APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Five
Subject	Claim or Played Card
DIC	Chris Patrias
Event	0-5000i Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	November 25, 2008

BD#	15
VUL	N/S
DLR	South

1,993 Masterpoints		
^	AK9632	
*	8 6	
*	AQ98	
*	5	

1,198 Masterpoints	
^	JT8
*	Q 9 4
♦	J 5 4
♣	KQ83

Fall 2008	
Boston, MA	

4,266 Masterpoints	
•	5
*	A K 3 2
*	KT72
♣	A 7 6 2

4,912 Masterpoints	
^	Q 7 4
Y	JT75
♦	6 3
*	JT94

West	North	East	South
			Pass
Pass	1♠	Dbl	Pass
2♣	2♠	3♣	3♠
4♣	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	4♣
Opening Lead	∳Κ
Table Result	Down 1, E/W - 50
Director Ruling	4♣ W, down 1, E/W - 50
Panel Ruling	4 . W, down 1, E/W - 50

The Facts: The director was called after a club was led from dummy (East) at trick 12. West played 4♣. He was in dummy after trick 11. Dummy's cards were the ♣6 and the ♦7. North had the ♦Q and a spade. Neither South nor West held a trump or a diamond higher than the queen.

Declarer sat for a while and at the urging of North to play a card, West called for the club, which was good.

E/W alleged that North played the \mathbf{Q} to the twelfth trick. North stated that he was claiming the thirteenth trick with the \mathbf{Q} for down one.

The Ruling: The director determined that North was claiming without stating a line of play. In accordance with Law 70D1 and the footnote to Law 70, the director judged that there was no alternate normal play (i.e. to save the ◆Q for trick twelve) and therefore awarded the thirteenth trick to N/S.

The Appeal: All four players attended the hearing.

Declarer agreed that he sat for a long time in the two-card ending. His only explanation was that he was trying to remember if the diamond was good. Both he and dummy were adamant that North faced the \mathbf{Q} on the table.

According to N/S, everyone knew the contract was down one, yet declarer sat for over a minute staring at dummy. Finally North said, "Play a card." After declarer called for the good trump, North showed the •Q with the intent to claim the thirteenth trick not play it to the twelfth trick.

The Decision: There was a lengthy altercation at the table before the director could obtain all the facts. Both sides had different stories. After about ten minutes, the director determined that this was a claim by North. The panel found no facts that would indicate his judgment was incorrect. Therefore (see Law 70E), the director's ruling was upheld and the result of 4♣ by West, down one, E/W minus 50 was affirmed.

The Panel: Bernie Gorkin (Reviewer) and John Ashton.