

Fall 2011 NABC
Appeals Casebook



Table of Contents

<u>NABC+ Appeal Cases</u>	<u>Page</u>
Case One - Unauthorized Information/Break in Tempo	3
Case Two - Misinformation	6
Case Three - Claim	10
Case Four - Claim	13
Case Five - Tempo	16
Case Six – Played Card	19
Case Seven - Misinformation	22
Case Eight - Misinformation	25
Case Nine - Unauthorized Information	28
Case Ten - Misinformation	31
Case Eleven - Break in Tempo	33
Case Twelve - Break in Tempo	35
Case Thirteen - Misinformation	38
Case Fourteen – Disputed Revoke	41
Case Fifteen - Break in Tempo	44
Case Sixteen - Unauthorized Information	47
Case Seventeen - Misinformation	49
 <u>Non-NABC Appeal Cases</u>	
Case One - Misinformation	52
Case Two - Unauthorized Information	55
Case Three - Misinformation	58

APPEAL	NABC+ ONE
Subject	Unauthorized Information, Break in Tempo
DIC	Harry Falk
Event	Life Master Women's Pairs
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	November 25, 2011

BD#	30
VUL	None
DLR	E

Jean Barry	
♠	QJ8
♥	AQ94
♦	964
♣	A107

Mary Savko		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	Ellie Hanlon	
♠	AT102		♠	K7654
♥	107652		♥	J3
♦	Q8		♦	103
♣	J6		♣	8543

Nancy Boyd	
♠	9
♥	K8
♦	AKJ752
♣	KQ92

West	North	East	South
		P	1♦
P	1♥	P	2♣
P	2♠¹	P	3♦
P	4♦²	P	4NT³
P	5♦⁴	P	5♥⁵
P	6♦	P	P
P			

Final Contract	6♦ by South
Opening Lead	♠A
Table Result	Making 6, N/S +920
Director Ruling	5♦ by South, Made 6, NS +420
Committee Ruling	6♦ by South, Made 6, N/S +920

(1)	Fourth Suit Forcing
(2)	Alleged BIT before 4♦ bid; 4♦=RKC
(3)	2 Keycards without the queen
(4)	Alleged BIT before 5♦ bid; N intended as signoff, S believed it asked for specific kings
(5)	Showed ♥K

The Facts: East claimed that the 4♦ call was slow. East claimed that the BIT was approximately three minutes. East/West claimed that there was a BIT by North before the 5♦ call. North denied that there was a BIT before her 5♦ bid. The Director determined that there was a BIT before the 5♦ bid.

The Ruling: The Director ruled that South had unauthorized information from the tempo of the 5♦ call making it more likely that further bidding would be successful. Therefore, based on Laws 12.C.1.e and 16.B.1 the Director adjusted the results to 5♦ by South making 6, N/S +420.

The Appeal: North/South appealed the Director's ruling and North, East, and West appeared at the hearing. The Screening Director determined that 4♦ was keycard for diamonds ("Minorwood") and 4NT showed two keycards without the queen of diamonds. South was using North's methods and mistakenly thought that 5♦ asked for specific kings. North reported that she took about five seconds to count the steps after her partner's 4NT response, review the auction, determine that they were missing one keycard and the trump queen, and then place the contract in 5♦. West thought that North took about 4-5 seconds to bid 5♦; East thought it was 10 seconds or more. East/West did not think that South should be allowed to bid over the BIT.

The Decision: The Committee determined that North's 5♦ bid was made in a normal tempo. It takes a few seconds to process the information from a Keycard ask, especially when the ask is not the common 4NT. Further evidence provided is that North's hand does not suggest that she wanted to make a more aggressive bid than 5♦. Since the Committee determined that there was no BIT, the table result was allowed to stand.

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chair), Eugene Kales, Ellen Kent, Richard Budd and Ed Lazarus.

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: I agree. 4-5 seconds is normal tempo in key card auctions. It'd be nice if expected times for "normal tempo" were written down somewhere. Good job by the AC noting that North's hand did not suggest a BIT.

Ton Kooijman: Might be a good idea to instruct the TD's that 5 seconds on this level of bidding is not considered to create a hesitation. Who am I to start quarrelling whether there was one?

Barry Rigal: Based on the facts as described I don't think there was a BIT - nor would there really have been a reason for South to bid on over a slow sign-off. Sensible AC ruling though, if I were the TD, I might well also have ruled the way he did and let the 'offenders' appeal.

Adam Wildavsky: The AC decision looks right, but I would like to know why the TD determined that there was a BIT before the 5♦ call and exactly how long he

judged it had taken. The TD is the first on the scene and is usually best placed to judge these matters. If he wants his ruling to stand up in committee though, he must provide more context.

Bobby Wolff: At the very least, an important case in order to establish precedent, when a bid is slowly made, which the subject partnership claims to be a specific ask, which, in turn, certainly is forcing but since the bid, if not conventional, could well be interpreted as a declination of going further since it lands on game (5 diamonds, with diamonds being the known trump suit). Since the bid was made, at least, relatively slow, there would be a case not to let partner then bid further unless he could prove that his hand demanded it. The facts are simple, but the solution is not so.

Modern bridge, with its variety of slam conventions, presents a difficult area to police. On the surface, at least it seems, that all high-level slam type auctions must have a way to sign off, when one hand or the other thinks game is the limit and, up to now, always makes a return to game (or sometimes 5 of a major) as the bid of choice to say, "no more". Here is where bridge jurisprudence must make a decision on what to allow and what not to and this hand could be thought of as a classic example.

Another major conundrum is that the slam itself is about a 40% contract being off an ace and having to bring in AKJ752 opposite 964 in the trump suit with no losers. With a 4-0 trump break (about 10% of the time), in reality no chance, but with either a 2-2 break or a guessed Qxx onside then made averages out at 40%. Should we allow the defenders, with just such a fact situation to get the most out of either holding, if the slam goes down, they accept +50, but if it makes it gets ruled back from +920 to +420 while the opponents are left with the reciprocal? And all while trying to determine if the perpetrators are being honest with their system claim.

Certainly not an easy decision, and specifically because of that, this hand and others like it MUST be discussed when the next hand involving similar facts appears, making precedents totally necessary in our appeals process, if we are dedicated to excellence.

Incidentally, I have no opinion on what decision to make except to say that -920 for E/W and +420 for NS should indeed be a possibility if for no other reason than to keep the double shot from E/W away from being realized.

In conclusion, if our critique does no more on this set of appeals than determines the above process on this hand and sets it firmly in place, we will have accomplished a major forward going improvement in our process.

APPEAL	NABC+ TWO
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Kenneth Van Cleve
Event	Life Master's Pairs
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	November 25, 2011

BD#	17
VUL	None
DLR	N

Joel Wooldridge	
♠	QJ5
♥	975
♦	AQ653
♣	73

Mark Tolliver		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	Marc Zwerling	
♠	106		♠	43
♥	AJ1032		♥	Q864
♦	KJ2		♦	84
♣	1062		♣	AQJ84

Ahmed Hussein	
♠	AK9872
♥	K
♦	1097
♣	K95

West	North	East	South
	P	P	1♠
P	2♣¹	P	4♠
P	P	P	

Final Contract	4♠ by South
Opening Lead	♠6
Table Result	Making 6, N/S +480
Director Ruling	4♠ by South, Made 6, E/W +480
Committee Ruling	4♠ by South, Made 5, E/W +450

(1)	2♣ bid was not alerted during the auction.
-----	--

The Facts: East called the Director at the end of the auction. He told the TD privately that he would have doubled an alerted 2♣ bid but felt he could not ask about an unalerted 2♣ bid without passing unauthorized information to West. North had told East/West at the start of the round that they play "Strong Notrump and a rubber bridge style." East felt that this made it plausible that North/South were not playing Drury.

The Ruling: The ACBL Alert Procedure states that "Players who, by experience or expertise, recognize that their opponents have neglected to alert a special agreement

will be expected to protect themselves.” The ACBL Club Director's Handbook says “Note that an opponent who actually knows or suspects what is happening even though not properly informed may not be entitled to redress if he or she chooses to proceed without clarifying the situation.” The Director ruled that the table result stands since a seeded pair, such as East/West, should have the experience/expertise to protect themselves.

The Appeal: East/West appealed the Director's ruling and North, South, East and West appeared at the hearing. East paused for a few seconds in order to allow South to alert 2♣. When he failed to do so, East judged that N/S were one of (in his opinion) many pairs who did not play Drury. East also felt that asking about 2♣ would bar a club lead if 2♣ wasn't Drury, and just feels awful. Furthermore, being required to ask puts his side in an untenable position; if he is mistaken, and the opponents do not play Drury, then he can no longer get lucky and have his partner lead a club from, say, 109x.

The Decision: North/South's agreement is that 2♣ was Drury. ACBL regulations require an alert of Drury, so this was a failure to alert, and therefore misinformation (MI). The non-offending side (NOS) was clearly damaged by the MI. At most of the tables at which the committee played, Drury was doubled, a club was lead, and a heart shift was found. Therefore, assuming that East was misinformed, reciprocal 450s are likely and nothing else is at all probable.

The difficult point is the regulations cited by the TD. The director ruled that Drury was common enough and that East's hand suggested that there was a failure to alert, so East needed to protect himself by asking about 2♣.

This regulation also applies to West. Once South bid 4♠, West pretty much knew that 2♣ was Drury. Furthermore, he also knew that he could ask about 2♣ before he acted, and if there was a failure to alert, his partner would get a second chance to act. The AC judged that this would not occur to even one player in 100. Practically, requiring this sort of protection is not reasonable, so we judged that West did not have to protect the partnership. East, however, strongly suspected that 2♣ was Drury before he acted.

Is "strongly suspected" enough to require protection? A few years ago, a player held 22 HCP and heard a Flannery opening and a jump described as "invitational." The AC ruled that he knew from his hand and experience that the jump was meant as blocking, so he was on his own. That case was obvious—that player knew what was going on. A similar made-up example: a player holds 24 HCP and hears a 3NT opening on his right. No alert. He knows there should be one. If he doesn't ask to protect himself, he gets no protection.

So where is the line in the sand? Is "strongly suspects" a failure to alert enough? What if East had held x, Qxxx, xx, AQJ109x? Now he's pretty certain, but not 100% that 2♣ wasn't natural. Where are the spades? Is that sufficient to require that East protect himself?

Finally, we judged that "recognized" means "knows intuitively" as in "recognized at a glance," not just "strongly suspected." If, for example, the opponents open 1NT then

bid 2♦, is that enough to assume that if there was no announcement, that 2♦ was a transfer? No. But when opener bids 2♥, then we think that should trigger the "did you guys fail to announce 2♦ as a transfer" question. Here, the jump to 4♠ makes it obvious that 2♣ was Drury, but 2♣ by itself is not enough to make it 100% obvious.

All in all, this is a very close case. On one hand, the offending side (OS) committed an irregularity. That irregularity damaged the NOS. The NOS was unwilling to ask a "bad" question for fear of compromising their rights. Equity is reciprocal 450s. On the other hand, the regulation could be interpreted to require that East protect himself. Most honest players, however, would not be willing to ask about an unalerted call here, so the Committee adjusted the score to 4♠ making 5.

The Committee: Jeff Goldsmith (Chair), Jacob Morgan, Richard Popper, Fred King, and Abby Heitner.

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: These are tough, but here I have so much sympathy for East that it would feel wrong to rule any other way.

Ton Kooijman: I am not so happy with this regulation demanding self-protection. The way the committee handled this case suggests that it agrees with me. In my opinion the key question here is what would have happened had South alerted the 2♣. East would have doubled etc. That is the basis for an adjusted score.

Barry Rigal: I have no doubt that this East would have doubled an alerted 2♣. Furthermore his rationale for not asking seems entirely rational (and appropriate) to me. AC ruling stands.

Adam Wildavsky: The regulation cited is pernicious and if followed blindly would make the alert procedure pointless, since players would all too often need to ask about calls that were not alerted. The AC did well to make a just ruling anyway. I hope it's not asking too much to think that TDs might be able to do the same.

