

Bonn, March 20th, 2014

WBF Disciplinary Hearing

Dear Mrs. Heth,
Dear Mr. Jafri,
Dear Mr. Harris,

Dear Mr. Polisner,

I refer to my previous letters. In the name of the GBF I criticize anew that our motion on changing the appointed day was not accepted. The “offer” to alternatively take part by Skype is out of the question. The mentioned meetings start on Friday. Furthermore the immediateness of taking evidence, especially in the given constellation, might be an important component of the rendition.

Precautionary we provide the following notes which are inter alia also the result of an internal investigation by the GBF:

I.

From *Art. 14* of the WBF statutes arises that the Swiss Law and thereby particularly the Swiss Procedural Law applies.

II.

The confirmation whether the provided documents are complete is still missing.

Furthermore the documents for session five and six, which were basis to the bill of “indictment” from October 4th, 2013, are missing.

We consider as objectively impossible that afterwards composed and provided documents written on typewriter accord to the actual percipience at the table if no documents which were produced at the table during the round form the basis of it.

Why have we not been provided with these if they were produced?

For the sake of completeness:

Why do the documents written on typewriter neither reveal a date nor an author and even a signature is missing?

In regard to the witness reports it is additionally to mention that the witnesses were “prepared” for a special behavior so that an uninfluenced percipience was not possible any more. Incidentally the witnesses were - undisputed - put in charge of other distracting duties which they pointed to by themselves. By these distracts the witnesses’ percipience was significantly affected.

III.

From the bill of indictment from October 4th, 2013 arises that the monitoring is supposed to be done during session five and six. It begs the question why the video monitoring was not continued during session six. The continuation would have certainly led to an advanced clarification.

While watching the video recordings it was conspicuous that they are provided to the internet several times but cannot be played in five cases. The only playable version contents of three parts so that it comes to doubt that sound and vision accord to reality.

IV.

1. How can a player or an observer relate a cough to a particular person on the other side of the screen?

It has to be taken into consideration that - in consequence of the climatic conditions in Bali and the very low regulated air conditioner - almost every participant of the tournament was affected for health reasons which caused that there were permanently sounds of coughing in the tournament hall. Thereby an additional difficulty in relating sounds to persons occurred.

2. While viewing attachment “A”, which are notes made by player Wold and the excel chart created from, it was conspicuous that for example in Board 1 a fivefold coughing was noted down which cannot be brought in line with the alleged code.

3. In Board 2 after the completion of the bidding player Wold allegedly asked Dr. Wladow for the meaning of a certain bid (4 Spades). This is incompatible with reality because Wold and Dr. Wladow were sitting on different sides of the screen.
4. Also the by Wold alleged recording of a result by Dr. Wladow is inapplicable because each score were noted down and entered into the Bridgemate by the Captain of the German team.

In further cases the notes are incorrect, too.

Conclusion:

The grave mistakes that are listed raise strong doubts about the possibilities for a good percipience of the player Wold so that the notes have no evidential value against Dr. Wladow/Dr. Elinescu

V.

An analysis of the hands in session five leads to following results:

1. Board 1 - allegedly coughed 1+1, this does not match the alleged code (3x coughing for Heart shortness). A differentiation of two times coughing with or without a pause is far-fetched and hardly certifiable due to the possibilities for a good percipience (see above).
2. Board 3 - no cough though Spade single. The editor's argumentation is contradictory to the accusation whereby the coughing takes place before the bidding to signal Spade single.
3. Board 5 - 1+1 does not match with the assertion, see Board 1. It suggests itself to cough once, in case the code matches.
4. Board 7 - 1+1 though Heart single (see above)
5. Board 8 - 2+2, why 2+2? The attempt to bring that in line with the code is not comprehensible again. On the video recordings we can see Dr. Wladow taking off his jacket and talking to an official, this conversation might have been about the cool air conditioner which was too cold for a lot of players anyway.
6. Board 10 - the protocol for this board contains weak allegations
7. Board 11 - 4+5, why should this mean a Spade lead? Why does South wants to signal a Spade lead? Indeed a Spade lead by North is ordinary after a strong Club opening.
8. Board 13 - 1+1, allegedly Heart single. In the report Spade single is specified, both does not match, neither the code nor the report.
9. Board 16 - 1 cough though Club and Heart shortness. Why did he not talk to the BBO-Operator about his state of health, now?

Conclusion:

Because the alleged code was not proven the boards of session five are not suitable to prove an irregularity in the form of an illegal agreement. Comparable cases also appear in session six so that this one either is not suitable to prove the alleged agreement.

VI.

As far as the moving of trays in addition is used as an indication for an illegal agreement, the video recordings did not prove the accusation true. The players' behavior relating to the trays is to be considered as ordinary at a Bridge table, the occasional searching for it, too. This additional accusation shows once more that the observers' cognitive ability was focused by the predetermined target of observation.

The players Dr. Elinescu and Dr. Wladow have been playing Bridge at international events for about twenty years, also world championships, European championships and Bermuda Bowl.

Due to their partially unordinary way of playing they were already under observation by tournament directors and officials, any observations ended without any incriminating results.

The captain, not only a well-known world class Bridge player with a long lasting international experience, also a member of the board of GBF, followed the players Dr. Elinescu and Dr. Wladow permanently at the tables, even in the closed room, because Dr. Wladow's knowledge of the English language is very limited. She also notes the private scores and handles the Bridgemate. During the whole tournament she did not recognize any anomaly in the behavior of the both players.

Thereby it has to be taken into consideration that the alleged code requires a special attention from the players to follow it. This special attention certainly would have attracted the captains attention.

Dr. Wladow suffers from asthmatic cough, therefor the climatic conditions were extraordinary irksome.

Finally it should be noted that no exceptional results were scored by the players which are based on the assumed illegal agreement.

We do not want to assume that the successful defense in Board 2 (Session 3) - lead of the unguarded fifth Ace against a declarer with a 2NT opening, followed by the doubleton King of Hearts, came about on the basis of violating 73 B.

Kind regards

Deutscher Bridge Verband e.V.

Ulrich Wenning

President

Cc: Mr. G. Rona