

APPEAL	Non NABC+ FIVE
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Boyd
Event	0-5000 LM Pairs
Session	Second Semi-Final Session
Date	July 24, 2010

BD#	15
VUL	NS
DLR	S

3967 Masterpoints	
♠	AT3
♥	QT54
♦	K5
♣	7653

2185 Masterpoints		Summer 2010 New Orleans, LA	1937 Masterpoints	
♠	J762		♠	KQ98
♥	82		♥	KJ
♦	J97		♦	AT3
♣	KQ82		♣	AJT4

3053 Masterpoints	
♠	54
♥	A9763
♦	Q8642
♣	9

West	North	East	South
			P
P	P	1N	2♦ ¹
P ²	2♥ ³	2♠	P
4♠	P	P	P

Final Contract	4♠ by East
Opening Lead	♣9
Table Result	Made 4, EW +420
Director Ruling	4♠ made 4, EW +420
Panel Ruling	4♠ made 4, EW +420

(1)	Alerted and explained as Diamonds and a Major
(2)	West asked for an explanation of the 2♦ bid
(3)	Alerted and explained as pass or correct

The Facts: North-South called the Director at the conclusion of the hand asserting that West's question about the 2♦ bid and subsequent pass conveyed unauthorized information.

The Ruling: The Director ruled that even if there was unauthorized information conveyed by West, pass by East was not a logical alternative as defined by Law 16B, so the result stands. The Director polled a number of players about this auction and found that most players bid with the East hand.

The Appeal: North-South appealed the Director's ruling and North, East, and West attended the Panel hearing. North argued that West conveyed unauthorized information by asking about the meaning of the 2♦ bid and then passing. North admitted

that West didn't pause, squirm, or show any signs of discomfort at his turn to bid. North based his request for an adjustment solely on the fact that West had asked the question and East had resulting unauthorized information. East reported that he bid 2♠ because he had better than a standard 1N opening. East stated that he didn't open 1♣ and rebid 2N because of his heart holding. West reported that he jumped to 4S because he assumed his partner had five spades.

The Decision: The Appeals Panel decided that this situation was an interpretation of ACBL Regulations and thus the province of the DIC of the tournament. The DIC's policy statement reported, "The act of asking for an explanation of an alerted call immediately after the alert is made can not, in and of itself, be deemed to convey unauthorized information." Therefore based on this policy, the Panel ruled that the result stands. North was informed by the Panel of the policy but chose to pursue the appeal anyway. An Appeal Without Merit Warning (AWMW) was given to North because the appeal was pursued despite the warning that it could not succeed.

The Panel: Charlie McCracken (Chairman), Harry Falk, and Jean Molnar.

Commentary:

Bramley: The no-merit limbo bar has been lowered to the floor with this one. Even the Panel finally got the message.

Goldsmith: No Merit.

Rigal: There are two issues here; the first is that as the regulations currently stand West did not convey UI to East. The second is that it was deemed (and I agree) that passing the East cards at the second turn was not a Logical Alternative. Note that in any event West would not have sold out at his next turn. Given that the position was properly explained to N/S the AWM seems properly allocated.

Wildavsky: I disagree that there is no logical alternative to bidding 2♠. Pass would be logical enough. That is not relevant here. East has no UI, so he was entitled to bid as he pleased.

I wonder whether North might have learned his bridge on foreign shores. The English Bridge Union has a rule, foolish in my opinion, that asking and then passing is deemed to convey UI. Since our rule is the opposite, and was clearly explained as such, there was no merit and finally the panel agrees. That's one for five so far.

Wolff: Obviously East committed no ethical crime and should be permitted to score up 4 spades making. However, it seems incredible to me that the original TD plus the 3 panel members failed to see that NS should have defeated 4 spades by merely giving partner a club ruff by returning his opening lead, after winning the ace of spades as soon as possible. Our desire for credibility cannot be successful if all the TD's missed such an obvious capper to the argument. Perhaps the TD staff should take more time before jumping to some conclusion which, at least in this case stays in second place

behind NS failing to defeat a baby hand. It is one thing for NS to not see it, but quite another very serious matter for the TD's involved (4 out of 4) to not.