Bobby Wolff: Believe it or not, this hand also presents an excellent example of another bridge conundrum. What if East asks "Is 2♣ natural or Drury?" and is told that it is natural. The opponents then bid to some contract and West, being on lead then leads a club and the declaring side then brings this hand to committee because the club lead was the best defense? What then if West had a singleton club or possibly instead a doubleton, would that make a difference to an appeals committee member and, if so, how much?

What actually happened is that East did not want to prejudice his side against that happening and so did not ask, as he expected South to alert if it was Drury. Because of his failure to double, the defense probably lost a trick in the play, which, based on the above facts, could certainly be attributed to South's failure to alert and the clause which states that East should have protected himself by asking. We, or rather bridge, should

not be faced with those kind of difficult decisions when a bid was not alerted which should have been. I guess that it would also be OK (especially with me) to return N/S to +450 while giving E/W either -450, -480 or perhaps even -465, if we feel that East should have indeed inquired, but we understand why he did not.

This particular committee did a very good job of taking most of the points of law and their effect into consideration, but nowhere does it suggest that we use this case as a precedent, which to me, because of frequency and the necessity for less experienced committees in the future to be guided properly, is the most important single point.

APPEAL	NABC+ THREE
Subject	Claim
DIC	Kenneth Van Cleve
Event	Life Master's Pairs
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	November 25, 2011

BD#	7
VUL	Both
DLR	S

John Cox	
♠	KQJ84
♥	105
♦	K3
♣	AQJ6

Stu Swan		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	Hadi Allahverdian	
♠	--		♠	A10963
♥	J9762		♥	KQ8
♦	Q10865		♦	AJ7
♣	874		♣	K5

Donna Wood	
♠	752
♥	A43
♦	942
♣	10932

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

Final Contract	2♥ by East
Opening Lead	♠7
Table Result	Making 4, E/W +170
Director Ruling	2♥ by East, Made 4, E/W +170
Committee Ruling	2♥ by East, Made 5, E/W +200

(1)	Transfer
-----	----------

The Facts: East claimed the remainder of the tricks along with the statement that he would pitch two cards on the good diamonds. It was disputed whether Declarer said, "Clubs", "Spades", or "Cards" during his claim statement. North said "Cards" first and then said "Spades". South maintained that Declarer said "Cards." Declarer agreed with North. Dummy could not contribute due to hearing difficulties.

Declarer played 2♥ on a transfer auction. He won the spade opening lead, discarding a club from dummy. The ♥K was won by the ace and a heart returned to the

queen. Declarer then played a heart to the jack drawing the last trump. Next, the ♦Q was led to the king and ace. The diamond jack and 10 won the next two tricks ending in dummy and Declarer claimed.

The Ruling: The Director ruled pursuant to Laws 70D1 and 70E1 that Declarer could not adopt a new line of play or finesse. Therefore, the Director ruled 2♥ by East, E/W +170.

The Appeal: East/West appealed the Director's ruling and East and West appeared at the hearing. The Screening Director was unable to determine clearly what Declarer said while making his claim. North and South were not present to comment, West did not hear the statement, and East could not remember. East said that he stated he would pitch two "cards" on the good diamonds. When North asked for a clarification, he said that he would "discard two spades and play a club toward the king." East admitted to having been momentarily confused and could not recall when or how he had said the word "crossruff." East is an experienced player with more than 8,000 masterpoints. It would have been irrational for him to have played all of the trumps before playing clubs.

The Decision: Although Declarer was temporarily confused, when asked for a clarification of "cards", he said that he would discard two spades on the diamonds. It would have been irrational for a player of East's experience to do anything but play a club to the king. The Committee did not know how the word "crossruff" was used, but it certainly implies the play of the side suits before the trumps. The Committee accepted East's clarified claim statement and allowed a result of 11 tricks to East/West. Therefore the Director's ruling was changed to 2♥ by East, making 5, for East/West +200.

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chair), Eugene Kales, Ellen Kent, Richard Budd and Ed Lazarus.

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: East clearly misclaimed. There was no way he was taking the rest of the tricks. Furthermore, it seems as if he was "planning" to pitch his clubs on the diamonds and ruff them. Only he had no more trumps. This sort of brain fart happens. +170.

Ton Kooijman: A question first. Reading the facts I understand that North eventually agreed that East said to discard spades during his claiming statement. What is the remaining problem then? + 200 to E/W it is.

Barry Rigal: I don't agree. I think declarer got confused and thought he had trumps and was going to pitch clubs. Irrational as that may be, his behavior seems to point in that direction. Why else would he claim when he surely needed a finesse in clubs. You and I would say 'Claiming on the club finesse'. He didn't; TD ruling should stand.

Adam Wildavsky: Yes, it would be irrational to cash the trumps before leading a club, but it would also be irrational to claim the rest of the tricks when there is no possibility of taking the rest, and also when there is a finesse still to be taken while not mentioning said finesse.

As is often the case, the declarer could have saved time and trouble by not claiming. How much effort would it have taken to lead a club before facing his hand? When declarer does not do that and does not mention the possibility in his claim statement I find every reason to believe that he was confused and might well have taken only 10 tricks had he played the deal out.

I prefer the TD's ruling to the AC's.

Bobby Wolff: Having to do with an imperfect claim and I have no opinion as both sides have a case even though N/S's case is somewhat icky, but they are entitled to try for everything they could get.

APPEAL	NABC+ FOUR
Subject	Claim
DIC	Harry Falk
Event	Life Master Women's Pairs
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	November 25, 2011

BD#	16
VUL	E-W
DLR	W

Migry Zur-Campanile	
♠	10853
♥	QJ762
♦	109
♣	A9

Lynn Shannon		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	Lynn Yokez	
♠	AKQ94		♠	6
♥	A4		♥	1053
♦	J8653		♦	AK74
♣	4		♣	KJ1052

Sylvia Moss	
♠	J72
♥	K98
♦	Q2
♣	Q8763

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

Final Contract	3NT by East
Opening Lead	♣6
Table Result	Making 3, E/W +600
Director Ruling	3NT by East, Made 3, E/W +600
Committee Ruling	3NT by East, Made 5, E/W +660

The Facts: South led the ♣6 against East's 3NT contract. North won the ♣A and returned the ♣9. South took East's ♣10 with the queen and switched to the ♥9. Declarer won the heart trick in the dummy with the ♥A and led a diamond. Declarer won the next two tricks with high diamonds. Declarer led the four of diamonds and then claimed the rest.

After the opponent's inquiry, Declarer stated: diamond to the jack, diamond back to 7; two high clubs to pitch dummy's losers, then a spade to the dummy. Later, Declarer said she led the diamond hoping defenders would pitch a club, making her ♣5 a winner, and then claimed when she realized that she did not need another winner.

The Ruling: The issue is whether Declarer would have caught the need to play the high diamond in time, not whether she would have unblocked the diamonds. The Director ruled pursuant to Laws 70.D.1 that Declarer could not adopt a new line of play. Law 70.D.1 provides that Director shall not accept from claimer any successful line of play not embraced in the original clarification statement if there is an alternative normal line of play that would be less successful. Therefore, the Director ruled 3NT by East, making 3, E/W +600.

The Appeal: East/West appealed the Director's ruling and North, South, and East appeared at the hearing. The Screening Director determined that Declarer pitched a spade from the dummy at trick two.

After cashing the ace-king of diamonds and getting the good news, Declarer not bothering to count her tricks led the four of diamonds with the plan to win the fourth round of diamonds in her hand and perhaps induce an opponent to discard a club. However, immediately after playing the diamond four, she realized that she did not need a third club trick and claimed the remainder of the tricks. When the opponents inquired how she would play it, she stated a line that would take the rest of the tricks. Had she adopted an alternative line of play suggested by North/South, she could not possibly have taken all of the remaining tricks. Therefore, the line Declarer suggested was clearly her intended line when she claimed.

North/South argued that when running a long suit, it is normal to play the high cards from the short side first and then run the suit using the high cards from the long hand. If Declarer had done this, she would have stranded her two club winners and taken only nine tricks.

The Decision: Declarer claimed all the remaining tricks when she had all of the tricks in top cards and adequate entries to both hands. When asked how she was going to play the hand, she stated a clear line that would cash all of the remaining tricks. Therefore the Committee accepted Declarer's claim for the remaining tricks and changed the assigned result to 11 tricks for East/West in 3NT, N/S -660.

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chair), Eugene Kales, Ellen Kent, Richard Budd, and Ed Lazarus.

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: Declarers should state a line of play if the line is more complex than "cash winners." That said, N/S asked declarer to state a line, and she did so. The stated line was valid. Once that happened, N/S should have dropped the issue.

Ton Kooijman: No doubt that declarer was going to play the ♦J from dummy. That is the only card for which you do not need a more precise statement. I do not like the TD decision.

Barry Rigal: Sensible and straightforward ruling. I'm, not sure why the TD was called; I wouldn't have.

Adam Wildavsky: The AC makes a compelling case. I wish I were convinced that this declarer would have taken the rest of the tricks had she played the deal out. All we know for sure from the write-up is that she could not count her winners.

Bobby Wolff: Another icky claim but I have no quarrel and approve the committee's decision to the TD's.

APPEAL	NABC+ FIVE
Subject	Tempo
DIC	Steve Bates
Event	NA Open B-A-M
Session	first
Date	November 27, 2011

BD#	26
VUL	Both
DLR	East

Gavin Wolpert	
♠	K8
♥	A85
♦	A53
♣	KQ842

Percy Wu		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	John Crutcher	
♠	QJ9763		♠	42
♥	KJ		♥	10432
♦	K97		♦	QJ84
♣	J3		♣	A97

Paul Fireman	
♠	A105
♥	Q976
♦	1062
♣	1065

West	North	East	South
		Pass	Pass
1♠	1NT	Pass¹	Pass
2♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	2♠ West
Opening Lead	♣K
Table Result	Making 2, N/S -110
Director Ruling	1NT by North, making 2, N/S +120
Committee Ruling	2♠ by West, Making 2, N/S -110

(1)	Disputed BIT. East/West said 3-4 seconds, North said 6 seconds and clearly longer than first pass by East
-----	---

The Facts: There may have been a break in tempo. The BIT was disputed.

The Ruling: Law 16.B.1 applies and pass is a logical alternative to the 2♠ call chosen. The director ruled that the contract was 1NT by North, making two, North/South +120.

The Appeal: East/West appealed the director's ruling. North and West attended the hearing. West stated that he did not notice any break in tempo by East. Additionally he stated that it was not possible to compare East's tempo with his original pass because he was dealer and had sorted his cards and then passed.

West indicated he was just competing with his six card spade suit since he had not opened two spades in third position. He said he might have opened 2♠ in first or second position.

North stated that East had taken approximately six seconds before passing over 1NT. He also pointed out the horrible hand West possessed with which he had taken another bid.

The Decision: This was the first time East/West had played together. West had approximately 1700 masterpoints while East held 980 masterpoints. They played a 2/1 system including major suit weak two bids.

The committee decided that the timing of the call for the director (after the 2♠ bid) and the alleged six second period of time was sufficient to conclude that a BIT had appeared to occur. The committee did not believe that East hand had any problem passing over the 1NT overcall, since there was no logical bid for East.

The committee did not believe that the UI demonstrably suggested that two spades would be more successful than other actions. On the contrary, if East held spade tolerance and extra values then passing and setting the opponents would possibly generate a larger plus. If East held a potentially biddable suit without spade support then West would not fare very well playing in a misfit, vulnerable.

Thus, the original table result was allowed to stand.

The Committee: Mark Bartusek (Chair), Abby Heitner, Richard Popper, Hendrick Sharples and Ed Lazarus

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: While I agree with the result of the ruling, the write-up went a bit astray. I would have ruled: "was there a BIT?" N/S say six seconds; E/W say none. Did East's hand suggest he had a problem? No—most would pass in tempo. Did West's hand suggest he had UI? Not particularly— he rebid his six-card suit. Therefore, there probably was no BIT. Result stands." The AC appeared to attempt to show that even if there was UI, it didn't demonstrably suggest bidding 2♠ over passing. The write-up did not do a good job of this.

