

APPEAL	Non NABC+ Eight
Subject	Change of Call
DIC	Roger Putnam
Event	Daylight Stratified Pairs
Session	Second of Two
Date	March 17, 2010

BD#	25
VUL	E/W
DLR	North

800 Masterpoints	
♠	T 9
♥	K Q 8 2
♦	A 9
♣	A K J 9 5

1,727 Masterpoints	Spring 2010 Reno, NV	85 Masterpoints		
♠		A Q J 4 3	♠	8 5
♥		J 9 5	♥	6 4 3
♦		T 7 6 3	♦	K 8 5
♣		6	♣	Q T 7 4 2

1,087 Masterpoints	
♠	K 7 6 2
♥	A T 7
♦	Q J 4 2
♣	8 3

West	North	East	South
	1♣	Pass	1♠
Pass	2♥	Pass	2NT
Pass	Pass ¹		

Final Contract	2NT by South
Opening Lead	♦ 6
Table Result	Made 3, N/S + 150
Director Ruling	2NT S made 3, N/S + 150
Panel Ruling	2NT S made 3, N/S + 150

(1)	Attempted to change the pass to 3NT.
-----	--------------------------------------

The Facts: The director was called when North, at his third turn to call, put a pass card on the table and then withdrew it. North said he made the wrong bid and placed the 3NT card on the table.

The Ruling: In accordance with Law 25, the director ruled that pass was an intentional call and, since East did not accept the 3NT bid, the change of call was disallowed and a pass was imposed.

The Appeal: N/S appealed the director's decision and all four players attended the review.

North said he pulled out the pass card, put it on the table (or very near the table) and then immediately pulled it back and put the 3NT card out. He said it was inadvertent that he passed and called it a mechanical error. He also said this problem would not occur without bidding boxes (i.e. he would have changed his verbal bid without pause for thought). He said the ACBL was incorrectly interpreting Law 25's use of "unintended" and should allow such clear mistakes to be corrected so as not to skew the field.

The Decision: ACBL regulations and the law are clear. The pass card was placed on the table and then changed to 3NT; the pass was ruled intentional (not inadvertent) and the 3NT was not accepted by East.

North wanted the panel to change or ignore ACBL policy, which the panel refused to do. Therefore, the director's decision was upheld.

Despite being told the law and ACBL policy on mechanical errors relating to changes of call, particularly involving the two different parts of the bidding box, North was adamant in wanting to pursue the appeal to a hearing. Therefore, the panel issued an appeal without merit warning (AWMW).

The Panel: Peter Marcus (Reviewer), Bernie Gorkin, Candace Kushner and Jean Molnar.

Commentary:

Rigal Nicely handled by panel and TD. On the facts as stated this was clear-cut.

Polisner Law 25 B is clear and pursuing an appeal after being explained the law deserves the AWMW

Wildavsky Looks right to me. I would like to see the ACBL's policy quoted verbatim when making a ruling like this.

Wolff I realize that the ACBL and this committee were following its own rules, but I think that the rules should be changed so that if either a mental error or a mechanical mistake occur (too small a difference in their interpretation) and it would be easily correctable with no UI given, then in the interest of bridge it should be allowed. NO HARM, NO FOUL!