

APPEAL	Non NABC+ Two
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Charles MacCracken
Event	Senior Swiss Teams
Session	Second of Two
Date	March 14, 2010

BD#	20
VUL	Both
DLR	West

5,400 Masterpoints	
♠	A K Q 8 6
♥	J T 4 2
♦	8 4 2
♣	9

4,000 Masterpoints		Spring 2010 Reno, NV	5,200 Masterpoints	
♠	7		♠	J 9 2
♥	K 9 8		♥	5 3
♦	J T 7 6		♦	A K 9
♣	K Q 7 6 3		♣	J T 5 4 2

5,500 Masterpoints	
♠	T 5 4 3
♥	A Q 7 6
♦	Q 5 3
♣	A 8

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

Final Contract	4♠ by North
Opening Lead	♦ A
Table Result	Made 4, N/S + 620
Director Ruling	4♠ N made 4, N/S + 620
Panel Ruling	4♠ W down 1, E/W - 100

(1)	Slow
-----	------

The Facts: The director was called immediately after North's double and again after the play of the hand was completed.

It was agreed that there were breaks in tempo (BIT) – slow passes by South.

The Ruling: Since North knew that South would not open light in fourth seat and that N/S had half the deck's high cards, it was judged that pass was not a logical alternative. Therefore, there was no violation of Law 16 and the table result was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: E/W appealed the director's decision and all four players attended the review.

E/W felt, after South passed, two freely made bids at the two and three levels (2♠ and 3♥), that North could not take a third call on a hand that did not open.

North knew that South would not open light in 4th seat and had to have either a major suit fit or long diamonds or defense to 4♣.

The Decision: Three players with about 5,500 masterpoints were given North's hand. Two passed and did not feel that North had another call. The third bid 4♦ but felt that pass was a logical alternative.

The panel, therefore decided that pass was a logical alternative and changed the contract to 4♣ by West with a result of down one for both sides – E/W minus 100 and N/S + 100.

The Panel: Peter Marcus (Reviewer), Nancy Boyd, Susan Doe and Candace Kuschner.

Commentary:

Rigal In a non-NABC case I'm convinced that the poll taken should be followed. Yes, South was 'marked' with relatively short spades (how could he not bid 3S with his actual hand?) so North knew two spade winners rated to stand up. But North had shown his extras twice and the third time was bidding on his partner's tempo. As usual, we have to encourage the others to be honest, and if N/S have to be sacrificed on the altar of good examples, so be it.

Polisner Although I prefer a poll of more than 3 players, but with the results of the poll, as well as my own opinion, makes Pass a LA and the decision correct.

Wildavsky Nice work by the panel. Rather than accepting an abstract argument as to whether a pass would have been logical, the TD ought to have done as the panel did and posed the hand as a problem to a few players.
As regards the panel's poll, I would always like to see the exact questions asked. Here it seems as though the panel asked whether Pass was a Logical Alternative. That is a question for the Panel to determine themselves. I prefer to ask just two questions

A. "What call would you make?"

B. "It is clear cut?" or "Is it close?"

Wolff A decent ruling, but with a downside. Because of the BIT EW will inevitably be able to choose whatever result worked out best for them, either 4 clubs doubled or not doubled or whatever North cheated his way into bidding. It is OK, even right to rule it back to 4 clubs not doubled, but EW should never be given the best of a number of options. In match points especially so since PTF (protect the field) comes into play.