



2004

APPEALS

Edited by David Stevenson

WELSH BRIDGE UNION

2004

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 Richard Hills for assisting with proof-reading. Many of the commentators are subscribers to the bridge-laws mailing list, an international discussion of the Laws of Bridge on the internet: if you are interested in joining (it's free!) the Editor will provide details. The Editor can also provide details of how to subscribe (including how much it costs) to the Australian Director's Bulletin, the foremost magazine for Tournament Directors in the world.

WELSH BRIDGE UNION

2004

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.com	From UK
Email:	bridg@blakjak.com	From elsewhere
Lawspage:	http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm	
Bridgepage:	http://blakjak.com/brg_menu.htm	
Rulings forum:	http://blakjak.com/iblf.htm	
Appeals forum:	http://blakjak.com/iacf.htm	

WELSH BRIDGE UNION

2004

APPEALS

Commentators

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

David Stevenson, 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 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.

Adam Wildavsky of New York City is a software engineer for Google, Inc. He has been interested in the laws ever since he became the director of the MIT Bridge Club. 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 earned a Bronze Medal in the 2003 Bermuda Bowl. His study of the laws is informed by his study of Objectivism, the philosophy of Ayn Rand.

Barry Rigal is an expatriate Englander living in New York, USA. During his UK career he won Gold Cup, Tollemache (3 times) and Spring Fours (five times), and represented UK in Camrose 6 times (6-0 record). He is a full-time Bridge player, journalist, commentator, and writer. He has been an Appeals Committee Team Leader at US Nationals for the last 3/4 years.

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.

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 has recently joined the EBU panel of referees.

Richard Hills is Immediate Past 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.demon.co.uk/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

2004

APPEALS

Abbreviations

There are some abbreviations, and they are listed here:

WBU	Welsh Bridge Union
L&EC	Laws & Ethics Committee
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]
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
Reddbl	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

2004

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 NS 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

September 2005
2005

WELSH BRIDGE UNION

2004

APPEALS

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	8
APPEAL No 1: How many tricks?	9
APPEAL No 2: Did she double?	13
APPEAL No 3: A weighted score	16
FINAL COMMENTS	21

APPEAL No 1: How many tricks?

Tournament Director:

Barrie Partridge

Appeals Committee:

David Harris (Chairman) Anne Jones Robin Mardlin

Swiss Teams Board no 20 Dealer West All vulnerable	♠ 92 ♥ K ♦ AKQ52 ♣ AQ643										
♠ A873 ♥ 8 ♦ J764 ♣ J752	<table style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"><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>		♠ KT4 ♥ AQJ962 ♦ T3 ♣ T9
	<i>N</i>										
<i>W</i>		<i>E</i>									
	<i>S</i>										
	♠ QJ65 ♥ T7543 ♦ 98 ♣ K8										

Auction not relevant

Result at table:

3♦ -2 by North, NS -200, or

3♦ -3 by North, NS -300

Director first called:

At end of round when teams could not agree on match result

Director's statement of facts:

The contract was 3♦ by North. At the end of play N/S scored 2 down while E/W scored 3 down. The failure to agree the score was not realised till the team captains could not agree a result for the match. TD asked the two pairs to sit and repeat the play of the board in order to resolve the dispute. The two pairs failed to resolve how the play went, even when TD stated that unless there was agreement he would rule the worse score respectively to each pair. The East West pair complied, and the North South pair did so and applied to appeal. At this time all the other players had left the playing area as it was the last match of the day, so the appeal would be held the next day.

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for N/S:

3♦ -3 by North, NS -3

Score assigned for E/W:

3♦ -2 by North, NS -2

Details of ruling:

With both pairs unable to agree on the full sequence of play and the result of the contract, the worst result respectively for each pair was assigned. Laws 79A and 85B.

Appeal lodged by:

North-South

Basis of appeal:

North was insistent that his recollection of the sequence of play was correct.

Comments by North-South:

North asked TD to note the following sequence of play that he recollected to have occurred.

T1	♦ lead to A
T2	♣ to the K
T3	♣ to the A
T4	♣ ruffed with ♦T
T5	♥A cashed
T6	♥ ruffed with ♦2
T7	♦K
T8	♦Q
T9	♦ conceded
T10	♠A
T11	♠ to K
T12	♥ cashed by E/W
T13	♠T to Q

Appeals Committee decision:

Score assigned for both sides:

3♦ -2 by North, NS -2

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

EW accepted North's assessment of tricks made and therefore result agreed.

