + 50\% \times 73.92 = 112.34$ MP to NS (72.9%), and 41.66 MP to EW.

Sorrento: Appeal No. 7

Italy v England

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Jean-Paul Meyer (France)

Open Pairs Final "B" 1st session

Board 2. Dealer South. North/South Vul.

	♠ J 5 3		
	♥ 10 8		
	♦ A J 10 9		
	♣ Q J 8 5		
♠ 2		♠ K 6	
♥ 9 7		♥ A 6 5 3 2	
♦ K Q 7 5 3 2		♦ 8 6 4	
♣ A 6 4 2		♣ K 10 3	
	♠ A Q 10 9 8 7 4		
	♥ K Q J 4		
	♦ -		
	♣ 9 7		
West	North	East	South
Jephcott	Meo	Theelke	Del Gaubio
3♦	Dble	Pass	4♠
All Pass			1♥

Comments: 1♥ was Canapé, the Double was not negative, but its explanation caused the problems

Contract: Four Spades, played by South

Lead: ♦K

Result: 11 tricks, NS +450

The Facts:

The Double was not alerted on either side of the screen. It was explained by North as being for penalties, but by South apparently as "points".

West claims that with a correct explanation, he would have led the Ace of Clubs, which would result in the contract making exactly.

The Director:

Ruled that there had been misinformation, which had resulted in damage.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to 4♠=, NS +420

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

North/South appealed.

Present: All players

The Players:

North and East agreed that on their side of the screen, the explanation had been "Punitivo", the Italian word for a Penalty Double. South explained that he too had said "Punitivo", but it was clear that in his pronunciation, this sounded like "Punti", which was what West thought he heard, and which he (correctly) thought translated to Points.

West reiterated that with an explanation "Penalty" he would have led Clubs.

The Committee:

Wants to remind the players that the only correct way of explaining the meaning of the calls is by writing, preferably in English. If you don't, and the opponent misinterprets, then you may be unwillingly guilty of misinformation.

Reluctantly, the Committee decided that there had been misinformation.

However, the Committee expressed doubts as to the likelihood of a different lead after a different explanation. The diamond lead still seems so obvious that no adjustment seemed necessary.

The Committee's decision:

Original table result restored. NS +450

Deposit: Returned

Sorrento: Appeal No. 8

Italy v Italy

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy)

Open Pairs Final "B" 3rd session

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
Rosati	Pagani	Lena	Marino
Pass	Pass	1♣	2♦
Dble	2♥	Dble	All Pass

Comments: 1♣ was strong, 2♦ a weak jump, the Double was take-out with 7+ points

Contract: Two Hearts Doubled, played by North

Result: 5 tricks, NS -800

The Facts:

North did not notice an alert of 1♣, so he assumed 2♦ showed Diamonds and a Major. Only when dummy came down did he realize what had happened.

East says he alerted with his finger, because he could not find the alert card.

The Director:

Ruled that there had been misinformation, but could not easily determine where the contract would end with correct one.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to Average Plus for North/

South and Average Minus for East/West.

Relevant Laws:

Law 40B, 40C, 12CI

Rules and Regulations 9.

East/West appealed.

Present: All players

The Players:

North repeated that he had not seen any alert, and explained that over a natural 1♣, 2♦ would show Diamonds and a Major, which is why he corrected to 2♥. Although the players were all Italian, they had never played against one another.

East told the Committee that he had rediscovered the Alert card after alerting with his finger, and had still used it. North said he had seen no such alert.

The Committee:

Found that East had indeed failed to alert properly. According to the Rules and Regulations, which make it the obligation of the alerting player to ensure that his screen-mate has noticed that an alert has been made.

The Committee found that the Director might have made more effort to find an assigned rather than an artificial adjusted score, but since that part of the ruling was not appealed, decided not to change the Director's ruling.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Forfeited

Sorrento: Appeal No. 9

England v Portugal

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Grattan Endicott (Scribe, England), Jean-Paul Meyer (France)

Open Pairs Final "A" 3rd session

Board 15. Dealer South. North/South Vul.

	♠ -		
	♥ K 9 8 3 2		
	♦ J 7 3		
	♣ K Q 10 9 6		
♠ K 10 6 5 2		♠ A Q J	
♥ J 6 5		♥ Q 7 4	
♦ K 6 4 2		♦ Q 8 5	
♣ J		♣ A 8 4 2	
	♠ 9 8 7 4 3		
	♥ A 10		
	♦ A 10 9		
	♣ 7 5 3		
West	North	East	South
Lara	Eginton	Capucho	Nelson
			Pass
Pass	Pass	INT	Pass
2♣	Dble	Pass (I)	Pass
3♠	Pass	4♠	
Pass			
Pass	Dble	All Pass	

Comments: (I) no four card Major

Contract: Four Spades Doubled, played by West

Lead: ♣K

Result: 9 tricks, NS +100

The Facts:

North asked East before doubling about the meaning of Three Spades and received the answer "probably 5 spades 4 hearts". North complained that this information had affected the defence.

The Director:

Found that the explanation was correct according to the system.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

No infraction

North/South appealed.

Present: All players

The Players:

North recounted the play: Club to the Ace, small Heart to the Ace, Club ruffed, Diamond to the Queen and Ace, club ruffed, Heart towards the Queen.

North explained that if he rises with the King, it costs a trick when West has four Hearts.

West explained that she had originally intended a part-score contract but revalued the hand after North's Double.

East explained that the bid of Three Spades would now imply 54 in Spades and Hearts.

The Committee:

Agreed that North had been misled but not misinformed. West had simply used good judgment.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Forfeited

Sorrento: Appeal No. 10

England v England

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Grattan Endicott (England)

Open Pairs Final "B" 3rd session

Board 13. Dealer North. All Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
Smith A	Bowles	Smith R	Mohandes
	Pass	1♥	Pass
3♠	Pass	4♥	Pass
4♠	Pass	5♥	All Pass

Contract: Five Hearts, played by East

Result: 11 tricks, NS -650

The Facts:

Three Spades was at first explained, by East to North, as "first round control". One round later, East corrected this explanation to "splinter". North asked for a ruling because over a splinter, he has available a Double that asks for the lead of the suit below, in this case diamonds. With the lead of the King of Diamonds, East makes only 10 tricks.

The Director:

Found that there had indeed been misinformation, but was unable to decide what the result would be. When hearing of the lead directing double, East-West are unlikely to go past Four Hearts.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to 60% for North/South, 40% for

East/West

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C, 12C3, Code of Practice enabling Tournament Director to award Adjusted Scores under Law 12C3.

North/South appealed.

Present: All players

The Players:

North started by stating that in fact a score of -620 is worth more than 60%. In addition, East/West were also now quite aware that there was a missing diamond control, and yet went past 4♥.

East explained the options available to him after a double of 3♠. Pass would show interest without the ♣A, so East would probably bid 4♥, ending the bidding.

The Committee:

Agreed with the Director on the point of misinformation, but found that he had failed to provide equity for North/South. An adjustment to 4♥ making would be absolutely necessary, and it was felt that some added compensation should be provided for the chance of East/West bidding on regardless.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to

Both sides receive:

20% of 5♥-1 by East (NS +100) plus

80% of 4♥= by East (NS -620)

Deposit: Returned

Committee's Note:

The score for +100 was 140.04 MP, out of a top of 154. -620 would have scored 101.58, and so the result for this table was 20% x 140.04 + 80% x 101.58 = 109.27 MP to NS (70.96%), and 44.63 MP to EW.

The Committee further noted that the Directors had been extremely busy during this section and put no blame on them for awarding this artificial score.

Tenerife: Appeal No. I

Finland v Netherlands

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (England)

Ladies Pairs Qualifying 1st session

Board 15. Dealer South. North/South Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Van Zwol</i>	<i>Bäckström</i>	<i>Hoogweg</i>	<i>Koistinen</i>
Pass	1♠	Pass	2♠
Pass	Pass	Dble	Pass
3♣	All Pass		

Comments: 1♥ is 8-1 IHCP, unbalanced

Contract: Three Clubs, played by West

Lead: ♥3

Play: ♠K, Heart ruff, ♠A, Heart, on which West discarded a Spade.

Result: 8 tricks, NS +50

The Facts:

Before deciding what to do on the third round of Hearts, West consulted the Convention Card and read that the opening of 1♥ was explained as being “unbalanced”. Since she could not imagine that South might hold 2 Clubs, she discarded a Spade. She told the Director that she would have ruffed with the King if she had known that South could be 5332.

The Director:

Found that there was no damage.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 40C

East/West appealed.

Present: All players

The Players:

North/South explained that with a 5332 in a Major they can open either 1NT or 1 of the Major, and they realize that this is not “unbalanced”.

West explained that she realized North held all the remaining points, and that the only distribution that was possibly unbalanced in South was with singleton or void in clubs. That meant that the contract was doomed, and she discarded a spade to guard against trumps being 5-0. She had thought about this play for a long while and was quite surprised to find a 5332 distribution in South. She had not asked any further questions, solely relying on the mention UNBAL on the Convention Card.

The Committee:

Confirmed that a 5332 distribution is not unbalanced. West had therefore been misinformed. However, West should have realized that the first ruff had been with the 8, which meant that North had made a very strange false card if she had more than three clubs. If declarer had realized this, she would have asked again and discovered that North/South did indeed consider a 5332 worthy of a 1♥ opening.

Furthermore if the clubs are 5-0 the contract will always go two down because North can lock declarer in dummy by a spade. If clubs are 4-1 she will always go one down, so West was not damaged.

The Committee’s decision:

Director’s ruling upheld.

North/South receive the standard penalty of 10% of a top and are asked to correct their Convention Card.

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 2

France v England

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy)

Ladies Pairs Qualifying 1st session

Board 5. Dealer North. North/South Vul.

	♠ Q 8 3 2		
	♥ A 6 3		
	♦ K 5		
	♣ K Q 10 3		
♠ -		♠ A 5	
♥ K 7 2		♥ Q 10 9 8 5	
♦ 9 7 6 4 3		♦ A 10 8	
♣ A J 9 8 7		♣ 6 5 4	
	♠ K J 10 9 7 6 4		
	♥ J 4		
	♦ Q J 2		
	♣ 2		
West	North	East	South
<i>Senior</i>	<i>Delacour</i>	<i>Penfold</i>	<i>Battin</i>
	1♣	1♥	4♠
4NT	5♠	All Pass	

Contract: Five Spades, played by South

Result: nine tricks, NS -200

The Facts:

West had intended her bid of 4NT to show a choice of contracts, but East interpreted it as being Blackwood (RKCB in effect). East wanted to give this explanation in written form, but could find no paper. North claimed that she asked "Blackwood?" and had received a positive reply.

The Director:

Found that there were facts in dispute and applied Law 85B, deciding that North had made her call without waiting for an explanation. Since she did not receive an explanation, she could not claim misinformation.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 85B

North/South appealed.

Present: All players

The Players:

West explained that she intended 4NT to indicate either both minors, or one minor and a 3-card Heart fit. That would be the correct system if East had opened the bidding, or if West had been able to bid 2NT. East explained that she had interpreted it as Blackwood. East/West told the Committee that they had never encountered the sequence and had no way of proving the one or the other explanation to be correct.

North repeated that she had asked the question and had thought she got a positive reply. East denied having answered to any question.

North stated that she intended to disturb East/West's Ace asking and would not have bid 5♠ if she had received the other explanation.

The Committee:

Agreed with the Director about the disputed facts. Most probably, North had mistakenly interpreted some gesture from East.

However, she would have received the same information if she had waited for a written explanation. The Committee decided therefore to affect a ruling as if the answer had in fact been Blackwood.

Since East/West had no way of providing evidence that this explanation was correct, the Appeal Committee must assume mistaken explanation.

The Committee considered North's choice of bid very poor. In fact, the overcall might be more appropriate over the explanation as given by West. The Committee felt that North had not been damaged by the explanation.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling modified, but original table result still stands.

Relevant Laws:

Law 40C

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 3

Russia v Italy

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Grattan Endicott (England)

Ladies Pairs Qualifying 2nd session

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>D'Andrea</i>	<i>Volina</i>	<i>Canesi</i>	<i>omanovska</i>
2♥	Pass	2♠	Pass
3♥	Pass	4♥	All Pass

Comments: 2♥ showed five Hearts and four or more of a minor.

Contract: Four Hearts, played by West

Lead: King of Diamonds

Result: 11 tricks, NS +650

The Facts:

East intended her bid of Two Spades as being an asking relay, and she explained the “response” of Three Hearts as showing four clubs and minimum two spades. West had forgotten that part of the system and had simply intended Three Hearts as natural, and afraid of the void in spades. East/West could not produce evidence of this, and so the Director ruled misinformation. After the session, some sort of evidence was found but by now it was too late to change the ruling and so an appeal was necessary.

The Director:

Considered that there had been misinformation and applied Law 12C3.

Ruling:

North/South receive:

60% of the available Matchpoints

East/West receive:

40% of the available Matchpoints

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

Law 12C3, Code of Practice enabling Tournament Director to award Adjusted Scores under Law 12C3.

East/West appealed.

EBL Appeals Book, 2001

Present: All players

The Players:

East produced a piece of paper, with a hand-written explanation of the bidding after the opening of 2♥. According to this, 2♠ is indeed an asking bid, and 3♥ and 3♣ indicate clubs, resp. diamonds as the minor suit, and two cards in spades. With three spades, the responses are 3♣ and 3♦, and with void or singleton, 2NT. East explained that she had last played with her current partner two years ago in Malta, and this system had been agreed upon there. East/West had not discussed the sequence this year.

When asked why she used the asking bid of 2♠, rather than bidding 4♥ straight away, she responded that she would have liked to hear 3 card support. With only 2 spades, she preferred partner to play the hand.

East/West had not lodged their system, as had been asked by the organization.

North stated that she would have led a heart with a different explanation.

The Committee:

Considered that the Organization had asked the players to lodge their systems, but that only a minority had done so. Nevertheless, the Committee decided not to disallow the evidence and consider it on its merits. It was found that the paper was genuine and that this system was indeed played in Malta. However, without any intermediate discussion, it cannot be said that there was partnership understanding that this system still applied.

The Committee therefore decided that North had indeed been misinformed.

