

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Four
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Guillermo Poplawsky
Event	Stratified Daylight Open Pairs
Session	First Session
Date	July 20, 2008

BD#	6
VUL	E/W
DLR	East

2,139 Masterpoints	
♠	9 2
♥	Void
♦	A Q J 8 5 4
♣	Q 7 6 4 2

200 Masterpoints		Summer 2008 Las Vegas, NV	8000 Masterpoints	
♠	K J 6 4 3		♠	A Q 8 7
♥	5 4 3		♥	A K T 9 7 6 2
♦	9 7 3 2		♦	T
♣	8		♣	J

500 Masterpoints	
♠	T 5
♥	Q J 8
♦	K 6
♣	A K T 9 5 3

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

Final Contract	6♣ Dbl'd by North
Opening Lead	♥5
Table Result	Made 7, N/S plus 1190
Director Ruling	6♣ dbld N, made 7, N/S +1190
Panel Ruling	6♣ dbld N, made 7, N/S +1190

(1)	BIT 20 seconds
-----	----------------

The Facts: South broke tempo before doubling 5♥.

The Ruling: The director polled four players of equal ability – all made a call (6♣) after South's double. Since pass was determined not to be a logical alternative (LA), in accordance with Law 16, the table result of 6♣ doubled by North, making seven, N/S plus 1190 was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: East said North should sit for the double because of his heart shortness and his ♦Ace is a good defensive value. North said he thought the opponents could make a game and was continuing his sacrifice.

The Decision: A large number of players in the 1500-2500 MP range were polled before two were found who would take the 5♣ approach to this hand. Both bid 6♣. Both said pass was not a logical alternative.

Since the consultants with a similar mind set to North's believed there was no logical alternative to 6♣, the panel ruled that Law 16A was not violated so the table result of 6♣ doubled by North, making seven, N/S plus 1190 was allowed to stand.

The Panel: Charlie MacCracken (Reviewer), Bernie Gorkin and Peter Marcus.

Commentary:

Rigal I have to admit that with the North hand I would bid this way as well. I would take the double as a suggestion but not a command here. Pass would be non-forcing so double just shows some sort of extras – and lo and behold partner has soft trump tricks and it is STILL right to bid.

Smith I'm mildly surprised with the results of the two polls, but they both clearly indicate that pass is not a logical alternative to the peers of this player. I'm especially glad to see that the director conducted a poll before making the ruling. That procedure should be more common. I also agree with the methodology of the panel in trying to find peers who agreed with the earlier actions of North. It would have been useful if the reviewer could have found more than two, and, as I noted in Non-NABC+ One, I would not completely discount what other polled players said even if they did not match North's actions at each earlier turn.

Wildavsky Pass seems logical enough to me. As Edgar Kaplan put it, on a different case, "Would it have been obviously foolish to pass, an egregious error, absurd? No, it wouldn't--pass would be right quite often." In fact pass was right on this deal, had West found a spade lead. A poll of two players is not enough to establish that there is no logical alternative to an action. One need not restrict the poll to 5♣ bidders. Most of us can put ourselves in the place of someone who made a different call than we would have.

Wolff Hesitation disruption (HD) needs to be dealt with more strongly. N/S needs to be given plus 200 vs. 5♥ doubled and E/W should either get only an average (compromise between minus 200 and minus 1190). West might have led a spade vs. 6♣ doubled.