



2005

APPEALS

Edited by David Stevenson

WELSH BRIDGE UNION

2005

APPEALS

Edited by David Stevenson

All the appeals from the WBU events have been included herein. It is hoped that they will provide interest and an insight into the way that people in Wales are ruling the game.

After the success of the earlier editions it was decided to repeat this publication. This publication has been put on David Stevenson's Lawspage. The feedback from this will be used to decide whether to repeat this in future years. Also consideration will be given as to whether to publish it as a booklet (as is happening in other countries in similar situations). So, whether you liked this publication or not, if you can see how you would improve it, if you would like to purchase a paper copy, or if you have any other comments, please tell the L&EC Chairman, Anne Jones. If you wish to comment on the actual appeals, the layout, the editing or the Commentary please tell the Editor, David Stevenson. The way to contact the L&EC Chairman or the Editor is detailed on the next page.

Comments have been made on the appeals by an international group of people who have donated their time, for which we thank them. Also further thanks are due to Peter Eidt of Germany and Jeffrey Allerton of England for doing the proof-reading.

WELSH BRIDGE UNION

2005

APPEALS

Contacts

Anne Jones
Chairman Laws and Ethics Committee
Welsh Bridge Union
93 Coryton Rise
Whitchurch
CARDIFF CF14 7EL
Wales UK

Tel [1]:	02920 651407	From outside UK replace 0 with +44
Tel [2]:	02920 657066	
Email:	anne@baa-lamb.co.uk	
WBU web site:	http://www.wbu.org.uk/	

David Stevenson
Editor Appeals booklet
63 Slingsby Drive
WIRRAL CH49 0TY
England UK

Tel:	0151 677 7412	From outside UK replace 0 with +44
Fax:	0870 055 7697	
Mobile:	07778 409955	
Email:	mcba@blakjak.org	From UK
Email:	bridg@blakjak.org	From elsewhere
Lawspage:	http://blakjak.org/lws_menu.htm	
Bridgepage:	http://blakjak.org/brg_menu.htm	
Rulings forum:	http://blakjak.org/iblf.htm	
Appeals forum:	http://blakjak.org/iacf.htm	

WELSH BRIDGE UNION

2005

APPEALS

Commentators

There are comments on each Appeal by various commentators. Their comments here reflect their personal views.

David Stevenson (b. 1947), the Editor, is an International Tournament Director from Liverpool, England. He has served as a member of the Tournament Appeals Committee of the World Bridge Federation, and on Appeals Committees in the ACBL, Scotland, Ireland and Sweden. He is a member of the Laws & Ethics Committees in England and Wales. He was formerly the Secretary of the European Bridge League Tournament Directors' Committee, a commentator in the ACBL appeals books and Chief Tournament Director of the WBU. He hosts forums for Bridge Rulings and Appeals Committees.

Adam Wildavsky (b. 1960) of New York City is a software engineer for Google, Inc. He has been interested in the laws since he became the director of the MIT Bridge Club in 1979. Adam is a member of the ACBL Laws Commission and NABC Appeals Committee, an ACBL casebook commentator, and is a regular contributor to the Bridge Laws Mailing List. He won a Bronze Medal in the 2003 Bermuda Bowl in Monaco. His interest in the laws is informed by his study of Objectivism, the philosophy of Ayn Rand. His web site is www.tameware.com.

Alain Gottcheiner is a Belgian, occasional TD, has had some successes in national championships, has written about conventions and systems and is known as a "systems freak". His main appointments as an AC member are as an expert about strange conventions. His other fields of interest include mathematical anthropology, the sociology of games and dolichotrichotomy.

He has a general tendency towards severity to UI and MI, but dislikes lawyering attitude more than anything else.

Barry Rigal (b. 1957) lives in Manhattan with his wife Sue Picus. He is chairman of National Appeals for the ACBL and a full time bridge player, writer and commentator. His tournament record includes most of the major UK National titles and two US National titles.

He is currently working on an exposé of top-level bridge (after which he expects he will never eat lunch in this town again).

Bob Schwartz (b. 1945) is a computer consultant. Member of the ACBL Board of Governors, ACBL National Appeals Committee and the ACBL Competition and Conventions Committee. Married (over 30 years) with 3 children. Likes golf and poker--tolerates bridge.

Eric Landau is an American. He was a successful tournament player in the ACBL and Canada in the 1970s and 1980s, but has been semi-retired from competition since the late 80s and currently plays only once in a while. He is the author of the book "Every Hand An Adventure", and his writings have also appeared in The Bridge World, the Bulletin of the ACBL and various lesser-known publications. He directs at the club and local levels occasionally, and managed a bridge club for several years.

Fearghal O'Boyle is a European Tournament Director from Sligo, Ireland. He is heavily involved in Bridge administration in Ireland and writes a regular 'Rulings' article in the Irish Bridge Journal.

Frances Hinden and **Jeffrey Allerton** are tournament players from Surrey, England. Recent successes include winning the 2003 Gold Cup, while Jeffrey is a past European and World junior champion. They both used to direct club and county competitions, and Frances is a member of the EBU panel of referees.

Mike Amos (b. 1949) recently remarried and lives in rural Shropshire on the Welsh Borders. He is a National Director for the EBU and has wide experience of directing a range of events in England and in Wales. He is particularly interested in training others to be TDs. Mike enjoys his bridge both playing and directing and hopefully encourages others to enjoy it too. He even plays once a month or so with David Stevenson.

Richard Hills is a former President of the Bridge Federation of the Australian Capital Territory. Inspired by the editorial example of David Stevenson, he has edited three unofficial ACBL appeals casebooks, which are available for download from the following websites (which also contain other interesting directorial information):

Australian Bridge Directors Association website
<http://www.abf.com.au/directors/appeals.html>

David Stevenson's Bridge Laws website
<http://www.blakjak.org/appeals.htm>

Richard's competitive successes include winning five Australian Youth Bridge Championships, being Chess Champion of both Tasmania and Canberra and winning his school's Spaghetti Eating Championship.