Ton Kooijman: I do not follow the approach of the AC. East shows some strength (around 8-9), not spades for his hesitation and pass. With both strength and spades he would not have passed (to be honest: I do not understand East's hesitation with this holding). And West needs that strength to bid 2♠. I consider the 2♠ bid

suggested and not allowed. Or: in my poll I expect more than a rare pass where continuing is suggested.

Barry Rigal: This doesn't seem right to me. West took a second call in a dangerous position and got it right. I feel like the tempo influenced his action (we all know that some six second pauses are longer than others). Again, I prefer the TD ruling.

Adam Wildavsky: Both the TD and the AC rulings seem reasonable to me. On balance I give the nod to the AC. I agree that the UI, if present, did not suggest 2♠ over Pass.

I do think a BIT was likely, for the reasons cited by the TD. East may have had nothing to think about, but I'll wager he'd have passed more quickly with a three count. West knew from the auction, though, not the tempo, that his partner had a little something.

Bobby Wolff: I think that the UI did suggest 2♠ rather than pass and feel that West was out of line, unless somehow he could somehow convince the bridge police that his partner did not have a BIT. I think that with no BIT West would never have bid 2♠ unless he was interested in committing bridge suicide while vulnerable.

APPEAL	NABC+ SIX
Subject	Played Card
DIC	Terry Lavender
Event	Women's BAM
Session	1 st Qualifying
Date	November 27, 2011

BD#	9
VUL	E/W
DLR	North

Hyordis Eythorsdottir	
♠	754
♥	AKJ7
♦	J854
♣	J2

Janice Randles		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	Patti Hartley	
♠	3		♠	K862
♥	10984		♥	Q3
♦	KQ107		♦	A963
♣	8764		♣	Q95
		Valerie Westheimer		
		♠	AQJ109	
		♥	652	
		♦	2	
		♣	AK103	

West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	1♠
Pass	2♣¹	Pass	2♦²
Pass	2♠	Pass	4♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Final Contract	4♠ by South
Opening Lead	♥10
Table Result	Making 4, N/S +420
Director Ruling	Making 5, N/S +450
Committee Ruling	Making 4, N/S +420

(1)	two-way Drury
(2)	two diamonds shows full opener

The Facts: The director was called after trick six. The ♥6 had appeared on the table, and declarer wished to play a small club. Declarer and dummy claimed that the ♥6 fell out of declarer's hand and East/West claimed that the ♥6 was a played card.

The Ruling: The director decided that the ♥6 fell out as the club was being pulled and that it was not a played card. Law 50B applies for a minor penalty card from declarer's hand which meant that it can be replaced without penalty.

The Appeal: East/West appealed the director's ruling. North and West attended the hearing. East/West maintained that the ♥6 was played accidentally, but it was played, not dropped. South had pulled the wrong card.

These were the facts determined by the screening director:

The actual play went:

Trick 1: ♥10-♥A-♥x-♥x

Trick 2: ♠x-♠x-♠Q-♠x

Trick 3: ♠A-♣x-♠x-♠x

Trick 4: ♥x-♥x-♥K-♥Q

Trick 5: ♣J-♣Q-♣A-♣x

Trick 6: ♣K-♣x-♣x-♣x.

At this point, the ♥6 appeared on the table. South snatched it up saying, "Oops," and replaced it with the ♣3. The director was called immediately before or during trick seven.

The Decision: The AC understood the facts as follows: The director ruled that the heart was played. East ruffed and the defense took three tricks. Later, he returned to the table and told them that a club was allowed and adjusted the score to N/S making five.

The AC determined that there was no way to tell what actually happened at the table with regard to the played or dropped card at Trick 7. But it does not matter whether South played a heart or a club. If she played a club, she is stuck in dummy with only red cards. If she plays a heart, East ruffs and gets three tricks. If she plays a diamond, East can duck and get a ruff, or she can win and continue diamonds. That taps out declarer, who then has to give her the ruff anyway. So regardless of which card was played, we judged 4♠ making four was going to happen and therefore reinstated the table result.

The Committee: Jeff Goldsmith (Chair), Gene Kales, John Lusky, Abby Heitner and Lloyd Arvedon

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: We were lucky to find that the result was identical for each path which could be taken at the disputed play.

Ton Kooijman: The description seems to point to the ♥6 being a played card, may be not intended but still. If the TD decides it to be dropped then he should allow declarer to pick it up. Declarer does not have penalty cards, either major or minor; and apparently you need an AC to see that declarer just makes 10 tricks.

Barry Rigal: Proper AC ruling (careless TD decision) but in my opinion bridge logic shows ♥6 was dropped not played. Declarer is competent enough to know not to play a heart.

Adam Wildavsky: Nice work by the AC in a difficult situation.

Bobby Wolff: Good, the facts which obviated no contest for the result.

APPEAL	NABC+ SEVEN
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Steve Bates
Event	Open B-A-M
Session	2 nd Qualifying
Date	November 27, 2011

BD#	14
VUL	None
DLR	East

Tom Turgeon	
♠	K6
♥	Q1098632
♦	2
♣	763

Allan Falk		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	Peter Freidland	
♠	AJ98732		♠	Q
♥	J4		♥	K75
♦	J94		♦	K753
♣	K		♣	AJ954
		Richard Oshlag		
		♠	1054	
		♥	A	
		♦	AQ1086	
		♣	Q1082	

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

Final Contract	4♠ West
Opening Lead	♦2
Table Result	Down 3, N/S +150
Director Ruling	Down 3, N/S +150
Committee Ruling	Down 3, N/S +150

(1)	Alerted as forcing
-----	--------------------

The Facts: North/South did not have an agreement regarding the three heart bid after West responded to opener. East/West contended that they would not have bid four spades if given the proper explanation.

West said it was impossible for North to have a forcing hand without a diamond fit. East's hand with diamond length was unexpected.

The Ruling: Four players from the Flight A/X were given the West hand with the information that 3♥ was preemptive. All four players bid 4♠, with two of these players stating the bid was automatic.

The Appeal: East/West appealed the director's ruling. South and West attended the hearing. West stated that he believed North must have a diamond fit to make a forcing 3♥ due to the large number of HCPs held by East/West. If he had suspected that East held a good number of diamonds, he would have passed 4♥. He also stated that North/South did not have an agreement about North's 3♥ bid which made South's explanation misinformation.

Concerning the director's poll, he maintained that the A/X players polled were not his peers and that the committee would be a better judge of his actions.

South stated that the partnership had agreed to play jump shifts by advancer as forcing, but they did not discuss whether this changes if RHO bid. South stated he believed the jump shift to still be forcing, North thought his bid was no longer forcing because of the intervening bid.

The Decision: The North/South convention card listed jump shifts by advancer as forcing. The committee determined that no misinformation existed because South had correctly explained the partnership agreement. North had decided to change the agreement in real time based upon his own judgment in a competitive auction. Additionally, the committee judged the four spade bid by West would have been automatic even with a different explanation.

The table result was allowed to stand; and East/West were given an Appeal Without Substantial Merit Penalty.

The Committee: Mark Bartusek (Chair), Chris Willenken, Lynn Deas, Ed Lazarus and Lou Reich.

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: I agree with the AC's ruling and reasoning. And the AWMW.

Ton Kooijman: Strange statement from the AC to say that North deliberately deviated from the system; which makes his 3♥ bid a psyche. I have not seen such a thing in more than 50 years of bridge. What about the alternative that N/S did not have a clear agreement? It is all irrelevant since 4♠ looks automatic indeed. But why this twist then?

Barry Rigal: E/W were my teammates but I certainly didn't like their case. I hope I wasn't given an AWM though I would probably have let them advance their case on grounds of team solidarity. 'Contrived' seems about right.

Adam Wildavsky: This was an NABC+ event, and a strong one at that. I agree that the A/X players were unlikely to have been West's peers. It would be useful to know who was polled - I see no need for confidentiality.

More importantly, I doubt whether the poll included what I would consider the proper context. It is clear from the testimony that N/S had no agreement as to the meaning of the jump to 3♥ in competition. South was trying to be helpful, but he unlawfully provided his interpretation of the call rather than describing an explicit partnership agreement. Thus the poll question ought to have been whether 4♠ is automatic knowing the 3♥ was interpreted as forcing but that N/S had not discussed the auction in competition.

I disagree completely with the AC's determination that "no misinformation existed because South had correctly explained the partnership agreement." I see no evidence for this whatsoever. The convention card listed an agreement but was silent as to whether it applied in competition. Per Law 21B1(B) "the director is to presume mistaken explanation rather than mistaken call in the absence of evidence to the contrary."

Here's how I think a "By the book" ruling should go:

- 1) Was there MI? Yes, certainly. South's explanation was at best incomplete.
- 2) Were E/W damaged as a consequence of the MI? I would say yes, for two reasons.

One is that West's argument makes sense. With few high cards to go around, a forcing bid is more likely to be based on a fit than a preemptive one. The second reason is that West was entitled to know the actual N/S agreement, here "No specific agreement, but a jump to 2♥ would have been forcing had you passed" and also that South believed that 3♥ was forcing. That would make double more attractive.

On to score adjustment, if any, per Law 12c1e.

- 3) How likely was West to bid absent the MI? That is a matter for judgment. I estimate that with complete information at least one West in six would pass or double, so I would adjust the N/S score. Whether to adjust the E/W score is a closer matter.

The AWMW was unwarranted, and would be unwarranted even if the AC judged that bidding 4♠ with complete information was a 90% action so that no score adjustment was appropriate for either side.

APPEAL	NABC+ EIGHT
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Terry Lavender
Event	Women's B-A-M
Session	1 st Final
Date	November 28, 2011

BD#	27
VUL	None
DLR	South

Migry Zur Campanile	
♠	AK10987
♥	95
♦	KQ
♣	1095

Kerri Sanborn		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	Irina Levitina	
♠	Q632		♠	5
♥	AQJ84		♥	K1032
♦	—		♦	98652
♣	A762		♣	QJ4
		Jo Anna Stansby		
		♠	J4	
		♥	76	
		♦	AJ10743	
		♣	K83	

West	North	East	South
			2♦
Dbl	2♠¹	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	2♠ by North
Opening Lead	♣Q
Table Result	Down one, N/S -50
Table Ruling	Down one, N/S -50
Screening Ruling	4♥ by East, making 5, N/S -450
Committee Ruling	4♥ by East, making 5, N/S -450

(1) Altered by North to East as lead directing with diamonds, no alert by South
--

The Facts: North/South did not have system notes with them and were not sure how they play a two spade bid in this sequence. North thought her 2♠ bid was lead directing with diamond support, and South thought 2♠ was natural and did not alert her screen mate.

The Ruling: East/West did get differing information about the 2♠ bid. However, the directors thought that they had sufficient opportunity, even with the misinformation, to find their heart fit. This breaks any causal link between misinformation and damage, thus the result stands.

The Appeal: East/West appealed the director's ruling. The North/South pair produced system notes that supported South's view that 2♠ was non-forcing. The screening director changed the result to 4♥ by East, making 5, N/S -450. North/South were now the appellants after the change of score during screening. South argued that for East/West to score +450, a parlay of uncertain events had to occur. East had to bid 3♥, West had to raise to four, and East had to judge the play very well to make five. Further, South might have found the trump lead that holds declarer to 10 tricks. In the field that played the board, nine of 18 reached game and only four took 11 tricks. East/West argued that since East was told that 2♠ was lead directing, she expected to be able to bid three hearts over 3♦ to show a competitive hand with hearts. She judged that an immediate 3♥ bid would show more game interest than her hand warranted. With the correct information she would have bid 3♥ directly and West would raise to four.

The Decision: East was given misinformation that made it more attractive for her to pass two spades. Given the correct information, East/West would likely have reached four hearts. Neither player had done anything unreasonable given the information they received. Thus, the contract was adjusted to four hearts by East.

