

APPEAL	NABC+ FIVE
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Ken Van Cleve
Event	North American Swiss
Session	Second Final
Date	November 26, 2006

BD#	8
VUL	None
DLR	West

Steve Bloom	
♠	Q 8 2
♥	4
♦	7 5
♣	A K 9 7 5 4 2

Andreas Babsch		Fall 2006 Honolulu, Hawaii	Renate Hansen	
♠	A 7		♠	K 9 4
♥	Q J T 6 3		♥	A K 9 7 2
♦	Q J 9 6 4 2		♦	K 3
♣			♣	Q T 6

Betty Bloom	
♠	J T 6 5 3
♥	8 5
♦	A T 8
♣	J 8 3

West	North	East	South
1♥	3♣	4♣ ¹	Pass
4♥ ²	Pass	4NT ³	Pass
5♣ ⁴	Pass	5♥ ⁵	Pass
6♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	6♥ by West
Opening Lead	♣A
Table Result	6♥ making 6, E/W +980
Director Ruling	5♥ - W, making 6, E/W +480
Committee Ruling	5♥ - W, making 6, E/W +480

(1)	Asking for aces..
(2)	East said showed two aces. West said showed one ace.
(3)	Asking for kings.
(4)	No kings.
(5)	Break in Tempo (BIT) – rated as slight by West, denied by East.

The Facts: The director was called at the conclusion of the auction. N/S contended that East broke tempo prior to bidding 5♥, which was a sign-off; but, West felt he could bid 6♥ because partner had to have all the controls or a doubleton club.

The Ruling: There was UI as a result of the BIT. 6♥ was demonstrably suggested by the UI. According to several players who were polled as to what West should call after 5♥ by East, pass was determined to be a less successful logical alternative (LA). Therefore the table result was adjusted to a contract of 5♥ by West making six, +480 for both E/W and N/S.

The Appeal: West said that he expected all the aces to be held when East bid 4NT and that she would be looking for a Grand Slam. The partnership could not show aces and did not cuebid.

North said that he thought East was using Hesitation Blackwood to get partner to bid on with a club control.

The Decision: The committee determined that in the absence of any form of notes, and anything but a very cursorily completed convention card, that E/W had no agreement in place as to what the 4NT did or did not promise.

It would be easy to follow the "Intelligence Transfer" and assume that because all committee members would not bid 4NT unless they held all the aces that E/W would play the same way. But, quite clearly that was not the way East played the bid.

That said, the question was whether the BIT suggested bidding on -- which it clearly would do to West notwithstanding that this was manifestly not East's intention -- and whether there was any LA to the 6♥ call.

Since the club void figured to be wholly or partly wasted facing the expected club control in partner's hand, West might reasonably expect partner to have: KQx/Axxx/Kx/AQxx or the like. Slam would be on a finesse through the preempter and no diamond ruff.

As the directing staff's poll, a poll of experts, and the committee themselves all voted by a majority that pass was a LA, the ruling was upheld leaving the director's adjustment in place, contract of 5♥ by West making six, +480 for both E/W and N/S.

No appeal without merit warning (AWMW) was awarded as the points at issue were considered sufficiently complex.

The Committee: Barry Rigal (Chairperson), Chris Moll, Bill Pollack, Hendrik Sharples and Ellen Wallace.