WELSH BRIDGE UNION

2005

APPEALS

Abbreviations

There are some abbreviations, and they are listed here:

EBU	English Bridge Union
L&E	Laws & Ethics Committee
L&EC	Laws & Ethics Committee
WB	EBU White book, containing regulations for TDs and ACs
OB	EBU Orange book, containing regulations for players
WBF	World Bridge Federation
TD	Tournament Director
Director	Tournament Director
AC	Appeals Committee
Committee	Appeals Committee
LA	Logical alternative
AI	Authorised information
MI	Misinformation
UI	Unauthorised information
BIT	Break in Tempo [a hesitation, or over-fast call]
PP	Procedural penalty [a fine]
NOs	Non-offenders
N/S	North-South
E/W	East-West
!	Alerted
...	Hesitation [agreed]
(1), (2) etc	References to notes below
P	Pass
♠♥♦♣	Spades hearts diamonds clubs
Dbl	Double
Redbl	Redouble
NT	No-trumps
Benji	Benjamin: a popular name for a form of Acol where 2♣/♦ openings are strong and artificial, 2♥/♠ openings are weak

WELSH BRIDGE UNION

2005

APPEALS

General

From the 1st August 2000 Tournament Directors are permitted to give “weighted” scores when assigning, for example if they adjust a score because of misinformation they might give a score of 50% of 6♠ making, and 50% of 4♠ +2. Previously only Appeals Committees were permitted to do this. The World Bridge Federation hopes that this will reduce the number of Appeals.

The format used to show such results is based on the “Maastricht protocol” whereby higher N/S scores are shown first. It helps scorers and TDs if a consistent style is used. Example:

Score assigned for both sides (Law 12C3):

10% 6♣ -1 by West, NS +100
+60% 6♠ doubled -3 by N/S, NS -800
+30% 6♣ making by West, NS -920

Unlike most other publications of this sort around the world, we have named the Tournament Director in each case. He or she is the man or woman who attended the table, took the evidence, told the players the ruling, and presented the case to the Committee. But the ruling will only be given after he or she has consulted with at least one other Director, and possibly a top player as well. Thus he or she is not solely responsible for the ruling – on rare occasions he or she may not agree with it himself or herself.

Published
© Welsh Bridge Union

October 2006
2006

WELSH BRIDGE UNION

2005

APPEALS

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	8
APPEAL No 1: I wonder what this bidding means?.....	9
APPEAL No 2: A fit non-jump	15
APPEAL No 3: What does the hesitation mean?.....	19
APPEAL No 4: Average plus, average minus	23
APPEAL No 5: Standard leads	28
FINAL COMMENTS	33

APPEAL No 1: I wonder what this bidding means?

Tournament Director:

Hugh Arnold

Referee:

Anne Jones

Notes by editor:

A Referee is an Appeals Committee comprising one person.

Teams Board no 12 Dealer West N/S vulnerable	♠ AKQ6543 ♥ A ♦ A962 ♣ 2										
♠ J2 ♥ KQT653 ♦ T3 ♣ J73	<table><tr><td></td><td><i>N</i></td><td></td></tr><tr><td><i>W</i></td><td></td><td><i>E</i></td></tr><tr><td></td><td><i>S</i></td><td></td></tr></table>		<i>N</i>		<i>W</i>		<i>E</i>		<i>S</i>		♠ T8 ♥ J92 ♦ J85 ♣ AT865
	<i>N</i>										
<i>W</i>		<i>E</i>									
	<i>S</i>										
	♠ 97 ♥ 874 ♦ KQ74 ♣ KQ94										

Basic systems:

East-West play Natural + Multi

<i>WEST</i>	<i>NORTH</i>	<i>EAST</i>	<i>SOUTH</i>
2♦! (1)	Dbl (2)	2♠! (3)	Pass (4)
3♥	6♠	Pass	Pass
Pass			

- (1) Multi
- (2) Good hand
- (3) Playable in 2♠ or 3♥
- (4) Asked what the bidding meant and passed in tempo

Result at table:

6♠ making by North, NS +1430, lead ♥2

Director first called:

At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:

East called the TD and indicated that he did not consider the 6♠ bid by North was appropriate. TD asked to see North's hand which is obviously game-going. North must have a bid which must be 4♠ or 6♠. No point in calling 5♠.

Director's ruling:

Table result stands

Details of ruling:

TD considered North was perfectly entitled to call 6♠ if he wished. Law 16.

Appeal lodged by:

East-West

Director's comments:

The UI did not suggest that 6♠ would be more likely to succeed than 4♠.

Comments by East-West:

North's 6♠ bid is speculative (to say the very least). It is made less risky by South's interest in proceedings (shown by requesting an explanation of the auction). Thus there is a case that North is bidding on UI.

East claimed that 2♠ was not invitational in hearts. West said that if maximum he would have made a trial bid in a minor.

Comments by North-South:

South said that she would have asked a question out of interest even if holding xx xxx xxxx xxxx.

Referee's decision:

Score assigned for both sides:

4♠ +2 by North, NS +680

No deposit taken

Referee's comments:

6♠ disallowed. TD has considered 4♠ to be an LA and has misinterpreted the Law by considering that the question did not possibly convey UI.

I consider that South has conveyed UI and that the 6♠ call has been made safer. I consider that North has information that was not available from the legal auction.

Adam Wildavsky's comments:

I prefer the referee's decision to the TD's.

Alain Gottcheiner's comments:

One thing was not considered: South's claim that she would have asked the meaning of 2S whatever her hand. Always asking is proper; several pairs practise this, for the very reason that it avoids transmitting UI. It should have been investigated whether this N/S pair was one of those, for example by asking their recent opponents. Perhaps they even write it on their system notes, to cover themselves. If, and only if, it appears that they don't practise systematic asking, may the TD or AC assign an adjusted score.

Barry Rigal's comments:

If the director established that asking the meaning of the sequence established UI I'm surprised. I would have thought that this was not standard practice, but different countries have different standards here. I know US and UK have disagreement on UI passed by questions of this sort.

As an aside; the one man referee is a dangerous precedent unless you are dealing with an established expert in the laws and appeals.

I suppose the referee assumed that since 6S was a punt and unjustified by the hand there must have been UI – a dangerous path of reasoning to follow.

Bob Schwartz's comments:

I hate cases where the director is called at an inappropriate time and then a committee (or referee) rewards them. EW play multi. Instead of calling the director at 2 appropriate times during the auction (when the question occurred or when the 6S bid was made) they scream when the opponents land on their feet in a very lucky contract. My initials are BS and that says it all. Talk about double shots!!! Very poor decision by the referee: good decision by the TD.

David Stevenson's comments:

There will always be arguments as to what is shown by asking questions. Experience shows that in Wales players rarely ask when they have very little, and questions tend to show some interest in the auction, thus this tends to be assumed for the purposes of ruling. Of course, some players might ask just out of interest, and it is possibly somewhat unfair on them. It may be complicated by the fact that if a player thinks he knows what it means then he is very unlikely to ask with no possibility of bidding, so again, questions tend to show interest in the auction.

