

1APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Fourteen
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Tim Crank
Event	Stratified Open Pairs
Session	Second
Date	July 24, 2008

BD#	23
VUL	Both
DLR	South

978 Masterpoints	
♠	K J T
♥	Q 6 3 2
♦	K 9 8 7
♣	4 2

31 Masterpoints		Summer 2008 Las Vegas, NV	1036 Masterpoints	
♠	A 8 4 2		♠	7 3
♥	A J T		♥	K 9
♦	6 4 2		♦	T 5 3
♣	9 6 5		♣	A K Q 8 7 3

2852 Masterpoints	
♠	Q 9 6 5
♥	8 7 5 4
♦	A Q J
♣	J T

West	North	East	South
			Pass
Pass	Pass	1♣ ¹	Pass
1♠	Pass	2♣	Pass
Pass	Dbl	Pass	2♥
2♠	Pass	3♣	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	3♣ by East
Opening Lead	♥5
Table Result	Made 4, E/W+130
Director Ruling	2♠ W, Down 2, E/W-200
Panel Ruling	2♠ W, Down 2, E/W-200

(1) Opening bid with 4 Spades

The Facts: The director was called after the play of the hand. The opening bid of 1♣ was explained as showing four spades.

The Ruling: The director determined that without an Alert and explanation, which was UI to East, a pass of 2♠ is logical alternative and that a 3♣ bid was demonstrably suggested by the UI. Therefore, the result was adjusted to 2♠ by West, down two, E/W minus 200, in accordance with Laws 16A2 and 12C2.

The Appeal: East admitted that he forgot his pair's agreement. He thought that bidding 3♣ with solid clubs was clear-cut.

The Decision: Six players in the 900-1200 point range were consulted. Without the UI, four passed 2♠ and two bid 3♣.

Since four out of six players consulted passed without the UI, Pass was determined to be a logical alternative. In accordance with Laws 73C, 12C2, the director's decision to adjust the result to 2♠ by West, down two, E/W minus 200 was upheld..

The appeal was determined to have merit.

The Panel: Bernie Gorkin (Reviewer), Nancy Boyd and Candy Kuschner.

Players consulted: Six of East's peers.

Commentary:

Rigal Back repeatedly to the theme of AWMWs. Yet again E/W had UI, took advantage of it, were ruled against, appealed, and lost the case because a majority of people disagreed with their claim that there was no LA to the action taken. Case closed, AWMW; there should be no ambiguity about this; and yet.....

Smith Good ruling and panel decision. If E/W were truly playing the method described, it was illegal in this event. So how about a Law 90 procedural penalty for that in addition to the AWMW they should have received.

Wildavsky It surprises me that the ACBL allows a 1♣ opening to show 4♠ in this event. As for the appeal, it had not a shred of merit. I'd have adjusted the score and assessed a procedural penalty against E/W for flagrant use of UI.

Wolff The bridge gets sillier and worse. Why didn't West correct earlier if 1♣ club by East promised 4 spades? Some appeals really have become below anyone's standards.