

APPEAL	NABC+ THIRTEEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Steve Bates
Event	Jacoby Open Swiss Teams
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	March 21, 2009

BD#	27
VUL	None
DLR	South

Simon De Wijs	
♠	Q 8 4 3
♥	A K Q 8 7 4
♦	K 2
♣	2

Kitty Cooper		Spring 2009 Houston, TX	Steve Cooper	
♠	K 5		♠	A J T 9 7 2
♥	T 6 3 2		♥	J
♦	J 6		♦	T 8 7 4 3
♣	A 9 6 5 4		♣	K

Bauke Muller	
♠	6
♥	9 5
♦	A Q 9 5
♣	Q J T 8 7 3

West	North	East	South
			3♣
Pass	4♥	4♠	Pass ¹
Pass	Dbl	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	4♠ doubled by East
Opening Lead	♣Q
Table Result	Down 3, E/W -500
Director Ruling	4♠ dbld E down 3, E/W -500
Committee Ruling	4♠ dbld E down 3, E/W -500

(1) Break in Tempo (BIT) of 10-15 seconds.
--

The Facts: The director was called after the play of the hand. There was a BIT by South over 4♠.

The Ruling: Although there was a BIT, it did not demonstrably suggest a double; and, pass was not considered to be a logical alternative. Therefore, the table result of 4♠ doubled by East down three, E/W minus 500 was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: E/W appealed the director's decision. Only East attended the hearing. On the appeal form West maintained that the double by North was suggested by the BIT.

The Decision: The committee addressed three issues:

Was there an unmistakable hesitation?

The committee determined that there was.

Did that demonstrably suggest the call taken by North?

It did. South's pause did suggest values (thus making "not pass" more attractive than "pass" for North). Yes, South could have x/xxx/xxx/KQxxxx but there were more hands where South was contemplating double (be it action or penalty) or a bid at the five-level where simply the knowledge of values made it easier for North to act.

Was there a logical alternative action for North that would have been less successful?

In other words, given that South's BIT suggested it was safe for North to double, was pass a logical alternative?

The committee determined that there was no logical alternative to North's double. He had voluntarily committed to game on a deal where he was not concerned about keeping the opponents out. In that context his double was the only call consistent with his bidding thus far. Therefore, the table result of 4♠ doubled by East down three, E/W minus 500 was allowed to stand.

The appeal was determined to have merit.

The Committee: Barry Rigal (Chair), Mark Feldman, Bruce Rogoff, Alan Stauber and Adam Wildavsky.