

**2010 Fall NABC
Appeals Casebook**



Appeals at the 2010 Fall NABC Orlando, Florida

FOREWORD

The appeal hearings and commentary descriptions are now being compiled and edited by the American Contract Bridge League. They are published on the ACBL web page. This internet publication is intended to be a tool to help improve the abilities of those serving on appeals committees and tournament directors and to communicate decisions and the process to arrive at those decisions to the membership at large.

A total of thirty (21) cases were heard.

Ten (10) cases were from unrestricted (by masterpoints) North American Bridge Championship Events and were heard by a committee of peers. The names of the players involved are included.

Eleven (11) cases were from all other events and were heard by panels (committees) of tournament directors. The names of the players involved are included when the event from which the appeal came was a Flight A/X event or was the top bracket of a bracketed knockout event. When the names of the players are not used, the player's masterpoint total is included.

The cases are first presented without commentary. After the official panel of commentators has had an opportunity to provide their commentary (about 4 weeks) and any corrections to the cases, the commentary is added, corrections made and the internet publication is finalized.

Everyone involved in this process is due praise for their efforts. Special thanks to the NABC Appeals Committee and the Tournament Directors serving on the director committees, scribes and commentators. Without their considerable contribution of time and effort, this publication would not exist.

**Appeals at the
2010 Fall NABC
Orlando, FL**

THE EXPERT PANEL

Bart Bramley, was born in 1948 in Poughkeepsie, NY, and grew up in Connecticut. He has lived in Boston, Seattle, and Chicago, and currently lives in Dallas with his wife Judy and their two cats. He graduated from MIT and had careers in programming and options trading before taking his current job as a technical analyst at SCA Promotions in Dallas. His National wins include the Vanderbilt, the Reisinger, the LM Pairs and two Blue Ribbons. In WBF events he has won the Senior Bowl and was second in the World Par Contest. He is a staff member and frequent writer for The Bridge World. He is an avid sports fan, especially baseball and the Yankees, and plays a mediocre game of golf. He enjoys word games and trivia games. He is (was?) a big fan of the Grateful Dead.

Jeff Goldsmith, was born near Schenectady, NY in 1961. He has lived in Pasadena, CA, for the last 20 years. He graduated from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and Caltech. He is a software engineer, focusing on computer graphics and animation and internet programming, all with a heavy mathematical perspective. He created computer animation for JPL for several years including the movie about Voyager's encountering Neptune. He ice dances and plays many other games, particularly German board games. His web site (<http://www.gg.caltech.edu/~jeff>) contains lots of bridge and other material.

Ton Kooijman, was born in the early forties (he wants some guess remaining). His father was a good bridge player whom tried to teach him the game starting in the late fifties. He passed his examination for TD in the Netherlands in the late sixties, some months after he married. Quite soon he started directing in the highest divisions of bridge in the Netherlands. Not much progress in the seventies, though in his private life he became father of a son and a daughter, but at the end of that era he was selected to be TD in the Olympiad in his country in 1980 where he met the international bridge scene with illustrious people like Edgar Kaplan and Kojak, the latter becoming a real example of TD-behavior. In 1987 he was appointed one of the chief TD's in Europe but his job in bridge concentrated around the organization. During the nineties and zeroes, he was operations director for WBF and EBL. But he did not neglect the laws. In the Netherlands, he was chairman of the national appeal committee for many years; and he became a member of the WBF-Laws Committee in 1994. In 1997 he took Edgar Kaplan's place as chairman of this committee. His approach as member of the commentating group will concentrate more on the technical application of the laws than on the question whether a call is acceptable given the available unauthorized information. And since he is European the differences in approach between both continents might draw his attention.

Barry Rigal, was born in London, England in 1958. He currently resides in New York City with his wife, Sue Picus. A bridge writer and analyst, he contributes to many periodicals worldwide and is the author of a dozen books, including *Card Games for Dummies* and *Precision in the Nineties*. He enjoys theater, music, arts and travel. Barry is an outstanding Vugraph commentator, demonstrating an extensive knowledge of bidding systems played by pairs all over the world. He coached the USA I team to the Venice Cup in 1997. He has two North American team titles, but is proudest of his fourth-place finish in the 1990 Geneva World Mixed Pairs and winning the Common Market Mixed Teams in 1998 and the Gold Cup in 1991. He served as chairman of the ACBL National Appeals Committee from 2003-2006.

Matt Smith was born in 1957 in Victoria, B.C. and still lives there with his wife Vicky. He has been an ACBL National Tournament Director since 2002. He has been an assistant tournament director at several WBF Championships. Is a member of the ACBL Laws Commission, and the first working tournament director to have been appointed since Al Sobel. Matt is an avid golfer when not directing.

Adam Wildavsky was born in Ohio in 1960 and grew up in Berkeley and Oakland, CA and London, England. He is a graduate of MIT and since 1986 he has resided in New York City. He works as a senior software engineer for Google, Inc. Mr. Wildavsky has won the Blue Ribbon Pairs twice and the Reisinger BAM Teams once. He won a bronze medal in the 2003 Bermuda Bowl in Monaco. Mr. Wildavsky is chairman of the National Appeals Committee and vice-chair of the National Laws Commission. His interest in the laws is informed by his study of Objectivism, the philosophy of Ayn Rand.

Bobby Wolff, was born in San Antonio in 1932 and is a graduate of Trinity University. He currently resides in Las Vegas. His father, mother, brother and wives, including present wife Judy, all played bridge. Bobby is a member of the ACBL Hall of Fame as well as a Grand Life Master in both the WBF and the ACBL. He is one of the world's great players and has won 11 World titles and is the only player ever to win world championships in five different categories: World Team Olympiad, World Open Pair, World Mixed Teams, World Senior Bowl and seven Bermuda Bowls. He has represented the USA in the following team events: 12 Bermuda Bowls, 5 World Team Olympiads, 3 Senior Teams and 1 Mixed Team. Mr. Wolff has also won numerous NABCs including four straight Spingolds (1993-1996). He served as ACBL president in 1987 and WBF president from 1992-1994. He started the ACBL Recorder system in 1985, has served as tournament recorder at NABCs and is the author of the ACBL active ethics program. Among his pet projects are eliminating convention disruption, encouraging less hesitation disruption, allowing law 12C3 to be used in ACBL events and reducing the impact of politics and bias on appeals committees.

APPEAL	NABC+ ONE
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Life Master Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	11/26/10

BD#	27
VUL	None
DLR	S

Robert Colton	
♠	A8
♥	72
♦	J7542
♣	JT32

Mike Cappelletti		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	Michael White	
♠	T954		♠	KQ63
♥	Q86		♥	K953
♦	KT		♦	A98
♣	Q875		♣	K9

Bill Anderson	
♠	J72
♥	AJT4
♦	Q63
♣	A64

West	North	East	South
			1N ¹
P	P	DBL	P ²
P	2♦ ³	P	2♥
P	3♣	P	3♦
P	P	P	

Final Contract	3♦ by North
Opening Lead	♠ K
Table Result	Down 2, EW +100
Director Ruling	2♥ down 3, EW +150
Committee Ruling	EW +110 & NS -140

(1)	12-14 HCP
(2)	Slight BIT
(3)	Alerted as Diamonds and a higher suit

The Facts: Both sides agreed there was a break-in-tempo (BIT). Play was allowed to continue. South claimed that they played DONT run-outs after a double of 1N. North assumed that they were only playing DONT run-outs in direct seat after the double.

The Ruling: The Director ruled that there was no agreement about conventional meanings assigned to North's bids after the double. North was in possession of unauthorized information (UI) by the alert of the 2♦ bid. The Director also decided that passing was a logical alternative to bidding 3♣. The director determined that North was in possession of unauthorized information due to South's alert of North's 2♦ call. The unauthorized information suggests that North should bid again after South's 2♥ call.

According to Law 16, the director adjusted the final contract to 2♥. Pursuant to Law 12C, the Director determined that had North passed the most favorable result that was likely for E-W was +150 against 2♥, and that this was also the most unfavorable result that was at all probable for N-S. Therefore, he adjusted the result for both sides to 2♥ by South down 3, +150 to East-West.

The Appeal: North said he would never pass 2♥ since their partnership has the agreement that South cannot have a 5-card major and open 1NT. North-South stated that as a result of their agreement about opening 1N with a 5-card major, 2♥ was not a good spot; accordingly, North bid 3♣ to find a better fit. North-South argued that Pass is not a logical alternative to bidding 3♣. East reported that the double of 1NT forced their partnership to 2♠ or to double the opponents for penalty.

East-West play takeout doubles in continuing auctions of this sort. A double of 2♦ by East or West would have been takeout. East was not sure what his double would mean if the auction went 1N-P-P-X-P-P-2♦-P-2♥-P-P. East-West are forced to double or bid through 2♥, but can allow 2♠ or higher to play undoubled. East thought Pass of 2♥ by North-South was a logical alternative to bidding 3♣.

The Decision: The Committee believed there was unauthorized information available as a result of the alert of 2♦. North-South are experienced players but not a regular partnership. It was clear that North-South had an established a runout system over a direct double of 1N but had no firm agreement over a balancing double. The Committee believed that Pass of 2♥ was a logical alternative to bidding 3♣. The Committee further determined that based on the explanation of E-W's methods, it was not even at all probable that East would pass out 2♥. Per Laws 16 and 12c1e(ii) the Committee determined that the most favorable result likely for E-W was 2♠ making two, while the most unfavorable result that was at all probable for North-South was 2♠ making three. Therefore, the Committee adjusted the score to -140 for North-South and to +110 for East-West.

The Committee: Richard Popper (Chairman), E. J. Kales, Fred King, Tom Peters, and Gail Greenberg.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: Solomonic. The Committee found room to give two different scores that were in the 50-point gap between the table result and the Director's ruling. Quite an achievement!

I have a little more sympathy for N/S than the Director and the Committee. Did their convention card say that they don't open 1NT with a 5-card major? If so, North has a strong case not to pass in a known 6-card fit when he knows that 3♣ will be at least a 7-card fit, maybe an 8-card fit, or that 3♦ may be an 8-card fit. The only argument for passing 2♥ is "no double, no trouble". (N/S couldn't have known that the E/W agreements made it nearly impossible for them to get doubled in 2♥.) From North's perspective his partner ran from 2♦ because he had no fit. Why can't North run from 2♥

for the same reason? Is pass really LOGICAL? Maybe, but it's a lot closer than the Committee suggests.

Also, while the split scores are attractive, I don't see why E/W should not get 140 in 2♣, achievable on many plausible lines of play and likely defenses. E.g., diamond lead to the king, trump to the king, diamond ace, diamond ruff, trump to the ace. The defense is end-played to get only three more tricks.

Jeff Goldsmith: North knows via AI that something has gone awry. South cannot have a bid over 2♦ if he didn't bid it directly over the double and if he doesn't have a diamond fit. So I think pass isn't a LA. On the other hand, 3♣ is suggested over 3♦ by the UI. 3♣ vs. 3♦, however, doesn't change the result, so I'd rule result stands. South's short BIT was almost certainly either the creation of an opportunity for West to alert the double or an attempt to remember N/S's methods. It carried no UI, and hence was irrelevant. Did the MI from the incorrect explanation damage the NOS? No. If anything, it gave them a better chance to double and get a good result.

Ton Kooijman: In each set of appeals it happens that a misunderstanding occurs after a balanced 1 (2) NT call in a competitive auction. Either partner meant to bid a transfer which was taken as natural or meant to bid natural which was understood as a transfer. We just had a case in my country:

W	N	E	S
1NT	2NT	pass	3♥
pass	3♠		

1NT showed 8-11 and 2NT showed 15-18 NT. 3♥ was bid with QJxx AQxxxx xx x. North took it as a transfer, alerted, and bid 3♠. TD and appeal committee now demanded from South to bid 4♠. I consider this to be absurd. Does North have AKxxx(x) x AJx KJx(x) or does he take South's 3♥ as a transfer? Give me a percentage. My impression is that consulted players are brainwashed. The question to answer is not whether it is possible that a player after bidding a natural NT refuses to play his partner's suit having his own, but whether his partner may assume that he meant something different.

Case 1 is not as strong as the above one but still strong enough to allow North to understand in a legal way that South took his 2♦ as a transfer. So he is free to choose any call he wants.

Interesting is the question what the hesitation pass by South combined with his 2♥ bid might show North? Did South think of bidding 2♥ after the double at once? Then a pass by North now looks illegal, don't you think?

Barry Rigal: There was both UI and possible damage so the directors made the right ruling. As to what would have happened without that, the AC made a reasonable shot at working it out. Even if I might not have come to the same conclusion I can live with their calculations.

Adam Wildavsky: Having an agreement that partner cannot hold a five card major is one piece of data indicating that he does not hold five hearts. Hearing him bid 2♥ is an

indication that he does. There is no law requiring a player to abide by his agreements. North cannot use unauthorized information to help him resolve the contradiction.

As for the likely result had North passed 2♥, the committee did well to consider the implications of E/W's agreements. What I think they missed was that under current ACBL interpretations of the law NS are entitled to know both the actual NS agreement (here that there was none) and that South believed there was an agreement. Under those circumstances it seems to me at least at all probable that East would have chosen to violate his system and pass out 2♥, or that EW would have worked out that using penalty doubles is a good idea when the opponents don't know their methods.

Bobby Wolff: A good dual ruling which, of course, favors the field as it should in a pair game.

APPEAL	NABC+ TWO
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Life Master Pairs
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	11/26/10

BD#	30
VUL	None
DLR	E

Steven Ashe	
♠	5
♥	KJT87
♦	A62
♣	9872

Jan Martel		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	Chip Martel	
♠	QJ8		♠	KT7632
♥	A652		♥	43
♦	KT754		♦	983
♣	6		♣	43

Jeff Edelstein	
♠	A94
♥	Q9
♦	QJ
♣	AKQJT5

West	North	East	South
		2♠	3♠
DBL¹	4♥	P	5♣
P	5♦	P	5NT
DBL	6♣	P	P
DBL	P	P	P

Final Contract	6♣ DBL by South
Opening Lead	♠ Q
Table Result	Made 6, N-S +1090
Director Ruling	4♥ by North, made 6, N-S +480
Committee Ruling	4♥ by North, made 6, N-S +480

(1) West asked North about the meaning of South's 3♠ call. North answered "We have no agreement, I'm taking it as Michaels."

The Facts: As stated above, South was told North's comment that he was taking 3♠ as Michaels was Unauthorized Information (UI) – and to proceed with the auction. South's intent of 3♠ was for partner to bid 3NT with a spade stopper to "right side" the contract and that if partner did not bid 3NT, he planned to bid clubs.

The Ruling: If South's bid had been explained as South intended, North could have passed West's double. By bidding 4♥, South should assume North had long hearts and was willing to play it there. It is not clear how North would show long hearts and a good hand versus long hearts and a weak hand; however, pass was considered a logical alternative to bidding Michaels, LAW 16B1, and the unauthorized information made it more attractive to bid on. Score adjusted to 4♥, making 6 for N-S +480.

The Appeal:

The Appealing Side: South's intention when he bid 3♠ was to play 3NT if his partner could bid it, or else bid his clubs. He did not consider passing 4♥ to be a logical action versus showing his solid club suit.

The Non-Appealing Side: East stated that since North freely bid 4♥ over the double, pass was a logical alternative to the suggested 5♣ bid. As it is, hearts is a quite attractive suit in which to play, and if North did not have extra values (♦A and singleton spade), N-S's best contract would have been 4♥.

