

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Mechanical Error	<b>Case:</b>	N5
---------------------------	------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Truscott Senior Swiss	<b>Event DIC</b>	Ken Horwedel
<b>Date</b>	07/25/2016	<b>Session</b>	Second Qualifying


### Auction

West	North	East	South
1♥	1♠	(1♠ <sup>1</sup> )1NT	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Insufficient

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>N</b>	Bill Dinner
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠	QJ1075
		♥	8
<b>Vul</b>	<b>E/W</b>	♦	1085
		♣	KJ96
<b>W</b>	Carole Craige		
♠	K6		
♥	AK1042		
♦	A9		
♣	A874	<b>E</b>	Margaret Coe
		♠	A982
		♥	73
		♦	QJ643
		♣	102
		<b>S</b>	Gary Helman
		♠	43
		♥	QJ965
		♦	K72
		♣	Q53

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
1NT by E	Made 3	E/W +150	

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called when the second 1♠ bid was made. East was saying she made a mechanical error before the TD reached the table. The director took East away from the table and asked whether she had seen and registered North's 1♠ bid. She said that she had. N/S told the director that East bid 1♠ almost immediately after North bid 1♠.

### Director Ruling

ACBL Bid Box regulations put the onus on the player to convince the director a mechanical irregularity has occurred. The director considered the tempo of the auction, East's statement, and the East hand itself. He concluded that East had intended to bid 1♠. Because 1♠ was insufficient, he offered South a chance to accept it. South did not accept 1♠; East was required to substitute any legal bid or pass, barring partner. She chose 1NT. (Laws 25A, 85A, 27B)

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>1NT by E, Made 3, E/W +150</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Appeal

East/West requested a review of the ruling. They reiterated that their version of the facts was accurate. They also questioned why the director asked what he asked, as he apparently gave no weight to the answers to his questions.

## Panel Findings

Under current ACBL appeal procedure, the ruling is assumed to be correct unless an error (such as in procedure or in application of Law) has been made. While some may conclude differently, there was no evidence the director had missed facts or made an illegal ruling. As such, the ruling was upheld.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>1NT by E, Made 3, E/W +150</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
-----------------	--------------