

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Incomplete Designation	<b>Case:</b>	R4
---------------------------	------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday Morning Side Game	<b>Event DIC</b>	Karl Miller
<b>Date</b>	08/09/2013	<b>Session</b>	

### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention


### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	7	N	1270 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	S	♠	7		
		♥	J1065		
<b>Vul</b>	Both	♦	J1096		
		♣	AKJ9		
W	180 MPS			E	25 MPS
♠	AK954			♠	1063
♥	93			♥	AKQ82
♦	K7			♦	A853
♣	10864			♣	7
		S	2880 MPS		
		♠	QJ82		
		♥	74		
		♦	Q42		
		♣	Q532		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
2♥ by E			♣ 3

### Facts Determined at the Table

Clubs had been played to the first two tricks, with declarer trumping the second round. On the third trick, declarer led a small diamond up to the ♦K7 on the board and called "Diamond". Dummy did not pull the 7 and instead put his hand on the King. At this point, the director was called.

### Director Ruling

The director allowed the play of king to correct an unintended designation as allowed by Law 45C4b. It was the director's judgment that although dummy's actions were improper it was never declarer's intent to play the ♦7 instead of the king.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	2♥ by E, Made 3, E/W +140
--------------------------	---------------------------

### The Appeal

N/S appealed the ruling. The play had been clubs all around at trick one. A second club was led and trumped by declarer at trick two. They now led a small diamond to the dummy at trick three, which was when this incident occurred.

Dummy said he moved his hand and tapped the table near the ♦K7, inviting declarer to specify which diamond. The defenders said he actually tapped the King. Dummy admitted that he didn't pull a card because "the call of a [small] diamond was so strange".

The defense felt that dummy's actions suggested declarer call for the king. Declarer stated that she was always planning to play a diamond to the K, a diamond back to the A, and a diamond ruff. Declarer also claimed that her full statement was going to be: "play the diamond king" and the actions by dummy cut off her full statement.

The defense did not agree that the timing of the actions at the table validated this comment. There was more time between the statement and declarer saying "king" than would be expected had declarer simply been interrupted during a continuous statement.

### Panel Findings

The panel felt it was obvious that declarer's intent was always to play the ♦K. During discussion, it was pointed out that the director's ruling, based on Law 45C was not the appropriate citation. Law 46B (incomplete or erroneous call of a card) was the law that should have been applied and cited for this ruling, both at the table and during screening.

"In case of an incomplete or erroneous call by declarer of the card to be played by dummy, the following restrictions apply, *except when declarer's different intention is incontrovertible.*"

While the call of "diamond" would normally be deemed to designate the lowest diamond (46B2), incontrovertible intention overrules this.

During the screening, a discussion with West about dummy's rights and limitations occurred. At first, West did not understand what he had done inappropriately, but after the discussion with the screener, he recognized the violation.

The panel upheld the director's ruling of 2♥ by East, making three. Since dummy's actions were a violation of procedure, and since the table director cited the wrong law governing this situation, the panel deemed the appeal to have merit.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>2♥ by E, Made 3, E/W +140</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	William Michaels
<b>Member</b>	Kevin Perkins
<b>Member</b>	Matt Koltnow