

Appeal No. 8
India v Argentina

Appeals Committee:

J Gerard (Chairman,), G Endicott (Scribe,) J-C Beineix , J Polisner, R Cohen

Bermuda Bowl, Round Robin
Round 8; Table I

Board 5. Dealer North. North-South Vulnerable.

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

West	North	East	South
2♣	Pass	2♦	Pass
2NT	Pass	4♦	Pass
4♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

Comments: West explained the bid of 3NT as “no four card major”, but after the 4♦ bid he wrote “maybe I showed 4-4 majors.” East explained the 3NT bid as 4-4 majors. South called the Director before the opening lead was made

Contract: 4♠ by West

Opening Lead: ♦K

Play: ♦A. ♥J — 8! — 2 - A

Result: 4♠ = 10 tricks : N/S -420

The Facts: Before the opening lead South enquired of the Director whether he could inform North that E-W may possibly have had a misunderstanding. This request was refused [General Conditions of Contest 24.2(c)].

At the end of the hand, North called the Director to claim damage; he said that if he had known West might have had fewer than four cards in Hearts, he would have covered the ♥J

The Director: after investigation formed the opinion that North had correct information according to the system E/W were playing.

Ruling: Score stands. N/S -420. E/W penalised ½ VP for deficient convention card.

Relevant Laws: 40C. General Conditions of Contest 24.2(c)

North/South appealed.

Present: Indian players and Captain; Argentine East player

The Players: North gave a detailed account of his reasons for ducking ♡J if West has four but not if West has only three cards in the suit. He was aggrieved that he had been told West had four cards in Hearts when it was apparent to South this might not be the case.

East confirmed that the 3N bid showed 4-4 majors according to system, which includes Puppet Stayman not mentioned on the convention card. The Director's enquiries had shown this to be so.

The Committee: noted that North's only entitlement is to know the correct systemic meanings of opponents' calls. Noted that the Conditions of Contest state that "at all times from the beginning of the Auction to the completion of play each player receives information only from his screenmate about the meanings of calls and explanations given." Observed that this case illustrates the reason for the regulation, since contamination of North with extraneous information was avoided

The Committee's decision: The Committee was satisfied that the Director had explored the facts of the case carefully. His ruling was appropriate to the facts and was upheld. North had failed to grasp the law in question.

Deposit: forfeited