Director correctly and properly applied the law

David Stevenson's comments:

It is the TD's job to resolve disputes, not to treat players as though they were naughty children. It seems that the TD did not do his job. Fortunately the AC was prepared to delve a bit deeper.

Adam Wildavsky's comments:

Good work by the AC.

Barry Rigal's comments:

Well done North. I'm surprised that he was not able to convince E/W; were they being obstreperous, stupid, or just trying to get something they were not entitled to?

Frances Hinden's comments:

I am a little confused by this ruling – the players called the TD and asked him to rule; he told them to sort it out themselves. This seems rather an abrogation of responsibility: in either team's position, I'd hope for a ruling on the final result.

Although the AC make a point of saying the TD correctly applied the Law, they seem to agree, as they have indeed made a ruling on the actual tricks won. I'm mildly interested why EW now agree with NS about how the play went, whereas they couldn't the day before when it was presumably fresher in their minds? Surely it would have been better to have sorted this out closer to the time it actually occurred.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

I can understand the TD's frustration with the players for failing to agree the number of tricks, but is his ruling in accordance with the Law? The TD is empowered to award different scores to each side under Law 12C2 when awarding an assigned adjusted score in place of a result actually obtained, but here he should not be seeking to adjust the score, rather to form a judgement as to what has actually happened. Presumably there would have been a consensus as to what happened during the first couple of tricks (if nothing else the opening lead may have been recorded on the players' scorecards) and the TD may have been able to form a view as to the most likely number of tricks after that start.

Happily the number of tricks was agreed by both sides and there was no ruling for the AC to consider. If both pairs were experienced, the TD/AC could have considered fining both pairs for failing to comply with Law 79A.

Richard Hills' comments:

Law 79A requires both sides to agree the score before returning their cards to the board. Since neither side obeyed Law 79A, both sides are offending sides. So far, so good.

In 1987, the WBF in general (and Edgar Kaplan in particular) endorsed a policy that a TD should routinely rule against an offending side, and leave matters of delicate judgement to an appeals committee. In this case, the TD routinely ruled against both offending sides, and left the appeals committee to delicately judge which of the disputed facts were correct.

But...

In more recent times, sponsoring organisations have realised that Edgar Kaplan's policy had unintended consequences, as time was wasted when appeals committees had to set aside overly draconian rulings against offending sides. The current policy enunciated by the WBF Code of Practice is:

“The desire is that the Director shall not rule automatically in favour of the non-offending side when he is in no doubt that a true judgement requires him to rule otherwise.”

The above policy is logically equivalent to “shall not rule automatically against the offending side”, which is what the TD more-or-less did to both offending sides in this case.

It is true that the TD did ask the offending sides to resolve the facts between themselves, on pain of a worst-possible split score to both, but that was an abrogation of the TD's responsibility under Law 72A6:

“The responsibility for penalising irregularities and redressing damage rests solely upon the Director and these Laws, not upon the players themselves.”

Instead, the TD should have followed the current recommended best practice of assessing which disputed line of play “satisfied” (according to the balance of probabilities) the requirements of Law 85A, rather than the TD's actual decision to pass the buck to the appeals committee via Law 85B.

The appeals committee was right in stating that the TD “correctly” applied the Law. The TD's application of Law 85B was indeed legal as such, merely contrary to current WBF and WBU policy. But the appeals committee exceeded its powers in making that public statement on its interpretation of Law. Law 93B3 specifically denies to any appeals committee any right to interpret the Laws.

WBU Laws & Ethics Committee comments:

The committee reminds TDs that they have a duty to make a ruling when asked to do so. It is not acceptable to ask an appeals committee to make a ruling on the TD's behalf. This is contrary to Law and deprives the player of two levels of consideration.

Final summary by editor:

While there was some sympathy for the TD the overall view seems to be that he failed to do his job.

APPEAL No 2: Did she double?

Tournament Director:

Ted Hill

Appeals Committee:

Patrick Jourdain (Chairman) Di Harris Ian Constable

Swiss Teams Board no 13 Dealer North All vulnerable	♠ AQ43 ♥ 953 ♦ 2 ♣ QJT63	
♠ J862 ♥ KQJ4 ♦ A4 ♣ K42	<i>N</i> <i>W</i> <i>E</i> <i>S</i>	♠ 95 ♥ AT62 ♦ KT87 ♣ 975
	♠ KT7 ♥ 87 ♦ QJ9653 ♣ A8	

Basic systems:

North-South play Acol, Multi 2♦, Astro

East-West play Benji Acol, Strong NT 15-17

<i>WEST</i>	<i>NORTH</i>	<i>EAST</i>	<i>SOUTH</i>
	P	P	P
1NT	2♦! (1)	Dbl? (2)	P
P	P?		

