

# **1993 Summer NABC**

## **Appeals Casebook**



*Washington D. C.*

## **2020 Editor's Note:**

The 1993-1995 NABC Appeals Committee Decisions casebooks, compiled by John Blubaugh, have not been published electronically previously. The documents in question only existed in hard copy form. The ACBL would like to thank Denise Raggio for transcribing the text of the originals into an electronic format, without which this document would not be possible.

ACBL Headquarters  
May, 2020

## **1993 NABC Appeals Chairman's Note:**

This manual contains appeals that were heard during the Washington D.C. NABC. The cases are **not** intended to serve as examples for other Committees and Directors on how to rule. The purpose is to allow Committee members to take a close look at the work we are all doing.

The expert commentary provided with many of these cases will clarify where others feel the Committee was right or why they were wrong. Lack of commentary generally indicates that these experts agreed with the decision. It is worth noting that in several cases there was disagreement among the experts as to what should have been done. This illustrates how difficult it can be to attempt total uniformity in this area.

It was noted many times that it is quite difficult to pass judgment on these cases with the limited amount of information available. This necessary information can only be provided by the Committee chairmen. Sometimes they are serving on three or four cases per night. This makes it difficult for them to give a total accounting of the testimony heard and the Committee's reasoning. Remember, all of these people are volunteers trying to make a contribution.

We cannot express how appreciative we all must be for the work performed by John Blubaugh in assembling these cases and putting them in a very readable form. We can also thank him for his work in getting these cases to the experts and compiling their comments. John gets many of these cases in a nearly unreadable form with incomplete auctions and hand records. Chairmen sometimes make no comments whatsoever and John has to locate them during the tournament and fill in the blanks. Were it not for his efforts, this manual would not exist in the very complete form.

Hopefully, this attempt at introspection will help us to continue to improve the entire appeal process.

Alan Le Bendig  
Co-Chairman, NABC Appeals Committee

## **Special thanks to our expert commentators:**

Karen Allison  
Jersey City, NJ

Edgar Kaplan  
New York, NY

John C Anderson  
Sixes, OR

Alan Le Bendig  
Los Angeles, CA

David Berkowitz  
Old Tappan, NJ

Michael Rosenberg  
New York, NY

Henry Bethe  
Ithaca, NY

Peggy Sutherlin  
Dallas, TX

Richard Colker  
Wheaton, MD

David Treadwell  
Wilmington, DE

Bobby Wolff  
Dallas, TX



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Hesitation	<b>Event:</b>	Master Mixed BAM Teams	<b>Case:</b>	1
---------------------------	------------	---------------	------------------------	--------------	---

Auction			
West	North	East	South
			Pass
1♣	Pass	1♠	2♦
3♣	Pass	3♦	Pass
3♠	Pass	4♣	Pass
4♦	Pass	4NT	Pass
5♣ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	6♣	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

Board		N		
Dealer		S	♠ J1063	
Vul		Both	♥ J1054	
W			♦ 93	
			♣ 643	
♠ 975				E
♥ K8				♠ AK84
♦ AJ				♥ AQ2
♣ AQ10872				♦ 762
		S		♣ K95
			♠ Q2	
			♥ 9763	
			♦ KQ10854	
			♣ J	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♣ by W	Made 6	E/W +1370	

### Facts

North/South felt that the break in tempo made East's 6♣ bid very easy

### Committee Ruling

The Committee allowed the result, 6♣ by West, making six, E/W +1370, to stand. The Committee felt that the 5♣ bid was clearly not showing aces. The Committee also felt that East should be allowed to deduce that playing 5♣ would result in a bad matchpoint result and correct to 6♣.

### Commentary

**Allison:** I believe that the tempo break makes bidding 6♣ more desirable. West could hold Jxx xx Ax AQJxxx, as easily and 6♣ would have no play. Pass is a logical alternative.

**Anderson:** If 4NT is "not Blackwood...asking for aces," it is natural "to play." The hesitation indicates forward going values. Remove the ♥K and the ♣J for a quick 5♣.

**Berkowitz:** From East's point of view, West must have an ace (the 4♦ bid) and I would allow +1370 for East-West. But, I consider it close enough that I would not allow it if West had not bid 4♦.

**Colker:** Assuming West's 4♦ bid showed a control: if the ace, then 5♣ can't be showing number of aces; if shortness, then West must have the ♣A for his opening bid; and if the king he would (presumably) have bid No Trump with "soft" values - so he must hold slammish controls (including the ♣A). If East is good enough to work all this out (i.e., he verbalized the equivalent to the Committee), then he should be allowed to bid the slam.

**Kaplan:** If it is true that East intended 4NT as Blackwood, then realized from the hesitation that the 5♣ response was natural, the ruling was dead wrong. Mightn't West have held QJT Kx KQ QJTxxx, for a prompt 5♣ response?

**LeBendig:** This is a tough case to rule on. Was 4NT Blackwood? How experienced was this pair? It is hard to believe that West would be cuebidding 4♦ without the ace. On the other hand, since West did not interpret 4NT as Blackwood, he must have been considering bidding on.

**Wolff:** My comments throughout are based on how I would judge these cases in our highest level bridge events. Some of my opinions would change dramatically (more toward education) in lower level events or with less experienced players in top competition. There are a few fundamental themes that guide many of my decisions. These, together with the underlying spirit of Active Ethics, provide the foundation of our move to the next plateau.

This case should turn on the East/West description of the meaning of 4NT and then 5♣. One thing is sure, East was privy to the information that West was not responding Blackwood.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Hesitation	<b>Event:</b>	IMP Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	2
---------------------------	------------	---------------	-----------	--------------	---

Auction			
West	North	East	South
		1♦	3♣
3♠	5♣	Dbl <sup>1</sup>	Pass
5♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

Hand Record				
Board		N		
Dealer	E	♦ 8532	♥ 7	♦ K1063
Vul	None	♣ Q1052		
W			E	
♦ KQJ104 ♥ AKQ93 ♦ 75 ♣ 9		♦ A76	♥ 10852	♦ AJ982
		♣ K		
S		♦ 9		
		♥ J64	♦ Q4	♣ AJ87643

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♥ by W	Made 5	E/W +450	

### Facts

North/South claimed the Double should have shown a minimum hand and could have been xxx Jxx KQxxx KQ. They claimed the break in tempo indicated that East was considering another bid and could not hold the hand described.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee allowed the result, 5♥ by West, making five, E/W +450, to stand. The Committee also found that the appeal was substantially without merit and North/South were given a two IMP procedural penalty for bringing the appeal.

### Commentary

**Allison:** I disagree with the penalty to North/South. I believe the appeal would have merit for most pairs.

**Anderson:** Breaks in tempo cause awkward situations (were there any skip bid announcements?) I think that if the result stands, a two IMP procedural penalty against East/West would be more in order.

**Bethe:** While I believe that the Committee was right in the end to rule that the 5♥ bid should stand, I believe it is close. I believe that this decision should depend on the ability of the East/West pair, in particular of West: the better the player, the more likely pass is to be a logical alternative. I would have passed on the East hand and would therefore also pass on the West hand playing with me. I would certainly not consider this appeal to be without merit.

**Berkowitz:** I agree with the Committee if North/South are an expert pair. If North/South are weak players, they should be allowed to appeal.

**Colker:** The “frivolous appeal” penalty seems a bit too much (unless North/South are known “cry babies”).

**Kaplan:** The penalty for appealing was absurd. Personally, I would have passed the double as West, playing partner to have his double (xx xxx KQJxx KQJ). So, I would have adjusted the score, assuming that the tempo gave unauthorized information (was a Skip-Bid warning given?).

**LeBendig:** The experience of this pair is crucial to this decision. The better East/West are, the more probable that they deserve +100. This is certainly not an appeal lacking merit.

**Rosenberg:** West cannot reasonably pass the Double. If the Double is fast, pass is unethical. If the Double is slow, pass is suspicious or too ethical. North/South should not have penalized for bringing the appeal. Non-offenders should be encouraged to appeal huddle situations. In fact, the Director, if called, should rule for North/South. The Committee should overturn this decision.

**Treadwell:** Excellent ruling. There is no merit to this appeal.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Hesitation	<b>Event:</b>	Mixed Teams	<b>Case:</b>	3
---------------------------	------------	---------------	-------------	--------------	---

### Auction

West	North	East	South
	1NT	Pass	2♦ <sup>1</sup>
Dbl	2♥	3♦	3♥ <sup>2</sup>
Pass	4♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, transfer to Hearts
2: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ J10875 ♥ AJ6 ♦ A9 ♣ A106		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>E/W</b>			
W			E	
♠ Q96 ♥ 842 ♦ KQ1086 ♣ K9		♠ A3 ♥ 73 ♦ J543 ♣ J8753		
	S	♠ K42 ♥ KQ1095 ♦ 72 ♣ Q42		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♥ by N	Made 4	N/S +420	

### Facts

The Director changed the result to 3♥ by North, making four, N/S +170. North claimed that he was unable to discern if his partner's slow 3♥ bid was a stretch or an underbid. North stated that he had to guess what to do.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee upheld the Director's ruling, 3♥ by North, making four, N/S +170. The Committee also found the appeal to be substantially without merit and issued a quarter of a board penalty to North-South.

### Commentary

**Allison:** The Committee did well. We need more information in these reports.

**Bethe:** North's argument, that a slow 3♥ bid conveyed no specific information is, in my judgment, correct. A slow pass would have message content; a slow 3♥ bid does not. For completeness it would be useful if the Committee would note additional information: the No Trump range, whether North's voluntary 2♥ bid had information content. Again, I find this appeal without merit is without merit.

**Kaplan:** Two general matters - It would be useful to have all pertinent facts. Here, what was the No Trump range? There are references to upholding a Director or overruling. These terms are counterproductive. The Director gives a provisional ruling, the Committee gives its own ruling. Frequently, the two rulings should be different.

**LeBendig:** This, as well as other hesitation cases, seem to have been decided by applying the logical alternative guidelines prior to determining if the hesitation conveyed a clear message. In this case, I feel the 3♥ bid could just have easily been weakness with the fear partner would take it as strength. We must avoid any discussion of logical alternative until we are convinced that the hesitation has suggested that one action will be more successful than another.

**Rosenburg:** Please give the information on the No Trump range. Otherwise, it is difficult to evaluate the decision. The huddle definitely makes bidding more attractive. Good Committee decision.

**Treadwell:** The write-up does not indicate the one No Trump opening range. If it is a strong No Trump, then I agree with the Committee ruling, but I think the penalty was questionable. If the opening No Trump range was 12-14 high card points. North's action was completely valid and the score should stand.

**Wolff:** North/South's No Trump range is important to this decision. If the range is 14/15/16-17/18 HCP, then the Rule of Coincidence would apply, and North/South should be given +170 along with the penalty for bringing an appeal substantially without merit. For other No Trump ranges, I would tend to agree with North that his partner's out of tempo 3♥ bid was hard to read.

Regardless of the bridge adjudication, we must not lose sight of the disruption such hesitation auctions cause, and of the information that such hesitation auctions generally convey. I would in any case assess a penalty.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Hesitation	<b>Event:</b>	Spingold Knockout Teams	<b>Case:</b>	4
---------------------------	------------	---------------	-------------------------	--------------	---

### Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	1♦	Pass
1♥	Dbl	2♥	2♠
4♣ <sup>1</sup>	4♠	5♥ <sup>2</sup>	Pass
6♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, Splinter
2: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>		♠ J8643 ♥ (void) ♦ J2 ♣ KQ7652	
<b>Vul</b>	<b>E/W</b>			
W				E
♠ K95 ♥ AKQ1092 ♦ Q109 ♣ J			♠ 2 ♥ J864 ♦ AK87 ♣ A1084	
		S		
			♠ AQ107 ♥ 753 ♦ 6543 ♣ 93	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♥ by W	Made 6	E/W +1430	

### Facts

East broke tempo when bidding 5♥.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee changed the result to 5♥ by West, making six, E/W +680. The Committee felt that passing 5♥ was a logical alternative for West.

