

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Two
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Harry Falk
Event	Saturday-Sunday Side Game Series
Session	Saturday Afternoon
Date	July 19, 2008

BD#	19
VUL	E/W
DLR	South

1,262 Masterpoints	
♠	T 7 4
♥	A K T 6 2
♦	J 6 2
♣	Q 3

183 Masterpoints		Summer 2008 Las Vegas, NV	411 Masterpoints	
♠	Q 3		♠	A J 9 8 5 2
♥	J 9 5		♥	4
♦	9 7		♦	A K 5 3
♣	A K T 8 7 2		♣	J 4

1,354 Masterpoints	
♠	K 6
♥	Q 8 7 3
♦	Q T 8 4
♣	9 6 5

West	North	East	South
			Pass
Pass	2♥	2♠	4♥
Pass	Pass	4♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	4♠ by East
Opening Lead	♥3
Table Result	Made 4, E/W +620
Director Ruling	4♥ N, Down 3, N/S -150
Panel Ruling	4♥ N, Down 3, N/S -150

The Facts: West had a significant pause over 4♥. (N/S claimed a one minute plus pause – E/W claimed a 40 second pause).

The Ruling: The director ruled that pass was a logical alternative (LA) to 4♠. In accordance with Laws 16A2 and 12C2 the result was changed to 4♥ by North, Down three, N/S minus 150.

The Appeal: A poll of nine peers of the E/W pair got five votes for pass, three for 4♠ and one for double.

East stated that the 4♠ call was based on the assumption that at this vulnerability, 4♥ by a passed hand was likely preemptive. West stated that he needed time to consider a double and finally passed because of concern that South might be distributional.

North/South felt that the break in tempo (BIT) suggested competing further.

The Decision: There was unauthorized information from the break in tempo. This demonstrably suggested not passing. Pass was a logical alternative to 4♠. 4♥ down three was deemed the most unfavorable result for E/W that was at all probable and the most favorable result for N/S that was likely. In accordance with Laws 16A2 and 12C2 the table result was adjusted to 4♥ by North, down three, N/S minus 150. As no poll was taken prior to the appeal and as the appellants were inexperienced, no appeal without merit warning (AWMW) was imposed.

The Panel: Jay Albright (Reviewer), Nancy Boyd and Gary Zeiger.

Commentary:

Rigal I am not entirely happy but can live with the decision not to award an AWMW. Obviously this hand is far closer than case one; it is surely up to the screeners to let people know in advance what the options are if they use UI and lose the appeal in a position like this. I would not have been amazed had the poll result been different, but given what it showed, when the majority vote for the action not indicated by the UI we must be close to an AWMW.

Smith We have to stop looking for reasons not to give AWMWs when appropriate. They don't really mean anything unless a player accumulates several of them. So, when a case is obviously ruled correctly by the directors and by the panel or committee, an AWMW should be imposed automatically. The experience level of the appellants is just one of many reasons that should not be considered in making that decision.

Wildavsky West's testimony shows a profound misunderstanding of the laws. It doesn't matter why he hesitated, or whether his hand somehow warranted a hesitation. The fact that he did hesitate, for whatever reason, severely restricts his partner's options. An AWMW might have helped educate E/W – I doubt anything else would have an effect. Their appeal had not a shred of merit.

Wolff Good ruling, but these first two cases are back to the days of very unethical bridge. At least these two players (East and West), having many fewer master points than did the E/W pair in case Non-NABC+ One, have inexperience as an excuse. The panel needs to better educate these culprits.