With a more correct explanation it is not clear what lead would be chosen, although it would quite unlikely be a high diamond. The Committee decided to weight the scores, according to Law 12C3. With a heart lead, the contract may well go down, while with any other lead (excluding high diamonds) and a heart return, 10 tricks are the normal result.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to

Both sides receive:

50% of 4♥-1 (NS +100) plus

50% of 4♥ making (NS -620)

Deposit: Returned

Committee's Note: The Committee wants to point out that the chosen weightings represent “true” expectations.

Tenerife: Appeal No. 4

Croatia v Poland

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (England), Steen Møller (Denmark)

Ladies Pairs Final 1st session

Board 23. Dealer South. All Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Sendacka</i>	<i>Sver</i>	<i>Neronowicz</i>	<i>Pilipovic</i>
Pass	2♣	Pass	1♥
Pass	2NT	Pass	2♥
All Pass			3NT

Contract: Three No-Trumps, played by North

Lead: Jack of Diamonds

Play: North took the third round of diamonds, and then took the double club finesse from the table.

Result: 8 tricks, NS -100

The Facts:

West took the first trick and returned the seven of diamonds.

After the play to trick three, declarer consulted the Convention Card and asked about the meaning of the seven followed by the three. The reply was “odd number”. Since North believed the odd number referred to the remaining number of cards, she thought diamonds were 4-4. Now she thought she could afford to finesse the clubs towards East. North explained to the Director that she would have made her contract by playing differently if she had known that diamonds were 5-3.

The Director:

Ruled that North had been misinformed and adjusted the score.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to 3NT making, NS +600

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C, 12C2

North/South appealed.

Present: All players

The Players:

East/West explained that it was their system to return the seven from three cards to the Ace. The explanation “odd” refers to the original number and they could not imagine that anyone could misunderstand that explanation.

North told the Committee that she had asked what the seven-three meant and that she had received a reply “odd number of cards”.

The Committee:

Understood that there was a problem of misunderstanding. In some countries it is common to show the number of cards originally held, while in others the remaining number is shown. An experienced declarer should realize that problem and should never arrive in this situation. She should always protect herself. One way of doing that is to write down “A73” and “Ax73” and to make her opponent circle the relevant order of play.

The Committee felt that North had not done enough to protect herself.

The Committee’s decision:

Original table result restored

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 5

Israel v Austria

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (England), Steen Møller (Denmark)

Open Teams Round 6

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>T. Terraneo</i>	<i>Barel</i>	<i>Simon</i>	<i>Aviram</i>
1♥	Dble	2NT	Pass
3♣	Pass	4♥	All Pass

Contract: Four Hearts, played by West

Lead: Ace of Clubs

Play: Ace of Diamonds, King of Clubs, intending to give partner a ruff thereafter

Result: 10 tricks, NS -620

The Facts:

East had explained the bid of Three Clubs as “Trial bid with at least 3 clubs”.

North called the Director because he had based his plan on that explanation, intending to cash the first four tricks. With a different explanation, he would have played differently and defeated the contract.

The Director:

Discovered that East/West could not demonstrate that the explanation which North had received was the correct one and adjusted the score. The Directors believed the defence to be difficult and checked around the room, finding that 20 out of 27 declarers made Four Hearts.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to

Both sides receive:

25% of 4♥-1 by West (NS +100) plus

75% of 4♥ made (NS -620)

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

Law 12C3, Code of Practice enabling Tournament Director to award Adjusted Scores under Law 12C3.

North/South appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

East/West explained that they had recently changed their system and that East’s explanation had been the correct one. West had bid as if there had been no double in North. However, they agreed that they could not produce any evidence to support this.

East told the Committee that North had asked the same question twice and that the second time he had added that partner might well have forgotten the recent change in system.

North/South explained that the defence actually taken at the table was consistent with the explanation that had been received. With an explanation that better corresponded to Declarer’s actual hand, finding a successful line of defence is not difficult.

North/South believed they should get more benefit of the doubt than had been given to them.

The Committee:

Believed that the Director had made a correct decision when ruling that there had been misinformation and damage. The Director should however not only have followed the frequency of similar results around the room, but considered the deal on its merits. Given that this defender can picture declarer with singleton club, a successful line of defence is much more easily found than the awarded weight of 25% would suggest.

The Committee decided the defence would be found more than half of the time and settled on 60%.

The Committee’s decision:

Director’s ruling modified

Both sides receive:

60% of 4♥-1 by West (NS +100) plus

40% of 4♥ made (NS -620)

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 6

Netherlands v Switzerland

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (England), Steen Møller (Denmark)

Open Teams Round 8

Board 1. Dealer North. Nobody Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
Teylouni	Maas	Levy	Ramondt
	Pass	Pass	1♦
Dble	Pass	1♥	Dble
2♦	3♣	3♥	4♣
4♥	5♣	Pass	Pass
Dble	All Pass		

Contract: Five Clubs doubled, played by North

Lead: Jack of Spades

Play: Queen-King of Spades, six of Spades returned, small diamond to West's King and another spade.

Result: 10 tricks, NS -100

The Facts:

This was the vu-graph match, open room.

North had asked East about returns. North had written "Q752" and "Q7652" on a piece of paper and East had circled the 5 and 2 respectively. On this basis, North decided to ruff the fourth trick, instead of letting it run to the 8 and discarding a diamond. At the end of the play, North had asked a similar question of West. West circled the fourth highest from original holding. North called the Director. It turned out that East had not understood the question and thought North had been asking about the leads.

The Director:

Considered that North should have written not only the cards but also his question instead of speaking it.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

North/South appealed.

Present: All players except South, and both Captains

The Players:

North told the Committee that he had said "If you take and return". After East had circled the appropriate cards, North had thought for several minutes and then asked the question again to make absolutely sure. East had now replied "same as leads".

East stated that North had asked "what do you play" but he admitted that North had indeed used the word "return". East thought the question had been about leads in general, and had answered "same as leads" to indicate that subsequent leads are made in the same way as opening leads.

North believed it was clear that he wanted information about returns in the relevant suit, spades, and not about subsequent leads in other suits. He believed that East should have realized that.

When asked why he had written Q's on his questions, rather than K's, as had actually been played, North replied that they were both honours after all. The interesting cards were the small ones and he had been very specific to East about those.

The Committee:

Considered that North had done a lot to get the information that he wanted. He had used proper English words, and it was East who had misunderstood the word return. It should have been clear to East that North was only interested in the Spade situation. East/West's actual agreement was as West had explained it after the hand, and corresponded to the real holding. On North's very careful questions, East should have actively explained their methods to North, in accordance with the principle of full disclosure. East had not done so, and the Committee concluded that North had been misinformed.

The Committee also believed there was resulting damage. However, it was not certain that North would always discard.

The Committee decided that, if North had received the correct answer to the question he had asked, -as his alternative to make the contract by a different play was against the odds- North would discard two times out of three, and subsequently make his contract. The Committee decided to adjust the score on that basis.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to

Both sides receive:

66.7% of 5♣X making by North (NS +550) plus

33.3% of 5♣X-1 by North (NS -100)

Deposit: Returned

Comments:

The reason for this decision being different from Appeals No. 4 (Croatia v Poland, ladies) is that in No. 4 there was a misunderstanding that the declarer did far too little to clarify. In the abovementioned case, however the declarer made a huge effort to understand his opponents methods. It was very clear that he did that and still the declarer was never told about EWs' agreements by his screenmate. In accordance with the important principle of full disclosure the Committee under these circumstances had to rule against EW.

Tenerife: Appeal No. 7

Croatia v Luxembourg

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (England), Jean-Paul Meyer (France)

Open Teams Round 9

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Renno</i>	<i>Lamza</i>	<i>Helling</i>	<i>Tomic</i>
Pass	1♥	3♣	4♥
4♠	Pass	Pass	Dble
Pass	Pass	5♣	5♥
All Pass			

Comments: Three Clubs was explained by West to South as showing Spades and Diamonds

Contract: Five Hearts, played by North

Result: 10 tricks, NS -100

The Facts:

North initially put a bid of INT on the tray, but changed this to his intended 1♥. East, who was thinking of bidding 3♣ over INT, did the same over 1♥, but forgot that this was now showing Spades and Diamonds. South called the Director after the bid of 5♣, but then bid 5♥ before the investigations were over. Subsequently it turned out that East only realized his mistake when the Director asked him what 3♣ meant.

The Director:

Investigated the Convention Card and complementary sheets and discovered that 3♣ indeed showed Spades and Diamonds. This

meant that South had received a correct explanation. North did not get a correct information about the system, but the Director ruled that North was not damaged by this wrong explanation.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 40A

North/South appealed.

Present: All players except South, and both Captains

The Players:

North/South found that both players were deprived of their normal bids. North has a clear Double over 4♠, showing points, and preventing South from bidding at the 5 level.

East explained his mistake. He had thought some time of bidding 3♣ over INT and when North changed his call to 1♥, the decision had become easier and so he did make the call. East/West had been playing together for 4 years, and had been using two-suiter calls but have only recently changed them to specified 2-suiters.

The Committee:

Agreed with the Director that North had not been damaged, and found that the appeal lacked merit.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Forfeited

Tenerife: Appeal No. 8

Poland v Israel

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (England), Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark)

Senior Teams Round 2

Board 6. Dealer East. East/West Vul.

	♠ 5 4		
	♥ K 7 6 4 3 2		
	♦ Q J 9		
	♣ A 9		
♠ K Q 3		♠ A J 9 8 2	
♥ A Q 10 8		♥ J 9 5	
♦ -		♦ A 7	
♣ K J 6 5 4 2		♣ 10 8 7	
	♠ 10 7 6		
	♥ -		
	♦ K 10 8 6 5 4 3 2		
	♣ Q 3		
West	North	East	South
<i>Shachaz</i>	<i>Klapper</i>	<i>Pezi</i>	<i>Russyan</i>
2♣	Pass	2♠	3♦
4♠	Pass	Pass	5♦
Pass	Pass	Dble	All Pass

Comments:

2♣ Precision, 2♠ non-forcing

Contract: Five Diamonds doubled, played by South

Result: nine tricks, NS -300

The Facts:

West had noticed a hesitation during the passes after 4♠ on the other side of the screen and called the Director after the bid of Five Diamonds. South agreed to the Director that there had been some delay.

The Director:

Ruled on Unauthorized Information. He decided that passing was a logical alternative for South, and that the hesitation had suggested bidding on.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to Four Spades by East, 11 tricks, NS -650

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A2

North/South appealed.

Present: All players, both Captains and a Polish translator.

The Players:

North/South told the Committee that East had not even put a pass-card on the tray, and that East had pushed the tray through (contrary to regulations). East/West denied both these allegations.

North stated he had thought for maximum 10 seconds, and that the tray had stayed on his side for a total of 15 seconds. East said the delay had lasted at least 30 seconds, maybe a full minute. West said the tray had stayed away for a very long time. She remembered that they had 12 minutes for the last two boards, but after this one, there remained only 2 minutes for the last board. She thought the tray had come back after approximately 1 minute.

South explained that he did not open the bidding to see what would happen. West has maximum 15 HCP (Precision), and East is a passed hand, so partner North must have some points. At this favourable vulnerability he considered the save obvious.

The Committee:

Saw no reason not to go with the Director on his decision that there had been a break of tempo. South's bid of Five Diamonds is certainly helped by the hesitation, which could only have been from his partner.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 9

Latvia v Finland

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Grattan Endicott (England), Eric Kokish (Canada)

Open Teams Round 12

Board 13. Dealer North. All Vulnerable.

	♠ Q 10 4		
	♥ J 6 2		
	♦ A K J 9 2		
	♣ 8 7		
♠ 7 6		♠ K 8 2	
♥ A 10 5 4		♥ K Q 9 8 7 3	
♦ Q 10		♦ 6 4 3	
♣ A Q J 5 3		♣ 6	
	♠ A J 9 5 3		
	♥ -		
	♦ 8 7 5		
	♣ K 10 9 4 2		
West	North	East	South
<i>Juuri-Oja</i>	<i>Eliasson</i>	<i>Utter</i>	<i>Magnusson</i>
	1♦	2♥	2♠
3♣	All Pass		

Comments:

2♥ weak, 2♠ non-forcing

Contract: Three clubs, played by West

Result: three tricks, NS +600

The Facts:

South had alerted 2♠ and explained it as non-forcing, but North had not alerted it. West had intended his 3♣ to be forcing and indicating a Heart fit, but since 2♠ was not alerted to East, he had interpreted it as long clubs, which is why East passed. East then called the Director to complain about the non-alert.

The Director:

Could not find any evidence on East/West's Convention Card to indicate that there was indeed a double meaning for 3♣ depending on the forcing nature of 2♠.

The Director also insisted that if East is aware that this difference in meaning is so important to them, he should have protected himself better and ask for the range of the 2♠ bid.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

East/West appealed.

Present: South, East and the Captain of Finland

The Players:

South explained that North had indeed forgotten to alert, because he had simply thought it was natural.

East told the Committee that if 2♠ is forcing, 3♣ simply shows an independent suit, but if it is non-forcing, it must include Heart tolerance. East/West could not prove this by any system notes. When asked why he did not ask about the range for 2♠, East simply said that he had no reason to do so, since it had not been alerted.

The Committee:

Chose to believe the explanation of East/West about the difference of meaning for 3♣ dependent on the forcing nature of 2♠. It is a normal manner of playing after all.

The Committee read the relevant part of the alert regulations, which say

“Any call ... whose partnership meaning may not be understood by the opponents, is an alertable call ...”

The Committee then had to decide who had made the more grave error: North for not alerting or East for not protecting himself. Since an alert is there after all to awaken the opponent, East has some excuse for staying asleep without the alert.

The Committee decided to award an adjustment.

It was felt that the most likely end contract was Three Spades by North/South.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to 3♠+1 by North, NS +170

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 10

Iceland v Scotland

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Grattan Endicott (England), Eric Kokish (Canada)

Open Teams Round 11

Board 12. Dealer West. North/South Vul

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

West	North	East	South
Whittaker	Baldursson	Steel	Sigurhjartarsson
1♥	3♣	Pass	Pass
3♥	Pass	Pass	3♠
Pass	4♠	All Pass	

Comments:

3♣ showed Diamonds and Spades, but South had forgotten this.