The Decision: South possessed unauthorized information that North treated the 3♠ bid as Michaels and bid 4♥ expecting South to have five hearts. South is not allowed to use that Unauthorized Information, but must instead bid as if he heard his partner explain the 3♠ bid as "he has a good hand with a long, solid minor and wants me to bid 3NT if I have a spade stopper." Over the double of 3♠, North would have no reason to bid an indifferent heart suit, so the 4♥ bid should show good hearts, and South's Q9 is quite adequate support. There is no particular reason to think that North-South have a slam, so pass is a logical alternative to the suggested 5♣ bid. Thus the Committee adjusted the table result to 4♥, making 6. The Committee discussed the merit of the Appeal. Since all members of the Committee quickly reached the same conclusion, they did not consider there to be much merit to the appeal. However, the Director initially ruled that the table result of 6♣ doubled making stood, so it is understandable that South thought he should be allowed to bid his solid six-card suit. Therefore, the Committee did not assign an Appeal Without Merit Warning (AWMW).

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chairman), Dick Budd, Barry Rigal, Ed Lazarus, Tom Carmichael

Dissenting Opinion of Tom Carmichael: I agree with the decision but not the failure to award an Appeal Without Merit Warning (AWMW). It's time to draw a line in the sand. The right to appeal, enshrined in the Laws, does not give carte blanche to appeal because you don't like the decision. You must have a reason other than the subjective dissatisfaction with the result. If the Tournament Director (TD) tells you that there was a logical alternative to the action you took (one which was suggested by Unauthorized Information (UI)) and the committee unanimously upholds that view, you must expect to get an AWMW. In my opinion, if we are dealing with an appeal by the offending side in a UI case, the obligation is especially strong not to bring an appeal when the TDs have determined your action was tainted by UI. Inexperience is not grounds for avoiding an AWMW: if you are experienced enough to enter the Life Master Pairs, or to bring an appeal, than you can expect to be treated like everyone else.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: Issuing the AWMW depends on when, and how emphatically, the Director announced his final decision. I would issue it only if the Director returned in a timely fashion (well before the end of the session), and then only if

he said he had received a STRONG counter-indication to his initial ruling, usually based on a poll of peers. No such poll seems to have been taken. If the offenders got the impression that the Director(s) were uncertain, then they equally would have gotten the impression that they had a case. I agree that an AWMW would have been appropriate with a correct initial ruling.

Another bothersome aspect is the whiff of the “trick question” by West. At the time she asked, she didn’t (yet) care about the meaning of 3♠, as the answer would not affect her immediate action nor was it likely to affect any of her actions before the opening lead. If the response had been an accurate “I don’t know”, would the auction have been allowed to stand? Of course, the answer given was way out of line, after which N/S had no chance to recover.

Also, West’s final two doubles look more of the “steam” variety than anything related to bridge. The only plausible reason to double 6♣ would be if West believed the Michaels explanation and planned to lead ace and a heart, expecting partner to ruff. But the lead was the spade queen. I suppose the potential for a diamond trick makes the double barely defensible, but this is close to a disconnect.

Jeff Goldsmith: I agree with the dissent. I'd also like to see an automatic 1/4 board PP to anyone who says, "I take it as...." We need to eliminate that behavior, and heavy-handed penalties are a good way to start. In that vein, is South's 5♣ a bad enough abuse of UI to deserve a PP? I think it isn't. South simply didn't figure out that 4♥ had to be a sensible place to play and didn't realize that passing was an option. If he had tried to avoid using UI (which we assume, even though South told us he didn't), it is easily possible that he might get this wrong, so no PP. What about West's doubles? They seem like wild gambling actions to me. In fact, if she had passed 5NT, that would likely have ended the auction and E/W would have got a plus score. It's a close call whether they are enough to break the chain of causality between the OS's infraction and the NOS's bad result. If we deem that so, then N/S gets +480 and E/W keeps their -1090. I could buy either that ruling or reciprocal 480s.

Ton Kooijman: Do you have AWMW for TD’s? It is impossible to quit this case without awarding at least one.

Barry Rigal: I agree with the dissent; indeed I co-wrote it.

Adam Wildavsky: I agree with the dissent. This appeal had no merit.

Bobby Wolff: With the current perceived rules the ruling was indeed fair, but because of normal playing luck (NPL), which should always be respected, the ruling should revert NS back to +680, but allow EW to go -1090, for the simple reason, that when NS arrived in 6 clubs and got doubled they had no idea what they were doing, which usually begets a bad board, but when the unexpected happens which is entirely random, why should the EW field be penalized when EW surely would have accepted a very good result if they had gotten it as they figured to. Put another way, EW did nothing to deserve their windfall change of result so why should they receive it as a reward. Admittedly a change of perspective, but one which is much fairer to bridge in general.

The squeaking wheel bringing it to committee should be required behavior to right the wrong for the UI which was probably used, but should not upon winning the appeal, guarantee an improved matchpoint score for a pair which did nothing to deserve it, including, in this case, doubling a contract which was made.

APPEAL	NABC+ THREE
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Steve Bates
Event	Open Board-a-Match
Session	Second Final
Date	11/29/10

BD#	19
VUL	E-W
DLR	S

Greg Hinze	
♠	AJ52
♥	KJ984
♦	8
♣	964

Alexander Smirnov		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	Josef Piekarek	
♠	T		♠	Q43
♥	Q		♥	652
♦	AJ9753		♦	KT6
♣	AKQJT		♣	8752

Ira Hessel	
♠	K9876
♥	AT73
♦	Q42
♣	3

West	North	East	South
			P
1♦	2♦	P	3♦
5♣	P	P¹	5♥
P	P	DBL	P
6♣	P	P	P

Final Contract	6♣ by West
Opening Lead	♠ A
Table Result	Down 1, N-S +100
Director Ruling	6♣ by West, Down 1, N-S +100
Committee Ruling	5♥ DBL by South, made 5, N-S +650

(1)	East-West agreed to a break-in-tempo by East of 15 seconds at his second turn to call. North-South suggested that the BIT was longer than 15 seconds.
-----	---

The Facts: East-West agreed to a break-in-tempo by East of 15 seconds at his second turn to call. North-South suggested that the BIT was longer than 15 seconds.

The Ruling: Law 16B1(a) provides that a player may not choose from among logical alternatives one that could demonstrably have been suggested over another by the extraneous information. The Director ruled that the slow pass did not demonstrably suggest pulling the double. Therefore, the Director ruled that the table result of 6♣ down 1, for a score of North-South +100 was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: North-South appealed and all four players attended the hearing. North-South argued that the Break-in-Tempo (BIT) may have been as long as 30 seconds but possibly shorter. They also argued that the BIT suggests that East was thinking about bidding slam thus making it easier for West to bid 6♣.

The Decision: The Committee found that UI was present and that passing the double was a logical alternative. The members spent the bulk of their deliberations discussing whether the BIT demonstrably suggested bidding 6♣ over passing. Most members thought the hesitation made it more likely that East was considering whether to bid slam. The Committee voted 4-1 that the BIT demonstrably suggested bidding 6♣. Therefore, the score for both sides was adjusted to 5♥ doubled making 5 for N-S +650.

The Committee: Aaron Silverstein (Chairman), Robb Gordon, Fred King, David Stevenson, and Gene Kales.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: A poor Director's ruling. East is unlikely to have a big problem whether to pass 5♣ or correct to 5♦. South's 3♦ bid suggests that N/S have a big fit in at least one major, probably both, so East's huddle is much more likely to be in contemplation of a slam bid. And then his double, when he had no assurance that he could beat SEVEN, was a blatant attempt to convert his earlier huddle into a bid of "5.5 clubs". With a correct Director's ruling an appeal by E/W would have been meritless.

The writeup says the vote was 4-1. Why is there no dissenting opinion? If one of the Committee members had a good reason to disagree with the majority, I'd like to know it. Unwillingness to attach one's name to the dissent is a weak excuse for not sharing, and it unfairly diminishes the opinions of the four members who got it right.

Jeff Goldsmith: I very much doubt that East was thinking of bidding slam over 5♣, and no West would think that. What can East have? Aces? Trump honors? Right. If I were West, I'd assume that East is thinking about correcting to 5♦ and likely judged not to because we weren't doubled yet. Maybe partner has KJxxx J10xx xx xx. That said, West's choice to pull 5♥x seems impossible. At BAM, he was willing to play 5♥ undoubled, but not doubled when partner could have them nutted and he has two aces? I have no idea how he could have got this right without the right inference from the UI, so while I don't see that the slow pass demonstrably suggests bidding over passing, it must have in this case, because otherwise bidding 6♣ is inexplicable. Therefore, the AC got it right, but they should also have awarded a PP for blatant misuse of UI.

Ton Kooijman: Not so easy, but I accept the opinion of 4 out of 5.

Barry Rigal: Agree strongly with the AC. Disagree, strongly with the TD decision, since it should be up to the offenders to have to appeal a case of this sort, where as was shown by the 4-1 vote by the AC, the interpretation of the hesitation making the slam bid more attractive was more than reasonable. Hence damage should have been imputed by the TD.

Adam Wildavsky: I prefer the AC's ruling to the TD's. Since the case was close I'm surprised the TD did not rule in favor of the non-offenders.

Bobby Wolff: West should not be allowed to pull East's final double and be stuck with 5♥X -650.

APPEAL	NABC+ FOUR
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	November 30, 2010

BD#	11
VUL	None
DLR	S

Jill Levin	
♠	KQ543
♥	Q
♦	J853
♣	A53

Ranjan Bhaduri		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	Raymond Jung	
♠	A2		♠	J109
♥	AJ87		♥	K9642
♦	Q104		♦	----
♣	QJ87		♣	K10964

Jill Meyers	
♠	876
♥	1053
♦	AK9762
♣	2

West	North	East	South
			2♦
Dbl	3♠	4♥	4♠
5♥	P ¹	P	5♠
Dbl	P	P	P

Final Contract	5♠ Dbl by North
Opening Lead	♥4
Table Result	5♠ Dbl by North, Down 1, NS -100
Director Ruling	5♥ by East, Made 5, EW +450
Committee Ruling	5♠ Dbl by North, Down 1, NS -100

(1) Break in Tempo

The Facts: On North's 2nd turn to call, there was a noticeable break in tempo before passing. The huddle was agreed to by all, though its length was disputed. North-South claimed the break in tempo was 15-20 seconds, while East-West claimed it was much longer. South stated 3♠ was forcing and therefore the Pass of 5♥ was a Forcing Pass. North announced that she did not know exactly what 3♠ was. South countered; 2♠ would have been invitational, Redouble would have shown one suit, and 3♠ is forcing.

The Ruling: Absent evidence of any partnership agreement concerning the 3♠ call, the Director judged that North's pass of 5♥ was non-forcing. The Director also judged that the break in tempo demonstrably suggested bidding over 5♥. The Director ruled that a

Pass of 5♥ by South was a logical alternative. Therefore, the score was adjusted to 5♥ by East-West making 5. (Laws 73C, 16B1, and 12C)

The Appeal: South stated, and was able to produce system notes to the effect, that by partnership agreement, 3♠ shows length (6 or more) and strength in Spades with game going values. South argued that she would have raised to 4♠ with one fewer Spade and one more Club. From this agreement, South deduced that North's Pass of 5♥ was forcing. Therefore Pass, according to the partnership's agreement, could not have been a logical alternative to bidding. South was left only with the decision to bid 5♠ or Double, a decision that, according to South, could not have been affected by the unauthorized information.

South continued to support her call by arguing that East was likely to have five hearts for his raise to 4♥, and that West rated to have four. With the knowledge that her partner likely had a singleton heart, it was her conclusion that the hand would play extremely well in spades.

East-West observed that North took as much as a minute before calling over 5♥, an observation not agreed to by their opposition. They argued that South had sufficiently described her hand when she opened 2♦ and subsequently freely raised to 4♠. They contended North's break in tempo demonstrably suggested bidding 5♠, and that Pass was a logical alternative to bidding.

The Decision: The Committee discovered that, in other partnerships, North plays fit showing jumps in this auction. It was also discovered that the partnership normally plays 2♦ as multi, so this auction was uncommon for the partnership.

The Committee was concerned with the issue of whether or not North-South had a partnership agreement about the meaning of 3♠ in this auction. If the partnership did have an agreement, it was unclear how many Spades it showed. The absence of an agreement would bring into question whether or not the Pass should be considered forcing.

A majority of the Committee judged that North-South did have a partnership agreement concerning 3♠. Given the understandings of the partnership (Forcing 3♠ and Pass), it was judged that South's 5♠ bid was clear.

There was a break in tempo, however (assuming that Pass was forcing) no action was suggested over another by the unauthorized information. Furthermore, the Committee judged that South's singleton club and extra spade made 5♠ the only logical action. Therefore the table result was permitted to stand.

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chairman), Hendrik Sharples, Ellen Kent, Richard Budd, and Patty Tucker.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: I disagree strongly. N/S were making it up as they went along. Even if 3♠ were forcing, that does not make the later pass of 5♥ forcing. No, South decided that the pass was forcing because she “guessed” that 5♠ was the winning action after the huddle. South has good defense for her earlier actions and no particular reason to think that 5♠ will make. The Committee should have decided as the Director did, and for the same reasons.

Jeff Goldsmith: What was North thinking about? This is pretty obvious. She thought she had made a fit jump. Partner didn't alert, which provided her with UI. If partner had alerted and explained, she would have a decision between pass and 5♠. The UI, however, demonstrably suggests passing over 5♠, since partner could have only two spades. Therefore, North's passing was a violation. It didn't, however, damage the NOS, since bidding 5♠ would have produced a better result for the OS. Was this choice blatant enough to get a PP for abuse of UI? Probably not. Ignoring this, since it isn't relevant to the rest of the auction, once North passed, I think the director did the right thing. From his perspective, North made a fit bid, and fit bids do not create forces, so he should roll the auction back to 5♥. A high diamond or spade lead is likely, so 5♥ makes. Given the system notes that say 3♠ is a game force, however, South's passing 5♥ is not a LA, and 5♠ is a standout action, so the AC also got it right. Only they missed North's original infraction, because it was concealed by South's subsequent problem.

Ton Kooijman: Are there partnerships able to produce different system notes depending on the case? Or: was North aware of these system notes? Ok, forcing it may be but game going values? Why didn't anybody ask North how she could bid 3♠? I don't believe that NS had a worthy partnership agreement about the meaning of 3♠ and consider the hesitation to show extra values with which bidding 5♠ becomes attractive. So I join the TD here.

Barry Rigal: I'm unconvinced that anybody could play fit-jumps as forcing at the five-level when the opponents have bid 5♥ to make. I would not accept that unless the system file was VERY specific. The South hand looks nothing like a 5♠ call to me. If the bid was forcing, then with three small trumps surely the South hand is a double. I prefer the TD ruling.

Adam Wildavsky: N/S's testimony makes it clear that they were on shaky ground. Further, it does not follow from the fact that 3♠ was forcing that a pass of 5♥ is forcing. There is no reason to believe that E/W think they are saving, and many pairs follow the principle that a pass is seldom forcing on a preemptor.

I much prefer the TD's ruling.

Thanks to Jeff Goldsmith for setting me straight on this one!

Bobby Wolff: There is no way that pass in this case could be forcing, only claiming it to be as a ploy to win the day. A biased decision in favor of the well known players, It should be 5♥EW +450.

APPEAL	NABC+ FIVE
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	11/30/10

BD#	22
VUL	E-W
DLR	E

Claire Tornay	
♠	QJ9832
♥	Q976
♦	KQ
♣	9

Bas Drijver		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	Tim Verbeek	
♠	K		♠	AT4
♥	AJT		♥	832
♦	T54		♦	J9872
♣	AQJT87		♣	62

Marc Rabinowitz	
♠	765
♥	K54
♦	A63
♣	K543

West	North	East	South
		P	P
1NT	2♣ ¹	2♦	P
2♥	2♠	P	P
3♣	P	3♦	3♠
P	P	P	

Final Contract	3♠ by North
Opening Lead	♣ 6
Table Result	Down 2, EW +100
Director Ruling	3♠ by North, down 2, EW +100
Committee Ruling	3♠ by North, down 2, EW +100

(1) Single-suited hand

The Facts: After the 2♦ bid West volunteered that he could not remember its meaning, and that it was either natural or a transfer. At the conclusion of the deal West reported that he felt that he could safely bid 2♥ and later bid 3♣ over North's presumed spade bid.