Against 4♥, South would likely lead the jack of spades, winning. On a trump shift, declarer can win in dummy, ruff a spade and play the ♣Q. This risks losing to the king and having a trump returned; but if declarer does not touch clubs until all the spades have been ruffed, she risks taking only one club trick due to running out of trumps. Played this way, declarer can take five hearts, three spade ruffs, and three club tricks for a total of 11 tricks.

The committee judged the jack of spades the likely lead, and the line of play to take 11 tricks was likely enough to assign the result of East/West +450 to both sides. Thus the AC ruled as the screening director had.

Considering the uncertainties of the bidding and the play, as well as the fact that the director at the table ruled in favor of North/South, the appeal was found to have merit.

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chair), Eugene Kales, Danny Sprung, Mark Bartusek and Patty Tucker

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: The AC took a shortcut by determining that the result most favorable to the NOS was likely. Therefore, it is assigned to both pairs.

It is almost never right to award an AWMW if the appealing side changes during screening. The players simply do not have enough time to adapt to the changed scenario.

Ton Kooijman: Without mentioning it the TD's decided for a serious error by E/W (East not bidding 3♥ after 2♠). That looks to be too severe for E/W, the more so because East considered bidding 3♥ immediately. Making 11 tricks is the right decision.

Barry Rigal: Complex hand. I can buy into East's position, after which the AC made a sensible prediction of the play.

Adam Wildavsky: The screening director's ruling was vastly superior to that of the TD at the table. E/W do not have to play perfectly to receive redress for damage, and it is not clear that they made any mistakes at all. Correct information would certainly have made a 3♥ call by East more attractive. The appeal of the screening director's ruling was close to meritless.

APPEAL	NABC+ NINE
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Steve Bates
Event	Open B-A-M
Session	1 st Final
Date	November 28, 2011

BD#	28
VUL	N-S
DLR	West

Tien-Chun Yang	
♠	Q10876
♥	8653
♦	AQ8
♣	5

Andrzej Kozikowski		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	Mariusz Krasnicki	
♠	A432		♠	J5
♥	Q9		♥	KJ10
♦	54		♦	J10962
♣	AQ763		♣	1082

Sathya Bettadapura	
♠	K9
♥	A742
♦	K73
♣	KJ94

West	North	East	South	Final Contract	3NT by South, making 3, N/S +600
2♣¹	Pass	2NT²	Pass	Opening Lead	♠2
3♣³	Pass	Pass	Dbl	Table Result	Making 3, N/S +600
Pass	3♠	Pass	3NT	Director Ruling	Making 3, N/S +600
Pass	Pass	Pass		Committee Ruling	3♣ by West, down 2, N/S +100

(1)	Precision 2♣ opening, 11-15 HCP, long club suit
(2)	Alerted as a relay to 3♣
(3)	Alerted, forced by system

The Facts: The 2NT bid could be weak with club support or forcing with a suit of his own. After West bid 3♣, North asked a number of questions, including what the alert of 3♣ was, what the 2NT bid signified, and “What happens next?”

The Ruling: No adjustment. South knows what kind of hand East holds, and he knows West has a limited opener. There was no opportunity to poll other players. The directors felt that South had enough authorized information to allow the double. Law

16.A.1 states: “A player may use information in the auction or play if, (a) it derives from the legal calls and plays of the current board....”

The Appeal: East/West appealed the director’s ruling. North, South, East and West attended the hearing. East/West argued that North’s extensive questioning suggested values. It was very dangerous for South to double holding only two spades. However, North’s interrogation made it more attractive for South to double.

North/South stated that South knew that there was a weak hand on his right and a limited opening on his left. He expected partner to have 7–10 HCP and could not let the opponents steal the contract. North prefers to ask questions as the bidding progresses, so he can get a clearer picture of the opponents’ hands.

The Decision: In screening, it was determined that West did not verbally alert the 2NT call, and North did not notice the tap of the alert strip. After East alerted 3♣, North asked his questions. Although North’s question, “What happens next?” may have been innocent enough, the answer should have been obvious. Further there was no reason for North to have the information that the answer would provide at the time he asked his questions. It was unusual to ask about a bid that had not yet been made.

Thus the committee judged that North’s questioning suggested values near the top of what one would hold and still pass over a limited and natural 2♣ opening. Therefore, South had unauthorized information that suggested action over inaction. Further, pass was definitely a logical alternative to the suggested double.

The committee enforced a pass on South, ending with West playing 3♣. This figured to be down 2, with South over-ruffing spades at the expense of his natural trump tricks. The committee thought West’s lead of a small spade contributed to his poor result, but did not consider it a “failure to play bridge”.

The contract was adjusted to 3♣ by West down 2, North/South +100.

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chair), Eugene Kales, Danny Sprung, Mark Bartusek, and Patty Tucker.

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: Also a good job. I’m not sure I’d come to the same conclusion about the spade lead, but it is reasonable to rule as the AC did.

Ton Kooijman: The most interesting case so far. Questions asked creating UI that could influence partner’s choice of action. Normally one needs strong evidence to go that way. I have my doubts here. E/W did infringe the alert procedure and to decide then that the opponents asked too much is not an obvious approach. The double is by far not outrageous, so I would have allowed it.

Barry Rigal: Excellent decision; no bridge player would double 3♣— for take-out, limited here by failure to double 2NT. The questions are clearly not appropriate here.

Adam Wildavsky: I like the AC's ruling and their reasoning. The TD seems to have gone out of his way to protect the offending side. If anything TDs should do the reverse. Had the TD conducted a poll he would likely have learned that Pass is a standout with the South hand and is certainly a logical alternative. When he has no opportunity to conduct a poll he ought to give the benefit of the doubt to the non-offenders.

Bobby Wolff: I disagree to a relatively small extent with this decision, since North, certainly without much of a hand has a right to try to understand what the opponents are doing, (I do not think UI was being passed here). Whenever a partnership has unusual bidding methods like 2NT being a relay to 3♣. All that means is that instead of just bidding a preemptive 3♣ one gives his opponents two shots at the apple, but also a small dose of disbelief. For South to now balance only shows frustration and although dummy is, if anything on the lower side of what he or she might have had, but fate allowed the 22 HCPs to produce +600. I would be in favor of allowing +600 and be done with it, lucky though it might be, it is bridge.

APPEAL	NABC+ TEN
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Candy Kuschner
Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	1 st
Date	November 29, 2011

BD#	5
VUL	N/S
DLR	North

Stephen Drodge	
♠	83
♥	K54
♦	AJ
♣	AKJ962

Gabrielle Sherman		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	Erwin Linzner	
♠	AQ107		♠	J542
♥	QJ732		♥	A106
♦	K74		♦	83
♣	10		♣	Q853

John Miller	
♠	K96
♥	98
♦	Q109652
♣	74

West	North	East	South
	1♣¹	Pass	1♦²
1NT³	2♣	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	2♣ by North
Opening Lead	♠4
Table Result	Down 2, North/South -200
Director Ruling	2♣ by North, down 2, N/S -200
Committee Ruling	2♦ by South, down 1, N/S -100

(1)	16+HCP unbalanced, 17+HCP balanced
(2)	0-7 HCP
(3)	Explained as pointed or rounded suits (Crash)

The Facts: After the completion of the second board of the round, East/West were overheard by North/South as they discussed the meaning of the 1NT bid. West was trying to show two suits of same rank while East explained that he thought it showed two suits of the same shape.

The Ruling: Result stands. North/South did receive misinformation, but even with proper explanation it was not clear to bid 2♦. The Director judged that if 2♦ was the correct bid, South should have bid it anyway.

The Appeal: North/South appealed the director's ruling. North and South attended the hearing. South knew from the alert and explanation of the 1NT bid, that West had at least four cards in one of the minors. This made it more attractive to try to stop low and play in the known fit with the lead coming up to the strong hand.

The Decision: The 2♣ rebid showed 6+ clubs; 2♦ over 2♣ would have shown about 4 to 7 HCP with 6+ diamonds, non-forcing.

East/West disagreed about the meaning of the 1NT bid. The committee judged that West's understanding (majors or minors) was probably the correct one.

East's explanation of 1NT (showing Clubs and Hearts or Diamonds and Spades) was misinformation. This misinformation made bidding 2♦ less attractive to South than it otherwise would have been with the correct explanation. Pass was a reasonable action by South, given the misinformation he received. Therefore, the committee changed the result to 2♦ down one, North/South -100.

The committee considered whether East might have bid 2♠ after the 2♦ bid. Since he did not bid 2♠ over 2♣, presumably knowing partner had spades, and he could assume that his partner had at least four diamonds over the diamond bidder, he was not given the benefit of the doubt to make the winning bid when he did not do so at the table.

It should be noted that North/South should not have had to find out about the misinformation from overhearing East/West's discussion after the second board was played. West was responsible for correcting his partner's explanation immediately upon completion of the play of board 5.

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chair), Chris Moll, Abby Heitner, Josh Parker and Bart Bramley

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: Good job. It would have been reasonable to award E/W a 1/4 board PP for West's not correcting the misexplanation, since it is therefore likely that the table director would have ruled as the AC did.

Ton Kooijman: I do not have much to add, good decision by the AC. A small word to the TD: Try to base your bridge judgment decision on the outcome of a poll. It doesn't show competence to decide that bidding 2♦ in South is independent of the meaning of the 1NT bid.

Barry Rigal: Good point re: the explanation being owed by West. The AC ruling looks generous to N/S but maybe E/W needed to be penalized.

Adam Wildavsky: I agree with the AC's decision for the reasons they stated. I would also have assessed a procedural penalty against EW for their failure to disclose their misunderstanding.

APPEAL	NABC+ ELEVEN
Subject	Break in Tempo
DIC	Candy Kuschner
Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	2 nd Qualifying
Date	November 29, 2011

BD#	8
VUL	None
DLR	West

Pat Galligan	
♠	96
♥	QJ1062
♦	K93
♣	K54

Alex Ornstein		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	Jeff Aker	
♠	AK5		♠	J8743
♥	43		♥	K
♦	AJ762		♦	Q10854
♣	963		♣	A7

Robert Ng	
♠	Q102
♥	A9875
♦	—
♣	QJ1082

West	North	East	South
1♦	1♥	1♠¹	4♥
Pass	Pass	Dbl²	Pass
4♠	Pass	Pass	Dbl
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Final Contract	4♠X, East
Opening Lead	Q♣
Table Result	Down 1, N/S +100
Director Ruling	4♥X by North, making 4, N/S +590
Committee Ruling	4♥X by North, making 4, N/S +590

(1)	Shows at least five spades
(2)	Break in Tempo

The Facts: There was an agreed break in tempo before the double of 4♥ (stated as 12–15 seconds by East/West, as 20 seconds by North/South).

The Ruling: Per Law 16.B.1.a., pass by West is a logical alternative after East's double, so West cannot bid 4♠ after the agreed break in tempo. The result was adjusted to 4♥X by North making four, North/South +590.

The Appeal: East/West appealed the director's ruling. North, East and West attended the hearing. East/West stated that they polled several experts, all of whom said that pass was not a logical alternative to bidding 4♠. West passed directly over 4♥ since partner had not yet clarified the strength of his hand. Double says it is our hand, do something intelligent. West felt that with the best possible spade holding for this auction, he must bid 4♠.

The Decision: The committee agreed that the double said "Do something intelligent". However, the break in tempo suggested that a diamond fit was more likely, making the 4♠ call more attractive.

There are enough possible East hands in which 4♥ and 4♠ would both go down, that the 4♠ bid cannot be allowed when the break in tempo suggests that bidding will be successful. The appeal was found to have substantial merit.

The committee ruled as the TD had, adjusting the score for both sides to 4♥X by North, making 4, N/S +590.

