

APPEAL	Non NABC+ FIVE
Subject	Tempo – Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Bob Wallace
Event	Side IMP Pairs
Session	Evening (Only)
Date	July 16, 2006

BD#	31
VUL	N/S
DLR	South

5,080 Master points	
♠	K Q J 7 5 2
♥	Q
♦	Q 8 7 5 3 2
♣	

3,175 Masterpoints		Summer 2006 Chicago, Illinois	15,100 Masterpoints	
♠	9 6 4 3		♠	A 8
♥	9 6 5		♥	A K J 7 4
♦			♦	K J 4
♣	K 9 8 7 6 5		♣	Q J 2
		5,214 Masterpoints		
		♠	T	
		♥	T 8 3 2	
		♦	A T 9 6	
		♣	A T 4 3	

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

Final Contract	5♦ doubled by North
Opening Lead	♥A
Table Result	5♦ Dbld, N, -1, E/W +200
Director Ruling	4♦ Dbld, N, =, N/S +710
Panel Ruling	4♦ Dbld, N, =, N/S +710

(1)	Alerted, constructive values (8+ HCP).
(2)	Agreed break in tempo (BIT).

The Facts: The director was called after the play of the hand. The BIT was agreed.

The Ruling: It was judged that the 5♣ call was demonstrably suggested by a combination of the Alert and the BIT over a less successful logical alternative (LA) of Pass. Therefore in accordance with laws 16A2 and 12C2, the table result was adjusted to 4♦ double by North making four, N/S +710.

The Appeal: The appeal was filed after N/S had left the playing area. Since the BIT was not disputed and the table director's decision was ultimately upheld, N/S were never contacted.

East was the only player who attended the hearing. He said West's 3♣ bid confirmed some constructive values (8+ HCP), since they play lebensohl. West later told the table director that she intentionally bid 3♣ because of the sixth club and the diamond void. East confirmed a substantial BIT before doubling 4♦. He said West had to pull the double because: 1) she had zero defense; 2) she knew East had a club fit from the 3NT bid and 3) at IMPs safety matters and East had not doubled 3♦. East confirmed that he disagreed with West's 3♣ bid, but she never forgot conventional agreements.

The Decision: The panel was undecided whether to accept East's statement about West's ability to remember conventional agreements. Since resolving this issue could be critical to the resolution of the case, the panel decided to poll peers of West (3100 masterpoints) about what call to make over 4♦ doubled, giving some players the lebensohl information but not others.

The peers who were simply told that they had bid 3♣ all passed 4♦ doubled, since they hadn't promised any values. Of the four peers who were told that they had made a value showing 3♣ bid, two passed and two bid 5♣.

This response to the poll established that a pass of 4♦ doubled was a LA even with the understanding that 3♣ had shown values. Since the UI from the BIT demonstrably suggested pulling the double and pass was determined to be a LA, the panel upheld the table director's decision to adjust the result to 4♦ doubled making four, N/S +710.

The panel decided the appeal had merit.

The Panel: Gary Zeiger (Reviewer), Candy Kushner and Peter Marcus

Players Consulted: Eight peers of West.

Commentary:

Gerard Wow, how shameless can you be? "At IMPs safety matters." I guess that only applies to the partner of the doubler, especially when she doesn't have 15,100 masterpoints. And did East acquire all of those masterpoints by ignoring the auction, which contained subtle clues that some of East's stuff was booked for the dumpster? East's BIT was a "bad" hesitation, showing no sensitivity to the niceties of the Proprieties. North should have passed the redouble, I would even call 5♦ egregious, but that wouldn't have recovered +710.

Not for nothing, but if you asked me to choose the worst bid in the auction, I'd be torn between 3NT and double of 4♦. Don't think the two are unrelated. Part of East's BIT was probably spent wondering "Why didn't I bid 3♥?" Lo and behold, doing the right thing early on sometimes avoids later problems.

- Goldsmith** This was much easier than the panel made it out to be. West abused UI and deserved a 1/4 board procedural penalty (PP) in addition to the adjusted score.
The panel's indecision about whether to accept the statement that West never forgot conventional agreements is ingenuous. Everyone forgets methods sometimes. Statements of that sort ought simply to be ignored; they are pure hogwash.
- Polisner** Excellent work.
- Rigal** Well decided case. One has to rely on the consulted players here, and the split decision makes the case have merit I believe. This is clearly quite close to the cusp – so despite the fact that the tournament director's ruling was upheld, I agree with the merit issue.
- Smith** Good job by the director, and very good job by the panel to show that even if West did intend 3♣ to show values the adjustment should be made anyway on the basis of the slow double. The claim that 3♣ was indeed intended to show extra values looks pretty questionable to me, and doubting it may have convinced me that an AWMW was warranted. Maybe if West had seen fit to attend the hearing she might have convinced me of her statement (or if she had told the table director immediately), but being denied the ability to question her about it would lead me to reject giving E/W that benefit of the doubt.
- Wildavsky** Good decisions, but I see no merit in the appeal.
- Wolff** I completely agree with the decision of 4♦ doubled, N/S plus 710. To me this case only proves what we are doing. I have no doubt (can't prove it) that West would have passed a prompt double, in spite of his lack of defense. The reason being is that a fast double would immediately trigger with West that his partner may have a very weak club holding, making five clubs a terrible contract. BTW, I do not think much of the principle of asking peers what they would do, particularly in a low-level game. The asked players are more interested in trying to look good rather than to give a thoughtful non-ego involved response.