

APPEAL	NABC+ THREE
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Von Zedtwitz LM Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	July 20, 2007

BD#	14
VUL	None
DLR	East

Rick Binder	
♠	A Q 9 4 3
♥	K 9 7 5 4 3
♦	T 3
♣	

Bob Meixner		<b>Summer 2007 Nashville, Tennessee</b>	Wesley Suzuki	
♠	J 6		♠	7 2
♥	Q 8		♥	A T 6
♦	A K J 8 4 2		♦	Q 6
♣	T 7 3		♣	K Q J 5 4 2

Mark Aquino	
♠	K T 8 5
♥	J 2
♦	9 7 5
♣	A 9 8 6

West	North	East	South
		1♣	1♠
2♦ <sup>1</sup>	4♣	Pass	4♠
Pass <sup>2</sup>	Pass	4NT	Dbl
5♣	5♠	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	<b>5♠ by South</b>
Opening Lead	<b>♦K</b>
Table Result	<b>Down 2, N/S -100</b>
Director Ruling	<b>5♠ down 2, N/S -100</b>
Committee Ruling	<b>4♠ down 1, N/S -50</b>

(1)	At least 10 points – no upper limit.
(2)	20 second break in tempo (BIT).

**The Facts:** The director was called after West's BIT. The director found that there was agreement about the BIT and instructed the table to call back if there was a problem regarding the BIT. The director was called back after the hand and discovered the facts about the 2♦ bid as above.

**The Ruling:** The director judged that 4NT was not suggested by the BIT (double or 5♣ might be suggested); therefore, whether pass was a logical alternative (LA) was not relevant. In accordance with law 16A, there was no infraction and no adjustment.

**The Appeal:** N/S argued that West's BIT suggested that East bid and that a pass by East was a LA.

East said that his clubs were worthless on defense and that with a fitting diamond honor and long, strong clubs, bidding on was indicated. West's 2♦ bid suggested 10+ HCP but was not a game force.

The committee discovered that E/W did not have the agreement that West's pass of 4♠ was forcing. East did not double 4♣ because on a similar auction (1♠-pass-4♣) a double would ask for the lead of a heart.

**The Decision:** A clear BIT was established. Since players seldom take a long time considering whether to double, but more often are thinking about bidding, the committee determined that the BIT demonstrably suggested that East bid. The committee judged that a pass by East was a LA to bidding. With a singleton spade or the ace/king of diamonds and the ♣A, West would almost surely have taken action over 4♣. So, at best, 5♣ or 5♦ would require a finesse or two and might be hopeless. On the other hand, East's doubleton diamond (as opposed to having three diamonds) was all right for defense. It would not be surprising for E/W to have four tricks in the red suits on defense or one black suit trick and three tricks in the red suits. Therefore, the committee disallowed the 4NT call and adjusted the result to 4♠ by South down one, N/S minus 50.

**The Committee:** Doug Doub (Chair), Mark Bartusek, Ed Lazarus, Richard Popper and Jim Thurtell.

**Commentary:**

**Goldsmith** The director's decision was egregious. When are we going to see accountability for directors on cases like this? Good job, appeals committee.

**Polisner** Poor ruling and excellent decision and reasoning.

**Rigal** The situations that involve trying to work out what West was thinking about are always hard. East appears to have read his partner correctly as wanting to bid (as opposed to not being brave enough to double) and acted accordingly. The committee was right and the director wrong -- in my opinion, the director should have adjusted and required E/W appeal, if desired.

**Smith** Although it is not clear in the write-up, it seems that the director's ruling assumed that E/W were in a forcing auction. If not, then the ruling does not make sense to me. I agree with the committee that the huddle clearly suggests not passing, and, since the committee discovered that this was not a forcing auction for this pair, then pass was a logical alternative. I agree with the committee's decision here.

**Wildavsky** The tournament director got this one badly wrong. The appeals committee corrected an injustice.

**Wolff** Good ruling all around. Don't allow the BIT pass to gain.

**Zeiger** I refuse to believe the directors decided that whether pass was a LA was not relevant. I'm betting there was an error in transcription somewhere. *(Editor: You lose. The director decided that if pass was a LA the 4NT was not demonstrably suggested. If pass was not a LA, there was no infraction. Seems to me that therefore it is irrelevant whether pass was a LA.)* Maybe they thought pass simply wasn't a LA, an opinion with which I disagree. Good work by the committee.