

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Twenty-three
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Susan Doe
Event	A/X Swiss
Session	Playthrough
Date	July 27, 2008

BD#	<b>5</b>
VUL	<b>N/S</b>
DLR	<b>North</b>

<b>Gudrun Wallace</b>	
♠	K 9
♥	A Q T 9
♦	Q T 5 4 3
♣	J 5

<b>Janet Colchamiro</b>		<b>Summer 2008 Las Vegas, NV</b>	<b>Mel Colchamiro</b>	
♠	A Q 8 5 3 2		♠	T 7 6 4
♥	K J 4		♥	7 5 2
♦	7		♦	J
♣	Q T 9		♣	A 8 6 3 2

<b>Mary Gorkin</b>	
♠	J
♥	8 6 3
♦	A K 9 8 6 3
♣	K 7 4

West	North	East	South
	1♦	Pass	3♦ <sup>1</sup>
3♠	Pass	4♠	Pass <sup>2</sup>
Pass	5♦	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	<b>5♦ by North</b>
Opening Lead	<b>♠7</b>
Table Result	<b>Made 5, N/S +600</b>
Director Ruling	<b>4♠ W, down 3, E/W -150</b>
Panel Ruling	<b>4♠ W, down 3, E/W -150</b>

(1)	Alerted as weak. Actual agreement is invitational.
(2)	Alleged brief but unmistakable break in tempo (BIT).

**The Facts:** The director was called after the 5♦ bid.

E/W contended that there was a brief but unmistakable huddle by South before passing over 4♠. South said she had no bid and nothing to think about. North stated that there was no huddle but said that she now remembered that in this partnership 3♦ was invitational.

**The Ruling:** The director judged that South's hand supports the E/W contention that South probably broke tempo, however briefly. The UI demonstrably suggested bidding 5♦ over passing, which was determined to be a logical alternative (LA) at this vulnerability. Therefore, the result was changed for both sides to 4♠ by West, down three, E/W -150.

**The Appeal:** All four players attended the review.

South indicated she did not break tempo at all as she had “nothing to think about.”

E/W reiterated that the BIT was “slight” – perhaps a “flicker.”

The Decision: The panel polled six players of about the same masterpoint holding as North and found:

(a) all thought briefly before passing with the South hand and

(b) none were either interested in or willing to bid 5♦ with the North hand.

The panel judged that the probability of a BIT by South was reasonable. In accordance with Laws 16A and 73C, the panel upheld the director’s decision to change the result to 4♠ by West down three, E/W minus 150 for both sides.

The appeal was judged to have merit.

**The Panel:** Nancy Boyd (Reviewer), Candy Kushner and Gary Zeiger.

**Commentary:**

**Rigal** Disagree with the ruling; after the unexpected competition South is expected to take more than the minimum 3-5 seconds; and it is not clear in which direction any break might point. To my mind North can do what he likes. Note, defending 4♠ doubled is in abstract quite likely to be the best N/S can do.

**Smith** Good job by the directors and panel.

**Wildavsky** I agree with the director and panel rulings.

**Wolff** Excellent ruling - timely and just. The panel looked at the hands and determined what probably did happen. Remember N/S start out as culprits, by giving the wrong convention description.