

APPEAL	NABC+ TEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Steve Bates
Event	Jacoby Open Swiss Teams
Session	First Qualifying
Date	March 15, 2008

BD#	28
VUL	N/S
DLR	West

Dariusz Kowalski	
♠	T 7 3
♥	T 9 2
♦	7 5 4 3
♣	T 7 6

Billy Cohen		Spring 2008 Detroit, MI	Ron Smith	
♠	A J		♠	K 9 5
♥	Q 6 4 3		♥	A K 7 5
♦	Q T 8 6		♦	A K J
♣	K Q 9		♣	A 8 3
		Konrad Araszuiwicz		
		♠	Q 8 6 4 2	
		♥	J 8	
		♦	9 2	
		♣	J 5 4 2	

West	North	East	South
1♦	Pass	1♥	Pass
2♥	Pass	2♠ ¹	Pass
3♥ ²	Pass	4NT ³	Pass
5♦ ³	Pass	5NT	Pass
6♣ ³	Pass	6♦ ³	Pass
6♥ ⁴	Pass	6NT	Pass
7NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	7NT by E
Opening Lead	♦9
Table Result	Made 7, E/W +1520
Director Ruling	6♥ E, made 7, E/W +1010
Committee Ruling	7NT W, made 7, E/W +1520

(1)	Asks about raise.
(2)	Four-card support and a maximum.
(3)	5♦ + 1 key card, 6♣ = ♣K, 6♦ = ♦K.
(4)	Break in tempo (BIT) of 2-3 minutes.

The Facts: The director was called after the 7NT bid and again after conclusion of the play. The director determined the facts as presented above.

The Ruling: The director determined that there was a B IT that demonstrably suggested the call taken over the (less successful) logical alternative (LA) call of pass. Therefore, in accordance with laws 16A, 73 and 12 C 2, the director adjusted the score to 6♥ by East, making seven, E/W plus 1010.

The Appeal: All players except West attended the hearing.

East had a prime 22 count, including the jack of his partner's first bid suit, and he knew that his side had all the aces and kings. His partner's 3♥ bid had shown a maximum, and E/W's opening style is fairly sound. East could have bid 5♠ rather than 5NT to ask for the heart queen, but he wanted his partner to focus on his diamond length and all around strength toward bidding seven. East judged that 6NT was virtually certain to succeed, while 6♥ could go down if trumps were 4-1 or 5-0. In bidding only 6NT, East was "taking the low road." That is, he bid only a small slam, rather than the slam that his partner's BIT suggested.

N/S did not like the fact that West hesitated for two minutes and later bid 7NT. They thought that there might be hands where 6♥ would make but 6NT would not. However, when they attempted to construct one, they could not.

It was agreed that the 6♥ bid took about two minutes and the 6NT bid was made in tempo.

The Decision: East's logic, his bids and his hand all indicated that he intended to drive to 6NT, while inviting seven. Further, it is difficult to see how the 6NT bid was demonstrably suggested by West's BIT. Thus the committee allowed East's 6NT bid. Since East's bids were made in tempo, West did not possess any UI and was free to bid as he judged best. The table result of 7NT by West, making seven, E/W plus 1520 was reinstated.

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chair), Jeff Aker, Jacob Morgan, Bob White and Michael White.

Commentary:

Goldsmith The committee corrected a very poor tournament director ruling.

Polisner Well reasoned decision.

Rigal Looking at the East cards you can see that there were no LAs to the try for a grand slam, and it is certainly arguable that the tempo did not suggest that action (although it might suggest 'Not-Pass' over 'Pass'). It is easy in such positions to shoot the hesitator or his partner but I like both the initial tournament director ruling and the committee adjustment.

Smith I think the committee got this one right. Once East is allowed to bid 6NT (and I think he should be), then West is free to do whatever he wants since he is not in possession of any UI.

Wildavsky A thorough job by the committee.

Wolff Finally no convention disruption (CD), so bridge can be played. I agree with the committee's decision for the reasons given. I am not a fan of the ever so slow 6♥ bid, but to each his own. Bridge would be so much better off if the following was severely reduced (done away with would be much better):

1. CD.
2. Misbids are judged and administered differently than misinformation (the ability to psych, the lame excuse for not, can easily be determined as opposed to the 99+% of the time it being a forget under the guise of a misbid).
3. Extra long studies in sensitive auctions and then a conservative choice.
4. The ACBL to allow judging cases using law 12C3 instead of just 12C2.