

Subject of Appeal:	Disputed Claim	Case:	R6
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	Young LM Pairs	Event DIC	Mike Roberts
Date	08/09/2015	Session	First Final

Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
Pass	1♣	Pass	1♥
Pass	2♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

Hand Record

Board	3	N	970 MPS	
Dealer	S	♠	K65	
		♥	AK97	
		♦	74	
Vul	E/W	♣	Q1086	
W	630 MPS			E
				1120 MPS
♠	1073			♠
♥	QJ10			♥
♦	KQ652			♦
♣	K9			♣
		S	1000 MPS	
		♠	AQ42	
		♥	8652	
		♦	J98	
		♣	52	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
2♥ by S			♠ 7

Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was summoned at Trick Nine. The Declarer had claimed, with East on lead. They made the statement that they were "taking the top two spades then crossruffing". The remaining cards at this point were:

	♠ K 6	
	♥ 9	
	♦ —	
	♣ Q 8	
♠ 10 3		♠ 9 8
♥ —		♥ —
♦ K 5 2		♦ 10
♣ —		♣ A 7
	♠ Q 4 2	
	♥ 8	
	♦ 8	
	♣ —	

Director Ruling

The director ruled that the defense would get one additional trick, resulting in the contract failing by one trick. If East were to exit with a spade, it would be inferior, not irrational, to ruff the 13th spade, according to Law 70D1

Director's Ruling	2♥ by S, Down 1, E/W +50
--------------------------	---------------------------------

The Appeal

The line of play in 2♥ was as follows:

- Trick one: ♠7 led, won by South's ♠A
- Trick two: ♥A cashed
- Trick three: ♥K cashed
- Trick four: ♦4 led from dummy to South's ♦J and West's ♦Q
- Trick five: ♥Q cashed by West, East discarding the ♣3 (encouraging)
- Trick six: ♣K cashed
- Trick seven: ♣9, ♣10 from dummy, won by E with ♣J
- Trick eight: ♦A cashed by East

Declarer claimed after trick eight, in the position given above (with East on lead). South affirmed that they said they would take the two top spades [they said the AK, but clearly intended the KQ], and then crossruff. However, they argued, "The diamond is always a loser. It would be illogical to trump a spade when the 100% loser is better," even if they had not been bothering to count the spades.

Panel Findings

Clearly the claim was invalid, and at the time of the claim, declarer had not considered that they would need to trump twice in the dummy, with only one trump. It is simply a question of when declarer would "wake up", and whether they were allowed to count the spades while they were cashing them.

The panel ruled it was more likely than not that declarer would have gotten this right had play continued, but Law 70D1 requires a higher standard - the director shall impose a "normal" unsuccessful line of play on declarer, even if that line would qualify as "careless or inferior". Declarer's statement started with cashing the spade winners. If their original intent was to trump the third spade, they might (carelessly) not pay close attention to the spade count. After that, if declarer were still not to wake up, ruffing a spade is a normal line of play within the definitions of 70D1.

The panel decided that this was a close decision, and, even though the appeal did not bring anything new beyond the director's decision, they believed it was worth of closer examination. As such, the appeal was found to have merit.

Panel Decision	2♥ by S, Down 1, E/W +50
-----------------------	---------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	David Metcalf
Member	Eric Bell
Member	Matt Koltnow