

APPEAL	NABC+ FIVE
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Olin Hubert
Event	Spingold
Session	First Session
Date	July 21, 2008

BD#	4
VUL	Both
DLR	West

Bryan Maksymetz	
♠	A T 7 5 4 2
♥	Q 7 6 3
♦	K
♣	T 4

Rick Binder		Summer 2008 Las Vegas, NV	Mark Aquino	
♠	J 8		♠	K
♥	K T 9 5 4 2		♥	Void
♦	Q J 5 3 2		♦	A T 8 7 4
♣	Void		♣	K Q 9 8 6 5 2

Zygmunt Marcinski	
♠	Q 9 6 3
♥	A J 5
♦	9 6
♣	A J 7 3

West	North	East	South
Pass	2♠	3♣	4♠
Pass	Pass	5♣ ¹	Dbl
5♥	Dbl	5♠	Pass
6♦	Pass	Pass	Dbl
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Final Contract	6♦ Dbl by West
Opening Lead	♠A
Table Result	6♦ dbld W, Made 6, E/W +1540
Director Ruling	5♣ dbld E, Down 2, E/W -500
Committee Ruling	5♣ dbld E, Down 2, E/W -500

(1) Fumble with bid box

The Facts: East displayed indecision as to what to bid over 4♠.

The Ruling: The UI demonstrably suggested not passing, and pass was determined to be a logical alternative. Therefore, the table result was adjusted to 5♣ doubled by East, down two, E/W minus 500.

The Appeal: Agreed Facts:

1. South indicated a “stop” warning to West before bidding 4♠, and West hesitated appropriately.
2. East started to pull out a bid in tempo, paused, dropped his bidding cards back in the bidding box, and then bid 5♣.
3. West took a very long time to bid 5♥.
4. South called Director when 6♦ was passed to him.

North, South, and West appeared before the committee. West affirmed the facts above. He suggested that he “knew” the opponents had ten spades. He felt that South doubled 5♣ confidently so the only question was which red suit to bid. He was afraid redouble would lead to a misunderstanding.

On questioning West indicated that he and East played occasionally. They play leaping Michaels, and a cuebid shows a one-suiter and asks for stop. They have no agreement about jump cue or direct 4NT. He was confident that both partners would interpret a later 4NT as clubs and secondary diamonds.

The Decision: Unauthorized information accompanied the 5♣ bid. The UI demonstrably suggested alternative actions to a pass by East, and pass was a logical alternative. Therefore, the committee ruled as the director had and adjusted the score for both sides to 5♣ doubled by East, down two, E/W minus 500.

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chair), Robb Gordon and Ellen Kent.

Commentary:

Goldsmith Okay ruling. The judgment seems very straightforward, so why no AWMW?

Polisner Where was the AWMW? If we don’t issue one here, we should do away with the process.

Rigal Sensible ruling by all concerned; the merit here seems dubious – I’d have liked to hear the committee explain just why it thought it had merit. West correctly read his partner as two-suited on an auction where East could have shown a two-suiter very easily, but chose not to do so. To my mind that is definitely in appeal without merit warning (AWMW) territory – particularly when having committed a UI infraction, and having been ruled against by the director, you bring an appeal.

Smith It doesn't sound as if the committee thought much of E/W's case. Why no AWMW?

Wildavsky Good work all 'round.

Wolff #1 N/S were not entitled to a windfall profit, since if the king of diamonds was located in the other hand (on the bidding I estimate approximately a 60% chance) or if the location of the ace of clubs didn't behave, N/S, by defeating 6♦, would have gotten a top, and we never would have heard about this hand. "Natural Playing Luck" (NPL) should decree that the result must stand both directions. Then, if the committee so chooses, they could penalize E/W up to 12 or more IMPs for the fumbling. In this way most of the "Masters" are served, always a worthwhile goal.