

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Four
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Chris Patrias
Event	Mini Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	Second Qualifying Session
Date	November 25, 2008

BD#	18
VUL	N/S
DLR	East

3001 Masterpoints	
♠	Q
♥	A Q T 7 6 3
♦	K 6 5
♣	A 7 4

3259 Masterpoints	
♠	8 7 4 3
♥	J 5
♦	Q J 9 2
♣	J 6 3

Fall 2008 Boston, MA	
4661 Masterpoints	
♠	A K J
♥	K 9 2
♦	A 7 4 3
♣	Q 8 5

3715 Masterpoints	
♠	T 9 6 5 2
♥	8 4
♦	T 8
♣	K T 9 2

West	North	East	South
		Pass	1NT
Pass	2♦	Pass	2♥
Pass	4♥ ¹	Pass	4NT
Pass	5♥ ²	Pass	6♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Final Contract	6♥ by S
Opening Lead	♦Q
Table Result	Made 6, N/S +1430
Director Ruling	6♥ by S, made 6, +1430
Panel Ruling	6♥ by S, made 6, +1430

(1)	Mild slam try in hearts
(2)	North made an audible gasp, agreed upon at the table

The Facts: The director was called after the 6♥ call. North made a mild slam try by transferring at the two-level then raising to game. South then chose to bid Roman Keycard Blackwood,, and South gasped after (mistakenly) responding 5♥.North raised to 6♥.

The Ruling: Even though Law 16B concerning unauthorized information might suggest that North had the ♥Q and demonstrably suggest that South bid on, pass was not considered to be a logical alternative, since South knew the partnership had all five controls. Therefore, the table result of 6♥ by South, making 6, N/S plus 1430 was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: Since there is no source of tricks, bidding 6♥ is not clear and the unauthorized information could have influenced South.

The Decision: Two players were polled. Both disagreed with the 4NT bid. However, both felt that once bidding 4NT, they would never pass 5♥ when holding five key cards. Also, since the “gasp” could have meant something else than the ♥Q (one ace for instance), the unauthorized misinformation did not demonstrably indicate bidding rather than passing. While Law 16B may have been violated, the panel felt that pass was not a logical alternative and the UI did not demonstrably indicate bidding over passing. Therefore, the table result of 6♥ by South, making 6, N/S plus 1430 was allowed to stand.

The Panel: Bernie Gorkin (Reviewer), John Ashton and Su Doe.

Commentary:

Goldsmith Good except for the missing and obvious appeal without merit warning (AWMW). The use of "controls" instead of "key cards" in the ruling text is an error in terminology and ought to be avoided.

Polisner I agree with the decision to allow the table result to stand. However, depending on the extent of the “gossip,” I would have considered issuing a procedural penalty.

Smith I agree that the gasp doesn't suggest North holds the trump queen any more than it suggests he has only one ace. In any case, a player who asked for aces with a nine card trump fit was not planning to stop below slam when he discovered that his side had all the key cards. So the gasp didn't demonstrably suggest bidding 6♥, and pass was not a logical alternative for this player anyway. Therefore I agree with the directors and the panel. I don't understand why the write-up states that Law 16B “may have been violated.” Perhaps the panel is just pointing out that unauthorized information existed, but if so I think Law 73 is a better reference. There does not seem to be much merit to this appeal.

Wildavsky The poll of only two players was too few to determine that pass was not a logical alternative. That said, pass was certainly not logical – this appeal had no merit.

Wolff Another good ruling which featured a pair, E/W, that was attempting to get something for nothing. A close slam happens to make so they contrive to cancel it out on very flimsy evidence. They should be publicly censured.