- (1) 2♦ was alerted and described correctly as spades and another.
 (2) East claims she doubled, supported by partner, contested by both opponents

Result at table:

2♦ -2 by North, NS -200, or

2♦ doubled -2 by North, NS -500

Director first called:

At end of the hand

Director's statement of facts:

TD was called at the end of the hand when 2♦ went two off. N/S wanted to score it as -200 because they did not believe the contract was doubled. E/W believe it was doubled.

The recollections of the two pairs simply did not square. TD asked East why she doubled and she said it was for penalties. As she and partner play a strong NT she felt they had the balance of points and a good diamond holding. South said he passed 2♦ for penalties but he would have shown his 3 card spade support if 2♦ had been doubled.

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

2♦ doubled -2 by North, NS -500

Details of ruling:

Because East had rationalized her double to the TD's reasonable satisfaction, he ruled and advised all players of their right to appeal as a Committee could give more time to this matter. Law 85B.

Appeal lodged by:

North-South

Appeals Committee decision:

Director's ruling upheld

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

The committee unanimously upholds the TD's decision. We have no reason to overturn it – it is quite possible that neither North nor South noticed the double, and the evidence of E/W is quite consistent with the double.

David Stevenson's comments:

This case can be compared with the first case. The TD has a situation where two sides say different things so he reviews the evidence and makes a decision. However, he unfortunately advised the players to appeal, thus undoing all his good work and leading to another wasted appeal.

Adam Wildavsky's comments:

Fair enough, but what did contracts did the players write on their scorecards?

Barry Rigal's comments:

The TD made a sensible decision - no reason to overrule based on what was said.

Frances Hinden's comments:

We aren't told if the TD checked to see what the pairs had written down on their scorecards as the final contract – I assume E/W wrote 2♦x and NS 2♦. Did North make the final pass, or did North have the (bad) habit of never making the third pass?

As N/S could not bring any additional evidence to the Appeal, I can't see on what grounds they appealed ruling and would have been tempted to keep the deposit – except that the TD more or less told them to Appeal.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

Assuming that bidding boxes were in use, the TD could have asked each of East and West whether or not they saw North pull out a green pass card at the end of the auction. Also, did North express any surprise when South passed his virtually forcing 2♦ bid?

I agree with the AC decision. Where there are disputed facts, the contemporaneous information obtained by the TD will often be more reliable than any recollections made by the players during the appeal.

Richard Hills' comments:

Good work by the TD and AC. In contradistinction to what happened in Appeal One, this TD applied Law 85B in accordance with the current WBF and WBU policy by making a reasonable attempt to assess facts by using the criterion of "balance of probabilities".

Final summary by editor:

Everyone seems happy with the TD's decision, except for the advice to appeal.

APPEAL No 3: A weighted score

Tournament Director:

Linda Greenland

Appeals Committee:

Tim Rees (Chairman) Paul Denning Steve Capal

Multiple Teams Board no 8 Dealer West Nil vulnerable	♠ KQT9654 ♥ Q ♦ AKQ ♣ 82										
♠ 8 ♥ JT982 ♦ 3 ♣ KJT764	<table style="margin: auto; border: none;"> <tr><td></td><td style="text-align: center;"><i>N</i></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;"><i>W</i></td><td></td><td style="text-align: center;"><i>E</i></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td style="text-align: center;"><i>S</i></td><td></td></tr> </table>		<i>N</i>		<i>W</i>		<i>E</i>		<i>S</i>		♠ J32 ♥ AK3 ♦ 965 ♣ AQ93
	<i>N</i>										
<i>W</i>		<i>E</i>									
	<i>S</i>										
	♠ A7 ♥ 7654 ♦ JT8742 ♣ 5										

Basic systems:

North-South play Benji Acol

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
P	2♣! (1)	P (2)	2♦! (3)
2♥	2♠	3♥	4♠
P (4)	P	5♥	P
P	Dbl	P	P
P			

- (1) 8–9 playing tricks or 20-21 balanced
- (2) East asked the meaning of 2♣ bid and passed
- (3) Forcing relay
- (4) Alleged hesitation

Result at table:

5♥ doubled +1 by West, NS –750

Director first called:

At end of auction

Director's statement of facts:

TD was recalled at the end of the hand. N/S felt that E/W might have used unauthorised information to reach the 5♥ contract. They were unhappy with the 2♥ bid following the question over 2♣ and the 5♥ bid after the hesitation over 4♠. E/W do not agree the hesitation.

