

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

BD#	15
VUL	N/S
DLR	South

324 Masterpoints	
♠	K 7 6
♥	A K 8 5
♦	A T 7 6 5
♣	K

1,353 Masterpoints		Summer 2008 Las Vegas, NV	2,117 Masterpoints	
♠	T 8 4		♠	A Q 5
♥	T 9 6 3		♥	Q 7
♦	J 8 2		♦	K
♣	A J T		♣	Q 9 8 7 6 3 2

323 Masterpoints	
♠	J 9 3 2
♥	J 4 2
♦	Q 9 4 3
♣	5 4

West	North	East	South
			Pass
Pass	1NT	Db1 ¹	Pass
2♣ ²	2♦	3♣	Pass ³
Pass	3♦	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	3♦ by North
Opening Lead	Unknown
Table Result	Made 3, N/S + 110
Director Ruling	3♣ W making 4, E/W +130
Panel Ruling	3♣ W making 4, E/W +130

(1)	One-suited hand – forces 2♣..
(2)	Forced.
(3)	Disputed break in tempo (BIT).

The Facts: West called the director as there was concern about the N/S auction that led to a 3♦ contract. E/W claimed there was a BIT by South before passing 3♣. N/S did not agree.

The Ruling: The director judged that there was a BIT and that it suggested action over a pass, which was judged to be a logical alternative (LA). Therefore in accordance with Laws 16A1, 12C2 and 73C, the score was changed to 3♣ by West making four, E/W plus 130.

The Appeal: All the players attended the review.

North did not notice a BIT. Bidding could have been a disaster as she did not know how many diamonds partner held. South thought the time taken to bid was about five seconds. E/W were surprised when North turned up with only five diamonds. Bidding twice may have been okay but three times was questionable.

The Decision: Six players were polled and asked what they would do with the North hand— four passed, one doubled and one bid 3♥Therefore, the panel determined that there was a BIT, it demonstrably suggested action other than pass and that pass was a LA.

In accordance with Laws 16A1, 12C2 and 73C, the director's adjustment of 3♣ by West making four, E/W plus 130 was upheld.

Since two of the players polled bid, an appeal without merit warning (AWMW) was not issued.

The Panel: Nancy Boyd (Reviewer), Bernie Gorkin and Jean Molnar.

Commentary:

Rigal NO, NO, NO! The panel has again totally misrepresented when an AWMW should be awarded. An agreed break in tempo, and only two people out of six think an action is appropriate. More than half say no; case closed. AWMW.

Smith Surely you don't get a third bid opposite a silent partner after opening 1NT if there was a hesitation by partner. South's statement that he took five seconds is enough for me. Should N/S have expected to win this appeal? I don't think so. They should have been given an AWMW.

Wildavsky The fact that some players bid with no UI does not give this appeal merit. North had UI that prohibited him from bidding when pass would have been logical, and pass was clearly logical.

Wolff Again, a close to perfect ruling. However, another useful caveat (which I will also blog about), making a player who distorts a normal practice (such as either an opening 1NT with a singleton or a weak two-bid with less than a six-card suit, but perhaps 5-5 or even after opening Flannery with 5-6 in the majors instead of 4-5 then use that as an excuse to be able to use UI to his advantage) subject to closer scrutiny to not take advantage of possible UI. There have been some number of cases in the past of players, who after distorting, have tried (and usually succeeded) of making everything turn out okay for his partnership, which on the surface is quite legal, but if only slight UI is present he should not be allowed to perform his magic.