

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Seven
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Millard Nachtwey
Event	Red Ribbon Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	March 19, 2009

BD#	17
VUL	None
DLR	North

1,331 Masterpoints	
♠	J 2
♥	A K J T 3
♦	A Q 5
♣	Q J 4

1,356 Masterpoints		Spring 2009 Houston, TX	1,514 Masterpoints	
♠	K Q		♠	9 6 5 3
♥	7		♥	Q 9 6 5
♦	K J T 9 8 3		♦	6 2
♣	K T 9 7		♣	A 8 2

1,264 Masterpoints	
♠	A T 8 7 4
♥	8 4 2
♦	7 4
♣	6 5 3

West	North	East	South
	1♥	Pass	Pass
2♦	2♥	Pass	Pass
3♦	Dbl ¹	Pass	Pass ²
Pass			

Final Contract	3♦ doubled by W
Opening Lead	♥A
Table Result	Down 1, E/W -100
Director Ruling	3♥ N down 1, N/S -50
Panel Ruling	3♥ N down 1, N/S -50

(1)	The double card was played with extra emphasis by snapping on the table.
(2)	Alleged break in tempo (BIT).

The Facts: A director (unknown) was called at the end of the auction. At the end of the session E/W asked the DIC for rectification. E/W did not agree that South broke tempo. However, N/S did not disagree with the fact that North played the double card with extra emphasis.

The Ruling: The director determined that there was UI and that it demonstrably suggested a pass over 3♥, which was judged to be a logical alternative. Therefore, in accordance with Laws 16 and 12C1(e), the result for both sides was adjusted to 3♥ by North down one, N/S minus 50.

The Appeal: N/S appealed the director's decision and all four players attended the review. N/S stated that the double is strictly penalty in their methods. South stated that the ♠A is a sure trick.

Three player with about 1,300 Masterpoints were polled. One player got confused and forgot that partner had freely bid hearts twice. This player passed the double. Both other players bid 3♥ firmly without too much consideration.

The Decision: As law 16 prohibits a contestant choosing among logical alternatives one that was demonstrably suggested by UI and both 3♥ and pass are logical alternatives with pass being demonstrably suggested, the panel upheld the director's decision to adjust the result to 3♥ by North down one, N/S minus 50 for both sides.

The appeal was considered to have merit.

The Panel: Bill Michaels (Reviewer), Jay Albright and Mike Flader.

Commentary:

Polisner I guess that the disputed BIT by South was intended to imply that South had a difficult decision about passing or bidding 3♥ to show that North's double did not imply a claim to defend rather than something like KJX, AKXXXX, A, Kxx in which case 4♥ is indicated. In my opinion, the panel should have required 4♥ doubled as the final contract for minus 300.

Rigal At this vulnerability, the appeal has no merit. North should have been made to think twice about bringing this appeal given his behavior. Probably a procedural penalty (PP), rather than an appeal without merit warning (AWMW).

Smith Did E/W really deny that South hesitated before passing the double while N/S claimed it happened? If so, that just confirms that bidding 3♥ was a logical alternative. But I suspect that the write-up is wrong and E/W said that South hesitated. In any case, the panel polling confirms that pass is a logical alternative. The N/S contention that double is penalty in this sequence was correctly given little weight since it is an unusual agreement and apparently not documented. So this case was clearly decided correctly. N/S brought nothing new to the table and should have been given an appeal without merit warning (AWMW).

Wildavsky I fail to see the merit.

Wolff Again inexperience has taken hold of the decision makers. North's double (unethical or not) implies the expectation of taking five defensive tricks in one's own hand and that plus the unknown (to North) ace of spades in partner's hand will result in plus 300 for the defense which will beat all part scores. North's loud double can easily (and probably should) be penalized with a 1/4 to 1/2 of a board match point penalty and then all masters are again served (obviously the overall goal).

