

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Fourteen
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Harry Falk
Event	Flight A/X Swiss Teams
Session	Playthrough
Date	December 2, 2007

BD#	17
VUL	None
DLR	North

Bob Crossley	
♠	K 5 3
♥	7
♦	A 5
♣	Q J T 9 7 5 2

Bryan Maksymetz		Fall 2007 San Francisco, CA	Zygmunt Marcinski	
♠	Q T 9 6 4		♠	J 8 7
♥	Q 3		♥	A K J 9 8 5 2
♦	Q T 8 4 3		♦	7 6 3
♣	8		♣	void

Joanne Greene	
♠	A 2
♥	T 6 4
♦	K J 9
♣	A K 6 4 3

West	North	East	South
	1♣	3♥	5♣ ¹
Pass	6♣	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	6♣ by North
Opening Lead	♥A
Table Result	6♣, making 6, N/S +920
Director Ruling	5♣, making 6, N/S +420
Panel Ruling	6♣, making 6, N/S +920

(1) Substantial hesitation, one minute twenty second break in tempo (BIT).

The Facts: The director was called before the final pass and at the conclusion of the hand. All four players agreed there was a BIT in excess of one minute by South before the 5♣ call.

The Ruling: Per Law 16 A, the director felt that pass was a logical alternative for North and the 6♣ call was demonstrably suggested by the hesitation. The score was changed to 5♣, by North making six, N/S plus 420.

The Appeal: North, his captain (Jeff Polisner) and West appeared. North stated they did not use cue-bids. He felt South had to have ace, king fifth of clubs and two outside cards to warrant her jump to 5♣. The hesitation told him nothing extra. North produced a hand from earlier play where his partner shown very conservative bidding. The captain believed that the 6♣ bid was not demonstrably suggested by the BIT. West said no one could possibly bid 6♣ with the North hand without having gained information from the BIT.

The Decision: The panel found there was an unmistakable hesitation. Six experts were consulted. Not one bid on. One felt that extra time always shows extra values. One felt there is no such thing as an in tempo 5♣ call on this bidding, so North was free to make any call he chose to. One felt no one would bid 6♣, so the BIT had to suggest it. One felt BITs tend to suggest extras. The other two thought the BIT suggested nothing. Expert advice ran the full gamut of what the BIT suggested, so it did not clearly point to one decision over another. Law 16 requires a bid to be demonstrably suggested before a result achieved at the table can be adjusted. Since South could have been vacillating between 4♣ and 5♣, 3NT and 5♣ or some sort of slam try and 5♣, the panel decided that the BIT did not demonstrably suggest bidding 6♣, so the table result of 6♣ by North making six, N/S plus 920 was restored.

The Panel: Charles MacCracken (Reviewer), Su Doe and Jean Molnar

Players Consulted: Bill and Roseanne Pollack, Peggy Sutherlin, Lowell Andrews, Rich DeMartino and Renee Mancuso.

Commentary:

Polisner Having been involved in the appeal, I obviously agreed with the panel decision. When the director rendered his ruling, he said that “there was a LA to bidding 6♣ and on that basis, he was adjusting the score.” I asked him about what he thought the slow 5♣ bid suggested and he looked puzzled and said, “of course, it suggested bidding 6♣!” It was on that basis that our team appealed and the panel agreed that the slow 5♣ did not suggest bidding 6♣.

Rigal I can understand the dispute as to what to bid here, but it seems to me that it is NOT up to the players polled to tell you what a hesitation means. It is up to the panel to determine whether a hesitation demonstrably suggests bidding on. North (a pro?) is allowed to use his partner’s past history of bidding in his decision but not her tempo. He knows a cautious player who bids slowly has extras, (she won’t ever overbid so she can’t be thinking because she is about to overbid) so it demonstrably suggests bidding on. The relevant element of the poll was that no one would bid 6♣.

- Smith** Excellent job by the panel in polling on the question of “demonstrably suggested.” I agree that the opinions of the players polled does not state strongly enough that the hesitation “demonstrably suggested” the 6♣ bid.
- Wildavsky** I'd have tried harder to demonstrate that the UI suggested 6♣. Kudos to the panel for following the laws, but I disagree with their bridge judgment, or rather with the judgment of those they polled.
- Wolff** I DO NOT agree with allowing North to bid 6♣. Partner's very slow 5♣ bid, while being normally subject to all the things the panel discussed, nevertheless allowed North to use his judgment and concluded correctly that South was super strong for her action. Just because, perhaps, South felt that she could not cue bid 4♥ without a heart control should not allow her to make up for it with a "telling" slow 5♣. Only one time and this is it has hesitation disruption not been punished the way it should. Shame on this panel.