Once this principle is accepted the Referee's decision follows naturally: 4♠ is an LA, and 6♠ is suggested over 4♠ by the questions.

Eric Landau's comments:

Bridge is a game of full disclosure. A player is entitled to know as much about his opponents' bidding methods as they do. One of the reasons for this is so that he can "listen in on" his opponents' bidding, and use his knowledge of their methods to build a picture of the hidden opposing hands. This is far easier, more effective and less time-consuming than attempting to do so based on reviews and questions after the auction is over. Hence the law specifically gives players the right to inquire as to the meaning of their opponents' auction whenever it is their turn to bid.

If an inquiry which is made at the proper time, in the proper form, with no associated break in tempo, to presume, in the absence of other compelling evidence, that such an inquiry passes unauthorized information to partner irreparably compromises the fundamental principle of full disclosure. A player must not be forced into the position of putting himself at risk of an adverse ruling based on presumptive unauthorized information in order to exercise his right to follow the opponents' auction as it progresses. Yet that is precisely what the committee has done in this case, by its finding that "North's 6S bid... is made less risky by South's interest in proceedings... Thus there is a case that North is bidding on UI."

Compare this case with EBU appeal #6 in the 2005 EBU Appeals Booklet. That case was very similar to this one, except that in the EBU case the inquiry was not properly phrased ("Is that weak?"). Even so, that committee found, correctly, that the question was "normal", and hence carried no suggestion that would affect the questioner's partner's choice of call. That was an appropriate precedent, and this committee should have followed the same reasoning to let the table result stand in this case.

Fearghal O'Boyle's comments:

We have had similar cases before and we used to rule as the referee did – South's enquiry suggests values and this suggests 6S over 4S. However I wonder if this view is still current view? I know some leading (non EBU) authorities who would allow South to enquire free of charge even with a yarborough because they consider 'wanting to understand the auction' a valid bridge reason for the enquiry. Hopefully this case will re-open the discussion?

Frances Hinden's comments:

I don't like it when a TD imputes his own bridge opinions to another pair. Surely it is for the North player to explain his logic for bidding 6♠, not the TD to make it up for him? I believe that double-then-4♠ is a LA to 6♠, and I believe that *if* there is UI from South it suggests bidding 6♠. It's left to decide first if the question did give UI (do we believe South would still have asked holding xx xxx xxxx xxxx?) and secondly, if it did so, would South have moved over 4♠, 5♠ or something else from North and the slam reached anyway? Depending on South's remarks, I would consider giving a percentage of 4♠+2, and a percentage of 6♠ based on South moving over 4♠; but I don't object to the referee's decision.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

The official WBU guidance on the implications of asking questions is contained in the EBU Orange Book (section 3.4.1 of the 1998 version in use at the time of this appeal, section 3E2 of the 2006 version). So in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the Referee is correct to conclude that the question provided UI.

The TD and/or the Referee should have asked North why he chose to bid 6♠ but if they did ask the answer has not been recorded.

Finally it is not clear that the Referee gave enough consideration to the subsequent auction. Most pairs play double of 2♦ followed by a jump to 4♠ as showing a hand too strong for an immediate 4♠ overcall. With partner virtually marked with heart shortage, South ought to make a move towards slam in the Referee's hypothetical auction and I would consider a weighting between 4♠+2 and 6♠= to be appropriate. Note that although no percentage of the (illegally reached) table result is allowed in the weighting, we can include a percentage of an assigned score of the same contract as long as it is reached by a different (legal) route.

Mike Amos' comments:

Well, I was taught that when I made judgement rulings I should discuss them with others before leaping to conclusions. If I was discussing this case I'd want to hear someone tell me clearly why asking this question was UI. "Because it is!" I hear you all shout, but I do begin to wonder if this is always right. Secondly however I'd want to hear someone tell me how this question suggested a slam bid. It just seems a daft punt that worked.

Richard Hills' comments:

The referee correctly assessed that the director had misinterpreted Law 16. However, if a referee is defined as "an appeals committee comprising one person", then the referee exceeded their powers.

Law 93B3:

"In adjudicating appeals the committee may exercise all powers assigned by these Laws to the Director, except that the committee may not overrule the Director on a point of law"

The reason that this limitation on the powers of appeals committees is included in the Lawbook is that the average director has more expertise in the interpretation of the Laws than the average appeals committee does.

However, referees are an exceptional case, since the Welsh Bridge Union (and the English Bridge Union) carefully select referees with a much higher level of expertise than the average director has yet attained.

Therefore, the Welsh Bridge Union (and the English Bridge Union) should now redefine their referees as "Chief Directors", since Law 93A gives a Chief Director unlimited power when a director's erroneous ruling is appealed.

Final summary by editor:

Yet again, the main problem is whether asking questions provides UI to partner. WBU guidance, as given in the EBU Orange book, is to warn that there are dangers in asking questions. The commentators are strongly divided. The WBU guidance is based on experience of what players do, and came from a lot of problems. Some of the foreign commentators do not see the problem clearly.

If a player asks on some hands and not others then it is likely that his partner will realise, at least subconsciously, that he has a more suitable hand for bidding on the hands where he asks questions. Now, defining that as not unauthorised information is not the answer, because it is: partner is not allowed to bid on the presumption this hand is more suitable once it has asked questions, nor would we wish that to be the case.

It may be that part of the problem is that Welsh alerting involves more alerts than elsewhere, so people do not ask routinely. Whatever the reason, there is a problem in Wales with questions, and they do give UI at least some of the time.

I do not understand Richard's comments at all. The Appeals Committees, whether of one person or the more normal three, are not the Directors in Charge of events, and cannot act as though they are. But they can certainly apply Law 16 in a way that is different from a TD if they decide he has misjudged the hand.