The Ruling: The Director ruled that there was authorized information available that alerted East to the fact that there was a bidding misunderstanding and thus the 3♦ bid was allowed.

The Appeal: North-South appealed the Director's ruling and North, South, and East attended the hearing. North-South argued that East took advantage of West's uncertainty about the meaning of the 2♥ bid. East knew that West did not have a real heart suit, else East might have bid 3♥ instead of 3♦, or might have bid 3♥ directly over 2♠. In the actual

case, East was safe to clarify his earlier call by bidding 3♦. Alternatively, East might have passed 3♣ rather than risk a further misunderstanding. South asserted that competing to 3♠ would have been less attractive over 3♥ or 3♣. Upon questioning, South agreed that if East had bid 3♥ there would have been no special inference that East-West were having a misunderstanding as opposed to East actually possessing a heart suit.

East argued that West could not hold five hearts and four clubs, because he would probably not have opened 1NT with that shape and would certainly not have competed to 3♣. Therefore, East had authorized information that West did not have long hearts, and he did not give serious thought to bidding 3♥ directly over 2♠, based on West's putative heart suit. East suggested that 3♥ would have been a poor call regardless, given his barren hand and the adverse vulnerability.

The Decision: The East-West Convention Card had nothing marked in the "System On Over" section under "1NT Openings." East-West produced system notes (in Dutch) that said that transfers did apply on the given auction, so East had misbid. The Committee noted that the direct cause of North-South's poor result was South's decision to compete to 3♠ with a square defense-oriented hand that contained two poorly-placed Kings, and that South's decision would not have been materially different if he had thought that East had hearts instead of diamonds, or even if East had passed 3♣. Therefore, the table result was allowed to stand for North-South.

Equally, since the Unauthorized Information did not directly contribute to East-West's score, the table result was allowed to stand for them as well. The Committee noted that East's rationale for not playing West for real hearts after the 3♣ was compelling. Also, to force East to make a hyper-aggressive 3♥ bid directly over 2♠ would have been unfair.

[Yes, three diamonds can be made, which normally would render the whole discussion moot. However, to do so on a spade lead declarer must overtake dummy's stiff king with the ace to take a club finesse, an extremely non-intuitive play. On the more likely play of letting the spade king win and leading a trump, North, who can see the club suit in dummy and knows the location of the spade ace, has an easy defense of shifting to a low heart, either before or after unblocking the other high trump.]

The Committee considered a procedural penalty against West for his obvious violation of correct procedure, but regarded this violation as minor. The tenor of this Committee is that procedural penalties should be given only for gross violations. Other Committees may feel differently. Furthermore, once West took time before bidding 2♥, his doubt about the meaning of 2♦ was well-established, so his voluntary statement merely confirmed what everyone already knew.

Some members thought that East might have taken advantage of the alert procedure by bidding 3♦ with the expectation that his befuddled partner would correctly interpret the bid as showing diamonds only rather than a red two-suiter. The majority considered this too deep a position and noted that risk was still there. Since South competed to 3♠ we will never know for sure what West would have done over 3♦.

The Committee: Bart Bramley (Chairman), Michael Kamil, Michael Rosenberg, Jeff Aker, and Dan Gerstman.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: An awkward case. I have nothing new to add.

Jeff Goldsmith: The AC's decision was reasonable. I would have, however, awarded a PP to E/W, because West knows better than to do what he did, and his action inconvenienced many other contestants.

Ton Kooijman: Well, not just one but two cases with a competitive NT auction and players not knowing what they are doing. You know my position: when West bids 2♥ now East is allowed to understand the misunderstanding. No case, unless NS were damaged by wrong information. I follow the given analyses.

Barry Rigal: I'm happy the committee considered all the things it was supposed to, and did not award a PP – E/W are both either still juniors or close to being so. The ruling certainly seems reasonable to me.

Adam Wildavsky: Yes, East took a risk when bidding 3♦, but that risk was surely lessened by the unauthorized information available. I have no quarrel with the TD and AC rulings, but this case easily could have gone the other way.

Bobby Wolff: CD in action in the form of West's 2 heart bid and why didn't East bid 3 hearts instead of 3 diamonds? Both sides NS-100 in 3 spades and EW a 3MP penalty for CD. The playing of bridge effectively stopped with West's 2 heart bid and the guessing game started.

APPEAL	NABC+ SIX
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	11/30/10

BD#	10
VUL	Both
DLR	E

Thomas Bessis	
♠	975
♥	
♦	K653
♣	AQJ873

John McLaughlin		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	Lloyd Arvedon	
♠	AKQ632		♠	JT84
♥	Q9		♥	J87432
♦	98		♦	AJ7
♣	T52		♣	

Jessica Piafsky	
♠	
♥	AKT65
♦	QT42
♣	K964

West	North	East	South
		P	1♥
2♠	P	4♠	P
P	5♣	5♠	P¹
P	6♣	P	P
P			

Final Contract	6♣ by North
Opening Lead	♦ A
Table Result	Made 6, N-S +1370
Director Ruling	5♠ Dbl by West, Down 1, N-S +200
Committee Ruling	6♣ by North, made 6, N-S +1370

(1) South passed after 8-10 second Break-in-Tempo

The Facts: Both sides agreed that there was an 8-10 second break-in-tempo after East's 5♠ bid.

The Ruling: The Director determined that there was an 8-10 second break-in-tempo by South after East's 5♠ bid. The Director decided that South's BIT suggested further action. The Director ruled that pass by North was not a logical alternative to bidding 6♣ but that double of 5♠ was a logical alternative. The Director's polling of other players indicated that none passed but two players doubled 5♠. Since doubling 5♠ was a logical alternative to bidding 6♣, the Director adjusted the result to 5♠ doubled, down one, for a final result of N-S +200.

The Appeal: N-S appealed the Director's ruling and North-South attended the hearing. North testified that as a result of his three small spades and the opponent's bidding, he was able to visualize a spade void in his partner's hand. South testified that her tempo was reasonable and normal given that her partner first introduced Clubs at the five-level.

The Decision: In order to adjust the table result pursuant to Law 16B1, the Director must determine that unauthorized information was available. The key issue for the Committee was whether South's pause conveyed extraneous information to partner. The Committee found that South's tempo was normal for this auction. Therefore there was no extraneous information and North was free to bid as he pleased. Accordingly the committee allowed the table result to stand.

The Committee: Richard Popper (Chairman), Gail Greenberg, Tom Carmichael, David Stevenson, and Gerry Marshall.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: As usual, all parties fail to distinguish between "total time taken" and "break in tempo". If, as is strongly implied by the writeup, the TOTAL TIME TAKEN was 8-10 seconds, that is not even close to a break in tempo after an unusual auction at the five-level. Indeed, I would consider it a FAST bid before I considered it a SLOW bid. Therefore, I agree with the Committee that there was NOT a break in tempo, and North could do as he pleased.

Jeff Goldsmith: Oh, come on. Everyone in the room knew South had a problem. Her cards scream it. North's 6♣ confirms it. She did not pass in tempo. The AC goofed. The real questions were whether there was an AWMW deserved and whether North's 6♣ is a sufficient violation to garner a PP. I think North's decision is close, and it's reasonable for him to act. It might even be the percentage action, assuming that South will bid 6♥ way too often over 5NT. But it's clearly a violation, and he ought to know it, so I'd give him a PP for it. The AWMW is a slam-dunk.

Ton Kooijman: It would be nice if the approach followed by the AC is supported by regulations, saying that in a high competitive auction 8 to 10 seconds are not considered to create a hesitation. In that case there wouldn't have been an appeal.

Barry Rigal: A rare situation where the tempo of the auction and the AI available to North are such that it does seem to me that he could do what he wanted. Indeed there might be a case for saying that since North knows South has a spade void it is actually more likely that partner is thinking of doubling with bad clubs and eg 0553. I agree with the AC that in this bizarre auction 8 seconds is not a BIT.

Adam Wildavsky: The AC ruling looks strange, but their reasoning is sound as far as it goes. Aside from skip-bid rules the ACBL has no preset standards for normal tempo on any auction. If South's tempo was appropriate for what is surely an unusual situation then North had no UI and may bid as he pleases.

That said, the TD found that there was a break in tempo and he was aware that the auction was an unusual one. If I were in doubt South's hand would convince me that she had a problem. North's call seems unusual as well. If 6♣ were cold it seems likely that South would have bid it, either to make or as a save.

It seems simplistic, but usually when a pair reports a break in tempo to the TD there was in fact a break in tempo. The exact amount of time taken is less important than whether the other players at the table knew that this player had a problem. A player who made a habit of falsely claiming that his opponents had hesitated would soon develop a reputation.

The case may be close, but I prefer the TD's ruling.

Again, thanks to Jeff Goldsmith for helping me reason along the right lines.

Bobby Wolff: 6 Clubs +1370 allowed for NS, however a 3 matchpoint penalty for the BIT which insured his action. +1370 was allowed because it is normal.

APPEAL	NABC+ SEVEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	Second Semi-Final
Date	12/1/10

BD#	7
VUL	Both
DLR	S

Tom Peters	
♠	QJ8
♥	AQJ9
♦	8742
♣	Q3

Gary Gottlieb		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	Peter Fredin	
♠	K7532		♠	964
♥	T75		♥	K86
♦	Q9		♦	AT6
♣	T96		♣	AK42

John Zilic	
♠	AT
♥	432
♦	KJ53
♣	J875

West	North	East	South
			P
P	1♥	P	2♥
P	P	3♣	DBL
P¹	P	RDBL	P
3♠	P	P	P

Final Contract	3♠ by West
Opening Lead	♦ 7
Table Result	Down 1, N-S +100
Director Ruling	3♣ Dbl by East, Down 3, N-S +800
Committee Ruling	3♣ Dbl by East, Down 3, N-S +800

(1) Both sides agreed to a 15-20 second Break-in-Tempo
--

The Facts: Both sides agreed that there was a 15-20 second break-in-tempo by West after South's double of 3♣. South called the Director at North's turn to bid over 3♣ double.

The Ruling: The Director determined that there was a 15-20 second break-in-tempo by West after South's double of East's 3♣ bid. The Director determined that West's BIT suggested doubt about playing 3♣ doubled. The Director ruled that pursuant to Law 16B.1.(a), West's break-in-tempo provided unauthorized information that East could not use to run from 3♣ doubled. The Director also decided that passing 3♣ doubled was a logical alternative to running from 3♣ doubled by redoubling. Since passing 3♣ was a

logical alternative to redoubling, the Director adjusted the result to 3♣ doubled, down three for a final result of N-S +800.

The Appeal: E-W appealed the Director's ruling and all four players attended the hearing. East explained that South called the director only after North hesitated over the double. East reasoned that South might be concerned that his partner would not treat the double as for penalties, and accordingly that South would have a solid double of clubs, and so he redoubled in a situation where otherwise he would never have dreamed of acting. E-W also contended that the timing of the Director call conveyed unauthorized information to North.

The Decision: In ruling on a case pursuant to Law 16B.1, East may not select a bid that may have been suggested by BIT when there is a logical alternative bid not suggested by the BIT. As to East, the Committee decided that the BIT itself was the deciding factor in not allowing the redouble because passing by East was a logical alternative action to the redouble. The final result of 3♣ doubled, down three, for +800 N-S was upheld by the Committee.

The Committee agreed that that the timing of South's Director call should have been better, and noted that it could have been avoided altogether with a statement that "We agree that there was a break in tempo" by East-West. The Committee found the East-West argument to the Committee about the timing of the Director call was not sufficient grounds to make an otherwise illegal call, and assessed an Appeal Without Merit Warning (AWMW) to East-West.

The Committee: Jeff Roman (Chairman), Gail Greenberg, Richard Popper, Ellen Kent, and Chris Moll.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: I agree, including the AWMW. Yes, the timing of the Director call was unfortunate, but South could hardly call WHILE West was thinking and he called as soon as possible after West passed, which is the recommended (but rarely followed) protocol. A better standard is NEVER to call the Director when it is partner's turn to act. Anyway, it's hard to see what NORTH could have been thinking about. (For that matter, it's hard to see what WEST was thinking about.)

Jeff Goldsmith: I agree that East can't act, and E/W is clearly getting their -800. South's action, however, seems terrible to me. If it really was more than a couple of seconds after West passed, I think it definitely provided UI to North. I think North has a clear-cut pass of 3♣x, particularly after West tanks, but if he really had thought for more than five seconds, it is reasonable to assume that he was considering bidding. There's no way anyone this far from the table can rule anything but what the director did, but if I were at the table or in the AC, I could easily imagine ruling -200 for N/S and -800 for E/W. As the case went, an AWMW is warranted, as is a PP for abuse of UI, but had East aimed to get N/S their -200 rather than improving his own score, I'd certainly consider that a valid appeal. Of course, in reality, North probably was thinking about

calling the director or getting an agreement about the BIT, not about bidding 3♥. But any South who would even consider interrupting his partner there deserves -200 and a recorder form.

Ton Kooijman: An obvious decision with an obvious AWMW.

Barry Rigal: The most curious thing about this hand is WHY West broke tempo. Looking at his hand I'd be prepared to consider an argument that he had not broken tempo – if such an argument had been made; but it wasn't. I feel N/S were unfairly rewarded – and not because of any specious arguments about protecting the field.

Adam Wildavsky: Looks right to me.

Bobby Wolff: -800 3♣X for EW plus another 3MP penalty for taking advantage of a BIT.

APPEAL	NABC+ EIGHT
Subject	Disputed Claim
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	Second Final
Date	12/1/10

BD#	14
VUL	None
DLR	E

David Caprera	
♠	QT
♥	AK765
♦	J532
♣	92

Greg Hinze		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	David Yang	
♠	86432		♠	AK7
♥			♥	JT9
♦	AT64		♦	Q97
♣	KJ84		♣	T765

Clement Jackson	
♠	J95
♥	Q8432
♦	K8
♣	AQ3

West	North	East	South
		P	1♥
P	4♥	P	P
P			

Final Contract	4♥ by South
Opening Lead	♠ 2
Table Result	Down 2, NS -100
Director Ruling	4♥ by South, down 2, NS -100
Committee Ruling	4♥ by South, down 2, NS -100

The Facts: South was the declarer in 4♥. After drawing the opposing trumps, the lead was in dummy with only the diamond side suit to negotiate. As he was thinking about his play, West faced his hand and claimed two of the remaining three tricks.

North	
♥ 7	
♦ J53	
West	East
♦ AT4	♦ Q97
♣ 4	♣ 5
South	
♥ 84	
♦ K8	

The Ruling: The Director ruled based on Law 70D2 that East would always cover the lead of the Jack of Diamonds. If East covers the Jack of Diamonds, the defenders will always take two tricks from this position. The Director ruled that since East had already

shown up with the Ace and King of Spades and the Jack of Hearts, he could not also have the Ace of Diamonds, which makes not covering the Jack of Diamonds irrational. Therefore, the Director decided that failing to cover the Jack of Diamonds would qualify as irrational, not careless or inferior.

The Appeal: North-South appealed the director's ruling and North and South, attended the hearing. North-South argued that the claim by West, if allowed, would eliminate any chance that East would make a mistake.

The Decision: The Committee decided that because East had passed as dealer and shown up with the Ace and King of Spades, there was no possibility of a mis-guess by declarer if his diamond holding was King-Ten. It was felt that if the diamond Jack was played immediately from dummy, East might err in haste, but in this situation declarer had been thinking about his play for some time when West claimed.

