

APPEAL	Non NABC+ ELEVEN
Subject	Claim
DIC	Nancy Watkins
Event	Stratified Open Pairs
Session	First
Date	July 19, 2006

BD#	3
VUL	E/W
DLR	South

<b>6,500 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	J 7 3
♥	Q T 9 7
♦	Q T 9
♣	J 8 7

<b>1,060 Masterpoints</b>		<b>Summer 2006 Chicago, Illinois</b>	<b>1,580 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	4		♠	T 9 8 6
♥	A K 4 3 2		♥	J 8
♦	K 7 6		♦	A 8 5 4 3 2
♣	Q 6 4 3		♣	2

<b>17,300 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	A K Q 5 2
♥	6 5
♦	J
♣	A K T 9 5

West	North	East	South
			1♠
2♥	2♠	Pass	4♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Final Contract	<b>4♠ by South</b>
Opening Lead	<b>♥A</b>
Table Result	<b>4♠ by S down 1, E/W +50</b>
Director Ruling	<b>4♠ by S down 1, E/W +50</b>
Panel Ruling	<b>E/W: 4♠ by S down 1, E/W +50 N/S: 4♠ by S making 4, N/S +420</b>

**The Facts:** The director was called after an attempted claim with six tricks to go. With West on lead, South faced his cards and said he had winning clubs, then brought his hand back towards himself and wanted play to continue.

The play at the table was as follows:

1. ♥A ♥7 ♥J ♥6
2. ♥K ♥9 ♥8 ♥5
3. ♥4 ♥T ♠8 ♠Q
4. ♠A ♠4 ♠3 ♠6
5. ♠K ♥3 ♠7 ♠9
6. ♠2 ♥2 ♠J ♠T
7. ♣J ♣2 ♣9 ♣Q

**The Ruling:** The director judged that a claim wasn't made in accordance with law 68A – i.e. declarer did not demonstrably intend to claim.

**The Appeal:** With six cards remaining declarer faced his hand, stated his clubs were good, stopped claiming, unfaced his hand and wanted to continue play. A director came to the table and was told what had happened. The table director consulted another director and was advised that there had not been a claim in his opinion. The table director returned to the table and said to continue play. After winning the Queen, West returned a club. Declarer won that in dummy and discarded his losing diamond on her ♥Q. Declarer took the remaining tricks making four spades.

The reviewer had poor communications with the table director. The reviewer knew that the initial decision was to let the play continue (no claim). This was the last hand of the afternoon. The reviewer attempted to get information prior to the 7:30 PM start of the second session.

**The Decision:** The information from both pairs at the table was the same. The reviewer was under the impression that the issue was whether there had been a claim. After discussion, the panel concluded that in accordance with law 68A a claim had occurred. Law 68 defines a claim as any (found to be a strong explicit word) statement to the effect that a contestant will win a specific number of tricks. In addition, the declarer showed his remaining cards by holding them face up. There is more wording in law 68A that reads: ...or when he (the claimer) shows his cards. The panel discussed the parenthetical statement in law 68A “unless he demonstrably did not intend to claim.” It was judged that declarer had shown intent and only upon realizing that the claim was incorrect changed her mind. The panel was unanimous in deciding a claim had been made. The panel thought that there was director error at the table (in ruling to allow play to continue). When there is director error, we treat both sides as non-offenders and give both pairs the benefit of the doubt. The panel issued a two way score: N/S +420 and E/W +50. The decision was reported to both pairs with the statement that the decision was made because of director error.

Upon preparing the write up, the reviewer noticed that N/S had been noted as the appealing pair. After further discussions with the table director, it was discovered that the final table ruling had been changed. It had been determined that there was a claim at the point at which the director was called. The table director had returned to the table to give the ruling that a claim had occurred and that E/W were awarded a diamond trick. This ruling resulted in score of +50 for E/W (4♠ down one) that N/S had appealed. With these facts, the panel would have not ruled director error and would have upheld the ruling of 4♠ down one for both pairs.

Since this error (by the reviewer) was not discovered until a day later, the panel decided that there was now director error (in obtaining the correct facts). Therefore, the two-way score was allowed to stand.

**The Panel:** Patty Holmes (Reviewer), Ken Van Cleve and Gary Zeiger.

**Players Consulted:** None.