

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ One
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Matt Koltnow
Event	Friday Evening Swiss Teams
Session	N/A
Date	March 1, 2008

BD#	33
VUL	None
DLR	North

3270 Masterpoints	
♠	Void
♥	K Q J 9 4
♦	K 9 6 5
♣	A K 6 4

87 Masterpoints		Spring 2008 Detroit, MI	86 masterpoints	
♠	T 5		♠	A K Q J 9 7 3 2
♥	A 5 2		♥	3
♦	J 8 4		♦	3 2
♣	Q T 7 5 2		♣	J 9

4365 Masterpoints	
♠	8 6 4
♥	T 8 7 6
♦	A Q T 7
♣	8 3

West	North	East	South
	1♥	4♠	5♥ <sup>1</sup>
Db1 <sup>2</sup>	Pass	5♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	5♠ by E
Opening Lead	♥6
Table Result	Down 2, N/S +100
Director Ruling	5♥ dbld N, making 6, N/S +750
Panel Ruling	5♥ dbld N, making 6, N/S +750

(1)	10 second pause observed, all agree
(2)	Break in tempo by West, about 13 seconds

**The Facts:** The director was called after East bid 5♠. All agreed to an approximate 13 second hesitation by West before the double of 5♥.

**The Ruling:** By Law 16A and 12C2, pass was substituted for East's 5♠ bid and the contract and result were changed to 5♥ doubled by North, making six, N/S plus 750.

**The Appeal:** West stated that his double promised a defensive trick, but partner was allowed to pull. East admitted he had not promised any defense when he bid 4♠. He said, with the eighth spade, he thought pulling was clear since he couldn't be hurt much in 5♠. North/South said that the double should have discouraged a 5♠ bid, particularly since East had a potential defensive trick. Only the BIT encouraged pulling the double.

**The Decision:** Ten peers of East/West were consulted about what they would do with the East hand over 1♥, and then after 5♥, double, pass. Six would have bid 4♠. Of these, five would have passed the double. They were not given the UI.

The panel decided the UI from the BIT demonstrably suggested doubt about the wisdom of the double, and thus the pull to 5♠. The player poll clearly established pass as an unsuggested LA. The panel assigned a result of 5♥ doubled by North, making six, N/S plus 750.

While the appeal had no substantial merit, the panel did not award an appeal without merit warning (AWMW) to two players, each with less than 100 masterpoints, who seemed willing to learn from the experience.

**The Panel:** Gary Zeiger (Reviewer), Nancy Boyd, Jay Albright

**Players consulted:** Ten of East/West's peers.

**Commentary:**

**Polisner** I seriously doubt that it is possible to find ten peers (players with 86 masterpoints) except in a novice game. Be that as it may, the BIT suggested doubt and pass is a LA to 5♠.

**Rigal** Yes there was a tempo break and it did suggest bidding 5♠, with pass a LA. I can understand no AWMW, but if they know enough to appeal they know enough to get an AWM.

**Smith** Not good enough. There is no doubt that this appeal lacked merit. When that is true, committees and panels need to say so by issuing an AWMW. If a pair is ruled against by the directors and they do not understand it, they have a right to have it explained. After that, if they persist in appealing, they need to be told that they wasted the time of many people. Experience as a bridge player is not relevant.

**Wildavsky** An AWMW is a judgment about the appeal, not the appellants. If the panel finds the appeal lacks merit, it ought to issue a warning. The pair will learn at least as much with an AWMW as without one. If they have indeed learned, they'll accumulate no more warnings and will have no need for concern.  
The criterion for being experienced enough to accrue a warning is being experienced enough to file an appeal.

**Wolff** This case is a classic case of a BIT cancelling partner's takeout of a penalty double. Players should learn from this that in order for their judgment to be applied they must do so without BITs. Some are slow to learn, others never do or do not want to. Good ruling.