

APPEAL	Non NABC+ FOUR
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Millard Nachtwey
Event	Bruce LM Pairs
Session	First Final
Date	July 16, 2006

BD#	26
VUL	Both
DLR	East

3545 Masterpoints	
♠	A J
♥	A J 4
♦	Q J T 8
♣	K 8 6 2

1303 Masterpoints		Summer 2006 Chicago, Illinois	2210 Masterpoints		
♠	K Q 9 7 4		♠	8 6	
♥	T 7		♥	K Q 6 5 3 2	
♦	6 5 4 3 2		♦	A	
♣	5		♣	9 7 4 3	
		3000 Masterpoints			
		♠	T 5 3 2		
		♥	9 8		
		♦	K 9 7		
		♣	A Q J T		

West	North	East	South
		2♥	Pass
Pass	2NT ¹	Pass	3♥ ²
Pass	3♠	Pass	3NT
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Final Contract	3NT by North
Opening Lead	♥K
Table Result	N/S +630
Director Ruling	4♠ by N, down 2, E/W +200
Panel Ruling	4♠ by N, down 2, E/W +200

(1)	No Explanation.
(2)	North Announced "Transfer."

The Facts: The director was called at the end of the hand. The N/S agreement was that systems are not on after a notrump overcall. North said she could not have four spades because she always would start with a double (rather than a notrump overcall) holding the other major. South said that North did not necessarily show a heart stopper with her 2NT bid. His 3♥ bid (rather than bidding 3NT) was checking to make sure she had one.

The Ruling: The convention card did not have enough information to satisfy law 75D2 and there were no system notes available. 3♥ could have been Stayman, in which case the transfer Announcement suggests that the 3♠ bid may not show four spades. The UI demonstrably suggested that 3NT is more likely to succeed than the logical alternative (if there was no Announcement) of 4♠. In accordance with laws 16, 73F1 and 12C2 the table result was adjusted to 4♠ by North, down two, E/W +200.

The Appeal: N/S appealed the ruling. All four players attended the hearing. West said he asked for an explanation of 2NT after his partner led face down.* He was told it showed a strong notrump opening bid but did not necessarily show a full heart stopper (QTx is not considered a full stopper). N/S said that they told him that North's hand could not contain four of the other major because that hand would always start with a double, but neither East nor West heard that part of the explanation. N/S said they had system notes in their room that supported their explanations. Shortly thereafter E/W said they were not staying for any more of the hearing. South, who seemed annoyed with North, left a minute or so later.

**[N/S strongly disputed this. They said the explanation was not requested until the play was completed. East could not remember when his partner asked.]*

North explained the system. Notrump overcalls and takeout doubles have at least 15 HCP (she said she would have passed 2♥ if her hand did not have the ♦Q). In addition, had she held four of the other major she would have to start with a double. She does not need to have a full stopper to bid 2NT, so a cuebid primarily asks about the quality of the stopper. She is supposed to bid her minor without a full stopper; 3NT with a stopper and 3♠ with two stoppers, but she "fudged." Later she said she bid the hand accurately, but it was accidental. They play 0+ HCP overcalls. Her partner could have bid 2♠ over 2♥ with as little as 8 points vulnerable.

The reviewer told North to bring him all the system notes before the 7:30 PM game time. He was given a hand written spiral bound notebook (8 1/2 by 11) with four and a half of the 98 pages filled. The printing was large, legible and covered 1NT (strong and weak), 2NT and 3NT openings and responses thereto. It covered direct and balancing 1NT overcalls. It covered direct 2NT overcalls of one bids (19-21) and direct 2NT overcalls of weak twos (which was close to the balancing system described by North) But, it had nothing about balancing 2NT over weak twos or about any other part of their system. When asked about the notes for the rest of the system, North said there were two other notebooks – but one was in the car and she couldn't find the other.

The panel had met between sessions and had decided that, as long as the system notes verified North's statements, the table result would be restored. It reconvened to review the system notes. The panel noted that not only was bidding in the balancing position over weak twos not covered but there was nothing about South's possible actions in direct seat or their takeout double structure.

The Decision: N/S was unable to produce the promised, relevant, system notes, so there was no reason to change the table director's ruling. N/S should have known at the time of the appeal that their notes were inadequate; therefore, an Appeal Without Merit Warning (AWMW) was issued.

The Panel: Charles MacCracken (Reviewer), Candy Kuschner, Terry Lavender, Peter Marcus and Gary Zeiger.

Players Consulted: None