

APPEAL	NABC+ EIGHT
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Zeiger
Event	Roth Swiss Teams
Session	Second Final Session
Date	August 1, 2010

BD#	18
VUL	NS
DLR	E

Renee Mancuso	
♠	AKQ42
♥	
♦	AQJT3
♣	Q54

Michael Polowan		Summer 2010 New Orleans, LA	Jacob Morgan	
♠	J9875		♠	3
♥	J53		♥	T9762
♦	7		♦	K8652
♣	J962		♣	T8

Sheri Winestock	
♠	T6
♥	AKQ84
♦	94
♣	AK73

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

Final Contract	6NT by North
Opening Lead	♥9
Table Result	Made 6, NS +1440
Director Ruling	6NT made 6, NS +1440
Committee Ruling	3NT made 6, NS +690

(1)	Forcing
(2)	Alerted as agreed stall bid; 2-3 spades expected
(3)	Long hesitation; 15+ seconds agreed by all

The Facts: All four players agreed that there was a long hesitation by North of 15 or more seconds before her 3NT bid. East-West called the director after South bid 4NT.

The Ruling: The director polled three players who indicated that they would bid 4NT with the South hand because they had not shown extra values and that North's auction suggested extra values. The director ruled that even though the break in tempo demonstrably suggested bidding on, pass was not a logical alternative to 4NT on the

given hand. Therefore, the director ruled no adjustment because Law 16B1 was not violated.

The Appeal: East-West appealed the director's ruling and all four players attended the committee hearing. East-West argued in committee that pass was a logical alternative to 4NT on the given hand and asserted that the hesitation was much longer than 15 seconds, which North-South agreed to. North-South argued that pass was not a logical alternative and that the break in tempo didn't necessarily suggest moving on because it could have been based on a strain decision rather than extra values.

The Decision: The committee decided by applying Laws 16 and 12 that the hesitation in this auction usually shows extras and so demonstrably suggests bidding on, and that pass was a logical alternative. It adjusted the contract to 3NT making six for +690 North-South. It also noted that one committee member's teammate did in fact pass on the same auction.

The Committee: Aaron Silverstein (Chairman), Barry Rigal, Ira Chorush, Jeff Meckstroth, and Gary Cohler.

Commentary:

Bramley: Another tough one. While a technical analysis of the auction indicates that North implies extra values, and South has undisclosed extra values herself, South also knows that they have a misfit and will need more than just SOME extras to undertake a slam. Note that North does have considerably more than what would be needed to qualify as "extras". Bidding on with the South hand is not automatic, even though it may be the "right" bid. Given that pass is a logical alternative, the Committee made the right decision.

Goldsmith: Not only do I think passing 3NT is a LA, I think it's the only alternative. South has extras, but she also has a misfit. Time to get out while the getting out's good. Good ruling, AC.

Kooijman: Not much to say. Good idea to have partners of AC-members proving the logical alternative.

Rigal: I did write a dissent here but can't retrieve it right now. I'm convinced that fourth suit followed by a delayed no-trump action indicates doubt about strain or level. South has huge extras – more than enough to underwrite the four-level. Therefore there is no logical alternative to action here.

Wildavsky: This decision involved my teammates. As I noted in case 4, being objective about one's own cause is a difficult matter. I won't attempt it here.

Wolff: Somewhat tough decision, but certainly on the bidding given it is a logical alternative for South to pass 3NT so that I would choose that action to be forced.