

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ TWO
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Doug Grove
Event	Mini Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	First Final
Date	November 22, 2006

BD#	21
VUL	N/S
DLR	North

1,250 Masterpoints	
♠	9
♥	A K J
♦	K T 8 3 2
♣	8 6 3 2

1,300 Masterpoints		Fall 2006 Honolulu, Hawaii	4,100 Masterpoints	
♠	A J 7 6		♠	K 8 5 2
♥	5		♥	T 3
♦	Q 9 7 4		♦	A J 5
♣	T 9 5 4		♣	A K J 7

2,800 Masterpoints	
♠	Q T 4 3
♥	Q 9 8 7 6 4 2
♦	6
♣	Q

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

Final Contract	3♥ by South
Opening Lead	♣A
Table Result	Making 3, N/S +140
Director Ruling	2♠ by S doubled, N/S -1400
Panel Ruling	2♠ by S doubled, N/S -1400

(1)	Announced as a transfer.
-----	--------------------------

The Facts: North announced the 2♥ call as a transfer to spades. The actual N/S agreement is that the 2♥ call is natural.

The Ruling: South had UI available that demonstrably suggested bidding 3♥. A pass by South was considered to be a less successful logical alternative (LA). Therefore, in accordance with laws 16A and 12C2, the table result was adjusted to 2♠ doubled by North down five, N/S minus 1400.

The Appeal: South's contention was that after the double there was sufficient authorized information to indicate that partner did not have a spade suit in that the NT overcaller had to have two spades and West had to have three spades or more in order to double. Five players in the 2000-3000 masterpoint range were polled. Two players were given the auction up to 2♠. Both said that they would raise partner's spades. Three players were given the actual auction up to the 3♥ call. All passed 2♠ doubled. This clearly established pass as a LA.

The Decision: South knew from partner's Announcement of "transfer" that the 2♠ bid was not natural but rather just the completion of the transfer requested by partner. In the absence of an Announcement, South would have expected partner to be 6-4 or 6-5 in diamonds and spades respectively. Without the Announcement, pass is a clear logical alternative (LA). Therefore in accordance with law 16, South chose a call that was demonstrably suggested by the UI instead of a less successful LA. In accordance with law 12C2, the table director's adjustment to 2♠ doubled down five, N/S minus 1400, was upheld. This decision was made despite indications that the adjustment should have been to 3♠ doubled down six because South may well have raised to three directly. However, the panel knew that there was no matchpoint difference, so it left the table director's decision intact.

There was clear UI available of which South took advantage. An experienced player with South's masterpoints is expected to be aware of his responsibilities at the table when UI is available to his side. Therefore, an appeal without merit warning (AWMW) was given.

The Panel: Harry Falk (Reviewer), Roger Putnam and Gary Zeiger.

Players Consulted: Five players with between 2,000 and 3,000 masterpoints.

Commentary:

Goldsmith Fair enough. Minus 1400 doesn't need to be gilded. Did the panel consider a procedural penalty against South for misuse of UI?

Polisner This case at least has something to think about, but still falls short of being a meritorious appeal.

Rigal Given the voting by the players consulted the award of an AWMW seems entirely appropriate.
I do have a little sympathy with South (once 2♠ gets doubled there is almost enough authorized information around to get this right). But South must bite the bullet and pass anyway so he can respect himself in the morning.

- Smith** Although it apparently did not matter, the polling indicates that the correct ruling and panel decision should be 3♠ doubled down six. 3♠ was clearly a logical alternative to South's pass over 2♠. South made illegal choices according to Law 16 on two occasions: when he passed over 2♠; and when he bid 3♥ at his next turn. Making those illegal choices should warrant consideration of a procedural penalty for violating Law 73C (in addition to any score adjustment made). But those considerations should not enter into whether or not an AWMW is given. An AWMW should be a separate matter pertaining only to the quality of the appeal and its realistic expectation of success. These appellants should have had no reason to believe their appeal had any merit, so the AWMW was correct in my opinion. But it should be levied for the appeal, not for using UI.
- Wildavsky** I agree that the appeal had no merit. The table director and panel might have considered a procedural penalty in addition for blatant use of UI.
- Wolff** Convention disruption (CD) properly punished, although I always have misgivings about the non-offending side reaping a windfall.