### Commentary

**Allison:** I disagree with the ruling. How did the tempo break advance 6♥ over 5♥?

**Anderson:** This is OK. A pass and a pull to show more values was in order.

**Berkowitz:** I would allow 6♥. The slow 5♥ bid does not indicate a better hand than a fast 5♥.

**Bethe:** I think the Committee made an outstanding decision here. It is tempting to say, "What else could East have for the bid," but East might have bid 5♥ on x Jxx AKJxx Qxx. With the actual hand, East should either cue bid 5♣ or plan to pass and pull, and since that is so, West has a clear alternative of passing 5♥.

**Colker:** I agree with the ruling. Why didn't the Director rule the result to 5♥ by West, making six, E/W +680, to place the onus for appealing appropriately on East/West?

**Kaplan:** I agree that Pass is a logical alternative. Did the tempo suggest bidding on?

**LeBendig:** This was a recurring type of problem in this set of appeals. I'll refer to these as the slam theme. Here, I feel the slow 5♥ bid conveys strength and uncertainty as to what to bid at the five or possibly six level. If my assumption is correct, this makes the logical alternative discussion proper and I like the decision.

**Rosenberg:** This is a very important case. Passing 5♥ was a logical alternative but this is irrelevant. The huddle did not suggest bidding 6♥ (if anything, it suggested passing). However, there likely was other extraneous information in the form of gestures, mannerisms, regular partnership knowledge, etc. This Committee should have questioned all four players about the possible existence of such information. If there was none, then the result should be allowed to stand.

**Wolff:** I agree with the ruling, but not the reasoning. The message received from the out of tempo 5♥ bid is unclear, so it is unwise to make a bridge adjudication based on West's subsequent call. However, West had already shown his hand. East's 5♥ bid which is, in my opinion, an unconscionable underbid taken together with West's continuing on to 6♥ invokes the Rule of Coincidence..



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Hesitation	<b>Event:</b>	Flight A Senior Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	5
---------------------------	------------	---------------	-----------------------	--------------	---

### Auction

West	North	East	South
		Pass	1♦
4♠ <sup>1</sup>	Pass <sup>2</sup>	Pass	Dbl
Pass	5♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Skip Bid Warning
2: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		<b>N</b>		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠ 92 ♥ Q10982 ♦ 876 ♣ Q43		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>E/W</b>			
<b>W</b>			<b>E</b>	
♠ KJ107643 ♥ A43 ♦ 9 ♣ A7		♠ Q5 ♥ K65 ♦ J1053 ♣ KJ102		
		<b>S</b>		
		♠ A8 ♥ J7 ♦ AKQ42 ♣ 9865		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♥ by N	Down 5	E/W +250	

### Facts

The Director ruled that North/South should receive the result or Average Minus and East/West should receive the result of their score or Average Plus. North/South claimed that East/West could have scored +1100 by Doubling 5♥ and should not get an Average Plus for failing to double.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee changed the result to 4♠ by West, making five, E/W +650. The Committee felt that Pass was a reasonable alternative by South. East/West should not have to face this problem over five hearts.

### Commentary

**Allison:** It is OK for North/South to be -650, but don't East/West have to play bridge?

**Berkowitz:** I would give East/West +250 and North/South -650. The +250 is the logical result of their own bad bridge.

**Bethe:** South clearly could (would) consider Pass in the absence of the hesitation. Here I do believe that the appeal was without merit and would have so ruled.

**Colker:** I agree with the ruling as far as it goes. I think North/South should also have been assessed a procedural penalty (¼ board).

**Rosenberg:** This is weird since North/South has no problem. If West is an expert, I would let him keep his bad result, since he should Double. But this is unlikely. I sympathize with the Committee's ruling. Maybe against such random actions by North/South, there should be no redress except what occurs at the table.

**Wolff:** I agree that the result which should be entered on the scoresheet for matchpointing purposes is E/W +650.

In matchpoint ruling situations, the score that is entered for matchpointing purposes should be the most likely bridge result that would have accrued in the absence of any improprieties.

Next, we need to determine the score/matchpoints due to the two pairs involved. North/South, though it was through unacceptable means, put themselves in a real loss position. I believe that perpetrators of questionable actions (that are ruled adjudicable) should never gain from those actions, and I would rule North/South -650.

After an impropriety, the perpetrators should never gain from their actions, and every close judgment ruling situation should be decided against them.

On the other hand, non-offenders still must be held to playing the game and should not be given "two shots." This is unequivocably the case when their own choice of convenience or bridge actions has created the situation. West's 4♠ bid is not a percentage call, and it contributed to East's difficulty in Doubling. West should have Doubled anyway. It is perhaps true in a pure sense that East/West "should not have to face this problem over five hearts." Yet, if they had faced it reasonably, the Committee would not have been called and life would have gone on. Until a way is found to avoid giving double opportunities to non-offenders, they should be expected to capitalize on simple opportunities. I leave East/West at -250.

Players who choose to take a non-percentage action or to employ an unusual convention will live with the fallout of their choice.

.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Hesitation	<b>Event:</b>	Flight B Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	6
---------------------------	------------	---------------	----------------	--------------	---

### Auction

West	North	East	South
	1♣	Pass	1♦
Pass	1♠	Pass	4NT
Pass	5♥	Dbl	5♠ <sup>1</sup>
Pass	5NT	Pass	6♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	N	♠ AJ65 ♥ KJ6 ♦ 9 ♣ AJ864		
<b>Vul</b>	N/S			
W			E	
♠ 102 ♥ 943 ♦ J65432 ♣ 73		♠ 743 ♥ A875 ♦ 87 ♣ Q1095		
	S	♠ KQ98 ♥ Q102 ♦ AKQ10 ♣ K2		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♠ by N	Made 6	N/S +1430	

### Facts

The bid of 5♦ was made out of tempo.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee felt that this was a typical case of "Hesitation Blackwood" and the contract was reverted to 5♠ by North, making six, N/S +680. The Committee felt that the hesitation was apparently brief and there was a certain amount of bridge logic involved in bidding after the Double. In view of this and the relative inexperience of the players involved, no thought was given to a procedural penalty.

### Commentary

**Wolff:** I do not agree with the ruling in toto. N/S +680 is certainly right. However, under the assumption (which I realize is not the case here) that this is an NABC+ event, a penalty is a necessity.

There is, in my opinion, a special responsibility that devolves on anyone who plays a relatively unusual convention. The player and his partner must go above and beyond to thoroughly know this convention and to use it without telltale hesitations.

The concept is an important one which applies not only to the use of unusual conventions, but also to the taking of non-percentage bridge actions. In both cases, the activators must be prepared for the fallout from their actions and must zealously guard against being advantaged.

I would interpret the use of Blackwood with two quick losers in an unbid suit as an unusual convention. Hence the convention must be followed literally. Since it was not, there should be an automatic penalty as a reminder of the pair's responsibilities along with the score adjustment of +680.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Hesitation	<b>Event:</b>	Flight A Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	7
---------------------------	------------	---------------	----------------	--------------	---

### Auction

West	North	East	South
	1♣	1♥	1♠
Pass	3♠	Pass	4♦
Pass	4NT	Pass	5♠
Pass	5NT	Pass	6♣
Pass	6♠ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	6NT
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	N	♠ AJ65 ♥ KJ6 ♦ 9 ♣ AJ864		
<b>Vul</b>	N/S			
W			E	
♠ 102 ♥ 943 ♦ J65432 ♣ 73		♠ 743 ♥ A875 ♦ 87 ♣ Q1095		
	S	♠ KQ98 ♥ Q102 ♦ AKQ10 ♣ K2		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6NT by N	Made 6	N/S +1440	

### Facts

North's bid of 6♠ was made out of tempo.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee allowed the result, 6NT by North, making six, N/S +1440, to stand. The Committee felt that South was eminently justified in bidding 6NT because of North's overly strong bidding. The Committee did not feel that 6NT was suggested by North's hesitation.

### Commentary

**Allison:** How was 6NT made?

**Berkowitz:** 1440! Where are twelve tricks? I would allow the result because East/West had to do something very bad to allow 1440.

**Bethe:** I do not understand this one. What information did South have that (a) North did not have a singleton heart as opposed to the king and (b) that an ace was missing? Personally, I would be tempted to have North/South play 7♠, down one. North after all promised all five keycards with 5NT and looked for a grand and South should be only too happy to cooperate. Of course, looking at North's hand it is obvious that this player is not at that level. The 3♠ bid is questionable and every bid thereafter is impossible. Furthermore, clearly Pass of 6♠ was a logical alternative as was 7♠, and South should not be allowed to choose the winning alternative. The huddle suggested (likely) that North had a positional heart value, e.g. the heart king and was wondering whether to protect it.

**LeBendig:** The slam theme again. I would never have voted to allow 7♠ had it been right. But with the given facts (as well as the obvious inexperience of North/South), I agree with the Committee that the hesitation did not suggest that 6NT

would be the winning call. If twelve tricks are taken, I would think that East/West might deserve their result regardless of how I felt about North/South.

**Rosenberg:** I am suspicious. Normally, 5NT would indicate possession of all the key cards and South would bid 7♠. Maybe North's tempo convinced South something unusual was up and he bid 6NT as a safety bid. If there is no agreement about 5NT, what was North trying to do? I need more information but 7♠, down one, is not an inconceivable ruling. This is Flight A.

**Wolff:** East/West should keep their -1440. It appears there was either a club lead or some ghastly discarding on their part. A club lead is a big play - not a bad play - and a non-percentage play. East/West stood to gain from this gamble, but are not then entitled to additional protection when it does not work. On the other hand, in the case of pure and simple bad defense, the responsibility is to get your own good result through playing substantial (but not necessarily great) bridge. Again, no double shots.

I would give North/South Average Minus. They deserve worse. North's 5NT bid was a pathetic suggestion of 6NT, later confirmed by his slow 6♦. How could the Committee not feel North's hesitation suggested 6NT? Certainly the hesitation suggested there were alternative actions under consideration and 6NT covers all the bases. With a singleton heart in North, there would have been no hesitation and 6NT would not have been "right". Truly a hesitation to success hand!!



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Hesitation	<b>Event:</b>	Life Master Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	8
---------------------------	------------	---------------	-------------------	--------------	---

### Auction

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♦	Pass	1♥
Pass	3♣	Pass	3♦
Pass	3♠	Pass	4NT
Pass	5♦ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	5NT
Pass	6♣	Pass	7♦
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	W	♠ A8 ♥ 8 ♦ AKQJ9 ♣ AQJ105		
<b>Vul</b>	Both			
W			E	
♠ 6543 ♥ J10965 ♦ (void) ♣ 8762		♠ JT7 ♥ Q43 ♦ 10532 ♣ K93		
S		♠ KQ92 ♥ AK72 ♦ 8764 ♣ 4		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
7♦ by N	Made 7	N/S +2140	

### Facts

North hesitated before bidding 5♦. The Director reverted the contract to 6♦ by North, making seven, N/S +1390. North claimed his hesitation was in order to calculate the possibility that partner would pass his 5♦ bid (one or four keycards). 5NT asked for kings. North maintained that South would know that his trumps would be very good when he did not have any other kings and could count thirteen tricks.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee upheld the Director's ruling, 6♦ by North, making seven, N/S +1390. The Committee felt that the confusion of the meaning of 6♣ led to the subsequent 7♦ contract. The Committee felt that South might have been influenced by the slow response of 5♦ to Roman Keycard Blackwood.

