

APPEAL NABC+ SEVENTEEN
Subject: Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC: Steve Bates
Event: Jacoby Open Swiss Teams
Session: 1st Final, April 9, 2006

Board # 21 Murray Melton
Vul: N/S ♠ K Q 7 6
Dlr: North ♥ A Q J 6 2
 ♦ K 9
 ♣ 6 5

Eric Greco	Geoff Hampson
♠ 9 4	♠ T 3 2
♥ K 5	♥ T 9 8 7
♦ Q T 7 6 2	♦ 8 5
♣ A Q T 8	♣ K J 7 2

Simon Kantor
♠ A J 8 5
♥ 4 3
♦ A J 4 3
♣ 9 4 3

West	North	East	South
	1♥	Pass	1♠
Dbl	Redbl ¹	2♣	Pass ²
Pass	4♠	All Pass	

- (1) Alerted and explained as a support redouble.
- (2) Agreed break in tempo.

The Facts: North stated that he knew that a redouble was support (three cards in spades) but thought he was too good to support spades. He was going to jump later to show four spades. He admitted that 4♠ was an overbid, but, if he bids 3♠, partner will bid four. E/W felt that if North's redouble was strength, 2♠ was enough and that South would pass 2♠. The table result was 4♠ making four, N/S +620.

The Ruling: Since North's redouble should have been three spades only, he may have forgotten the agreed meaning of the redouble (i.e. a support redouble). The UI from the Alert could have suggested the aggressive action taken. Also, the UI from the break in tempo suggested a more aggressive action. Therefore, using law 16A1 and A2 and 12C2, the table result was adjusted to 2♠ making four, N/S +170.

The Appeal: North alleged that he knew his redouble showed only three spades, but he thought his side could make a slam if his partner had two or three control cards. He decided to redouble and await developments but was never going to stop short of game.

The Decision: The committee deprecated the jump to 4♠, which they considered to be an attempt to clear up the ambiguity engendered by the support redouble. Also it took advantage of the tempo break over 2♣, which suggested unbidable values.

However, whatever call North took, even 2♠, N/S were surely going to bid on. His partner's next call would imply that N/S had enough values for game.

Even if South took his partner seriously (or read him for only three spades), N/S would be in no danger in 5♠ or even in 4♥.

That said, it was clear that the contract had to be set back to 4♠ even though North had committed an egregiously inappropriate "act" when he jumped to 4♠ on a sequence where 3♠ might have left South uncomfortable about committing to spades.

The committee restored the table result of 4♠ making four, N/S +620 and E/W -620. The committee imposed a penalty of 3 victory points to the N/S team (which does not accrue to the E/W team) and referred North's actions to the ACBL Recorder.

The Committee: Barry Rigal (Chair), Jeff Roman, John Solodar, Chris Willenken and Eddie Wold

Commentary:

Goldsmith I like it! A 3VP procedural penalty (PP) shows we mean business. None of this 1VP namby-pamby stuff.

Polisner North should have been embarrassed by his pathetic attempt to justify his action. I disagree with the decision as if North only rebid 2♠ (thinking that he had already shown this hand by his redouble) South would likely pass.

Rigal The non-offenders were probably not due more than they got (a little harsh perhaps, I suppose) but the offenders ought to have learned by now that it does not pay to test the patience of the AC. Another case for the Recorder.

Wildavsky What would South have done over 2♠? I don't know. I've never seen that sequence before. I can imagine South passing in puzzlement, but bidding seems more likely. For now, I'm putting this one in the "Too close to call" column.

Wolff An excellent decision, which covered the bases, especially in not giving the opponents anything, but nevertheless penalizing N/S 3 VPs.

Zeiger If South had been confronted with a 2♠ bid by North, after 2♣ - pass - pass, why is the Committee so certain South would have bid on? Is game so easy opposite Kxx AQxxx Kxx Qx? Is even a three level contract a cinch? Is it really not at all probable for South to pass 2♠? Yes, I know it's teams, but needless minus scores lose IMPs too.

Since I know I'm no expert, I just called one to make sure my judgment was reasonable. He wanted to do something over 2♣, but thought double would be penalty oriented. He passed 2♣ and passed 2♠. He assumed North was maximum for his 2♠ bid, but still couldn't find a place to go, with no real fit, and no club stopper. I'm not saying pass is right. I'm saying it's clearly an LA.

The Committee was right to be offended by North's 4♠ call. They were right to issue a PP, as the director should have. They were wrong to allow NS to reach game.

2♠ making four, +170 N/S. Procedural penalty to N/S for the 4♠ call. AWMW for having the nerve to appeal. Wham!