Law 70D2 requires that the defense get two tricks in this situation, if there is no normal play by East that results in a different outcome. In this situation, normal includes careless and inferior for the class of player involved but not irrational. The Committee decided that for East to fail to cover the diamond Jack when played after some thought was beyond careless or inferior. Therefore, the Committee upheld

The Committee noted that West's claim was made because the round had been called, and there was no belief that he had any other motive.

The Committee: Stephen Landen (Chairman), Patty Tucker, and David Stevenson.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: I agree. While it is bad form for a defender to claim when his partner's play could still have an effect on the outcome, here the situation was obvious to everyone. South was wasting time, and West knew it.

I recall that in Orlando the "time police" were out in force, with penalties sometimes given unannounced and with no prior warning. Under such conditions we should not penalize players who expedite the game in a reasonable manner. Note that West knew the whole position and COULD have tried to claim much earlier. Instead, aware that his claim was imperfect, he gave declarer ample time to play. Only when time was a major factor did West attempt to speed up the play. No good deed goes unpunished.

Jeff Goldsmith: Good ruling all around.

Ton Kooijman: Good to say that the footnote belonging to the claim laws has been changed: 'irrational' doesn't exist anymore in WBF laws. Didn't the ACBL adopt this? Though I tend to follow the decisions made by TD and AC this is not a clear case. Not covering a jack deemed to be beyond careless and/or inferior? Brave.

Barry Rigal: Strongly disagree; I suspect that this is not a situation where a split score could have been awarded BUT for West to step out of line in this fashion requires a

procedural penalty – a minimum quarter of a board. This would not accrue to N/S. I'm sure it was innocent, but it should never happen again. I'd be prepared to rule the other way and give N/S the benefit of it too – but that seems unduly generous to them.

Adam Wildavsky: I would have ruled for the declaring side here. E/W cannot be allowed any possible benefit from a defensive claim when partner's play matters. If East might have played low when the ♦J is played quickly then some part of the time he will do the same when the ♦J is played slowly. This would be a careless and inferior play, but Law 69 explicitly caters to that.

The committee incorrectly cited the 1998 claim law, which is no longer in force. The 2008 version of Law 69 makes no mention of plays that would be "irrational."

Bobby Wolff: Since IMO West was only trying to catch up for the table's slowness I think declarer, South was trying to get something for nothing and hence, even though he had a possible point I would rule against the time it took him to do something and my sympathies are with West.

APPEAL	NABC+ NINE
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Steve Bates
Event	Reisinger Board-A-Match
Session	First Qualifying
Date	12/3/10

BD#	7
VUL	Both
DLR	S

Peter Fredin	
♠	K
♥	KQ742
♦	643
♣	AJ64

Kit Woolsey		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	Fred Stewart	
♠	QT9		♠	A8764
♥	JT83		♥	
♦	AK7		♦	QJ52
♣	T73		♣	K852

Hakan Nilsson	
♠	J532
♥	A965
♦	T98
♣	Q9

West	North	East	South
			P
P	1♥	1♠	2♥
D¹	P	2N²	P
P	D	RD	P
3♠	D	P	P
P			

Final Contract	3♠ Doubled by East
Opening Lead	♦ T
Table Result	Made 3, E-W +730
Director Ruling	3♠ Dbl by East, Made 3, E-W +730
Committee Ruling	3♠ Dbl by East, Made 3, E-W +730

(1)	Responsive
(2)	North-South asked and West explained 2N as natural

The Facts: East made 3♠ doubled following the lead of the ten of diamonds. North-South believed that the misinformation about the 2N bid led to their bad result.

The Ruling: The Director determined that “natural” was a correct description of the East-West agreement in this auction, so 2N was merely a mistaken bid. West’s pass of 2N (obviously intended as “pick a minor”), is authorized information to East as part of the auction, so East’s redouble is untainted. West does not have any unauthorized information, so his actions are unrestricted. The Director ruled that the table result should stand.

The Appeal: N-S appealed the Director's ruling and North, South, and West attended the hearing.

The appealing side: North-South argued that the misinformation led to the bad result, and without that misinformation the final contract would not have been doubled. They also argued that East-West should know what they are doing in such a straightforward auction.

The non-appealing side: Only West attended the hearing. He stated that their agreement is that 2N is natural, as further evidenced by his pass of 2N. The subsequent double and redouble made it clear that his partner had no interest in playing Notrump.

The Decision: The Laws do not allow a pair to hide their agreements from the opponents, but they do not require that they know their methods, nor do they penalize them for misbidding. West's testimony and the fact that he passed 2N demonstrate that East-West do not play this bid as some sort of pick a minor scramble. The Redouble, however, made it clear that 2N was not natural, thus North-South's decision to double 3♠ was not a result of the misinformation. The Committee ruled that the initial table result of 3♠ doubled making three be allowed to stand. Since there was misinformation present in the auction, the Committee found that the Appeal had substantial merit.

The Committee: Hendrik Sharples (Chairman), Joel Wooldridge, and Gerry Marshall.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: I agree with the decision, but not with all aspects of it. West's pass of 2NT does not guarantee that he thought that 2NT was natural. With his square pattern, heart stopper and all-around values he could have decided that 2NT was the best contract even if partner intended 2NT for takeout. I have no sympathy for either of North's doubles, holding a minimum opener opposite a passed partner and no surprises for the opponents. Notice that with the lucky spade layout 2NT is also cold.

Despite the misinformation, I would have given an AWMW. North took a flier and got burned. The misinformation had nothing to do with it. This appeal easily passes the "waste of time test", my main criterion for an AWMW.

Jeff Goldsmith: West's passing 2NT does not demonstrate that the partnership agreement is that 2NT is natural, only that he thought it was, or that he thought 2NT was the best contract regardless of what 2NT meant. To demonstrate that 2NT was a misbid and not a mistaken explanation takes substantially more than what was done, so L75's direction that the director assume misexplanation is in force. But by the time North doubled, East had already told everyone that he didn't have a natural 2NT by redoubling. So the MI from the misexplanation was overturned by a clear demonstration of the correct explanation. Therefore, N/S were not damaged. I approve of the AC's saying that

the laws do not require a pair to know the meanings of their actions, unless it happens so frequently as to disrupt the game substantially. Thanks. An AWMW is far closer than the AC's write-up suggests. I probably would have pushed for one, but I would have asked North if he knew that 2NT was not natural after East redoubled. He surely would have admitted that he did, which would have made awarding an AWMW pretty straightforward.

Ton Kooijman: No infraction, table result stands. And I go for an AWMW, if the TD did explain why he allowed the table result to stand.

Barry Rigal: I don't like this ruling; I'm not convinced just because West passed 2NT that 2NT was natural and that West remembered the system. Since West is likely to have written the system I accept this is the case – but maybe the partnership simply had no agreement? I feel N/S deserved more from this case than they got.

Adam Wildavsky: North's argument makes no sense to me. He knew that 2N was not natural and doubled 3♠ anyway. I see no merit to this appeal.

Bobby Wolff: CD strikes again (East's 2NT bid the 2nd round). More and more attempted conventions begets more and more CD and until the CD is penalized more consistently it will get worse before it gets better. The ruling in favor of EW making 3♠X is correct, but I would penalize EW 1/4 of a board for CD, making all actions at the table questionable and uncertain afterwards.

APPEAL	NABC+ TEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information Misinformation
DIC	Kenneth Van Cleve
Event	North American Swiss
Session	First Final
Date	12/5/10

BD#	24
VUL	None
DLR	W

Rafal Jagniewski	
♠	652
♥	94
♦	AT865
♣	764

Xiaodong Shi		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	Jiang Gu	
♠	A74		♠	QJT3
♥	K653		♥	AJT87
♦	K3		♦	972
♣	JT92		♣	Q

Michal Kwiecien	
♠	K98
♥	Q2
♦	QJ4
♣	AK853

West	North	East	South
1♣	P	1♦¹	DBL²
2♥	P	4♥	P
P	P		

Final Contract	4♥ by West
Opening Lead	♠ 5
Table Result	Made 4, E-W +420
Director Ruling	4♥ by West, Down 1, N-S +50
Committee Ruling	4♥ by West, Down 1, N-S +50

- | | |
|-----|---|
| (1) | Alerted on the right-side of the screen (East & North), but not alerted on the left-side of the screen until after South had bid 1NT. |
| (2) | After South heard the alert of the 1♦ bid, he changed his call to Double. |

The Facts: East-West pre-alerted that they play a 1♦ response to 1♣ as showing hearts. West claimed that South bid 1NT too quickly after the tray was passed under the screen. South claimed the bid was made in proper tempo. North led a spade and declarer won the first spade in the dummy. Declarer cashed the Heart Ace in dummy and led another heart after winning the opening lead in the dummy. North-South alleged that declarer might have finessed the heart jack without the 1NT bid.

The Ruling: Pursuant to Law 16(d), The Director determined that information from the withdrawn call is not authorized to the offending side. Declarer has a logical alternative to playing hearts in the manner that he chose. The unauthorized information suggests the

actual line of play taken by the declarer, instead of the logical alternative. The logical alternative line is less successful than the line suggested by the unauthorized information. According to Law 16(c) and 12(c), the score was adjusted by the director to 4♥ down 1, N-S +50. The East-West argument that the 1NT call was too hasty was not brought by East-West until after the ruling was delivered. Therefore, the argument about the speed of the 1NT call was not given enough weight to effect the final decision.

The Appeal: East-West appealed the Director's ruling and East, West, and the East-West captain attended the hearing. The screening director took a small poll of good players as to best line of play without knowledge of the 1NT overcall. One player chose the correct line while one did not. The East-West team captain said that their policy is not to call the Director for infractions and to generally approach the game in a friendly fashion. East-West testified that transfer responses to 1♣ were pre-alerted and played by both sides. West denied pulling the bidding tray through the screen before the 1NT call.

The Decision: The Committee noted that it seemed unlikely that when 1♦ appeared on the tray that South would have bid 1NT very quickly. It was suggested that if South had drawn the tray through [because bidding trays are often not pushed through adequately so need some further drawing through the screen] than he would have longer to see the 1♦ bid and react. However, there was no clear evidence that South drew the tray through the screen. On the hand, West gave South the chance to take his bid back and this indicated that West believed that his alert was slow. The Committee did not think that the Captain's view of how his team behaved did or should effect this conclusion.

The Director's view was that the alert was late and the Committee found no compelling evidence to overturn this view, therefore they decided that there was misinformation. This meant that the change of call from 1NT to double was legally correct. Knowledge of the 1NT bid was unauthorized to West. The Committee considered whether there was damage and whether to adjust, looking at the ramifications of the lead and various other matters, especially preserving entries. It was felt that the line of play taken at the table [♥A, ♥J] was the action of a player who knew the position of the ♥Q. Nevertheless that would not matter if there was no less successful logical alternative. The Committee judged that some sensible lines of play were losing ones, therefore the player had chosen amongst logical alternatives one that could demonstrably have been suggested by the unauthorized information. Accordingly, the Director's ruling and adjustment was upheld.

The Committee: Gail Greenberg (Chairman), Kit Woolsey, David Stevenson, Ellen Kent, and Chris Moll.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: Good here. A strong candidate for an AWMW, since the appellants brought no new arguments or evidence.

Jeff Goldsmith: Very well done on a difficult and unusual type of case. No consideration of an AWMW?

Ton Kooijman: This is by far the nicest case in the Orlando file. I am permanently looking for such situations and will use it for sure. Am I right to understand that the players arranged this among themselves? I consider that to be wrong and worth a procedural penalty. This is not an easy situation and it is up to the TD to allow South to change his call, informing the players about the application of law 16. Not calling for the TD makes it possible for West to play the hand as he did, pretending not to know that UI exists. EW deserve an AWMW and a further warning related to West's unethical behavior. Now for the TD: well done sir (?), if you also did case 2, I am willing to withdraw my remark there.

Barry Rigal: I like this ruling; not an obvious one by any means.

Adam Wildavsky: "The East-West team captain said that their policy is not to call the Director for infractions and to generally approach the game in a friendly fashion." I strongly object to the implication that a TD call need be anything but friendly, and to the implicit characterization of NS as unfriendly. The laws require players to summon the TD to deal with irregularities. Further, I do not understand why, this being the team's policy, they would then file an appeal. Such an action imposes substantially more of a burden on their opponents, the tournament staff, and the volunteer committee members than a TD call would.

I see no merit to this appeal. Had I any doubt the captain's statement would certainly convince me to issue one.

Bobby Wolff: Another form of CD, a slow alert caused the eventual declarer play to possibly be different, since West, the declarer should not have been privy to South's 1NT bid before it was changed because of the slow alert. It seems that committees want to penalize CD but are very inconsistent in their rulings for what only can be explained as trying to encourage players to play conventions, but not forcing them to learn them, which, in turn causes so much CD. Until CD is penalized out of existence we will continue to have a skewed game with all fairness being random.

I want to sometime soon suggest a handling of CD for TD's and committees to use which will only be a big improvement for the game's future and for that matter, much better for conventions to be used since it will cause the conventions to be explained and used much more correctly than they are now.

APPEAL	NON-NABC+ ONE
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Mike Roberts
Event	Orange Blossom Pairs
Session	Saturday Evening
Date	11/27/10

BD#	3
VUL	EW
DLR	S

65 Masterpoints	
♠	T32
♥	AQJT9
♦	K6
♣	K63

700 Masterpoints		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	310 Masterpoints	
♠	KQ6		♠	J7
♥	K632		♥	875
♦	AQ4		♦	JT
♣	Q75		♣	AJT842

30 Masterpoints	
♠	A9854
♥	4
♦	987532
♣	9

West	North	East	South
			P
1N	Db1 ¹	2♠ ²	3♣ ³
P	3♥	P	P
P			

Final Contract	3♥ by North
Opening Lead	♦ J
Table Result	Down 2, EW +100
Director Ruling	EW +100 and NS -600
Panel Ruling	3♥ by North, Down 2, EW +100

(1)	One-suited hand, not alerted
(2)	Transfer to Clubs, alerted
(3)	Improvised bid

The Facts: The Director was called at the end of the auction when East asked about the double and South said there had been a failure to alert. West declined to change his call, but East announced to the table that he and his partner would have both changed their bidding. He said he would have redoubled and then, when the hand was over, said that auction would have driven E-W to the 3NT game.

South bid 3♣ because she knew she had to bid to let partner show her suit, but did not realize that East's 2♠ relieved her of that responsibility.

The Ruling: Law 21B3 authorizes an adjusted score in cases where there has been damage as a result of a failure to alert. Law 12C.1.(e)(i) requires the most favorable result likely be assigned to the non-offenders had the irregularity not occurred. 3NT, making, was not judged to be likely, so E-W kept their +100. Law 12C2(e)(ii) requires that the most unfavorable result that was at all probable be assigned to the offenders. It was felt -600 fell into this category and was given to N-S.

The Appeal: E-W appealed and all four players attended the hearing.

Appealing side: East said he would have redoubled had he know that North had a single suited hand. When asked why he did not redouble anyway, he said with all the high cards all in one hand, 3N would not make. It was pointed out to him that knowing where all the cards were actually made it easier to make 3N. The key factor that allowed nine tricks was that South held a singleton heart and if South had held the ♣K, 3N was down for sure. East repeated his argument. He did not explain how he knew West would change his bidding before he saw the hand.

On a constructed auction after a redouble, South would have bid 2♣, North would have bid 2♥ after West passed and East would now bid 3♣. West said he would bid 3N.

Non-Appealing side: South was very apologetic for her failure to alert.

The Decision: Law 40B4 states “A side that is damaged as a consequence of its opponents’ failure to provide disclosure of the meaning of a call or play as these Laws require is entitled to rectification through the award of an adjusted score.” In general, three conditions have to be met before an adjustment according to Law 12 is made. There must have been an irregularity (a failure to alert), there must have been damage (E-W thought they were kept from reaching 3NT and the damage must have been as a direct result of the irregularity).