The Committee: Richard Popper (Chair), Jim Thurtell, Fred King, Gail Greenberg, and Ed Lazarus

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: I don't think passing 4♥ doubled is even remotely an option. Result stands seems totally normal. Furthermore, I don't see how the BIT demonstrably suggests bidding over passing. Rather, I suspect the opposite: a slow doubler is likely to be considering passing, which suggests passing over doubling. In reality, East was thinking of bidding, because he had a big diamond fit. That's pretty unlikely, and furthermore, most of the time when he is thinking about bidding, he'll actually bid or pass, not double. Therefore, it's overwhelmingly likely that East was thinking of passing. In that case, the slow double suggests passing, not bidding, because if partner has a marginal double, 4♠ rates to go down. With two aces, West expects 4♥ to go down, also, so passing is demonstrably suggested over bidding. ...which would matter if 4♠ weren't a completely automatic action.

I think the AC was blinded by the actual East hand. If they had not seen it, they would have come to a different conclusion than they did.

Ton Kooijman: Are the players polling around nowadays instead of the TDs? Stop it then, the outcome here shows that players might be biased in their choice for peers. I do not have any doubt that pass is a logical alternative.

Barry Rigal: Both East and West are regular partners/teammates of mine and they asked me whether there was an logical alternative to 4♠. I say no and I think any real bridge player would agree, loudly. Poor AC ruling.

Adam Wildavsky: The TD ruling is incomplete. It is silent on the heart of the matter — did the UI demonstrably suggest 4♠ over Pass? Typically a slow double suggests pulling, but each case must be judged individually. Here I think that a slow double suggests, not necessarily long diamonds, but extra offense of one form or another, so it does make a pull more attractive. Could East have been thinking about whether to double or pass? Certainly, but that seems substantially less likely to me. So I agree with the AC and disagree with Jeff Goldsmith. It's a close call, though. Given time Jeff might bring me around to his way of thinking.

Would Pass be logical? I was not certain so I took a poll, as perhaps the TDs should have. I sent email to 112 experts. Of the 56 who responded 50, or 89%, bid 4♠ while 6 or 11% passed. All the passers seriously considered 4♠. 27 of the 4♠ bidders, or 54%, seriously considered Pass. By the standards established by Law 16 this seems to make Pass a LA, though only if those I polled should be considered West's peers. The TD and AC cannot commission such an extensive poll, so this information is useful primarily to show that often a decision is not as clear cut as we might suppose.

Bobby Wolff: I disagree with the final decision, since I think East's bid cried out for West to do something intelligent and he did. West, with two hearts certainly knows that East is stuck and does not want to go past 4♠ as a possible resting place. To me it is a slam dunk to allow 4♠ to be bid.

APPEAL	NABC+ TWELVE
Subject	Break in Tempo
DIC	Candy Kuschner
Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	2 nd Qualifying
Date	November 29, 2011

BD#	11
VUL	None
DLR	South

Lynn Deas	
♠	J4
♥	AQ95
♦	K954
♣	K83

Jan Van Cleef		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	Bob Drake	
♠	Q73		♠	K108
♥	J7632		♥	K
♦	2		♦	AQ873
♣	A1095		♣	QJ74

Curtis Cheek	
♠	A9652
♥	1084
♦	J106
♣	62

West	North	East	South
			Pass
Pass	1♦¹	Pass²	1♠
Dbl	1NT	2♣	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	2♣ East
Opening Lead	♦J
Table Result	2♣ East, making 4, N/S -130
Director Ruling	1NT by North, down 1, N/S -50
Committee Ruling	1NT by North, down 1, N/S -50

(1)	Precision, announced as could be short
(2)	BIT, stated by East/West as 5 or 6 seconds, as 10 seconds by South

The Facts: There was an agreed BIT after the 1♦ bid, but a disagreement about the length of time of the BIT.

The Ruling: Since East broke tempo before passing 1♦, unauthorized information was available to West. Pass is a logical alternative for West and per Law 16.B a score of North/South -50 in 1NT is assigned.

The Appeal: East/West appealed the director's ruling. North, South, East and West all attended the hearing. East thought the BIT was minimal. He needed a few moments to consider whether he should bid over a Precision 1♦ (as opposed to a standard 1♦).

West is an aggressive player. Non-vulnerable versus vulnerable as a passed hand (partner was unlikely to play him for much), a passed hand on his right and a limited opening on his left, he considered it automatic to double.

The Decision: South thought that East took close to 10 seconds to pass, along with some slight body shifting. East did not dispute the body shifting, but thought the time was closer to five or six seconds.

The committee agreed with the director's finding of the BIT by East. This demonstrably suggested that double would be more likely to be successful, since it improved the chance that East/West could have the values to reach a makeable contract.

Also, passing 1♠ was judged to be a logical alternative to the double. West's hand is light in high cards and Q73 of spades is more of a defensive than offensive asset. Many players would consider passing the West hand, and many would actually pass.

Thus the committee enforced a pass. North would rebid 1NT and East would pass. Since South did not bid 2♠ on the actual auction, there is a good chance South would pass 1NT. Six tricks would be likely with three hearts and one of each other suit. In fact, notrump contracts were played by North/South at three of the committee members' tables, with six tricks taken each time.

The committee changed the result to 1NT by North, down 1, North/South -50. Since it was not disputed that there was some BIT when East passed, the committee thought it should have been obvious to East/West that pass over 1♠ by West was a logical alternative to the suggested double. Therefore, East/West were given an Appeal Without Merit Warning.

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chair), Bart Bramley, Chris Moll, Abbie Heitner, and Josh Parker

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: I think the AC got it right up to a point. Will West pass over 1NT? If it is at all probable that he'd bid 2♥, the OS might get -50 for 2♥ down one. I don't think it's sufficiently likely that he'd bid 2♥ for the NOS to get +50, but I could buy that it's at all probable both white at MPs. If E/W were playing a convention over a dead NT which allowed West to show clubs and another suit, he'd surely use it, so we might get back to the table result if that was available.

Not only is the AWMW deserved, I think a 1/4 board PP for abuse of UI is, too.

Ton Kooijman: If West has any understanding of the laws, and his name looks familiar to me in which case he does, he should have been penalized. This is not a close decision between pass and double.

Barry Rigal: Seems right. Note that if East had passed smoothly an aggressive West might have balanced over 1NT with 2♥? That is how to do worse than defending 1NT.

Adam Wildavsky: The TD ruling is incomplete. It should note that the UI available to West demonstrably suggested double over pass. Other than that a perfect decision by the TD, duplicated by the AC. I agree that the appeal had no merit.

When East says that he needed time to decide what to do over the 1♦ opening he is in effect saying that he made UI available to his partner. To avoid doing so in the future he must learn to make his calls in a consistent tempo as required by the laws. This could mean acting more quickly when he has a problem, acting more slowly when he has no problem, or resolving doubt in favor of bidding rather than passing when he realizes that he has already made UI available.

Bobby Wolff: While West does possibly have a TO double, when partner has a BIT he should not be allowed to make that bid since once partner breaks tempo West definitely now knows that he should be competing. At least to me, simple case and although once passing and hearing it go 1NT pass, pass, he might if that partnership has a TO available be allowed to back in, but that is then up to the committee whether that also should be allowed. If not then N/S should be playing 1NT -50.

APPEAL	NABC+ THIRTEEN
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Candy Kushner
Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	1 st Qualifying
Date	November 29, 2011

BD#	5
VUL	N/S
DLR	North

Christal Henner-Welland	
♠	83
♥	K54
♦	AJ
♣	AKJ962

Richard Carle		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	Merlin Vilhauer	
♠	AQ107		♠	J542
♥	QJ732		♥	A106
♦	K74		♦	83
♣	10		♣	Q853

Uday Ivatury	
♠	K96
♥	98
♦	Q109652
♣	74

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

Final Contract	3NT by North
Opening Lead	♥A
Table Result	Down 1, N/S -100
Director Ruling	Down 6, N/S -600
Committee Ruling	3NT North, down 6, N/S -600 N/S 3NT North, down 1, N/S -100 E/W

(1)	Could be short
(2)	Limit raise in clubs (actual agreement)
(3)	Heart shortness

The Facts: East said that 2♠ was not alerted during the auction and asked the meaning before he led. He was told it showed a singleton heart. He then led a heart, hoping to set up the heart suit. Since neither hand corresponded to the explanations, East/West felt they had no chance to work out the North/South hands.

The Ruling: Citing Law 47.E.2.b: “When it is too late to correct a play under 2(a) above, the director may award an adjusted score,” the director changed the result to 3NT by North down six, +600 for East/West.

The Appeal: North/South appealed the director’s ruling. North, South and East attended the hearing. North/South stated that their agreement was explained, but that North had forgotten that the double added two additional steps.

East stated that he would have led a spade except for the misinformation. He had no idea what his partner discarded on the second and third clubs. His return when in with the ♣Q was a complete guess.

The Decision: Since North did not remember that the double after a limit raise added two additional steps to their responses and their system notes did not mention the additional two steps after a double, there was no clear evidence that this was their actual agreement. Law 75.C explains that the explanation is classified as misinformation rather than a misbid. As a direct result of this misinformation the opening leader started with the ♥A rather than the normal spade lead. The committee agreed that an opening spade lead and the normal heart shift would result in East/West winning 10 tricks, setting the 3NT contract six tricks. The committee therefore upheld the adjusted score for North/South of -600.

However, it was the Committee’s opinion that East quit playing bridge after trick one. When the committee looked at the East/West defense, they found that while the misinformation had started East off on the wrong lead, when North’s singleton heart was not the King then the heart continuation was playing his partner for KQJxxxx which was totally against bridge logic with the auction. A spade shift here would have resulted in nine tricks for the defense and equity. When North eventually won the third heart and played the ace and king of clubs followed by a club to East’s ♣Q, the ♠J through the king would have once again resulted in nine tricks for the defense and restored equity. But East, by his own admission, did not know what his partner had discarded on the second and third clubs and so had no idea what to lead when he won the ♣Q. He shifted to a diamond, presenting declarer with eight tricks. While neither mistake, the heart continuation at trick two nor the diamond shift when he won the ♣Q, are enough to sever the relationship between the misinformation and the damage, the committee felt that the two in combination comprised a serious error. Per Law 12C1(b) the non-offenders do not receive an adjusted score in this case so the committee allowed the table result to stand for East/West: +100.

The appeal was found to have substantial merit.

The Committee: Richard Popper, (Chair), Fred King, Ed Lazurus, Jim Thurtell and Jacob Morgan

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: I like the decision.

Ton Kooijman: Interesting case, I'm trying to get a better idea about the definition of a serious error. Not noticing discards by partner at all probably contributes to make it one, though.... I do not feel happy with the reasoning followed by the committee. When continuing hearts in itself is not a serious error and choosing for a diamond later is neither how can the combination make it one? You almost drove through the red traffic light twice so here is the fine?

One other point, when a first lead in spades leads to minus six and a first lead in hearts to minus five you cannot say that the latter is an equity result, the difference in matchpoints between the two results should be compensated. I hope that the committee had the outcome in matchpoints on the table when it decided so.

I think that I would have given E/W the balance of 3NT -6, the result had E/W been properly informed.

Barry Rigal: I'm not sure if I agree with the precise ruling, but I concur with East having ceased to play bridge. I think N/S received a windfall here but I'm not sure how to take it away from them. No PP seems appropriate for the fact that both players were simultaneously bidding incompetently.

Adam Wildavsky: Excellent application of Law 12C1(b) by the AC to improve the TD's ruling.

