

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Three
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) -Tempo
DIC	Jean Molnar
Event	Sat/Sun KO
Session	Final
Date	November 25, 2007

BD#	13
VUL	Both
DLR	North

3,800 Masterpoints	
♠	9 8
♥	9 7 5 2
♦	Q 5 2
♣	A T 6 5

3,000 Masterpoints		Fall 2007 San Francisco, CA	1,100 Masterpoints	
♠	A J 5 2		♠	7 6 4
♥	A T		♥	K Q J 8 3
♦	A 9 8 7		♦	6 3
♣	Q J 8		♣	7 3 2

450 Masterpoints	
♠	K Q T 3
♥	6 4
♦	K J T 4
♣	K 9 4

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

Final Contract	2NT, by West
Opening Lead	♦2
Table Result	2NT, by West, making 2, E/W +120
Director Ruling	4♠ by West, down 2, E/W -200
Panel Ruling	4♠ by West, down 2, E/W -200

(1)	Announced as transfer.
(2)	Break in tempo (BIT).
(3)	BIT.

The Facts: The defenders were told before the opening lead that 2♥ was not a transfer. The director was called after the auction was completed. Neither North nor South would have bid differently.

The Ruling: After discussion, the directors felt that West's bidding was not consistent with the information she gave her opponents about their agreement. In accordance with laws 16 A and 12 C 2, the score was adjusted to 4♠, down two, E/W minus 200.

The Appeal: East stated that she forgot their methods and felt that she could not rebid her hearts. She chose to rebid 2NT, since she did not feel she could pass. West thought that the hand might play well in notrump, thus her decision to pass.

N/S noted that there were two BITs, not one, and that West's choice of final call was inconsistent with the hand she held.

The Decision: The panel felt that UI existed and that both East and West could have selected calls suggested by the UI. East could have elected to raise spades. If she does so, her partner would bid game. The BIT by East before bidding 2NT demonstrably suggested a pass as the panel felt that West had a clear bid of 4♠ over the 2NT call.

In accordance with laws 16 A and 12 C 2, the panel upheld the director's decision of 4♠, down two, E/W minus 200.

The appeal was judged not to have merit and an appeal without merit warning (AWMW) was issued to E/W.

The Panel: Mike Flader (Reviewer), Ron Johnston, Gary Zeiger.

Commentary:

Polisner Classic case of UI and West taking full advantage. I would have issued a further penalty against West for blatantly taking advantage of the UI.

Rigal Clearly West picked up from the tempo on the problem here from his failure to repeat the spades. Might South have doubled 4♠ and collected 500? An AWMW equally clearly appropriate.

Smith What does a 2♠ bid by a 1NT overcaller mean after partner signs off in 2♥? Spades? A heart game try? An obvious (and therefore authorized) indication that the 2♠ bidder thought 2♥ was a transfer? What would East think if there had been no announcement of transfer (the conditions that the directors and panel should have started from)? What does the hesitation before bidding 2♠ "demonstrably suggest?" What does the hesitation before the 2NT bid "demonstrably suggest?" All of these issues should have been decided only after polling some players. Although the adjustment may have been ultimately correct, there is nothing to justify it except for the opinions of directors. And that is not how this system is supposed to work. It seems that the directors and panel eventually focused on West's pass to 2NT and almost certainly correctly decided that the UI from the slow 2NT bid alerted West that the train was off the tracks, and that 4♠ is a logical alternative to passing. But process matters, and it wasn't followed as it should have been in this case.

Wildavsky Good work all 'round.

Wolff Another good ruling. Both convention disruption and UI must be eradicated and when they occur, the bridge police will always take over.