

Subject of Appeal:	Disputed Claim	Case:	N2
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----


Event	von Zedtwitz LM Pairs	Event DIC	Harry Falk
Date	07/22/2016	Session	Second Qualifying

Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
Pass	Pass	1♣	Pass
1♥	Pass	3♣	Pass
3NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

Hand Record

Board	19	N	Ron Smith		
Dealer	S	♠	K987		
		♥	K1065		
Vul	E/W	♦	754		
		♣	K8		
W	Atul Rai			E	James Masilamani
♠	Q32			♠	A
♥	AQ982			♥	J73
♦	Q102			♦	K63
♣	106			♣	AQJ943
		S	Oren Kriegel		
		♠	J10654		
		♥	4		
		♦	AJ98		
		♣	752		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by W			♠ 7

Facts Determined at the Table

After seven tricks (opening lead won by dummy's ace, losing heart finesse, ♦A and four more spade tricks), South was on lead in the following position:

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

West claimed stating that "if the hearts break, I have the rest." North noted that hearts are 3-0, accepting West's claim of five tricks. North pointed out that six tricks would always have been available on a squeeze. West called the director

Director Ruling

Per Law 70D1, the director ruled that he could not accept from West any successful line of play not embraced in the original claim/clarification statement (the squeeze) if there is an alternative normal line of play that would be less successful. West's line of play was deemed to include cashing winning tricks, ending with a losing heart at trick 13. The claim was resolved as five tricks to declarer and one trick to the defense for down three, N/S +150

Director's Ruling	3NT by W, Down 3, N/S +150
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

East/West requested a review of this ruling. They felt there was no way West would play the hand which would not result in taking all six tricks, as it would be more than careless or inferior to play clubs before playing other suits (breaking up the squeeze).

Panel Findings

The Reviewer spoke with an expert player to gauge the likelihood that declarer would misplay the remaining position (by playing clubs or not noticing a heart discard by North on the play of diamonds, for instance). The expert judged the likelihood was nil. Law 68B1 defines a claim of some tricks as a concession of the remainder. Declarer's statement was a claim of five or six tricks, dependent on the heart distribution. In this case, it was a claim of five and a concession of one. Law 71 says that a concession must stand, except that the director shall cancel a concession if a player has conceded a trick that could not be lost by any normal play of the remaining cards. The panel was convinced that this was the case and canceled the concession of one trick, changing the result to 3NT by West, down two, N/S +100.

Expert Consulted: Dan Korbel

Panel Decision	3NT by W, Down 2, N/S +100
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Koltnow
Member	Gary Zeiger
Member	Jenni Carmichael