APPEAL No 2: A fit non-jump

Tournament Director:

Mike Amos

Appeals Committee:

Keith Shuttleworth (Chairman) Peter Hand Liam Sheridan

Swiss Pairs Board no 32 Dealer West E/W vulnerable	♠ QT975 ♥ A972 ♦ Q7 ♣ A3										
♠ J3 ♥ 53 ♦ AK82 ♣ 87642	<table><tr><td></td><td><i>N</i></td><td></td></tr><tr><td><i>W</i></td><td></td><td><i>E</i></td></tr><tr><td></td><td><i>S</i></td><td></td></tr></table>		<i>N</i>		<i>W</i>		<i>E</i>		<i>S</i>		♠ A2 ♥ KJ8 ♦ 63 ♣ KQJT95
	<i>N</i>										
<i>W</i>		<i>E</i>									
	<i>S</i>										
	♠ K864 ♥ QT64 ♦ JT954 ♣ --										

Basic systems:

North-South play 2/1, 5 card majors

<i>WEST</i>	<i>NORTH</i>	<i>EAST</i>	<i>SOUTH</i>
Pass	1♠	2♣	3♣! (1)
3♦	3♠	... Pass	Pass
4♣	Pass	Pass	Pass

(1) Invitational raise in spades

Result at table:

4♣ making by East, NS –130, lead ♠x

Director first called:

At end of hand

Director's statement of facts:

TD was called by South who wanted to query West's 4♣ bid after the agreed long hesitation by East over North's 3♠. E/W argued that 3♦ showed club support and committed the partnership to the 4 level in clubs.

South further complained that 3♦ should have been alerted if it showed club support.

West argued that she had the best possible holding in diamonds (AK) and five clubs. East pointed out that she had only shown three card support with 3♦. South argued that if 3♦ had been alerted North might have bid differently – ie 4♠ because he would know South was short in clubs.

Director's ruling:

Table result stands

Details of ruling:

On the UI issue TD feels pass is not a logical alternative.

On the MI issue TD feels 3♠ is still the normal bid: ♦ Qx is a poor holding.

Appeal lodged by:

North-South

Director's comments:

It is correct that 3♦ should have been alerted if it showed club support.

TD polled five players to determine issues.

When the ruling was given South argued that her bidding had been affected and she might have bid 4♠ – she did not argue this at the time.

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

Agreed that 3♦ should have been alerted but failure to do so did not in our opinion damage N/S, since West was in effect committing partnership to 4♣.

Richard Hills' comments:

The TD and AC correctly assessed that the MI did not have any impact on North's bidding, but failed to take into account whether South's bidding was affected. It is possible, especially given the matchpoints scoring method, that if South had known that West held primary club support, rather than the MI that West was showing merely club preference, then South might occasionally have taken the push to 4S once North failed to double 4C.

Therefore, my Law 12C3 ruling would be:

25% of 4Sx-1 NS -100
+ 75% of 4C= NS -130

Mike Amos' comments:

I was the TD and I haven't changed my mind. The AC agreed with the ruling so they must have got it right. I can see no reason not to retain the deposit.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

I agree with both the TD and the AC. Note that the TD demonstrated good practice by consulting before making his ruling.

Frances Hinden's comments:

I fully agree that pass is not a LA for West. However, I don't understand the AC's comment on the MI question: NS claim that had they known 3♦ showed club support they would have bid differently; but if 3♦ were natural then it hasn't committed EW to the 4-level at all. I do agree with the TD's argument for the final ruling. I suspect (possibly unjustly) that South didn't consider bidding 4♣ because he was expecting the 4♣ bid to be disallowed.

Fearghal O'Boyle's comments:

The TD and AC did a good job and left no stone unturned. A player who bids 3D is not a player who is going to pass 3S!

David Stevenson's comments:

This looks right: West has assessed the hand as worth 4♣ otherwise he can hardly bid 3♦! So while a pause in a competitive auction normally shows a hand that is not unhappy if partner progresses, so suggests bidding 4♣ over pass, it does not appear that pass is a logical alternative.

As for South's later argument about bidding 4♠ if she knows 3♦ shows a club fit, 4♣ certainly showed a club fit and she did not bid 4♠ then.

Bob Schwartz's comments:

West (a passed hand) vulnerable trots out a new suit at the 3 level in fact as a reverse-and NS claim that they needed to be alerted that this was club support. NO ALERT IS NEEDED!!!!!! NOT NOW NOT EVER. PLAY BRIDGE. Keep the deposit.

Barry Rigal's comments:

The meaning of 3D in this sequence is what some people would call "Just bridge mister". South committed her hand to a limit raise, and would not have bid again, dummy might have been 5-3 not 4-5 in the minors just as easily from North's perspective.

Yes, I might have alerted 3D if playing against people who needed help – not so here apparently.

Yes, there is no LA to 4C with five-card support and extra shape for West. Correct TD and AC ruling – possible case for a PP I suppose from the lack of alert?

Alain Gottcheiner's comments:

Agree with the AC. Infraction but no subsequent damage. PP against E/W for failure to alert.

East has shown extra values and/or shape in a FNJ (ed: fit non-jump) context (the pair being committed to 4C at least had N passed, pass is now stronger than 4C).

For the same reason, 3S shows a weak and/or unsuited hand. This all means South would never bid 4S, if only for fear of pushing E/W to a makeable 5C.

Adam Wildavsky's comments:

Good work all around.

Final summary by editor:

Everyone seems happy – except N/S! Some feeling that the deposit should have been retained.

APPEAL No 3: What does the hesitation mean?

Tournament Director:

Andrew Crawford

Appeals Committee:

Chris Jagger (Chairman) Paddy Murphy Keith Shuttleworth

Swiss Pairs Board no 29 Dealer North Both vulnerable	♠ AJ5 ♥ 4 ♦ QT964 ♣ KJ62	
♠ Q83 ♥ AKJ8 ♦ AK5 ♣ Q93	<div> <div>N</div> <div>W<div>E</div>S</div> </div>	♠ KT976 ♥ T763 ♦ 83 ♣ T4
	♠ 42 ♥ Q952 ♦ J72 ♣ A875	

Basic systems:

East-West play Acol, 12-14 NT

<i>WEST</i>	<i>NORTH</i>	<i>EAST</i>	<i>SOUTH</i>
	1♦	Pass	1♥
... Dbl	Pass	1♠	2♦
Pass	Pass	2♠	Pass
4♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

Result at table:

4♠ making by East, NS -620

Director first called:

At end of auction

Director's statement of facts:

The above auction was established. The TD was recalled at the end of play and asked for a ruling. The TD asked East why she had bid 2♠ and the answer was "I was not going to let the auction die in 2♦."

Director's ruling:

Table result stands

Details of ruling:

Although East has unauthorised information because of West's hesitation before doubling, the TD formed the opinion that pass was not a logical alternative after N/S had subsided in 2♦.