Four players with 200-400 MPs were consulted to determine if the final condition was met. None felt that their intent to play in a club contract would change if the double was penalty or if it was single-suited. One said she would certainly not want to play 3N knowing North-South had a long suit.

Based on the consultants’ advice that there was no damage under Law 40, the Panel saw no reason to change the table result and restored the N-S score of -100. The Panel considered an Appeal Without Merit Warning, but did not achieve unanimity, so none was given.

The Panel: Charles MacCracken (Chairman), Jean Molnar, Matt Koltnow, and Matt Smith.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: Well, a N/S appeal would have had merit, but they were not the appealing side. Note that SOME players can take an adverse ruling, even a bad

one, and live with it, especially when they were the original offenders. However, E/W are the REAL offenders. Their case reeks. Give them the AWMW.

Jeff Goldsmith: No merit. Table result stands.

Ton Kooijman: This was an awful decision by the TD. I can image an uproar by other contestants if a top is so easily awarded. However, part of the reason is the choice by the ACBL to maintain: 'most unfavorable score ... at all probable'. Our experience for many years now is that the offenders, even when willing to accept their given score, do not accept such huge score given to their opponents. This is what I should tell the AC, spreading my risks. And no official warning.

Barry Rigal: East appears to be a paid up member of the double-dummy analysts club when it comes to wanting their pound of flesh. The TDs got it right, and the AWMW issue seems close.

Adam Wildavsky: N/S should have appealed this ruling! E/W's appeal was without merit. They provided no reasons to back their contention that they would have bid differently given a correct explanation.

Bobby Wolff: Since EW was in a position to easily set 3 hearts 3 tricks for +150, which would undoubtedly result in an average+ result they are not entitled to any more than the +100 they achieved. And once South bids what he knew to be a cue bid after East's intervention of 2 spades which meant a club suit, his cue bid forced (or at least strongly suggested) to his partner to bid his suit, which from the looks of his hand was close to 100% to be hearts. Two or more wrongs done willingly by bridge players should justify bad results for both pairs, but instead the Panel did right in awarding +100 to EW for both pairs. Since life has taught most bridge players to always interpret the facts for their own benefit, listening to what they claim is a waste of time unless it is at least, partly deprecating to themselves.

Please, all of us should always keep in mind that when there is a TD call and then a decision made, usually there has been some kind of, at the very least, possible wrongdoing done, so consequently the total matchpoints awarded should never exceed the value of one board and often should result in less than one board. It is important to NEVER forget that truth.

APPEAL	NON-NABC+ TWO
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Jean Molnar
Event	Daylight Open Pairs
Session	Monday Morning
Date	11/29/10

BD#	11	o
VUL	None	
DLR	S	

5190 Masterpoints	
♠	J7
♥	QJT
♦	Q754
♣	Q954

2600 Masterpoints		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	4200 Masterpoints	
♠	Q2		♠	54
♥	K985		♥	7642
♦	AT		♦	KJ863
♣	AK863		♣	JT

3100 Masterpoints	
♠	AKT9863
♥	A3
♦	92
♣	72

West	North	East	South
			1♠
DBL	1NT	P	2♠
P ¹	P	3♦	P
P	DBL	P	P
P			

Final Contract	3♦ Dbl by East
Opening Lead	♠ A
Table Result	Down 1, NS +100
Director Ruling	3♦ Dbl by East, Down 1, NS +100
Panel Ruling	2♠ by South, Made 2, NS +110

(1) Alleged Break-in-tempo

The Facts: The Director was called after East's 3♦ bid. North-South claimed that there was a break-in-tempo (BIT) by West after South's 2♠ bid. East-West deny that there was a BIT.

The Ruling: Law 16B1(a) requires that "the partner may not choose from among logical alternatives one that could demonstrably have been suggested over another by the extraneous information." Law 16B1(b) provides that "A logical alternative action is one that, among the class of players in question and using the methods of the partnership, would be given serious consideration by a significant proportion of such players, of whom it is judged some might select it." The Director ruled that even if there was a BIT by West, pass was not a logical alternative bid by East. Pursuant to Law 16A1(a), the table result was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: North-South appealed and all four players attended the hearing. North-South argued that pass was a logical alternative to bidding 3♦ by East. East-West argued that West is always deliberate and thus there was no BIT and that East has no defense against Spades but has a good playing hand opposite a takeout double.

The panel polled four players in the 3,000-8,000 point range. Three of the four felt that pass was a logical alternative to bidding 3♦ with the East hand. At the very start of the screening process, West explained that her hand had extra values for her takeout double. West's extra values lend credence to the allegation that she had a problem over 2♠ and that a BIT occurred.

The Decision: The Panel ruled that there had been a BIT. The hand itself suggests that West had something to think about and West's initial comments in the screening process suggest that there had been a BIT. The polling results from the panel indicate that pass was a logical alternative to bidding 3♦ with the East hand. Pursuant to Law 16B1, the Panel determined that East not be allowed to bid 3♦ when it might have been suggested by the BIT. Therefore, the result was adjusted to 2♠ by South, making 2, for +110 N-S.

The Panel: William Michael (Chairman), Bernie Gorkin, and Tom Marsh.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: Correct. The Director should have done the same.

Jeff Goldsmith: Hold on a sec. Players are not supposed to be polled as to whether they think an action is a LA, but what they would actually do and what they are seriously considering. Did any of the polled players pass? These days, it is sufficient for pollees to consider an action seriously for it to be an LA.

Personally, I think bidding is clear-cut. (It is not clear to me whether to bid 2NT to try to find hearts or to bid 3♦ to get the lead I want against 3♠.) White at matchpoints, you cannot sell to 2♠ when they have nine of them and you have a nearly sure 8-card fit. You know it is almost certain that they will bid 3♠, so bidding is essentially free.

On the other hand, East could have bid 2♦ over 1NT, and that is also free. He did not, so I will buy that passing is a LA for this East.

Ton Kooijman: With more emphasis now: why doesn't the TD go around and ask players about their choice with the East hand? It does not help the status of the TD staff when one of them decides that pass with the East hand is not a logical alternative. To be honest, the 3♦ bid is worth a warning for unethical behavior.

Barry Rigal: The panel ruling seems well founded and well argued. I am surprised the initial ruling was in favor of E-W.

Adam Wildavsky: i) "The panel polled four players in the 3,000-8,000 point range. Three of the four felt that pass was a logical alternative to bidding 3♦ with the East hand."

This is not what we should be asking in polls. It is the panel's responsibility to decide whether a call was a LA, not the pollees'. The panel commissions the poll to inform their judgment. The questions to ask, after providing only the authorized information, are "What calls would you seriously consider?" and then "Of those, which one would you choose?" (Thanks to Steve Willner for suggesting this formulation)

ii) Not bidding 3♦ is surely logical for a player who passed up an opportunity to bid 2♦. I much prefer the Panel's ruling to the TDs. If I had my way, a TD could not rule "no logical alternative" until he had taken a poll.

Bobby Wolff: A reasonable ruling based on a clear huddle, followed by a questionable action by partner. My only addition to the discussion would be to establish precedents for future committees to compare situations for commonality with the idea of making decisions consistent with similar facts and judgments. These precedents will tend to take a great deal of pressure off individual committees in determining degree. Obviously all precedents need to be filed, be published and readily available to future committees to ponder, if necessary.

APPEAL	NON-NABC+ THREE
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Anita Goldman
Event	Mixed Pairs
Session	Thursday Afternoon
Date	12/2/10

BD#	12	o
VUL	N-S	
DLR	W	

14500 Masterpoints	
♠	KJ983
♥	
♦	Q8
♣	KQJT42

6147 Masterpoints		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	7495 Masterpoints	
♠	652		♠	QT7
♥	J7652		♥	K93
♦	T742		♦	J95
♣	5		♣	9863

14556 Masterpoints	
♠	A4
♥	AQT84
♦	AK63
♣	A7

West	North	East	South
P	1♣	P	1♥
P	1♠	P	4N ¹
P	5♣ ²	P	5N ³
P	6♣ ⁴	P	6N ⁵
P	7N	P	P
P			

Final Contract	7N by South
Opening Lead	♦ 2
Table Result	Made 7, NS +2220
Director Ruling	7N by South, Made 7, NS +2220
Panel Ruling	7N by South, Made 7, NS +2220

(1)	RKC
(2)	1 or 4 Key Cards (Spades)
(3)	Specific Kings & Promises all Five Controls
(4)	♣ K
(5)	BIT

The Facts: The Director was called after the play was finished and South had made 7N. Both sides agreed that there was a break-in-tempo (BIT) by South before his 6N bid.

The Ruling: Law 16B1(a) requires that “the partner may not choose from among logical alternatives one that could demonstrably have been suggested over another by the extraneous information.” Law 16B1(b) provides that “A logical alternative action is one that, among the class of players in question and using the methods of the partnership,

would be given serious consideration by a significant proportion of such players, of whom it is judged some might select it.” The Director ruled that even though there was a BIT by South that demonstrably suggested bidding, pass was not a logical alternative bid by North. The Director reported that he was unable to consult with other Directors or players in making his decision due to the time remaining until the end of the event. Pursuant to Law 16A1(a), the Director ruled that the table result was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: East-West appealed and all four players attended the hearing. As all parties agreed that there was a demonstrable BIT by South before bidding 6N, the length of time of the BIT was not discussed. East-West argued that with the North-South bidding sequence, there was no way for the partnership to determine if they had the Queen of Spades. Therefore, there was no way for N-S to be able to count 13 tricks in the bidding. North-South argued that North knew from the 5N bid that they possessed all five key cards. They also argued that South had no idea when he bid 6N that North had such great holdings in the black suits. North admitted to the Panel that his 6♣ bid was an error in the auction and that he should have bid 7N directly over the 5N bid.

The Decision: Both sides agreed that there had been a BIT by South before his 6N bid. The Panel consulted three Grand Life Masters regarding whether the North hand should bid over South’s 6N bid. All three players polled were adamant that they would bid 7N. Two of the three players reported that they would have bid 7N over South’s 5N bid on the previous round of bidding. None of the three experts thought that pass was a logical alternative bid with the North hand. Two of the players polled weren’t sure what the BIT showed and the third expert stated, “I don’t care if there was a hesitation, I’m bidding 7.” The Panel considered the expert opinions very compelling. Pursuant to Law 16B1, the Panel determined that pass was not a logical alternative bid with the North hand. Therefore, the table result of 7N by South, making 7 for +2220, was allowed to stand. The appeal was found to have substantial merit.

The Panel: William Michael (Chairman), Su Doe, and Tom Marsh.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: I agree strongly enough to suggest that an AWMW was appropriate. Historically, Directors and Committees have been reluctant to allow a grand slam bid after a hesitation, no matter how clear-cut it is. I am glad to see they both got it right.

Jeff Goldsmith: If South is going to bid that badly, why should we let North bid that well? If he wanted to bid 7♣, that I could buy. 7♣ looks cold---either South has the ♠Q or a doubleton. (With Axx, he would have asked for the ♠Q over 5♣.) In the former case, he will bid 7♠ and we can correct to 7NT. In the latter, he will pass and we will be in a contract that is cold, in contrast to one, which requires a squeeze to make. But 7NT? That means North is assuming South has the ♠Q, and if he were willing to make that assumption, he would have bid 7NT on the previous round.

Sorry, N/S +1470. There was a hesitation. It provided UI. The UI suggests bidding over passing, because if South thought 6NT was not the right contract, North knows it is not.

Passing is a LA for anyone who would not bid 7NT over 5NT. Therefore, 7NT is not allowed.

Since bidding seven is a fairly normal action, no PP should be given.

Important safety tip: if you want your partner to participate in a post-Blackwood auction, plan your responses to his normal actions before you ask. Thinking before asking does not constrain him. Thinking before setting the contract does.

Ton Kooijman: In this case I feel caught by the procedure followed. I can imagine that a majority bids 7NT anyway, but what are the arguments? Technically spoken that call does not look safe. In our federation we once had the rule of thumb that when it was possible to construct a normal hand using the legal information with which the hesitation slam does not make, we did not allow that call (yes I know, that is not the legal approach). You do not need to look any further, this is such a hand. North does not believe that South is choosing between 6♠ and 6NT, this is pairs! In addition, the hesitation seems to show all kings or the ♠Q. Even then, South can't be sure about seven. However, North is. Therefore, I would walk around trying to find a player not bidding 7NT, only to surrender if I fail.

Barry Rigal: I am not sure whether we should be judging by using GMs in a Mixed Pair non-NABC event...but I do agree with the opinions given. As North I also might have bid 7♣ over 5NT but waiting one round in case partner was about to bid 6♥ is not so terrible?

Adam Wildavsky: Did 5N really promise all the key cards but say nothing about the queen of trump? I know of no one who plays the method as described in the write-up. That said, South's bidding is evidence that he plays it that way.

How did declarer take 13 tricks? A major suit squeeze does it, but there are other reasonable lines. I am just curious -- it is not likely relevant to the ruling.

While I agree that the hesitation demonstrably suggested bidding seven I would have liked to see testimony from E/W to that effect. One could argue that it is just as likely that South was choosing between 6N and 6♠.

As for whether Pass would have been logical, three players is not a large enough sample size to determine that it was not. See my comments on case 6.

The rulings seem reasonable, but I find Jeff Goldsmith's argument compelling. South needed to plan his auction before bidding 4N, not afterwards. When he unnecessarily varies his tempo in a manner that could make information available to his partner he should not be surprised to receive an adjusted score.

Bobby Wolff: Did anyone ask how 7NT was made? Since a squeeze on East in spades and hearts could occur, (with declarer guessing the ending) it can be made, but how can this panel not even mention that fact. South's BIT before bidding 6NT did not have to be because he was thinking about bidding a grand slam, but rather because of

selecting the strain to play a small slam. IT WOULD HELP FOR EVERY PANEL OR COMMITTEE TO HAVE AT LEAST ONE QUALIFIED EXPERT PLAYER AVAILABLE FOR JUDGMENTS. In this case, it is likely that EW did not discard well or at least not deceptively enough, but since they are ruled at -2220 that is penalty enough for whatever happened.

APPEAL	NON-NABC+ FOUR
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Tom Marsh
Event	0-5000 Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	First Final
Date	12/2/10

BD#	14
VUL	None
DLR	E

890 Masterpoints	
♠	T765
♥	KQJT83
♦	8
♣	76

3400 Masterpoints		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	2200 Masterpoints	
♠	KQ983		♠	A42
♥	92		♥	A65
♦	642		♦	AK5
♣	KJ5		♣	Q432

1800 Masterpoints	
♠	J
♥	74
♦	QJT973
♣	AT98

West	North	East	South
		1N	Dbl ¹
2♥ ²	Dbl	3♠ ³	Pass
4♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	4♠ by East
Opening Lead	♦ Q
Table Result	4♠ by East, Down 1, NS +50
Director Ruling	4♠ by East, Down 1, NS +50
Panel Ruling	4♠ by East, Made 4, NS -420; 4♠ by East, Down 1, EW -50

(1)	Alerted as same size hand
(2)	Transfer to spades
(3)	Super accept in spades

The Facts: The Director was called after the play was finished and East contended that she would have taken second round spade finesse had she known South had a single suit (actual agreement).

The Ruling: The auction, including East's 3♠ call indicates that the South hand was not thought to be of equal strength. In addition, South tried to speak up prior to the play period and East asked no questions. The ruling was that the poor explanation was not related to the result.

The Appeal: East/West appealed the director's ruling of 4♠ down one.

