

APPEAL	Non NABC+ Eleven
Subject	Unauthorized information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Millard Nachtwey
Event	Red Ribbon Pairs
Session	Second Final
Date	March 19, 2010

BD#	<b>7</b>
VUL	<b>Both</b>
DLR	<b>South</b>

<b>632 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	A J T 5 4 3
♥	T
♦	T 7
♣	Q 9 6 4

<b>1,900 Masterpoints</b>		<b>Spring 2010 Reno, NV</b>	<b>1,600 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	2		♠	K 6
♥	5 4		♥	A K 9 6 3
♦	A K 9 5 4 3		♦	J 8 6 2
♣	J 8 7 5		♣	3 2

<b>290 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	Q 9 8 7
♥	Q J 8 7 2
♦	Q
♣	A K T

West	North	East	South
			1♥
3♦	Dbl	4♦	Dbl <sup>1</sup>
Pass	4♠	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	<b>4♠ by North</b>
Opening Lead	<b>♥ A</b>
Table Result	<b>Made 4, N/S + 620</b>
Director Ruling	<b>4♦ doubled W made 4, E/W + 710</b>
Panel Ruling	<b>4♠ N made 4, N/S + 620</b>

(1) Break in Tempo (BIT) – N/S = 30 seconds; E/W = 90 seconds.

**The Facts:** The director was called immediately after the 4♠ bid and again after the play of the hand had been completed. N/S stated that they had system notes to verify that bidding over the double of 4♦ is suggested. However, they could not produce those notes.

**The Ruling:** The director judged that the BIT demonstrably suggested bidding and that pass is a logical alternative [Law 16B1(a) and (b)]. Therefore, the contract was changed to 4♦ doubled by West with a result of making four assigned to both pairs (N/S minus 710 and E/W plus 710). Law 12C1(e).

**The Appeal:** N/S appealed the director's decision. All four players attended a screening at which N/S, immediately after the session, showed the system notes to the screening director at an Internet site. The notes said that the double in this sequence "expects partner to bid." The screening director restored the table result of 4♠ by North making four for both sides. At this point, E/W said they would like to appeal. The North hand was given to three players (2 with just over 2,000 points and one with 1,100 points). With the system information, all bid 4♠. E/W were upset that N/S would be allowed to bid after a lengthy BIT. South said his hesitation was to decide whether he was good enough to bid again or make a double to force partner to bid at the four (or five) level. He finally decided he was and doubled. South also stated that pass would not be forcing but partner would make an appropriate call. Partner bidding 4♠ was not suggested by the BIT as their notes verify.

**The Decision:** The panel decided that pass was not a logical alternative in accordance with the N/S system notes which were presented within an appropriate time period. Therefore, the panel restored the table result as the screening director had done.

**The Panel:** Tom Marsh (Reviewer), John Gram and Bill Michael.

**Commentary:**

**Rigal** What director and E/W pair would have thought a double of 4D was to play? I'd be ashamed to call a TD over this, but I would not be the most embarrassed person involved at the end of this case. (In my 'kinder, gentler' persona I won't spell out who SHOULD be the most embarrassed person.) Well done the panel

**Polisner** Assuming that the notes on the Internet could not have been modified between the play and the screening (I am always a skeptic), the TD was correct in his ruling and the Panel was correct in changing it.

**Wildavsky** Both the TD and the Panel seem to have ruled correctly, given the information they had available to them.

**Wolff** A reasonable decision based on system notes online. The ACBL needs to clarify our status as to what doubles are supposed to mean in different situations otherwise an unethical pair will be able to double slowly and claim that his partner is supposed to decide what to do.