Appeal lodged by:

North-South

Director's comments:

East has authorised information from auction that West is strong – N/S have passed out 2♦ and so have a max 22-23 (no game try).

Comments by South:

The tempo break was a 35+ second pause (counted routinely) before the double. The pass of 2♦ was if anything on the quick side, say 3 seconds in a competitive auction.

West has had opportunity to support and not done so and 2♠ is not a 50% call. There has to be some lower limit to protection.

Note South has bid East's side suit and it could be a cross-ruff. E/W vulnerable v not.

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

As established by Director, agreed hesitation over 1♥.

Whilst we could see that West's action may be questioned, there was no unauthorised information here hence West is blameless.

The question is therefore what the slow double of 1♥ suggests to East when 2♦ comes round to her. We thought the most likely reason for a slow double was some points but unsuitability for the other two suits. We in no way thought the likely hand would be lots of values and a spade 3 card fit. So we did not consider that East had taken advantage of the unauthorised information. Perhaps the reverse – if East had tried to take advantage she was more likely to surmise that West was unsuitable for spades. Further we considered 2♠ a reasonable bid.

Adam Wildavsky's comments:

When the AC noted that West was "blameless" I think they meant that with no UI West was entitled to bid as he pleased.

As for 2S being "reasonable", that was not a question the AC ought to have addressed. The question is rather whether Pass would have been reasonable ("logical" in Law 16), and if so whether it was demonstrably suggested by the UI. South testified that West's Pass over 2D was quick. One could argue that a quick pass obligated East to bid 2S if that was a LA.

All told I think this was a close call. Had West hesitated before passing over 2D I would never allow 2S, and one could argue that the information conveyed by the hesitation before doubling was similar.

Alain Gottcheiner's comments:

Agree heartily. The argument that "if East had tried to take advantage she was more likely to surmise that West was unsuitable for spades" is very strong. Perhaps even East decided to bid 2S willy-nilly, to avoid taking advantage.

Barry Rigal's comments:

The AC and TD were guilty of muddled reasoning though they came to the correct conclusion. Was there a BIT? Yes. Does it DEMONSTRABLY SUGGEST the actions taken? Absolutely not! Who knows what West is thinking about – it could be anything, weak strong or whatever. Once West passes 2D there is no UI to prevent East from bidding again – some people might have done more the first time.

This was a clear case where N/S did not like their result after a BIT; but their appeal was frivolous in the extreme and they should have had their deposit withheld and have been made to write out 20 times "I will not appeal just because I do not like my opponents' result, when no infraction has taken place. And a BIT does not automatically lead to an adjusted score."

Bob Schwartz's comments:

Keep the deposit!

David Stevenson's comments:

Certainly I do not feel pass was a logical alternative: at another table on a similar auction I bid 2♠ not 1♠ on the first round! I wish the AC had made their thoughts clearer: when they say "Further we considered 2♠ a reasonable bid" was this just an irrelevant comment, or did they actually mean Pass was not an LA? Certainly they were right to consider what the hesitation meant.

Fearghal O'Boyle's comments:

The TD and AC reasoned perfectly.

Frances Hinden's comments:

The TD got this right; the AC have considered carefully what the hesitation actually suggests but once you decide there is no LA to 2♠ it doesn't matter. If NS were an experienced pair I would have kept the deposit.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

I agree with the AC. The UI did not suggest 2♠ (rather than Pass) over 2♦ so there is no reason to adjust from the table result. It seems perverse to suggest that East would not normally compete to 2♠ in what would normally be a 5-4 spade fit and the AC ought to have seriously considered keeping the deposit.

Mike Amos' comments:

While not the TD at the table, I was the DIC for this case as well.

The case is a relatively simple judgement one. Was there UI? Did it suggest 2♠ was more likely to be successful? Was pass a logical alternative?

I thought at the time that Pass was not an LA. Quite what the AC thought I'm not sure, but at least they upheld the ruling.

Richard Hills' comments:

In my youth, I used to balance when opponents stopped at a low level. With distressing frequency, my opponents then proceeded to bid and make game. So, now that I am as old as the Hills, I rarely balance, thus scoring many more matchpoints and imps.

So, I disagree with the director's comment "East has authorised information from the auction that West is strong". Rather, the authorised information from the auction was either:

(a) West is strong,

or

(b) North-South have underbid.

West's hesitation told East that option (b) was not true. Ergo, not only was passing 2D a logical alternative, passing 2D was the only legal logical alternative consistent with Law 16.

Therefore I would adjust the score to 2D making eight tricks.

Final summary by editor:

Not unanimous, but the majority view was that the TD and AC got this right. Even so, they had different reasons: the TD felt pass was not an LA, the AC thought the hesitation did not suggest 2♠ over Pass. Not all the commentators differentiated between the two.

APPEAL No 4: Average plus, average minus

Tournament Director:

Andrew Crawford

Appeals Committee:

Chris Jagger (Chairman) David Stevenson Brian Nicholls

Swiss Pairs Board no 19 Dealer South E/W vulnerable	<p>♠ 3</p> <p>♥ J</p> <p>♦ 8542</p> <p>♣ AQJ7542</p>	
<p>♠ QJ84</p> <p>♥ AKQ3</p> <p>♦ J97</p> <p>♣ K3</p>	<p><i>N</i></p> <p><i>W</i> <i>E</i></p> <p><i>S</i></p>	<p>♠ AK76</p> <p>♥ T86</p> <p>♦ KT63</p> <p>♣ T6</p>
	<p>♠ T952</p> <p>♥ 97542</p> <p>♦ AQ</p> <p>♣ 98</p>	

Basic systems:

East-West play Acol, 12-14 1NT

<i>WEST</i>	<i>NORTH</i>	<i>EAST</i>	<i>SOUTH</i>
			2♥!
2NT!	Pass (1)	3♣	Pass
3NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

(1) Asked about 2NT: told it was Lebensohl

Result at table:

3NT making by West, NS –600, lead ♣Q

Director first called:

At end of auction

Director's statement of facts:

At the end of play North said he would have bid 3♣ if he had been given a correct explanation of the 2NT overcall by West. After consultation with his colleagues TD asked West what 3♣ was and was told it was not Stayman following a 2NT overcall and she treated 3♣ as a suit.

Apparently East thought partner had a 5 card suit and therefore she must bid 3♣ – she said afterwards she got Lebensohl wrong.

Note by editor:

Some players play a 2NT response to a double of a weak two as Lebensohl, forcing 3♣, usually showing a weak hand with a long suit. It appears that East got confused and thought that it applied to a 2NT overcall of a weak two.