**Dissenting Opinion:** Committee member Bruce Rogoff felt that there are often hesitations over RKC 4NT bids, and though he didn't feel that North had anything to think about, he didn't see how South could have been helped. If North had a void, for example, South's hand isn't helped. Or, perhaps North's jump shift was light and he was about to lie by one keycard.

### Commentary

**Allison:** I agree with Rogoff.

**Anderson:** I agree with Rogoff. Maybe 6♣ showed a specific unbid king. The diamonds should be: AKxxx; the clubs, AKQJx.

**Berkowitz:** I do not believe that the huddle led to 7♦. I would allow the result to stand. This is a bad ruling.

**Colker:** I disagree with the Committee's ruling, and agree with Bruce Rogoff who dissented. South can count thirteen tricks: three spades, two hearts, five diamonds, one club, and two club ruffs in dummy (South)! In fact, the only reason to bid 5NT might be to determine if 7NT can make at matchpoints and 5♦ must show four key cards after the 3♣ jump shift. Therefore, 7♦ should stand. The confusion over the meaning of 6♣ is irrelevant since there was no hesitation over 6♣. If the Committee felt the 7♦ bid was based solely on the confusion over 6♣, it (the Committee, except for Bruce) should be given a "frivolous ruling" penalty!

**Kaplan:** I agree with Rogoff.

**LeBendig:** Once more, the slam theme. This pair was fairly inexperienced. Slow answers to Blackwood never seem to be less. They are either voids, or extra values. I feel South knew the void was unlikely. There was disagreement as to what 5NT was. South thought it was specific kings when he made the bid. North obviously thought it was quantitative. I feel there was help and the Committee made the right decision.

**Rosenberg:** Why didn't South ask for the trump queen? I agree with Rogoff that South was not helped by the hesitation and, unless there was some gesture implying a good hand, would allow the table result of N/S +2140 to stand.

**Sutherlin:** I strongly disagree with the decision to roll the contract back to 6♦. Slowness in responding 5♦ to 4NT provided no useful information to South. South took his shot at 7♦, hoping and expecting North to have good diamonds since he had no king.

**Treadwell:** I think the ruling was atrocious. What information did the hesitation transmit? North had the four keycards his bid said he had and which South knew he should have for the 5♦ response. Any conclusion over the meaning of 6♣ is irrelevant since there was no hesitation indicated in the write-up for this call.

**Wolff:** I agree with the ruling. I also agree with Bruce's assessment that RKC often begets hesitations. All doubt should be decided against the hesitators.

.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Hesitation	<b>Event:</b>	Flight B Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	9
---------------------------	------------	---------------	----------------	--------------	---

### Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
Pass	1♥	Pass	1NT <sup>1</sup>
Pass	2♥	Pass	Pass
2♠	Pass <sup>2</sup>	Pass	Dbl
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Forcing
2: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	S	♦ A ♥ KQ7632 ♦ KJ3 ♣ J109		
<b>Vul</b>	E/W			
W			E	
♦ 108743 ♥ AJ10 ♦ A64 ♣ 62		♦ 952 ♥ 85 ♦ Q10752 ♣ AQ3		
	S	♦ KQJ6 ♥ 94 ♦ 98 ♣ K8754		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
2♠X by W	Down 3	N/S +800	

### Facts

North hesitated before passing over 2♠. The Director removed the Double and changed the contract to 2♠ by West, down three, N/S +300. South maintained that he had no reasonable alternative to the Double since he failed to bid 1♠ over 1♥.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee unanimously voted to uphold the Director's ruling, 2♠ by West, down three, N/S +300. The Committee felt that Pass was a logical alternative to Double for South.

### Commentary

**Allison:** The slow pass confirms a full opening bid by North.

**Bethe:** The South hand has all the attributes of a penalty double of 2♠: trumps, outside defense, shortness in opener's suit and an opponent who could not act over 1NT. I do not, in this case, believe that there is a logical alternative to Double and would be prepared to impose it as opposed to Pass or 3♥ if it came to that.

**Kaplan:** I agree that Pass is a logical alternative. Did the tempo suggest the Double?

**LeBendig:** This is another unclear hesitation as to what might be the winning action. But even if we make an assumption, that bidding would be more successful than passing, I don't think there is a logical alternative to Double. Had North passed very quickly or with relief, I would want to force South to Double.

**Rosenberg:** North could have had a light third seat opener. The huddle nullifies this possibility and makes the Double more attractive. I do not believe that South was up to the inference that North did not open a weak 2♥ and, therefore, must have a full opening bid. I agree with the ruling.

**Sutherlin:** I disagree with the Committee. The Double of vulnerable opponents at matchpoint play seems clear-cut.

**Treadwell:** I don't agree at all. Pass at matchpoints is not a logical alternative to Doubling with the South hand. The Committee apparently believed that hesitations barred a partner from any action except Passing.

**Wolff:** I disagree with the ruling. South should be subject to discipline if he didn't Double. In that case, he could be accused of Passing out of fear that his partner, whose hesitation already suggested he would like to bid on, would pull the Double. The N/S +800 should be allowed to stand.

Hesitations that carry information are disruptive to the game. The message must be sent that, with or without score adjustment situations, communicative tempo in NABC+ events is not acceptable. This is a case where a penalty for an informative hesitation might be in order. Bridge would be better off if we discouraged informative hesitations.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Hesitation	<b>Event:</b>	Flight B Swiss Teams	<b>Case:</b>	10
---------------------------	------------	---------------	----------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
1♣ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	1♣ <sup>2</sup>	3♥
4♠	Pass	4NT	Pass
5♦	Pass	5♣ <sup>3</sup>	Pass
6♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, could be short
2: Alerted, could bypass a longer diamond suit
3: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠ 1086		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>	♥ 94		
		♦ 876		
		♣ KQ762		
<b>W</b>			<b>E</b>	
♠ AJ75		♠ K9432		
♥ A63		♥ Q		
♦ A3		♦ KQJ42		
♣ 9843		♣ AJ		
	<b>S</b>	♠ Q		
		♥ KJ108752		
		♦ 1095		
		♣ 105		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♣ by E	Made 7	E/W +1010	

### Facts

East hesitated before bidding 5♣.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee allowed the result, 6♣ by East, making seven, E/W +1010, to stand. The Committee did not feel that a Pass by West was a logical alternative.

### Commentary

**Allison:** What type of Blackwood is this? If 5♦ shows one or three, then the bid is normal. If not, West must pass.

**Berkowitz:** If 5♦ showed three key cards, this ruling is inconceivable.

**Bethe:** Impossible! Surely East could have only one ace for the 4NT bid - or even two and be unable to make slam. Since one would not fault a Pass by West in this auction, one should not allow the 6♣ bid.

**Colker:** I served on this Committee and disagree with the ruling. West's 5♦ was a misbid (showing four key cards, he lied). After West's overbid of 4♠, East could reasonably have bid 4NT with something like: Kxxx Kxx Kxxx Ax or KQxxx Jx KQxx AJ, giving slam no play. Additionally, East's huddle suggested enough key cards to make 5♦ illogical (thus ruling out hands like the examples above) and making 6♣ more appealing. In short, West had every reason to Pass 5♣ having already overbid, and in light of the ethics surrounding East's huddle over 5♣. Thus, the contract should have been ruled back to 5♣, making seven, E/W+510.

**LeBendig:** The slam theme again. There may be a hand that West could continue on. This is not it. Surely his number of aces is known (1430?). The slow 5♣ bid only suggests one thing, and Pass is clearly a logical alternative.

**Rosenberg:** There is not sufficient information. What was 5♦? If it is zero or three key cards is it really safe to bid 6♠? Could not East have: T98xxx K KQJT KQ? In any event, West has a sub-minimum hand for his bidding and I would never let him bid 6♠ after a huddle. This is a horrible ruling and it sends the wrong message.

**Sutherlin:** This is a poor Committee decision. West had already overbid considerably. East knew that West had three aces (presumably they were playing 1430 responses). If they weren't playing 1430, then West bid because he didn't like his hand. He can't change his mind after partner's slow 5♠ bid.

**Wolff:** In an NABC+ event, West would be under serious suspicion. As it is, I have no comment.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Hesitation	<b>Event:</b>	Life Master Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	11
---------------------------	------------	---------------	-------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
	1♦ <sup>1</sup>	1♥	Dbl <sup>2</sup>
Pass	1♠	2♣	Pass
Pass	2♠	3♣	Pass <sup>3</sup>
Pass	Dbl <sup>4</sup>	Pass	3♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, Precision 1♦
2: Alerted, Negative
3: Break in Tempo
4: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	N	♠ A1092 ♥ AQ52 ♦ K106 ♣ 84		
<b>Vul</b>	N/S			
W			E	
♠ 865 ♥ 94 ♦ J7542 ♣ A103		♠ Q4 ♥ KJ1076 ♦ A ♣ KJ975		
	S	♠ KJ73 ♥ 83 ♦ Q983 ♣ Q62		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♠ by N	Down 1	E/W +100	

### Facts

South hesitated before passing over 3♣. North hesitated before the Double of 3♣.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee ruled that the 3♠ bid be cancelled and the contract be changed to 3♣X by East, making three, E/W +470. The Committee unanimously felt that Pass by South was a logical alternative to bidding 3♠.

### Commentary

**Anderson:** Pairs that use the innuendo of hesitations deserve to be -470. Excellent!

**Bethe:** Although I agree with Committee not to allow the pull to 3♠, I am not so clear on the probable result in 3♣X. Assume South leads a spade and the defense plays three rounds. Why would East guess clubs? East would either (a) play a club to the ace, lead the heart nine, ace and a second trump dooms the contract, or (b) play a heart from hand, win the diamond and play another heart, ruff the diamond return and be forced to guess clubs. I am sure that North/South should be -470, I am not sure that East/West should get better than Average Plus or +100. Is E/W+470 a "likely result" within Law 12c2?

**Wolff:** The first and most flagrant culprit is North with his Double of 3♣. This is the call that should be cancelled, leaving the score of East-West at +110 for the field's matchpointing and for the East/West pair. This is the bridge result once the irregularities are removed. There is no reason to give a bonus to East/West and at the same time, penalize others in the E/W field. It feels as if North/South should be given the matchpoints for -470. Certainly an automatic penalty for the disruption to the game caused by their informative hesitations must be assessed.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Hesitation	<b>Event:</b>	Stratified Senior Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	12
---------------------------	------------	---------------	-------------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	1♥	1♠
4♥ <sup>1</sup>	Pass <sup>2</sup>	Pass	4♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: No Skip Bid Warning
2: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		<b>N</b>		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>			
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>			
<b>W</b>				
♠ 9				
♥ J87542				
♦ KJ2				
♣ 987				
			<b>E</b>	
			♠ A103	
			♥ KQ963	
			♦ A43	
			♣ 42	
		<b>S</b>		
			♠ KQ865	
			♥ (void)	
			♦ 985	
			♣ AKQ105	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♠ by S	Made 4	N/S +620	

### Facts

West did not give a skip bid alert before bidding 4♥. East/West claimed that North took thirty seconds, asked for a review, and then Passed. North admitted to possibly hesitating for ten seconds.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee changed the contract to 4♥ by East, down one, N/S +100. The Committee felt there was a sufficient break in tempo to suggest taking action. Bidding 4♠ may have been suggested.

