

APPEAL	Non NABC+ Thirteen
Subject	Questionable Call
DIC	Doug Grove
Event	Second Sunday BCD Swiss Teams
Session	First of Two
Date	December 6, 2009

BD#	32
VUL	E/W
DLR	West

1,559 Masterpoints	
♠	9
♥	K 8 4 3 2
♦	A Q 3
♣	A K J 4

652 Masterpoints		Fall 2009 San Diego, CA	1,472 Masterpoints	
♠	Q 8 7 6 3		♠	A J 5 4
♥	Q 9 7		♥	J 6 5
♦	K 9		♦	J 8 6 5 2
♣	8 6 3		♣	9

1,751 Masterpoints	
♠	K T 2
♥	A T
♦	T 7 4
♣	Q T 7 5 2

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♥	Pass	1NT
Pass	3♣	Dbl	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	3♣ doubled by North
Opening Lead	♦2
Table Result	Made 6, N/S + 770
Director Ruling	3♣ N made 6, N/S + 770
Panel Ruling	3♣ N made 6, N/S + 770

The Facts: The director was called at the end of the auction. West said he wasn't looking at what his partner's actions were. North and South stated they saw the double card. North said she made the final pass. The director inspected East's bidding box and found the card in the following order: pass card, double card, then the remaining pass cards and finally the remaining double cards.

The Ruling: The director judged on the evidence of the auction and the order of the pass and double cards in East's bidding box that East had doubled 3♣. Therefore, the contract of 3♣ doubled was played and the table result of making six, N/S plus 770 stood for both sides. Law 85A1.

The Appeal: E/W appealed the director's decision and all four players attended the hearing.

West reiterated that he didn't see a double and East said he, of course, wouldn't double with that hand.

N/S reiterated that they each saw a double and both remembered North making the final pass. South stated that he wouldn't have passed the jump shift if East had passed.

The Decision: Law 85A1 states that the director "... shall base his view on the balance of probabilities, which is to say in accordance with the weight of the evidence."

Three key issues were:

1. Both North and South claim to have seen the double.
2. South passed his partner's jump shift.
3. Most relevant, the order of the pass and double cards the director found in East's bidding box.

Therefore the contract was 3♣ doubled and the table result stood for both sides.

The panel issued an appeal without merit warning (AWMW) to East and West since there were no new or different facts presented at the hearing.

The Panel: Bernie Gorkin (Reviewer), Charlie MacCracken and Gary Zeiger.

Commentary:

Polisner Finally an AWMW.

Rigal Finally; we reach case 13 for the first AWMW of the set? Not before time. Two AWMWs might be applicable here – if that were legal.

Smith I'm impressed that the table director examined the bid box. I'm not sure I would have thought of that. But that added to the other facts that the panel mention make it pretty clear to me that this case was decided correctly. I'm also impressed with the panel for giving a deserved AWMW in the kind of situation where it is too often not awarded.

Wildavsky You have just entered ... the Twilight Zone! Nice work by the director in examining East's bidding box. I agree that the appeal had no merit.

Wolff A good ruling, which followed the evidence. A slam dunk decision