

APPEAL	NABC+ EIGHT
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Millard Nachtwey
Event	Whitehead Women's Pairs
Session	First Final
Date	March 14, 2008

BD#	22
VUL	E/W
DLR	East

Jennifer Ballantyne	
♠	A J T 7
♥	Q J 7
♦	A J T
♣	T 9 2

Ljudmila Kamenova		Spring 2008 Detroit, MI	Diana Schuld	
♠	K 9		♠	Q 4 3
♥	6 4 2		♥	8 5 3
♦	K Q 9 8 3 2		♦	7
♣	Q J		♣	A K 8 7 5 3

Angela Fenton	
♠	8 6 5 2
♥	A K T 9
♦	6 5 4
♣	6 4

West	North	East	South
		Pass	Pass
2♦	Pass ¹	Pass	Dbl
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Final Contract	2♦ doubled by W
Opening Lead	♥
Table Result	Down 1, E/W -200
Director Ruling	2♦ dbld W, down 1, E/W -200
Committee Ruling	2♦ W, down 1, E/W -100

(1)	North asked questions about 2♦, which was not Alerted. Some hesitation but not more than ten seconds.
-----	---

The Facts: The director was called after the play of the hand. The director determined that there was no unmistakable break in tempo or inappropriate hesitation.

The Ruling: There was no unmistakable hesitation; however, even if it was determined that there was one, authorized information gave South inferences she needed. The table result of 2♦ doubled by West, down 1, E/W minus 200 was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: E/W thought that pass was a clear choice with the South hand and that not many players would balance with 3-2 in the minors. N/S did not appear.

The Decision: In the preview of the case, all five members of the hearing committee passed with the South hand. The committee judged that, in accordance with law 16 A, the questions by North made UI available to South even if there was no unmistakable hesitation. The committee judged that pass was a logical alternative (LA) and that the questioning demonstrably suggested the call taken by South (double). The committee awarded an adjusted score of 2♦, not doubled, down one, E/W –100.

The Committee: Aaron Silverstein (Chair), Jacob Morgan, Barry Rigal, Jeff Roman and Michael White.

Commentary:

Goldsmith I want to know what the "questions" were. If it went "please explain 2♦," "natural, weak," ten-second pause, pass, then there's no UI. If everyone at the table knew North had a problem, then there is UI. Given that North didn't, in fact, have a problem, without more evidence that there was UI, I'd rule that there isn't. Add in that the director thought there was no UI--- from here, I'll guess that there wasn't. The only clue that there might have been is the light double, but with both majors, favorable vulnerability, partner's being marked with some high cards, partner's being able to bid either major at the two-level, and matchpoint conditions, that doesn't seem all that far-fetched.

If one judges that there was UI, then does it demonstrably suggest reopening? That's a complicated question, but upon reflection, I think the answer is yes.

If a committee disagrees with my findings on the UI, then they must adjust---pass is clearly a LA.

Polisner I don't object to the decision, but I would have liked to know exactly what questions were asked by North.

Rigal I was on the committee for this decision, and the initial view that the south cards were a clear-cut pass meant that unless it could be determined that there was no hesitation or BIT by North, there was going to be a score adjustment. We determined that North's behavior in the circumstances constituted UI to South; I'm happy with that decision.

Smith The directors should have polled some players before making this ruling. Clearly the committee corrected an erroneous ruling here.

Wildavsky I don't understand why the director ruled the way he did in either part of his decision. Certainly the question made UI available, and that UI demonstrably suggested acting. Perhaps the director extrapolated from NABC+ case one, which had appeared in the daily bulletin by the time this case came up. Such extrapolation is not justified here, but this is something committees ought to keep in mind. In close cases we should consider the message our decision will send.

How is this case different from case 1?

The main difference is that here the UI clearly suggested acting. One sign of this is that action chosen at the table led to a theoretically better outcome -- in NABC+ case one the action chosen would have led to a worse outcome had the opponents not acted. This is not a definitive argument -- we don't decide such cases based on the actual lie of the cards. The lie of the cards, though, can be instructive since it is an instance at least as likely as any other.

Another difference is that the call chosen here was more flexible, catering to both offense and defense, either of which could have been suggested by the UI.

Wolff I agree with the committee decision. Having said that, I wonder why the reasoning on this hand wasn't the same as it was on NABC+ case number one where it is obvious because of the bidding that North had somewhere between 11 and 15 HCP's. Perhaps the reasoning of the NABC+ case number one committee is not what we should use as a basis for our decision, but rather upon what this committee based their decision, whether either a BIT or something just as telltale had happened.