

APPEAL	Non NABC+ SEVEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Priscilla Smith
Event	Stratified Open Pairs
Session	First of Two
Date	March 16, 2007

BD#	21
VUL	N/S
DLR	North

1,300 Masterpoints	
♠	A 8 3
♥	T
♦	Q 8 7 6 5 4
♣	K 7 2

469 Masterpoints		Spring 2007 St. Louis, Missouri	568 Masterpoints	
♠	K Q J 7 6		♠	T 9 8 5 2
♥	9 8 5		♥	K 6
♦	T		♦	A J 2
♣	A 8 5 4		♣	Q T 9 6

1,400 Masterpoints	
♠	4
♥	A Q J 7 4 3 2
♦	K 9 3
♣	J 3

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

Final Contract	4♥ dbld by South
Opening Lead	♠K
Table Result	4♥ dbld S, made 5, N/S +990
Director Ruling	3♠ dbld E, made 3, E/W +530
Panel Ruling	3♠ dbld E, made 3, E/W +530

(1) Agreed break in tempo. N/S said it was not long.

The Facts: All players agreed that North hesitated before doubling East's 3♠ bid.

The Ruling: The BIT demonstrably suggested bidding over a logical alternative (LA) of passing the double.

Therefore, in accordance with laws 16 and 12, the result was adjusted to 3♠ by West doubled making three, E/W plus 530.

The Appeal: N/S were a regular partnership. South said that North always bids “deliberately.” South didn’t feel that the hesitation before the double was as long as E/W did. But, N/S agreed it was a BIT of maybe 15 seconds. North said she was a very aggressive bidder, often opening strong offensive hands with little defense at the one level. South also said that North had several times in the past doubled the opponents after South opened at the one-level with the contract making because South had little defense. Therefore, N/S had agreed that, if North doubled and South didn’t have what she should have for defense, South was expected to pull the double and not leave North out on a limb. North did not feel she should double less frequently because of South’s known aggressiveness but that South should pull doubles if she had little defense. North said she was considering bidding 4♥ or doubling – not passing or doubling. E/W had little to say other than they felt that the BIT was longer than N/S did, maybe 20-30 seconds.

The Decision: The panel felt a BIT had occurred. N/S had no note on their card about their history with ineffective penalty doubles and that the comments were self-serving. Four players from the Red Ribbon Pairs (the Red Ribbon Pairs played different hands) with about 1400 masterpoints were given the hand South held. One bid 4♥, three passed (one of whom considered bidding 4♥). Pass was considered a LA. Since the 4♥ call was demonstrably suggested by the BIT and pass considered a less successful LA, the score was adjusted to 3♠ doubled by E/W making three. This was in accordance with laws 16 A2 and 12 C2.

Given the N/S experience level, it was felt that they should have known their obligation not to take an inference from a BIT. Therefore an appeal without merit warning (AWMW) was issued.

Players Consulted: Four players from the Red Ribbon Pairs each with approximately 1400 masterpoints.

The Panel: Peter Marcus (Reviewer), Su Doe and Patty Holmes.

Commentary:

Polisner A typical UI case and routine AWMW.

Rigal Okay we got our AWMW – and again we are getting close to procedural penalties. I'm happy with the decision not to give one – maybe the panel might have mentioned the possibility though. Nice to see the non-experts are living up to the ethical standards of the experts....

Smith Correct and clear-cut, including the AWMW.

Wildavsky I agree -- this appeal had no merit.

Wolff Another good ruling, but, if North hesitated before doubling (agreed), then North was being unethical by taking out.
Appeals committees and panels should increase their responsibility to lessening the instances of this happening in the future.