Contract: Four Spades, played by North

Result: 8 tricks, NS -200

The Facts:

South had forgotten that 3♣ showed the pointed suits and of course forgot to alert as well. When the tray came round again, South remembered the system and called the Director before bidding again.

The Director:

Ruled that it was too late to change the bid of Three Hearts and asked to play on. At the end of the board, the Director checked the Convention Card, which confirmed that 3♣ showed the two-suiter. The Director subsequently ruled that the failure by South to alert 3♣ had caused no damage to East/West.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

East/West appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

East/West stated that they did understand the legal considerations of the case. West was entitled to a correct information about the system, but not to the knowledge that South had forgotten this. West explained that if he knows the clubs are supposed to be with South, his hand has more defensive potential than if the clubs are in North.

East/West were asked to explain the style of their doubles over a natural 3♣ overcall, and they stated that a Double could have been made with anything from 5♠/5♦, 7HCP to just 5♦, 11 HCP.

The East/West captain added that, while they are not entitled to know that there has been a misunderstanding, the possibility of such an occurrence might well be enough, in case of doubt, to make West pass.

North/South had no comments on the case itself, but South added that, when he had remembered the convention, he had bid 3♠ rather than passed 3♥, because he considered this to be more fair.

The Committee:

Started by restating the legal position. When West is told that 3♣ shows Spades and Diamonds, and South passes (presumably showing long clubs and no interest in the 2 suits shown), what does West do?

After a lengthy discussion, the Committee decided to call the Director back in, and asked him the comments that were made by the players that had been consulted. It turned out that 3 out of 4 players would have bid 3♥, while the fourth would have investigated if the possibility existed that North/South had a bidding mistake. It was on that basis that the Director had made his ruling.

In the end, the Committee voted, and when the result was 2-2 the Chairman cast his second vote with the Director.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 11

Austria v Belgium

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Grattan Endicott (Scribe, England), Naki Bruni (Italy)

Open Teams Round 12

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
Kaplan	Gloyer	Polet	Schifko
Pass	Pass	1♠ ⁽²⁾	Pass
INT ⁽¹⁾	Pass	3♣ ⁽²⁾	Pass
4♣ ⁽⁴⁾	Pass	4♦ ⁽³⁾	Dble
Pass ⁽⁴⁾	Pass	Redble ⁽⁵⁾	Pass
4♠	Pass	4NT	Pass
5♣	All Pass		

Comments:

- (1) Forcing
- (2) Game-forcing
- (3) Cue-bid
- (4) no 1st or 2nd control
- (5) 1st control

Contract: Five Clubs, played by East

Lead: Three of Hearts

Result: 11 tricks, NS -600

The Facts:

The Director was called to the table before the opening lead. South drew attention to the 'long' delay in returning the tray after the 4NT bid. West disputed this. South also complained that he had failed to obtain a clear explanation of the 5 Clubs bid, West had taken time to make this bid and stated that he was unsure what was the agreed trump suit. After the play was completed the Director was recalled and North/South protested the failure to show the King of Clubs, the 4NT being RKCB, or to bid 6 Clubs.

The Director:

Could not establish how long had been the delay in

returning the tray after the 4NT bid, and made a Law 85B ruling, advising the NS players of their right to appeal.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 16

Law 85B

North/South appealed.

Present: All players, both Captains, and the Austrian scorer.

The Players:

North/South wished to stress that they suggested no ethical fault on the part of their opponents but they felt that the failure to admit possession of the King of Clubs could have been influenced by the long delay in passing the tray and should be considered a use of unauthorized information. There was in their opinion illicit information and their opponents had gained from it.

East/West confirmed to the Committee that 4♠ was bid to suggest a possible contract and denied a Heart control, West being limited to a doubleton in Spades at this stage. East confirmed that the 3♣ bid would normally show at least four cards in the suit. Whilst East had deemed Clubs to be the trump suit when he had bid 4NT, if partner had responded 5♦ he could sign off in 5 Spades. West said he had chosen not to show the key card because he thought he had a bad hand. Both sides expressed opinions as to whether 5♠/5♣ should be made. South said the delay had been at least one-and-a-half minutes before the tray came back with the 4NT bid, but East said that the tempo was normal – about 15 seconds.

The Committee:

The Committee held that the circumstance in which 4NT was bid following a long and complicated auction was one where East had some entitlement to consider his bid whatever the nature of his problems. It is not the case that West can tell from a delayed return of the tray in such a position what East has needed to think about. The Code of Practice states: "Attention is drawn to the distinction to be made in the tempo expected when players encounter highly unusual situations. Directors and Appeals Committees should be sympathetic." Furthermore the Committee was of a mind that the delay was not anywhere near one-and-a-half minutes.

The Committee's decision:

There was no unauthorized information. Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 12

Czech Republic v Belgium

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Grattan Endicott (Scribe, England), Carlo Mosca (Italy), Jean-Paul Meyer (France),

Open Teams Round 14

Board 10. Dealer East. All Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Labaere</i>	<i>Zadrazil</i>	<i>Carcassonne</i>	<i>Vozabal</i>
3♣	Pass	2♣	2♦
		3NT	All Pass

Comments: 2♣ is weak with Diamonds, or 20-23 balanced, or a semi-forcing one-suiter

Contract: Three No-Trumps, played by East

Result: 5 tricks, NS +400

The Facts:

Appeals 12 and 15 are from the same match, but from different tables.

The Director was called during the auction, between North's Pass and East's 3NT bid. East complained that she had not received a clear explanation of South's 2D bid. Her difficulty was that after a natural overcall 3C would be forcing, whilst after a take-out bid it would be non-forcing. The Director asked the players to complete the board, at the end of which East-West felt they had been damaged.

The Director:

Considered there had been an infraction but

that the damage was not consequent.

Ruling:

Result stands.

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C, 12C2.

East/West appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

East stated that in the absence of an alert from North she thought herself entitled to treat South's bid as natural. Opposite a forcing 3NT her hand was so good that she believed she must bid 3NT. North said he had not alerted but, in answer to her question, had told East that the actual situation had not been discussed but that it would be either take-out with majors or natural.

The Committee:

Decided that there had been misinformation by North to East, and that East was entitled to some protection. The Committee did not consider East's 3NT bid was the best judged bid available. Various possible alternative auctions (with good information) were examined. A contract of Four Diamonds was selected from these as most nearly fitting what was appropriate for both sides under Law 12C2. This being adjudged equitable there was no reason to have recourse to Law 12C3.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to 4♦ by East/West, 2 down, NS +200

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 13

Sweden v Hungary

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Eric Kokish (Canada)

Open Teams Round 14

Board 9. Dealer North. East/West Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
Honti	Andersson	Szilagy	Gullberg
	1♣	2♥	Pass
Pass	2NT	Pass	3♦
Dble	Pass	Pass	3♠
All Pass			

Comments: 1♣ was 12-16 (almost any distribution) in a strong diamond system, 2♥ was a weak overcall, and the meaning of 2NT was what caused the problems.

Contract: Three Spades, played by South

Result: 9 tricks, NS +140

The Facts:

South had not been certain about the meaning of the bid of 2NT. He had explained it as "minors, but could also be strong NT". On the next round, the tray had apparently come back to South-West (with the two passes), after some delay. West called the Director, claiming that South had used the unauthorized information that was present in the delay, to run from Diamonds to Spades.

The Director:

Established that the delay had been slight, around 15 seconds

The Director consulted with players, who would all have taken out to Spades, and ruled that passing was not a logical alternative.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A

East/West appealed.

Present: All players except East, and both Captains

The Players:

West corrected a few things from the Director's statement. South had told him 2NT showed a minor two-suiter, only later adding that he was not certain about this.

The delay had been, according to West, longer than 15 seconds, and he had not corrected the Director earlier because the Director had established, at the table, that there had been a break in tempo.

North told the Committee he had taken only a few seconds to take in the bidding and decide to pass, and had then answered a question posed to him by East. He thought the tray had gone back within a delay of some 15 seconds.

North/South were not certain about their actual methods. If the overcall is of 1♥, and this is raised to 2♥, then 2NT certainly does show the minors, but this particular sequence had not been discussed.

When asked why he had doubled 3♦, West replied he thought they had nowhere to run.

West finally pointed out to the Committee that if the agreement really was minors, there would have been no need for any delay, and the tray would have come back immediately, especially since North/South are notoriously fast bidders. In his opinion there had been unauthorized information.

The Committee:

Agreed with the Director on his ruling that there had been slight misinformation, and on his judgment that there passing was not a logical alternative.

The Committee added a third consideration in finding that there was no reason to adjust the score: even if there is unauthorized information, it is not clear what that information suggests. South does not know that North has the same doubts that he has, and he has no way of telling what North is thinking about, or even that it was North thinking and not simply East or North asking for explanations.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 14

Czech Republic v France

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Eric Kokish (Canada),

Ladies Teams Round 6

Board 17. Dealer North. Nobody Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Lustin</i>	<i>Erdeova</i>	<i>Avon</i>	<i>Hnatova</i>
	Pass	Pass	Pass
1♠	Pass	Pass	INT
2♠	Dble	All Pass	

Contract: Two Spades Doubled, played by West

Lead: small Club

Play: Club to South's King, low Heart returned, on which West played the King.

Result: 7 tricks, NS +100

The Facts:

North's Double had been alerted, by North to East, and explained as Take-Out.

South had not alerted the Double, but West had asked anyway, and South had said it was Penalty. After the end of play, West called the Director and stated she would have played low to the Heart, and made her contract, if she had known the Double was for take-out. South is already known to have Ace-King of Clubs, and if the double is for take-out, the King of Spades had to be in South and the two red aces in North, to account for the three passes at the start of the auction.

The Director:

Found nothing on the Convention Card to substantiate either explanation of the Double, so had to rule that West had been misinformed.

The Director accepted West's explanation and ruled that West had been damaged by this misinformation.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to 2♠X making, NS -470

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

Law 12C2

North/South appealed.

Present: All players, both Captains and a Czech translator.

The Players:

North/South explained that West should have been able to tell that South held the King of Spades. South had overcalled INT after all, and in North/South's opinion, this can only be done with a Spade stopper.

West restated her opinion that North could not have made a penalty double without the King of Spades. In her opinion, there was no objection to compete with INT without a Spade stopper.

The Committee:

Felt that both sides were expecting their opponents to have the same idea of the bid of INT as was common in their own country. When basing your line of play on such information, West could have done more to protect herself by asking about the style of the INT overcall and the Double.

The Committee's decision:

Original table result restored

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 15

Belgium v Czech Republic

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Grattan Endicott (Scribe, England), Carlo Mosca (Italy), Jean-Paul Meyer (France)

Open Teams Round 14

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vulnerable.

	♠ 5 4 2		
	♥ 6		
	♦ K Q 8 3 2		
	♣ J 8 4 3		
♠ K		♠ Q J 9	
♥ K Q 10		♥ A J 9 4	
♦ J 5		♦ 10 9 7 6 4	
♣ A Q 10 7 6 5 2		♣ K	
	♠ A 10 8 7 6 3		
	♥ 8 7 5 3 2		
	♦ A		
	♣ 9		
West	North	East	South
<i>Kurka</i>	<i>Kaplan</i>	<i>Mraz</i>	<i>Polet</i>
1♣	Pass	1♦	2♦
3♣	3♦	Dble	3♠
Pass	Pass	Dble	All Pass

Contract: Three Spades Doubled, played by South

Lead: Jack of Diamonds

Result: 9 tricks, NS +730

The Facts:

Appeals 12 and 15 are from the same match, but from different tables.

The Director was called at the end of the play. West claimed that he had been misinformed and that if he had correct information he would lead the King of Spades. The information he had been given suggested that North/South had fits in both majors and in this circumstance the King of Spades did not seem a useful lead.

The Director:

Consulted expert players, all of whom led the Spade (although one said he would like to know who were his opponents), and established that North was correct in explain-

ing that South's bid was natural by agreement.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to 3♠X-1, NS -200

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

North/South appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains.

The Players:

informed the Committee that, to West, South had explained North's bid as a cue bid with a fit in both majors. North had not been surprised by the number of Diamonds in the pack because in his judgement East could have a three-card suit. He had correctly explained his partnership agreement to East. The East player stated that his bid would always show at least four Diamonds.

The Committee:

Agreed with the Director that West had received misinformation and had been damaged in consequence. The Committee found that the King of Spades would be the likely lead if West had not been misinformed. Serious consideration was given to retention of the deposit.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 16

Spain v Finland

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (England), Jean-Paul Meyer (France)

Open Teams Round 15

Board 1. Dealer North. Love All.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Juuri-Oja</i>	<i>Knap</i>	<i>Utter</i>	<i>Wasik</i>
	Pass	INT	Pass
2♣	Pass	2♦	Pass
3NT	All Pass		

Comments: INT=13-17, 5-card major possible, 2♦= no 4-card major, minimum hand

Contract: Three No-Trumps, played by East

Lead: Three of Hearts

Play: 1) Heart to the Ten; 2) Club to the Jack; 3) Heart to the Ace; 4) Queen of Clubs, taken by the King (spade discarded); 5) Four of Diamonds for the six, nine and Jack.

Result: 9 tricks, NS +400

The Facts:

North had thought for a considerable time before playing the ♦4. East had played the 6 on this after a pause of 15 seconds. South called the Director at the end of the hand, claiming that this hesitation had led him to believe that East held the ♦Q, which is why he had not put in the King, thus presenting Declarer with his ninth trick.

The Director:

Established that East did not dispute the pause, and had not said “sorry” or anything of that sort, and that South had been misled as a result.

However, it was not certain that South would always play the King, and the Director did not want to give South a free safety play by adjusting the score completely.

South has drawn inference from a mannerism of an opponent and the Laws state that this has to be done at his own risk.

East had no reason to hesitate however, and although the Director did not believe East had any intention of deceiving, he “could have known” that the pause would benefit his side and should not keep the full benefit that had resulted.

