

APPEAL	Non-NABC Six
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Patty Holmes
Event	Director Please Compact KO
Session	First Session,
Date	November 24, 2008

BD#	34
VUL	N/S
DLR	East

2621 Masterpoints	
♠	T 6 5 3 2
♥	8
♦	Q 8 4 2
♣	K Q 9

1082 Masterpoints		Fall 2008 Boston, MA	1592 Masterpoints	
♠	J 4		♠	9 8 7
♥	9 7 6 5		♥	K J T 4 3
♦	J T 5		♦	7 6
♣	6 5 3 2		♣	J 7 4

1007 Masterpoints	
♠	A K Q
♥	A Q 2
♦	A K 9 3
♣	A T 8

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

Final Contract	6NT by S
Opening Lead	♠7
Table Result	Making 7, N/S +1470
Director Ruling	5♥ by S, down 2, N/S -200
Panel Ruling	5♥ by S, down 2, N/S -200

(1)	Alerted as game forcing
(2)	Announced as "taking as transfer" before bidding 5♥

The Facts: The director was called at the end of the auction. South stated that he was taking the 5♦ bid as a transfer to hearts.

The Ruling: The original ruling was that the result would stand. The E/W pair filed a verbal appeal to that decision. After further discussion, the event staff considered the announcement that the 5♦ bid was being taken as a transfer to hearts was UI. Therefore, in accordance with Laws 16B1 and 12C1(e) changed its decision to 5♥ by South, down two, N/S minus 200, prompting N/S to appeal.

The Appeal: The appealing side indicated that they had no specific agreement about 4NT responses when no agreed suit existed. With other partners, North would have answered diamonds to “see where the auction was going” before bidding slam. She also discussed (post delivery) that she is always on the wrong side of decisions – directors ALWAYS make her bid something she would never bid. South indicated that with a single suited hand he would have bid his suit at the two-level since they were in a game forcing auction.

The Decision: The panel considered the appellants’ comments regarding the concept that with a single suited hand, South would have bid differently. Six peers of N/S were polled and all passed the 5♥ bid on the auction and information given. They were also asked if they would consider bidding Blackwood with a single suited hand – all said yes (an example was given of a two loser hand). In accordance with Laws 16B1, 12C1, and 73C, this strong result led the panel to uphold the director’s final ruling of 5♥ by South, down two, N/S minus 200.

The Panel: Nancy Boyd (Reviewer), Su Doe and Jean Molnar.

Commentary:

Goldsmith Presumably, N/S were playing 1430 and 5♦ denied an ace, in which case the ruling is clearly correct. The appeal had no merit whatsoever, despite the initial erroneous ruling.
Most of the appeal paragraph could have been eliminated. We don't need to know that an appellant whined.
I wonder if the Announcement is correct procedure or not. According to the Announcement rules, transfers from diamonds or hearts after any notrump rebid are announced. On the other hand, no bids are Alerted above 3NT starting with opener's rebid. If Announcements are Alerts, then the transfer must not be Alerted. If not, it must. In theory, Announcements are fundamentally Alerts. They are covered in the ACBL Alert documents. On the other hand, they are treated in different sections. The delayed Alerts section does not refer to "Announcements or Alerts," but only to "Alerts." So I think it could be argued either way whether this transfer needs to be Announced. I also think that the transfer Announcement is too general. After 1S-1NT-2NT, a 3D transfer needs to be announced. That seems a little odd to me. Note that the conflicting rules apply to a common auction: 2C-2D; 2NT-4D/4H, so they ought to be resolved clearly.

Polisner My only concern is: How could the original ruling have been that the table result stands?

Smith I guess the panel was too embarrassed to issue an AWMW after the inexplicable original directors ruling. I'm glad at least that the first ruling was changed by the event staff. I can't fathom what led to it.

Wildavsky South was due a procedural penalty for her violation of correct procedure. Yes, our rules for Alerting and Announcing are too complicated, and not everyone knows that bids above 3NT are neither Alertable nor Announceable after the first round of the auction. That said, "I'm taking it as" should not be part of anyone's bidding vocabulary. This appeal had no merit, and the initial and inexplicable director ruling does not grant it any.

Wolff I disagree with the final ruling. Although there was confusion, North's 6NT bid was entirely reasonable on the auction and not to allow it is too much of a distortion.