The Decision: Polling indicated that the correct explanation would lead to the proper play in the spade suit. Therefore, the North/South score was adjusted to 4♠ by East, making 4, North/South -420. However, this was the final round of a National event, and the declarer has around 2,200 masterpoints. It was felt by the Panel that East had plenty of information that the explanation given could not be correct, failed to use that information, earning the table result. The second round finesse is the indicated percentage play in the spade suit after the Jack appears, so the result of 4♠, down one, was left to stand for East/West, as this was deemed a serious bridge error. Law 12C.1(b).

The Panel: William Michael (Chairman), Su Doe, and Ken Van Cleve.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: No, no, no. To justify a split score the given action must fall into the narrow band of "possible but unlikely". The offenders get a bad score because it is (barely) possible, but the non-offenders do not get the reciprocal good score because the given action is still unlikely. Instead, they get the best score among "likely" actions. For that to be applicable here, (1) the winning trump play must be possible but unlikely, and (2) the misinformation must directly affect the ability to find the winning play. I might have agreed if the Panel had said that, but they did not. Rather, according to their poll, they say that (3) with correct information the winning play is somewhere between reasonable and automatic, contradicting (1). In addition, they say that (4) East should have found the play anyway, contradicting (2).

Therefore, they should have ruled either 420 both ways, if they really believed (3). (The infraction led directly to the bad result.) Alternatively, they should have ruled 50 both ways, if they really believed (4). (The infraction had nothing to do with the bad result.) In addition, if they really believed BOTH (3) and (4), they needed to start over. I believe (4): THIS East was NEVER going to find the winning play, notwithstanding his statement to the contrary. Therefore, I would have let the result stand for both sides. If N/S were lucky enough to be playing against someone who would always go down, they should not be deprived of their result because of an irrelevant infraction.

However, there is more. When it comes to "serious bridge errors", the Panel is at the head of the class. This suit combination is NOT subject to the usual restricted choice analysis, because South can play the jack or ten from a holding of jack-ten-THIRD as well as from jack-ten doubleton or stiff jack or stiff ten. Thus, with no other indications the correct play is not to finesse on the second round. Ah, but South showed a one-suiter, you say? Yes, but North also showed a suit. All of this means that there is no "right" play.

Besides, East can still make even without guessing trumps. I know, because I did so myself when I played this hand, by squeezing South in the minors, without the count.

Jeff Goldsmith: I guess this panel has never seen a South who would play the ♠J from ♠J10x. I would rule result stands. There was a misexplanation, but declarer knew that by the time he saw dummy. There were only 14 HCP out and if South had all of them, he would have led the HK. So the MI was exposed, and declarer could have found out what N/S's methods were if he cared. Since declarer did not care what the double was, there was no damage from the MI, and there can be no adjusted score.

In addition, the terrible bridge judgment shown by the panel ought to have been avoided. Let us strongly encourage consultation with expert players before a panel judges that a player's blunder breaks the connection between damage and the NOS's bad result.

Ton Kooijman: One of my popular subjects: serious error. Thank you. And my conclusion is that East did not stop playing bridge. Does she have to decide that JT KQT QJT9 AT98 is not worth a double? In addition, that North then has xxx Jxxxx xxx xx with which a double is impossible. While she is put on the wrong track that South has a strong balanced hand? Not in my opinion and if the poll shows that the right information gives her 4♠, I would adjust the score to + 420 for EW.

Assume South has the hand as given and East finesses the T, losing that trick. 'How can you double with 13, I thought North had misexplained?' 'Well I counted some extras for my tens and honestly thought that I had 14HCP'. Do we adjust now?

And if there is some doubt about East's technical ability in handling the spades a weighted score could be given, 70% making and 30% one down for example (I know not in your jurisdiction).

Let me quote L12C.1.(b). It seems to say that subsequent damage only can exist if the serious error is not related to the infraction. Though this is not my personal point of view I agree with the approach that a mistake related to an infraction by the opponents should be treated mildly.

Barry Rigal: Are we sure, the finesse is right in abstract? South is allowed to false card from J10x you know...but if South has a single-suiter the finesse is indeed the indicated play. I am not sure that N/S are entitled to retain their score but E/W certainly should not benefit here.

Adam Wildavsky: I would like to see the poll questions and responses -- the conclusion makes no sense to me. Declarer knew when dummy came down that the explanation was incorrect. He had the opportunity to ask again. Suppose he then learned that South had diamonds and North hearts. How would that lead to a successful play in the spade suit?

The panel should refrain from giving bridge lessons. A second round hook is decidedly anti-percentage, since South could hold JT_x. Even if the panel were right, this is not the kind of "serious error" envisioned under 12C1(b).

The TD ruling was 100% correct. The panel decision was unjust.

Bobby Wolff: Presumptuous is probably the right word to be used in rendering their decision. To say that South's play of the Jack should tend to make the spades clear to be 4-1 based on the bidding is just plain wrong and has exactly NO application regarding the likelihood of restricted choice. The reason being that South should play the Jack (or Ten) from J10x taking it totally out of any official percentage table. Since the committee wanted to rule against the CD involved makes it OK with me, but please TD Panel, do not feel good about your not understanding what the jack of spades represented.

APPEAL	NON-NABC+ FIVE
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Tom Marsh
Event	0-5000 Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	Second Semi-Final
Date	12/1/10

BD#	3	o
VUL	E/W	
DLR	S	

3400 Masterpoints	
♠	A764
♥	AT832
♦	T9
♣	A7

2005 Masterpoints		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	2005 Masterpoints	
♠			♠	QJT8
♥	J4		♥	KQ5
♦	KJ543		♦	Q876
♣	KQJT94		♣	85

1950 Masterpoints	
♠	K9532
♥	972
♦	A2
♣	632

West	North	East	South
			2♠
2N¹	3♠	3N	Pass
Pass	Dbl	Pass	Pass
4♣	Dbl	4♦	Pass
Pass	Dbl	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	4♦ Doubled by East
Opening Lead	♠3
Table Result	4♦ by East Dbl, Made 4, NS -710
Director Ruling	3N by East Dbl, Down 2, NS +500
Panel Ruling	3N by East Dbl, Down 2, NS +500

(1)	When asked, East stated that it showed a strong notrump. East/West had no agreement
-----	---

The Facts: The Director was called after the play was finished and determined that East/West had no agreement as to the meaning of the 2 notrump call. East stated, when asked, that it showed a strong notrump.

The Ruling: The contract was rolled back to 3 notrump doubled, down 2, North/South +500. There was unauthorized information that made the run from 3 notrump doubled more attractive. A player poll indicated that a number of players would sit, so pass was a logical alternative. Laws 16B and 12.C.1.

3 notrump would be down 2 on a heart lead and continuation, and a duck of the ♣A.

The Appeal: West's shapely 2 notrump bid without stoppers in either major made it logical to pull 3 notrump doubled after partner said he had a strong notrump hand.

The Decision: Six Flight B players were polled and without knowing the unauthorized information, four indicated that they would pass 3 notrump doubled. Per Law 16.B.1.(a), after a player makes available to his partner extraneous information that may suggest a call or play the partner may not choose from logical alternatives one that could demonstrably have been suggested by the extraneous information. In this case the reply to the question about the meaning of the 2 notrump call was extraneous information. An Appeal Without Merit Warning (AWMW) was not given by the Panel.

The Panel: John Gram (Chairman), Ken Van Cleve, and Nancy Boyd.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: Where is the AWMW? If not, why not? In addition, giving the defenders credit for leading a heart ON OPENING LEAD is a stretch, but leading spades works just as well. I agree with 500 both ways.

Jeff Goldsmith: Good general ruling, but I am not convinced that a heart lead is either likely or at all probable, but it does not matter. 500 is available on a spade lead, too. E/W get an AMWM and a 1/4 board PP for blatant abuse of UI.

Ton Kooijman: This is a nice example to show how severe these cases have to be judged. Running from 3NT is certainly reasonable but 'pass' is not unreasonable. Not giving an official warning is another chance missed to educate your players.

Barry Rigal: Absolutely no excuse for failing to give an AWMW. The Panel's failure to award one here brings back to mind the apposite line from Pirkey Avot (The ethics of the Fathers) "If not now, when?"

Adam Wildavsky: It is not enough to state that an AWMW was not given. We need to know why. West testified that he pulled because his unusual NT contained no stopper in the unbid suits? That is beyond laughable. Would one stopper have been enough to sit, or would he need two? I would have assessed a procedural penalty against EW for blatant use of UI, in addition to the score adjustment.

Bobby Wolff: Although I am glad that NS got their head handed to them by the committee for just another example of bridge stopping altogether once CD arose, I definitely think that EW should be down 500 in 3NT doubled, in spite of the somewhat ridiculous notion of West standing for the double. However the right number of matchpoints were then awarded to EW (probably O). The only problem left (at least for me) is the unfair prospect of NS getting a top (in a matchpoint event) once they saw fit to double 4 of a minor. Somehow -710 does not look deserving to me to be awarded a top and I, as a would be chairman of that Panel, would find a way to take NS's top away from

them, simply because what they eventually did (double 4 diamonds) doesn't deserve a top and the NS field deserved protection (PTF). EVER ONWARD, EVER UPWARD!

APPEAL	NON-NABC+ SIX
Subject	Unauthorized Information and Misinformation
DIC	Anita Goldman
Event	Mixed Pairs
Session	First session
Date	12/2/10

BD#	27	o
VUL	None	
DLR	S	

10500 Masterpoints	
♠	AT95
♥	A3
♦	T8
♣	KT852

860 Masterpoints		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	880 Masterpoints	
♠	J83		♠	
♥	9865		♥	QJT2
♦	AJ		♦	KQ7543
♣	AQ76		♣	J94

3800 Masterpoints	
♠	KQ7642
♥	K74
♦	962
♣	3

West	North	East	South
			2♠
Dbl	3♣ ¹	3♦	Pass
Pass	3♠	4♥	Pass
Pass	4♠	Pass	Pass
Dbl	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	4♠ Doubled by South
Opening Lead	♦A
Table Result	4♠ by South Dbl, Made 4, NS +590
Director Ruling	3♠ by South, Made 4, NS +170
Panel Ruling	4♠ by South Dbl, Made 4, NS +590

(1) 3♣ is agreed as a fit showing bid, not alerted
--

The Facts: The 3♣ bid was not alerted at the time the bid was made. The failure to alert and an explanation of the meaning of the bid was made before the opening lead. East stated that if 3♣ had been properly alerted, she would have bid 3♦, but would not have bid 4♥ after North's 3♠ bid. West stated that he would not have doubled 4♠ if he was properly alerted.

The Ruling: The Director ruled that the contract be rolled back to 3♠ making 4, North/South +170. Per Law 20.F.6, the Director determined that East had taken action based on the misinformation. Per Law 21.B.3, the Director determined that North/South

gained an advantage from the irregularity, and awarded an adjusted score of +170 to North/South.

The Appeal: North argued that he bid 4♠ after the 4♥ call because his hand seemed more likely to make 4♠ with East showing both red suits. The clubs would be on his right, making his hand more valuable.

West stated that he would not double 4♠ if he knew North could have 4♠; he felt that a maximum of 3♠ was all that North could hold.

East said she would still bid 3♦ over 3♣, but would not have bid 4♥ after 3♠, if properly informed. East could not give a definite answer as to why she would bid differently with the correct explanation.

The Decision: Regarding the UI aspect of this case, the Panel felt that 4♠ was an acceptable call, even with the UI arising from the failure to alert. The auction provided by East/West makes the North hand less valuable defensively, and more valuable offensively. 100% of the players polled bid 4♠ with the North hand, some stating they were bidding to make, others as a sacrifice. The Panel did not feel that Law 16.B.1 had been violated, and allowed the 4♠ call to be made.

Polling also showed that had the alert been properly given by South, all players would still bid 4♥, some feeling that it was actually more appealing after the correct explanation. Therefore, the logic that was used for the table ruling was overturned, and the 4♥ bid enforced. Polling was split on whether West's hand would double, but some players did. No player thought it was out-of-line to double 4♠. Those that did double would double with the correct explanation. The Panel felt that North had shown the hand he actually held, and the double was made at West's own risk, not directly because of the MI.

Law 21.B.3 states that "When it is too late to change a call and the Director judges that the offending side gained an advantage from the irregularity, he awards an adjusted score." The Panel felt that there was no violation of Law 16.B.1, and no advantage gained by North/South under Law 21.B.3. Therefore, there was no basis in law to adjust the table result, so it was restored to both sides.

The Panel: William Michael (Chairman), Matt Koltnow, and Nancy Boyd.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: Good. Another example of the non-offenders being more offensive than the offenders. A classic "give me two chances and I'll get it right every time".

Jeff Goldsmith: East was blowing smoke. He knew North had a spade fit. His partner passed 3♦, so he does not have a big hand, which means he does not have spade length, which means N/S have about 11 spades. Unless South is prone to 9-card weak twos, North has spade support, so the MI case is nonsense. North had UI from the failure to alert. He clearly was willing to play short of 4♠, as he made a non-forcing bid the

previous round. The UI suggests bidding 4♠ over passing, and for him, clearly passing or doubling is a LA. Therefore, 4♠ is illegal, and we roll back to 4♥ and use Law 12 to determine the scores. The likely result is down 1, so E/W get -50. I do not see making as being at all probable, and North's doubling is more, not less favorable to N/S, so N/S get +50.

Ton Kooijman: Many of your players seem better in fairy-tales than in bridge. Once again, the TD apparently does not play that often either. Of course, East would bid 4♥ anyway. Interesting question is whether North would have bid 4♠ with a proper alert. I think he would, 4♥ looks like it is making.

Barry Rigal: I agree with restoring the 4♥ call... but what about the UI leading to the 4♠ bid. If South had properly alerted the 3♣ call, would North always save? Consider South with ♥Qxx instead of ♥Kxx. 4♠ still loses three red-suit losers and ♣A, 4♥ goes down on the club leads and ruffs. It was negligent of the Panel not to consider adjusting to 4♥ undoubled down three.

Adam Wildavsky: I disagree with the Panel's decision regarding UI and with their approach. The question is not whether 4♠ is acceptable but whether Pass would have been logical. Not bidding 4♠ would usually be logical for a player who stopped in three on the previous round. He bid 3♣ to let partner in on the decision, and partner has made one. Further, walking the dog by bidding 3♣ then 3♠ then 4♠ just gives the opponents a fielder's choice. Sometimes they will go wrong, as they did here, but that is not the way to bet.

Telling us that 100% of those polled bid 4♠ is meaningless without telling us how many were polled and of those how many would have bid 4♠ on a previous round. North's peers are those who would bid 3♣ followed by 3♠. Further, one must poll a substantial number of players (I would say 10 when practical, but there are no official guidelines) before concluding that a reasonable-looking action is not a logical alternative.

I prefer the TD's ruling to the Panels.

Bobby Wolff: There was definitely CD present when North's 3♣ bid was not alerted and explained. When West reasonably doubled (on that eventual bidding sequence) the result became random subject to the entire layout of the cards, which in this case allowed NS to make their doubled game, but only after CD. Obviously, I, after noting the CD, would have allowed +590 to stand (normal playing luck for both pairs), but I would have penalized NS 1/2 of a board for their failure to alert. Therein all masters would be served including penalizing CD and PTF.

APPEAL	NON-NABC+ SEVEN
Subject	Break in Tempo
DIC	Karl Miller
Event	Open Pairs
Session	Second Session
Date	12/2/10

BD#	3	o
VUL	E/W	
DLR	S	

14700 Masterpoints	
♠	42
♥	QT974
♦	QJ73
♣	JT

1050 Masterpoints		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	712 Masterpoints	
♠	AKQJT973		♠	6
♥	8		♥	KJ6532
♦	A9		♦	
♣	A8		♣	KQ6432

9100 Masterpoints	
♠	85
♥	A
♦	KT86542
♣	975

West	North	East	South
			3♦
4♠	5♦	Pass ¹	Pass
5♠	Pass	Pass	6♦
6♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	6♠ by West
Opening Lead	♦Q
Table Result	6♠ by West, Made 7, NS -1460
Director Ruling	6♠ by West, Made 7, NS -1460
Panel Ruling	6♦ by South Dbl, Down 4, NS -800

(1) Agreed break in tempo, up to 30 seconds

The Facts: Agreed break in tempo after the 5♦ bid. North said she is always deliberate and took approximately 5 seconds to bid 5♦.

