

APPEAL	NABC+ FOUR
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Olin Hubert
Event	Silver Ribbon Pairs
Session	First Final
Date	March 12, 2007

BD#	8
VUL	None
DLR	West

Rebecca Rogers	
♠	J 8 2
♥	Q 5 4 3
♦	Q J
♣	9 6 3 2

Alan Siebert		Spring 2007 St. Louis, Missouri	Alan Stout	
♠	K Q 9 7		♠	A T 5 4 3
♥	A 8 7 2		♥	K J 9
♦	A 8 4		♦	9 7
♣	T 8		♣	A J 7

Dixie Hsu	
♠	6
♥	T 6
♦	K T 6 5 3 2
♣	K Q 5 4

West	North	East	South
1NT ¹	Pass	2♥ ²	2NT
3♠	Dbf ³	Pass	4♦
Pass	Pass	4♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	4♠ by West
Opening Lead	♦Q
Table Result	4♠ making 5, E/W +450
Director Ruling	3♠ dbld, made 5, E/W +730
Committee Ruling	3♠ dbld, made 5, E/W +730

(1)	Announced as 10-13 HCP
(2)	Transfer announced
(3)	All agreed to long break in tempo

The Facts: The director was called at the end of the hand. All the players agreed to the auction and hesitation. North stated that their partnership agreement is that 2NT shows strength (cards) and 2♠ would be a cue bid. In addition, North stated that an immediate double of a weak notrump shows 14+ HCP (any distribution). South stated that 2NT was intended to show the minor suits.

The Ruling: The director judged that pass was a logical alternative to bidding 4♦ with the South hand. Two players were polled and they both passed the double in the auction given. The result was adjusted to 3♠, doubled, making five, E/W +730.

The Appeal: North stated that since their partnership agreement was that 2NT by South in this sequence showed strength, and 3NT by the North hand would be to play, that double would be pass or pull since her partner knew she didn't have 14+ HCP. South stated that she was aware of North's hesitation, but that her 4 diamond bid was automatic.

East pointed out that North could have one more spade and an Ace and King more than she had and still have less than 14 HCP.

The Decision: The committee asked the North-South pair if they had any notes or anything else in writing to support the agreements referred to in their appeal. North stated that the notes were in her room, but not with her. The committee considered the lack of any written notes indicating the North-South agreements, and the fact that in an undefined auction, the hesitation before doubling by North, suggested bidding with the South hand.

Since pass by South was considered a clear cut Logical Alternative to the action taken, the committee upheld the director's ruling of 3♣ doubled making five, +730 E/W. This was per Law 16, unauthorized information from break in tempo. The play to take eleven tricks is straightforward and eleven tricks was the result achieved at the table.

An appeal without merit warning (AWMW) was issued to N/S.

The Committee/Panel : Gail Greenberg (Chair), Bob Schwartz, Ken Barbour, Chris Moll, Dick Budd.

Commentary:

Goldsmith If, indeed, N/S had the agreements North believed they did, it's clear that South didn't know them, negating North's argument. The real issue is whether North can have a penalty double of 3♣. The opponents have announced a 9-card fit, so about the only hand possible is AKQ/Axxx/xxx/xx. That's pretty unlikely, but just barely possible, so passing is a LA. Is South's action sufficiently blatant to award a PP? Yes--in order to avoid one, I think she needs to think about the problem at the table, conclude that the double was not penalty, Alert the double, explain that there may be some system stuff going on that she forgot, and act. She won't get to pull, but she also won't get her PP.

Polisner North should have known better than to have brought this frivolous appeal.

Rigal Well done by the director and committee to give the AWMW. This is pretty close to a procedural penalty, and certainly to discussion of its merits, though I can understand why none was given.

Smith Correct by the directors, and a thorough and thoughtful job by the committee. The polling results should have convinced the appellants not to appeal so the AWMW was correct.

Wildavsky I'm surprised N/S brought this appeal.

Wolff An open and shut ruling. There is no doubt that North was only trying to make the right bridge bid, considering that she thought 2NT was natural. However, the study made it obvious to South that partner did not have a full blown penalty double opposite a minor suit takeout. There are extenuating circumstances such as West's free 3♠ bid, but nevertheless convention disruption (CD) should continue to pay a significant price since in most cases, including here, what North did ends the legitimate bridge at the table immediately.

Zeiger I have one issue. If the Committee considered the system notes to be germane, the Chair should have asked North if she was staying in one of the host hotels, and asked her to get them. Since she was indeed staying at one of them, the Committee should not have considered the lack of notes as relevant. If she was asked to get them, and declined, this should have been included in the write up. If the Committee decision would have been the same, but the merit issue changed, with system notes, obtaining them would still have been important.