

APPEAL	NABC+ FOURTEEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) and Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Silodor Open Pairs
Session	First Final
Date	March 19,2010

BD#	16
VUL	E/W
DLR	West

G. Venkatesh	
♠	J 9 7 4
♥	6
♦	Q 9 7 6 5 3
♣	Q 4

Gloria Silverman Bart		Spring 2010 Reno, NV	Les Bart	
♠	T 5		♠	6 2
♥	A K Q J		♥	9 8 7 2
♦	8 4 2		♦	A K
♣	A K J 7		♣	9 8 6 3 2

Jyotindra Shah	
♠	A K Q 8 3
♥	T 5 4 3
♦	J T
♣	T 5

West	North	East	South
1♣	2♦	3♣	3♦
3♥	Pass ¹	4♥	Pass ²
Pass	Db1 ³	Pass	4♠
Db1	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	4♠ doubled by South
Opening Lead	♣ A
Table Result	Down 2, N/S -300
Director Ruling	4♥ W making 5, E/W +650
Committee Ruling	4♥ W making 5, E/W +650

(1)	North reached to the bid box, pulled back, then passed.
(2)	South reached to the bid box, pulled back, then passed.
(3)	Shows no defense to 4♥, not Alerted.

The Facts: The director was called after the auction and again after the play was completed.

The facts are as described above. E/W said that the MI did not result in damage.

The Ruling: The MI did not result in damage. However, UI was available to North before North's double, which was deemed to be demonstrably suggested by the UI. Pass in place of a double was determined to be a logical alternative. Therefore the contract was changed to 4♥ by West and the result of making five assigned to both pairs (E/W plus 650 and N/S minus 650).

The Appeal: N/S appealed the director's decision. North, East and West attended the hearing.

North agreed that the double of 4♥ was not Alerted by South and conventionally showed no defense to 4♥. E/W acknowledged that they were not damaged by the failure to Alert. There was the "reaching for the box" by South (and to some extent by North over 3♥). However, North said that the double was almost required from the bidding and the vulnerability (favorable for N/S), and, subsequently, it was normal for South to bid 4♠ on the way to a possible 5♦. Upon questioning by the committee, it was determined that N/S were an experienced and successful international partnership.

E/W stated that the "reaching" by South over 4♥ made it easier for North to double to show no defense. They added that there was a brief hesitation by South that may have indicated some uncertainty as to what to do over 3♣ before South's 3♦ bid.

The Decision: The committee determined that bridge players should know not to reach for the bidding box until they are sure of the bid they want to make. An experienced pair such as N/S should certainly know this. While the committee had sympathy for North's double, it agreed with the director that pass was a logical alternative. Therefore, it ruled as the director had and adjusted the result for both sides to 4♥ by West making five.

The committee found that the appeal had substantial merit.

The Committee: Jeff Roman (Chairman, Tom Peters (Scribe), Bruce Reeve, Jim Thurtell and Bob White.

Commentary:

Goldsmith Ruling solid. Finding of merit questionable

Polisner Whether the AC thought that players should know better about "reaching" is irrelevant unless it was considering imposing a PP against N/S. The issue is one of UI which existed due to the "reaching". Good ruling and decision.

Rigal I believe this to be a very tough call. I can understand where the committee was coming from. I wish that a group of players could have been found who supported its view. I really don't know what I would have done so I can't complain too violently about any decision.

Wildavsky I see no merit to this appeal. North said his double was "almost" required. If his system did not absolutely demand a double, though, then the laws required him to pass.

Wolff More on the stupidities we allow by not railing against them