The Ruling: In application of Law 16.B.1.a, pass is not an option and the bid of 6♠ is not demonstrably suggested from the available alternatives.

The Appeal: East's BIT showed values which makes bidding 6♠ more attractive. South felt he had a double shot at this hand, figuring that 6♠ would not be allowed.

The Decision: Player polling indicated that the 6♠ bid was influenced by the BIT. No player polled considered any other call other than double over 6♦. Pass was clearly demonstrated to be a logical alternative. With the East hand, all players polled stated that they had to trust their partner's judgment as to the double, and passed. 6♠ was

demonstrably suggested by the UI. Based on the polling data, the adjustment for East/West was indicated to be 6♦ doubled, minus 4 under Law 16.B.1.

The situation was a little different for North/South. South had made a serious error in bridge judgment, risking a set that would score less than just allowing 5♠ to be played. Furthermore, he made this decision based on his assumption that a 6♣ bid would be disallowed by the directing staff (he did not state that he thought a double would be disallowed). This was considered to be a “wild or gambling action”.

The Panel considered allowing the table result to stand for these reasons. Law 12.C.1.b states that “if, subsequent to the irregularity, the non-offending side has contributed to its own damage by a serious error (unrelated to the infraction) or by wild or gambling action, it does not receive relief in the adjustment for such part of the damage as is self-inflicted.” 6♣ making 7 East/West seems to be the result that North/South earned due to its own actions. However, there was no infraction of law before the 6♦ bid was made. The Laws Commission decided in Washington, D.C. 2009, that an irregularity mentioned in 12.C.1.c applied to action taken after the UI is presented, not to the action producing the UI. Therefore, it was decided there was no basis under law to leave the table result to stand for North/South.

The Panel: William Michael (Chairman), Matt Koltnow, and Nancy Boyd.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: Acceptable, barely. Since everyone agreed to the break in tempo I guess there was one, but I am more lenient about taking time in highly volatile auctions like this one. East got his first turn to bid at the five level. Of course he is going to have a lot to think about, and even if he does not he should take some time anyway. I consider 15 to 20 seconds mandatory on this auction, so 30 seconds is not that much of a break.

Given that, West’s 5♠ bid was deemed AUTOMATIC despite the break in tempo, then his SIX spade bid cannot be too far away either.

I loathe South’s premeditated double-shot. I find his reasoning perverse. Wasn’t he worried that West took advantage when he bid FIVE spades? Don’t you think South would have called the cops if the final contract had been 6D doubled, arguing that he had been placed in an unfair position because West’s 5S bid was based on the break in tempo? Just asking.

The Committee uses highly nuanced rationale for depriving South of his richly deserved score of -1460. I would have interpreted the Law differently. You cannot take an intentional anti-percentage action when your SOLE REASON is the anticipation of a favorable ruling if things do not work out. If that is your strategy, you have to live with your table result.

Jeff Goldsmith: Two statements in the write-up are awful. "Player polling indicated that the 6♣ bid was influenced by the break in tempo." It did not. No one knows what West was thinking, and claiming that you do is unacceptable. Player polling indicated

that doing something other than bidding 6♠ was a LA. We need firm guidelines for writing up polls and executing them. "[6♦] was considered to be a 'wild or gambling action.'" Say what? And a "serious error in bridge judgment." Huh? Tomorrow, North holds x xxxxxx Axx xxx, E/W's diamonds are 2-1, and 6♦x is par.

As far as the actual ruling goes, I think it is much closer than the Panel does. If West had passed 6♦, would that have been forcing? E/W were not asked, so we do not know. I think most would assume that once North passed 5♠, N/S were assumed to be saving, so E/W is in a force. Therefore, if West does not bid 6♠, he will pass, not double. There is no way on Earth East will double 6♦; he will bid 6♥. If pass is not forcing, East should not pass a double; he again has an obvious 6♥.

The pollees seemed pretty certain, but it seems to me as if the the poller did not understand the hand, so his poll was probably at best grossly flawed. However, I do not know that players with 712 masterpoints will understand the auction, either, so it is reasonable to rule as the director or the Panel did. If E/W were expert players, there is no way 6♦x could be a final contract.

Ton Kooijman: Here we go again, a TD telling the players that pass is not a logical alternative for 6♠. BRRR. I read Adam's comment and agree fully: no such decision without polling. I am somewhat surprised not to read anything about the 5♠ bid. That was made after the hesitation and therefore needs to be judged too. OK, no LA, but still. The decision to award 6♦x minus 4 is the right one for me.

Barry Rigal: The Panel do not appear to have considered that if West had passed 6♦ – which would surely have been the most likely call from a hand barred from bidding 6♠ then East would have bid 6♠-- indeed arguably East would take that action over a double of 6♦. For that and other reasons a split score of 6♦x for E/W and 6♠ making for N/S seems to be fairest. I am sure others will find some good Talmudic reasoning to accomplish this result.

Adam Wildavsky: i) "Player polling indicated that the 6♠ bid was influenced by the break in tempo."

It indicated no such thing. That conclusion would require mind reading. Rather the poll indicated that Pass was a Logical Alternative. We must be careful not to attribute motives to players' actions. The laws do not require us do so in order to adjust the score. We can and do adjust without any accusation of evil intent, and it is important that we are able to continue to do so.

ii) Kudos to the Panel for following the minutes of the Laws Commission. I do not think they read quite closely enough, though. Here is what the minutes had to say:

Next, the commission discussed Unauthorized Information in the context of Law 12C.1.(e). Adam Wildavsky moved that "When considering a score adjustment for a violation of Law 16B, the irregularity referred to by Law 12C.1.(e) is the action that may have been influenced by the unauthorized information." The motion carried.

As stated, we intended this interpretation to apply to 12C.1.(e) specifically. We did not state, and I believe did not intend to state, that a hesitation is not an irregularity.

South said that he was gambling on a score adjustment. The irregularity referred to by Law 12C.1.(e) does not come into play. Gambling is gambling, and I would like N/S to have kept their table result, per Law 12C.1.(b).

What about E/W? It depends on the probable outcomes had West not bid 6♠. His other choices were Pass and Double. It is certainly possible that East will bid 6♠, or 6♥, which will get EW to 6♠. Per Law 12C.1.(e), we assign the offending side "The most unfavorable result that was at all probable had the irregularity not occurred." Here it seems to me that 6♦x is at least "all probable" so I agree with the Panel that the E/W score should be adjusted to +800.

If you are having trouble keeping score, so was I! As I see it, the TD gave the right adjustment (none) for N/S and the wrong adjustment (none) for EW. The Panel gave the right adjustment (+800 instead of +1460) to EW and arguably the wrong adjustment (-800 instead of -1460) to N/S.

Bobby Wolff: As Desi (Arnaz on I Love Lucy) might have said, "There is some splaining to do." How can any committee or Panel rule in favor of a player who openly explained, without embarrassment, that he bid 6♦, because after East had hesitated he thought his side, NS, would be protected against EW not bidding 6♠. That type of action, at least to me, is unethical to say the least. A player should never be in a position to be able to insure the opponents from eventually taking the winning bridge action because he would be barred from doing so. If bridge was originally called "a gentleman's game" and for good reason, what should it now be called, "a manueverer's game"? Steven Potter should include this type of action in his best seller, "One-upmanship". My ruling would be both NS and EW would live with EW+1460 with EW getting perhaps a 1/4 board or whatever penalty for possibly being advantaged by the BIT by East. Again most (or possibly all) masters would be served. When our Laws Commission allows significant glitches to remain in effect we need to interpret the laws to always put justice first, in other words to how Edgar Kaplan would have interpreted his own laws, if necessary.

APPEAL	NON-NABC+ EIGHT
Subject	Break in Tempo
DIC	Doug Grove
Event	Open Pairs
Session	Second Session
Date	12/3/10

BD#	20	o
VUL	Both	
DLR	W	

2400 Masterpoints	
♠	852
♥	T2
♦	K87
♣	AT985

1084 Masterpoints		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	850 Masterpoints	
♠	A43		♠	KQJ976
♥	A654		♥	K
♦	62		♦	543
♣	K432		♣	QJ6

441 Masterpoints	
♠	T
♥	QJ9873
♦	AQJT9
♣	7

West	North	East	South
Pass	Pass	1♠	2♥
3♥ ¹	Pass	3♠ ²	Pass
4♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	4♠ by East
Opening Lead	♥Q
Table Result	4♠ by East Made 4, NS -620
Director Ruling	3♠ by East Making 4, NS -170
Panel Ruling	3♠ by East Making 4, NS -170

(1)	Limit raise or better
(2)	Agreed break in tempo

The Facts: Agreed break in tempo by East before the 3♠ bid.

The Ruling: In application of Law 16.B.1.a, a player may not choose from logical alternatives one that could have been suggested over another by the break in tempo. Since pass was a logical alternative, the score was adjusted to 3♠ by West, making 4, North/South -170.

The Appeal: East/West stated that they never open light in 3rd chair. West said he made the limit raise to see if partner had a big hand, and was always going to bid game. East/West agreed to the facts of the case.

North/South felt that West did not have the liberty to bid 4♠ after the BIT. They agreed to the facts of the case.

The Decision: Law 16.B.1 states in part, "...the partner may not choose from among logical alternatives one that could demonstrably have been suggested over another by the extraneous information." As this information was available to West, and there would not be an overwhelming majority of players at that level of play who would bid 4♠ with a balanced 11 count, the table director's ruling was upheld.

This was screened very quickly, and no discussion of Law 16 occurred with the appellants. Due to this consideration, and the relative inexperience of the players, no Appeal Without Merit Warning was awarded.

The Panel: William Michael (Chairman), Matt Koltnow, and Nancy Boyd.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: Whoa, just a minute! If ever a hand screamed for a poll, this is it. Why wasn't one taken? Note that game is excellent even without East's heart king, which would leave him with just a decent weak two-bid. West's hand is not just "a balanced 11-count", it is a hand that many players, perhaps a majority, would open. In addition to the prime high cards, it has well-positioned heart length and a ruffing value. The Panel's mention of a possible AWMW implies that they think that passing 3♠ is so obvious that bidding game can happen only with help from partner. Note that West has no alternative way to show a game force based on high cards. A poll might have led to the opposite conclusion, or perhaps a split decision.

The actual decision is acceptable. A player that passes the West hand as dealer MIGHT not be willing to force to game opposite a third-seat opener. However, I dislike the Panel's cavalier attitude about the whole thing.

Jeff Goldsmith: No merit.

Ton Kooijman: I consider it possible that EW speak the truth, in which case I feel sorry for them. No option but to disallow the 4♠ bid.

Barry Rigal: 'I never open light in third seat' A la lanterne! An AWMW was the VERY least E/W deserved.

Adam Wildavsky: Good work all around, except...

How can screening have taken place without explaining the laws to the players? That is one of the main objectives of screening. This appeal had no merit, and the players signed a form indicating that they understood they would be subject to penalty in that case.

Bobby Wolff: Hooray for undeniably the right ruling, except that West should incur an extra disciplinary penalty for flagrantly abusing the sacred trust of not being unbelievably unethical. Yes, he only has 1084 master points making him a 3 1/2-time

life master, but shouldn't he know better than to do what he did? When we do not rise to what we need to be it is nothing short of a terrible example by our police force and justice system. Shame!

APPEAL	NON-NABC+ NINE
Subject	Unintended Designation of Card in Dummy
DIC	Robert Hendricks
Event	Open Pairs
Session	Second Session
Date	12/3/10

BD#	28
VUL	NS
DLR	W

G. S. Jade Barrett	
♠	T73
♥	875
♦	KQ4
♣	T873

Antonio Sementa		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	Alfredo Versace	
♠	6		♠	982
♥	AKQT94		♥	J32
♦	T63		♦	A975
♣	J96		♣	A52

Anne Dawson	
♠	AKQJ54
♥	6
♦	J82
♣	KQ4

West	North	East	South
1♥	Pass	1♠	Pass
2♥	Pass	3♥	3♠
Pass	4♠	Dbl	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	4♠ by South, Doubled
Opening Lead	♥A
Table Result	4♠ by South, Dbl, Down 1, NS -200
Director Ruling	4♠ by South, Dbl, Down 1, NS -200
Panel Ruling	4♠ by South, Dbl, Made 4, NS -790

The Facts: Earlier in the play, declarer led the ♦2, with the ♦T, ♦K, and ♦A completing the trick. She won the spade return in dummy and led a club to her hand, winning the K. She now led a diamond toward dummy, initially calling “diamond”. In some order she said “oops, queen”, and East played the winning ♦9.

Away from the table, she admitted that it was possible she had seen the ♦9 before changing her designated card. She also stated that her intent was to win the diamond and lead another club.

The Ruling: Because of the possibility that the play of the ♦9 could have affected her change of designated card in dummy, the director did not feel that the standard of Law 45.C.4.b was met. Therefore it was ruled that the ♦4 was played from dummy.

The Appeal: South stated that it was never her intent to play anything other than the ♦Q.

The Decision: The play had gone:

♥A - ♥5 - ♥2 - ♥6

♥K - ♥7 - ♥3 - ♠4

Three rounds of spades ending in dummy;

♣3 - ♣2 - ♣K - ♣6

♦2 - ♦T - ♦K - ♦A

♥J - ♠J - ♥4 - ♥7

♦8 - ♦6 - *

*at this point declarer said “diamond...oops, I meant queen”. The ♦9 was played, but the exact timing of events was murky at this point. The floor director was called and took declarer away from the table. The Director asked if she had seen the ♦9 before she attempted to correct her call to the ♦Q. She was unsure whether she had seen the ♦9 before she said “oops...”.

Law 46.B.Incomplete or Erroneous Call of a Card states that “In case of an incomplete or erroneous call of the card to be played from dummy, the following restrictions apply, except when declarer’s different intentions are incontrovertible:...2. If declarer designates a suit but not a rank he is deemed to have called the lowest card of the suit indicated.”

The remaining cards were:

	-	
	8	
	Q4	
	T8	
		-
KQ		3
6		97
J9		A5
	Q	
	-	
	J8	
	Q4	

The Panel felt that there was no chance that declarer was intending to do anything other than play the ♦Q. There could be nothing to gain by running the ♦8, and it was clear from declarer’s line of play that she was attempting to get back to dummy to repeat the club finesse. Declarer was in control on this hand, and had a readily assumable line of play in mind. The Panel felt, therefore, that it met the standard of “declarer’s different intention

is incontrovertible” was met, and the board was adjusted to reflect the play of the ♦Q on this trick.

The Panel: William Michael (Chairman), Matt Koltnow, and Nancy Boyd.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: Good decision, correcting a poor Director’s ruling.

Jeff Goldsmith: Good job by the Panel. It is sad that N/S had to appeal. Why didn't E/W overturn the ruling when they saw the hand?

Ton Kooijman: These rulings are the most difficult ones regarding the application of our laws. Only when she meant to play the Q but produced a sloppy designation the change can be made. My personal rule of thumb is that when I am not able to construct any content related reason for a player’s mistake I allow the change. I can’t, so let her play the Queen.

Barry Rigal: I like the ruling...I am prepared to bet that the speed of the play of the ♦9 broke all highway speed-limits – and frankly I am disappointed that this pair even called the Director.

Adam Wildavsky: The Panel's reasoning is perfect -- they corrected an injustice.