APPEAL	NABC+ Fourteen
Subject	Disputed Revoke
DIC	Susan Doe
Event	Senior Mixed Pairs
Session	2 nd
Date	November 30, 2011

BD#	24
VUL	None
DLR	West

Mike Cappelletti, Sr.	
♠	QJ103
♥	K73
♦	72
♣	QJ103

Angela Fenton		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	Laurence Betts	
♠	875		♠	A642
♥	9542		♥	J10
♦	A9854		♦	KQ1063
♣	A		♣	86

Eileen Easterling	
♠	K9
♥	AQ86
♦	J
♣	K97542

West	North	East	South
P	P	1♦	2♣
2♦	X	3♦	3♥
P	4♣	P	P
4♦	P	P	P

Final Contract	4♦ by East
Opening Lead	♠K
Table Result	Down 1, N/S +50
Director Ruling	Making 4, N/S -130
Committee Ruling	Down 1, N/S +50

The Facts: East/West alleged that North had revoked. The score had been entered and approved and the individual hands had been shuffled and returned to the board. The play of the hand went as follows:

- Trick 1: ♠K-♠x-♠x-♠A
- Trick 2: ♣6-♣x-♣A-♣x
- Trick 3: ♦4-♦x-♦K-♦J
- Trick 4: ♣8-♣x-♦x-♣x

At this point (trick 5) there is disagreement as to what the declarer led from the dummy. The defense (North/South) contends that the declarer now led a heart. East and West (Declarer and dummy) contend that a small diamond was led, pulling North's

last trump. What is not in dispute is that later in the play, North gained the lead and then led a diamond. North stated that when he returned the diamond 98x of diamonds was still in dummy.

The Ruling: The allegation of a revoke was timely for assessing rectification. The players had not progressed, which would have ended the round. (Law 8.B.1: “In general, a round ends when the Director gives the signal for the start of the following round, but if any table has not completed play by that time, the round continues for that table until there has been a progression of players.”)

Both pairs had agreed on a result, so the scrambling of the quitted tricks was acceptable.

The available evidence (the actual hand) suggests that the lead of a heart at trick 5 is a poor play —there is no reason not to draw the last trump. Therefore, the director deemed that a diamond was led. (Law 85.A.1: The director shall base his view on the balance of probabilities, which is to say in accordance with the weight of the evidence he is able to collect.”)

Accordingly, the director ruled that the revoke had occurred and adjusted the score to 4♦, making 4, N/S -130.

The Appeal: North/South appealed the director’s ruling. North attended the hearing. The play of the hand as described by North was as follows:

Trick 1: ♠K-♠5-♠3-♠A
Trick 2: ♣8-♣2-♣A-♣Q
Trick 3: ♦4-♦2-♦K-♦J
Trick 4: ♣6-♣4-♦A-♣3
Trick 5: ♥2-♥3-♥J-♥Q
Trick 6: ♠9-♠7-♠10-♠2
Trick 7: ♠Q-♠4-♣5-♠8
Trick 8: ♦7-♦Q-♣7-♦5

At that point, Declarer said, “I’ve got to lose one heart, down one.” The hands were shuffled and returned to the board. The board was scored electronically and approved, after which East (Declarer) asked, “How many diamonds did you have?” North answered, “Two.” “Then you revoked,” East said and the Director was called.

The Decision: When you have a 10-card trump fit, there are only three trumps outstanding. It isn’t difficult to count them. After both opponents follow to the first round and both show out on the second round declarer would have to be oblivious not to notice, in which case as soon as play were completed he would ask the opponents not to shuffle their cards. The Declarer would then call the Director.

Additionally, declarer's comment, "I've got a heart to lose," is consistent with the sequence of play as described by North. Therefore, the committee ruled that no revoke took place and restored the table result of 4♦ down 1, N/S +50 and E/W -50.

The Committee: Jeff Goldsmith (Chair), Abby Heitner, Mark Feldman, Doug Doub and Jeff Aker

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: Our inferences seem reasonable.

Ton Kooijman: Sherlock Holmes at work, I hope this doesn't happen too often.

Barry Rigal: This has nothing to do with the personalities involved, but North's testimony sounds extremely convincing. If I'm wrong I will not play Omaha against him again.

Adam Wildavsky: I find the AC's logic more compelling than the TD's. Further, a player who suspects a revoke ought not shuffle his cards nor allow his opponents to shuffle theirs.

Bobby Wolff: It seems that the decision as to whether a revoke took place was well decided in the end, worth no further comment.

APPEAL	NABC+ FIFTEEN
Subject	Break in Tempo
DIC	Susan Doe
Event	Senior Mixed Pairs
Session	2 nd Final
Date	December 1 st , 2011

BD#	13
VUL	Both
DLR	N

John Ashton	
♠	10652
♥	AQ10
♦	75
♣	KJ53

Buddy Hanby		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	Cindy Bernstein	
♠	973		♠	AQJ8
♥	532		♥	J9876
♦	Q42		♦	J108
♣	10872		♣	9

Marie Ashton	
♠	K4
♥	K4
♦	AK963
♣	AQ64

West	North	East	South
	P	P	1♦
P	1♠	P	3♣
P	4♣	P	5♣ ¹
P	6♣	P	P
P			

Final Contract	6♣ South
Opening Lead	♥5
Table Result	Making 6, N/S +1370
Director Ruling	5♣ South, N/S +620
Committee Ruling	5♣ South, N/S +620

(1)	B.I.T.
-----	--------

The Facts: The director was called when the dummy was tabled. All parties agreed that there was a break in tempo before South's 5♣ bid.

The Ruling: Six players were polled including two national and two world champions and of the six, four passed and two bid on with the South hand. Five directors were also polled and all passed. The poll results established that pass was a logical alternative to bidding 6♣. The Director cited Law 73.C, "When a player has available to him unauthorized information from his partner, such as from a remark, question, explanation, gesture, mannerism, undue emphasis, inflection, haste or

hesitation, an unexpected alert or failure to alert, he must carefully avoid taking any advantage from that unauthorized information;" and Law 73.F "When a violation of the proprieties described in this law results in damage to an innocent opponent, if the director determines that an innocent player has drawn a false inference from a remark, manner, tempo or the like of an opponent who has no demonstrable bridge reason for the action, and who could have known, at the time of the action, that the action could work to his benefit, the director shall award an adjusted score." Accordingly, he adjusted the contract to 5♣ by South, making six, for North/South +620.

The Appeal: North/South appealed the director's ruling. All four players attended the hearing. North alleged that when South bid 3♣ his intention was to drive to six. There was a good chance at the tricks in notrump so 5♣ rated to be a losing matchpoint contract. Even though partner hesitated before bidding 5♣ he felt committed to his original plan. East/West reiterated that North should not be allowed to bid 6♣ after South's hesitant 5♣ bid. The committee determined that a bid of 4NT over 4♣ would have been Roman Keycard Blackwood.

The Decision: There was a significant break in tempo that suggested that South wanted to do more than just bid 5♣. Thus, the BIT demonstrably suggested that north bid 6 rather than pass. Both in the committee's judgment and that of the polled players (4 of 6 passed), pass was a logical alternative to the suggested 6♣ bid. Therefore, the contract was changed to 5♣ by South making six.

North/South should have realized that pass was a logical alternative to the suggested 6♣ bid, especially after hearing about the results of the poll, and they should not have appealed the director's ruling. Therefore, they were assigned an AWMW.

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chair), Ellen Kent, Lou Reich, Bob White, and Josh Parker

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: Well done again, including the AWMW.

Ton Kooijman: Another case in which a more severe penalty should be given. North did not act in accordance with the ethical standard we need to follow in this game. And it is a shame that N/S appealed.

Barry Rigal: While I agree that at pairs bidding 6♣ is perhaps the best chance to salvage a decent result, 3NT might easily be going down if partner has short spades or a stiff honor. Reluctantly I agree the AC decision including the AWM. Once the rationale for the original decision is given, unless the AC determines no logical alternative, the AWM is on point.

Adam Wildavsky: I agree that the appeal had no merit. I do not understand why TDs were polled.

When making a ruling depending on bridge judgment the field is represented by two separate yet equally important groups: the TDs who investigate irregularities and the players they poll. These are their stories.

Bobby Wolff: I do not think that North should be barred from bidding 6♣ because:

1) In reality South had no extras to do anything other than bid 5♣, and perhaps she was even thinking of passing 4♣ or instead bidding 4♦ since she may have had only 3 clubs, but needed to force to game and so chose to bid 3♣.

2) North's reason to risk slam at pairs is certainly valid as 3NT was likely to be the final contract at many tables.

3) Six clubs was by no means lay down, depending on the minor suit breaks, and if slam would have gone down E/W shouldn't be in a position to get a double shot.

All the above reasons are, at least to me, easily determined to allow North to bid the slam.

APPEAL	NABC+ SIXTEEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Susan Doe
Event	Seniors Mixed Pairs
Session	2 nd Final
Date	December 1 st , 2011

BD#	3
VUL	E-W
DLR	S

Suzi Subeck	
♠	865
♥	K4
♦	A42
♣	J10985

Sheila Sache		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	Don Sache	
♠	Q10932		♠	K74
♥	Q652		♥	J9
♦	QJ3		♦	K1096
♣	6		♣	AK43

Stan Subeck	
♠	AJ
♥	A10873
♦	875
♣	Q72

West	North	East	South
			1NT¹
P	P	X²	P
2♠³	P	3♣	P
3♥	P	3♠	P
P	P		

Final Contract	3♠ North
Opening Lead	J♣
Table Result	Making 3, N/S - 140
Director Ruling	Making 3, N/S - 140
Committee Ruling	3♣ East, down 3, N/S +300 N/S 3♣ East, down 4, N/S +400 E/W

1	10-12 HCP
2	Shows at least a queen better than opener's NT
3	Alerted as Minor Suit Stayman

The Facts: The director was called at the end of the auction. North/South alleged that West had unauthorized information from hearing her partner's alert of the 2♠ bid.

The Ruling: There is unauthorized information, but the action taken by West over 3♣ is deemed to be based on the hand held and not on the UI arising from the alert

and explanation. Three directors and six players polled regarding what they would do without the UI and only one player chose to pass. Therefore, the ruling is that there is UI but no consequent damage, the table result stands.

The Appeal: North/South appealed the director's ruling. North attended the hearing. North reiterated that West had UI from East's alert of her 2♠ bid. Further, North stated that West had said, "Of course I pulled 3♣ because I heard partner alert." North argued that East easily could have had a long club suit.

The Decision: The table director had determined that the East/West agreement was that 2♠ was indeed Minor Suit Stayman. The committee decided that a pass of 3♣ was a logical alternative. In addition to one of the polled players passing, the committee believed that a significant number of West's peers would pass. Thus, a pass was enforced upon West resulting in a final contract of 3♣ by East. After East plays three rounds of trumps it was deemed unlikely that the North/South would find the best defense in ruffing out the ♥Q to establish South's heart suit. Thus, per Law 12.C.1.e, North/South were awarded +300 as the most favorable result that was likely and East/West were assigned -400 as the most unfavorable result that was at all probable. The appeal was found to have substantial merit.

The Committee: Mark Bartusek (Chair), Gail Greenberg, Chip Martel, Chris Willenken and Mike Kamil

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: OK, but if -400 was unlikely, it still has to be established as being at all probable. I don't have a strong feeling either way, but the AC needs to state that -400 was at all probable to award it.

Ton Kooijman: This case reads as a joke. There is a poll in which eight out of nine say A. And then the AC writes down: in accordance with the sole player out of nine who passed the committee believes that a significant number of players would pass. What are you doing? No mentioning of wrong questions asked, just ignoring an overwhelming outcome of a poll. This is simply impossible in my world.

Barry Rigal: I cannot imagine passing 3♣ in a month of Sundays. TD ruling seems preferable.

Adam Wildavsky: The TD ruling mystifies me. If one out of six of East's peers would Pass then, by the ACBL LC's guidelines, Pass is a LA. Granted, one out of six might be sampling error—the true rate could be higher or lower. The only way to resolve this question is by polling additional players. It would make life easier for TDs and ACs if we were to establish polling guidelines — I will propose this to the LC.