### Commentary

**Anderson:** Yes, there obviously was a hesitation (otherwise 4♠ is suicide).

**Berkowitz:** 4♠ is too dangerous but does the huddle suggest 4♠? It suggests double to me. So, I would allow 4♠ but not allow a double.

**Kaplan:** I would not give East/West a score adjustment after their failure to announce a Skip-Bid.

**Rosenberg:** It seems clear that North indicated he had a desire to bid. Therefore, South is probably forced to Pass. West should be castigated for omitting the skip bid warning. It is really important on this auction. Perhaps East/West should keep their bad result although this seems a little harsh.

**Wolff:** On target, except another penalty for North's disruptive informative hesitation.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Hesitation	<b>Event:</b>	Master Mixed BAM Teams	<b>Case:</b>	13
---------------------------	------------	---------------	------------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
	1♣	Pass	2♣ <sup>1</sup>
2♥	Pass	Pass	3♣
3♠	3NT	4♠	5♣
Pass <sup>2</sup>	Pass	5♣	Pass
Pass	Dbl	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, forcing club raise
2: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ 642 ♥ A82 ♦ A32 ♣ AK63		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>			
W			E	
♠ AK875 ♥ KJ9765 ♦ 87 ♣ (void)		♠ QJ103 ♥ 104 ♦ J10964 ♣ Q8		
	S	♠ 9 ♥ Q3 ♦ KQ5 ♣ J1097542		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♣X by W	Made 5	E/W +650	

### Facts

North/South believed that West had the hand that warranted another bid. They felt that East took the sacrifice with a hand that does not have a great deal of distribution and nothing more than already promised.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee changed the contract to 5♣ by North, making five, N/S +600. The Committee felt that Pass by East was a reasonable alternative to bidding 5♣.

### Commentary

**Allison:** Certainly East cannot be allowed to bid after hesitation. This is a good ruling.

**Anderson:** Right on.

**Berkowitz:** East should be warned.

**Bethe:** In order for information to be conveyed, the tempo must convey something not already known. West had shown a hand with substantial major suit length and some strength; the pass merely allowed partner some say in the final decision. East's hand, good trumps and no minor suit defense, really did not allow Pass as a logical alternative, particularly at the vulnerability.

**LeBendig:** This is a very tough case. I feel I could argue either side persuasively.

**Rosenberg:** East cannot bid 5♣ after the huddle. North misdefended 5♣ but, luckily, this is irrelevant since a bad result is due anyway. This is a good ruling.

**Wolff:** I agree with the ruling of East/West -600 for their teams Board-A-Match comparison. However, North/South's defense was far less than good and they must not be given two opportunities to win or tie this board. Therefore, while always protecting North/South to no worse than -650. I would give North/South the difference between the matchpoint result of N/S +600 and N/S +100.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Hesitation	<b>Event:</b>	Master Mixed BAM Teams	<b>Case:</b>	14
---------------------------	------------	---------------	------------------------	--------------	----

Auction			
West	North	East	South
		Pass	Pass
1♦	Pass	1♠	2♥
2♠	3♥	3♠	Pass
Pass <sup>1</sup>	4♥	4♣	Pass
Pass	Dbl	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

Hand Record			
Board	N		
Dealer	E	♠ 1072 ♥ J1043 ♦ A ♣ AJ862	
Vul	None		
W			E
	♠ K65 ♥ A ♦ KQ653 ♣ Q1097		♠ AQJ94 ♥ Q2 ♦ J984 ♣ 53
		S	
		♠ 83 ♥ K98765 ♦ 1072 ♣ K4	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♠X by E	Made 4	E/W +590	

### Facts

North/South claimed that West hesitated before passing over 3♠. East/West denied any break in tempo. East/West failed to appear before the Committee.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee could not determine if any break in tempo had occurred. They also believed that East would always have bid 4♣ in this competitive auction. The result, 4♠X by East, making four, E/W +590, was allowed to stand.

### Commentary

**Editor's Note:** The original write-up indicated that North/South did not appear before the Committee and this was the information that was provided to the expert panel. However, subsequent information indicates that East/West did not appear.

**Allison:** I think the Committee did what it had to without North/South being present. I wonder about North's Double. Was it an attempt at a two-way shot with a Committee in mind?

**Anderson:** North/South had no case.

**Berkowitz:** I would not allow 4♣. A third hand opener could be a little light but not after the huddle.

**Bethe:** This is a case where the Committee might well have found that the hitch/hesitation did occur because of subsequent actions. If East/West play that a Double of 3♥ would be a game try, then East's actions are inconsistent on their face unless there was subsequent information. A Double of 4♥ would be more consistent, unsuccessful as that is likely to be.

**Colker:** I disagree with the ruling. If East couldn't even make a game try over 3♠, and if North/South were likely to be overbidding at 4♥ (they didn't make any game tries either), why is East suddenly bidding for a minus score rather than defending for a plus especially holding soft (defensive) heart values? Try making 4♣ opposite Kxx Ax KQxx Qxxx! The huddle is the key. West's hand "looks like" a huddle, and East's 4♣ bid looks irrational without West's huddle. On the other hand, North/South didn't show up for the hearing. I might be inclined toward assigning -790 to North-South, but I would definitely give -620 or -650 to East/West!

**Rosenberg:** Since North/South did not appear, the Committee had no choice. However, if it was a question of North/South's word against East/West's, I would assume a break in tempo on a "Rule of Coincidence" basis. However, North's Double might be an unjustified two-way shot. If East doesn't have his bid, the contract will revert to 4♥. If East has his bid, why Double? There needs to be more discussion about when you have a two-way shot and when you don't.

**Wolff:** I agree with the ruling only because North/South didn't appear and there was no proof of a hesitation. In cases of more serious allegations, I would hope the Committee would subpoena the appellants to appear at a later date.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Hesitation	<b>Event:</b>	Master Mixed BAM Teams	<b>Case:</b>	15
---------------------------	------------	---------------	------------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
			1♣
Pass	1♥	Pass	1NT
Pass	Pass <sup>1</sup>	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	S	♠ Q106 ♥ 87653 ♦ KJ6 ♣ 76		
<b>Vul</b>	E/W			
W			E	
♠ A932 ♥ 10 ♦ 8753 ♣ QJ53		♠ KJ8 ♥ AQ42 ♦ 1042 ♣ A109		
	S	♠ 754 ♥ KJ9 ♦ AQ9 ♣ K842		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
1NT by S	Down 1	E/W +50	

### Facts

North hesitated before passing South's 1NT bid. East/West contended this was unethical and a deliberate attempt to prevent them from balancing. East/West did not feel North had any problem considering the poor quality of his five-card heart suit.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee allowed the result, 1NT by South, down one, E/W +50, to stand. The Committee did not feel there was any deliberate attempt by North to discourage East/West from entering the auction.

### Commentary

**Allison:** North could have known that his hesitation could have been damaging to his opponents. I think East/West should have been protected. North's huddle is egregious.

**Anderson:** Maybe a Conduct and Ethics Committee was in order for North/South.

**Colker:** This case can't be decided on paper. The players have to be interviewed. I would be inclined to give North/South either a warning or a small procedural penalty, but East/West get nothing. Even without a huddle, East has little to recommend balancing. He has no four-card suit other than North's and his values are primarily in North/South's suits. By the way, the Committee cannot wait to be convinced of "intent" on North's part before taking some action against North/South! Intent isn't the issue here, effect is!

**Kaplan:** If the ruling was given for the reason described, the legal basis was wrong. The deception need not be a deliberate attempt (see Law 73F2).

**Rosenberg:** The correct ruling depends on the strength of the North player. If he could have known that a huddle might have been beneficial to his side, then North/South should be penalized.

**Treadwell:** I agree with the bridge ruling. If the North player was an experienced player, I would be inclined to give a minimal procedural penalty for the unwarranted hesitation.

**Wolff:** If North did hesitate, he should be given a penalty for a disruptive hesitation and a reprimand. To condone this kind of action, whether or not it is intended to mislead the opponents, sets exactly the wrong example.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Hesitation	<b>Event:</b>	Master Mixed BAM Teams	<b>Case:</b>	16
---------------------------	------------	---------------	------------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♥	5♣	Dbl <sup>1</sup>
Pass	5♦	Pass	5♥
6♣	Dbl	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	W	♠ Q73 ♥ AK754 ♦ AQ83 ♣ 5		
<b>Vul</b>	N/S			
W			E	
♠ J10985 ♥ J32 ♦ J7 ♣ 942		♠ K ♥ 8 ♦ K54 ♣ AKQJ10873		
S		♠ A642 ♥ QJ96 ♦ 10962 ♣ 6		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♣X by E	Down 2	N/S +300	

### Facts

The Director reverted the contract to 5♣X by East, down one, N/S +100, because South made a slow Double of 5♣. North/South maintained that this Double was card showing because they played Precision and North's hand was limited. This made the pull automatic in their view.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee allowed the Director's ruling to stand, 5♣X by East, down one, N/S +100. The Committee felt that Pass was a logical alternative to bidding 5♦. The Committee also discussed assessing a penalty against North/South for bringing an appeal that substantially lacked merit. This was not done but North/South was warned about their competitive double.

### Commentary

**Allison:** If the double was not (and that seems to be the case) alerted, I would not allow North to remove it! They should be chastised (if indeed, it was card showing) for not alerting.

**Berkowitz:** I would not allow North to pull the double.

**Colker:** I would have given North/South the additional "frivolous appeal" penalty. North's pull is an egregious action no matter what North/South's system!

**LeBendig:** It is a shame North/South were not penalized for this appeal. If we cannot stop players from taking advantage of the unauthorized information, surely we can stop them from filing these appeals.

**Rosenberg:** Did the Committee ignore West's 6♣ bid? This strange bid turned a plus into a minus. It seems to be a 100% action for West to bid 6♣ under the current ruling philosophy. If North/South have their bids, then 6♣ is a good save. If

North-South are going down, the Committee will return the contract to 5♣. Something is wrong here. I happen to think that bidding with the North hand is the correct bridge action, but I would need a lot of convincing to let North pull a slow Double.

**Wolff:** I agree with the ruling and the warning to North/South.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	Life Master Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	17
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	-------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
	2♦ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	2NT
3♦	4♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted as Flannery

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>		♠ KJ952 ♥ KQJ1062 ♦ 7 ♣ 3	
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>			
W				E
♠ 73 ♥ 7 ♦ QJ853 ♣ K9742			♠ 1086 ♥ A83 ♦ AK109 ♣ Q65	
		S		
			♠ AQ4 ♥ 954 ♦ 642 ♣ AJ108	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♥ by N	Made 5	N/S +650	

### Facts

The North/South players' convention card was incorrectly marked as Flannery. Their real agreement was that the bid showed both major suits.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee allowed the result, 4♥ by North, making five, N/S +650, to stand. The Committee felt that it was bizarre that East did not move forward. East/West might have been missing a slam if the 2NT bid was tactical. The 4♥ bid should have alerted East to possible extra strength.

### Commentary

**Anderson:** When understandings are not properly explained (full disclosure), a procedural penalty should be assessed in the Life Master Pairs.

**Bethe:** The Committee could well have given North/South a penalty for an incorrectly filled out card and improper explanations. The basic ruling seems right, however: the misinformation did not affect East's calls.

**Colker:** North/South should receive a warning or maybe a small procedural penalty. East/West's appeal borders on "frivolous."

**Kaplan:** Yes, for East/West. But should North/South keep their score?

**LeBendig:** Surely East/West deserve -650. But what of North/South? Could the 4♥ bid have been partially based on misinformation from South? What would it have meant systemically? Maybe this was creativity at work since South was obviously confused.