After due consulting, the Director decided to award a split score.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to

North/South receive:

33.3% of 3NT-1 by East (NS +50) plus

66.7% of 3NT made by East (NS -400)

which translates to -3 for the team of North/South (other table result NS -120)

East/West receive:

66.7% of 3NT-1 by East (NS +50) plus

33.3% of 3NT made by East (NS -400)

which translates to -1 for the team of East/West

Relevant Laws:

Law 73D1, 73F2

Law 16A2

Law 12C3, Code of Practice enabling Tournament Director to award Adjusted Scores under Law 12C3.

North/South appealed.

Present: North, South, and both Captains

The Players:

North explained why he had needed to think before switching to Diamonds. He pictured East with 3325, because he knew partner held four spades. North had tried to cut East/West’s communications in Diamonds. The ♦4 was fourth best.

South stated that he too had pictured East with 3325, specifically since East had discarded a spade in dummy. When East “hesitated”, South found this showed the Diamond Queen, and the nine (or the seven) would be the right card to play.

North/South believed it was unethical to hesitate with a small doubleton and not apologize at the table.

East, who did not attend the meeting, had asked his captain to convey his apologies to North/South. He was tired, it was hot, and he did not do it on purpose, but had fallen asleep.

The Committee:

Thought the Director had made a perfect ruling.

The Committee felt that since the ruling may seem strange to players, and is not very common, North/South were entitled to have the Committee review the ruling and their deposit was returned for that reason only.

The Committee’s decision:

Director’s ruling upheld.

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 17

Italy v Russia

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Jan Kamras (Sweden, Scribe), Jean-Claude Beineix (France)

Open Teams Round 15

Board 12. Dealer West. North/South Vul.

	♠ A 7 5 3		
	♥ 10 2		
	♦ Q 10 3		
	♣ A Q 5 4		
♠ Q 6		♠ J 8 4	
♥ 9 8 5 4		♥ K Q J 6 3	
♦ J		♦ K 9 5 4	
♣ J 10 8 6 3 2		♣ 9	
	♠ K 10 9 2		
	♥ A 7		
	♦ A 8 7 6 2		
	♣ K 7		
West	North	East	South
<i>Kholomeev</i>	<i>Lauria</i>	<i>Zlotov</i>	<i>Versace</i>
3♣	Pass	Pass	Dble
Pass	3NT	All Pass	

Comments: 3♣ was alerted by West as being very weak.

Contract: Three No-Trumps, played by North

Result: 7 tricks, NS -200

The Facts:

North called the Director claiming that there had been no alert on his side about the 3♣ opening being very weak. He stated he would not have bid 3NT had he known this.

The Director:

Ruled that there was no specific regulation requiring an alert for such openings. The general alerting policy applies, which state that one must alert things that are unexpected for opponents. Wild and random pre-empts are quite common at this level of competition. Besides, East/West's style of pre-empting was clearly indicated on the front page of their Convention Card. This meant there had been no misinformation. Furthermore, North made no

attempt to inquire as to the meaning of 3♣ before deciding on his action.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A

EBL and WBF alerting policy

North/South appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

South said that, having been alerted to the 3♣ opening being very weak, he took this into account when reopening, but that his partner had no chance to take the right decision.

West stated that he alerted his call more as an additional courtesy to South.

The Committee:

Found that the Director judged the situation correctly based on the undisputed facts.

Since the appellants presented no further evidence in support of their case, the Committee found the appeal to be without merit.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Forfeited

Tenerife: Appeal No. 18

Italy v Spain

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Grattan Endicott (England), Steen Møller (Denmark)

Ladies Teams Round 8

Board 6. Dealer East. East/West Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Santos</i>	<i>Manara</i>	<i>Matut</i>	<i>Ferlazzo</i>
		1♥	1♠
2♣	4♠	5♣	Pass
6♣	Pass	Pass	6♠
Dble	All Pass		

Comments: 2♣ was forcing

Contract: Six Spades Doubled, played by South

Result: 8 tricks, NS -800

The Facts:

The tray had come back with the two passes after some delay. West said it had taken a minute, while South agreed it was more than 30 seconds. West called the Director after the bid of 6♠.

The Director:

Decided that the break in tempo had been established and that this constituted unauthorized information to South. After consultation of his colleagues and some players, he considered passing a logical alternative for South. There are 12 tricks available to East/West.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to 6♣ by West, making, NS -1370

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A, 12C2

North/South appealed.

Present: All players, both Captains, and a Spanish translator

The Players:

North/South's captain explained that he had given his players the instruction to always sacrifice on big boards. South explained she had decided to bid 6♠ even before the tray had come back. She had not bid 5♠ because she did not feel the need to sacrifice against Game, but she did need to do so against Slams.

The Committee:

Stressed that when a player is in the possession of unauthorized information, she should bend over backwards not to take advantage of it. It was suggested in Committee, that North might have been thinking about doubling, in which case the sacrifice was less suggested than the pass. For this reason the appeal was not judged to be without merit, although this was a close call.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 19

Germany v Ireland

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Grattan Endicott (England), Steen Møller (Denmark)

Senior Teams Round 9

Board 6. Dealer East. East/West Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Barry</i>	<i>Chmelik</i>	<i>MacKenzie</i>	<i>Hoeger</i>
		Pass	Pass
1♥	2♣	2♥	Pass
Pass	2NT	Pass	3♦
Pass	3NT	Pass	Pass
Dble	All Pass		

Contract: Three No-Trumps Doubled, played by North

Lead: Two of Hearts

Result: 11 tricks, NS +750

The Facts:

South had explained to West that 2NT showed Clubs and Diamonds. West called the Director after the hand, claiming he would not have doubled if he had known that 2NT was merely natural, which is how North had explained it to East.

The Director:

Ruled that there had been misinformation.

The Director asked if the double had any lead-directing meaning, which it turned out not to have. The Director ruled that the damage was not connected to the misinformation.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 40C

East/West appealed.

Present: All players, the Captain of Germany and a German translator

The Players:

West stated he had thought they were “overboard”. He claimed he would not have doubled if he had been told that North held a good hand with only clubs. If North indeed has ten cards in the minors, the stops in the majors would be slight, and he thought his side were going to score three heart tricks, two diamonds and perhaps a spade. West stated that East had not shown any points, the Heart support could have been given even on a Yarborough.

South explained that he and North were not regular partners and they were having some misunderstandings. South thought the double was “out of this world”.

The Committee:

Found that the double was chancy, and not related to the misinformation.

The Committee’s decision:

Director’s ruling upheld.

Deposit: Forfeited

Appeal Committee Special Meeting No. I HUM system of Luxembourg

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Jean-Claude Beineix (France), Naki Bruni (Italy), Steen Møller (Denmark)

Grattan Endicott assisted in the meeting as a witness.

Open Teams

The Facts:

One pair from the team of Luxembourg was playing a HUM system during the tournament.

At the start of the 20th match, which was against the Netherlands, the pair from Luxembourg informed their opponents of the fact that they had made one small change to their system. The Dutch pair called the Tournament Director to protest against this.

The Director:

Ruled that a pair was not allowed to change their system without prior notification in the correct form. He ordered the Luxembourg pair to play the system as originally lodged and informed the Tournament Appeal Committee. The Chairman of the Appeal Committee decided that the pair was not allowed to play in the next match and had to appear before a special Committee meeting.

The Players:

Explained the change of their system, which only applied to their openings at the two level when they were not vulnerable. All hands with 0-7 HCP are opened at the two-level. Originally, 2♣ was reserved for one-suited hands, including 5332 and 4333 distributions. 2♦ showed 4-4 in both minors or in both majors, and 2♥ and 2♠ showed 4 of that major and a minor. Just before the championship, they changed this last element to 5 of the major, thereby putting the hands that contain 4 of a major and 4 of a minor in the 2♣ opening.

They had lodged the original system according to the regulations.

They had brought the new system with them to the championship and lodged the full system, and the new Convention Card, with the systems desk. A special page with the change, was also handed in. They informed the systems desk of the small changes and were told that they could play the new system without problem.

At the start of each match, they informed the opponents of the change and there had been no comments by opponents until now (round 20).

The responsible for the Systems desk confirmed that he had received the documents mentioned, as they were in his files. He had labelled and stored them, but he had not gone through them, and he did not recall that the team had told him about changes. He had not approved the change of system, in the manner in which this was always done, including a mention of the round during which the changes could first be played and he had not distributed the change to the other captains, something that is also part of the standard procedure.

The Luxembourg captain told the Committee that he had attended the Captain's meeting, during which it was stated once more that no changes would be accepted to Brown Sticker conventions. He did know his players had made a small change, but thought the rule did not

apply to changes before the tournament and he was not even aware that it concerned changes to a Brown Sticker convention.

The Committee:

Read the relevant parts of the Systems regulations:

“1.2 Submission of Systems

Each team captain is responsible for sending the convention cards ... before 10 May, 2001...”

“1.6 Changes to Cards

... no later than 25 May, 2001...”

“1.7 Special Responsibility for HUM, RED and BROWN STICKER

... there is a special responsibility for users to explain their methods in sufficient detail, the **first time** that Cards are submitted ... no pair will be permitted to claim ignorance of this special responsibility”

also relevant is a part of Appendix A – systems policy:

“5 Convention Cards

... After the closing date for submission of systems, the following will be the policy governing any changes to the Convention Card and Supplementary Sheets:

... c) Neither the replacement of a Brown Sticker convention with another Brown Sticker conventions, nor the introduction of a new Brown Sticker convention will be permitted”

The Committee considered the opening of 2♣ by this pair (when non-vulnerable). According to their lodged system, that opening shows: 0-7 HCP, any one-suiter, 5332, or 4333. This is certainly a Brown Sticker convention. In the new system, in addition to the already mentioned distributions, the distribution 4432 (4 of a major and a minor) is possible. This is definitely a change, not merely a clarification.

The Committee concluded that the change of system had not been approved by the Chairman of the Appeal Committee in his duty as Chairman in situ of the Systems Committee, or by his appointed substitute. Nor was the change in any way or manner possible after 25 May, 2001.

It is very important that the players who use HUM systems and Brown Sticker conventions adhere in full to the regulations that are in force.

The Committee's decision:

- 1) The Luxembourg pair has to revert to the system as originally submitted;
- 2) This system had been, and still was available to all captains so the coming opponents do not need to be informed at this specific time;
- 3) The pair is allowed to play from the next match on;
- 4) The pair has to make absolutely certain, before every match, that the opponents have the correct version of their system;
- 5) The pair receives an official warning: no change to their system, however small, will be allowed. If they do make changes, they shall have to play the WBF world standard system from then on to the end of the tournament.

Committee's note:

No mention is made in the regulations that no change is allowed to any part of a HUM system. Such a change in a HUM is however clearly not allowed. The change that was in discussion in this instance involved a Brown Sticker convention, so the appropriate regulations applied.

Tenerife: Appeal No. 21

England v Croatia

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Naki Bruni (Italy), Jean-Paul Meyer (France), Grattan Endicott (England) sat in on the meeting in order to act as Scribe.

Senior Teams Round 12

Board 9. Dealer North. East/West Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Perasic</i>	<i>Jones</i>	<i>Caric</i>	<i>Collings</i>
	Pass	Pass	1♠
Dble	Pass	INT	2♣
Pass	2♠	All Pass	

Contract: Two Spades, played by South

Lead: Ace of Diamonds

Play: ♦A / ♠A / ♦K / ♦Q / ♥3 / ♣8 / ♣K / ♥9 / ♣J

Result: 7 tricks, NS -50

The Facts: The Director was called at the end of the play of the hand. Declarer complained that he had been misinformed about the meaning of East's INT bid. It had been explained to him as natural, 5-9 with a stopper. He had based his line of play on this information. Opponents told the Director that they have a negative 2♣ response to the double, two of any other suit shows at least 9 HCP, INT is used for balanced hands for which neither of these responses is suitable and is expected to include a stopper in opponent's suit.

The Director:

Ruled that there was no misinformation.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 40C

North/South appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

North/South expressed their view that the explanation of the INT was incomplete. Given the possibilities not covered by Two Clubs or Two of another Suit, it was evident that there were a whole raft of hands for which the INT bid would be used. They considered that South was entitled to be told this, and that some of them might not include a stop in Spades.

East/West said that they had given correct information to their opponents. They had played together for some thirty years and this situation had never arisen previously as far as they recalled.

The Committee:

The Committee found that East/West had explained their methods correctly.

There is little merit in appealing when South's choice of play does not succeed.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Forfeited

Tenerife: Appeal No. 22

Israel v Wales

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Grattan Endicott (Scribe, England), Naki Bruni (Italy), Jean-Paul Meyer (France)

Ladies Teams Round 10

Board 18. Dealer East. North/South Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
Harris	Naveh	Clench	Melech
Pass	INT	Pass	Pass
2♦ ⁽²⁾	Dble	Dble ⁽¹⁾	Pass
All Pass		2♥ ⁽³⁾	Dble

Comments:

- (1) Majors or Minors or Diamonds
- (2) Preference for Diamonds
- (3) Majors

Contract: Two Hearts doubled, played by East

Result: 7 tricks, NS +100

The Facts:

The Director was called during the auction and North complained that a convention had been used by East/West that was not on the Convention Card. The Director required the players to complete the hand. Called again after the play of the Board was completed, the Director was told that North/South felt damaged. They believed they would have found their 3NT contract if they had been able to prepare a defence to the convention beforehand, instead of playing "blind" against it.

The Director:

Applied a penalty of 0.5 VP to East/West for a deficient Convention Card.

Ruled that North/South had not been damaged by the use of the convention.

Ruling:

Result Stands

East/West receive a penalty of 0.5 VP

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

Law 40B, 40E1

North/South appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

North/South repeated to the Committee their belief that, with time to prepare a defence to the convention, they would have found their 3NT contract. South said she had intended her double to show points. She could not redouble on the previous round because this would be an S.O.S. asking for rescue.