Director's ruling:

Artificial score awarded:

Average plus to N/S, average minus to E/W

Details of ruling:

In the TD's opinion, West's 3NT involves illegal use of unauthorised information. East's explanation of "Lebensohl" warns West that they have had a misunderstanding and by bidding 3NT West ensures a silly contract is not reached. East is likely to pass any call West makes.

Since E/W do not seem able to describe their methods after a 2NT overcall, although they play Puppet Stayman over 2NT opening and Stayman over 1NT overcall, the TD found it impossible to determine what the final contract would be. E/W defence to Weak Twos is double for takeout.

Appeal lodged by:

Not recorded on form.

Appeals Committee decision:

Score assigned for both sides (Law 12C3):

70% of 4♠ –2 by West, NS +200

+ 30% of 4♠ –1 by West, NS +100

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

There seemed no question of North taking a different action.

We thought in the absence of the UI West would have considered 3♠ a logical alternative, which East would raise. Based on frequencies obtained in 4♠ and the fact that the contract is being played the other way up they are more likely to go two off.

Richard Hills' comments:

The AC decision seems flawed. They are correct in stating that, because of East's UI, the call that West should have made was 3S instead of 3NT.

But they forgot that East was under the misapprehension that West's 2NT was lebensohl, not strong and balanced. Since the lebensohl convention is a mechanism for signing off in a 3-level partscore, East's misapprehension would have caused them to pass 3S (which was the reason that West illegally chose a 3NT rebid at the table).

Ergo, the Law 12C3 adjusted score should have been:

70% of 3S-1 NS +100
30% of 3S= NS -140

Also, if I had been TD, I would have imposed a procedural penalty of the standard amount upon East-West, due to West's misapprehension-clarifying rebid of 3NT which was a blatant infraction of Law 73C:

"When a player has available to him unauthorised information from his partner, as from a remark, question, explanation, gesture, mannerism, special emphasis, inflection, haste or hesitation, he must carefully avoid taking any advantage that might accrue to his side."

Mike Amos' comments:

While not the TD at the table, I was the DIC for this case as well, so the blame for the illegal (sic!) ruling rests firmly at my door. We spent ages and ages on this. I'm not sure how you even start a serious conversation with a player who thinks this is Lebensohl and a partnership who deny emphatically that they have any methods over a 2NT overcall. The North-South pair were cross and aggressive. (It was they who appealed and I think may have ended up with a worse score). The AC obviously couldn't endorse our cop out and so decided how EW would have bid and ruled accordingly. Undoubtedly this was a better ruling.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

It is good practice for the TD to record the Law(s) he is using and this case demonstrates why. He appears to have used the "average plus/average minus" provisions of Law 12C1 but the first sentence of that Law tells us that it should only be applied "when no result can be obtained". Here a result was obtained and the AC was right to award an assigned adjusted score under Law 12C2/3.

I am a little surprised so see that the AC consulted the frequencies when deciding how many tricks 4♠ would make. Whilst this method has some merit when they expect the auction to be duplicated at most tables, it should not be used here where the 2♥ opening will not have been found at most of the other tables. Here they should consider the play on the lead of ♥J, a marked singleton. Now declarer should make nine tricks if he plays the hand sensibly and the natural conclusion would be a higher weighting for 4♠-1.

Frances Hinden's comments:

Sadly, not the TD's finest hour. Once a result has been obtained, you can't then award ave+/ave-. I agree with the final contract of 4♠ once you decide North will pass 2NT, and while the play is not easy to analyse the ruling seems fair. A good player would make nine tricks in spades, but the evidence from the auction is that EW are not experts. However, I would like to ask North why he would bid 3♣ over 2NT natural but not over 2NT "Lebensohl". If he has a good explanation, I would be tempted to adjust to 3♣ NS making 10 tricks on a non-trump lead as I don't think East or West has a bid over it.

Fearghal O'Boyle's comments:

West must treat the 3C bid as some sort of Staymanic bid. If East thinks 3S is non-forcing won't he pass 3S? Otherwise the AC got it right.

David Stevenson's comments:

As a member of the AC I unsurprisingly agree with what we decided. However, I was surprised at the time (and still am) at the award of an artificial adjusted score by the TD. The Law book defines three types of adjusted score:

- (1) Artificial: eg Average, Average minus, Average plus. This is given when no result is obtained, for example when a board cannot be played because it has been fouled or there is not time.
- (2) Assigned: eg both sides get given the score for N/S making 4♥ -1. This is given when there was a result on the board, and then the TD adjusts for unauthorised information, misinformation, or suchlike. Exceptionally this score is "split": this means a different score is assigned to each side.
- (3) Weighted: eg both sides get given the score for N/S making 4♥ -1 60% of the time. 2♥ +1 40% of the time.

Since there was a result on the board an Artificial adjusted score is not allowed by the Law book.

Perhaps one thing I might add: E/W were an extremely weak pair, and this affected our decision. Even though East explained 2NT as Lebensohl our decision was based on what we thought she would do after a 3♠ rebid by partner, and it was not clear that she would necessarily carry on with her earlier mistaken idea.

Bob Schwartz's comments:

West's 3N bid is clearly an attempt to recover from a silly explanation-and deserving of a procedural penalty. Over here West would respond 3H rather than 3S and I'm not sure what would have happened thereafter, so I don't agree with the assigned result if that is EW's methods. If EW methods would have West bid 3S 1st with both—than OK—but award the PP.

Barry Rigal's comments:

Here is a clear case of an infraction based on exploiting UI. This is ideal for giving the offenders the worst of it in 4S and a PP for taking gross advantage of UI. The AC started out right but let them off far too light. They needed a good talking to. No methods over 2NT – yes, I have a bridge in Brooklyn that is still for sale!

Alain Gottcheiner's comments:

Settle the first point: there has been UI that East misunderstood, it affected West's decision, ergo adjust.

Av+/Av- should not be awarded in such a case. The TD should perhaps have redirected the matter to the AC himself, if he thought it too difficult to determine the plausible final result.

I'd have been more severe to E/W: there is a possibility that, absent UI, West would have passed. This is "the most unfavourable result that was at all probable". Therefore, while the AC's decision of a weighted score in 4S is right for N/S, E/W should get about -500 (their probable score in 3C). That is, unless they can prove that 3C over 2NT would have been forcing.

