

Subject of Appeal:	Disputed Score	Case:	R3
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	2 nd Friday AXY Side Swiss	Event DIC	Hank Meyer
Date	03/18/2016	Session	Evening

Auction

West	North	East	South
			1♣ ¹
1♠	Dbl	2♣ ²	Pass
2♠	Dbl	3♠	Dbl
Pass	4♥	Dbl	4NT
Pass	Pass	Dbl	Pass
Pass	5♦	Pass	Pass
P (X) ³	(Pass)	(Pass)	(Pass)

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Could be short
2: Limit Raise in Spades
3: Disputed Double

Hand Record

Board	15	N	4050 MPS
Dealer	S	♠	
Vul	N/S	♥	
		♦	
		♣	
W	4350 MPS		E 4250 MPS
♠			♠
♥			♥
♦			♦
♣			♣
		S	28000 MPS
		♠	
		♥	
		♦	
		♣	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♦(X) by N	Down 2		

Facts Determined at the Table

The teams discovered the problem when West came over to confirm the score of the match before turning it in and the other team disagreed. The teams discovered that North/South had scored the 5♦ contract undoubled (E/W +200) while East/West scored it as doubled (E/W +500). They did not call the director until after a considerable amount of discussion amongst themselves. There is no hand record because the next round had started and the board was shuffled before the TD arrived.

N/S said that, during the discussion between the teams, West stated that "someone" had doubled 5♦. North said that she thought East had doubled 5♦, but East said that she had not. N/S said it was at this point that West said that he had doubled 5♦. N/S said that West had started to pick up his bidding cards after 4NT doubled was passed around to him and that South reminded him that North had another call coming. They said that North bid 5♦ and this was passed out.

E/W said that East had agreed with North that she had not doubled the 5♦ contract. However, West insisted that he had doubled the 5♦ contract and had said so rather than stating "someone" doubled as North/South claimed. They also denied that West had started to pick up his bid cards early.

North and West's private scores showed 5♦ as doubled down, E/W +500. East did not keep score. South did not show his scorecard to East or West but said he had recorded E/W +200.

Director Ruling

The table director ruled that the score would be 5♦ by N, down 2, E/W +200. He based his ruling on 1) East's statement that she had not doubled 5♦ and her failure to state that her partner had doubled; 2) West's statement that "someone" had doubled which was amended to indicate he had doubled after the table had agreed that East did not double.

Director's Ruling	5♦ by N, Down 2, E/W +200
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling, and were the only players to attend the review. West reiterated that he disagreed with the statement that he had said "someone" doubled 5♦. West also said that South never displayed a scorecard with a score of E/W +200 on it to anyone. Both East and West felt that South attempted to monopolize the conversation with the director.

West approximated his hand as ♠J109xx ♥xx ♦AQxx ♠xx and East as ♠Axx ♥Axxx ♦x ♣Axxxx, but the reviewer was unable to confirm this with N/S.

The reviewer asked about the auction after West doubled 5♦ and both players insisted that all three players had passed and had not simply picked up their bid cards. The reviewer also confirmed with the director that the director had not seen South's scores.

Panel Findings

The panel felt that in light of the disputed statements that the ruling was to be based on Law 85A1, that the director should base his view on the balance of the probabilities in accordance with the weight of the evidence he is able to collect. The panel felt that the primary evidence available consisted of North's and West's private scores, both of which indicated that 5♦ had been doubled and showed a score of +500 for E/W. The panel therefore ruled according to Law 84 that the final contract was 5♦X by North, down two, E/W +500.

Panel Decision	5♦X by N, Down 2, E/W +500
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Eric Bell
Member	Kevin Perkins
Member	Mark Labovitz