

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Nine
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Sam Stoxen
Event	Stratified Open Pairs
Session	First Session
Date	Monday, July 21, 2008

BD#	28
VUL	N/S
DLR	West

3,672 Masterpoints	
♠	5
♥	K 6
♦	Q J 8 7 4 3
♣	T 9 7 4

627 Masterpoints		Summer 2008 Las Vegas, NV	1,553 Masterpoints	
♠	A J 8 4 2		♠	T 3
♥	Q 7 2		♥	A J T 8 5 4 3
♦	K 9 2		♦	A
♣	5 3		♣	A 8 6

5,385 Masterpoints	
♠	K Q 9 7 6
♥	9
♦	T 6 5
♣	K Q J 2

West	North	East	South
Pass	2♦	3♥	4♦
Pass ¹	Pass	Dbl	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	4♦ Dbl'd by North
Opening Lead	♥2
Table Result	Down 3, N/S -800
Director Ruling	4♦ N, Down 3, N/S -300
Panel Ruling	4♦ N, Down 3, N/S -300

(1)	BIT (Break in Tempo)
-----	----------------------

The Facts: The director was called after the auction. There was a BIT.

The Ruling: The director judged that action was demonstrably suggested by the BIT and that pass was a logical alternate (LA). East was willing to play 3♥. Therefore, in accordance with Laws 16A AND 12C2, the result was adjusted to 4♦ by North, down three, N/S minus 300.

The Appeal: West was the only player to attend the hearing. He said he asked a “couple questions” about the auction, then decided his ♦K was not worth anything and passed. He knew if his partner had a really good hand, he would either bid on or double. His partner later admonished him for not bidding 4♥ immediately.

The Decision: Seven of E/W's peers were given the East hand and asked what they would do after 4♦ with no UI. All but one doubled, bid 4♦ or said they would do one or the other but they weren't passing. However, most said they would have bid 4♥ the first round. When told about partner's BIT, they didn't feel they could take further action since they had been willing to play only 3♥ earlier. The panel determined that these statements confirmed pass as a logical alternative for East. The panel upheld the director's adjustment of 4♦ by North, down three, N/S minus 300.

The Panel: Jean Molnar (Reviewer), Nancy Boyd and Charlie MacCracken.

Players consulted: Seven of E/W's peers.

Commentary:

Rigal If everybody would bid with the East hand then partner's tempo is irrelevant; I approve of the idea of passing (if you bid 3♥ you cannot be worth 4♥ can you?) but here the key is to ignore the tempo and ask the polled group what they would bid. It sounds like the polled players thought there was no LA to bidding. We are not training directors, we are asking for bidding judgment. Having said that, paradoxically, I agree with the directors and the AWMW. But if we relied on the polled players I think we should go the other way; we can't take the verdict we want, but the one they give us.

Smith Good analysis by the panel. As I mentioned earlier, it is always difficult to find peers of players who take unusual actions earlier in a hand. But here, the panel drew the right conclusions from what the polled players said they would do if they had bid only 3♥ earlier. We do have to be careful about allowing polled players to offer opinions on what they think is proper after a hesitation (as apparently happened here). We should be polling players solely on the subject of bridge opinion, not application of the laws. Applying the law is the province of the panel. But I think the panel got it right anyway. I actually don't think this appeal had any merit.

Wildavsky Good work all around.

Wolff Fair ruling. Bidding after partner's BIT has evidently become very fashionable and should be attacked.