

APPEAL	Non NABC+ Fourteen
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Kevin Perkins
Event	Second Sunday Open Pairs
Session	First of Two
Date	December 6, 2009

BD#	23
VUL	Both
DLR	South

1,250 Masterpoints	
♠	Q J T 7 2
♥	A Q J 2
♦	
♣	A Q 7 3

512 Masterpoints		Fall 2009 San Diego, CA	58 Masterpoints	
♠	K 9 8 4		♠	
♥	7		♥	K T 8 4 3
♦	A K Q T 8 5		♦	9 6 3 2
♣	K 8		♣	J 6 4 2

2,150 Masterpoints	
♠	A 6 5 3
♥	9 6 5
♦	J 7 4
♣	T 9 5

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1♦	Dbl	2♦ ¹	Pass
3NT	Pass	4♦	Pass
Pass	Dbl	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	4♦ doubled by West
Opening Lead	♠Q
Table Result	Made 4, E/W + 710
Director Ruling	3NT W down 2, E/W - 200
Panel Ruling	3NT W down 2, E/W - 200

(1) Alerted. Explained as inverted minor.

The Facts: The director was called after the play of the hand was completed. East was not in agreement that inverted minors applied over a double.

The Ruling: The director judged that UI was available to East and that the UI suggested bidding. Pass was judged to be a logical alternative. Therefore the result was adjusted for both sides to 3NT by West down two, E/W minus 200. Laws 16B1 and 12C1.

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

East stated that she would never play NT with a void even if she had a good hand.

The Decision: Four peers of East were polled. Two would have passed over the double and two would have bid 2♦. All four passed 3NT. Two of North's peers were polled. They both passed 3NT (because of the pitches needed on diamonds). Both said that after 4♦ they realized that East wasn't limit and they doubled 4♦.

Therefore, by laws 16B1 and 12C1, the result assigned to both pairs was 3NT by West down two.

While the appeal had no merit, the panel determined to simply educate a player with 58 masterpoints.

The Panel: Bernie Gorkin (Reviewer), Matt Koltnow and Charlie MacCracken.

Commentary:

Polisner First of all, nobody would play 2♦ as inverted. However, after West told East that it was inverted, that was UI and the correct ruling and decision followed.

Rigal Education is all well and good but there is a time and place –and that is after the AWMW award. Maybe the panel should have recalled Dorothy Parker's modification of the line about leading a horse to water but not being able to make it drink – she used 'horticulture' as the central theme.

Smith Routine, but another AWMW missed. An AWMW doesn't really have much teeth, but it does at least say to pig-headed appellants that you wasted our time, and you should have known it.

Wildavsky A pair sophisticated enough to lodge an appeal is sophisticated enough to receive an AWMW. The AWMW is an educational measure, and it ought to have been employed here.

Wolff Again, a simple, but well-reasoned decision.