

APPEAL NON-NABC+ FOUR  
 Subject: Unauthorized Information (UI)  
 DIC: Doug Grove  
 Event: Red Ribbon Pairs  
 Session: First Final, April 7, 2006

(525 MPs)  
 Board # 6 ♠ 5  
 Vul: E/W ♥ Q 7  
 Dlr: East ♦ A K J 6 5 3  
 ♣ T 7 5 3

(1375 MPs)	(1267 MPs)
♠ K 9 7 3	♠ A Q 8
♥ J 5 3	♥ A T 9 5
♦ 7	♦ T 9 8
♣ K J 6 4 2	♣ A Q 9

(525 MPs)  
 ♠ J T 6 4 2  
 ♥ K 8 4 2  
 ♦ Q 4 2  
 ♣ 8

West	North	East	South
		1NT <sup>1</sup>	Pass
Pass	2♦ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	2♠
Dbl	3♦	Pass	Pass
Dbl	All Pass		

- (1) 15-17 HCP.  
 (2) Alerted as showing both major suits.

**The Facts:** The N/S convention card was marked Cappelletti, Natural versus weak notrump. North believed that actions taken in the passout seat were natural. The table result was 3♦ doubled down one, N/S minus 100 after an opening diamond lead.

**The Ruling:** North was deemed to have UI from the Alert. Therefore, law 16 applies. The 3♦ call was demonstrably suggested over a less favorable (to N/S) logical alternative of Pass. Therefore, the table result was adjusted to 2♠ doubled down four, N/S minus 800.

**The Appeal:** N/S maintained that North did not take it as natural because the most spades South could have was five. North thought 3♦ would play better. South said that he would not have bid 2♠ immediately over 1NT if he held minimal values. E/W agreed with the facts and the reasoning supporting the director's decision.

**The Decision:** There was UI when South Alerted and explained 2♦ as showing the major suits. All three peers who were consulted decided to pass over 2♠ doubled. Each also felt, when informed of the UI, that a 3♦ call would be more successful than a Pass of 2♠ doubled. The panel decided based upon the peer advice, to uphold the director's decision to adjust the table result to 2♠ doubled down four, N/S minus 800.

However, since several players with two or three times N/S masterpoint holding would have bid 3♦ because South could not have had a six-card spade suit on this auction, no AWMW was issued.

**The Panel:** Tom Whitesides (non-voting Reviewer), Su Doe, Charlie MacCracken (scribe) and Gary Zeiger.

Players consulted: Three players with 400-650 masterpoints because North and South each have about 525 masterpoints.

**Commentary:**

**Gerard** Crack me up. South could not have a six-card spade suit. Did North Alert South's pass to 1NT? South himself said he could have had a six-card suit. Why do we allow this kind of stuff to perpetuate itself?

**Polisner** The UI analysis leads to the fact that pass was a logical alternative to 3♦ and thus the ruling and decision were right on target.

**Rigal** South COULD not have a six-card spade suit! Maybe they play bridge differently in the non-NABC+ games. That might be a reason for not awarding a procedural penalty, but not an AWMW.

**Wildavsky** I don't understand the point made by the "several" players with thousands of masterpoints. Are they claiming that they would never pass over 1NT when holding a six card major? I hope their partners Alert such passes – it sounds like an unusual agreement to me!

**Wolff** Look at how strong this committee was on North for rebidding 3♦ when his hand (and the fact that South's first bid was a pass over righty's 1NT) cried out for it. I too believe in laying convention disruption (CD) low, but the ACBL's approach doesn't do nearly enough to nip CD at its source, by extolling partnerships to learn their conventions or else not play them. Do the players at the table always hear about their peers voting on various actions? If not, the AWMW and its rules have serious logistic problems and even though the players might hear what happened they probably need some guidance as to what that really means.