

APPEAL	NABC+ THIRTEEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Steve Bates
Event	Jacoby Open Swiss Teams
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	March 21, 2009

BD#	27
VUL	None
DLR	South

Simon De Wijs	
♠	Q 8 4 3
♥	A K Q 8 7 4
♦	K 2
♣	2

Kitty Cooper		Spring 2009 Houston, TX	Steve Cooper	
♠	K 5		♠	A J T 9 7 2
♥	T 6 3 2		♥	J
♦	J 6		♦	T 8 7 4 3
♣	A 9 6 5 4		♣	K

Bauke Muller	
♠	6
♥	9 5
♦	A Q 9 5
♣	Q J T 8 7 3

West	North	East	South
			3♣
Pass	4♥	4♠	Pass ¹
Pass	Dbl	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	4♠ doubled by East
Opening Lead	♣Q
Table Result	Down 3, E/W -500
Director Ruling	4♠ dbld E down 3, E/W -500
Committee Ruling	4♠ dbld E down 3, E/W -500

(1) Break in Tempo (BIT) of 10-15 seconds.
--

The Facts: The director was called after the play of the hand. There was a BIT by South over 4♠.

The Ruling: Although there was a BIT, it did not demonstrably suggest a double; and, pass was not considered to be a logical alternative. Therefore, the table result of 4♠ doubled by East down three, E/W minus 500 was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: E/W appealed the director's decision. Only East attended the hearing. On the appeal form West maintained that the double by North was suggested by the BIT.

The Decision: The committee addressed three issues:

Was there an unmistakable hesitation?

The committee determined that there was.

Did that demonstrably suggest the call taken by North?

It did. South's pause did suggest values (thus making "not pass" more attractive than "pass" for North). Yes, South could have x/xxx/xxx/KQxxxx but there were more hands where South was contemplating double (be it action or penalty) or a bid at the five-level where simply the knowledge of values made it easier for North to act.

Was there a logical alternative action for North that would have been less successful?

In other words, given that South's BIT suggested it was safe for North to double, was pass a logical alternative?

The committee determined that there was no logical alternative to North's double. He had voluntarily committed to game on a deal where he was not concerned about keeping the opponents out. In that context his double was the only call consistent with his bidding thus far. Therefore, the table result of 4♠ doubled by East down three, E/W minus 500 was allowed to stand.

The appeal was determined to have merit.

The Committee: Barry Rigal (Chair), Mark Feldman, Bruce Rogoff, Alan Stauber and Adam Wildavsky.

Commentary:

Goldsmith Very good ruling. I particularly like the step-by-step breakdown of the ruling.

I disagree about what the BIT suggested. I think it suggested 1-2 in the majors, just what South actually had. With three hearts, South would have bid 5♥. With only one, he would have passed in tempo or doubled. With two and two spades, he'd pass in tempo. So he probably has one spade and two hearts, just enough to consider bidding 5♥ and reject it.

Does knowing partner's major suit length demonstrably suggest anything useful? I don't see how. The five-level seems out of the question.

I agree that passing isn't a logical alternative once North has committed to game. In fact, I think many good pairs consider South's pass forcing.

Polisner This is the classic case where it would be helpful to have the results of a poll about the issue of logical alternative. It is so easy for committee members to do the "correct thing" when they know the hand and thus a no logical alternative decision could be suspect.

Rigal Relatively clear-cut we thought, at the time.

Smith Okay, so the slow pass suggests the double. I still don't see the merit here either. Again, I am left wondering if director polls might dissuade some of these appellants from bringing cases to committee in the first place. If not, then I would hope committees would have less difficulty assigning an appeal without merit warning (AWMW) when appropriate.

Wildavsky A close call. I could see another committee ruling differently.

Wolff This committee has created its own way of measuring responsibility. I really do not think a hesitation disruption (HD) by South can be judged and consequently would also allow the result of 4♠ doubled to stand.