

APPEAL	Non NABC+ ONE
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Boyd
Event	Bruce 0-5000 LM Pairs
Session	First Qualifying Session
Date	July 23, 2010

BD#	26
VUL	Both
DLR	E

2152 Masterpoints	
♠	AQJ5
♥	984
♦	J
♣	AQ872

4658 Masterpoints		Summer 2010 New Orleans, LA	3440 Masterpoints	
♠			♠	T982
♥	A32		♥	KQJ
♦	98652		♦	Q743
♣	KJT96		♣	53

1678 Masterpoints	
♠	K7643
♥	T765
♦	AKT
♣	4

West	North	East	South
		P	P
1♣	1♠	1NT	4♠
P ¹	P	P	

Final Contract	4♠ by North
Opening Lead	♥K
Table Result	Made 4, NS +620
Director Ruling	4♠ doubled made 4, NS +790
Panel Ruling	4♠ doubled made 4, NS +790

(1)	Alleged fast pass over jump to 4S by South
-----	--

The Facts: North-South called the Director after the auction, alleging that West passed immediately after South's jump to 4♠.

The Ruling: The Director determined that West passed immediately after the jump to 4S. The Director found that the fast pass after 4♠ conveyed unauthorized information to his partner that suggests passing because his opening bid was weak in third seat. The Director ruled that double was a logical alternative to pass because half of the players polled indicated that they would double with the East hand. The Director adjusted the score to 4♠X +790 North-South.

The Appeal: East-West appealed the Director's ruling asserting that double was not a logical alternative to pass with the East hand. East-West admitted to the fast pass over 4♠ and that there was unauthorized information available to partner from the fast

pass. East-West asserted that while there was unauthorized information from the fast pass of 4♠, they felt that there was authorized information available to East that suggested the final pass, i.e. West's third seat opening bid and failure to double 4♠.

The Decision: The Panel polled six players with between 3000-5000 points. Four players bid 1NT and then doubled 4S with the East hand. The other two players passed the 1♠ overcall but would have doubled 4♠ if they had bid 1NT. One player thought partner's pass of 4♠ was forcing.

The Panel decided that East had unauthorized information pursuant to Law 73C. The question then became whether double was a logical alternative to pass with the East hand. The Panel decided as a result of the polling data that double was clearly a logical alternative to pass in this auction. Therefore, since the fast pass demonstrably indicated that West had a weak hand, Law 16B1 required that East double 4♠.

The Panel: Bernie Gorkin (Chairman), Bill Michael, and Peter Marcus.

Commentary:

Bramley: Was the STOP card used? This seems like such an obvious question that I can't believe nobody asked it. While good form is to pause after any skip-bid, with or without the STOP card, the violation is clearer when it is used. Since West agreed that he quick-bid it's all moot. I like the ruling and the precedent.

E/W have a valid point that the auction itself is suspicious enough to deter East from doubling. However, styles vary, and East cannot be allowed to work it out with an assist from partner.

Goldsmith: No Merit.

Rigal: I really like the basis of this decision but I'm shocked, shocked that East would be deemed to have to double here. With no trump trick and ♥KQJ a broken reed on defense, I think West might have been due a PP, but N/S got an unexpected and undeserved bonus. I look forward to reading RW's comments here.

Wildavsky: Was the Stop Card used? It doesn't affect this ruling, but enquiring minds want to know!

That said this was a fine effort by the TD. Kudos to NS for calling him and giving him a chance to make it.

Not only has the appeal no merit, I'd have assessed a procedural penalty against West for his failure to follow prescribed procedures. Apparently he has not been called to account for such violations often enough. How many of his 4658 MPs were won with actions like this one?

Wolff: A wonderful innovative ruling which addresses unethical fast passes which attempt to preclude partner from acting further.