

APPEAL	NABC+ TEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Steve Bates
Event	Mixed BAM Teams
Session	Second Final
Date	July 25, 2008

BD#	12
VUL	N/S
DLR	West

Ron Smith	
♠	A 8 2
♥	A J 4 2
♦	Q 8 6 5 4
♣	5

Michael Mikyska		Summer 2008 Las Vegas, NV	Adrienne Green	
♠	J 7 3		♠	Q T 9
♥	7 6 5		♥	K T 8
♦	A J 9		♦	T 2
♣	J 8 4 2		♣	A T 9 6 3

Linda Smith	
♠	K 6 5 4
♥	Q 9 3
♦	K 7 3
♣	K Q 7

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♦	Pass	1♠
Pass	2♠	Pass	2NT ¹
Pass	3♣ ²	Pass	3NT
Pass	Pass	Pass ³	

Final Contract	3NT by South
Opening Lead	♣2
Table Result	Down 1, N/S -100
Director Ruling	3NT S, made 3, N/S +600
Committee Ruling	3NT S, down 1, N/S -100 3NT S, made 3, E/W -600

(1)	Asks for more information.
(2)	Artificial showing minimum with three spades.
(3)	Asked opponents to explain auction singling out the 3♣ bid.

The Facts: The director was called at the end of the session and found the facts as noted above.

The Ruling: The questioning at East's final turn to call made UI available to West. The director determined that a club lead was demonstrably suggested by the UI and that a heart lead was a logical alternative (LA). It was judged both likely and at all probable that 3NT would make with a heart lead. Therefore, in accordance with Laws 16, 20F1 and 12C2, the table result was changed to 3NT by South making three, N/S plus 600 and E/W minus 600.

The Appeal: All four players were present at the hearing.
The testimony confirmed the facts found and presented by the director.

The Decision: The committee found that:

- UI was present.
- The UI demonstrably suggested a club lead over a heart lead (Law 16).
- A heart lead was a LA (Law 16).

The committee then had to determine the likely and at all probable results after a heart lead (Law 12C2).

The committee discussed the play after the ♥7 lead. Declarer would duck in dummy and most Easts would play the king and switch to clubs, beating the contract absent subsequent misdefense. Some Easts would put in the ♥T, after which the contract would surely make. It came to a decision that, while 3NT making nine tricks was “at all probable,” it was not likely. Therefore, the committee adjusted the table result to 3NT making three, E/W minus 600 for the offending side and allowed the table result of 3NT down one, N/S minus 100 to stand for the offenders.

The appeal was determined to have merit.

The committee seriously considered assessing a procedural penalty (PP) against West, who asked the worst kind of question at the least appropriate time. In the end, it decided against imposing a PP.

The Committee: Gail Greenberg (Chair), Peter Boyd, Gary Cohler, Chris Compton and Sam Lev.

Commentary:

Goldsmith I don't think playing the ♥K is such a sure thing. Many would lead the ♥7 from the 9765 of hearts, in which case playing the king probably blows a trick. From East's perspective, South might think the opening lead is from K987. I think I'd give reciprocal 600s, though the committee's ruling is thoughtful.

East is not due a procedural (PP). Supplying UI is not generally illegal. West, however, should get at least a 1/4 board PP. It is unthinkable to lead a club after that behavior by partner. Is there any good reason not to give a PP?

Polisner This write-up is incomprehensible as far as the play with a heart lead. When 2NT was Alerted, it was obviously somewhat of an artificial forcing bid and thus the issue is the meaning of 3♣. Would the result be any different if East, at his final turn to call, asked for an explanation of all Alerts (which is his right to do)? In real life, there is no difference in that scenario and the one which occurred at the table.

I would have deemed the play of the heart ten to be so poor as to not be reasonable (with the heart seven lead) as to not have allowed 3NT to make. The table result should stand for both sides and possibly a PP for the question.

- Rigal** Because the committee gave N/S 3NT down one even after adjusting the lead, I don't have to get into the issue of why a club lead looks normal on a deal where East did not overcall. I would have left it at 3NT down one on a club lead, with a procedural penalty to East for the reasons described. If the committee (reasonably) decided that the failure to double 3♣ made the heart lead more attractive, they should have said so! Given that this was not done, the end-result of N/S minus 100 and E/W penalized for the questions is a fair one. Maybe this way East will know better next time.... or not.
- Smith** I bow to the judgment of the committee on the likely outcomes after a heart lead. I find it hard to believe that this E/W pair had the audacity to come before a committee at all after the outrageously timed question and the clearly illegal choice of a lead after it happened. Somebody should have given them a penalty.
- Wildavsky** A close case. Both the director and the appeals committee (AC) rulings seem reasonable to me. I'd have assessed a substantial procedural penalty against E/W in addition. A more experienced AC might have. Because the appeal was filed late in the evening I persuaded three top experts who are not members of the NAC to serve, and I'd like to thank them, as well as all the NAC members, for their time and hard work.
- Wolff** The ruling seemed appropriate, especially the split scores. "Little By Little We Do Great Things!"