

Subject of Appeal:	Contested Claim	Case:	N9
---------------------------	-----------------	--------------	----

Event	Reisinger BAM Teams	Event DIC	Matt Koltnow
Date	12/01/2017	Session	Second Qualifying

Auction

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

Hand Record

Board	12	N	Bill Bailey		
Dealer	W	♠	AK852		
		♥	(void)		
		♦	73		
Vul	N/S	♣	QJ7432		
W	Aleksander Dubinin			E	Andrei Gromov
♠	QJ96			♠	43
♥	QJ			♥	AK107632
♦	AQJ52			♦	K8
♣	85			♣	K10
		S	Max Schireson		
		♠	107		
		♥	9854		
		♦	10964		
		♣	A96		

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Shows Hearts, Alerted

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♥ by W	Down 2	N/S +100	♠A

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was consulted after the E/W compared with their teammates but within the allowable period to request a ruling.

The play to 4H was:

- Trick 1: ♠A - ♠3 - ♠7 - ♠6
- Trick 2: ♣Q - ♣K - ♣A - ♣5
- Trick 3: ♠10 - ♠J - ♠K - ♠4
- Trick 4: ♣J - ♣10 - ♣6 - ♣8
- Trick 5: ♠8 - ♥A - ♠9 - ♦2
- Trick 6: ♥2 - ♥4 - ♥Q - ♣5
- Trick 7: ♥J -

At this point, West claimed conceding a trump. He thought he started with only eight combined trumps. South showed his remaining three trumps, and since he had not yet played to trick seven this confirmed West's misremembering of the trump suit. The players agreed to down two.

Director Ruling

Law 68B indicates that declarer had conceded a trump trick to South, and the defenders had agreed to it per Law 69A. The director was unable to cancel the concession by the standard of Law 71B, "if a player has conceded a trick that could not be lost by any normal line of play of the remaining cards." That law is footnoted with "'normal' includes play that would be careless or inferior for the class of player involved." Playing a spade would be merely careless if declarer thought he had an inescapable trump loser, as would playing a diamond to the king and tossing a small trump on the table. The result of 4♥ by West, down two, N/S +100 was ruled to stand.

Director's Ruling

4♥ by W, Down 2, N/S +100

The Review

E/W appealed the director's ruling. All four players and the N/S captain attended the review. E/W were told that by regulation they were expected to show some error that the director made in order to win the appeal.

E/W said that after the ♥Q won and North showed out, West showed the ♥J with the expectation that the hand was now over. West said that he had probably miscounted his trump fit as being 6-2 at that moment, but it was not important since it was obviously easy to cross to dummy with the ♦K and draw two more trumps with the king and the ten. The table was five minutes late and there was some confusion about recording the score, but both East and West believed after seeing three hearts to the nine remaining in South's hand there was an inescapable trump loser and that the result was down two. E/W thought that South should have realized that he did not have another trick coming.

South said that while his memory of what happened was not perfect, he thinks West initiated the claim since it would have been unusual for him to have claimed without knowing at that point what was going on with the diamond suit. North also recalled that West initiated the cessation of play and South reacted to it by showing his cards.

Panel Findings

The panel agreed with the director that it was clear that West had claimed/conceded, and at the point he did, he seemed to have lost touch with the number of outstanding trumps. If he had a clear understanding of what was happening, he would not have offered or agreed to down two. While in the rush and confusion of a late finishing round, N/S accepted a trick (conceded by much more experienced opponents) that they might have questioned under more normal circumstances. Accepting that trick did not rise to a violation of Law 79A2: "A player must not knowingly accept either the score for a trick that his side did not win or the concession of a trick that his opponents could not lose."

The panel did not find the E/W argument compelling and agreed with the director that it would not be worse than "careless or inferior" for a player who had lost track of how many trumps were outstanding to play the remaining cards in a way that would result in the defense scoring another trump trick for down two.

The ruling of 4♥ by West, down two, N/S +100 was upheld. The appeal was found to have merit.

Panel Decision

4♥ by W, Down 2, N/S +100

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Smith
Member	David Metcalf
Member	Jenni Carmichael