

APPEAL	NABC+ THREE
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Wernher Open Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	July 18, 2006

BD#	28
VUL	N/S
DLR	West

Larry Cohen	
♠	T 6 4 3
♥	K Q T 6 5
♦	8 2
♣	8 4

Bob Walsh		Summer 2006 Chicago, Illinois	Delores Brenner	
♠	7 5		♠	A K Q J 9 8 2
♥	9 4		♥	A
♦	J 9 7		♦	K 3
♣	A K Q T 9 5		♣	6 3 2
		Craig Gardner		
		♠		
		♥	J 8 7 3 2	
		♦	A Q T 6 5 4	
		♣	J 7	

West	North	East	South
Pass	Pass	4♠ ¹	4NT
5♣	5♥	5♠	6♥
Pass	Pass	6♠	Dbl
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Final Contract	6♠, doubled, by East
Opening Lead	♥3
Table Result	6♠ by E, doubled, E/W +1310
Director Ruling	6♥ by N, doubled, down two, N/S -500
Committee Ruling	6♠ by E, doubled, E/W +1310

(1) 4♠ was alerted as less strong than 4♦, since E/W agreed to play Namyats

The Facts: E/W had agreed to play Namyats (four of a major is a weaker hand with a long suit and four of the respective minor is a stronger hand) and had put it on their card. East on this hand decided to make a strategic underbid, knowing that Namyats was on the card and that West was a passed hand and probably did not hold the values for slam exploration. The 4♠ bid was alerted and explained according to the partnership's agreement.

The Ruling: It was judged that when East became aware that her partner thought she held a weak hand (from the UI of the alert and explanation), this now demonstrably suggested a 6♠ call. It was judged that double was a logical alternative (LA) but pass was not a LA. Therefore, the table result was adjusted to 6♥, doubled, down two, -500 N/S in accordance with laws 16A and 12C2.

The Appeal: E/W, the only players to attend the hearing, contended that their bid was properly alerted and explained. The partnership (which played roughly once a month) had a detailed and well-documented system file. Since East was willing to give up on slam possibilities facing a passed hand, she strategically deviated from the agreement. East claimed that there was no infraction. She was merely using her own bidding judgment (by which she indicated that she thought that 6♥ might make). Her partner's lead-directing call was facing her length, and the ♦K was clearly waste paper. Had the club ace been with South (which was where the auction implied it would be) a club lead would be necessary to beat slam.

The Decision: The committee questioned East about her exploitation of Namyats, asking such questions as whether her hand would be a Namyats 4♠ bid in first or second seat. She said that it would not be; it would be a 4♦ bid. The committee determined that by East's reasoning, her bid was an intentional deviation from the convention and that she would also have bid 4♠ in third seat with much weaker (defensive) hands. Since a player is allowed to deviate from partnership agreements intentionally (so long as the player's partner is as much in the dark about it as the opponents), the committee concluded that no infraction occurred. Therefore the committee restored the table result 6♠ doubled making seven, E/W +1310.

The Committee: Richard Popper (chairperson), Mark Bartusek, Ed Lazarus, Barry Rigal and Peggy Sutherlin.