**Wolff:** Agreed that the score should be North/South +650. Also, North/South should be given a penalty for misdescribing their agreements on the convention card.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	Bracketed BAM Teams	<b>Case:</b>	18
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
	1♠	2NT	Pass
3♦ <sup>1</sup>	3♥/P <sup>2</sup>	3NT	Pass
4♦	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted as Transfer to ♥, after North's second bid
2: Call Withdrawn after explanation of Alert

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ AJ652 ♥ KQ654 ♦ K83 ♣ (void)		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>E/W</b>			
W			E	
♠ 973 ♥ 109 ♦ 109764 ♣ Q62		♠ K1084 ♥ AJ7 ♦ AQ2 ♣ AK3		
	S	♠ Q ♥ 832 ♦ J5 ♣ J1098754		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♦ by W	Down 1	N/S +100	

### Facts

The 3♦ bid was alerted. The bid was explained as a transfer to hearts after North bid 3♥. North was allowed to withdraw the bid and Passed. North/South did not feel East's 3NT bid or later Pass was justified. They believed the result should have been adjusted to 4♥X or 5♦X.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee allowed the East/West score, 4♦ by West, down one, E/W -100, to stand. North/South was awarded Average Plus or their score, whichever was greater. The Committee was unable to determine what the result would have been without the misinformation.

### Commentary

**Allison:** The 3NT bid should not be allowed. East should not be allowed to try to save his side from a bad result when there has been misinformation. I believe East tried to use North's 3♥ bid (to which he was not entitled).

**Berkowitz:** Anyone who served on this Committee should not be allowed on any others!

**Bethe:** It would be useful to distinguish between misinformation-incorrect information received from the opponents- and unauthorized information - additional information received from partner not arising from a hesitation. This decision should have been filed under unauthorized information.

**Kaplan:** East is not entitled to "hear" North's bid. Surely he must correct 4♦ to 4♥.

**LeBendig:** Regardless of the experience level, we must make players aware of what they are not allowed to "know" when there is a problem such as this. East recovered from an accident by using information he was not entitled to. It's true that there is some uncertainty as to what might have occurred. A contract of 4♦ is not one of those possibilities.

**Sutherlin:** Perhaps North/South were entitled to more than average plus. It is impossible to determine what would have happened if North had "passed" and East had bid 3♥.

**Rosenberg:** I am aghast at this scandalous ruling. East is supposed to bend over backwards to be ethical, not do everything possible to give his side the best score. I would force East to play 4♥ (Maybe he bid 2NT natural with long hearts) or at least 3♥. This would give North/South +400 or +500. East/West cannot be allowed to escape unscathed.

**Treadwell:** I agree with the ruling if, in fact, -100 was Average Minus or worse for East/West. This would be consistent with the ruling for North/South.

**Wolff:** I am assuming that North's 3♥ bid was in a slow tempo which allowed for a timely alert. In that case, East/West cannot gain from having information about North's hand which they got directly by failing to properly know and use their own convention. 3NT would have been difficult to arrive at without North's bid. East/West should be given Average Minus or -100 whichever is worse, with North/South's score to be the complement.

In the absence of a happening outside the control of both pairs at the table, no ruling should allow more total matchpoints than top on a board.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	NABC IMP Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	19
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	----------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
		1♠	Pass
2NT <sup>1</sup>	Pass	4♥ <sup>2</sup>	Pass
4♠	Pass	5♦	Pass
5♣	Pass	6♣	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, forcing raise
2: Alerted, five+ hearts

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		<b>N</b>		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠ 65		
		♥ J8762		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>	♦ AQ104		
		♣ J7		
<b>W</b>				<b>E</b>
♠ AJ83		♠ K10974		
♥ Q10		♥ AK943		
♦ J86		♦ K95		
♣ KQ83		♣ (void)		
		<b>S</b>		
		♠ Q2		
		♥ 5		
		♦ 732		
		♣ A1096542		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♣ by E	Made 6	E/W +980	

### Facts

South asked specific questions and determined that East would have shown a void in preference to an outside suit. South indicated that he suspected a void, but was assured that one was not present. South hoped the bad heart break would doom the contract after the Ace of Clubs was cashed. South insisted that he would have led a diamond if given the correct information. This would have defeated the contract.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee determined that no misinformation had been given and the result, 6♣ by East, making six, E/W +980, was allowed to stand.

### Commentary

**Berkowitz:** I believe East/West and I would let the result stand.

**Kaplan:** Why had no misinformation been given?

**Rosenberg:** Why was no misinformation given? Presumably, because East broke his partnership agreement when he bid 4♥. But, I would need a lot of convincing that this was indeed a firm agreement. I would need written proof, and even then I would have to know it is something East was not likely to forget. It is too convenient to be able to forget your system in situations which cannot hurt you but can hurt your opponents. The ruling probably should have been 6♣, down one, then West would be more careful of his explanations next time.

**Sutherlin:** This is probably the correct ruling. You'd have to have been at the table to assess questions and responses.

**Wolff:** I would be interested in knowing the specific questions asked by South, the answers given by West, East's reasons for the bid, and what evidence there was of East/West's agreements. As it is presented, I agree with the ruling.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	Master Mixed BAM Teams	<b>Case:</b>	20
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	------------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1♦	Dbl	2♦ <sup>1</sup>	Pass
3♦	Dbl	Pass	3♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, forcing raise

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	S	♠ AK76 ♥ K1064 ♦ A8 ♣ KQ2		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>			
W			E	
♠ Q8 ♥ AQ87 ♦ J1053 ♣ A104		♠ 9532 ♥ 92 ♦ K97 ♣ J753		
	S	♠ J104 ♥ J53 ♦ Q642 ♣ 986		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♥ by S	Down 1	E/W +50	

### Facts

South contended that the suggestion of values in East's hand indicated that North's hand would be more distributional. South would have passed if given the correct information.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee reverted the contract to 3♦X by West, down three, N/S +500. The Committee felt that East's hand suggests that East/West did not play inverted minor suit raises over a double. Therefore, misinformation was given and North/South was damaged.

### Commentary

**LeBendig:** I agree that there was misinformation here. I do not feel there was a direct path that could be drawn from the bad result back to the misinformation. Again, the experience level here would be crucial in my feelings and this was a national event.

**Wolff:** I agree with North/South +500. NABC+ players should be in accord as to when and how their conventions apply in all easily anticipated auctions. Conventional misunderstanding are disruptive, and those caused by a lackadaisical attitude are unacceptable

A pair that cannot demonstrate a prior agreement as to a specific application of a convention (e.g. the meaning of 2♦ over a double of partner's 1NT when playing transfers) should be considered to have given misinformation. Adjustment situations will be ruled accordingly. Penalties for disrupting the game should also be given.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	Flight A Barometer Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	21
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
Pass	1NT	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention


### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		<b>N</b>		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠ J6 ♥ Q852 ♦ AJ93 ♣ AKQ		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>			
<b>W</b>			<b>E</b>	
♠ K42 ♥ K1096 ♦ Q87 ♣ 1087		♠ A10953 ♥ A74 ♦ 5 ♣ J632		
	<b>S</b>	♠ Q87 ♥ J3 ♦ K10642 ♣ 954		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
1NT by N	Down 1	E/W +100	♠3

### Facts

The lead conventions described by the partner of the opening leader were not consistent with their convention cards and partnership agreements. Declarer subsequently took the incorrect line of play. The opening lead was the three of spades. East's convention card was marked attitude. West's card was not completed under leads. West told declarer that the lead was a standard fourth best.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee unanimously allowed the result, 1NT by North, down one, E/W +100, to stand. The Committee assumed a three matchpoint penalty to East/West for an improper designation on their convention card and their failure to have an agreement on leads.

### Commentary

**Allison:** I would be inclined to allow North to make +150. Had he had the correct information, he might have worked out the diamond suit.

**Berkowitz:** I don't subscribe to giving out random matchpoint penalties.

**Kaplan:** Players are not required to have agreements on leads.

**LeBendig:** Our guidelines (as expressed in the Active Ethics Manual) require that players have agreements on situations they might normally expect to run into. Opening leads might be considered something that would be encountered. Besides, not having an agreement is different from expressing the existence of an agreement that does not exist.

**Rosenberg:** Declarer lost his chance to guess diamonds because of West's improper explanation. Even though I believe it is correct to go wrong, I would allow North to score +150. This may seem harsh, but eventually people will understand to explain their agreements, not what they think a bid or card should mean (in their opinion).

**Sutherlin:** This is the correct ruling. The misinformation supplied to North had little to no affect on the play of the hand. If it had, North/South would have been entitled to some adjustment.

**Wolff:** Here, I sympathize with North and I would award average or -100 whichever was better (but never better than +150 of course). North was deprived of several bridge inferences that might have led to the "right" play in the diamond suit. The matchpointing score is -100. The penalty against East/West is automatic, and must be of a magnitude to guarantee that the total number of matchpoints given to these two pairs is no more than top on a board.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	NABC IMP Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	22
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	----------------	--------------	----

Auction			
West	North	East	South
	1NT	Dbl <sup>1</sup>	2NT
3♦	Pass	Pass	3♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: No Alert

Hand Record			
Board	N		
Dealer	N	♦ Q73 ♥ AK6 ♦ AK73 ♣ 953	
Vul	None		
W			E
♠ 98		♠ AJ1062	
♥ 1084		♥ 973	
♦ QJ10854		♦ 962	
♣ Q8		♣ 64	
	S	♠ K54 ♥ QJ52 ♦ (void) ♣ AKJ1072	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♥ by S	Made 6	N/S +230	

### Facts

East's Double was not alerted. It was intended to show a single-suited hand.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee could not find a direct line from the failure to alert (or misinformation). South knew by looking at his hand what had happened but did not do enough to advance the cause of his partnership. For instance, he could have bid 4♦ over 3♦. The Committee allowed the result, 3♥ by South, making six, N/S +230, to stand.

### Commentary

**Bethe:** I believe it should be the norm to assess a penalty for failure to alert or for improper explanations when the score is not changed.

**Kaplan:** Yes, for North/South, but I would not leave East/West unpunished.

**LeBendig:** It would be nice if we could find a uniform procedural fashion to deal with players that forget normal, simple situations.

**Wolff:** I agree with North/South +230. I would give a penalty to East/West for disrupting the game because of not knowing their conventions.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	Flight A Swiss Teams	<b>Case:</b>	23
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	----------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
1♣	Pass	1♣	2♥
Pass	Pass	3♣ <sup>1</sup>	Pass
3♠	Pass	4♣	Pass
4♣	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Skip Bid Announced

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		<b>N</b>		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠ 10985 ♥ J9 ♦ KJ53 ♣ Q32		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>			
<b>W</b>			<b>E</b>	
♠ KQ4 ♥ A107 ♦ 1082 ♣ K987		♠ J762 ♥ K ♦ A76 ♣ AJ1065		
	<b>S</b>	♠ A3 ♥ Q865432 ♦ Q94 ♣ 4		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♣ by E	Made 5	E/W +650	

### Facts

East made a skip bid announcement before bidding 3♣. North/South felt that this conveyed unauthorized information to West.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee reverted the contract to 3♣ by West, making four, E/W +130. The Committee felt that unauthorized information might have been available to West.

### Commentary

**Anderson:** West was lucky to get away without censure (or hanging).

**Bethe:** It would be useful to distinguish between misinformation-incorrect information received from the opponents- and unauthorized information-additional information received from partner not arising from a hesitation. This decision should be filed under unauthorized information.

