


APPEAL	NABC+ NINE
Subject	Claim
DIC	Candace Kuschner
Event	Silodor Open Pairs
Session	Second Qualifier
Date	March 19, 2015

BD#	24
VUL	None
DLR	W

Suzi Subeck	
♠	K976
♥	A9742
♦	Q4
♣	87

Peter Boyd-Bowman	
♠	AQ
♥	KJ106
♦	6
♣	AK9643

	
Stan Subeck	
♠	8432
♥	Q53
♦	J953
♣	105

Bob Heller	
♠	J105
♥	8
♦	AK10872
♣	QJ2

West	North	East	South
1♣	P	1♦	P
2♥ ⁽¹⁾	P	3♣	P
4♦ ⁽²⁾	P	4♥ ⁽³⁾	P
6♣	P	P	P

Final Contract	6♣ by West
Opening Lead	♥A
Table Result	Made 6, N/S -920
Director Ruling	6♣ by W, Made 6, N/S -920
Comm. Decision	6♣ by W, Made 6, N/S -920

(1)	Game forcing
(2)	Minorwood
(3)	One Key Card

The Facts: The director was called after the fourth trick when West claimed. The play had been the Ace of Hearts led to the first trick, followed by a switch to a diamond, won in Dummy by the Ace. A low diamond was trumped by Declarer in hand and then the Ace of Clubs was cashed. The declarer then claimed, stating they would pull trumps and that the Diamonds were good.

The Ruling: While the diamonds were not good at the time of the claim, the play of the ♦J on the 10 would occur in front of Declarer, allowing him to trump. A high club would remain in Dummy, allowing access to the two remaining good diamonds (either by leading a club or trumping a heart). While the claim statement was poorly made, the mechanics of play per the statement would still allow declarer to take the

remaining tricks. Accordingly, per Laws 70A and 70D1, the claim was allowed to stand, made 6, N/S -920.

The Appeal: South appealed the director's decision and was the only participant to attend the hearing. His contention was that Declarer believed the diamond suit to be good when it was not. If Declarer made the careless decision of playing a third round of trumps prior to playing the diamonds, he would not be able to make the slam.

The Decision: The Committee judged that while Declarer did incorrectly think the diamond suit was good, he did know the count on the trump suit based upon the timing of the claim. He would know that when everyone followed to the second round of trumps that all were accounted. He would then play diamonds, starting with the King, and when the 10 was covered by the Jack, he would see it and trump. The remaining club in Dummy would then provide access to the remaining established diamonds to make his slam. The score of N/S -920 was confirmed.

The Committee: Aaron Silverstein (chair), Fred King, Ed Lazarus, Meyer Kotkin, Jim Thurtell (scribe)

Commentary:

Martel – Rulings look wrong to me, I think when declarer is clearly out of touch with the hand (as opposed to just being a bit sloppy in the claim wording) should be harsher about making a careless play, for example, cashing the club K next, planning to win the third trump in dummy. I think it is different than e.g. claiming with KQJx facing ATxx of trumps, which turns out to be wrong because they are 5-0.

Marques – Good decision. Next case.

Kooijman – I am normally a mild TD in cases of badly explained claims. But I seem to be alone here in not allowing it. If declarer thinks that the diamonds are good why couldn't he play the ♣K and then cross to dummy? I allow declarer to discover his mistake when he doesn't see the ♦J dropping on the ♦K, but it is too late, he will lose two more tricks starting his discards with the ♥6.

Goldsmith – Right. Declarer is allowed to see what stares him in the face. But if North had had the four diamonds, declarer would be down one. If the screening director or table director had explained this to N/S, I'd strongly consider this appeal to be without merit. I don't know if that happened or not.

Woolsey – I do not agree with this decision at all. If declarer thought the diamonds were good, which apparently he did, it would be quite natural for him to continue with king of clubs, planning on then leading a club to dummy if the clubs were 3-1 and running the good diamonds. Note that if dummy's clubs were Qxx instead of QJx and declarer thought the diamonds were good, this is exactly how declarer would have played the hand. There is no reason at all to think that declarer would have led a

club to the queen. This claim should not have been allowed. This point slipped by the committee.

Wildavsky – I would not give a declarer who could not count the diamonds credit for counting the clubs. The AC considers the timing of his claim significant, but it would be more so if declarer had waited to claim until trump were drawn.

I'd have adjusted the score for both sides to 6♣ down 2. Surely this would have been the result a significant fraction of the time had declarer not claimed.