Bobby Wolff: At least to me, while it will not be to others, a wonderful decision which embodies what we all intended (at least should) our game to be. Sometimes we need to sneak around the written word and use common sense to move forward. The declarer did get slightly careless, but not enough to insure the authorities to have to follow the law and allow what was never intended to happen. We do live in a world where silly things do happen, but when given a choice we should look for ways to restore the status quo.

APPEAL	NON-NABC+ TEN
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Sol Weinstein
Event	A/X Swiss Teams
Session	First Session
Date	12/1/10

BD#	7
VUL	Both
DLR	S

Candace Griffey	
♠	QJT9
♥	AJT
♦	Q52
♣	AJ7

Jackie Sincoff		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	Roger Lord	
♠	K87		♠	653
♥	82		♥	KQ9753
♦	AKT63		♦	85
♣	KT6		♣	82

Kathy Baum	
♠	A42
♥	64
♦	974
♣	Q9543

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1♦	1N	2♦ ¹	2N ²
Pass	3♣	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	3♣ by North
Opening Lead	♦8
Table Result	3♣ by North, Down 2, N/S -200
Director Ruling	3♣ by North, Down 2, N/S -200
Panel Ruling	3♣ by North, Down 2, N/S -200

(1)	Transfer to hearts, not alerted
(2)	Transfer to clubs

The Facts: North said she would have played the hand differently if she had known that 2♦ showed hearts, not diamonds. When at the end of the hand she was asked if she would have bid differently with the correct information, she said she did not know.

After comparing with her teammates, South said she had time to think about it and would not have bid over 2♦ and would have passed.

The Ruling: Result stands.

The Appeal: South explained that if 2♦ was natural, then East/West had an 8-card+ diamond fit making it more probable that North/South had an 8-card+ club fit. If transfer to hearts had been announced, South felt it was less likely that North had 3+ clubs. South claims she would have passed if the transfer had been announced.

East/West stated that transfers are routinely used in this type of overcall auction, and West forgot to announce.

Decision: Eleven Flight A players and one Flight B player were polled regarding what action they would take over 2♦ showing diamonds or if they knew it showed hearts. All the A players bid the same whether 2♦ showed diamonds or hearts – five passed, six moved to 3♣ per their methods. Only one player changed calls.

South appealed under provisions of Law 40.B.2.d.4: “A side that is damaged as a consequence of its opponent’s failure to provide disclosure of the meaning of a call or play.....is entitled to rectification through the award of an adjusted score”.

The Panel in deciding to uphold the table result and table director ruling (North/South - 200) referred to Law 12.C.1.b: “if, subsequent to the irregularity, the non-offending side has contributed to its own damage....it does not receive relief in the adjustment for such part of the damage as is self-inflicted”.

Considering that South held three diamond cards and North overcalled one notrump, the East/West fit in diamonds could be no more than eight cards.

The Panel felt the damage occurred from South’s aggressive bidding (bidding to the three level on five clubs to the queen with only six high card points and a balanced hand).

The Panel: John Gram (Chairman), Nancy Boyd, and Ken Van Cleve.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: Good poll, focusing on whether the decision to bid was affected by the misinformation, and showing that it was not. The poll also showed that the decision to bid was close, but that was not the crux of the matter.

The first line of “The Facts” should be deleted, since North never elaborated (with good reason), and the point was never raised again.

Jeff Goldsmith: The Panel cited L12C.1.(b), claiming that South's bidding was a serious error when more than half their polled players did the same thing? Is this some sort of joke?

The rationale for the ruling may be off-the-wall, but the ruling is reasonable. It seems as if the wrong information (East has diamonds) makes it much more attractive to pass vs. get to 3C than does the correct information (East has hearts), because E/W rate to be on a 3-4 diamond fit. North would likely have doubled with strong NT values and a doubleton diamond. Therefore, the NOS was not damaged by the MI.

North knew at Trick 3 that 2D did not show diamonds, so her comment about the play was nonsense. The ruling is not completely obvious, so no AWMW.

Ton Kooijman: Hurray for a brave TD: score stands. However, why did (s)he ask North about her bid after the 2NT? Isn't such a question meant for South? Well, we know her answer. The poll affirmed that the final contract had no relation to the infraction: score stands. How is it possible not to read anything about the given official warning to NS? Both produced too much nonsense, this appeal is a just time consuming nuisance.

Barry Rigal: Strongly disagree; when the opponents announce a fit you are entitled to assume they have one. N/S may not deserve more than the final contract but E/W do not deserve to be getting the benefit of their 'forget'.

Adam Wildavsky: I would not fault South's bidding, especially since many of those polled did the same. I do agree that reaching 3C is no more or less attractive depending on East's real suit. Adjusting the score would not be out of the question, though. E/W committed an infraction and may have profited thereby. A procedural penalty would be reasonable. They did in fact violate correct procedure through their failure to alert.

Certainly, this appeal had merit.

David Stevenson pointed out to me that the Panel's decision does not follow the laws. While I do not agree that Law 12C1(b) should have been used here, when applicable it tells us to let the score stand for the NOS and to adjust the OS score as if there were no Law 12C1(b). See my comments on Non-NABC+ Case 11 as well.

Bobby Wolff: If this is not a clear example of what CD does to the game I cannot imagine what would. CD strikes and bridge stops. Unless and until CD is pounded into oblivion, we will always be subject to when it does strike to be playing a game no one in his right mind would want to learn. It would be easy to ordain, learn the conventions a partnership plays or strike it off the card, and the only way to insure that is to be waiting at all street corners to give expensive discipline for not complying. To allow NS to go -200 and EW to reap the benefit belongs with the OJ ruling. Lawmakers, hang your heads in shame and also the inexperienced Panels and committees that make and enforce these kinds of rulings.

APPEAL	NON-NABC+ ELEVEN
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Bill Michael
Event	Daylight Pairs
Session	First Session
Date	12/4/10

BD#	10
VUL	Both
DLR	E

12350 Masterpoints	
♠	4
♥	963
♦	9543
♣	AQT87

4750 Masterpoints		Fall 2010 Orlando, Florida	4325 Masterpoints	
♠	AQJT2		♠	6
♥	T		♥	AK8742
♦	AKQJT72		♦	86
♣			♣	9652
		1015 Masterpoints		
		♠	K98753	
		♥	QJ5	
		♦		
		♣	KJ43	

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

Final Contract	6♦ by West
Opening Lead	♣A
Table Result	6♦ by West, making 6, NS -1370
Director Ruling	6♦ by West, making 6, NS -1370
Panel Ruling	6♦ by West, making 6, NS -1370

(1)	Asks partner to raise with 2+ spades, bid 3♥ with 0 or 1 spade, not alerted
-----	---

The Facts: The Director was called to the table at the end of the round. North repeated the auction and reported East said she would have passed 2♠ since it was not forcing. North stated that he would not have bid had he known that 2♠ was not forcing.

Later West stated that their agreement over a 2♠ response requires opener to bid 3♥ with less than two spades. East said she would have passed anyway.

The Ruling: The failure to alert did not affect the final result of the hand and the table result stands. Law 12.C.1.b - the non-offending side contributing to its own damage does not receive relief for the portion of the damage that was self-inflicted.

The Appeal: North/South appealed and all four players attended the hearing. North stated that since the 2♣ call was not alerted, he was entitled to assume that it was forcing. After the play of the hand, as East/West were leaving the table, East mentioned that she would pass the 2♣ bid. North felt damaged by the lack of an alert.

Decision: North appealed under the provisions of Law 40.B.2.d.4: “A side that is damaged as a consequence of its opponent’s failure to provide disclosure of the meaning of a call or play.....is entitled to rectification through the award of an adjusted score”.

Nine players with more than 5,000 masterpoints were polled and all of them passed the 2♣ bid with the North hand whether it was forcing or not.

The Panel in deciding to uphold the table result and table director ruling (North/South - 1370) referred to Law 12.C.1.(b): “if, subsequent to the irregularity, the non-offending side has contributed to its own damage....it does not receive relief in the adjustment for such part of the damage as is self-inflicted”.

The Panel: John Gram (Chairman), Matt Smith, Nancy Boyd, and Olin Hubert.

Commentary:

Bart Bramley: Justice. An obvious pro-client pair. This was a real cheap shot by the pro, deserving an AWMW. The write-up never makes clear whether 2♣ WAS forcing, only that East planned to pass it regardless.

Jeff Goldsmith: Another L12.C.1.(b)? What is this all about? 2♣ was natural and forcing. East's claim that she would pass is just silly and irrelevant. N/S were not misinformed. There was no infraction, therefore no basis for adjustment.

I would give an AWMW, only the table director seems to have been grossly confused, and I do not feel as if I could blame N/S for losing their minds with him.

Ton Kooijman: Reading the information given 2♣ was forcing, so what is north complaining about? If 2♣ being forcing is not alertable then where is the infraction? In addition, bridge does not allow questioning LHO about what his next call might be. I am somewhat surprised to read about a poll, we do not need it here.

Barry Rigal: Sensible decision and not by any means an obvious one.

Adam Wildavsky: The TD and Panel rulings as stated applied Law 12C.1.(b) incorrectly. This law states only that the non-offending side keeps its result if it makes a serious error unrelated to the infraction. Were this law to apply we would still adjust the score for the offenders.

That said, I see no infraction and so no possibility of adjustment for either side. East, for reasons best known to her, decided to announce after the deal that given the opportunity

she would have passed a forcing bid. Such an announcement may be discourteous, but it has no relevance to the actual bidding and play.

Bobby Wolff: Trying to analyze what happened, imagine North coming in vulnerable with the North hand between two bidders and then not having his partner support him or do anything except pass. Again some 'splaining needs to be done including even beginning to believe a TD who says he consulted 9 players (with 5,000+ master points) showing them the East hand and playing change of suits forcing for one round and hearing your partner bid 2 spades and claiming that all 9 players passed. I doubt more than one would actually pass and it would surprise me that anyone would even consider such a partnership-baiting move. Yes, I agree with the ruling, but the side rhetoric does not bode well for our future unless we go to work and slay the dragon who is only breathing a hotter flame.

FINAL COMMENTS

Adam Wildavsky

Chairman, National Appeals Committee

Committees decided as the TD did in six of ten cases. By my reckoning, they improved on the TD's ruling in case 3 and worsened it in case 4. I found cases 1 and 6 too close to call.

As usual, Panels had a more straightforward set of decisions. They ruled as the TD did in five of eleven cases. In my judgment, they improved on the TD's ruling in cases 1, 2, and 9 and worsened it in cases 4 and 6. I make case 7 too close to call.

I would like to eliminate all poor A/C decisions but I do not know how to do that directly. If we had fewer appeals, though, we might be able to give more attention to those that remained and produce better decisions overall. This change could help Panels as well. One way to reduce the caseload would be to assess appeal without merit warnings when they are deserved. I would say warnings should have been assessed in NABC+ cases 2, 9, and 10 and Non-NABC+ cases 1, 5, 8, and 11. No warnings were in fact issued by any Committee or Panel.

I have a couple proposals pending that should allow us to assess AWMWs more often, though hopefully only when they are deserved, and to clarify the meaning of the AWMW. I will report in a future casebook whether I have been able to persuade the powers that be to put them into effect and if so how well they seem to have worked.

As far as Panels go, I am happy that they take polls but I am concerned that the polls are less useful than they could be because of inconsistent methodology. I'd like to see polling guidelines put into place, both for TDs and Panels, and full disclosure of poll results, per my comments on Non-NABC+ cases 2 and 6.

Making correct rulings is not always easy. Sometimes it is like playing bridge, where we cannot simply instruct our partners "Make fewer mistakes next time" or "You'll do better with more training." Still, with more time to make decisions and the ability to consult with those more knowledgeable we should be able to get all the straightforward cases right. For now, I will suggest two principles that I find useful:

1. Always follow the laws specifically. Whether changing a score or letting it stand cite the law or laws applied. We have become a lot better about this over the past 15 years, even through two updates of the lawbook.
2. Take an expansive view of logical alternatives. A Committee should be prepared to consider an action logical if even one member asserts that given the testimony regarding the bridge logic of the situation he would have taken that action, or if he strongly believes

that a significant number of the player's peers would take it. Following this principle would have avoided a number of poor decisions over the years. I cannot think of any case where it would have resulted in changing a correct ruling.

As always, my figures are online. I welcome comments or corrections:

http://tameware.com/adam/bridge/laws/nabc_casebook_summaries.html

FINAL COMMENTS

JEFF GOLDSMITH

The Panels seem intent on using L12.C.1.b way too much. I'm more willing to use that than just about anyone, but four (Cases 4, 7, 10, and 11) out of eleven cases seems to be some sort of groupthink gone awry.

In order for L12.C.1.b to apply, the NOS have to have been damaged. If they were not damaged, there is no adjustment, so this law is not relevant. Subsequent to the damage, they have to do something foolish or take a huge risk and as a result discard some of their equity. But only that remaining equity is at risk. So if they were getting a terrible result because of the infraction and took a wild shot to get back to average, they do not lose their redress despite their wild (presumably losing) gamble. Let's say they were going to get a 75% score before the infraction. The infraction brings them down to average. Now they revoke and get a zero. They still get 25%. The OS gets 25% also. I have never seen such a ruling, but the wording of the current laws seems pretty clear on this.

How bad does the error have to be? L12.C.1.b says that for full redress not to occur, the NOS must perform "a serious error (unrelated to the infraction)" or take "a wild or gambling action." This is strong language; ordinary errors or errors of carelessness do not apply. If a world champion misses a double squeeze, that is not a serious enough error for L12. For an ordinary mortal, the error has to be pretty huge. No ordinary misjudgment or misguess applies; this has to be a blunder. Misguessing how to play KQ98x vs. Axx is not even close. If someone cashed the king-ace and did not notice that an opponent showed up with a stiff honor and then he failed to take a marked finesse---that is enough.

Note the "unrelated to the infraction" clause. If the error was at all forced by the infraction, it does not interfere with redress. In the 75-25% example above, if the error was bidding too much over a bid, which ought not to have been there, it does not matter that the overbid was a serious error. The player should not have been in that position, so his error related to the infraction does not cost him any equity.

Overall, L12.C.1.b should probably come up once every year or so, maybe less often than that. The main goal of that law is to prevent someone's thinking, "The opponents have committed an infraction. Whatever I do, I am getting a 75% score. I might as well bid a

slam, even though it is almost certain to go down. If it makes, I get a top. If it goes down, I get my 75% score. I can't lose." L12.C.1.b prevents this plan from working. In addition, it provides for the case where someone does something silly subsequent to and unrelated to an opponent's infraction. If that silly mistake cost them some of what equity they had left, they get their redress minus what their blunder cost them. Fair enough. Normal sorts of misguesses, errors in judgment, bad leads, etc. do not apply. They have to be "oopses."

Note that none of this, of course, has anything to do with the OS. Once they damage the NOS, they are getting their score adjusted, and any loss of redress by the NOS has nothing to do with them.

None of the four applications of L12.C.1.b in these cases fit those criteria.

- Case 4: taking the percentage play in spades is not an error at all. If declarer's play had been anti-percentage, even that would not have been enough.

- Case 7: bidding 6♦ is not a serious error. For all South knows, 6♦x might be par on the hand. He has an ace; partner might have a defensive trick. Even if most would not do it, it is still not a blunder. But even if it were, it's not relevant to L12.C.1.b, because it occurred *prior* to the infraction. The Panel got that part right.

- Case 10: A majority view in the bidding is never a serious error. Nor is it a wild gambling action. If you expect a big chunk of the field to do the same thing, that is not much of a gamble.

- Case 11: There was no infraction. L12.C.1.b only applies if the NOS has been damaged by an infraction of law.

So while discussing L12.C.1.b on Case 7 is reasonable, it should never have had any relevance to any of these four cases.