Director's ruling:

Score assigned for both sides:

4♠ +1 by North, NS +450

Details of ruling:

TD does not feel that West has a 2♥ bid. Law 16A.

Appeal lodged by:

East-West

Director's comments:

N/S are unlimited, I do not feel that 2♥ is a 70% action.

Comments by North-South:

We had a 2♣ opener on a previous board and fully explained that auction. There were two fully completed convention cards on the table.

Comments by East-West:

Bid over 2♦ which West took as a negative was reasonable to show two suits.

Any hesitation over 4♠ was because it was a stop bid.

Opposition double of 5♥ was to have his cake and eat it.

Appeals Committee decision:

Score assigned for both sides (Law 12C3):

70% of 4♠ +1 by North, NS +450

+ 30% of 5♥ doubled +1 by West, NS -750

Deposit returned

Appeals Committee's comments:

East asked about a 2♣ bid that she should already have known about, when she had no intention of bidding.

West's 2♥ is not a 70% action, but she might bid later in the auction.

The alleged hesitation over 4♠ is not proven, so has not been considered.

Once West has passed over 2♦ the auction could continue 2♠ – 4♠. At this point West could show a 2-suiter eg 4NT. If she does, the hand is likely to be played in 5♥ doubled (as in the actual auction).

David Stevenson's comments:

I hardly know where to start! The TD is asked to rule concerning two bits of alleged UI, a question, and a disputed hesitation. She does not seem to have considered the disputed hesitation, and thus we do not have the benefit of the dispute being sorted out by the person best able to do so, namely the TD who attended at the table. She decides that 2♥ is not a 70% action. While true, to disallow it requires that the call is suggested over a logical alternative by the UI. How does the question as to what 2♣ is suggest bidding 2♥?

The reason generally that there is perceived to be a problem when a player asks the meaning of a call and his partner then enters the auction is that players have an unfortunate habit of not asking unless they have values. In this case it is a strong opening, and East is unlikely to have values. While it is possible that the TD decided that 2♥ was indicated by the question it would have helped if she had indicated how. I cannot see it myself.

There is also the possibility that West even if passing over 2♦ would make a bid later in the auction but the TD does not seem to have considered this.

Turning to the AC, they have not mentioned their logic for assuming the question suggests 2♥ either, but they have considered West bidding later. It is a little difficult to see how it is illegal to bid 2♥ one round, but legal to bid 4NT the next.

The AC also did not consider the alleged hesitation because it was not proved: how often are hesitations proved? Surely it is the job of the TD and AC to decide whether UI was present, and to do so based on their view of what occurred. Proof at bridge is reserved for allegations of cheating and disciplinary matters: decisions on unauthorised information and other events at the table are done on the view taken by the TD or AC after listening to all the evidence.

In my view the question about 2♣ did not suggest 2♥ in any way, so the 2♥ bid is legal. The TD and AC should each have reached a view as to whether there was a hesitation before the pass over 4♠, remembering that 4♠ was a skip bid, so it would be a hesitation over and above the required ten seconds. If there was, I do not believe that the 5♥ bid was evident on a defensive flat hand, and would rule it back to 4♠.

Adam Wildavsky's comments:

OK.

Barry Rigal's comments:

I prefer the TD adjustment – any ruling even partly in favor of the offenders seems flat out wrong.

Eric Landau's comments:

I'd have voted to uphold the TD's original ruling. Either West's 2♥ bid is acceptable despite the extraneous information from East's question, in which case the score should have been adjusted back to the table result, or it isn't, in which case the TD's ruling should stand. The notion that West might have passed 2♦ and subsequently reached 5♥x by entering the auction at the five-level seems to be entirely an artifact of the committee deliberations. There is no suggestion that E-W offered any such contention. If anything, West's rationale for his 2♥ call suggests an unwillingness to introduce his two-suiter on a subsequent round. I might not have quarreled with the committee assigning, say, a 5% probability to such a scenario, but 30% seems way out of line.

