

Adjudication Principles for Directors and Appeals Committees

Players' uncorroborated testimony is irrelevant and inadmissible unless it relates to physical actions of either side. Corroboration may come from system notes, confirmation by an opponent, the convention card, recognized authority, or even objectively acceptable bridge logic, but not statements regarding intentions, personal tendencies, philosophy, etc., which are irrelevant. We should not say that we don't believe the player who presents such statements in support of his case, we should say we certainly do believe him but cannot use what he says because the Laws do not allow us to do so.

The class of player involved is not to be considered when making a ruling. The footnote to Laws 69, 70, and 71 merely point out that even good players may do something inferior or careless, so do not give them any favoritism in regard to claims. Treat all players in an event the same, assuming all have bridge ability equal to a typical player in that event. When a player has shown evidence in the deal involved that he lacks or exceeds that level of ability, then his "class of player" can be considered. Not by evidence from what he says, but from what he has done, either in the auction or in the play. That does not mean average skill is to be assumed when determining a proper adjusted score for a changed contract. The non-offending side should be assumed to play rather well, much better than average, while the offending side should be assumed to play rather badly, quite a bit worse than average, when deciding on a suitable adjusted score..

Law 90 (Procedural Penalties) applies to the types of infractions typified in L90B, which are all related to offenses regarding the proper procedures to follow in duplicate bridge. They are not to be assessed for general disciplinary purposes, such as for blatant creation or misuse of unauthorized information, or for blatant misinformation. Except when egregious offenses justify the measures provided for in L91, discipline is not a concern of the Laws. A Player Memo should be written for ethical violations if a lecture seems insufficient.

The most unfavorable result for the offending side, when adjusting the score in accordance with L12C2, is the worst one that might reasonably have occurred either in absence of the irregularity or subsequent to the irregularity. It is only the non-offenders who are given a score adjustment that reflects what would have happened if the irregularity had not occurred.

When a pair after leaving the table or starting a new board recognizes that they have acquiesced in a claim erroneously, the claim should be reconsidered by the Director exactly as it would have been at the table. That is, they should be given a trick (or tricks) that were claimed if it (or they) could have been lost by ANY normal play by the claiming side, including play that is careless or inferior.

