

Appeal No. 13 Italy v Sweden

Appeals Committee:

David Harris (Chairman, England), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), Grattan Endicott (England), Barry Rigal (USA)

Open Teams Qualifying Round 2

Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.

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

West	North	East	South
<i>Goldberg L.</i>	<i>Astore</i>	<i>Goldberg</i>	<i>U.Moraglia</i>
	Pass	Pass	Pass
2♣	Dble	5♣	Dble
Pass	5♦	Pass	Pass
6♣	Pass	Pass	Dble
All Pass			

Comments: 2♣ Precision-style

Contract: Six Clubs Doubled, played by West

Result: 11 tricks, NS +100

The Facts:

West called the Director when the tray returned with 5♦-pass. He stated that South had hesitated a long time before doubling 5♣.

The Director:

Allowed the play to continue and asked East why she had not called the director when North had bid 5♦. She told him that she wanted to do so after the end of the auction.

The Director reminded the players of regulation 13.4.e/f/g which says that if the wrong player calls the Director, he may rule that there was no Unauthorized Information. The Director decided to do so.

Ruling:

Result Stands

Relevant Laws:

Law 16B1a

Regulation 13.4.e, f, g

East/West appealed.

Present: All players except South

The Players:

North was asked how long it had taken before the tray had come back with the double. He stated that it was probably somewhat slow, but his partner always bids slowly.

West had told the Director, at the table, that she estimated it as being 3-4 minutes.

East also stated, in the Committee, that South had thought for more than one minute.

East told the Committee that she had not known that she should have called the Director.

West said that North had exactly what he had promised before: close to an opening, with the three other suits. He called the bid of 5♦ “stupid bridge”. East summed it up as “They did wrong”.

North stated that he had bid 5♦ because the double was not for penalties but a kind of take-out.

Neither North nor South had alerted it though.

North was asked why South (who was not at the hearing) had taken such a long time before bidding.

North answered that his partner always bids slowly, and that it was doubtful whether or not to compete.

The Committee:

Decided that they had sufficient evidence to believe that the break in tempo was proven. It was estimated at one minute. If the Double had been alerted, the Committee would have been more sympathetic towards it being called take-out. The hesitation clearly suggests a non-pass, and passing is a Logical Alternative. North after all has a clear trick.

The Committee decided that North should not have bid 5♦.

The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling adjusted:

Score adjusted to 5♣X by West, making 11 tricks, NS -550

Deposit: Returned