

APPEAL	NABC+ TEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Rockwell Mixed Pairs
Session	Second Final
Date	March 14, 2007

BD#	25
VUL	E/W
DLR	North

J. Bachman Nabors, III	
♠	Q 9 7
♥	A 7 6 3
♦	A Q
♣	A 5 4 2

Mary Savko		Spring 2007 St. Louis, Missouri	John Potter	
♠	K J 6		♠	A T 4 3
♥	K Q J T 9 2		♥	8 5
♦	9 3		♦	7 5 4
♣	Q T		♣	K J 7 3

Merle Stetser	
♠	8 5 2
♥	4
♦	K J T 8 6 2
♣	9 8 6

West	North	East	South
	1NT ¹	Pass	2♦ ²
Pass	2♥	Pass	3♦
Pass	3♥	Pass	4♦
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Final Contract	4♦ by South
Opening Lead	♥K
Table Result	4♦ down 2, E/W +100
Director Ruling	4♦ down 2, E/W +100
Committee Ruling	5♦ down 3, E/W +150

(1)	15-17 NT, not announced
(2)	Transfer to hearts, announced after West asked the meaning of 2♦ bid

The Facts: The director was called after the last round of bidding. South stated that she thought partner opened 2♣ and she was responding 2♦ to show controls. West alleged that South sighed and put her 4♦ bidding card on the table with emphasis. N/S did not notice any extraneous information and East stated he was not paying attention to South's actions.

The Ruling: Since there was no corroboration of the UI alleged by West, there was no adjustment per Laws 12 and 16.

The Appeal: This event was the first time N/S had played together, and both players stated that South had forgotten a number of their bidding agreements during the afternoon and evening sessions. South stated that she kept bidding diamonds because she only had a singleton heart. She stated that she made all bids in tempo and without undue emphasis. North said he wasn't paying attention when partner bid 2♦ and simply failed to notice her bid. Then North stated that he passed 4♦ because he had the ♦A (thus 4♦ wasn't a cue bid), and his partner had already misbid a number of hands. He also stated that he was aware of West's interest in the auction.

West stated that she waited after the 2♦ bid for an Announcement or an Alert, then asked about the bid and was told it was a transfer to hearts. She also demonstrated the way in which South put her 4♦ bidding card on table with emphasis.

The Decision: The committee discussed what information was authorized (AI) and what information, if any, was unauthorized (UI) for North. North was entitled to know that South had already misbid some hands and that South couldn't be cue bidding the ♦A with her 4♦ bid. The committee agreed that since West's allegation that South placed her 4♦ bid on the table with undue emphasis could not be confirmed, it couldn't be considered in the decision.

Usually, North could also take inference from West's interest in the auction and decide that passing 4♦ was the correct decision. But, the committee felt that North's failure to announce the 2♦ bid as a transfer created the information of West's interest that he admits using.

The following regulation applies:

Players who by experience or expertise, recognize that their opponents have neglected to Alert a special agreement will be expected to protect themselves.

Since West was forced to ask North what the 2♦ bid meant, it was North's infraction that gained him the information of West's interest in the auction.

Based on the above, the committee adjusted the contract to 5♦ down three, E/W +150. Once North bids 4♥, South would bid 5♦ and North would pass, and neither East or West would double.

The appeal was judged to have merit.

The Committee: Gail Greenberg (Chair), Abby Heitner, John Lusky, Chris Moll, Aaron Silverstein

Commentary:

- Goldsmith** Good discussion of the issue about West's "interest" in the auction, but what did that have to do with anything? I can't see any reason at all for the actual assigned score. South stated that she thought that her partner had opened 2♣. That's consistent with her failure to announce 1NT's range. How did she find out that he didn't open 2♣? By the announcement, however delayed, of 2♦. Once that happens, she can no longer find out that partner didn't open 2♣ unless something unusual happens. Nothing id; partner opened 2♣ and bid and rebid hearts. Over 3♥, bidding 4♥ is a logical alternative (LA). 4♦ is demonstrably suggested over 4♥ by the UI, so it's not allowed. West will double 4♥ and no one has any reason to run. South must then explain that 2♦ wasn't a transfer, but showed 0-1 controls. 4♥ doubled will take four tricks, so N/S get -1400 and E/W +1400. In context, 4♦ would have been a normal bid, so no PP is appropriate.
- Polisner** I would have decided that the final contract was 3♥ by North. If South really thought that North had opened 2♣ (as bizarre as that might be), she should be stuck with that statement and would pass 3♥ and quietly gone down five.
- Rigal** N/S got very lucky here. If North believes South's bidding he will surely be going to at least the five-level. His partner has shown a slam-try with the red suits, and he has a spectacular hand in support of partner. The adjustment was the least E/W should have got; and I'm not happy with the director ruling.
- Smith** The committee found an interesting way to adjust the score on this board. I can't say that its reasoning and conclusions are wrong. North (although not with any intent) created a situation where questions by his responsible opponent may have given him information to which he was not entitled, and that information may have helped him to decide to pass 4♦.
- Wildavsky** When an appeals committee (AC) changes the score in favor of the appellants there's no need to tell us that they found that the appeal had merit.
I do not agree that the AC could not consider West's allegation simply because it was uncorroborated. It is the AC's job to weigh the evidence. They did well to reach the correct decision anyway.
The AC faltered slightly at the end. They need not judge what would have happened had South bid 5♦. They simply specify what they judge likely and at all probable results had South done so. A write-up saying that it was neither likely nor at all probable that either East or West would double would show us that the AC followed the laws.
As for the regulation cited, this case helps show us its foolishness. If we cannot assume that a call that's not alerted is not Alertable then what good does the Alert system do us?

Wolff

First, when the committee changed the result from N/S 4♦down two minus 100 to 5♦ down three, minus 150, it probably had an enormous match point difference since E/W can make 3♥ for plus 140. To me, the important thing is what convention disruption (CD) caused. West was now effectively ruled out of competitively bidding hearts, CD took over and bridge ceased. Perhaps we should instigate a rule that when something like this happens we give the non-offenders something like an average plus and the offenders anywhere from an average minus on down to zero or worse if other bad things happened. Why deal with fictitious artificiality?

Zeiger

The Committee should have noted it was allowing South's diamond calls based on the AI from the auction. Once North bids 3♥, South knows the auction has gone haywire.