Adam Wildavsky's comments:

What did 2H show? If it was a weak two then the AC's ruling seems reasonable enough. I think the TD's ruling was illegal. Law 12 does not permit him to award an artificial adjusted score after a result has been obtained on a board.

Final summary by editor:

A bit of a mess, with which the AC did their best. The TD does not seem to have taken advantage of the fact that Law 12C3 is enabled in Wales: if he could not decide between various possibilities, why not just give 15% or 20% of each of them? Unsurprisingly the commentators did not endorse the TD's ruling but there were various views as to what should have been done.

APPEAL No 5: Standard leads

Tournament Director:

Ken Richardson

Appeals Committee:

Malcolm Harris (Chairman) Filip Kurbalija Jon Williams

Swiss Teams Board no 9 Dealer North E/W vulnerable	♠ A4 ♥ KT94 ♦ J96 ♣ KJ85	
♠ QJ52 ♥ 872 ♦ Q53 ♣ A73	<div>N</div> <div>W<div>E</div>S</div>	♠ T73 ♥ AQJ3 ♦ 72 ♣ T942
	♠ K986 ♥ 65 ♦ AKT84 ♣ Q6	

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
	1NT	Pass	2♣!
Pass	2♥	Pass	3NT
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Result at table:

3NT -2 by North, NS -100, lead ♣9

Director first called:

During the play, at the end of trick 2

Director's statement of facts:

TD was called by declarer. E/W didn't have a convention card, declarer asked what lead they were playing and was told "Standard". The opening lead was the ♣9.

North believed that East could not have the ♣T. He played the ♣Q to the first trick, losing to West's ♣A. On the Club continuation declarer played the ♣8 from hand, losing to the ♣T.

Declarer maintained that if he had been correctly informed of their lead style he wouldn't have played a low Club, and might have found the endplay against East, throwing her in with the last Club to lead Hearts towards his King.

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

3NT -1 by North, NS -50

Subsequently changed after consideration of declarer's statement that he would have found the endplay to:

Score assigned for both sides:

3NT making by North, NS +400

Details of ruling:

The explanation given of E/W lead style as "Standard" did not conform to the lead underlined on EBU 20A, where the ten is considered an honour card and fourth highest is underlined. A specific example is given: 10xxx. Without a convention card to consult, declarer had to ask the opponents, and although E/W considered their lead style to be standard this does not conform to the EBU 20A guidelines.

TD gave declarer the benefit of the doubt as to his stated line of play, it was possible to find the endplay against East and come to 9 tricks.

Trick 1 – West wins ♣A.

Trick 2 – Declarer wins club return with the King.

Trick 3 – Declarer runs the ♦9, losing to West's ♦Q.

Trick 4 – West continues a third club, won by declarer with the Jack.

Tricks 5-8 – Declarer cashes 4 diamond winners.

Trick 9 – Declarer cashes ♠K.

East has to come down to 4 cards. Optional cards in brackets.

♠	(x)
♥	AQ(J)
♦	--
♣	T

Trick 10 – Declarer comes to hand with the ♠A, club exit now endplays East. If East tries to avoid the endplay by keeping a spade exit card then he must bare his heart ace and declarer can lead a heart from dummy at trick 10.

Appeal lodged by:

East-West

Director's comments:

N/S chose not to attend the appeals meeting as they felt they couldn't add anything to the facts as recorded by the TD on the appeals form.

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

The appeal was heard at the end of the event and all members of the committee were eager to make a quick getaway. The chairman asked the TD to record the committee's findings and comments.

Despite wanting to get away the committee deliberated for some time.

The committee felt that the TD's decision was correct, but felt very sorry for the East/West pair.

Adam Wildavsky's comments:

I don't understand why the AC felt sorry for the EW pair, nor why they felt the fact was worth mentioning. EW gave MI and then appealed when the TD correctly ruled against them. I feel sorry for North, who had to petition the TD to achieve the result he was denied at the table. With the information he received he had little choice but to take an unsuccessful line of play.

Alain Gottcheiner's comments:

Answering "standard" should be avoided, and be treated quite severely if it happens to deceive opponents. This is clearly not a standard lead.

I can't think of any reason for "feeling sorry" for E/W.

Perhaps the adjusted score could have been weighted (perhaps after presenting this as a card problem to some of North's peers, as it could be difficult to find many other declarers in 3NT), but I can surely live with the AC's decision to be harsh to E/W, whose manifold infraction (no CC, insufficient disclosure verging on refusal to answer) was rather serious.

Barry Rigal's comments:

Note that if declarer does not put up CQ from dummy at trick one West may take the CA and shift to a heart. Now declarer is likely to go down.

It seems to me that E/W did commit an infraction (C9 from 109 is not standard anywhere in the world). Give N/S the best of it and save your sympathy for a more deserving cause.

Bob Schwartz's comments:

What were EW's agreements??? This seems to be a relevant question—and it does not seem to have been ascertained. If low is their agreed method and East chose to violate it—what is the problem?? I do not like this ruling at all, but without more information cannot judge adequately.

David Stevenson's comments:

Why on earth did the TD and then AC give declarer "the benefit of the doubt as to his stated line of play"? Are they absolutely certain that he would have found the endplay? Suppose the opening lead had been from 9x then the club finesse at trick 2 would have won the contract and the endplay would have lost it because the wrong hand has the ♣T. Sure, if you have to give the benefit of the doubt, perhaps you would, but in Wales we weight the scores. The TD and AC should only be giving 3NT making if they are confident it would be made the majority of the time, and accepting declarer's assertion when he knows where all the cards are seems extremely generous.

The AC felt very sorry for the E/W pair: why? They were playing in an event where two convention cards are required and they did not have one. Then, instead of taking care with their description of leads they say "standard" when they are not playing standard. Amazing!

While N/S are not required in Welsh appeals to attend if they do not wish to that does not mean the AC may not take note of the fact that they had insufficient interest in the matter to attend. How on earth were the AC so sure the endplay would be found if the players were not there to convince them?

I think a reasonable decision by the AC would have been:

Score assigned for both sides (Law 12C3):

60% of 3NT making by North, NS +400
+ 40% of 3NT -1 by North, NS -50
Double standard penalty to E/W

While it is very abnormal to issue a procedural penalty for a pair with no convention card, this pair needed a severe lesson. They are playing non-standard leads, they have no convention card, and they do not tell their opponents what their leads are.