The Committee:

Agreed that for sure East/West were at fault. As for North/South they should be aware that a double of INT by a passed hand would not be for penalties, whoever were the opponents. This is only common sense. Accordingly they should be expected to have prepared principles by which to counter two-suited doubles, in particular, in this situation. Moreover it is not unusual that a double following a penalty double can now be a take-out double in a situation like this.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 23

Denmark v Finland

Appeals Committee:

Grattan Endicott (Chairman and Scribe, England),
Naki Bruni (Italy), Jean-Paul Meyer (France)

Ladies Teams Round 11

Board 12. Dealer West. North/South Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Koistinen</i>	<i>Kirstan</i>	<i>Bäckström</i>	<i>Krefeld</i>
Pass	1♠	2♠	Pass
3♣	Dble	3♦	Dble
All Pass			

Contract: Three Diamonds Doubled, played by East

Play: immaterial, but the following end position is reached, East having made three tricks so far, and in hand:

	♠ -
	♥ K Q 10
	♦ 9 8
	♣ -
♠ -	
♥ A J 9 6	
♦ Q	
♣ -	

Result: 5 tricks, NS +800

The Facts:

The Director was called after the play on the following board. East wished to withdraw her concession of three tricks in the above position. According to East, both the King of Hearts and the Ace of Hearts had been played, but South asserted that she had not in fact played the Ace, having it in her hand but not having put it in the played position.

The Director investigated how the card had been held and reached a conclusion that it had been played.

The Director:

allowed the withdrawal of concession in respect of one trick.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to 3♦X-3, NS +500

Relevant Laws:

Law 45C1, 70A, 70B, 71C

North/South appealed.

Present: All players and the Captain of Denmark

The Players:

South repeated to the Committee that she did not consider her card played. She had demonstrated to the Director the position of her card as it was after East had conceded the tricks. She agreed that if she had ducked the trick declarer's play next of a diamond would lead to the same position. East said she had made no statement concerning her action in the latter case since in fact the Ace had been played so that she could see it.

The Committee:

In the presence of the players, the Committee discussed with the Director his investigation of the alleged play of the Ace. In their deliberations the Committee upheld the ruling of the Director that the Ace had been played. It was also noted that even if the Ace had not been played to the trick there can be no doubt at this level of play that Declarer would then play a Diamond, and this must be deemed the only normal play in that position.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 24

Italy v Sweden

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Grattan Endicott (England)

Ladies Teams Round 9

Board 2. Dealer East. North/South Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Karlsson-Uisk</i>	<i>Oliveiri</i>	<i>Evelius-Nohrén</i>	<i>Arrigoni</i>
Pass	1♥	Pass	1♦
Pass	2♠	Pass	2NT
Pass	3♣	Pass	3♥
Pass	3♠	Pass	3NT
Pass	4♣	Pass	4♦
Pass	4♠	Pass	5♥
All Pass			

Comments:

1♦ nat 11-20; 1♥ nat 4+; 2♥ nat maybe 3 cards; 2♠ asking; 2NT 4 card support, singleton; 3♣ asking 3♥ club singleton, minimum; 3♠, 3NT first or second round control in spades; 4♣ and 4♦ first or second round controls; 4♠ first round control.

Contract: Five Hearts, played by North

Lead: Jack of Clubs

Play: Declarer North played two rounds of Hearts, East taking the second, while West played the six and eight in that order. East now switched to the Queen of Diamonds.

Result: 11 tricks, NS +650

The Facts:

East/West called the Director to protest about the explanation that South had given to West, saying that 4♠ showed first round control in Spades. West's signal in Hearts, which denied the Ace of Spades, was given so as not to help declarer. East had been told 4♠ showed first or second round control, and she had therefore concluded from her partner's signal that North held the Ace of Spades, and she had switched to Diamonds as a consequence.

The Director:

Found that the explanation "first round control" had been the correct one, so West had not been misin-

formed. The Director also found that the switch to Diamonds would always be made, so he ruled there had been no damage.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

East/West appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

North explained that, when she bid 4♠, she had forgotten she had already showed the (first or) second round control in spades by her 3♠ of two rounds of bidding before. She had intended 4♠ to show first or second round control and she realized after the Board that her partner's explanation had been the correct one.

East explained that she had asked quite clearly if 4♠ showed first or second round control. North had responded "control", thinking it was clear that this meant "first or second round control". East had interpreted it as such, so this was really not a problem.

West explained her reasons for not showing the Spade Ace: knowing that North was void in Spades, she did not want to help declarer.

East then explained her reasoning: if her partner had been given the same information than she had, she would certainly have shown the Ace of Spades. That meant that North must have the ♠A, and so the Diamond switch was the only chance of beating the contract.

The Committee:

Found that South's explanation was consistent with bridge logic. North had shown the same control twice, so the second time it had to be a first round control. West had received the correct information, and she should not expect redress for her decision to deny the Ace of Spades as a result.

On the other hand, East had not received the correct information, and as a consequence she had no way of expecting her partner to falsecard in such a sensitive position.

With a correct explanation, East will "know" that North either has a void or the Ace in Spades. If it is the Ace, then the switch to Diamonds is still imperative if the contract shall fail. If it is a void, then the Diamond switch could probably only cost an over-trick.

The Committee concluded that with correct information, East would probably also switch to the ♦Q, but that was not an absolute certainty.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to

Both sides receive:

75% of 5♥ made by North (NS +650) plus

25% of 5♥-1 by North (NS -100)

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 25

Ukraine v Finland

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (England), Eric Kokish (Canada)

Open Teams Round 22

Board 15. Dealer South. North/South Vul.

	♠ J 8 2		
	♥ K 9 3 2		
	♦ A K 6		
	♣ 10 9 8		
♠ K 9 5 3		♠ A 10 7 6 4	
♥ J 10 6		♥ Q 8 4	
♦ 9 3		♦ Q J 7 2	
♣ A J 6 2		♣ 7	
	♠ Q		
	♥ A 7 5		
	♦ 10 8 5 4		
	♣ K Q 5 4 3		
West	North	East	South
<i>Stubb</i>	<i>Nemtsev</i>	<i>Pesonen</i>	<i>Mikhailenko</i>
Pass	1♣	Pass	Pass
Pass	Pass	2♠	2♣
3♠	All Pass		Dble

Contract: Three Spades, played by East

Lead: King of Clubs

Play: first trick for the ♣A, ♠K, ♠ to the Ace.

Result: 8 tricks, NS +50

The Facts:

East called the Director at the end of the play, claiming misinformation. He had not received, from North, an alert on South's double. South had alerted it and explained it as shortness in spades. East claimed he would not have played spades to be 2-2, but would have finessed, had he received the explanation that South had given.

The Director:

Ruled that North, by not alerting, had explained the double as Take-Out, and that South had actually given the same informa-

tion by other words, adding more than he needed by explaining his hand rather than his agreement.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A

East/West appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

South explained that he had said Take-Out and written "short" to explain.

East stated that it was explained as Take-Out to him by the non-alert.

East/West stated they did not ask for full restitution, but that with South's explanation, East had more chance of finding the correct line.

The Committee:

Saw no reason to amend the Director's ruling in any way.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Forfeited

Tenerife: Appeal No. 25

Ukraine v Finland

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (England), Eric Kokish (Canada)

Open Teams Round 22

Board 15. Dealer South. North/South Vul.

	♠ J 8 2		
	♥ K 9 3 2		
	♦ A K 6		
	♣ 10 9 8		
♠ K 9 5 3		♠ A 10 7 6 4	
♥ J 10 6		♥ Q 8 4	
♦ 9 3		♦ Q J 7 2	
♣ A J 6 2		♣ 7	
	♠ Q		
	♥ A 7 5		
	♦ 10 8 5 4		
	♣ K Q 5 4 3		
West	North	East	South
<i>Stubb</i>	<i>Nemtsev</i>	<i>Pesonen</i>	<i>Mikhailenko</i>
Pass	1♣	Pass	Pass
Pass	Pass	2♠	2♣
3♠	All Pass		Dble

Contract: Three Spades, played by East

Lead: King of Clubs

Play: first trick for the ♣A, ♠K, ♠ to the Ace.

Result: 8 tricks, NS +50

The Facts:

East called the Director at the end of the play, claiming misinformation. He had not received, from North, an alert on South's double. South had alerted it and explained it as shortness in spades. East claimed he would not have played spades to be 2-2, but would have finessed, had he received the explanation that South had given.

The Director:

Ruled that North, by not alerting, had explained the double as Take-Out, and that South had actually given the same information by other words, adding more than he

needed by explaining his hand rather than his agreement.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A

East/West appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

South explained that he had said Take-Out and written "short" to explain.

East stated that it was explained as Take-Out to him by the non-alert.

East/West stated they did not ask for full restitution, but that with South's explanation, East had more chance of finding the correct line.

The Committee:

Saw no reason to amend the Director's ruling in any way.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Forfeited

Tenerife: Appeal No. 23

Denmark v Finland

Appeals Committee:

Grattan Endicott (Chairman and Scribe, England),
Naki Bruni (Italy), Jean-Paul Meyer (France)

Ladies Teams Round 11

Board 12. Dealer West. North/South Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Koistinen</i>	<i>Kirstan</i>	<i>Bäckström</i>	<i>Krefeld</i>
Pass	1♠	2♠	Pass
3♣	Dble	3♦	Dble
All Pass			

Contract: Three Diamonds Doubled, played by East

Play: immaterial, but the following end position is reached, East having made three tricks so far, and in hand:

	♠ -
	♥ K Q 10
	♦ 9 8
	♣ -
♠ -	
♥ A J 9 6	
♦ Q	
♣ -	

Result: 5 tricks, NS +800

The Facts:

The Director was called after the play on the following board. East wished to withdraw her concession of three tricks in the above position. According to East, both the King of Hearts and the Ace of Hearts had been played, but South asserted that she had not in fact played the Ace, having it in her hand but not having put it in the played position.

The Director investigated how the card had been held and reached a conclusion that it had been played.

The Director:

allowed the withdrawal of concession in respect of one trick.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to 3♦X-3, NS +500

Relevant Laws:

Law 45C1, 70A, 70B, 71C

North/South appealed.

Present: All players and the Captain of Denmark

The Players:

South repeated to the Committee that she did not consider her card played. She had demonstrated to the Director the position of her card as it was after East had conceded the tricks. She agreed that if she had ducked the trick declarer's play next of a diamond would lead to the same position. East said she had made no statement concerning her action in the latter case since in fact the Ace had been played so that she could see it.

The Committee:

In the presence of the players, the Committee discussed with the Director his investigation of the alleged play of the Ace. In their deliberations the Committee upheld the ruling of the Director that the Ace had been played. It was also noted that even if the Ace had not been played to the trick there can be no doubt at this level of play that Declarer would then play a Diamond, and this must be deemed the only normal play in that position.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 24

Italy v Sweden

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Grattan Endicott (England)

Ladies Teams Round 9

Board 2. Dealer East. North/South Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Karlsson- Uisk</i>	<i>Oliveiri</i>	<i>Evelius- Nohrén</i>	<i>Arrigoni</i>
Pass	1♥	Pass	1♦
Pass	2♠	Pass	2♥
Pass	3♣	Pass	2NT
Pass	3♠	Pass	3♥
Pass	4♣	Pass	3NT
Pass	4♠	Pass	4♦
Pass	4♠	Pass	5♥
All Pass			

Comments:

1♦ nat 11-20; 1♥ nat 4+; 2♥ nat maybe 3 cards; 2♠ asking; 2NT 4 card support, singleton; 3♣ asking 3♥ club singleton, minimum; 3♠, 3NT first or second round control in spades; 4♣ and 4♦ first or second round controls; 4♠ first round control.

Contract: Five Hearts, played by North

Lead: Jack of Clubs

Play: Declarer North played two rounds of Hearts, East taking the second, while West played the six and eight in that order. East now switched to the Queen of Diamonds.

Result: 11 tricks, NS +650

The Facts:

East/West called the Director to protest about the explanation that South had given to West, saying that 4♠ showed first round control in Spades. West's signal in Hearts, which denied the Ace of Spades, was given so as not to help declarer. East had been told 4♠ showed first or second round control, and she had therefore concluded from her partner's signal that North held the Ace of Spades, and she had switched to Diamonds as a consequence.

The Director:

Found that the explanation "first round control" had

been the correct one, so West had not been misinformed. The Director also found that the switch to Diamonds would always be made, so he ruled there had been no damage.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

East/West appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

North explained that, when she bid 4♠, she had forgotten she had already showed the (first or) second round control in spades by her 3♠ of two rounds of bidding before. She had intended 4♠ to show first or second round control and she realized after the Board that her partner's explanation had been the correct one.

East explained that she had asked quite clearly if 4♠ showed first or second round control. North had responded "control", thinking it was clear that this meant "first or second round control". East had interpreted it as such, so this was really not a problem.

West explained her reasons for not showing the Spade Ace: knowing that North was void in Spades, she did not want to help declarer.

East then explained her reasoning: if her partner had been given the same information than she had, she would certainly have shown the Ace of Spades. That meant that North must have the ♠A, and so the Diamond switch was the only chance of beating the contract.

The Committee:

Found that South's explanation was consistent with bridge logic. North had shown the same control twice, so the second time it had to be a first round control. West had received the correct information, and she should not expect redress for her decision to deny the Ace of Spades as a result.

On the other hand, East had not received the correct information, and as a consequence she had no way of expecting her partner to falsecard in such a sensitive position.

With a correct explanation, East will "know" that North either has a void or the Ace in Spades. If it is the Ace, then the switch to Diamonds is still imperative if the contract shall fail. If it is a void, then the Diamond switch could probably only cost an over-trick.

The Committee concluded that with correct information, East would probably also switch to the ♦Q, but that was not an absolute certainty.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to

Both sides receive:

75% of 5♥ made by North (NS +650) plus

25% of 5♥-1 by North (NS -100)

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 25

Ukraine v Finland

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (England), Eric Kokish (Canada)

Open Teams Round 22

Board 15. Dealer South. North/South Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Stubb</i>	<i>Nemtsev</i>	<i>Pesonen</i>	<i>Mikhailenko</i>
Pass	1♣	Pass	Pass
Pass	Pass	2♠	2♣
3♠	All Pass		Dble

Contract: Three Spades, played by East

Lead: King of Clubs

Play: first trick for the ♣A, ♠K, ♠ to the Ace.

Result: 8 tricks, NS +50

The Facts:

East called the Director at the end of the play, claiming misinformation. He had not received, from North, an alert on South's double. South had alerted it and explained it as shortness in spades. East claimed he would not have played spades to be 2-2, but would have finessed, had he received the explanation that South had given.

