| APPEAL | NABC+ SEVEN |
| :--- | :---: |
| Subject | Unauthorized Information (UI) |
| DIC | Henry Cukoff |
| Event | Lebhar IMP Pairs |
| Session | Second Qualifying |
| Date | March 19, 2009 |




| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{NT}^{1}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{*}^{2}$ | $4{ }^{3}$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{v}$ | Pass | 6 | Pass |
| Pass | Pass |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |


| Final Contract | $\mathbf{6}$ by East |
| :--- | :---: |
| Opening Lead | $\mathbf{\wedge 6}$ |
| Table Result | Made 6, E/W +1370 |
| Director Ruling | N/S Average +, E/W Average - |
| Committee Ruling | $\mathbf{5}$ E, making 6, E/W +620 |


| $(1)$ | $15-17$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| $(2)$ | Majors. |
| $(3)$ | Announced as transfer to hearts. |

The Facts: The director was called at the conclusion of the play of the hand. The facts are as described above.

The Ruling: The director judged that East's unilateral action of bidding $6 \leqslant$ after a $4 \vee$ bid that makes no sense may have been based on unauthorized information. In accordance with Law 12C1(d), an artificial adjusted score was awarded based on the fact that no rectification could be made that would allow normal play of the hand. Therefore, N/S received an average plus and E/W received an average minus.

The Appeal: E/W appealed the director's decision. North was the only player who did not attend the hearing.
E/W maintained that $4 \star$ must either be a transfer (their agreement) or strong with diamonds. East said he would always bid $6 \star$. West said that East might bid $4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$, but then he would bid $6 \star$.
N/S said that 6 was an attempt to clear up a misunderstanding.
The Decision: The committee determined that there was UI that West thought East had hearts. $6 \star$ is likely to correct that misunderstanding. $4 \uparrow$ was a logical alternative. After $4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$, the committee felt that West was likely to bid $5 \star$. Then East might pass or bid $6 \star$. The committee judged that $5 \star$ was both likely and at all probable. The committee considered whether West might bid $6 \vee$ on some auctions, forcing East to correct to $7 \star$, but judged the possibility not even at all probable. The committee saw no reason to invoke Law 12C1(d). Therefore, the result for both sides was adjusted to $5 \bullet$ by East, making six, $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}+620$, per Laws 16 and 12C1e.

The committee found that the appeal had merit.
The Committee: Aaron Silverstein (Chair), Jeff Aker, Peter Boyd, Chris Moll and John Lusky.