Fearghal O'Boyle's comments:

Maybe declarer can ask more questions e.g what do E/W lead from 3 or 4 small cards? There are players who do not treat the 10 as an honour card. Will the endplay always be found? Might it not be West who has the 4-card Club suit? N/S didn't attend the appeal. I'm inclined to use 12C3 and give 3NT-1 one third of the time and 3NT made two thirds of the time.

Frances Hinden's comments:

I agree with the TD and AC. Declarer was very honest when he said he 'might' have found the endplay. By being misinformed of the opening lead style, he was deprived of the chance to show off his declarer play technique. Note that if West switches to a heart when in with the ♦Q, declarer can endplay East in hearts to give a third club trick. Law 12C3 gives the TD/AC the option to award a combination of 3NT making and 3NT going off; the sooner declarer (rather than dummy) points out the possibility of the endplay, the higher the percentage of 3NT making I give him.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

E/W thought they played standard leads, but was the 9 the systemic lead from this holding or not? The TD ought to have asked E/W to complete convention cards immediately for use in the remainder of the event; it is not recorded whether he did or not. I find the AC comment strange: why feel sorry for the E/W pair if they failed to complete convention cards with the result that opponents were given misinformation? Indeed had complete convention cards been available there would not have been a need for the appeal and the AC members would have been able to make the "quick getaway" they were seeking!

Mike Amos' comments:

One of the things which is worth remembering about the appeal cases of the WBU is that the circumstances of the TDs and the ACs are very different from those of the EBU. At Brighton, there is a full-time consultant, with enormous experience as well as four or five top national TDs. ACs are made up of L&E members and experienced international players. WBU events may just have a single TD and far less experienced AC members. So if we criticise these rulings and decisions it is against this background. Here we need to know what the real agreements of EW were. If they truly were "standard" as underlined on the back of an EBU20A, it's possible there was no MI and East chose a non-standard lead for reasons best known to him or herself. No one investigated this or if they did failed to tell us. It is probably more likely that there was MI, many players lead odd cards from suits headed by the ten and think these standard ("second from poor suits" as here or even MUD). But even if there is MI, 3NT making 100% of the time????? Surely that is a *little* generous. To succeed with the endplay you need to be certain of the location of the ♣10. I can see lots of ways of going wrong. Playing towards the ♥K looks 50% to me, is the endplay better than that? Exiting in ♠s might lead to failure. The player with the ♣10 might hold ♠Q and J when playing ♥s was the right line. Sorry for the sarcasm, it's not a little generous, it's off the scale. 33% making 67% one off would be my first pitch. (Maybe even some of -2) Sorry TD and AC, I think you both got this wrong.

Richard Hills' comments:

Presumably "felt very sorry for the East-West pair" meant that the AC was sorry that East-West were such an inexperienced pair that they did not realise there were basic responsibilities in higher-level competitive bridge such as completing convention cards and giving unambiguous explanations.

Was this particular event sufficiently important to have an Appeals Adviser available to instruct the inexperienced East-West pair in their basic responsibilities?

WBU Laws & Ethics Committee comments:

The L&EC felt that the comment made by the AC about feeling sorry for E/W was an unfortunate one. It is difficult to see why the AC was sorry for a pair who did not follow the rules in two different ways, and even more difficult to see why the AC should say so.

Final summary by editor:

The AC's sympathy was generally held to be misplaced. However, the failure of the TD and AC to give a weighted score is unexplained, and commented on by several commentators, especially those who play in jurisdictions where weighted scores are permitted.

FINAL COMMENTS

Richard Hills' comments:

There is a comprehensive footnote to Law 75 which gives an indicative example explaining the difference in assessment and consequences between Misbid and Misinformation.

Unfortunately, in the current 1997 Lawbook, Law 16 lacks such a footnoted indicative example. Given the arcane language of Law 16 it is therefore easy for an average director to misinterpret it, as happened in appeal number 1.

Fortunately, the World Bridge Federation Laws Committee is well aware that the language of Law 16 can be improved in the forthcoming new edition of the Lawbook. Its Secretary, Grattan Endicott, has stated on the Bridge Laws Mailing List:

"I can offer no guarantee as to the content of a future Law 16. However, Law 16 is listed for in depth discussion in Verona and the subcommittee aims to draft a clearly stated law embodying its intentions, to be agreed, on the subject."

Regular posters to the Bridge Laws Mailing List range from idiosyncratic eccentrics to esteemed authorities to idiosyncratically eccentric esteemed authorities.

To subscribe to the Bridge Laws Mailing List, visit:

<http://www.amsterdamed.org/mailman/listinfo/blml>

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

In general the Welsh appeals committees have done a good job. For judgement rulings it is always best practice to consult and it is interesting to note that the AC decision I least prefer is the one where there was a Referee (appeals committee of one).

Frances Hinden's comments:

A good effort from the ACs. While I might have ruled differently in some of these cases, I don't think any of their rulings were obviously wrong.

Eric Landau's comments:

Another good job by the Welsh ACs. I agree with their decisions in cases #2 through #5, and have nothing to add to them. I do, however, have more than a little to say about #1, and apologize for the length of my comment.

David Stevenson's comments:

The TDs were about half and half, the ACs somewhat better. But five years after the introduction of Law 12C3 and weighted scores in Wales, the instinct to give a weighted score is still absent from many TDs and ACs. It is probably difficult for our commentators from the USA and similar countries who do not use Law 12C3 to realise, but giving adjustments is *much* easier when weighted scores are available, since the level of accuracy is not required. But in the first place a TD or AC must have the idea in his mind.

Bob Schwartz's comments:

We have just concluded our Summer Nationals in Chicago-and had the astonishing number of 4 appeals cases TOTAL for the entire tournament.

I am amazed at the number of cases that had no merit that were submitted for commentary. I am at a loss to figure out the requirements for keeping deposits—there were far too few being kept. I would like to see more commentary by the committees as to what testimony was heard and why the committee reasoned as they did.

Alain Gottcheiner's comments:

Do they *ever* keep any deposit?

Final summary by editor:

As Mike Amos points out in one of his comments it is easier to get things right in England with a higher standard of TDs for consultation and AC members available, at least that is true in the three events from which appeals are taken for the EBU Appeals booklet. Unlike that publication, this WBU Appeals booklet lists all appeals from the year at any WBU event. In view of that the level of the decisions as seen by the commentators seems very adequate.

As usual there are complaints about the lack of deposits taken. It may be noted, however, that the average level of player appealing is a lot less experienced than our commentators are used to (some of whom are more used to the North American Nationals).