

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Unintended Call	<b>Case:</b>	N17
---------------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----

<b>Event</b>	Roth Open Swiss Teams	<b>Event DIC</b>	Kevin Perkins
<b>Date</b>	07/30/2016	<b>Session</b>	Second Semifinal


### Auction

West	North	East	South
		Pass	1♣
Pass	1♠	Pass	2♣
Pass	3♣ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Unintended

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	34	N	Alan Watson		
<b>Dealer</b>	E	♠	AJ9xx		
		♥	AQx		
<b>Vul</b>	N/S	♦	QJ		
		♣	Kxx		
W	Andrea Manno			E	Massimiliano DiFranco
♠				♠	
♥				♥	
♦				♦	
♣				♣	
		S	Melody Bi		
		♠	(void)		
		♥	Jxx		
		♦	Axxx		
		♣	AQJxxx		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
3♣ by S	Made 6	N/S +1	

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called when the 3♣ bid was made. Immediately after his 3♣ bid touched the table, North realized it was not the bid he wanted to make. The director's inquiry focused on whether a bid had been made. ACBL Bid Box regulations call for directors to apply the provisions of Law 45C (Played Card) to determine whether a bid has actually been made and is part of the auction. East, West, and South all described the position of the bid cards as on the table; North held the cards much higher and off the table.

From these facts, the director ruled that North had bid 3♣, per Law 85A. However, the director's impression was that 3♣ was not North's intended call, so he directed North to replace 3♣ with what he intended. East and West objected vociferously; they made it clear they thought North should not be allowed to change his call. The director decided to take North away from the table to make a more careful determination whether 3♣ was North's intention. Away from the table, North told the director that it was obvious he could never have intended 3♣ as it was non-forcing. He meant to bid 2♦, systemically game forcing.

### Director Ruling

The director considered the facts he was able to collect, and he concluded that North did indeed intend to bid 3♣. He thought the best explanation for North's 3♣ bid was that he intended to support clubs on his next turn after having forced to game; he had just gotten one round ahead of the bidding. That means North's action was intended and not able to be corrected. Law 25 did not apply; he cautioned South that she had UI (Law 16B1) and that she could not gain an advantage from anything she had heard.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	3♣ by S, Made 6, N/S +170
--------------------------	---------------------------

## The Appeal

N/S requested a review of the ruling. They thought that the director had ruled correctly when he analyzed North's action as unintended (a mechanical error). They questioned why he changed his mind and how he determined North's action was intended rather than unintended.

## Panel Findings

Under current ACBL appeal procedures, the original ruling is to be considered correct unless a procedural error is detected or an illegal ruling has been made. The reviewer independently explored the theory of 3♣ being intended at a later turn as did his panel advisor. The reviewer found no procedural error or incorrect application of Law; as such, the table ruling must stand. The table director had effectively made two different rulings (first applying Law 25A, then deciding its provisions had not been met and applying 16B1 instead). As such, the appeal was deemed to have merit.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>3♣ by S, Made 6, N/S +170</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Advisor</b>	Gary Zeiger