

APPEAL	NABC+ ELEVEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Gary Zeiger
Event	NABC Swiss Teams
Session	First Qualifying
Date	July 26, 2008

BD#	9
VUL	E/W
DLR	North

Jim Looby	
♠	Q 9 5 3 2
♥	J 7 3
♦	T 6
♣	J T 2

Larry Griffey		Summer 2008 Las Vegas, NV	Spike Lay	
♠	A 8		♠	K J
♥	Q T 8 6 4		♥	
♦	A Q 9 5 2		♦	K 8 7 4
♣	4		♣	A K Q 9 8 6 3

Barnet Shenkin	
♠	T 7 6 4
♥	A K 9 5 2
♦	J 3
♣	7 5

West	North	East	South
	Pass	1♣	1♥
2♦	2♥	4♥ ¹	Pass
4♠ ²	Pass	5♦ ³	Pass
6♦	Pass	7♦	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	7♦ by West
Opening Lead	♥3
Table Result	Made 7, E/W +2140
Director Ruling	5♦ W, making 7, E/W +640
Committee Ruling	7♦ W, making 7, E/W +2140

(1)	Meant as exclusion Blackwood.
(2)	Meant as cuebid. Taken to mean 0 controls.
(3)	10-15 second BIT.

The Facts: The director was called after the end of play of the hand The 10-15 second BIT was agreed by all players at the table. There were no Alerts or questions asked during the auction.

The Ruling: There was UI from the BIT which demonstrably suggested bidding on. A sample hand that East could have held is KJxx/ -- /KJxx /KQxxx. Three players were polled – two of those polled passed making pass a logical alternative (LA), In accordance with Laws 16A2 and 12C2 the table result was adjusted to 5♦ by West making seven, E/W plus 640.

The Appeal: East and West attended the hearing. Despite the bidding misunderstanding West maintained that he was searching for a grand slam. He was not stopping below 6♦. A void was extremely likely in the East hand based upon the auction. E/W were a regular partnership who played many treatments and conventions. East thought he was bidding exclusion 3014 RKC while West thought the 4♥ bid was a splinter since exclusion RKC had always been a triple jump in past auctions. West could not imagine playing East for a hand that didn't have a reasonable play for slam after the 4♥ jump. It was determined that 2♦ was not game-forcing in competition and that a jump to 4♦ would have been “minorwood” asking for controls.

The Decision: The committee agreed that the BIT demonstrably suggested bidding on, but a pass by West over 5♦ was deemed not to be a LA. The committee did not believe that East would force to the five-level without at least one first round control and extra playing strength since 2♦ was biddable on an 8-9 HCP hand in competition. A strong hand with a singleton heart would have bid 4♦, “minorwood.” In addition, it seemed odds against for West to play his partner for the rare hand that didn't provide a reasonable play for slam. The committee was surprised by the results of the director's poll and didn't know whether those polled has been apprised of the E/W methods. There was no UI for East; thus, there were no restrictions on him carrying on to 7♦. Thus, the table result of 7♦ by West making seven, E/W plus 2140 was restored for both sides.

The Committee: Mark Bartusek (Chair), Ed Lazarus, Lou Reich, Bob Schwartz and Jim Thurtell.

Commentary:

- Goldsmith** Close call. Passing 5♦ is probably wrong, but I'm pretty sure some number of West's peers would take that action, so it is a LA. I think it ought not be a LA, but by our current rules, I think it is.
- Polisner** Poor ruling and excellent work by the committee. I see that the concept of “if it hesitates - shoot it” is still the rule by many directors.
- Rigal** Tough case. If 2♦ is not a game force, the continuation over 5♦ seems reasonable to me. Are there any LA's? I'll buy into the committee decision – with some reservations – after which the 7♦ bidder is, presumably, on his own. Restoring the table result still feels questionable to me; but I understand why the committee did it and can't find a good reason to do otherwise.

- Smith** The polled players were top flight experts, and they were apprised correctly of the E/W methods. I think committees should be very reluctant to overrule a director poll on logical alternatives without finding out from the director how it was conducted.
- Wildavsky** A close case – this one could have gone either way. I can't fault either the director or the appeals committee ruling.
- Wolff** Good ruling, except for not giving E/W a procedural penalty for not knowing their conventions and causing “Convention Disruption” (CD). I suggest a one or more victory point penalty for the CD problem