

APPEAL	NABC+ SIX
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Whitehead Women's Pairs
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	March 19, 2009

BD#	6
VUL	E/W
DLR	East

Jerry Jungmichel	
♠	A T 9 3
♥	K T 8 5 3
♦	2
♣	8 7 4

Barbara Sartorius		Spring 2009 Houston, TX	Sharon Hait	
♠	K Q 7		♠	J 8 6 5 4
♥	J		♥	A 9 6 4
♦	A 4		♦	T
♣	A K Q J T 5 2		♣	9 6 3

Shirley George	
♠	2
♥	Q 7 2
♦	K Q J 9 8 7 6 5 3
♣	

West	North	East	South
		Pass	5♦
6♣ ¹	Pass ²	Pass	6♦
Dbl	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	6♦ doubled by South
Opening Lead	♣K
Table Result	Down 1, N/S -100
Director Ruling	6♦ dbld S, down 1, N/S -100
Committee Ruling	6♦ dbld S, down 1, N/S -100

(1)	Break in Tempo (BIT).
(2)	Break in Tempo (BIT).

The Facts: The director was called initially after the 6♦ bid and returned after the hand had been played to conclusion. N/S said that West bid 6♣ immediately. West said she paused 10-12 seconds and East said West paused appropriately. E/W said that North had a long BIT over 6♣. North said that she had something to think about.

The Ruling: The director judged that a BIT over 6♣ by North would not demonstrably suggest that South bid – it would demonstrably suggest a double or pass. Therefore, since there was no violation of Law16, the director allowed the table result of 6♦ doubled by South down one, N/S minus 100 to stand for both sides.

The Appeal: E/W appealed the director's decision. All four players attended the hearing. E/W stated that there was a 10-12 second hesitation over 6♣ by North. N/S agreed that the hesitation was no longer than 10-12 seconds.

N/S stated that the auction required some thought by North. N/S further stated that the BIT suggested that South refrain from doing anymore bidding, since North was probably not considering bidding 6♦ but doubling. A player in South's position should, perhaps, bend over backwards to bid after North's BIT.

The Decision: The committee judged that there was at least a slight BIT by North but not an unduly long one. The auction did require some thought – whether to double, and, if so, what to lead, etc.

While the committee thought a pass by South may have been a logical alternative, it did not think that the BIT demonstrably suggested bidding 6♦. If anything, the BIT suggested that South pass.

Therefore, the committee upheld the director's decision to allow the table result of 6♦ doubled by South down one, N/S minus 100 to stand for both sides.

The committee determined that the appeal had merit.

The Committee: Tom Peters (Chair), Tom Carmichael, Mike Kovacich, Jim Thurtell and Bob White.

Commentary:

Goldsmith I'm not sure I buy the "not demonstrably" argument, but I think it doesn't matter. South heard her partner fail to double 6♣. At favorable vulnerability, wouldn't most players shrug and bid again? Even if partner had said out loud, "we might be able to beat 6♣," wouldn't most Souths say, "not with my hand, we can't." I'd rule that passing 6♣ is not a logical alternative for South and let the result stand. There might be some players for whom passing is a logical alternative, but I doubt South is one of them. The appeal had merit.

Polisner Well done except that an appeal without merit warning (AWMW) would have been warranted.

Rigal Definitely merit; I do not know what the pause suggested but on an auction of this sort it is hard for even a regular partnership to work out what is going on. Sensible decision all round.

Smith I can't disagree with the logic of the directors and the committee. But I still feel uneasy about this one. I don't think anyone would think twice if South had passed even with a huge break in tempo by partner, so I am not buying that ethically South should bid 6♦ after a hesitation by partner. So, why did she bid 6♦?

Wildavsky Good work all around.

Wolff Good enough ruling based on the facts and probability of North considering doubling ahead of bidding 6♦.