

APPEAL	NABC+ FOUR
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Silodor Open Pairs
Session	Second Final
Date	March 14, 2009

BD#	25
VUL	E/W
DLR	North

Kent Mignocchi	
♠	K J 5 3 2
♥	T 5
♦	Q 5 4 2
♣	A 7

P. Drew Cannell		Spring 2009 Houston, TX	Dennis Kasle	
♠	8 6		♠	A Q T 7 4
♥	K Q J 8		♥	4 3
♦	A K T 3		♦	J 9 6
♣	K 5 4		♣	T 6 2

Alison Wilson	
♠	9
♥	A 9 7 6 2
♦	8 7
♣	Q J 9 8 3

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

Final Contract	3NT by West
Opening Lead	♦2
Table Result	Made 4, E/W +630
Director Ruling	4♠ E, down 2, E/W -200
Committee Ruling	4♠ E, down 2, E/W -200

(1)	Diamonds and an unspecified major.
(2)	Question: What is 2♥? Answer: Natural.

The Facts: The director was called after the opening lead and again after play was completed. Before the opening lead there was discussion about the 2♥ bid. East said it was a transfer. West said it became obvious later in the auction that 2♥ was a transfer.

The Ruling: The director ruled that the answer to the question about 2♥ was UI for East. The UI demonstrably suggested to East that the contract should not be placed in hearts. The director judged that 4♠ over 3♥ or 3NT was a logical alternative. Therefore, the result was adjusted to 4♠ by East, down two, E/W minus 200 for both sides. This was in accordance with Laws 12 and 16.

The Appeal: E/W appealed and South was the only player who did not attend the hearing. East provided system notes showing that without interference, the 3♥ would indicate a doubleton heart along with spade support. East argued that his hand didn't merit anything other than signing off in 3♠. When asked why he passed 3NT, he mentioned the possibility of Kx or AQ doubleton in hearts.

The Decision: The director reported polling five experts with three of five stating they would bid 4♠ over 3♥, but that they had been told that 3♥ showed heart values with spade support. The consensus of the committee was that with 3♥ showing a doubleton, the odds didn't favor committing to game. However, it was agreed that a substantial fraction of players of the caliber of the appellants would seriously consider bidding 4♠ (or 4♦ or 4♥ to make West declarer) and that some would bid it. Therefore, there was unanimous agreement to uphold the director's adjustment of 4♠ by East down two, E/W minus 200 for both sides, per Laws 12 and 16.

The appeal was found to have merit.

The Committee: Mark Feldman (Chair), Lynn Deas, Danny Sprung, Patty Tucker and Bob White.

Commentary:

Goldsmith I'll buy 3♠ being a good bid. Give West a maximum, four spades, and two hearts, and 4♠ might be cold (KJxx xx AKQx Axx), or it might have no play (KJxx Ax Axx AJxx). At matchpoints, I think the odds clearly favor the low road. But driving to game is a logical alternative, so East must do that. So the logical alternatives left to consider are 4♥, a re-transfer, and 4♠. 4♥ is surely a logical alternative, and 4♠ is suggested by UI over 4♥, so 4♠ is not allowed; 4♥ must be chosen. West will be charmed to pass 4♥, thinking his partner is 5-5 in the majors. The number of tricks taken in 4♥ is not easy to estimate. I'll guess E/W will take seven. I rule reciprocal 300s.

The appeal has merit, and no procedural penalty (PP) should be given, because East did what he thought was the proper thing.

Polisner Well thought out by the directors and committee. This would have been a more difficult case without E/W's system notes as even with the UI available to East, he had an easy 3♠ bid.

Rigal Good decision. The committee and director both followed the correct procedure and came up with the sensible conclusion.

Smith The committee did a thorough and intelligent job on this case. Yes, it is possible and maybe even likely that most Easts would bid 3♠ without the UI. But the committee correctly applied Law 16 in that if bidding 4♠ is a logical alternative action then it must be inflicted on East.

Wildavsky I agree with the committee and director rulings. It's close whether this one had merit – I have no quarrel with the committee that found that it did.

Wolff Okay ruling because of the awful convention disruption (CD) which almost always makes it impossible to adjudicate.