

APPEAL	NABC+ THIRTEEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Silodor Open Pairs
Session	First Final
Date	March 19, 2010

BD#	14
VUL	None
DLR	East

Suresh Agarwal	
♠	Q
♥	8 7 6 4 2
♦	J T
♣	9 5 4 3 2

William Cole		Spring 2010 Reno, NV	Jeff Roman	
♠	T 9 6 5 4		♠	J 8 2
♥	K 5 3		♥	A 9
♦	9 7		♦	Q 8 4 2
♣	Q T 6		♣	A K J 7

Curtis Bare	
♠	A K 7 3
♥	Q J T
♦	A K 6 5 3
♣	8

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

Final Contract	3♥ by South
Opening Lead	♠ 4
Table Result	Made 3, N/S +140
Director Ruling	2♠ Dbl'd E down 1, E/W -100
Committee Ruling	3♥ S made 3, N/S +140

(1)	15-17.
(2)	Equal strength.
(3)	Transfer to spades, Announced.
(4)	Break in tempo (BIT)

The Facts: The director was called initially after the 3♣ bid and again after the play of the hand was completed.

All players agreed that there was a BIT by South prior to his second double.

The Ruling: The BIT was judged to demonstrably suggest that bidding (by North) would be more successful than passing, which was judged to be a logical alternative to bidding. Therefore, the contract was changed to 2♠ doubled by East down one (E/W minus 100 and N/S plus 100).

The Appeal: N/S appealed the director's decision. West was the only player who did not attend the hearing.

North argued that by doubling 2♥ with such scant values that it is clear from his hand that he was always planning on completing the description of his shape by bidding 3♣. South was concerned that the 3♥ contract could have been defeated with a club lead, and that E/W were getting a two-way shot at a good result.

The director read the applicable rules to the appellants, and the committee informed them that although Deep Finesse was able to defeat 3♥, leading a spade was not the sort of serious defensive error (per law 12c1b) that a committee would take into consideration.

The Decision: The committee asked the director for the results of director polling. Not surprisingly, it had been difficult to find players who believed doubling 2♥ with the North hand was the right action. An informal poll of two players from the Red Ribbon Pairs had both passing the second double. The director had recorded neither their masterpoint totals nor their thoughts about the double of 2♥. A subsequent formal poll of players with 1500 to 2500 masterpoints found six of six bidding on with the North hand. One of those players would have doubled 2♥.

The committee agreed that there was a hesitation, and that bidding on was made more attractive by that hesitation. However, we did not feel that any player who doubled 2♥ with such scant values would give passing even a momentary consideration, and thus ruled that passing was not a logical alternative.

Thus the table result was allowed to stand.

The Committee: Hendrik Sharples (Chairman), Abby Heitner, Ed Lazarus, John Lusky and Victor King.

Commentary:

Goldsmith I hate ruling that the unsuccessful action is not a LA, but passing 2Sx is unthinkable to me. The spade lead issue was irrelevant. There was a table result in 3H; why did anyone even bring up the issue that 3H could have been defeated?

Polisner I agree that passing the double after having doubled 2 H for penalty was not a LA. As to the "poll", how difficult is it to tell the players polled that whether or not they would have doubled 2 H is irrelevant and ask them to presume that they were asked to substitute for N at the critical point. What is an "informal poll"? I find it difficult to believe that a proper poll of 10 peers would have more than 1 player passing. However, if a proper poll had a significant number seriously considered passing and more than 1 actually did pass, I would feel compelled to uphold the TD's ruling.

Rigal I approve of the committee decision but not its offering sympathy to N/S. For what, pray? Almost forced to act – yeah right! I'd offer sympathy while giving a procedural penalty and/or an appeal without merit warning but not in any other circumstances.

Wildavsky The AC's ruling seems unexceptional. Given the results of the "informal" poll, though, I could see another committee ruling differently. I like the TD's ruling in that it gave the benefit of the doubt to the NOS in a close case.

Wolff As far as I can see we should immediately stop the polling system. Even if one time it happens to ring true, there will be many who do not believe it. The time has come the walrus said to do away with that idiocy