

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ ONE
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Gary Zeiger
Event	Flt A/X Pairs
Session	First
Date	November 18, 2006

BD#	12
VUL	N/S
DLR	West

Varis Carey	
♠	T 8 7
♥	A 5
♦	A K J T 8 6 4
♣	6

Roberta Magnus		Fall 2006 Honolulu, Hawaii	Jadwiga Polujan	
♠	A K Q 6 3		♠	4
♥	Q 8 6 4 3 2		♥	T 9 7
♦			♦	7 5 3
♣	7 5		♣	K Q T 9 3 2

Robert Whitcher	
♠	J 9 5 2
♥	K J
♦	Q 9 2
♣	A J 8 4

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

Final Contract	4♥, doubled, by West
Opening Lead	♣6
Table Result	Making 4, E/W +590
Director Ruling	3NT by S making 4, N/S +630
Panel Ruling	3NT by S making 4, N/S +630

(1)	Agreed significant break-in-tempo (BIT)
-----	---

The Facts: Before East's second pass, East hesitated for a long time. This hesitation was agreed by all to be a significant BIT.

The Ruling: West's 4♥ call was determined to have been demonstrably suggested by the BIT over a less successful logical alternative (LA) of pass. Therefore in accordance with law 16 A2 and 12 C2, the score was adjusted to 3NT by South making four, N/S plus 630.

The Appeal: West maintained that, although there was a significant BIT by East, it was always her intention to bid 4♥.

Several players were polled to determine whether pass was a LA to bidding 4♥ for West. About half of those consulted would have bid 4♥, the remainder would have passed.

When the players polled were asked what the BIT by East suggested, most thought it expressed a desire to bid on. One player thought East may be thinking of doubling. All agreed that the BIT made it considerably easier for West to bid 4♥.

Based upon these findings, 4♥ was determined to have been demonstrably suggested by the BIT and pass a less successful LA.

The Decision: The table director's decision of an adjustment to 3NT making four, N/S plus 630 was upheld. This was in accordance with laws 16 A2 and 12 C2. Based upon the number of players polled who bid, the appeal was determined to have merit, therefore, an appeal without merit warning (AWMW) was not issued.

The Panel : Harry Falk (Reviewer), Patty Holmes and Candy Kushner

Players Consulted: Jim Gordon, Barry Harper, Eddie Wold and five players with between 1,000 and 2,000 masterpoints.

Commentary:

Goldsmith Seems normal. Is there any reason to report that players claim, "I always intended to..." when it's totally irrelevant? And false in this case: West could have bid 4♥ over 2NT. She didn't, so she didn't always intend to bid 4♥ over 3NT.

Polisner Good ruling and decision. Routine case.

Rigal I'm not sure the poll taken made the decision not to award an AWMW so clear. But at least the basic decision was appropriate. I wonder whether West told the panel "six-five come alive" and at what point it is appropriate to start playing possum.

Smith It looks as if N/S should beat 4♥ doubled, but, since they could not get back to their equity position of playing 3NT even if they had, it becomes irrelevant to the ruling. All bases seem to have been covered here by the director and the panel. Good decision.

Wildavsky The rulings look right to me.
One thing that can help us decide cases like this is to note that players considering doubling usually do double. In practice a player who hesitates and then passes is considering bidding much more often than he's considering doubling.

Wolff I agree with the decision. Players need to learn (if they don't know already) that slow action in a competitive situation will always put that partnership at a disadvantage. So many players pretend not to know, leaving me to think that for every time a director is called that possibly several times the director is not called, making the hesitation a percentage play. Sure 4♥ is tempting to bid, especially at this vulnerability, but in order to be able to bid it your partner needs to have passed in tempo.