

APPEAL	NABC+ TWELVE
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	NABC+ IMP Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	March 15, 2007

BD#	11
VUL	None
DLR	South

Andre Chartrand	
♠	
♥	J T 9 8 6 5 3
♦	9
♣	Q J 8 5 4

Chris Willenken		Spring 2007 St. Louis, Missouri	Robert Levin	
♠	9 7 6		♠	K Q T 8 4 3
♥	K 4		♥	A 7 2
♦	K J T 3 2		♦	Q 8 6 5
♣	A K 9		♣	

Serge Chevalier	
♠	A J 5 2
♥	Q
♦	A 7 4
♣	T 7 6 3 2

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1NT	Dbl ¹	2♥ ²	2♠
Pass	Pass	Dbl	3♣
Pass	Pass	4♣	Pass
4♠	Pass	Pass	Dbl ³
Pass	5♣	Pass ⁴	Pass
Dbl	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	5♣ doubled by South
Opening Lead	♣K
Table Result	5♣ dbld S down 1, N/S -100
Director Ruling	4♠ dbld W made 4, E/W +590
Committee Ruling	4♠ dbld W made 4, E/W +590

(1)	Pointed or rounded suits.
(2)	With no double a transfer. With double was not discussed.
(3)	An agreed hesitation, moderate in length.
(4)	Director called about hesitation.

The Facts: The E/W NT range is a good 14 to 17 HCP. There was an agreed break in tempo (BIT) prior to South's double of 4♠.

The Ruling: The BIT demonstrably suggested bidding rather than passing. Pass was considered to be a logical alternative (LA). The result was adjusted to 4♠ by West doubled making four, E/W plus 590 in accordance with laws 16 A2 and 12 C2.

The Appeal: South's voluntary 2♠ bid showed a fit for one of North's suits and interest in competing. North passed 2♠ because he knew the hand belonged to the opponents and wanted to make the auction obscure. North passed 4♠ because the opponents might be bidding toward slam, and he felt he had done enough. He pulled the double since partner's bid had shown interest in competing in clubs, and it was unlikely that a passed hand would have 4♠ beat by itself. North was willing to defend 4♠ undoubled but not doubled.

E/W did not appear. Given the agreed BIT prior to South's double of 4♠, the hand spoke for itself.

The Decision: A BIT before South's double of 4♠ was established. The BIT clearly suggests that North pull the double with a doubtful hand. Was pass a LA to 5♣? North had already described a "joke" hand by passing 2♠. The IMP odds on doubling four of a major for a one-trick set are 5-2 against doubling. Thus, South would not normally double unless he expected to set 4♠ in his own hand. Here, it is clearly logical for North to pass 4♠ doubled. Give South AJTx or AJT9 of spades, for example. Going minus 300 in 5♣ doubled instead of plus 100 against 4♠ doubled costs 9 IMPs.

The committee adjusted the result to 4♠ doubled by West making four, E/W plus 590. Since North held a freak hand and South had freely supported clubs, the committee decided that the appeal had merit.

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chair and Scribe), Dick Budd and Adam Wildavsky.

Commentary:

Goldsmith Good job on the ruling and the write-up. I'm not convinced that the appeal without merit warning (AWMW) should have been rejected, but it's OK to fail to give one.

Three-man appeals committees (ACs) are a bad thing, and one in which two of the three are regular partners ought never happen.

Polisner Again, I disagree with a director and the appeals committee (AC) deciding on its own what is a logical alternative without a poll of peers. I also disagree with the AC that North had already described a "joke" hand by passing 2♠. To me, the question is whether passing 4♠ doubled is logical holding minus defense. I am distressed by North's either brilliant analysis about why he passed 2♠ or was just making it up after the fact.

Rigal I have quite a bit of sympathy with North here; he has a defenseless freak, and his partner has announced a club fit. I think I would have been in sympathy with allowing the pull.

Smith Well done by all again.

Wildavsky I haven't changed my mind. I agree with the TD and AC decisions.

Wolff Overall a good ruling. North was really insinuating himself when he passed 2♠, then passed 4♠, and finally took out his partner's slow double. E/W should have discussed the meaning of a possible transfer after interference, but that turned out to not be a factor.

Zeiger I have just one minor quibble. Why were Doug Doub and Adam Wildavsky, longtime partners, on the same committee? Correct decision.