APPEAL	NABC+ SEVENTEEN
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Nancy Boyd
Event	Reisinger B-A-M Teams
Session	2 nd Semi-final
Date	December 3 rd , 2012

BD#	21
VUL	N-S
DLR	N

Chris Willenken	
♠	J874
♥	AQ96
♦	32
♣	A54

Nik Demirev		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	Michael Polowan	
♠	Q63		♠	1052
♥	K75		♥	1084
♦	AK87		♦	Q96
♣	932		♣	KQJ7

Michael Rosenberg	
♠	AK9
♥	J32
♦	J1054
♣	1086

West	North	East	South
	P	P	P
1♣¹	P	1♦	P
1NT	X	P	P
P			

Final Contract	1NTX West
Opening Lead	♦3
Table Result	Making 1, N/S -180
Director Ruling	Down 2, N/S +300
Committee Ruling	1NTX West, making N/S -180 N/S 1NTX West, down 2, N/S +300 E/W

(1) 1♣ bid was not announced as “could be short”
--

The Facts: The director was called to the table after the play of the hand was complete. East/West agreed that 1♣ can be opened with fewer than three clubs. North stated that the diamond lead was based on the analysis of the auction disclosing that West could not have four diamonds.

The Ruling: A player survey confirmed the North/South contention that the hand can be made as the cards lie, but would fail if Declarer misguesses either the spade

or heart positions. Accordingly, the director adjusted the score for both sides to 1NTX, down two, +300 for North/South.

The Appeal: North/South appealed the director's ruling. South, East and West attended the hearing. South asserted that with the opening lead of the ♠4 (a normal lead had North had the information that Declarer could hold four diamonds and fewer than three clubs) South would have won the ♠A and returned the ♠9. If Declarer misguesses the spade position and later misguesses the hearts the defense can take eight tricks.

The Decision: East/West gave misinformation which made the winning lead less attractive. Per Law 12.C.1.e the committee assigned East/West the most unfavorable result that was at all probable had they given correct information, which it judged was -300. North/South (the NOS) were assigned the most favorable result that was likely had they received correct information, which the committee judged was -180, the same score they achieved at the table

The rationale for not awarding North/South +300 is that in order for the result to have been awarded, three separate plays all would have had to transpire.

1. On the opening lead, South would have to win the ace, not the king of spades and return the nine.
2. West would have to play low to trick two.
3. West would also have to misguess the heart position.

The committee judged that the likelihood of all three plays to have occurred was not sufficiently likely to satisfy that criteria. The appeal was found to have substantial merit.

The Committee: Gail Greenberg (Chair), Kit Woolsey, Boye Brogeland, Howard Weinstein and Steve Garner

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: I don't get the ruling. If declarer misguesses both majors, the defense takes 9 tricks. That's never happening, however, as by the time declarer has to guess hearts, South, a passed hand, has shown up with the SAK. He could play South for QJ9, but that's enormously against the odds, so he won't, and the guess on the second round of the suit isn't too hard as the cards lay.

Will South play the SK or SA? He knows his partner has at least one, probably two entries, so he ought to play the SA and a small one back; he's not worried about blocking the suit. Will declarer get the spades right? I don't see why he should.

So on a spade lead, E/W is going -300 probably 75% of the time, +180 maybe 25% of the time (and that's generous). So reciprocal 300s seem in order.

But doesn't North have some responsibility for leading 32 doubleton against 1NT? His partner is going to have trouble working this out. If it had been 72, I'd be more sympathetic. I don't know that the lead is a wild gamble, but I very much doubt it's percentage or remotely close. I think he thought South's pass of his takeout double was due to a diamond stack. It wasn't.

The AC apparently decided that the opening lead caused the bad result and was a wild gambling action, as they took N/S's good result away from them on a non-argument. Something went awry in the middle of this ruling.

Ton Kooijman: I have some problems with the information given. Why can't West have four diamonds with just the hand he shows? And could it be that East denies majors (and what about West)? For sure E/W should be warned, you can't play this without a strict alerting method and if this fails already on the 1♣ opening without West later rectifying that mistake.... Don't you have a pre-alert which should be used here? So I don't know what really happened, but with my assumptions I do not see how the infraction leads to a diamond lead. And then we have this reasoning by the AC resulting in a by far not obvious three off given a spade lead. The WBF laws committee has found a more equity based method to adjust the score in such a case: the weighted score. The TD decides the probabilities for a spade and diamond lead (maybe including a heart lead too) and for minus three and two. He uses the opinion of peer players to find out. That gives N/S a fairer score. In this case I would not have objected -300 to E/W. Some education is needed.

Barry Rigal: Very harsh ruling for N/S; once the ruling has gone against E/W it seems unreasonable not to give N/S something, +100 would be my best guess. Certainly E/W should know better than to have this auction without alerting.

Adam Wildavsky: The AC missed something here. South will win the ♠A more often than he will win the ♠K, and should return the 9 in either case since partner would likely have overcalled with S J8743 and close to an opening hand. Due to the principle of restricted choice it is normal for West to misguess regardless of which honor South plays. He could also go right since he knows that holding the SJ South might have switched to hearts, but it's far from a sure thing. The most important point, though, is that a spade misguess is all the defense needs. They will surely switch to hearts after cashing either two or three spades and this will set up 8 tricks for the defense.

I prefer the TD's ruling to the AC's.

Bobby Wolff: An excellent decision which penalizes lack of full disclosure and at the same time does not assume the other side to get a windfall result, of which they have not earned.

I am proud of this committee for this decision and sincerely hope that this type of decision will be made much more often in the future.

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ONE
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Chris Patrias
Event	Morning K.O.
Session	1 st
Date	November 29, 2011

BD#	7
VUL	Both
DLR	S

1,400 Masterpoints	
♠	876432
♥	32
♦	Q4
♣	J95

3,250 Masterpoints		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	600 Masterpoints	
♠	10		♠	K9
♥	Q854		♥	A1076
♦	AKJ105		♦	8
♣	K86		♣	AQ10732

1,400 Masterpoints	
♠	AQJ5
♥	KJ9
♦	97632
♣	4

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

Final Contract	3NT West
Opening Lead	♦Q
Table Result	Making 5, N/S -660
Director Ruling	Down 2, N/S +200
Panel Ruling	Making 5, N/S -660

(1)	Asked and explained as 11-15 HCP
(2)	No alert

The Facts: The opening lead was the ♦Q and the result was 3NT by West making five, N/S-660. North/South called the director after the opening lead was faced and dummy was spread. East thought that the 2♦ bid was a cuebid showing clubs and spades per their agreement. West thought the 1♦ bid was artificial and therefore no alert of 2♦ was required. The director took North away from the table where the player said he would have led a spade had he known the 2♦ bid was natural.

The Ruling: The director ruled that the failure to alert 2♦ resulted in a disadvantage to N/S. A spade lead would have resulted in 3NT going down two, N/S

receiving +200. (Law 40.B.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 as these Laws require is entitled to rectification through the award of an adjusted score.")

The Appeal: E/W appealed the director's ruling. The reviewer talked extensively with both the E/W pair and the N/S pair to determine the exact order of events and to determine partnership agreements. E/W had discussed the use of 1NT and double over Precision 1♣ or 1♦ bids, but had no agreement concerning the 1♣-2♣ or 1♦-2♦ sequences. The reviewer polled eight 750-1500 point players concerning their opening lead. Two scenarios were used in polling two separate groups of players with four players in each group, one in which the correct alert of 2♦ was made, and the second where no alert was made. The most telling comment was made by a player from the second group who complained "I have no idea what to lead when I have no clue what is going on in this auction."

Since neither East nor West believed that their own understanding of the 2♦ bid required an alert no explanation of the bids was made prior to the opening lead.

The Decision: In discussion with the panel several topics arose. One panelist pointed out that if 1♦ is to be treated as natural, despite it being as short as two diamonds, then West has made a misbid and no protection to N/S is due. Another argument made was that cuebids or natural bids of opponents' suits have a self-alerting quality that should prompt investigation. The panelists also discussed the topic of Precision players (N/S) who are quite aware that opponents frequently have trouble with their overcall methods and "by experience or expertise recognize their opponents have neglected to Alert a special agreement will be expected to protect themselves." (from the Alert pamphlet) N/S shared with the reviewer that in the previous 12 boards E/W had had several bidding misunderstandings which also should have prompted more investigation from North prior to selecting his opening lead.

Even if the agreement is reached that the 2♦ bid should have been alerted, the panel decided that the weight of other factors (cuebids having a self-alerting effect, the odd progression of the auction if North woodenly believed West to have 5/5 in the majors, their own experience of playing precision and the frequency of opponents misbidding following 1♣ and 1♦ openings, along with North's knowledge that E/W had previous bidding problems) should have led North to ask questions prior to making his opening lead.

The panel overturned the ruling of the table director and allowed the original table result to stand, E/W +660.

The Panel: Dan Plato (Chair), Matt Koltnow and Bill Michael

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: Not enough information. The reviewer talked extensively with each pair to determine their agreements. It would have been nice to let us in on his

findings. 1♦ was either natural (which the ACBL deems as 3+ cards) or it was a convention (if it can be two or fewer cards). The text suggests the latter, but never actually states which agreement was in place.

If 1♦ is 2+, then it's a convention. According to the ACBL alert chart, no cue bids of conventional opening bids are alertable. In that case, there was no infraction, and the table result stands.

If 1♦ is 3+, then it's natural. Natural overcalls of natural opening bids are alertable. The failure to alert was an infraction. Nearly everyone plays cue bids as Michaels (perhaps every other cue bid should be alertable...I alert cue bids when they are not Michaels), so North just reasonably assumed 2♦ showed the majors. This made the winning lead substantially less attractive, so N/S was damaged by MI. 3NT down two is a likely result without the MI, so N/S +200, E/W -200.

I suspect that 1♦ could be short (why would anyone ask if there was no alert?), so it's likely that result stands was the correct ruling.

Barry Rigal: It would be helpful to have definitive clarification on this issue. Does a natural 2♦ require an alert? (I think both 2♦ as clubs and spades OR natural requires an alert from East). Should E/W have explained the auction anyway? My guess is that the failure to alert was MI, and that there was also a UI issue when West bid 3NT over 3♣. I think N/S were hard done by here — though I'm not sure how to adjust the score here — arguably N/S are not entitled to the full benefit of defeating 3NT.

Adam Wildavsky: The write-up implies that 1d could be short, but does not say so outright. Assuming that it did not promise at least three diamonds I see no irregularity by EW. In any case if North wanted to know what 2♦ meant he could have and should have asked. I expect most players would not know whether 2♦ requires an alert here, regardless of what it means. After a perusal of the ACBL's alert regulations it seems to me that none is required.

I agree with the Panel's decision. Had I any doubt (for instance if 1d had promised 3+ diamonds) I would apply the regulation I termed "pernicious" in case NABC+ 2. If it has any applicability it must be here: "Players who, by experience or expertise, recognize that their opponents have neglected to alert a special agreement will be expected to protect themselves."

APPEAL	Non-NABC+TWO
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Eric Bell
Event	A/X Pairs
Session	2 nd
Date	November 29, 2011

BD#	10
VUL	Both
DLR	E

3,100 Masterpoints	
♠	Q82
♥	AK1085
♦	10
♣	K1098

7,500 Masterpoints		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	8,500 Masterpoints	
♠	AJ753		♠	964
♥	—		♥	976
♦	J87632		♦	KQ4
♣	J2		♣	Q754

3,100 Masterpoints	
♠	K10
♥	QJ432
♦	A95
♣	A63

West	North	East	South
		P	1♥
P	2NT¹	P	2NT/3NT²
P	4NT	P	5♠³
P	6♥	P	P
P			

Final Contract	6♥ by South
Opening Lead	♠A
Table Result	Making 6, N/S +1430
Director Ruling	4♥, Making 4, N/S +650
Panel Ruling	6♥, Making 6, N/S +1430

(1)	Jacoby 2NT, not alerted
(2)	South originally put 2NT on the table, told the director it was a mechanical error and director allowed the change to 3NT.
(3)	Shows two keycards and the queen of trump

The Facts: The opening lead was the ace of spades and the result was 6♥ by South making 6, +1430. E/W called the director during the auction and after the hand.

The Ruling: The director ruled that North was in possession of Unauthorized Information due to the failure to alert the 2NT bid and that 4♥ was a logical alternative

to 4NT. West argued that in defending 4♥ he would not lead the ace of spades but find a more passive lead. The score was changed to 4♥ by North making 5, +650 (per laws 16.B and 12.C.1.e: "The score assigned in place of the actual score for a non-offending side is the most favorable result that was likely had the irregularity not occurred.").

