

| | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|----|
| Subject of Appeal: | Undisclosed Agreement | Case: | R2 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|----|

| | | | |
|--------------|--|------------------|-------------|
| Event | 1 st Sunday A/X Swiss Teams | Event DIC | Peter Wilke |
| Date | 03/23/2014 | Session | Second |


Auction

| West | North | East | South |
|------|-------|------|-------|
| | | | 1♦ |
| 1♥ | 1♠ | 4♥ | Pass |
| Pass | Pass | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

Hand Record

| | | | | | |
|---------------|------------|--|----------|----------|----------|
| Board | 19 | N | 1200 mps | | |
| Dealer | S | ♠ | AQ984 | | |
| | | ♥ | 5 | | |
| Vul | E/W | ♦ | KJ10 | | |
| | | ♣ | A764 | | |
| W | 6950 mps |  | | E | 1370 mps |
| ♠ | K | | | ♠ | J53 |
| ♥ | KQJ986 | | | ♥ | A742 |
| ♦ | Q72 | | | ♦ | A3 |
| ♣ | 1032 | | | ♣ | KQ95 |
| | | S | 2630 mps | | |
| | | ♠ | 10762 | | |
| | | ♥ | 103 | | |
| | | ♦ | 98654 | | |
| | | ♣ | J8 | | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| Final Contract | Result of Play | Score | Opening Lead |
| 4♥ by W | Down 1 | N/S +100 | ♥ 5 |

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned near the conclusion of play of the hand. North had passed out 4♥ without any apparent problem. West claimed that N/S must have some agreement about the likelihood of South psyching. If he had this information, he would have made his contract

Director Ruling

Law 40C1 states, "A player may deviate from his side's announced understandings always, provided that his partner has no more reason to be aware of the deviation than have the opponents.... If the Director judges there is undisclosed knowledge that has damaged the opponents, he shall adjust the score and may award a procedural penalty." Law 40A3 states, "A player may make any call or play without prior announcement provided that such call or play is not based on an undisclosed partnership understanding." The Director judged that North was aware of South's propensity to psych and initially adjusted the result to 4♠ by North, down 2, E/W +300, but as the Review began, a correction was made to down 1, E/W +100.

| | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Director's Ruling | 4♠X by N, Down 1, E/W +100 |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|

The Appeal

Both sides appealed the director's ruling, and North, South and West attended the review. N/S were asked, as a result of the change in ruling, if they wanted to withdraw their appeal. They wished to proceed as they wanted the table result to stand. N/S said psyching was perfectly legal, and any adjustment to the table result would be an attempt to deny the right to psych. North said that when vulnerable opponents voluntarily bid 4♥, he decided South must have psyched.

N/S produced their convention card, which said, in two places, that N/S have an obstructive bidding style. N/S also claimed that this was the first psych by South in this tournament. N/S do not have many masterpoints but were both experienced rubber bridge players. South was known by the Reviewer to be an excellent player.

West claimed he would have made 4♥ if he had any clue that North might have passed with the hand he held. The play was: trump lead and a trump to dummy; a spade to the King and Ace; a small club to the King and a spade ruff; ♥6 to dummy's 7 and a spade ruff; a club ducked to the J and a diamond exit. West is also very experienced despite a low masterpoint holding.

Panel Findings

Several Flight A players were given the North hand, and taken through the auction. They were told to assume a hyper aggressive style that believed in obstructing the opponents. All bid 1♠ at first turn, then doubled in pass out seat. When reminded of the vulnerability, and asked if something funny might be going on, all said a psych hadn't been revealed yet, so their values had to be shown.

The Panel decided the E/W appeal first. There was no legal way to allow West to make 4♥, since there was no lawful way for him to be given the knowledge needed to make 4♥. That appeal was rejected, but an Appeal without Merit Warning was not considered.

The Panel then considered the N/S appeal. It concluded that N/S had indeed violated Laws 40A3 and 40C1. The Panel did not allow North to field the psych, and assigned a result of 4♠X by North, down 1, E/W +100 for both sides. An Appeal without Merit Warning was given to N/S, as they should have known their Appeal could not succeed. N/S were also given a 3 VP procedural penalty, as the pass of 4♥ was deemed to be sufficient evidence of an undisclosed partnership understanding.

| | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Panel Decision | 4♠X by N, Down 1, E/W +100 |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|

Panel Members

| | |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Reviewer | Gary Zeiger |
| Member | Eric Bell |
| Member | Matt Smith |