**Wolff:** I agree and I would be very disappointed if East didn't also.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	Stratified Open Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	24
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	-----------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
Pass	1♠	Dbl	2♣ <sup>1</sup>
Pass	2♠ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	Pass
Dbl	Pass	3♦	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, Reverse Drury
2: Less than Opening Bid

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	S	♠ A8653 ♥ Q107 ♦ 7 ♣ KJ83		
<b>Vul</b>	Both			
W			E	
♠ Q942 ♥ K93 ♦ Q86 ♣ 754		♠ 107 ♥ A42 ♦ AJ1052 ♣ A109		
	S	♠ KJ ♥ J865 ♦ K943 ♣ Q62		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♦ by E	Down 2	N/S +200	

### Facts

The North/South convention cards were marked Reverse Drury. The bid was alerted and explained after the auction that 2♣ did not promise any spades.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee allowed the result to stand by four to one vote. The Committee felt that the lack of expertise of the North/South pair was the problem, not the bad explanations or any other impropriety.

### Commentary

**Rosenberg:** West had no reason to bid. East/West deserve their bad score. However, if North/South want to play conventions such as Reverse Drury, they must understand what they mean and a procedural penalty would not be inappropriate.

**Sutherlin:** This is a questionable decision. North/South were not playing what their convention card stated. This may have had a direct effect on the East/West bidding resulting in their -200.

**Wolff:** Once again, in an NABC+ event, reasoning as to lack of expertise would not apply. If East/West were disadvantaged by the mismarked convention card and by the incomplete explanation of North/South's convention, then it seems unreasonable that they would not be given redress simply because the opponents were inexperienced and or sincere. We should encourage players from the beginning to learn and understand their conventions before putting them on the card. If nothing more, a warning is in order to North/South about their responsibility to know their conventions.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	Stratified Open Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	25
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	-----------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
			1♥
Pass	1NT <sup>1</sup>	2♦	2♠
Pass	2NT <sup>2</sup>	Pass	3♦
Pass	3♠	Pass	4♥
Pass	4♣	Dbl	5♥
Pass	Pass	Dbl	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, forcing
2: Explained as natural

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		<b>N</b>		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>S</b>	♠ J7654 ♥ 1052 ♦ J4 ♣ Q52		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>			
W			E	
♠ 10983 ♥ 97 ♦ 7652 ♣ 1086		♠ Q ♥ Q ♦ AKQ1083 ♣ AJ743		
	<b>S</b>	♠ AK2 ♥ AKJ8643 ♦ 9 ♣ K9		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♥X by S	Made 5	N/S +850	

### Facts

North's 2NT bid was explained as natural.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee unanimously felt that the failure to 2NT did not materially affect East's actions. The Committee decided that no penalty should be given North/South. They had a misunderstanding that forced them to play a five level contract.

### Commentary

**Wolff:** I agree with the ruling. If in fact, North's bidding was tactical rather than a misunderstanding, East's appeal is substantially without merit.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	Spingold Knockout Teams	<b>Case:</b>	26
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	-------------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
1♦	1NT	Dbl	2♣
Pass	2♠	3♦	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, Stayman

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		<b>N</b>		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠ A543 ♥ A6 ♦ QJ7 ♣ A752		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>			
<b>W</b>			<b>E</b>	
♠ KQJ8 ♥ KQ98 ♦ 1054 ♣ Q3		♠ 72 ♥ J1074 ♦ AK962 ♣ KJ		
		<b>S</b>		
		♠ 1098 ♥ 532 ♦ 83 ♣ 109864		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♦ by W	Made 4	E/W +130	

### Facts

South's 2♣ bid was alerted as Stayman. East/West alleged this misinformation prevented them from getting to their heart game.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee changed the contract to 4♥, making four, E/W +620. The Committee found that North/South did not have an understanding that 2♣ was Stayman in the auction. Therefore, North's explanation constituted misinformation and the East/West pair was damaged.

### Commentary

**Allison:** The misinformation deprived East/West of any opportunity to reach 4♥. I'm not sure I'd award them +620, but I have no serious reservations about the decision.

**Anderson:** The ruling should have read: "May have been damaged".

**Berkowitz:** I would allow the result to stand. I see no direct or indirect path to 4♥ for East/West.

**Kaplan:** If East/West (my teammates, by the way) want to score +620, let them bid 4♥ at the table. I'd have given a split score: =620 (a push) and +130 (10 IMP loss), plus five IMPs to the North/South team.

**Rosenberg:** This is a very harsh penalty. I doubt if East/West would get to 4♥ anyway. But this is a judgment call, not an educational case.

**Sutherlin:** The improper alert may have affected the East/West result. Therefore, East/West were entitled to the benefit of the doubt, 4♥ for +620.

**Wolff:** I disagree; too much was given to East/West. North/South's misunderstanding is penalizable as usual under their responsibility to know their conventions. However, the auction stands. East/West will gain much more often than lose in such situations. Here, it is difficult to see how East/West would have arrived at game in hearts (a poor contract) if they had been told that 2♣ was natural and then heard North bid 2♦. That is, it is not clear to me that the "damage" to East/West was caused by the misalert and not by the North/South auction generated by the misunderstanding.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	Life Master Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	27
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	-------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
		Pass	1♣ <sup>1</sup>
1♥	Pass	2♠	3♦
Pass	3♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, both minors

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	E	♠ J65 ♥ Q10542 ♦ 95 ♣ KJ2		
<b>Vul</b>	N/S			
W			E	
♠ AK ♥ A9763 ♦ J763 ♣ 73		♠ 109832 ♥ 8 ♦ 84 ♣ Q10985		
	S	♠ Q74 ♥ KJ ♦ AKQ102 ♣ A64		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♥ by N	Down 1	E/W +100	

### Facts

South's 1♣ opening bid was alerted as showing both minor suits. East/West considered this psyching an artificial bid. They also felt that they had been given misinformation and believed that the Rule of Coincidence might apply to this situation or North-South may deserve a procedural penalty.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee unanimously found that the East-West players had been given the correct information regarding North/South's partnership agreements. The Committee felt that South misbid and did not psyche according to Law 75B. The result, 3♥ by North, down one, E/W +100, was allowed to stand.

### Commentary

**Anderson:** OK. North/South need to get it together when using this type of system.

**Wolff:** Perhaps the right ruling according to the Law. But how/why did North bid 3♥ and how/why did South Pass? The Rule of Coincidence might apply. I would like to hear North/South's explanations of their calls.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	Life Master Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	28
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	-------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1♦	Pass	2♣	Pass
2♦	Pass	2♥	Pass
2♠	Pass	2NT	Pass
3♦	Pass	3♥	Pass
3♠	Dbl	Rdbl	Pass
3NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention


### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	S	♠ A9752 ♥ 62 ♦ 5 ♣ 87542		
<b>Vul</b>	E/W			
W			E	
♠ QJ4 ♥ 83 ♦ AKQ8732 ♣ J		♠ K3 ♥ AQ10754 ♦ 10 ♣ AQ63		
	S	♠ 1086 ♥ KJ9 ♦ J964 ♣ K109		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by E	Made 5	E/W +660	

### Facts

When asked about Declarer's hand, West indicated Declarer might have a long suit but was probably flat. He indicated that Declarer could not have a good six-card suit.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee was unanimous in finding that North/South had not been injured by West's explanation and the result, 3NT by East, making five, E/W +660, was allowed to stand.

### Commentary

**Allison:** We aren't given enough information here. What are East/West playing? This is one of a number of hands where we lack enough information to determine how well the Committee did.

**Berkowitz:** How did 3NT make five? I would allow North/South to keep their poor result.

**Bethe:** All of the calls starting with 2♣ were alerted (I should know I was West) as part of a relay auction. The West hand showed a one suiter (two spades) of seven cards (three diamonds) and short clubs (three spades). I said that East was very unlikely to have a good six-card suit in a one-suited hand.

**Rosenberg:** I need more information about the play. East/West should be penalized if at all possible since the explanation by West is probably false and contains misinformation.

**Sutherlin:** When North decided to Double because he didn't like the sound of the auction, he was rolling the dice. They came up "snake-eyes" for him.

**Wolff:** I agree with East-West +660. However, East/West must clean up their act. They are playing an unusual system, and must know their methods and cannot gain from their own misunderstandings.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	Stratified Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	29
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
			2♦ <sup>1</sup>
2♠	Dbl <sup>2</sup>	Rdbl <sup>3</sup>	Pass
2NT	Pass	3♦	Dbl
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, Mini-Roman
2: Alerted, values (N/S play negative free bids)
3: Alerted, forcing (if Double by North was not penalty)

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		<b>N</b>		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>S</b>	♠ KJ743 ♥ Q96 ♦ 84 ♣ 763		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>			
<b>W</b>			<b>E</b>	
♠ AQ986 ♥ A75 ♦ 932 ♣ 105		♠ 102 ♥ 1083 ♦ AQJ6 ♣ K942		
	<b>S</b>	♠ 5 ♥ KJ42 ♦ K1075 ♣ AQJ8		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♦X by E	Down 4	N/S +1100	

### Facts

East bid over the “alleged negative double” acting as if the Double was for penalties. Bidding from this point was normal. North sent South away from the table after the auction to explain his Double was for penalty not as explained.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee unanimously allowed the result, 3♦X by East, down 4, N/S +1100, to stand. North/South was assessed a three matchpoint penalty for not having an agreement in a situation they should have discussed.

### Commentary

**Wolff:** This is a confusing set of facts. It is difficult to understand how East-West would be playing the method described in auction explanation “(3)”. “Facts” seem to say East disregarded explanation “(2)” in making his call, and that this generated an East/West misunderstanding. I pass on this ruling except to agree wholeheartedly with the penalty to North/South for convention confusion.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	Bracketed Knockout Teams	<b>Case:</b>	30
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
		Pass	Pass
4♣ <sup>1</sup>	4♦	4♥	6♦
Pass	Pass	Dbl	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, NAMYATS - Hearts

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		<b>N</b>		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠ K8 ♥ K6 ♦ KQ98732 ♣ A6		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>			
<b>W</b>				<b>E</b>
♠ 104 ♥ AJ102 ♦ (void) ♣ KQJ10984			♠ J973 ♥ 963 ♦ A6 ♣ 7532	
		<b>S</b>		
		♠ AQ652 ♥ Q874 ♦ J1054 ♣ (void)		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♦X by S	Down 1	E/W +100	

### Facts

The East/West agreement was that the bid of 4♣ was Namyats. West contended that he could make an error with a bid without necessarily incurring a penalty.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee felt that the Alert gave unauthorized information to West that he had forgotten their agreements. The Committee felt that a significant number of this player's peers (1000 to 1500 masterpoints) would have seriously considered bidding 6♥ had they not heard the alert. Therefore, 6♥ becomes a logical alternative and the bid was imposed on West. This certainly would have been doubled. The Committee felt that East/West would probably win five tricks. The score was adjusted to 6♦X by East, down five, N/S +1700.

### Commentary

**Anderson:** 6♥ was a stand-out bid when four clubs is natural (albeit, insane). A very good decision.

**Colker:** East's failure to open 2♥, 3♥ or 4♥ in first seat at favorable vulnerability must mean something. (E.g., bad hearts, defense outside hearts, a two-suiter, a psych with a club fit...something). Thus, a 6♥ bid by West is a dubious save. He has the ♥A, the club suit wrapped up, and diamonds aren't splitting well. I think forcing West to bid 6♥ and go for -1700 was too extreme. I would have recommended Average Plus (plus three IMPs) to North/South and Average Minus (minus three IMPs) to East/West, but this is a tough call.

