

29th December 2017, Riyadh

Appeals Committee, 2017 King Salman World Blitz Chess Championship

Appeal of GM Ernesto Inarkiev against his loss against Magnus Carlsen

The game Carlsen-Inarkiev reached the following position after 27.Rxb7+



In this position, GM Inarkiev (Black) played 27...Ne3+, an illegal move as his king was in check. GM Carlsen did not notice and continued 28.Kd3. The arbiter was not present and therefore could not intervene. GM Inarkiev claimed that GM Carlsen's 28.Kd3 was illegal and stopped the clock.

Inarkiev then claimed the game and IA Carlos Dias awarded the game to Inarkiev. The Chief Arbiter Takis Nikolopoulos intervened, citing Appendix A Article 4.2 and asked GM Inarkiev to continue the game. GM Inarkiev refused and the game was awarded to Carlsen by the Chief Arbiter

Appendix A of the Rules of Chess Article 4.2 is as follows:

*If the arbiter observes an illegal move has been completed, he shall declare the game lost by the player, provided the opponent has not made his next move. If the arbiter does not intervene, the opponent is entitled to claim a win, provided the opponent has not made his next move. However, the game is drawn if the position is such that the opponent cannot checkmate the player's king by any possible series of legal moves. **If the opponent does not claim and the arbiter does not intervene, the illegal move shall stand and the game shall continue. Once the opponent has made his next move, an illegal move cannot be corrected unless***

this is agreed by the players without intervention of the arbiter.


The Appeals Committee considered GM Inarkiev's claim that GM Carlsen's move 28.Kd3 was illegal.

The Appeals Committee decided that according to A4.2 above, the illegal move 27...Ne3+ should stand and the game should have continued and that the Chief Arbiter acted correctly.

Effectively what GM Inarkiev's claim is that in the position after 27...Ne3+, GM Carlsen's only legal move is to claim the game. While accepting that the precise sequence of events which occurred (the player claiming the game) is not specifically covered by A4.2, the committee felt the meaning of: '**the game shall continue**' in A 4.2 means exactly that and that Carlsen's move, which was legal under rules 3.1-3.9, was in accordance with the meaning and spirit of A4.2

Therefore the appeal was rejected. The committee also decided that the appeal fee should be returned as the claim was not frivolous.

Jorge Vega (Acting Chairman), Malcolm Pein, Hisham Al Taher



M.A.T
15