

Subject of Appeal:	Inadvertent Designation	Case:	R1
---------------------------	-------------------------	--------------	----

Event	1 st Sunday AXY Swiss	Event DIC	Jenni Carmichael
Date	11/29/2015	Session	First

Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	1♥	Pass
1♠	Pass	2♠	Pass
4♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

Hand Record

Board	5	N	2100 MPS		
Dealer	N	♠ 4	♥ 8765		
Vul	N/S	♦ J98	♣ J9653		
W	5100 MPS			E	7000 MPS
♠	KQ1076			♠	A953
♥	92			♥	KQ103
♦	A102			♦	Q76
♣	KQ8	S	2060 MPS		
		♠	J82		
		♥	AJ4		
		♦	K543		
		♣	A74		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♠ by W	Down 1	N/S +50	♣ 5

Facts Determined at the Table

After winning the second round of clubs, Declarer cashed the King and Queen of spades drawing 2 rounds of trump then led a heart to the King, won by South. The ♠J was returned, Declarer playing low, North pitching a club and Declarer called "spade", then almost immediately corrected to "Ace of spades". The director was called by North/South to determine whether or not West was entitled to change the original designation of a small spade.

Director Ruling

The director invoked Law 45C4b. While the change of call was made almost immediately, the standards for determining that the change was timely ("without pause for thought") had not been met. The burden of proof failed to meet the standard of overwhelming as directed by the Laws Commission.

Director's Ruling	4♠ by W, Down 1, N/S +50
--------------------------	---------------------------------

The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling. There was virtually no dispute as to the facts. All four players agreed that the change of call happened quickly. The reviewer did ask Declarer why she did not finish pulling trumps as there appears to be no valid bridge reason for abandoning this line of play. The attempt was to find out if Declarer might have thought trumps were drawn and/or confused as to which hand contained the remaining high trump. Declarer offered no reason other than she wanted to knock out the ♥A.

Panel Findings

The Panel concluded that Law 46 (incomplete designation of a card from Dummy) was the more appropriate law to apply to this case. Being that the ♠J was the last outstanding trump, it had been led, and the Ace was in the Dummy, playing last to the trick, it was highly unlikely that Declarer could be thinking of leading a spade to the subsequent trick or taking a finesse. The Panel decided that the call of 'spade' had been incomplete and that the ♠A was the incontrovertible intent of Declarer. Furthermore, the Panel felt that if Law 46 was not applied to this case, there would be little point to having it at all.

Panel Decision	4♠ by W, Made 4, E/W +420
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Marc Labovitz
Member	Matt Koltnow
Member	Jeanne van den Meiracker