



EUROPEAN BRIDGE LEAGUE

| |
|---|
| 4th EBL TOURNAMENT DIRECTORS COURSE |
| 31 st August – 5 th September 2001 Tabiano di Salsomaggiore Terme, Italy |

**Appeal No. 16, Tenerife
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. Nobody Vulnerable.

| | | |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| | S K 10 | |
| | H 9 8 | |
| | D Q 10 5 4 | |
| | C K 8 7 5 4 | |
| S Q 9 8 6 | / | S J 7 5 |
| H Q 6 4 2 | / | H A K 10 |
| D A J 3 2 | / | D 8 6 |
| C J | / | C A Q 10 3 2 |
| | S A 4 3 2 | |
| | H J 7 5 3 | |
| | D K 9 7 | |
| | C 9 6 | |

| West | North | East | South |
|------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| <i>Juuri-Oja</i> | <i>Knap</i> | <i>Utter</i> | <i>Wasik</i> |
| | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 2C | Pass | 2D | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass | | |

Comments:

1NT=13-17, 5-card major possible, 2D= 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 D4. 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 DQ, 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.

The Director:

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, 16A2, 12C3, Code of Practice

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 D4 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

Appeal No. 29, Tenerife

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 Vulnerable.

| | | | |
|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | S A | | |
| | H A 7 5 3 | | |
| | D K 8 6 3 | | |
| | C K 9 4 3 | | |
| S K J 5 | / | S Q 9 8 3 | |
| H Q 9 8 6 2 | / | H - | |
| D 9 2 | / | D A Q 10 5 | |
| C Q 6 5 | / | C A 10 8 7 2 | |
| | S 10 7 6 4 2 | | |
| | H K J 10 4 | | |
| | D J 7 4 | | |
| | C J | | |
| West | North | East | South |
| <i>Gonca</i> | <i>Hallberg</i> | <i>Alfejeva</i> | <i>Simpson</i> |
| | 1C | 1D | Dble |
| 2H | Pass | 2S | Pass |
| Pass | 2NT | All Pass | |

Comments:

The 1D has the same meaning as the 1D 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 1D 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 3D, because 3D would be terminal, while 2NT was invitational.

West repeated she had said “as opening bid”, meaning that the 1D overcall had the same meaning as the 1D opening. On the Convention Card, under overcalls, was mentioned: “1D=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 2S-1 by East (NS +50) plus

33.3% of 2NT-4 by North (NS –400)

Deposit: Returned

Appeal No. 8, Skövde, Sweden

Appeals Committee:

Torsten Åstrand (Chairman, Sweden), Christer Grähs (Sweden), David Stevenson (England)

Open Pairs

Board 12. Dealer West. North-South Vulnerable.

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | S A T 7 | |
| | H J 6 | |
| | D 9 5 3 | |
| | C A K J T 4 | |
| S 8 3 | | S J 9 6 4 2 |
| H A 9 8 3 | | H K Q J 8 2 |
| D A Q T 6 2 | | D K |
| C 6 5 | | C K 7 |
| | S K Q 5 | |
| | H 7 4 | |
| | D J 8 7 4 | |
| | C 9 8 3 2 | |

| West | North | East | South |
|------|----------|------|-------|
| Pass | 1Da | 1S | 1NT |
| Pass | Pass | 2H | Pass |
| Pass | 3Ca | Pass | Pass |
| 3H | All Pass | | |

Comments:

1D = natural or balanced, 10-15

3C = see description in text

Contract: Three Hearts, played by East

Lead: Diamond four

Result: 10 tricks, NS -170

The Facts:

Director was called after 3H bid was made. South had said that 3C showed either 4-5 or 5-4 in the minors. After 3H South added that North could have an 11-13 no-trump hand with good clubs. West wrote on a piece of paper that if he had been allowed to he would have bid 4H instead of 3H.

The Director:

Realised he should have allowed West to take his 3H back. Note that in Sweden only Appeals Committees may use Law 12C3

Ruling:

Score for both sides adjusted to
4 hearts making by East (NS-420)

Relevant Laws:

Law 21, 82C

North/South appealed.

Present: West and South

The Players:

East-West did not understand why the meaning of 3C made such a difference to the West and since he had not tried for game either of the two previous rounds they did not believe West would ever reach game.

West said if there is no guarantee of a diamond suit North his hand is much better and he would have bid game.

The Committee:

Did not think that West was really likely to bid 4H but should have been given the chance to. They felt the writing on a piece of paper was not relevant since if 3H had not made ten tricks West would not have sought a ruling.

Since they were adjusting under Law 82C both sides were treated as non-offending so the score would be split. The Committee was somewhat surprised that the Director had not split his adjustment and given North-South NS-170.

The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to

North/South receive:

80% of 3H+1 by East (NS -170) plus

20% of 4H made by East (NS -420)

East/West receive:

60% of 3H+1 by East (NS -170) plus

40% of 4H made by East (NS -420)

Deposit: Returned