**Rosenberg:** West's failure to bid 6♥ was scandalous at both turns. West should have been reprimanded. A good ruling.

**Treadwell:** I think we should prohibit a player from using Namyats for at least two years after he has forgotten he is playing it. The same goes for his partner if it is misalerted. (This is facetious, of course).

**Wolff:** The ruling of North/South +1700 is appropriate with an admonition to West that, "Yes, you can make an error with a bid without necessarily incurring a penalty, but not when you subsequently take illegal advantage of your opponents". Note that no penalty as such has been given here. We have only instated a legitimate bridge result on this board. It's just that -1700 feels so bad. Penalties breed improvement.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	Master Mixed BAM Teams	<b>Case:</b>	31
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	------------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
Pass	1♣	2♦ <sup>1</sup>	Dbl
Rdbl	Pass	2♥	Pass
Pass	3♣	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, 11-15 HCP, 4-4-4-1 distribution, singleton ♦

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		<b>N</b>		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>S</b>	♠ AJ4 ♥ A93 ♦ 2 ♣ AQ9642		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>			
<b>W</b>				<b>E</b>
♠ 1052 ♥ Q75 ♦ A653 ♣ 1075			♠ Q6 ♥ KJ10 ♦ QJ10987 ♣ 83	
	<b>S</b>	♠ K9873 ♥ 8642 ♦ K4 ♣ KJ		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♣ by N	Made 5	N/S +150	

### Facts

The 2♦ bid was Alerted as showing eleven to fifteen high card points with a singleton diamond.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee felt that East had clearly violated the Alert procedure and West may have given misinformation about their methods. The most favorable likely result for North/South would occur if East was not allowed to bid two hearts (Law 12c2) and North/South reached 4♣, making six. The result was changed to N/S +680.

### Commentary

**Anderson:** Thoughtfully correct.

**Bethe:** This hand contains two issues: the misinformation as to what 2♦ meant and the unauthorized information of the Alert to East. Having said that, South's calls were inconsistent with the explanations available - If East is 4-4-4-1 short in diamonds, clearly South should Double 2♥ and lead a trump; the opponents have no high cards and no fit. East/West would have no reason to run and would wind up taking four tricks. Thus the damage to North/South was subsequent to but not consequent from the misinformation. As far as East's actions, it strikes me that the removal to 2♥ was an attempt not to hear the unauthorized SOS. So, I think the Committee was wrong: North/South should keep their result and East/West get a procedural penalty.

**LeBendig:** +680 seems to be a very friendly interpretation of "the most favorable result that was "likely" (12C2). If placed in a screen situation, I cannot fathom any rationale for the 2♥ bid. There are many issues to resolve here. I would expect this decision to take quite a while.

**Rosenberg:** I don't see how North-South could reasonably make +680, so I would give +650. Otherwise, this is a good ruling.

**Wolff:** I agree with this ruling. This appears to be a situation where West did not hear the opening bid. If so, I am disappointed that North/South did not clear this up before proceeding to create a ruling situation.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	Red Ribbon Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	32
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
	1NT	Dbl <sup>1</sup>	2♦ <sup>2</sup>
4♥	Dbl	Pass	Pass
Rdbl	Pass	5♦	Dbl
5♥	Dbl	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, Four card Major with longer minor suit
2: No Alert

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	N	♠ 642 ♥ A82 ♦ A32 ♣ AK63		
<b>Vul</b>	N/S			
W			E	
♠ AK875 ♥ KJ9765 ♦ 87 ♣ (void)		♠ QJ103 ♥ 104 ♦ J10964 ♣ Q8		
	S	♠ 9 ♥ Q3 ♦ KQ5 ♣ J1097542		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♥X by W	Down 1	N/S +100	

### Facts

South's 2♦ bid was not alerted. The North/South convention cards showed that 2♦ was a transfer to clubs. Nothing on the card indicated that this was off over a Double, especially a conventional Double. North explained South's bid as natural.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee unanimously agreed to let the result, 5♥X by West, down one, N/S +100, stand. The Committee assessed a quarter of a board penalty against North/South for not knowing what they were playing and giving misinformation to the opponents.

### Commentary

**Allison:** This is a very harsh penalty in the Red Ribbon Pairs. It was the correct ruling; there is no line between the misinformation and damage.

**Berkowitz:** I would not assess the quarter board penalty.

**Bethe:** We should have a blanket rule in the absence of clearly contrary information: the opponents were misinformed. In this case, this would lead us to conclude that South was right as to their agreements and North gave misinformation that CLEARLY affected West's subsequent actions. So Eas-/West should have been protected, probably to average plus, possibly to +880.

**Kaplan:** Penalty for misinformation, yes, but not for ignorance.

**LeBendig:** A discussion as to their responsibilities seems more appropriate than a procedural penalty for this level of bridge. East/West clearly earned their result.

**Sutherlin:** East/West were playing a convention that created uncertainty in the auction. In the absence of an agreement as to what they were doing, North should have said: "We have not discussed what we are doing versus this convention and we have no agreement regarding the 2♦ bid". East's light entry into the auction was primarily to create confusion. This time he and his partner got the worst of it.

**Rosenberg:** North should state that there is no agreement over the Double. I don't think the penalty is fair for not knowing in the Red Ribbon Pairs. East/West were headed for a top until West Redoubled and East pulled. Why didn't East pull to 4♦? North/South were fully punished by the hand, only East/West's unusual actions let them escape.

**Treadwell:** I don't agree. East/West probably were damaged by the misinformation and should have been given Average Plus just as much as North/South were properly penalized for giving false information.

**Wolff:** I agree with the matchpointing result of North/South +100 since that is the most likely result. Given that North/South are stuck with their misunderstanding, look at what might have happened if West had the right information. West may bid 4♥ for East to choose the major and he would not have Redoubled. Why should North/South, the culprits, be allowed +100? Perhaps the penalty was an adjustment for this reason.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	Life Master Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	33
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	-------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	3NT <sup>1</sup>
Pass	4♣	Pass	4NT
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, Gambling 3NT

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	N	♠ K1052 ♥ 752 ♦ KJ432 ♣ 3		
<b>Vul</b>	E/W			
W			E	
♠ A96 ♥ Q83 ♦ A108 ♣ 8762		♠ J853 ♥ J1094 ♦ Q65 ♣ 105		
	S	♠ Q7 ♥ AK6 ♦ 97 ♣ AKQJ94		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4NT by S	Made 5	N/S +460	

### Facts

South's 3NT bid was alerted as gambling. East asked several questions about the 3NT bid before passing 4♣. South claimed that he had psyched the 3NT bid and decided that 4♣ would not be worth many matchpoints.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee unanimously decided to let the result, 4NT by South, making five, N/S +460, stand. The Committee felt that whatever the 3NT bid showed, 4♣ was forcing so South had to bid again.

### Commentary

**Allison:** 4♣ is not forcing. Nonetheless, I think South, who knew his convention, may bid 4NT at his own risk.

**Anderson:** OK. But, why would 4♣ be forcing?

**Bethe:** The Committee's reasoning is flawed but the result is right. On the evidence, there was no infraction, so how could the score be adjusted? Perhaps North hesitated before removing 3NT? And why, pray tell, was East asking questions in the middle of auction? On that hand!

**LeBendig:** You are always expected to finish bidding the hand you started to bid regardless of any extraneous information from partner. If you opened 3NT behind a screen feeling it was ACOLish, wouldn't you pass 4♣? Surely partner had a good reason for suggesting 3NT was a bad contract. It does feel like 4♣ should be the proper contract.

**Rosenberg:** This Committee is completely crazy. Over a gambling 3NT, 4♣ is a weak runout (pass or correct) and is not forcing. If North/South do not agree as to what hands can open 3NT in third seat, South cannot bid 4NT because of information from North's explanation, that North thinks South must have a weak hand. I would rule that North-South play 4♣, down one, E/W +50.

**Wolff:** I agree with North-South +460, but disagree with the Committee's reasoning. Without further evidence from North/South's testimony, I think 4♣ was known by both parties to be a runout. South elected to make a weak gambling 3NT call in third chair, then had to try to recover. The Alert is unlikely to have given him any information he didn't already have, so the result should stand as ruled.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Hesitation	<b>Event:</b>	IMP Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	34
---------------------------	------------	---------------	-----------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
	1NT	Pass	2♦ <sup>1</sup>
Pass	3♣	Pass	3♥
Pass	3NT	Pass	4♣
Pass	5♣ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	6♣
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, transfer to clubs
2: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>		♠ Q73 ♥ AK6 ♦ AK73 ♣ 953	
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>			
W				E
♠ 98 ♥ 1084 ♦ QJ10854 ♣ Q8			♠ AJ1062 ♥ 973 ♦ 962 ♣ 64	
	S		♠ K54 ♥ QJ52 ♦ (void) ♣ AKJ1072	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♣ by N	Made 6	N/S +920	

### Facts

3♥ was explained as control showing. 4♣ was explained as reaffirming slam interest. 5♣ was explained as showing three-card support. The 5♣ bid was made out of tempo

### Committee Ruling

The Committee allowed the result, 6♣ by North, made six, N/S +920, to stand. The Committee felt the bid of 6♣ was automatic and South was not influenced by North's explanations or tempo.

### Commentary

**Allison:** In light of North's never cuebidding, 6♣ is not ok.

**Berkowitz:** 6♣ after a huddle is automatic, not without it. I would change the result to +420.

**Bethe:** The Committee clearly ruled correctly: North's 5♣ bid cannot be from an inability to cue bid, so must be from an excess of cue-biddable values. With a truly control poor hand, North would sign off in 4NT.

**Rosenberg:** The Committee is wrong. Far from being automatic, South's 6♣ bid is a stab in the dark. North could easily lose both major suit aces and or the club queen. 5♣ did not show three-card support. North's failure to cuebid (except through his tempo!) with his suitable hand should have resulted in missing slam. Maybe North could not bid 4NT because he feared the spade suit.

**Wolff:** I agree with N/S +920 as the matchpointed score. The result is the most likely bridge result in the absence of irregularities.

North's tempo break could be based on many choices. Its message is not clear. The thinking would be different if the Alert of 3♥ as control showing were incorrect, or if the Alert said a heart control was shown. Now, South would have used this unauthorized information in making decisions later in the auction.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	Red Ribbon Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	35
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	------------------	--------------	----

Auction			
West	North	East	South
			Pass
Pass	3♣	3♦	3♠
Dbl <sup>1</sup>	Pass	Pass	3NT
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: No Alert, Rosenkranz
Double

Hand Record			
Board	N		
Dealer	S	♠ AJ4 ♥ A93 ♦ 2 ♣ AQ9642	
Vul	None		
W			E
♠ 1052 ♥ Q75 ♦ A653 ♣ 1075		♠ Q6 ♥ KJ10 ♦ QJ10987 ♣ 83	
	S	♠ K9873 ♥ 8642 ♦ K4 ♣ KJ	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by S	Down 1	E/W +50	

### Facts

East/West was playing the Double of 3♠ as a Rosenkranz Double, showing the Ace or King of Diamonds. This was not alerted. During the play of the hand. South finessed West for the ♠Q based on the Double.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee adjusted the result to 3NT by South, making five, N/S +460. The Committee felt that if Declarer had received the proper information he would have played the Ace and King of Spades. This drops the doubleton Queen of Spades and South would probably score eleven tricks.

