

APPEAL	Non NABC+ Seven
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Chris Patrias
Event	0-5000 Spingold
Session	First Match
Date	July 21, 2008

BD#	22
VUL	E/W
DLR	East

3,002 Masterpoints	
♠	K 6 4
♥	Q J 3
♦	K 6 4 3
♣	K J 6

2,007 Masterpoints		Summer 2008 Las Vegas, NV	1,843 Masterpoints	
♠	Q T 2		♠	J 8 7 5 3
♥	8 7 2		♥	K T
♦	T 7 5 2		♦	J 9 8
♣	7 3 2		♣	Q T 5

4,256 Masterpoints	
♠	A 9
♥	A 9 6 5 4
♦	A Q
♣	A 9 8 4

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

Final Contract	6♥ by South
Opening Lead	♠2
Table Result	Made 6, N/S +980
Director Ruling	5♥ S made 6, N/S +480
Panel Ruling	6♥ S made 6, N/S +980

(1) Break in Tempo (BIT)

The Facts: The director was called during the auction. South's 5♥ bid was slow. During the auction North explained that there was no agreement about the 5♥ bid – it was standard. After play, South said it asked for good trumps.

The Ruling: It was determined that there was a BIT. North chose from among logical alternatives (LA) one that was demonstrably suggested by the BIT. Since good trumps should be one of the top two honors or two of the top three honors, pass was determined to be a LA. Therefore in accordance with Laws 16A2 and 12C2, the table result was changed to 5♥ by South, making six, N/S plus 480.

The Appeal: All players attended the review.

South said she had a very good hand, and she knew partner had an opening hand. She wanted to explore for slam but wasn't sure how because she had all the aces. (Although they play Roman Keycard Blackwood, she didn't think to use it.) She thought 5♥ was standard to see if partner had any heart honors. North said she knew partner was asking about trumps. She thought QJx was good enough. Her partner is always a very slow bidder.

E/W didn't think North had a hand to bid six. It's flat with eight losers. They asked if 4♥ was weaker than 3♥ would've been and the answer was, "Yes."

The Decision: Ten of N/S's peers were asked what they would bid with the North hand after 5♥ by partner. Seven said that they would bid 6♥. They thought they had an excellent hand for their previous bidding. Some thought that the BIT suggested doubt on partner's part about whether or not to try for slam. They felt that passing 5♥ would be taking advantage of UI.

The panel decided that the 6♥ bid was not demonstrably suggested by the BIT. South wanted to try for slam but wasn't sure exactly how to go about it. She chose to ask partner about the quality of her trumps. North felt that QJx was good enough, since she could have had three small on this auction. The lucky lie of the hearts allowed the slam to make.

Therefore, the table result of 6♥ by South, making six, N/S plus 980 was restored.

The Panel: Jean Molnar (Reviewer), Harry Falk and Candy Kushner.

Players Consulted: Ten of North's peers.

Commentary:

- Rigal** The director who gave the initial ruling appears to have overlooked the significance of the word 'demonstrably' in 'demonstrably suggested'. A slow 5♥ call here is a slam try – the bid itself gives that AI, and in context of the ask normally relating to trumps, two honors is a great holding. Note the gratuitous and wrong-headed comment regarding the lucky lie of trumps from the panel; the slam needs either hearts, or clubs to behave. It is neither lucky nor unlucky but round about 50%.
- Smith** I agree with the panel that a slow 5♥ does not give North any useful information about what South's problem was, so it does not demonstrably suggest bidding 6♥. North is free to do whatever he wants.
- Wildavsky** How did the slow 5♥ bid suggest 6♥? The wording of Law 16 suggests that the director must demonstrate why a call is suggested – he did not do so. I agree with the panel's ruling.
- Wolff** The panel's ruling was right-on! I am disappointed with the panel's decision to say the 5♥ bid after a BIT was helpful in allowing North to bid a slam. That doesn't make sense and causes alarm that the panel was simply not qualified to determine bridge decisions.

