

APPEAL	Non NABC+ FIVE
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Doug Grove
Event	Red Ribbon Pairs
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	March 15, 2007

BD#	8
VUL	None
DLR	West

675 Masterpoints	
♠	J
♥	K Q J T 2
♦	T 5
♣	K J T 9 8

1,536 Masterpoints		Spring 2007 St. Louis, Missouri	578 Masterpoints	
♠	9 8 5 3 2		♠	A K T 6
♥	8 4		♥	A 7 6 5
♦	K J 7		♦	Q 6 4 3
♣	Q 6 3		♣	2

760 Masterpoints	
♠	Q 7 4
♥	9 3
♦	A 9 8 2
♣	A 7 5 4

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♥	Pass	1NT ¹
Pass	2♣	Dbl	2♥
2♠	3♥	3♠	Dbl ²
Pass	4♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	4♥ by North
Opening Lead	♠A
Table Result	4♥ made 4, N/S + 420
Director Ruling	3♠ dbl, W, made 3, E/W+530
Panel Ruling	3♠ dbl, W, made 3, E/W+530

(1)	Forcing.
(2)	After agreed break in tempo (BIT). A pause of 20-25 seconds.

The Facts: An unmistakable hesitation, just before the double by South, was agreed to by all four players.

The Ruling: The bid of 4♥ was demonstrably suggested by the BIT and pass is a less successful logical alternative (LA). Therefore in accordance with laws 16 A2, 12 C2 and 73 F1 the result was adjusted to 3♠ by West doubled, making three, E/W plus 530.

The Appeal: North said he could not conceive of a South hand that would defeat 3♠ after his partner limited his hand to three spades and 11 or fewer points with his 1NT bid. North said the 2♥ bid could show two, three or four hearts, but admitted that the subsequent double suggested a small number of hearts. He did not bid 4♣ because N/S had found a heart fit and because his suit was so good. E/W had a train to catch and just reiterated the long break and the likelihood of South having a doubleton heart.

The Decision: Two players with approximately 700 masterpoints were consulted. They both passed after bidding 3♥ and hearing partner double. Since there was an unmistakable break in tempo that demonstrably suggested not passing and pass was a LA, the panel upheld the table director's decision of 3♠ by West doubled, making three, E/W plus 530 in accordance with laws 16 A2, 12 C2 and 73 F1. An appeal without merit warning (AWMW) was issued.

The Panel: Charles MacCracken (Reviewer), Su Doe, Patty Holmes, Candy Kuschner and Gary Zeiger.

Commentary:

- Polisner** It is difficult to construct many hands which have a shot to defeat 4♠ holding the North hand, but pass is a LA.
- Rigal** Well done on the AWMW and the decision by both houses. Yes North has low defense but this was not an auction where he was being consulted. I understand no procedural penalty given North's weakness and extra shape. We have to see more of these rulings to try to keep the players in order.
- Smith** Good, including the AWMW.
- Wildavsky** I agree -- this appeal had no merit.
- Wolff** Another taking advantage of UI decided after the hesitation was confirmed. Well done.