The Director:

Ruled that North, by not alerting, had explained the double as Take-Out, and that South had actually given the same information by other words, adding more than he

needed by explaining his hand rather than his agreement.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A

East/West appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

South explained that he had said Take-Out and written "short" to explain.

East stated that it was explained as Take-Out to him by the non-alert.

East/West stated they did not ask for full restitution, but that with South's explanation, East had more chance of finding the correct line.

The Committee:

Saw no reason to amend the Director's ruling in any way.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Forfeited

Tenerife: Appeal No. 26

Sweden v France

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (England), Eric Kokish (Canada)

Ladies Teams Round 11

Board 5. Dealer North. North/South Vul.

	♠ 6 5 2		
	♥ 9 6		
	♦ 9 7 3 2		
	♣ J 9 7 6		
♠ Q J 10		♠ K 8 7 3	
♥ K 10 4		♥ 7	
♦ Q J 6 4		♦ A K 10 5	
♣ Q 8 5		♣ A 10 3 2	
	♠ A 9 4		
	♥ A Q J 8 5 3 2		
	♦ 8		
	♣ K 4		
West	North	East	South
<i>Lustin</i>	<i>Midskog</i>	<i>Avon</i>	<i>Göthe</i>
		I♦	Dble
3NT	All Pass		

Contract: Three No-Trumps, played by West

Lead: Nine of Hearts

Result: 6 tricks, NS +150

The Facts:

South had thought for some time before making the final pass.

West called the Director, claiming that this hesitation had influenced North in her selection of lead.

West stated the pause had been one minute long. South confirmed the hesitation and did not disagree about its length. North stated that she had not noticed the delay. East said she had.

The Director:

Considered the hesitation established, but did not believe the hesitation carried any information affecting the choice between Hearts and Spades.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A

East/West appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

South explained that she was usually a fast bidder but she was fixed.

North stated that she believed the final contract had been reached, and she asked questions about the nature of the 3NT bid and started considering her lead. Sometimes the tray stays on the other side, even when the final pass has been made.

She explained the choice of a Heart. It was clear to lead a major and she knew partner had certainly at least four Hearts. If partner had five or more in any suit, it was more likely to be Hearts.

East/West considered that a fast pass would tell partner to choose, whereas a slow pass would indicate that the shortest suit should be led.

The Committee:

Considered the hesitation proven.

While it is true that the hesitation carries no information regarding Hearts or Spades, it does carry the information that there is some interesting lead to be found, and this inclines to suggest North's shorter major.

When in possession of unauthorized information, a player should not take the action that is demonstrably suggested by it, when there are logical alternatives available to that action.

In this case, the action that has been suggested is to lead the shorter suit, and since a Spade lead is certainly an alternative, North should not have led a Heart.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to 3NT by West, made, NS - 400

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 27

England v Poland

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Steen Møller (Denmark)

Open Teams Round 23

Board 10. Dealer East. All Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
Zmudzinski	Liggins	Balicki	Fawcett
Pass	1♥	Pass	1♣
Pass	2♦	Pass	1♠
Dble	Pass	3♣	Pass
3♠	Pass	4♠	All Pass

Comments:

1♣ is either natural, 5+ clubs or balanced 11-14/18-19, 2+ clubs

1♠ shows 5 clubs and 4 spades

2♦ is a transfer to hearts

Contract: Four Spades, played by West

Result: 8 tricks, NS +200

The Facts:

South had alerted his bid of 1♠ to West and explained it as per agreement. North had not alerted it. East had not enquired about the meaning of the bidding.

After the play, East/West had called the Director to complain about the failure to alert 1♠ by North. East claimed he had intended 3♣ as a natural bid, while West, who had known about the 5 card club suit in South, had interpreted it as a cue-bid.

The Director:

Took into consideration that the opening of 1♣ is accurately described on the Convention Card and that East could have protected himself better.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

EBL Appeals Book, 2001

Law 75A

East/West appealed.

Present: All players and the Captain of Poland

The Players:

East explained that this was almost like a Polish Club. He never expected that North needed to reply INT with any of the balanced meanings, and when 1♠ was not alerted to him, he expected a balanced hand, not necessarily with five clubs. If he needed to consult the Convention Cards for every bid, he would never be able to finish the matches in time.

West explained that they play a special defence over conventional clubs. The Pass shows either no overcall or a 16+ hand. East/West had clearly agreed to treat this 1♣ opening as conventional.

North stated he never alerts this 1♠ bid, although he does alert the INT response, which can be made with four spades. North did not know why South alerted it. South added that West had even asked him why he thought he needed to alert this natural bid.

North/South pointed out that when East was going to bid clubs, a suit bid by his opponents, he might have been more careful in checking with his opponents how many clubs had been promised.

North/South further pointed out that their line of defence had allowed West to make his contract. North had led his singleton club, but South could not read this, as he would also lead the 4 from 10-4. South had played the Queen of Hearts, which West had ducked, and on which North had given suit preference. Now South gave his partner the club ruff. North pointed out that West, who did know the full club position, should have taken the ♥Q and played three rounds of trumps, with a chance of making the contract if he played the ♠10 to the third round of trumps.

West replied that to play three rounds of trumps that way would have been against the odds. When South did not play clubs to the second trick, West was hoping he would not do so in the third either.

The Committee:

Found that East had been careless in not checking his opponents' systems more completely.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Forfeited

Tenerife: Appeal No. 28

Lebanon v Iceland

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (England), Steen Møller (Denmark)

Open Teams Round 23

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Thorvaldsson Eidi</i>		<i>Jonsson</i>	<i>Harfouche</i>
2♣	2♥	4♣	1♠ ⁽¹⁾
Pass	4♠	Pass	4NT ⁽²⁾
Pass	5♦	Pass	6♠
All Pass			

Comments:

⁽¹⁾ forcing

⁽²⁾ RKCB

Contract: Six Spades, played by South

Result: 12 tricks, NS +1430

The Facts:

West called the Director, claiming that the tray had stayed on the North/East side for some time before returning with 5♦. South did not agree to this, and the Director asked on the other side. North admitted that he had needed some time to consider his response, since he could show his void if he had held an Ace, but not in the case of the fifth key-card. East said it had taken some 15 seconds, and the scorer, who was Polish, also said 15 seconds.

The Director:

Ruled that according to the Code of Practice, a delay of 15 seconds in the return of the tray does not carry any unauthorized information.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A

East/West appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

East/West stated that while it is not always easy to bid in proper tempo, it should be possible to give the answer to a Blackwood question in less than 15 seconds. The hesitation shows something extra, and this makes bidding 6♠ easier.

North agreed that he had paused, thinking about showing his void in clubs and deciding against it without a true Ace.

West told the Committee that at the table, everybody had agreed about the hesitation. The Director had written "agreed hesitation" before leaving the table to consider the case. He thought there should be no more discussion about that part of the ruling. South stated that he already knew partner had the void in Clubs. After all, the opponents are World Champions and they have bid 2♣ and 4♣. If partner had shown two key-cards, he would have bid Seven Spades.

West further stated that South had been fiddling with his bidding card of 5♠, but South denied this. West had not told this to the Director at the time of the ruling.

The Committee:

Read the relevant part of the Code of Practice:

"The WBF considers it desirable that players should vary the tempo randomly when returning the tray under the screen. Where North and South are the players with next turn to call when the tray is received, these are the players who are responsible for the movement of the tray. It is considered there can be no implications if a tray returns after 15 seconds or less. This period may be extended in the later stages of a complicated or competitive auction without necessarily creating implications."

The Committee found that the Director had been correct, in accordance with the Code of Practice, in ruling there had been no misinformation.

On a lighter note, the Committee also considered the bidding, finding that South had been correct in assuming that partner had a void in clubs. Opponents' bidding suggested they had 9 clubs (or even 10) and added to his 4, this did not leave many for partner.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 29

England v Latvia

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Steen Møller (Denmark)

Open Teams Round 25

Board 5. Dealer North. North/South Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Gonca</i>	<i>Hallberg</i>	<i>Alfejeva</i>	<i>Simpson</i>
	1♣	1♦	Dble
2♥	Pass	2♠	Pass
Pass	2NT	All Pass	

Comments:

The 1♦ has the same meaning as the 1♦ opening for this pair, 4 of a Major and 5 of a Minor

Contract: Two No-Trumps , played by North

Result: 4 tricks, NS -400

The Facts:

East had alerted and correctly explained his 1♦ overcall to North. West had also alerted, and South had asked what it was. West had replied “as opening bid”, but South stated to the Director he had heard “is opening bid”, and he had interpreted it as natural. He had now doubled, intending it to be negative over Diamonds, but North had interpreted it as showing Diamonds. North/South called the Director after the hand was over, complaining about West’s misexplanation.

The Director:

Found that South had failed to protect himself by asking a question orally and not insisting on a written reply.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Regulation C2

North/South appealed.

Present: All players and the Captain of England

The Players:

South explained he had received a reply “is opening bid”. He had interpreted this as meaning a natural hand with diamonds and 13HCP. It was unlikely he would affect a Take-Out double over any other explanation.

North stated that he had bid 2NT, rather than 3♦, because 3♦ would be terminal, while 2NT was invitational.

West repeated she had said “as opening bid”, meaning that the 1♦ overcall had the same meaning as the 1♦ opening. On the Convention Card, under overcalls, was mentioned: “1♦=system”.

The Committee:

Considered that South had been rather lazy, and agreed with the Director that South had failed to protect himself. However, West had also failed to provide enough accurate information. Even in written form “as opening bid” is not an accurate description when the bid shows not just one, but two unknown suits.

The Committee decided to apportion the blame 2/1 – 2 parts to West, 1 part to South.

The Committee ruled that with correct information, a contract of Two Spades is a likely end-spot, and that seven tricks are available.

The Committee’s decision:

Score adjusted to

Both sides receive:

66.7% of 2♠-1 by East (NS +50) plus

33.3% of 2NT-4 by North (NS –400)

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 30

Denmark v Israel

Appeals Committee:

Grattan Endicott (Chairman, England), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Jean-Paul Meyer (France)

Open Teams Round 27

Board 1. Dealer North. Nobody Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>I. Herbst</i>	<i>D. Schaltz</i>	<i>O. Herbst</i>	<i>P. Schaltz</i>
	2♠	3♥	4♠
Dble	Pass	4NT	5♣
5♥	Pass	Pass	5♠
Pass	Pass	6♥	Pass
Pass	6♠	Dble	All Pass

Contract: Six Spades Doubled, played by North

Result: 11 tricks, NS -100

The Facts:

Two Spades was weak. There had been a pause of about two minutes before the Double over 4♠. The whole table agreed to this. West did not alert his Double, but East did, and explained it as "points". East then alerted his bid of 4NT and explained it as "Take-Out with Minors". West did not alert 4NT. West's Pass over 5♠ was alerted and explained as forcing on both sides of the screen.

North/South called the Director at the end of the hand to complain about the bid of 4NT.

The Director:

Established that there was no disagreement over the pause before the Double, and consulted the Convention Card, which did not contain any useful indication as to the meaning of the Double, except that support doubles are in use, without mentioning until what level they are used.

The Director found that it was normal to play this Double as not being for penalties, and that there had therefore been no useful unauthorized information conveyed in the break of tempo.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A

North/South appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

North/South started by saying that a pause of this length certainly contains unauthorized information. When the tray comes back quickly, a void in trumps and a side Ace-King make it a good idea to pass for penalties. When it takes a lot longer, it is easy to alert and say it is not for penalties before removing.

North/South then added that when the Convention Card does not support the supposed meaning of a bid, one should believe the player who made it, and who, in this case, had not alerted it.

West explained he had not alerted his Double, because he believed "general values" to be the natural meaning. East/West explained that they would not Double 4♠ with four spades, because partner would not leave it in with a void. East would certainly leave a double in with 2 spades, and sometimes with 1.

East/West could not remember having used such doubles before in the tournament.

East/West offered as further evidence that the double had not been for penalties by pointing out that they went to 6♥ over 5♠.

North/South stated that they felt that if a double contains such a difficult meaning, one should not be taking two minutes for it, since that contains too much unauthorized information.

The Committee:

Found that the Double had certainly been unusual and not for penalties. East had not used unauthorized information when taking the Double out. It was felt however, that in later rounds, East could have realized the kind of difficulties that West had been in before doubling. It was felt therefore that the bid of 6♥ could have been influenced by the unauthorized information contained in the slow Double.

The Committee felt East/West should not be rewarded for their actions after 5♠.

On the other hand, South used poor judgment in not Doubling 6♥. South did not at any time enquire about special meanings (4NT could hardly have been Blackwood), and on lead with ♣AK to cash, surely he should have protected partner from bidding on.

The Committee thought about applying some sort of special score adjustment for North/South, but felt in the end that they had contributed too much to their own result.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to

North/South receive:

The table result (NS -100)

East/West receive:

5♠= by North (NS +450)

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 31

Italy v the Netherlands

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Grattan Endicott (England), Steen Møller (Denmark)

Senior Teams Round 19

Board 3. Dealer South. East/West Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Englander</i>	<i>Baroni</i>	<i>Bomhof</i>	<i>Ricciarelli</i>
1♥	1♠	2♥	1♦
Redble	Pass	Pass	Dble
3♥	All Pass		2♠

Contract: Three Hearts, played by West

Result: 10 tricks, NS -170

The Facts:

South explained his Double to West as support, three cards in spades. North explained the Double to East as maximum values, near 16HCP. North/South were playing Blue Club. East called the Director at the end of play, claiming that with correct information, he would have bid 4♥.

The Director:

Asked North/South to explain their methods and established that South had given the correct explanation of the bid. The Director then ruled misinformation, but found that East would not bid 4♥ all of the time.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to

Both sides receive:

30% of 3♥ + 1 by West (NS -170) plus

70% of 4♥ = by West (NS -620)

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

Law 12C3, Code of Practice enabling Tournament Director to award Adjusted Scores under Law 12C3.

North/South appealed.

Present: All players

The Players:

North stated that he recognized that he had misinformed his opponent.

After the sequence 1♦-1♥-pass-2♥, a double would be a maximum, and after 1♦-pass-1♠-2♥ a double shows 3-card support. It is the second sequence that applies here.

