

| | |
|---------|---------------------------------------|
| APPEAL | NABC+ THREE |
| Subject | Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo |
| DIC | Henry Cukoff |
| Event | Rockwell Mixed Pairs |
| Session | Second Qualifying |
| Date | March 11, 2008 |

| | |
|-----|-------------|
| BD# | 8 |
| VUL | None |
| DLR | West |

| | |
|-------------------------|-----------|
| Bernace De Young | |
| ♠ | 9 |
| ♥ | A J 6 5 3 |
| ♦ | 5 4 |
| ♣ | A Q J 6 2 |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Stanley Yellin | | Spring 2008 Detroit, MI | Karen Yellin | |
| ♠ | 5 | | ♠ | A K Q 7 6 3 2 |
| ♥ | Q 9 4 2 | | ♥ | K 8 |
| ♦ | A K Q T 8 3 | | ♦ | 6 2 |
| ♣ | K 7 | | ♣ | T 4 |

| | |
|------------------|---------|
| Cam Doner | |
| ♠ | J T 8 4 |
| ♥ | T 7 |
| ♦ | J 9 7 |
| ♣ | 9 8 5 3 |

| | | | |
|------------------|-------|------|-------|
| West | North | East | South |
| 1♦ | 2NT | 3♠ | 3NT |
| Dbl | Pass | Pass | 4♣ |
| Dbl ¹ | Pass | 4♠ | Pass |
| Pass | Pass | | |

| | |
|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Final Contract | 4♠ by E |
| Opening Lead | ♥T |
| Table Result | Making 5, E/W +450 |
| Director Ruling | 4♠ E making 5, E/W +450 |
| Committee Ruling | 4♠ E making 5, E/W +450 |

| |
|-----------------------------------|
| (1) After a break in tempo (BIT). |
|-----------------------------------|

The Facts: The director was called after the 4♠ bid and again at the end of the play. 2NT showed hearts and clubs. 3♠ was forcing. West asked about 2NT at his turn and broke tempo before the second double. (length of the BIT was disputed). South said “he considered his options.” West said there was “a slight break.”

The Ruling: Polling established that pass was not a logical alternative (LA). Since law 16 A was not violated, the table result of 4♠ by East making 5, E/W plus 450 was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: N/S argued that the hesitation showed doubt. If you were going to bid 4♠, you should have done it at your previous turn to call. South characterized the hesitation as 5-7 seconds. East judged it to be 2 or 3 seconds and West around 5 seconds. The reason to double 4♣ was to stop partner from bidding.

The Decision: The committee discussed whether there was an unmistakable hesitation. We discussed the normal tempo of the auction, but shelved it for a later time. Next, the committee judged that if there was a BIT, it did suggest bidding over passing. The committee then discussed whether pass was a LA. Four members of the committee felt that although pass could be right, as the poll suggested, it was an action unlikely to be chosen by anyone. Since pass was not a LA, the committee upheld the director's decision to allow the table result of 4♠ by East making five, E/W plus 450 to stand. The appeal was found to have merit.

The Committee: Aaron Silverstein (Chair), Lynne Deas, Gail Greenberg, Ed Lazarus and Jacob Morgan.

Commentary:

Goldsmith Another without merit. Would anyone even consider playing 4♣ doubled holding the East hand? If I took a poll, I bet I'd get more "what's the problem" replies than thoughtful hesitations. 3NT doubled with what looks like 7-8 tricks, sure---but 4♣ with one or two?

Polisner I agree, but I would have had a problem in determining that there was even an unmistakable BIT. South's 3NT bid was an effort to mess with the opponents' auction and then later complain that an opponent may have taken a few seconds to "consider his options." I normally like to see the steps in UI cases considered in proper order. I agree that there was no LA to bidding 4♠. I would have issued a appeal without merit warning (AWMW).

Rigal Sensible decision and the merit of this appeal was certainly not all that apparent – though I can live with the decision. No reason for the N/S argument that East had to bid over 3NT doubled, since he was happy to defend that contract.

- Smith** This was a distasteful appeal. South threw sand in the eyes of the opponents, and then objected when they needed a small amount of time to work out what to do in the unusual auction he had created. In such circumstances we should be slower to decide that a meaningful hesitation has occurred, but in any event the committee decided correctly that pass was not a LA for East anyway. N/S should have been given an AWMW.
- Wildavsky** I'm delighted that the director took a poll. I'd have loved to know the result of the poll, not just the conclusion drawn. It might have affected both N/S's decision to appeal and the committee's decision whether to assess an AWMW.
- Wolff** Result stands N/S minus 450, E/W plus 450, but a one MP procedural penalty (PP) penalty for E/W. Again the calibration regarding the PP resulted in a small penalty with the following facts considered: 1. A short BIT, 2. West, having to deal with a psychic by his right hand opponent, 3. East having such an overwhelming choice of bidding 4♠. "Let the punishment fit the crime, tra la!"