

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Fifteen
Subject	Inadvertent Call
DIC	Robert Hendricks
Event	2 <sup>nd</sup> Sunday Side Game
Session	Second
Date	12/02/07

BD#	<b>29</b>
VUL	<b>Both</b>
DLR	<b>North</b>

<b>3,415 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	9 7 5 2
♥	A 8
♦	J T 9
♣	A K 8 4

<b>632 Masterpoints</b>		<b>Fall 2007 San Francisco, CA</b>	<b>41 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	A 8 4		♠	K Q J 6
♥	K 7 6 2		♥	T
♦	Q 6 3		♦	A 8 7 5 4
♣	J 5 2		♣	Q 9 3

<b>632 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	T 3
♥	Q J 9 5 4 3
♦	K 2
♣	T 7 6

West	North	East	South
	2♣ <sup>(1)</sup>	2♦	Pass
3♦	Pass	Pass	3♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Final Contract	<b>3♥ by South</b>
Opening Lead	<b>♦3</b>
Table Result	<b>Down 1, N/S -50</b>
Director Ruling	<b>3♥ by S, down 1, N/S -50</b>
Panel Ruling	<b>3♥ by S, down 1, N/S -50</b>

(1)	North stated he intended to bid 1♣, not 2♣
-----	--

**The Facts:** The director was called at the completion of the bidding. North stated that he intended to bid 1♣, not 2♣. North grabbed the club bidding card from the bidding box, not noticing that the 1♣ card was missing from the box and did not note his actual bid.

**The Ruling:** There was no violation of partnership agreements. There was no infraction of Law 75. Therefore, the table result of 3♥ by South down one, N/S minus 50 was allowed to stand.

**The Appeal:** E/W stated that the tournament director was intellectually dishonest because he tried to make the facts fit the way he ruled. N/S was a new partnership, but they were in collusion to keep E/W from getting a good score. South should have forced to game.

E/W were told by the director that it would do no good to appeal.

Neither North nor South attended the review. The reviewer was unable to ask about their methods after 2C openers. The auction itself does not raise a red flag, if 2H would have promised either 2 of the top 3, or 3 of the top 5 honors.

**The Decision:** The irregularity in the auction is satisfactorily explained by North's statement that he pulled the 2♣ card by mistake. The missing 1♣ card (verified by the director) gives even more credence to his statement. Since the 2♣ bid was accidental, it does not constitute a psych. The partnership's agreement was correctly explained. Therefore, there was no violation of Law 21 or the regulation that prohibits the psyching of an artificial opening. North is from Mississippi and South from British Columbia. The appeal had no merit, so an appeal without merit warning (AWMW) was awarded.

**The Panel:** Charles MacCracken (Reviewer), Ken Van Cleve and Sol Weinstein.

**Commentary:**

**Polisner** Since there was apparently no UI available to South (such as "oops"), South's bid of 3♥ was routine. No violation - no adjustment. I would not have issued an AWMW to a player with only 41 master points, but would have attempted some education about the appeal process.

**Rigal** N/S had an accident -- immediately 100% obvious to everyone but E/W who must have been coming close to ZT or the equivalent in their appeal. The AWMW was richly deserved.

**Smith** What about the explanation by North did E/W find so strange? Why would anyone want to psych a 2♣ opener with that North hand? And what did South do to suggest the call was fielded? Surely she was as surprised as anyone that North passed 3♥.  
So despite all evidence to the contrary, this E/W pair decided that this was a conspiracy worthy of the Kennedy assassination. The only thing missing in their argument is that the director, in addition to being "intellectually dishonest" and thoughtful enough to tell them not to bother appealing a ridiculous case, was in on it all from the beginning. Wow!  
E/W should have filed a player memo if they found all of this strange and suspicious, and I would hope the recorder would throw the complaint in the garbage as soon as he saw it. E/W are a conduct committee waiting to happen.

**Wolff** Good ruling on virtually a non-event, especially since mechanical errors are never intentional and are not in the same category as hesitation disruption and convention disruption.

