

APPEAL	Non NABC+ TWO
Subject	Tempo – Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Bill Wittmann
Event	Joan Hasch Stratified Pairs
Session	First
Date	July 14, 2006

BD#	3
VUL	E/W
DLR	South

10,367 Masterpoints	
♠	
♥	K 9 5 4 2
♦	A Q 8 7 4 3
♣	9 7

2,617 Masterpoints	
♠	A K Q 9 6
♥	7
♦	J 5
♣	K Q 6 5 4

2,185 Masterpoints	
♠	T 8 7 4 3 2
♥	J 8 6 3
♦	T 9
♣	A

5,889 Masterpoints	
♠	J 5
♥	A Q T
♦	K 6 2
♣	J T 8 3 2

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1♠	2♠ ¹	4♠	4NT ²
Pass ³	5♦	5♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	5♠ by West
Opening Lead	♣9
Table Result	5♠ making six, E/W +680
Director Ruling	5♠ down one, E/W -100
Panel Ruling	5♠ down one, E/W -100

(1)	Shows hearts and a minor.
(2)	What is your minor?
(3)	Slow.

The Facts: N/S called the director after the opening lead and claimed that East (dummy) had no bid over partner's slow pass. N/S also claimed that West went to the bidding box and fingered a bid before passing. N/S felt East was not entitled to bid 5♠; therefore, South would be able to bid 5♥ and get partner off to the correct lead and a subsequent contract of 5♠ would go down one instead of making six.

The Ruling: The 5♠ call was considered to be suggested by the break in tempo (BIT) and pass a less successful logical alternative (LA). After projecting a heart lead with an auction permitting South a bid of 5♥, the table result was adjusted to 5♠ by West down one, N/S +100.

The Appeal: East said that the auction told her to bid 5♠. She thought they were unlikely to lose more than three red suit tricks. With her complete lack of defense, she thought N/S were likely cold for 5♦.

Since E/W had acknowledged the BIT, South did not call for the director until she saw the dummy. N/S said that with a passed hand opposite the two-suiter, it was unclear whether 5♦ or 5♥ would make. N/S thought the BIT clearly encouraged the 5♠ bid.

The Decision: The panel found that E/W had played twice before this event. West's BIT demonstrably suggested action over inaction. Four peers of E/W were given East's hand to bid. All duplicated the 4♠ bid at East's first turn. Two of the four passed over 5♦, while two bid 5♠. The two players who passed bid 5♠ after a projected auction of 5♦ – Pass – 5♥ – Pass – Pass.

This information established pass over 5♦ as a LA, but also suggested that a final contract of 5♠ was possible. Based on peer input, the panel assigned an auction (from 4NT) of:

4NT	Pass	5♦	Pass
5♥	Pass	Pass	5♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

On this auction, South was able to bid 5♥, which made a heart lead at all probable. The possibility of a heart lead on this auction was confirmed by a poll of experts (see North's masterpoint holding), half of whom led a heart.

The panel assigned a contract of 5♠ by West, down one, N/S plus 100, after the lead of a small heart.

Since the player input suggested a final contract of 5♠ was likely after a pass by East over 5♦, the panel decided it was reasonable for E/W to believe the 5♠ bid should be allowed. Thus, the appeal was judged to have merit.

The Panel: Gary Zeiger (Reviewer), Patty Holmes and Peter Marcus.

Players Consulted: Dick Budd, Hjordis Eythorsdottir (Disa), John Herrman, Tony Kasday and four peers of E/W.

Commentary:

Gerard Yah, I can't do anything about it, but doesn't that club lead by Mr/Ms 10,367 masterpoints look suspiciously like a double shot? Opposite a passed hand 4NT, wasn't a club lead hopeless? The result wouldn't change because N/S had no additional equity, but North didn't come to the party with clean hands.

- Goldsmith** I'm a little skeptical of the poll results, but some would pass red on white at matchpoints. I'm pretty surprised that anyone would pass 5♦ but save over 5♥; that not only makes sure that they'll be doubled, but 5♥ looks like a contract East can beat. That two players polled chose that route makes it likely that it'd happen, though without the poll results, I'd reject that conclusion, figuring that anyone who passed 5♦ would also pass 5♥. Assuming pass is a LA, the likely result most favorable to the non-offending side is 5♠ doubled down one. South may double 5♠ on the basis that if East doesn't think he can make 5♠, believe him. There's no result at all probable that is worse, so reciprocal 200s are in order. Should there be an appeal without merit warning (AWMW)? I think that not only would most of East's peers bid 5♠, but some of them would think that it is ridiculous to do anything else. So, no AWMW.
- Polisner** I disagree in most respects and would have assigned an adjusted score of 5♦ plus 400 for N/S unless the polling indicated that most (all) of the peers holding the West hand would balance with 5♠, vulnerable versus not vulnerable, which I don't believe would be the case.
- Rigal** I'm confused. If what East was campaigning for was the first 5♠ bid to be allowed and the table result to be restored, the panel said no. Where is the merit?
- Smith** Although I suppose it is implied, the table ruling does not really explain how the projected auction will proceed after East's forced pass of 5♦. The methodology and conclusions of the panel were generally very good, and the panel focused on all the right issues. What I really don't understand is why some polled players would consider it reasonable to pass over 5♦ (perhaps ending the auction) but then decide it is right to bid 5♠ over a correction to 5♥. Why? Given the information from the players polled, and given that I think this is the way panels and directors should make judgment rulings, I guess I shouldn't quarrel with the panel ruling. But I wonder if maybe a larger sample group would have found some players who would have passed over 5♦ AND over the correction to 5♥. I just don't see the logic of the two polled players who bid 5♠ over 5♥ after passing 5♦ originally. The fact that the panel found that half of the experts led a heart on the projected auction makes the adjustment correct for both sides based on the panel's conclusions.
- Wildavsky** Good work all around, but I see no merit to the appeal. East seems to see nothing wrong with taking the action suggested by UI. An AWMW would have helped disabuse him of that notion.
- Wolff** I also agree to the convoluted final decision. Mere supposition but I guess warranted. My bias suggests to me that anyone who would lead the nine of clubs in the real auction doesn't deserve a favorable ruling.