

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Two
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Matt Koltnow
Event	Compact Knockout – Bracket One
Session	First Match
Date	March 14, 2009

BD#	35
VUL	E/W
DLR	South

Mark Lair	
♠	A K J T 7 4 3
♥	A
♦	K
♣	T 9 5 4

Norm Coombs		Spring 2009 Houston, TX	Scott Gates	
♠	Q 6		♠	5
♥	9 4		♥	T 8 6 5 3 2
♦	T 9 8 7 5		♦	J 4 3 2
♣	K J 6 3		♣	A 8

Marc Levine	
♠	9 8 2
♥	K Q J 7
♦	A Q 6
♣	Q 7 2

West	North	East	South
			1♣
Pass	1♠	Pass	1NT
Pass	3♠ ¹	Pass	4♥ ²
Pass	4NT ³	Pass	5♦ ⁴
Pass	6♠	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	6♠ by North
Opening Lead	♣A
Table Result	Down 2, N/S - 100
Director Ruling	6♠ N made 7, N/S + 1010
Panel Ruling	6♠ N made 7, N/S + 1010

(1)	Game forcing.
(2)	Control showing bid.
(3)	Keycard Blackwood.
(4)	1 or 4 keycards.

The Facts: The director was called at the end of the match (this was the eleventh of twelve boards). In passout seat, over East's objections, West asked if 1♣ was precision.

The Ruling: West's question was UI (Law 16) to East. It clearly suggested a club lead. Five players from other teams in the top bracket were consulted and without the UI three led the ♣A but two led a heart. Thus, a heart was determined to be a logical alternative to the ♣A. The opening lead of a heart would result in N/S making an over trick. Therefore, score was adjusted to 6♠ by North, making seven, N/S plus 1010 for both sides using Laws 73F and 12C1.

The Appeal: E/W appealed and the team captain knew about it.

This was the penultimate hand in the match and South came up to the director after play of the final board to ask if he had cause for redress. There was no time to convene a normal hearing because the match was late finishing and the next match was underway.

The Decision: The panel accepted the facts as presented and ruled there was U.I. from the comment and that it demonstrably suggested a club lead would be more likely to succeed. Expert opinions showed that there was a logical alternative to the ♣A lead. Laws 73F and 12C1 thus require an adjustment to 6S by North making seven, N/S plus 1010.

Before he sat down for the next match West stated to the reviewer that he had asked his partner to lead face down and then immediately asked about the club bid (i.e. before East could lead), thus confirming the facts. The question appears superfluous because the auction was over, so West could not take action and he would see the club bidder's hand shortly after opening lead was made.

The appeal was clearly without merit, so an AWMW was considered. However, the case was started and finished with no time for reflection by the appellants, so none was given.

The Panel: Charles MacCracken (Reviewer) and Jay Albright.

Commentary:

Polisner Very weird. West has been a top level player for 50 years and would certainly know that if 1♣ was Precision, there would have been an Alert. Correct ruling and decision.

Rigal I'm happy to see such actions penalized and would like West's behavior noted for the recorder (if there is one any more? *Note: Yes, there is!*). Not that there was malice – but people have to learn proper procedure. Under the circumstances I'll let the absence of an AWMW go uncriticized.

Smith I thought for sure that West in NABC+ case #11 asked the most dangerous question of the tournament, but that was before I saw this case. Let's see. I'm a very experienced player, 1♣ was not alerted, I'm in the passout seat to a slam with my partner about to be on lead, my club holding is KJxx, and I decide now is a good time to ask whether 1♣ is Precision? In order, I think the ruling should be 6♠ making seven, a severe procedural penalty, an AWMW, and a referral to the recorder.

Wildavsky Open and shut. I don't think we should ever hear an appeal without a signed appeal form. That way the appellants have acknowledged that they are in jeopardy of an AWMW, a poorer score than they had coming in, or both. It's not clear from the write-up whether a form was signed here.

Wolff Questions like this sometimes are just a crude attempt to help a partner's opening lead and it worked. Good decision.