

APPEAL	Non NABC+ Ten
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Arleen Harvey
Event	Second Thursday Afternoon Side Game
Session	Only
Date	December 3, 2009

BD#	17
VUL	None
DLR	North

310 Masterpoints	
♠	J 7 4
♥	K Q 9 7 5
♦	K J T 9 5
♣	

6,269 Masterpoints		Fall 2009 San Diego, CA	176 Masterpoints	
♠	A Q 8 5 2		♠	9 3
♥	2		♥	J 6 3
♦	A 8		♦	Q 7 4
♣	K Q 9 6 4		♣	J T 8 7 3

585 Masterpoints	
♠	K T 6
♥	A T 8 4
♦	6 3 2
♣	A 5 2

West	North	East	South
	1♥	Pass	3♥
4♣	4♥	Pass ¹	Pass
4♠	Pass	5♣	Dbl
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Final Contract	5♣ doubled by West
Opening Lead	♥K
Table Result	Made 5, E/W + 550
Director Ruling	5♣ dbld W made 5, E/W+ 550
Panel Ruling	5♣ dbld W made 5, E/W+ 550

(1)	Agreed break in tempo (BIT).
-----	------------------------------

The Facts: The director was called at the time of the BIT and again after the play of the hand. The hesitation was agreed by all four players.

The Ruling: West's previous bid suggested his intent to bid 4♠ over an expected 4♥. In this auction, for this West, pass was not a logical alternative. Therefore, the table result stands.

The Appeal: N/S appealed the director's decision and were the only players to attend the hearing. E/W were present when N/S indicated they would appeal the ruling but had disappeared by the end of the session when the paperwork was ready to be signed. North and South both thought the BIT by East over 4♥ was in the range of 10-12 seconds and stated that E/W had agreed to the BIT. Each felt the BIT suggested bidding on and that pass by West was a logical alternative especially because of the lack of suit quality.

The Decision: Law 16B1 states that after a player makes available extraneous information to partner by a hesitation, partner may not choose from among logical alternatives one that could have been demonstrably suggested by that information. A logical alternative is one that, among the class of players in question and using the methods of the partnership, would be given serious consideration by a significant proportion of such players, of whom it is judged some might select it.

Seven players with a masterpoint holding similar to that of West were polled on how they would handle the West hand. Four cuebid 4♥ immediately, one bid 4♣, and two bid 3♠. One of the 3♠ bidders and one of the 4♥ bidders would consider 4♣; and they, as well as the actual 4♣ bidder, said they were then committed to bidding 4♠ if the opponents competed to 4♥.

The panel judged that although there was a BIT, and that BIT demonstrably suggested not passing, pass was not a logical alternative for a player who had elected to bid 4♣ at his previous turn. The table result was allowed to stand for both sides.

The appeal was judged to have merit.

The Panel: Jay Albright (Reviewer), Nancy Boyd and Mike Flader.

Commentary:

Polisner Proper ruling and decision.

Rigal Sensible decision by both the director and panel. Not such an easy decision either.

Smith Very good by the directors and the panel. Not much merit that I can see, though.

Wildavsky I agree with both rulings. I don't see any merit to the appeal. As everyone must have been aware, West committed to bidding again when he started with 4♣.

Wolff Since NS should have beaten 5♣ with a first trick overtaking of partner's king of hearts lead and a diamond shift (an easy defense) N/S should lose all of their leverage and must go minus 550 in 5♣ doubled, making five. Whether E/W should be penalized for the hesitation disruption, before West completed his planned attack and bid 4♠ over the opponent's 4♥, is up to the committee. My suggestion is to allow E/W to keep their earned score of plus 550 but be slapped with a procedural penalty of somewhere between a 1/4 and 1/2 of a board penalty for East's slow pass over North's 4♥ bid, followed by West's 4♠ bid. In this way equity is served with most masters being tended to.