Frances Hinden's comments:

I'm not convinced by the AC's logic on this one. If pass is a LA over 2♦, I don't see why it is not also a LA to pass over 4♠ – it is more, rather than less, dangerous to come into the auction once North has had a chance to show a single-suited spade hand. In addition, just because the hesitation over 4♠ “was not proved” doesn't mean they shouldn't rule on whether there was a hesitation or not. I would have liked to have seen the ruling as follows:

1. Did the questions from East give UI to West? Had East already demonstrated he always asked about all alerted bids?
2. If the question did give UI to West, was pass over 2♦ a LA? It certainly is not to me, (although I would prefer 2NT or 3♣ to 2♥) but this depends a little on the players. For many people, the fact N/S are unlimited is an incentive to bid, not a reason not to. If pass is not a LA, then the table result stands.
3. If pass is a LA, then I don't think West will bid next round, and the adjustment to a contract of 4♠ is correct, although I might award a percentage of 4♠ making 10 tricks.
4. If pass is not a LA, then the 2♥ bid is permitted, and we have to decide if West hesitated over 4♠ above the STOP warning requirement. If so, then I believe the 5♥ bid should be disallowed and we are back to 4♠.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

The AC decided that East's questions suggested one logical alternative (bidding over 2♦) over another (passing over 2♦). They decided that bidding was not a 70% action and thus they disallowed West's 2♥ bid. That's logical enough, but what followed wasn't. If the UI suggests bidding rather than passing over 2♦ then surely the UI must also suggest bidding rather than passing over 4♠. As they have decreed that West would pass over 4♠ 70% of the time, then pass was clearly considered to be a logical alternative at that stage. Therefore, they were wrong to assign this weighted score. Isn't this a more subtle variation of a “Reveley ruling”?

Personally, I consider passing over 2♦ to be a 0% action on the West cards, NV against a Benjamin 2♣ opener who has not yet had a chance to name his suit. It is a question of what West bids and the UI does not suggest one bid over another. Hence I would let the table result stand.

Richard Hills' comments:

It seems that the TD ruling was probably correct. It also seems that the AC possibly made an illegal "Reveley ruling".

The AC apparently agreed with the TD that East's Ruritanian Asking Bid demonstrably suggested West's 2♥ overcall. If so, then surely West's hypothetical balance over 4♠ would also have been demonstrably suggested by East's Ruritanian Asking Bid? In that case it is irrelevant that West would choose to balance 30% of the time if there had been no irregularity in the auction.

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."

The White Book (TD Guide), definition of Reveley ruling at clause 16.3:

"If a call (or play) is disallowed because the TD judges that an illegal alternative was chosen when unauthorised information was present then this call or play may not be used in any calculations of weighting. Note that it is possible for the result to be included when it might have been reached in another way."

Since the TD and AC apparently agreed that both East and West committed infractions (East's Ruritanian Asking Bid; West's use of UI), why did neither the TD nor the AC award East-West a procedural penalty? Such habits by East-West really should be discouraged.

Final summary by editor:

The commentators do not seem to be able to see a clear line here, varying from one that thinks everything is right to one who considers both TD and AC were completely wrong.

FINAL COMMENTS

David Stevenson's comments:

Sadly I believe that the TDs this year did not distinguish themselves, not so much in whether their decisions were right, but more in whether they actually did what they were meant to. One TD left it to an AC: a second one made his decision but then suggested an AC: the final one only looked at part of the problem.

The ACs did a better job overall, with only one appeal falling below a high standard.

Adam Wildavsky's comments:

While based on a small sample size, WBU AC rulings seem to have improved a great deal since last year. I found no decision with which I could take issue. The small number of cases is also a good sign – it's an indication that TD rulings are improving. Kudos to all concerned.

Jeffrey Allerton's comments:

There seem to have been very few Welsh appeals, so I conclude that the Welsh tournament directors have been doing a good job. Interestingly, all three appeals involved disputed facts. Of the two appeals where the AC had a decision to make, I agree with the AC on one, but disagree on the other. Perhaps not a big enough sample to draw a meaningful conclusion.

Richard Hills' comments:

The paucity of Welsh cases lends credence to the American idea that perhaps appeals committees are a bit of an unnecessary, time-wasting and ineffective luxury. Indeed, it was rather distressing to note that a probably good TD decision on Appeal Three was possibly ruined by a possibly illegal appeals committee decision.

An alternative to current Welsh practice would be to use a Chief Tournament Director referee for **all** appeals.

This would allow correction of TD errors in determining facts (as in Appeal One), while simultaneously preventing illegal rulings by appeals committees (as possibly happened in Appeal Three).

Final summary by editor:

While there were few Welsh appeals that is probably because of the size and number of tournaments and perhaps because Welsh players call the TD less than English players do. I doubt that much can be read into the number of appeals. Similarly, there are probably too few to decide how good a job is being done.