

APPEAL	NABC+ FIVE
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Olin Hubert
Event	Silver Ribbon Pairs
Session	Second Final
Date	March 12, 2007

BD#	<b>19</b>
VUL	<b>E/W</b>
DLR	<b>South</b>

<b>Steve Cooper</b>	
♠	A Q T 9 8 6
♥	9
♦	K J 7 4 2
♣	7

<b>Galano Glafkos</b>		<b>Spring 2007 St. Louis, Missouri</b>	<b>Judith Eaton</b>	
♠	5		♠	K J
♥	A Q T 8 7 5 4		♥	K J
♦	Q		♦	A T 9 6 5 3
♣	A Q T 3		♣	8 4 2

<b>Kitty Cooper</b>	
♠	7 4 3 2
♥	6 3 2
♦	8
♣	K J 9 6 5

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1♥	1♠	2♦	3♠
4♥	4♠	Db1 <sup>1</sup>	Pass
5♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	<b>5♥ by West</b>
Opening Lead	<b>♠A</b>
Table Result	<b>5♥ making 6, E/W +680</b>
Director Ruling	<b>4♠ N, dbld, dwn 1, E/W +100</b>
Committee Ruling	<b>4♠ N, dbld, dwn 1, E/W +100</b>

(1)	Agreed break in tempo
-----	-----------------------

**The Facts:** The double of 4♠ was made by East after an agreed break in tempo (BIT). 5♥ was bid by West after the tempo break.

**The Ruling:** There was a BIT. There are logical alternatives to bidding 5♥, including pass. The BIT suggested the action taken over other less successful logical alternatives. The score was adjusted per Law 16 A. 2 and Law 12 C 2 to 4♠ doubled by North, down one, E/W +100.

**The Appeal:** East stated that her double simply showed cards, and West stated that his 5♥ bid was obvious.

**The Decision:** The only UI issue before the committee was whether there was a logical alternative to bidding 5♥. The committee found that pass was clearly a logical alternative, especially since East could have more spades and fewer hearts for the double. The committee found that this issue was so clearly resolved that the appeal had no merit. So, in upholding the director's decision, the committee issued an appeal without merit warning (AWMW) to E/W.

The play in 4♠ doubled was discussed and the consensus of the committee was that nine tricks would be taken by North.

**The Committee:** Gail Greenberg (Chair), Ken Barbour, Ed Lazarus, Tom Peters and Bob Schwartz.

**Commentary:**

**Goldsmith** An easy one. Good job all around. How about a procedural penalty (PP) for the pull of the slow double?

**Polisner** Excellent - including the AWMW.

**Rigal** Excellent ruling by all concerned and the AWMW was again entirely in point. It was a little tempting to be swayed by West's shape but all parties got this absolutely right.

**Smith** Another easy decision, including the AWMW. Sadly, there seems to be an increase in the number of appeals at this NABC after a decline in recent tournaments. Thus far the quality of the appeals has not been very high.

**Wildavsky** East clearly had "cards." If her double showed cards then why did it take her so long to come up with it? I agree that the appeal had no merit. I also agree with Jeff Goldsmith that a PP was warranted.  
As for the adjusted score, the job of the appeals committee is not to decide what the result would have been -- that is impossible. Rather they must decide, and tell us, what they judge as the most favorable likely result and most unfavorable at all probable result absent the infraction, per law 12C2.

**Wolff** A good ruling except that I think normal defense would beat 4♠ two tricks, minus 300 N/S. The defense would (and should) probably go king of hearts lead, overtake with a spade coming back.

**Zeiger** The only UI issue before the Committee was whether there was a LA to 5♥? Excuse me. Isn't there a little item in the Laws about the action taken being demonstrably suggested over other LAs by the UI? Yes, yes, I know the UI did demonstrably suggest 5♥ over pass, but why couldn't the Committee address it?  
Will we see ANY appeals in this casebook with merit?