

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tricks Scored	<b>Case:</b>	N7
---------------------------	---------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Rockwell Mixed Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	McKenzie Myers
<b>Date</b>	03/14/2017	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifying

### Auction

West	North	East	South
1♠	Pass	2♠	Pass
3♣	Pass	3♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention


### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>16</b>	N	Jill Marshall		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠	<b>J63</b>		
		♥	<b>A102</b>		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>E/W</b>	♦	<b>Q1093</b>		
		♣	<b>AQ7</b>		
W	Marti Malcolm			E	Chuck Malcolm
♠	<b>AKQ954</b>			♠	<b>1082</b>
♥	<b>98</b>			♥	<b>QJ6</b>
♦	<b>5</b>			♦	<b>A8642</b>
♣	<b>K983</b>	♣	<b>102</b>		
		S	Joe Degaetano		
		♠	<b>7</b>		
		♥	<b>K7543</b>		
		♦	<b>KJ7</b>		
		♣	<b>J654</b>		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
<b>3♣ by W</b>	<b>Down 2</b>	<b>N/S +200</b>	<b>♠3</b>

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after the hand was over. There was a disagreement on the number of tricks scored. Both sides had agreed on a result of down two, but E/W said they had agreed to down two having miscounted earlier tricks.

The two sides agreed on the play of the first 11 tricks, but there was a dispute as to the facts regarding what happened on the last two tricks. N/S described the last two tricks as the defense having led a diamond, on which declarer discarded the ♣9. Her last card was the last trump.

E/W say that she ruffed the diamond at trick 12 and led the club at trick 13, expecting it to lose. All the players agreed that declarer did not think the club was a winner, perhaps having forgotten dummy's 10. Declarer had lost a trick earlier to one of South's small clubs. East told the director that West could not be compelled to make a stupid play; no one would discard at trick 12 to retain a trump for trick 13.

### Director Ruling

The director ruled that the N/S description of what happened sounded more reasonable. By Law 85A, he directed that the score be recorded as 3♣ by West, down two, N/S +200.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3♣ by W, Down 2, N/S +200</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Review

E/W requested a review of the ruling. All four players attended the review. E/W said that the director made the wrong ruling as he misunderstood the facts. Declarer had never played to trick 12; she claimed by showing both cards. The declaring side asked that the table director be asked specifically whether a claim had been made.

The reviewer asked the table director whether anyone had ever indicated a claim was made. The director said that the only evidence was dummy's suggestion that the director could not compel declarer to take a stupid line of play (discarding the club at trick twelve).

### Panel Findings

The reviewer considered both sides' arguments, and he felt that it was unclear which set of facts accurately described what happened. One possibility was the original ruling, where declarer discarded the club and won trick 13. The other possibility was that there was a claim made during trick twelve after the diamond lead.

Even if West's actions were to be understood as a claim, the Reviewer would then need to apply Law 70A to resolve it. As there was no original claim statement, Law 70D1 prohibits the director from accepting a line of play not previously mentioned if there is an alternative normal line of play that would be less successful. Normal is defined as including careless. The reviewer felt that any player who did not know the ♣9 was a winner might carelessly discard it at trick 12.

What actually happened at the table can never be known with certainty. However, the reviewer was convinced that either path led to down two, and the original ruling was upheld. As E/W felt their version of the facts was never understood or considered by the director, the review was deemed to have merit.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>3♣ by W, Down 2, N/S +200</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Consultant</b>	David Metcalf