The Appeal: North/South appealed the director's ruling. The reviewer met all four players following the event to verify the facts as presented by the director at the table. Later he talked with North about their partnership agreements. He determined that 3NT showed balanced extras in their partnership agreement. North/South frequently open 1NT (15-17) with five card majors according to their convention cards. They also play a fairly simple set of conventions and agree that any cuebid over 3NT would show first round controls, not second round controls. North's view of his hand was that it was too good to use a splinter bid and when South showed a balanced hand with extras (quite possibly 18 or 19 since she could have opened 1 NT with 15-17 and a five card major) he had more than enough with his fifth heart, strong trump controls, singleton, and six loser hand to drive to slam.

The reviewer gave the North and South hands to five pairs asking them to continue the auction after 1♥-2NT-3NT. Almost all the expert players chose 4♣ as their next call. About half continued to slam, others stopped at 4♥. When told they could not make the cuebid per partnership agreement, most of the pairs stopped at 4♥. The reviewer also asked three players in the 3000-4000 point range and two indicated they would bid 4N, the other said he would bid 4♥.

The Decision: While it is clear that Unauthorized Information exists for North, Law 16.B.1.(a) states: "After a player makes available to his partner extraneous information that may suggest a call or play, . . . the partner may not choose from among logical alternatives one that could demonstrably have been suggested over another by the extraneous information." The panel agreed that the UI here actually suggests that South was confused, had forgotten their agreements, and did not have a particularly strong hand (all supported by the 14 point hand she actually had), and for North, trying to put the brakes on this auction by bidding 4♥ rather than 4NT could be the winning action. North took an original view of his hand that elevated it above the limited splinter bid, and when South bid 3NT, showing 18 or 19 balanced points, North was handcuffed by methods that allowed him only one way to explore slam.

The panel overturned the ruling of the table director and allowed the original table result to stand, N/S +1430.

The Panel: Dan Plato (Chair), Gary Zeiger, Terry Lavender, Jean Molnar and Brian Russell

Experts consulted: Tom Carmichael, Kevin Dwyer, Mike Cappelletti, Jr., Also four players in the 2500-3500 point range were polled.

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: Was there UI? Yes, North had two sources of UI, his partner's withdrawn call, and his partner's failure to alert 2NT.

What did the UI suggest? The former suggested that partner thought he had bid less than he had, probably 1NT. If so, partner rates to have about 18 HCP. In practice, the misbid was probably really a slip, but North does not know that, so that partner bid 2NT originally is UI, since 2NT was not a legal bid. The failure to alert suggests that partner does not know we have heart support, plus he thinks North is limited to about 14 HCP. All in all, the UI strongly suggests bidding more rather than bidding less.

What are the LAs for North after partner's 3NT? Most play that 1H-2NT; 3NT shows extra values, but less than 1H-2NT; 3H, typically around 14-15 balanced or maybe just a sixth trump and a minimum. Given that, most of North's peers would probably either sign off in game or make a slam try. North insists that his partnership cannot make a slam try below game. If N/S had supplied system notes to that effect, we could accept such a statement, but we are encouraged not to without solid documentation. Let's say N/S had that documentation. Then it is probably too risky to move past game, and 4H is sufficient. If North did make a slam try, it would be either 5D or 5H. 5H will probably get passed. It's hard to say what would happen to 5D, but a substantial portion of the time, it'd produce 5H. So while 5D may be a LA, the combination of North's choosing it and South's doing something that produced a worse score than 650 seems less than an at all probable event. If North could make a slam try below game, there is a substantial chance that N/S would reach slam. 1H-2NT (natural); 3NT-4NT is 18-19 balanced. Presumably 4C instead of 4NT shows about the same with club concentration. It's hard to figure out what would happen thereafter. It's possible that N/S would reach 6H. It's also possible they'd reach 6NT.

Does the UI suggest the actual choice over less successful LAs? You bet. Driving to slam when your hand is both better than and contains more support for partner's suit than he expects is demonstrably suggested by the UI. Therefore, 4NT is an infraction. We must adjust the score. I don't think anything better than 650 is likely for E/W, so they get -650. It's possible N/S would reach 6NT. It's borderline at all probable; I'm guessing that North would jump to 6H at some point, and South would pass, so I'll judge that reaching 6NT is just barely not at all probable and award +650 for N/S.

Was West's lead a failure to play bridge? No, not at all; leading an ace against a slam, particularly when you are void in trump, is normal. So E/W get -650.

Was North's 4NT a sufficiently big abuse of UI to warrant a PP? Yes, I'd give him a 1/4 board PP.

Did the appeal have merit? No. Award an AWMW.

Barry Rigal: First let me make it clear that I like the Panel Ruling; there was no UI pointing to North doing more than 4♥. The Panel realized this point and made the right ruling. Having said that, there is something seriously wrong either with the poll or the way the panel have to respond to it. When you ask a poll question you need to have strict constraints as to what you do with the information from it. Here the Panel basically ignored the poll, in essence deciding that the wrong question was asked. If this was so the write-up should just have ignored the poll. But in abstract when a poll indicates Pass as the mainstream action you can't ignore it. This particular issue — of the panel ignoring polls, because it knows better — needs addressing so that formal guidelines apply.

Adam Wildavsky: The TD ruling was woefully incomplete. It is not enough to determine that UI was present, but also what actions, if any, it suggested. The panel did so and I agree with their reasoning. Their decision looks right to me.

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ THREE
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	John Ashton
Event	Tuesday Evening A/X Swiss
Session	Single
Date	November 29, 2011

BD#	26
VUL	Both
DLR	E

11,500 Masterpoints	
♠	KJ953
♥	J432
♦	62
♣	Q9

5,150 Masterpoints		Fall 2011 Seattle, Washington	1,200 Masterpoints	
♠	108		♠	AQ4
♥	A10		♥	K865
♦	108754		♦	K93
♣	A762		♣	K84

11,500 Masterpoints	
♠	762
♥	Q97
♦	AQJ
♣	J1053

West	North	East	South
		1NT ¹	P
2♣	P	2♥	P
2NT ²	P	P	P

Final Contract	2NT by East
Opening Lead	♦Q
Table Result	Making 2, N/S -120
Director Ruling	Down 1, N/S +100
Panel Ruling	Down 1, N/S +100

(1)	15-17 HCP
(2)	Was not alerted as may or may not have a four-card major

The Facts: The opening lead was the ♦Q and the result was 2NT by East making 2, +120. N/S called the director when dummy was tabled and upon completion of play.

The Ruling: Prior to making his opening lead South inquired more than once about E/W partnership agreements about the 2NT bid. The only explanation he ever got was that E/W played "regular Stayman." The director determined that South would have led a spade if West promised no four card major. If East ducks the first spade North could shift to a club (he has no outside entry and no reason to pursue the spades). Declarer can win the club in hand and start to establish diamonds. South would win and

continue club leads before the diamonds can be established. N/S would win three diamond tricks, one spade, and two clubs. The table result was changed to 2NT by East down 1, +100 for N/S.

The Appeal: E/W appealed the director's ruling. The reviewer met briefly and separately with both pairs in between rounds of the Swiss Team event. E/W agreed that an alert and full explanation was due to their opponents, but East argued that he would always make eight tricks. N/S play 1NT-2NT as purely invitational. E/W had four way transfers marked on their convention cards.

The reviewer took four separate polls on various elements of the hand: viability of the queen of diamonds lead, opening lead if the 2NT bid is alerted and explained, if North is allowed to win at trick one what lead would be made at trick two, and viability of East ducking the first spade.

The panel's original feeling was that the queen of diamonds was an unattractive lead and was the cause of N/S not finding the line of defense in beating the contract. In polling four expert players two chose the queen of diamonds as the one and only lead that might set the contract.

Given a full explanation of the 2NT bid three of four polled players chose a spade as their opening lead.

When allowed to hold the first spade lead, two of three people holding the North hand indicated they would switch to a club.

Polling three experts given the East hand and told the opening lead was the ♠7, covered with dummy's 8, and North contributing the 9, one expert stated "I feel certain the spade honors are on my right and I can afford to duck." Two other experts stated that ducking at trick one felt right to them.

The Decision: Given that all elements of the table director's ruling were supported by a variety of expert players, the panel determined that the table director's ruling was appropriate and allowed the adjusted score to stand. Laws applied were Law 47.E.2.(b): "Change of Play Based on Misinformation: When it is too late to correct a play under 2 (a) above, the Director may award an adjusted score"; and Law 12.C.1.(e).(i): "The score assigned in place of the actual score for a non-offending side is the most favorable result that was likely had the irregularity not occurred."; and Law 40.B.6.(a).: "When explaining the significance of partner's call or play in reply to an opponent's inquiry, a player shall disclose all special information conveyed to him through partnership agreement or partnership experience. . ."

The Panel: Dan Plato (Chair), Anita Goldman, Bill Michael and Brian Russell

Experts consulted: Mike Passell, Cezary Balicki, Cameron Doner, Bernace De Young, Dan Gerstman, Steve Landen, Kevin Dwyer, Joe Godefrin, Dennis Clerkin, Jerry Clerkin

Commentary:

Jeff Goldsmith: Was there misinformation? Yes. East misexplained 2NT. But if South inquired more than once about 2NT, could he not have just asked, "does 2NT promise a 4-card major?" That's not a "bad" question, just one which many players don't know has to be answered. If East had been a very experienced player, I might grant that South should assume he knows to provide that information. Given that he wasn't, I'm going to put the onus on South to have found out and judge that he was not damaged by MI he could have and should have overcome. Maybe not all Souths, but one with 11,000 masterpoints who knows his opening lead choice is dependent on this information must ask.

I'll rule that the table result stands. E/W, however, get a 1/2 board PP for failure to explain (West has over 3,000 MPs—surely he should know to say something before the lead) that 2NT didn't promise four spades.

Alternatively, I'm happy to rule that the MI caused damage and give E/W -100. And that South's opening lead was a wild gamble and was the primary cause of his side's bad result, so they keep it. Each of these come to about the same thing, so feel free to pick which one appeals to you more.

Bottom line is that I am not giving free shots to folks when their opponents forget to (or don't know to) alert and explain in accordance to this particularly obscure regulation.

Barry Rigal: First things first; that's a bunch of experts who have been consulted for a non-NABC appeal. Second East was playing four-suit transfers so 'knew' what 2NT meant. He owed his opponents more care —and what about West for heaven's sake, when his partner refused to define his bid properly? I'm amazed South didn't lead a club —after which 2NT is easy (or easier) — but that said, I'd expect 2NT to go down on a spade lead. So correct TD and panel ruling. In my opinion East if an expert is close to a PP.

Adam Wildavsky: I see no merit to this appeal. Why did EW believe that they could be allowed to profit once they had provided misinformation? Even had the DQ been judged a serious error that would have resulted only in a change to the NS score -- EW would have kept their result.

Note the contrast of South's actions with North's in the first Non-NABC+ case. There North did not ask any questions in a situation where he needed to. Here South had no need to ask -- 2N can have only one meaning when it is not alerted. He never the less asked for clarification, and more than once. Should he have said "Does 2N promise a 4-card major"? He might have a right to do so, but it is not what the league encourages. Per the ACBL Alert Procedures, "The proper way to ask for information is "please explain."

One aspect of the write-up is incorrect in an instructive way: "The director determined that South would have led a spade if West promised no four card major." No one can make such a determination without the power of divination. Instead we must, as the Panel notes, apply Law 12C1(e): "The score assigned in place of the actual score for a non-offending side is the most favorable result that was likely had the irregularity not occurred." They omitted the second clause, which is also important: "For an offending side the score assigned is the most unfavorable result that was at all probable had the irregularity not occurred."

THE COMMENTATORS

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 website (<http://www.gg.caltech.edu/~jeff>) contains lots of bridge and other material.

Ton Kooijman was born in the early forties (he wants some mystery to remain in his life). His father was a good bridge player who 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.

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. 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. 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. 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.