

APPEAL	NABC+ SIXTEEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Guillermo Poplawsky
Event	Open Swiss Teams
Session	First Final
Date	July 29, 2007

BD#	12
VUL	N/S
DLR	West

Mark Lair	
♠	J 7 6 2
♥	A K Q 4
♦	2
♣	Q 9 8 3

Gerry Marshall		Summer 2007 Nashville, Tennessee	Bernie Lambert	
♠	5 4		♠	T
♥	J T 9 7		♥	8 3 2
♦	J 9 8 5 3		♦	A K T 7 6 4
♣	J T		♣	K 6 5

Jim Mahaffey	
♠	A K Q 9 8 3
♥	6 5
♦	Q
♣	A 7 4 2

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♣	1♦	1♠
3♦ ¹	3♠	Pass	4NT
Pass	5♦	Dbl	Pass ²
Pass	Rdbl	Pass	6♠
Pass	Pass	7♦	Dbl
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Final Contract	7♦ doubled by East
Opening Lead	♠A
Table Result	7♦ dbld down 6, N/S +1400
Director Ruling	7♦ dbld down 6, N/S +1400
Committee Ruling	7♦ dbld down 6, N/S +1400 1 VP procedural penalty to N/S

(1)	Alerted weak.
(2)	South reached into bid portion of bid box and started to pull a bid identified as 5♠ by E/W but E/W acknowledged that the bid could not be seen by North.

The Facts: The director was first called after South's fumble with the bid box and again after the play of the hand. Prior to the 7♦ bid, East asked what the redouble meant. South said, "I believe it shows a first round control." North said after the hand that they have no agreement and he redoubled because he had a good hand.

The Ruling: While there was UI from the fumble with the bid box, the director judged that it did not demonstrably suggest the redouble (law 16). South's explanation of the redouble indicated that no agreement existed (law 75). The table result of 7♦ doubled down six, N/S plus 1400 was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: East explained that he had understood South's explanation of the redouble as being a firm statement of having a diamond control. He indicated that he expected South to have a diamond control for his use of Blackwood. He did not know he could call the tournament director back, and South was already visibly agitated and he did not want to upset him further.

Had he known that North might have a singleton diamond he would never have saved, given his club king as a likely second trick.

Fu Zhong, representing N/S and the team, said that N/S play a form of keycard Blackwood (KCB) where 5♦ had denied a void.

The Decision: The committee did not pursue the UI issue; it was agreed that South's fumble did not demonstrably suggest the redouble. It determined that South's explanation was not satisfactory given that there was no firm agreement here. But, East had failed to meet his obligations; given the inherent doubt of the response, he should have asked again. And, he should have asked about the KCB responses used by N/S. It was impossible for South to have only one diamond and North none. West could not have six diamonds and raise only to 3♦ at favorable vulnerability.

Despite South's failure to explain himself correctly, East had not done his part to protect himself for the reasons stated above.

The table result of 7♦ doubled down six, N/S plus 1400 was allowed to stand, and N/S's team was fined one victory point (a procedural penalty 'PP') for N/S's inadequate explanation.

The Committee: Barry Rigal (Chair), Tom Peters, Richard Popper, Jeff Roman and Eddie Wold.

Commentary:

Goldsmith I see no reason for the PP. South should have answered, "we have no agreement," but he tried to contribute his general bridge knowledge. "I believe" makes that pretty clear, that South wasn't stating a firm partnership agreement, but was just guessing from experience. So why does the appeals committee feel that trying to be helpful warrants a PP? Yeah, the explanation wasn't perfect, but it was good enough. The discussion about East's responsibilities ought to have been simpler: East knew that his opponents didn't have an agreement about this auction, both from common sense and from South's explanation, which directly implied it. He was on his own. The appeal had no merit.

Polisner The only thing to which I object is the 1 victory point penalty.

Rigal I was part of the committee, so should perhaps not express a view as to how lucky N/S were here. We felt that even if there were UI East damaged himself. The PP seemed the least we should do here to N/S.

- Smith** While South should have simply stated that there was no agreement about the redouble, I think the way South phrased his answer was enough for an experienced opponent to understand that it was not a statement of a firm agreement. So, East was on his own. The committee's logic in questioning the wisdom of East's call, in any case, is good. I think the procedural penalty was unnecessary and inconsistent with how committees and directors treat such misinformation in other cases. If misinformation leads to damage, adjust the score. If not, leave it alone unless it is a chronic problem with a particular pair.
- Wildavsky** While the damage to E/W seems to be primarily self-inflicted, N/S must not be allowed to profit from their infraction. I'd have adjusted the N/S score to minus 100, per law 72b1. Then no procedural penalty would be necessary.
- Wolff** An excellent ruling of allowing the final table result, but penalizing N/S one victory point for an incorrect explanation.
- Zeiger** N/S clearly gave misinformation, based on their representative's testimony about their Roman Keycard methods. This clearly led to them gaining an advantage. No thanks. I can live with not giving E/W redress due to failure to play bridge, so to speak, but N/S must be minus 100 in 6♠. I just love ruling against everybody, especially when it's right.
As a side note, one of the committee members should have recused himself from this case. I have complete faith in his integrity, but the appearance is not good.