North/South told the Committee that, in their opinion, East/West had enough information to bid 4♥ on their own. They had redoubled and bid 3♥, and that should have been enough to draw the correct conclusions.

East stated that he had also wanted to appeal the Director's decision. He was certain that with correct information he would be bidding 4♥ 100% of the time. If South really holds 16 HCP, his K-J of diamonds are worth less. Also, when the Double shows points rather than Spades, the chances of partner having 3 Spades become greater, also reducing the chances of making 4♥. North's positive 1♠ bid combined with the 16 HCP with South had an influence on East's final decision, making that 4♥ would be a borderline decision.

The Committee:

Felt that East/West had presented a very good case.

The Director had ruled correctly, and there was no merit in the appeal.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Forfeited

Tenerife: Appeal No. 32

Sweden v France

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (England), Steen Møller (Denmark)

Senior Teams Round 22

Board 5. Dealer North. North/South Vu.

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

West	North	East	South
Roudinesco	Hallén	Delmouly	Bäckström
	2♦	Pass	2NT
3♠	3NT	Pass	4♦
Pass	4♥	All Pass	

Comments:

2♦: Multi, 2NT: strong relay

Contract: Four Hearts, played by North

Result: 10 tricks, NS +620

The Facts:

North had alerted his bid of 3NT and explained as showing a maximum weak two in either major. North had also alerted 4♦, which was explained as transfer. South had not alerted either bid. West called the Director and claimed that if 4♦ had been alerted on his side, he could have doubled it in order to receive a Diamond lead and defeat the contract.

The Director:

Found that West had been misinformed and damaged and adjusted the score.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to 4♠ -1 by North (NS -100)

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C, 12C2

North/South appealed.

Present: All players

The Players:

North/South explained their systems. 2♦ is strong in diamonds or weak in either major. The responses to 2NT are that 3♣ and 3♦ show the strong variant, 3♥ and 3♠ the very weak ones, and 3NT a maximum

weak two in either major. Subsequently 4♣ and 4♦ both ask for the major, with 4♣ asking to bid in transfers so as to let the strong hand play. All these bids were in a full description of the system, 46 pages long, which had been lodged.

North stated they had not discussed the sequence after an intervention.

North had indeed intended his 3NT bid to indicate a maximum weak two, in which case 4♦ was asking to name the major suit. South told the Committee that he had not been sure that 3NT was not the strong diamond variant, and he had bid 4♦ just in case partner wanted to hear some support for that suit.

North complained about the use of the word transfer for the bid of 4♦. A more correct explanation was bid your major, but since it could hardly have been Spades, the (mis)-description was probably unimportant. In any case, he had alerted it.

South stated that he had not counted his hand until after the bid of 4♥. Then it became clear to him that partner could not have had the strong hand (unless West had been bidding on very little).

West explained that 3NT had not been alerted to him, and so he interpreted 4♦ to be natural, which he could not double. He told the Committee that he knew North held a weak hand with Hearts from looking at his own hand and hearing South bidding strong relays. He explained that he did not want to clarify the situation for them, and that he did not want to disturb them in what might well be an accident in their bidding. But if West had known it was conventional, he would most certainly have doubled it for the lead.

North/South offered a different sequence, in that after the double, North could let South play the hand by passing.

The Committee:

Was of the opinion that North was inventing system at the table. There was in actual fact no partnership agreement. South would have been obliged, if asked, to explain the various possibilities concerning the bid of 3NT. But the mere fact that there is more to tell about some calls does not make them alertable, and so the non-alert did not constitute misinformation. West knew about the actual hand and he was hoping for a misunderstanding. He should not have asked for a misexplanation as well.

The Committee's decision:

Original table result restored

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 33

France v Russia

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (England), Jaap van der Neut (Netherlands)

Open Teams Round 29

Board 18. Dealer East. North/South Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Petrinin</i>	<i>Multon</i>	<i>Gromov</i>	<i>Quantin</i>
		Pass	Pass
1♦	2♣	Pass	2♠
Pass	2NT	Pass	3♦
Pass	3♥	Pass	3♠
All Pass			

Comments:

1♦, when in 3rd position, can be 4414

Contract: Three Spades, played by South

Lead: Jack of Hearts

Result: 7 tricks, NS -200

The Facts:

This was the vu-graph match, open room. It was the last Board of the match.

North called the Director at the end of the hand, because he had not received any alert on the bid of 1♦. Over a short 1♦, 3♦ was natural, which was how South had intended it. Over a natural 1♦, 3♦ would have been a cue-bid, and that is the way North had interpreted it.

The Director:

Considered that the Convention Card had been very accurate, and that North could have protected himself better, by asking or consulting the Convention Card.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

EBL Appeals Book, 2001

North/South appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

The Director started by clarifying something which had only surfaced just before the appeal hearing. At the table, East had told that he alerted both times his partner had opened 1♦ third in hand. The Director had consulted the bidding records and had interpreted the word “both” as having happened on boards 10 and 14. This was untrue, as the opening had been 1♦ only on Board 14 previously. East had meant boards 14 and 18, and had not agreed that he had not alerted 1♦ during this board.

North/South stated that they did not believe there had been an alert on Board 18, or they would not have been in Committee.

North/South stated that over short diamond openings, they play a first cue-bid as conventional, and a second one as natural. Here, 3♦ was clearly natural, but North had misinterpreted it because of the missing alert.

When asked whether they prepared against opponent's system, they asked they did not, because they were quite confident in their defensive methods, and they relied solely on the alert to know what defence to use. Specifically when the opponents use two different systems, they should really alert.

East stated that he had been wrong in not alerting in the correct fashion, but it was the way he had been alerting in all the matches, and in this one, and none of the opponents had protested. He always made large movements with his arms, and made eye contact with his screen-mate to see if he acknowledged an alert. Apart from three opening bids, first or second in hand, all his bids were alertable, so he really could not forget an alert. He stated quite firmly that he had also alerted the 1♦ opening on this occasion. East had asked the organizers to be able to see the video of the rama room to show that he had alerted, but it turned out the the cameraman had not been present at that moment, and that the image had been focused on the table and not on his alerting.

The Committee:

Found that when the players accept to continue with an irregularity, the Director or Appeal Committee should not step in with technicalities. In all likelihood, East had in fact alerted and when the bidding came to North after 3♦, North had forgotten this. The Committee ruled there had not been misinformation.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 34

Belgium v Turkey

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Grattan Endicott (Scribe, England), Naki Bruni (Italy), Jean-Paul Meyer (France), Jaap van der Neut (Netherlands)

Open Teams Round 29

Board 9. Dealer North. East/West Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
Zorlu	Kaplan	Assael	Polet
	4♣	Pass	4♥
4NT	5♦	Dble	5♥
All Pass			

Comments:

4♣ showed a good Heart pre-empt, 4NT was for the minors

Contract: Five Hearts, played by South

Lead: Ace of Clubs

Result: 11 tricks, NS +450

The Facts:

5♦ had been alerted by North to East, and explained as “shortness”. The bid had not been alerted by South to West. East/West have an agreement that the Double of a short suit asks for the lead of the higher remaining suit (in this case Spades), while a double of a holding in Diamonds simply says not to lead a Diamond. West called the Director after the play and stated that if he had known the Diamonds were short, he would not have misinterpreted partner’s double and would have led a Spade, thereby defeating the contract.

The Director:

Ruled that there had been misinformation, but that the Spade lead would not have been found all the time.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to

Both sides receive:

25% of 5♥= by South (NS +450) plus

50

75% of 5♥-1 by South (NS –50)

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

Law 12C3, Code of Practice enabling Tournament Director to award Adjusted Scores under Law 12C3.

North/South appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

North drew the Committee’s attention to the fact that East had first doubled and only then had asked the meaning of his bid. East stated that he knew from his holding, since West held at least 5/5 in the minors, that the North bid was shortness.

The Committee:

The Committee was somewhat concerned over a possibility that East might have doubled initially to show his fit in Diamonds. However, this would not in any way affect the meaning of his bid for West according to his partnership agreements. An alert by South would have been appropriate, although normal bridge reasoning would lead any player to think that North should not be expected to have bid a Diamond suit, as such, after West had shown length in both minors. In making his choice of lead it was crucial for West that he should know the meaning of North’s 4♦ and it represented a gross failure of self-protection on his part when he did not ask about that meaning before he made his lead. For this reason the table result was restored. The Committee also considered that East should be advised that it would be better in such a situation to enquire about the North bid so that there could be no doubt that his double was indeed intended to request a Spade lead – on this hand there is some question as to whether he would know that he wanted a Spade lead, but if he had asked the question it would be apparent to the Director that indeed that was his intention.

The Committee’s decision:

Original table result restored

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 35

Russia v Spain

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Jaap van der Neut (Netherlands)

Ladies Teams Round 18

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vulnerable.

	♠ K Q 9 2 ♥ A J 9 ♦ 9 6 2 ♣ A K 6		
♠ A 10 8 7 4 ♥ K 10 6 3 2 ♦ 4 ♣ J 5	♠ J 3 ♥ 7 4 ♦ Q 10 3 ♣ Q 10 8 7 4 3	♠ 6 5 ♥ Q 8 5 ♦ A K J 8 7 3 ♣ 9 2	♠ 6 5 ♥ Q 8 5 ♦ A K J 8 7 3 ♣ 9 2
West	North	East	South
<i>Sanchiz</i>	<i>Gromova</i>	<i>Babot</i>	<i>Khonicheva</i>
Pass	INT	Dble	2♣
Pass	2♠	Pass	3♣
Pass	3♠	Pass	4♣
Pass	4♦	Dble	5♣
All Pass			

Contract: Five Clubs, played by South

Result: 8 tricks, NS -300

The Facts:

The Double over INT was alerted and South asked for an explanation. West wrote "C or D - 10+ point 6+ cards 6 losers". North/South play different systems depending on the meaning of the Double and South wanted to know if it was penalty or not. She asked West "should you pass?", to which West responded "I should pass". West would later explain to the Director that she had misunderstood the English word "should" and intended to say "I could pass". South called the Director after the bid of 3♠. It was clear to her that North had misunderstood her bidding because of different explanation at the other side of the screen.

The Director:

Ruled that there had been misinformation. He understood that the misinformation caused the derailment of North/South's bidding and adjusted the score.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to 3♣-1 by South (NS -100)

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C, 12C2

Conditions of Contest 3.1

East/West appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

North/South explained that their methods depended

on the meaning of the Double. If the Double is for penalties, South's responses are natural, and 2♣ shows clubs, nothing else. If the Double shows one suit, the responses become transfers, and 2♣ is Stayman.

North/South had consulted opponent's Convention Card, which stated "Cappelletti", to which had been added, in pencil "mod". North/South know this convention, but in their country that always implies Penalty doubles.

East/West explain their system. Over INT, a Double shows one Minor, 2♣ both Majors and 2♦ one Major. They call this Cappelletti in their country, but they have learnt that this is not correct and so they have added the mention "mod" to their Convention Card.

West explained that she thought she had explained correctly, and she was a bit baffled by the question. She thought the word "should" meant "could" and she never intended to say that she "must" absolutely pass.

East/West believed that if North/South's methods depended so heavily on the meaning of the Double, they should not have asked questions that could possibly be misunderstood.

The Committee:

Consulted the "Guide to completion of the Convention Card", in which the convention known as Cappelletti is described. Among the explanations is no mention of a Double showing anything specific, thus making the Double for penalties the standard meaning. The mention Cappelletti on East/West's Convention Card was in error, and the addition "mod" insufficient. Apart from the fact that the Convention Card ought to have been changed in the prescribed way, an additional note describing in detail the full set of conventional overcalls should have been added.

The Committee felt however, that this misrepresentation on the Convention Card in itself did no damage to North/South. The conventional overcalls, as truly played, should not have posed problems for a pair who have standard defences against these types of conventions. North/South may have been surprised to find out that their opponents were using doubles to show one-suiters, but they certainly had the methods to deal with them.

As to the explanation given, the Committee felt that the description as written on paper was remarkably precise and correct. South should have realized from this explanation that this was not the sort of Double on which West "must" always pass.

The Committee's decision:

Original table result restored

Director asked to investigate the Convention Card

Deposit: Returned

Committee's Note:

The Committee asked the Director to investigate further into the Convention Card of East/West, and apply a penalty if necessary. The Director later told the Committee that the change in pencil had been made during the tournament, that no extra sheets were made available and that the change had not been lodged at the systems desk. The Director applied the standard penalty of 0.5 VP.

Tenerife: Appeal No. 36

Germany v Netherlands

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (England), Steen Møller (Denmark)

Senior Teams Round 23

Board 2. Dealer East. North/South Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Rebattu</i>	<i>Schneider</i>	<i>Van Oppen</i>	<i>Gromoeller</i>
2♦	Dble	2♥	2♠
Pass	2NT	Pass	3♦
Pass	3NT	All Pass	

Comments:

2♦ showed both majors

Contract: Three No-Trumps, played by North

Lead: small Heart

Play: Heart to King and Ace, Diamond to the King, Club to the Ace, Heart, Diamond.

Result: 9 tricks, NS +600

The Facts:

South had alerted and explained his bid of 2♠ as “values in ♠, not in ♥”, but North had not alerted it. East called the Director after dummy came down, claiming he would have lead a Spade if he had known that 2♠ showed a stopper but not a suit.

The Director:

Ruled that although there had been two different explanations, the difference was not substantial enough to affect the choice of suit to lead.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

East/West appealed.

Present: All players

The Players:

East stated he had asked about the meaning of the

Double, to which he had received an answer saying it had not been discussed. The meaning of the bid of 2♠ had been different on either side of the screen. If the Spade suit is natural, then a spade lead is not enough to defeat the contract. But if the bid shows a stopper, then a Spade lead might be necessary so as to kill the stopper. East thought he had been damaged by the misexplanation.

North stated he did not remember they had asked about the Double. They do not have an agreement about the meaning of 2♠, but he had explained it by saying that it showed Spades, not Hearts.

South stated he had not alerted 2♠, but had explained it as “since you have shown both major suits, it cannot be a real suit but it shows a stopper”.

North said he thought his partner had found the common-sense bid at the table.

North/South did not see why it should be clear cut to lead spades.

