

APPEAL NON-NABC+ THREE

Subject: Claim

DIC: Doug Rankin

Event: Sunday-Monday KO Teams (Bracket 3)

Session: Round 3, Monday, April 3, 2006

Board # 36 (1382 MPs)  
Vul: Both ♠ 8 2  
Dlr: West ♥ 2  
♦ A J T 9 8 3  
♣ J 8 6 2

(506 MPs)	(236 MPs)
♠ A Q T 9 7 3	♠ K 6 5
♥ J 8 6 4	♥ K T 7 5 3
♦	♦ Q 4 2
♣ Q 9 3	♣ K 5

(413 MPs)  
♠ J 4  
♥ A Q 9  
♦ K 7 6 5  
♣ A T 7 4

West	North	East	South
1♠	Pass	1NT	Pass
2♥	Pass	3♠	Pass
4♠	All Pass		

**The Facts:** West claimed at trick 8: West (Declarer) held, ♠ QT9, ♥ J and ♣ Q9; the cards remaining in the dummy were ♠ 6, ♥ KT, ♦ Q4 and ♣ K. The ♥ and ♣ Aces had been played and trumps drawn from the N/S hands. West claimed she had all good cards. N/S claimed that West had shown her cards as if in play and did not mention that she was pitching diamonds. Therefore, N/S alleged West could have a possible loser.

**The Ruling:** The table director was persuaded by N/S that West had faced her cards in such a way that there was doubt about the subsequent play. The original decision was to award N/S one more trick, which made the result 4♠ down two, N/S +200. E/W appealed this decision. The original Reviewer rescinded the original decision and restored the table result of 4♠ down one; N/S +100, at which time N/S appealed and a different Reviewer was assigned.

**The Appeal:** N/S felt that West was not sufficiently definitive in stating her claim and that she placed her cards on the table in the order in which she was going to play them. Therefore, there could be a losing diamond left in dummy at trick 13. West said she was taking the rest of the tricks and was merely showing her winning cards one by one. She wasn't indicating a line of play.

**The Decision:** Law 70 A. states, "In ruling on a contested claim, the Director adjudicates the result of the board as equitably as possible to both sides, but any doubtful points shall be resolved against the claimer." The panel unanimously agreed that there was no doubtful point to resolve and awarded declarer all six of her winners. The panel upheld the original Reviewer's decision of restoring the table result of 4♠ down one, N/S +100. Because of the original decision (awarding an additional trick to N/S), the panel did not issue an AWMW to N/S.

**The Panel:** Charlie MacCracken (Reviewer), Harry Falk, Tom Whitesides and Patty Holmes (non-voting scribe and original Reviewer)  
Players consulted: None.

**Commentary:**

- Polisner** The reviewer and Panel got it right except for the failure to award an AWMW. The fact that the original ruling was so pathetic should not have dissuaded the Panel from so doing.
- Rigal** A sensible ruling; and given the change of tricks, I can live with the failure to give an AWMW – though I might have needed to be there to let N/S off. Had the initial ruling gone the other way, it would have been a different matter. Another case where the initial director call looks distasteful to me.
- Wildavsky** Fair enough. These cases would be easier if the tournament director (TD), upon reaching the table, required the declarer to state his proposed line of play. The laws are silent as to proper procedure when the claim is not accompanied by an immediate statement. It seems to me that the claimer ought to be able to make a statement at any point, and must be required by the TD to make one if he has not already.
- Wolff** I certainly agree with the final ruling. I'm not sure what the first director was thinking about, but he needs to be updated in dealing with claims.