

APPEAL	NABC+ THIRTEEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Steve Bates
Event	Chicago Mixed Board-a-Match Teams
Session	First Final
Date	July 27, 2007

BD#	2
VUL	N/S
DLR	East

Cheri Bjerkan	
♠	9 7 6 4 3 2
♥	K J 4
♦	
♣	T 6 4 3

Kevin Bathurst		Summer 2007 Nashville, Tennessee	Jenny Wolpert	
♠	5		♠	A Q T
♥	T 9 7 5		♥	2
♦	K T 7 6		♦	A Q J 8 5 4
♣	A K Q J		♣	8 7 2

Robert Hampton	
♠	K J 8
♥	A Q 8 6 3
♦	9 3 2
♣	9 5

West	North	East	South
		1♦	1♥
3♣ ¹	3♥	4♥	Dbl
4♠	Pass	5♦ ²	Pass
6♦	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	6♦ by East
Opening Lead	♥A
Table Result	Made 6, E/W + 920
Director Ruling	5♦ E making 6, E/W + 420
Committee Ruling	6♦ E, making 6, E/W +920

(1)	Fit showing game invitation.
(2)	An agreed hesitation - break in tempo (BIT).

The Facts: The director was called to the table after the 6♦ bid and was called back to the table four rounds later after the comparison. All players at the table agreed that there was a BIT by East just before she bid 5♦.

The Ruling: The director determined that the BIT demonstrably suggested the 6♦ bid. Pass was determined to be a less successful logical alternative (LA). Therefore, the result was adjusted to 5♦ by East making six, E/W plus 420.

The Appeal: East stated that in considering a response to the 4♠ bid she felt that the partnership understanding was that a fit showing jump did not establish the first bid suit as trump for Roman keycard Blackwood (RKC). East felt that West did not interpret the 4♥ bid as RKC. East felt that with three small clubs and a singleton heart she did not have any extra values to show in addition to her 4♥ cue bid and therefore bid 5♦.

West felt that the 4♥ bid was a cue bid and could not have been made without two controls – one being either the ♥A or ♠A. If East had the ♠A and a void in hearts, West was looking to bid 7♦. When East did not bid 5♥ over 4♠, West settled for 6♦.

N/S felt that the 4♥ bid could have been made without two controls and, therefore, West should have passed 5♦, or that passing 5♦ was a LA to bidding 6♦.

The Decision: The committee reviewed the E/W conventions, the auction and the BIT carefully. The committee decided that the 4♥ bid would not have been made without two controls. It also found that there was an agreed upon BIT and that in accordance with law 16 the 6♦ bid was demonstrably suggested by the BIT. However, the committee determined that pass was not a LA. The committee judged that once East had bid 4♥, the E/W pair would not stop short of slam.

The committee restored the table result of 6♦ by East making six, E/W plus 920.

The Committee: Ed Lazarus (Chair), Abby Heitner and Jim Thurtell.

Commentary:

Goldsmith The appeals committee really thought that none of West's peers would pass 5♦ with those cards? 3NT isn't playable, so 5♦ could win the board. I'm sure some would pass. The director got this right. Presumably, he did a poll. Where are the poll results? Yes, I know I've often not put much stock in polls, but they are expected procedure.

Polisner I agree with the appeal committee's analysis from West's perspective. The only thing that bothers me is that West should think that East does not have the ♠A (failure to bid 3♠) so she must have the ♥A making 6♦ routine.

Rigal At an NABC+ event in an NABC I'll buy into the ruling by the committee; I agree that the director made the correct initial ruling though.

Smith I agree that the hesitation suggested not passing, and it seems to me that it gave E/W an advantage in sorting out the auction and arriving at the right contract. But, if the committee judged that once 4♥ was bid EW were always getting to slam (and that pass was therefore not a logical alternative), then I defer to the committee's bridge judgment. But, I have misgivings.

- Wildavsky** A close call. The tournament director's ruling was reasonable, as was the appeals committee's. Note that East's testimony is largely irrelevant. We don't care why she hesitated; only that she hesitated.
- Wolff** On the bridge of it, the ruling certainly is correct. Once East cue bid 4♥ as either a control bid or Blackwood, West had a slam acceptance. Convention disruption (CD) caused the uncertainty it always causes and as above E/W were always headed to 6♦. But the CD possibly caused the E/W players, as it usually will, to not be certain, therefore the ruling is somewhat suspect. A Solomonic decision might be to allow 6♦ since they were always headed there, but give a small procedural penalty (perhaps a 1/4 board) which will remind them to clean up their misunderstandings or cross conventions off their convention card.
- Zeiger** I agree with West's analysis that East had to have at least two controls for her bidding. Committee correct, although this one is close enough that I have no real argument with the table ruling being in favor of the non-offenders.