West said he had asked about 2♠, and South had responded “we have the agreement that when opponents show two suits and we bid one of them, then we bid the suit we control”. South denied using the word “agreement” in that sentence, and West admitted he was speaking from memory and could not remember the exact words.

The Committee:

Found that the Director had ruled perfectly and the case ought not to have been brought before them.

The Committee’s decision:

Director’s ruling upheld.

Deposit: Forfeited

Tenerife: Appeal No. 37

Hungary v Ireland

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Steen Møller (Denmark)

Open Teams Round 33

Board 15. Dealer South. North/South Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
McGann	Hegeus	Hanlon	Szilagyi
1♣	Pass	2♥	Pass
3♦	Pass	3♥	Pass
5♣	Pass	5♦	Pass
6♥	All Pass		

Comments:

1♣ = 9-12 balanced or any 17+; 2♥ = weak; 3♦ = strong with diamonds

Contract: Six Hearts, played by East

Lead: Spade

Play: Spade to the Queen, Spade to the Jack, ♠A, ♥K which North took

Result: 12 tricks, NS -1430

The Facts:

5♣ was intended by West as Exclusion Blackwood, and he alerted it, and explained it as such. East did not understand it as such, did not alert it, and he bid 5♦ as a natural support. West interpreted this as one key-card and he bid the slam.

After the play, North called the Director to complain about the wrong explanation that he had received. If 5♣ is alerted to him, he can double it for the lead. The club lead would defeat the slam.

The Director:

Established that in East/West's methods, 5♣ indeed was exclusion Blackwood.

The Director found however that North would not double the bid with that information anyway, as South might have a natural Spade lead.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C

North/South appealed.

Present: All players and the Captain of Ireland

The Players:

North claimed that, because of his holding of A932 in Hearts, the Club lead is needed to shorten dummy's ruffing power.

Although North suspected that 5♣ could not be natural, it was not totally impossible. North stated that he passed quickly, in order not to stop the bidding by asking what 5♣ meant. Maybe they would end up in a no-hop contract.

North stated that if there was a void in Clubs with West, then he needed to ask partner to lead the suit that would shorten dummy, which would establish his second trump trick.

At this moment the Director added that North had not stated this at the table. There North had simply stated that if 5♣ showed a Heart support, then he would have doubled, but if it had shown Diamonds and Clubs, he would not give information to opponents.

East stated that over 5♣, North had passed quickly, he had bid 5♦, and when the tray came back with 6♥, he had told his screen-mate that 5♣ might have been Exclusion Blackwood.

West stated that 5♣ was certainly Blackwood. Since 3♦ was forcing to game, 4♣ would be the way to show a two-suited hand.

East/West found that North must clearly have realized that 5♣ was not natural, and that it must therefore show Heart support. What more information could he possibly need?

The Committee:

Found that the Director's ruling was correct and that the appeal lacked merit.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Forfeited

Tenerife: Appeal No. 38

Spain v England

Appeals Committee:

Steen Møller (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy)

Senior Teams Round 25

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Harper</i>	<i>Diaz</i> <i>Revinga</i>	<i>Hackett</i>	<i>Alcaez</i>
2♦	2NT	3♥	INT
Pass	Dble	Pass	Pass
4♣	Dble	All Pass	

Comments:

2♦ shows a one-suited hand, strong if minor; 2NT is Lebensohl

Contract: Four Clubs Doubled, played by West

Result: 9 tricks, NS +200

The Facts:

3♥ was alerted and explained by East as “pass or correct”. East did not alert it and passed. North called the Director after the tray returned with 4♣, claiming he would not have doubled if he had known that West need not have Hearts.

The Director:

Found that North had received correct information about East/West’s methods and should have known from his hand that East/West were in a less than optimal contract.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A

North/South appealed.

Present: All players except South, and both Captains

The Players:

North stated that he felt that he was prevented from finding his normal contract of 4♥.

When asked why he had doubled 3♥, he stated that he had no choice. He knew he was close to a Game score, and defending undoubled would not be enough. He stated that he did realize that East/West had a misunderstanding.

East explained their system. West had shown a one-suiter, and every bid after that was “pass or correct”. The system had not been confirmed after an intervention such as a Lebensohl 2NT and East thought that was the reason for West’s pass. West explained that he had panicked. His 2♦ overcall should have been made on hands that are stronger than the one he had. Since he did not have a way of showing both minors, he decided to treat his hand as a one-suiter. He chose the strong variant rather than the weak one (3♣) because of the enormous distribution. When the tray returned with 3♥ he was ashamed of his choice, and he passed, not worrying until it got doubled.

North found it was strange that East/West had never discussed the sequence with a Lebensohl intervention, since this was not an uncommon system.

East explained his choice of bidding 3♥. Over a weak major, 3♥ or 3♠ is a good choice, and if West has a minor, he’s stronger, and the four-level should not pose problems. He wanted to catch North/South before they had found their own fit.

The Committee:

Felt that North/South had not suffered damage from any misinformation, but rather from North’s unfortunate choice of bid. North knows East/West cannot have long Hearts and he should just have passed to collect +600.

The Committee’s decision:

Director’s ruling upheld.

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 39

Greece v Luxembourg

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Steen Møller (Denmark), Jaap van der Neut (Netherlands)

Open Teams Round 33

Board 19. Dealer South. East/West Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Renno</i>	<i>Zotos</i>	<i>Helling</i>	<i>Skoularikis</i>
			Pass
1♠	Pass	2♥	Pass
3♠	Pass	3NT	Pass
4♠	Pass	5♠	Pass
6♠	All Pass		

Contract: Six Spades, played by West

Result: 12 tricks, NS -1430

The Facts:

Appeals 39 and 40 are from the same match, but different tables.

East had thought for a very long time before bidding 3NT. That was undisputed, and periods like 2 minutes were mentioned. South and West had both noticed and acknowledged the delay. South called the Director after the end of play, to complain about West's bidding on after the unauthorized information.

The Director:

Consulted 6 Directors and 5 players, none of who would have passed with the West hand over partner's 3NT. On that basis, the Director found that passing on the West hand was not a logical alternative.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 16A

North/South appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

North thought that West has a clear pass.

East explained why he had thought. In a previous version of their system, 3♠ had been non-forcing, and he was thinking about going to slam over that meaning of 3♠, finally deciding against it. When West bid 4♠ he should have a very good suit and East tried for slam.

The Committee:

Agreed that passing had not been a logical alternative, and believed that North should not have appealed the Director's decision.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Forfeited

Tenerife: Appeal No. 40

Luxembourg v Greece

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Steen Møller (Denmark), Jaap van der Neut (Netherlands)

Open Teams Round 33

Board 9. Dealer North. East/West Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Liarakos</i>	<i>Kloppen- burg</i>	<i>Kagayam- mides</i>	<i>Schaaper</i>
	1♣	3♠	4♠
Pass	5♦	Pass	6♦
All Pass			

Comments:

North/South play a HUM system. 1♣ shows 8-13 HCP, 5 in a minor or 4441 with unknown short suit.

Contract: Six Diamonds, played by North

Lead: Five of Hearts

Result: 12 tricks, NS +920

The Facts:

Appeals 39 and 40 are from the same match, but different tables.

South had explained his bid of 4♠ as showing a singleton, while North had explained it as “likely to be a void; if not, a strong hand”. East complained that with a different explanation, he would have led the ♠A, defeating the contract.

The Director:

Investigated the system and could not find evidence for the meaning of 4♠.

The Director ruled misinformation and adjusted the score.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to 6♦-1 by North, NS -50

Relevant Laws:

Law 75A, 40C, 12C2

North/South appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

The Players:

East explained that when 4♠ is explained to him as singleton, the lead of the ♠A is imperative, but if it is explained as void, then he could not lead ♠A. He knew his partner did not have ♠K as he would have doubled 4♠ if he had that King. He knows that South has both minors so the only chance to defeat the contract is by a heart lead.

North explained their system. The actual situation is not directly covered in the system notes, but they employ the principle that similar situations are treated in a similar way, and he pointed to two such similar situations, which he proved by the system notes which were available to the Committee. Over an opponent's 3♠ opening, 4♠ shows a void or a very strong three suited hand with a singleton. And when there is a 3♠ “overcall” on their forcing pass (14+ HCP), similar systems apply. In both cases, 4 of a minor shows that minor and hearts, and 4NT shows both minors. The cue bid is a stronger version and shows a void or a singleton with a very strong hand.

North stated that he had explained 4♠ as “a void, or probably a void, but it could also be singleton and very strong”. East agreed to that explanation, but thought that North indicated a void.

The Committee:

Found that North had gone sufficiently far to try and explain their agreements. There was no clear agreement, and yet he had tried to explain all the clues that were available to him. South had in fact indicated a void in spades by choosing the strongest bid in his arsenal, and then by raising 5♦ to slam. It was the opinion of the Committee that East simply had a guess that was very difficult for him to get right, but it was not by the opponent's explanations that he did not get it right but rather by their bids.

The Committee's decision:

Original table result restored

Deposit: Returned

Tenerife: Appeal No. 41

Iceland v Norway

Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Naki Bruni (Italy), Grattan Endicott (England)

Open Teams Round 35

Board 9. Dealer North. East/West Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Brogeland</i>	<i>Ingimarsson</i>	<i>Sælensminde</i>	<i>Magnusson</i>
	1♠	Pass	2NT
Pass	3♣	Pass	4♠
All Pass			

Contract: Four Spades, played by North

Lead: King of Diamonds

Play: ♦K / ♦Q / ♠A / ♣2-10 / ♠J-Q-K / ♣8-J-K At this point, the remaining cards are

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

at which point North claimed

Result: 9 or 10 tricks

The Facts:

North claimed, saying "I take your last trump".

The Director:

Ruled that North may well have forgotten about the extra outstanding trump.

The Director found that North would execute a play that leads to 10 tricks 2 times in 3.

Ruling:

Score adjusted to

Both sides receive:

66.7% of 4♠= by North (NS +420) plus

33.3% of 4♠-1 by North (NS -50)

Relevant Laws:

Law 70A, 70C3

Law 12C3, Code of Practice enabling Tournament Director to award Adjusted Scores under Law 12C3.

North/South appealed.

Present: All players except East, and the Captain of Iceland

The Players:

North/South spoke through their Captain, who was also the scorer at the table, and he had witnessed the facts.

North had wished to speed up play by claiming when West had been thinking about the return. It was clear to North that he knew trumps had been 4-0. After all, he had noticed the bad break, and had already finessed once. If he had thought West had only one trump left, surely North would have cashed the ♠10 before playing the second round of Clubs.

When asked if he had claimed for 10 or 11 tricks, North stated he had not pronounced a number at the table.

West told the Committee that he had been thinking after taking the ♣K. Then North had claimed with the statement "I take your last trump". He had not wanted to call the Director then, but asked declarer "how many trumps do you think I have", to which North had replied "one". This fact had not been told to the Director at the table, but North did not dispute it before the Committee.

The Committee:

Began by stating that the Director's ruling was wrong in Law. Since there is no assigned adjusted score to be given, Law 12C3 cannot be applied.

The Committee judged that North had, quite probably, forgotten about the extra outstanding trump. In that case, Law 70C3 says that claimer shall lose any trick that can be lost by normal play.

The Committee then had to decide whether or not there is any line of normal play that leads to the loss of the tenth trick. Claimer will take whichever card is returned, including a diamond, which can be ruffed in either hand. He will then cash the ♠10, as per his claim statement, and will then believe his cards to be high. There is a well-established principle that, when a claimer knows he has high cards, any order he can play them is deemed "normal". It is the view of the Committee however that, in a case like this, this does not include the trump suit, which is cashed last.

With that principle in mind, there is no order of play of the cards that will not lead to 10 tricks. West will (to North's surprise) ruff one of the tricks that North believes is his, but declarer or dummy has a trump left to ruff the diamond return.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling changed.

Score adjusted to 4♠ by North, making 10 tricks, NS +420

Deposit: Returned

Statistics of the Appeals Committees

Sorrento

There were 10 appeals in Sorrento, 8 from the Open Pairs and 2 from the Senior Pairs. 8 different members served on the Committees, with an average committee size of 3.4 people. The Board-Appeal ratio was 0.21, the lowest number in European and World Championships since 1999.

The Director's decision was upheld in 5 cases. 3 Appeals were deemed without merit.

Committee Members in Sorrento

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark)
 Steen Møller (Vice-Chairman, Denmark)
 Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium)
 David Birman (Israel)
 Naki Bruni (Italy)
 Grattan Endicott (England)
 Krzysztof Martens (Poland)
 Jean-Paul Meyer (France)

Tenerife

There were 41 appeals in Tenerife.

Four of those came in the Ladies' Pairs tournament, a competition that saw not a single appeal two years before in Malta. Both the Senior Teams and the Ladies' Teams needed 7 appeals, and the Open Teams 23.

With 50,820 hands played over the two weeks, that comes down to 0.90 appeals per 1,000 boards, which is slightly higher than in Malta (0.70).

The deposit has been forfeited on 11 occasions,

The Director's decision was upheld 24 times.

11 different members served on Committees. The average Committee size was 4.15 persons.

Committee Members in Tenerife:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark)
 Steen Møller (Vice-Chairman, Denmark)
 Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium)
 Grattan Endicott (Scribe, England)
 Jan Kamras (Scribe, Sweden)
 Jean-Claude Beineix (France)
 Naki Bruni (Italy)
 Eric Kokish (Canada)
 Jean-Paul Meyer (France)
 Carlo Mosca (Italy)
 Jaap van der Neut (Netherlands)

Board-Appeal Ratios of recent Championships:

(number of appeals per 1000 boards)

Year	Championship	Venue	Boards	Appeals	BAR
1999	EC Open & Senior Pairs	Warszawa	49,840	29	0.58
1999	EC Open, Women, Senior Teams & Women's Paris	Malta	54,396	38	0.70
2000	Bermuda Bowl, Venice Cup	Bermuda	39,528	13	0.33
2000	EC Mixed Pairs & Teams	Bellaria	45,096	10	0.22
2000	Olympiad	Maastricht	66,692	21	0.31
2001	EC Open & Senior Pairs	Sorrento	47,328	10	0.21
2001	EC Open, Women, Senior Teams & Women's Paris	Tenerife	50,820	38	0.90