### Commentary

**Colker:** If South knew that the Double was Rosenkranz, he might have passed 3♦X for a better score than +460. In fact, 3NT should make six, for +490, if the tricks are cashed in a reasonable order. I can't figure out how (or why) the Committee arrived at the score +460 (making five????). I think the score should be either +630 (three spades doubled, making six) or +580 (the average of three spades doubled making five and making six).

**Kaplan:** I don't understand the ruling. Why would Declarer have guessed spades?

**LeBendig:** Might the feeling have been that spades would have been guessed after clubs? I hope this was not the same liberal interpretation of 12C2 as in Number Thirty-One.

**Wolff:** I would give North/South +520 if West led a low diamond and +490 otherwise. Every close judgment ruling situation will be decided against the "Culprits" who will never gain.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Undisclosed Agreement	<b>Event:</b>	Life Master Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	36
---------------------------	-----------------------	---------------	-------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
			1♣
1♦	1♥	3♦ <sup>1</sup>	Pass
Pass	Dbl	Pass	3♥
Pass	4♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, Preemptive ♦ raise

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	S	♠ AK4 ♥ AKQ54 ♦ 865 ♣ 98		
<b>Vul</b>	None			
W			E	
♠ J108 ♥ J876 ♦ AQJ42 ♣ 10		♠ Q7652 ♥ 2 ♦ K973 ♣ Q75		
	S	♠ 93 ♥ 1093 ♦ 10 ♣ AKJ6432		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♥ by N	Made 4	N/S +420	

### Facts

East/West felt that this hand fell into the Rule of Coincidence. South made a light bid (the North/South convention cards did not indicate unusual methods) and North with his good hand and the knowledge that South probably held a singleton diamond did not investigate slam but merely bid 4♥ ending the auction.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee decided that, although it is very close, the case did not quite satisfy the philosophy behind the Rule of Coincidence. The result, 4♥ by North, making four, N/S +420 was allowed to stand. The Committee was divided four to one on this issue.

**Dissenting Opinion:** Committee member John Blubaugh disagreed with the ruling. It took his Committee almost an hour to decide if the Rule of Coincidence could be applied to this case. After deciding that the Rule of Coincidence could apply, the Committee became mired in determining what would have happened if North had cuebid 3♠ after South's 3♥ bid. Some Committee members did not feel that this would have propelled the auction beyond 4♥.

"I believe this was immaterial. When the cuebid was not made, the auction was ended. The contract that might have resulted from a 3♠ cuebid cannot be determined. The Rule of Coincidence is vague. The burden of proof was on North/South to explain why their bids were normal and within their system. North did not convince me that his bid of 4♥ was normal."

### Commentary

**Allison:** I think John made a good case. I think the Committee was not out of line.

**Anderson:** Let's drive this hand to 6♣, making six. John Blubaugh understood that it is easy to be at the five level if South has opening bid values. Is North really a Life Master?

**Bethe:** I agree with John that North's failure to take some slam going action is unusual and the coincidence with South's very light opening is remarkable. North could well have been wrong not to take stronger action; hearts could have broken, South could have had the ♦J instead of the ♦109. I think that the fact that 4♦ is the limit of the hand is also coincidence, and the North/South bidding would likely have ended there in any case.

**Colker:** I chaired this Committee and agree with ruling 100%! The Rule of Coincidence was designed to combat undisclosed partnership understandings, not to punish normal expert bidding practices (i.e., open aggressively, be conservative in competition) or "razor's edge" decisions in competition. North/South were an occasional expert partnership who play together maybe once a year. They had no understandings regarding the auction, and North admitted that his failure to cuebid 3♣ was, in retrospect, perhaps an oversight. However, North knew that South held three-card heart support and a stiff diamond, yet failed to bid 3♦ over 3♦. Thus, he couldn't have a very good hand. In addition, suits were unlikely to be breaking well. Given this, cuebidding might get the partnership to an unmakeable (on the lie of the cards) slam. Note: While 6♦ is a terrible contract, 6♣ makes on the simple club finesse.

**Kaplan:** The whole notion of a "Rule of Coincidence" is in error. In Law, there is no such Rule, indeed, such a Rule conflicts with the Laws.

**LeBendig:** The rule of coincidence, as defined in the Active Ethics Manual, is a proposed method for judging certain situations that make very little if any sense by our collective bidding judgment standards. It is meant to specifically cover situations when an over bid is combined with an under bid to produce a normal result. 1NT (15-17 HCP) with a fourteen count and the responding hand invites with eleven. Years ago, the original Ethical Oversight Committee suggested that when a Committee felt that a player knew "something" that led to a truly incredible result, they might be judged by using Law 16A. This was first used in a rather well known case at the Baltimore NABC. I feel this "Rule" is an equitable method of judging a partnership by the same standards. In this particular case, I do find it very bothersome that North made no try given the lightness of the South hand. However, I agree with the decision that no try would have carried them past 4♦.

**Rosenberg:** North certainly should have made a slam try. However, it would require evidence to convince me that anything untoward occurred. Personality and history are important. It is difficult to investigate a case like this without accusing North/South of cheating.

**Wolff:** It seems common these days to open the South hand 1♣. Pairs opening these hands are used to such junk and allow for it as did North, in this case by not cuebidding. North/South did owe East/West an explanation of their partnership's tendencies. East/West are perhaps not deserving of an adjustment. 6♣ and 6♦ are reasonable contracts, particularly 6♣. Under the "normal playing luck shot" rules, since Eas-/West would gratefully accept their -420 or -480 if the slam was cold, should they gain when it isn't? I think not! The goal is to make players aware of their responsibilities and to improve by penalizing wrongdoing, but at the same time not fine the field by awarding high scores to non-offenders who just happen to be there. If I had been sitting on the Committee, my opinion might have been changed if North/South's testimony made me doubt these light actions were basic to their partnership.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Disputed Claim	<b>Event:</b>	IMP Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	37
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	-----------	--------------	----

Auction			
West	North	East	South

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention


Hand Record				
Board		N		
Dealer	W	♠ AQJ4 ♥ 8 ♦ QJ1094 ♣ J84		
Vul	E/W			
W			E	
♠ 73 ♥ AKQ1094 ♦ A3 ♣ K106			♠ K86 ♥ 63 ♦ K852 ♣ AQ75	
		S		
		♠ 10952 ♥ J752 ♦ 76 ♣ 932		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4NT by E	Down 1	N/S +100	♠

### Facts

The play of the hand went a spade to the Ace, a spade to the King, the Ace of Hearts, the King of Hearts and a claim stating "the hearts are coming home."

### Committee Ruling

The Committee unanimously ruled that the result, 4NT by East, down one, N/S +100, be allowed to stand. The Committee also found the appeal to be without substantial merit although no penalty was given for bringing the appeal.

### Commentary

**Allison:** Why was there no penalty?

**Berkowitz:** Why was there no penalty?

**Colker:** I would have imposed the "frivolous appeal" penalty.

**LeBendig:** Should this appeal have been heard? Was the appealing player a novice? If not, how could we have failed to penalize?

**Rosenberg:** East/West should learn the rules concerning claims.

**Treadwell:** This is a matter of Law and should not have been appealed without assessment of a procedural penalty if it was a Flight A player, or an admonishment if a lower flight.

**Wolff:** I agree, except East/West should be penalized for appealing.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Unauthorized Information	<b>Event:</b>	Flight A Open Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	38
---------------------------	--------------------------	---------------	---------------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
			2♥
Pass	2NT	4♠	Pass
Pass	Dbl	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention


### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		N		
<b>Dealer</b>	S	♠ KQ108 ♥ Q652 ♦ J2 ♣ KJ6		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>			
W			E	
♠ 64 ♥ KJ ♦ Q10986 ♣ 10985		♠ AJ97532 ♥ 10 ♦ A54 ♣ A3		
	S	♠ (void) ♥ A98743 ♦ K73 ♣ Q742		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♠X by E	Down 3	N/S +500	♥A

### Facts

The ♥A was led. North deliberated and played the ♥2. South shifted to a club and the contract went down three tricks. East/West claimed that North's hesitation at trick one called extra attention to his play. North/South maintained that North had a right to think about his play after the opening lead.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee unanimously agreed to allow the result, 4♠X by East, down 3, N/S +500, to stand. The Committee considered the allegation that North's play of the ♥2 was slow and pointed and found that the ♥2 "spoke for itself."

### Commentary

**Allison:** I would have a real problem with this case if East played a lightning fast low heart. No card speaks for itself!

**Anderson:** The ♥2 spoke for itself (with extra added emphasis).

**Rosenberg:** This is a crucial case. No card speaks for itself as loudly as the time in which it takes to play it. Maybe the ♥2 was count, or thoughtless, or whatever. However, North is correct that he has a right to think. So the question is did East consider before playing to trick one or did he call for the ♥J instantaneously? If the latter is the case, he now only has himself to blame. If he took time, then North's play should have been fast and smooth. If it wasn't, I suspect North is one of those players who cannot bear to signal in tempo. If I believe this, I would rule +100 for North/South.

**Treadwell:** This is a good ruling. For a Flight A player to bring this to Committee has little merit. Should there have been a procedural penalty?

**Wolff:** I agree that the result as achieved should stand. This is clearly a case of hesitation information. It just happens that this same information was available legally. North is entitled to think and would have more leeway if East played rapidly

from the dummy. The bridge of it shouldn't require much think-time on this particular hand. I would tend to make North more conscious of his tempo with a warning or a penalty.



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Event:</b>	Open Pairs	<b>Case:</b>	39
---------------------------	----------------	---------------	------------	--------------	----

### Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1NT	Dbl <sup>1</sup>	Rdbl	Pass <sup>2</sup>
Pass	2♣	Pass	Pass
3NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted – Four card major & a longer minor
2: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>		<b>N</b>		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>S</b>	♠ Q5 ♥ QJ96 ♦ KJ86 ♣ 973		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>E/W</b>			
W			E	
♠ KJ96 ♥ A32 ♦ AQ5 ♣ Q82		♠ A32 ♥ 10874 ♦ 10732 ♣ K10		
	<b>S</b>	♠ 10874 ♥ K5 ♦ 94 ♣ AJ654		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by W	Down 2	N/S +200	♥J

### Facts

The opening lead was the ♥J from the North hand. West repeatedly asked South if this had some significant meaning. South claimed that it did not. After the hand, North said the partnership agreement was the Jack inquired about the Ten and asked for attitude. West maintained that he had several plays for down one if he had been given correct information about the ♥J lead.

The Director changed the result to Average Plus for East/West and Average Minus for North/South. North/South considered the 2♣ bid to be a psyche. North could not understand why East/West was given an Average Plus when West elected to bid a game with a 4-3-3-3 sixteen count when partner was known to have invitational values. North also claimed West should have expected two suits to break five-four from the auction and could have avoided 3NT. North felt that West fairly earned his bad result jumping to game.

### Committee Ruling

The Committee agreed that East/West earned their result and gave them the original result, -200. The Committee gave North/South an Average Minus and assessed them a procedural penalty of forty percent of one board.

### Commentary

**Anderson:** A well-earned decision against all parties.

**Kaplan:** Judging from the ruling, the Committee must have judged that South's replay was deliberately unenlightening. Surely, then, further disciplinary action was called for. Was such an action taken, or recommended?

**Rosenberg:** It feels as if South's huddle might have made North more aware of his danger. If so, North should play 2♣X, down 300. If North was just being careful, then what is East/West's complaint?

**Wolff:** This is the best ruling of the group! East/West were caused to suffer the damage of their own bad judgment. North-South, the "Culprits" were not allowed to gain from a hesitation and were penalized for possibly attempting to capitalize on the unauthorized information. The field was not disadvantaged. I would hope the matchpointed score was North/South +200 and East/West -200.