

APPEAL	NABC+ FIFTEEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Steve Bates
Event	Jacoby Open Swiss Teams
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	March 20, 2010

BD#	23
VUL	Both
DLR	South

Dan Jacob	
♠	Q 8 7
♥	A 6 5
♦	8 7 4 3
♣	8 4 2

Mark Feldman		Spring 2010 Reno, NV	Michael Rosenberg	
♠	A K 9 3		♠	J 4 2
♥	K J 3 2		♥	Q T 9
♦			♦	J 9 5
♣	K Q T 9 6		♣	A 7 5 3

Nagy Kamel	
♠	T 6 5
♥	8 7 4
♦	A K Q T 6 2
♣	J

West	North	East	South
			1♦
Dbl	2♦	Pass	3♦
Dbl	Pass	4♣ ⁽¹⁾	Pass
5♣			

Final Contract	5♣ by East
Opening Lead	♦ A
Table Result	Made 5, E/W +600
Director Ruling	4♣ E made 5, E/W +150
Committee Ruling	4♣ E made 5, E/W +150

(1) An agreed significant pause. (break in tempo – BIT).
--

The Facts: The director was called after the play of the hand was concluded. Both E/W and N/S agreed to the BIT.

The Ruling: Six of E/W's peers were polled. Two passed quickly over 4♣. They both felt that the BIT made 5♣ more likely and that East should bid 5♣ over the second double to show the actual values. One commented that without the BIT 5♣ rated to be successful 90% of the time. Another thought the likelihood was 60%. One would bid 5♣ but could see passing and another could see either passing or 5♣.

The director concluded that the UI demonstrably suggested the 5♣ bid and that pass was a logical alternative.

The contract was changed to 4♣ by East making five – E/W plus 150 and N/S minus 150.

The Appeal: E/W appealed the director's decision and all four players were present at the hearing.

East said he was considering passing 3♦ doubled, since if West held a strong 4-4-1-4 hand a larger and more likely plus might be available on defense. If East's strength were in diamonds, then a 5♣ bid by West is less likely to be successful. West judged that with his strong hand, including five good clubs, a diamond void and heart honors behind the opening bidder, that raising to 5♣ was a standout action.

N/S argued that 5♣ could easily fail by at least one trick and that West should not be allowed to bid 5♣ after the suggestive BIT.

The Decision: Given the agreed BIT, the committee had two questions to answer. First, did the BIT demonstrably suggest that West bid 5♣? It seemed likely that East was thinking about bidding 4♣ or 5♣, but it is also possible that East was considering pass, 3NT or three of a major (with 2-3-4-4, perhaps). Note that if East was considering either pass or 3NT, he would not have a poor hand. In practice, players do not hesitate for a lengthy amount of time with poor hands. Thus, the committee determined that East's BIT demonstrably suggested that West bid 5♣.

Next, the committee had to decide whether pass was a logical alternative to 5♣. West has an excellent hand, especially on the auction. If East has five small clubs and either major suit queen, 5♣ would be a favorite to make. Since East would bid only 4♣ with these "unbiddable" values, most successful IMP players would go for the vulnerable game with a 5♣ bid.

However, it is certainly possible that 5♣ would be too high. East is likely to have only four clubs and he need not hold any useful high cards. West has already bid strongly and East had two chances to make a positive bid. The committee decided that at least a significant minority of West's peers would seriously consider passing 4♣ and that some would pass. Thus pass is a logical alternative to West's chosen 5♣ bid.

Since the BIT demonstrably suggested that West bid 5♣ and pass is a logical alternative, West was not allowed to bid 5♣. The committee adjusted the contract to 4♣ and the result to making 5 – E/W plus 150 and N/S minus 150.

The appeal was found to have merit.

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chairman), Ed Lazarus, Jacob Morgan, Mike Passell and Hendrik Sharples.

Commentary:

Goldsmith OK. Yes, a hesitation then pass usually shows extras. (See Cases 1 and 4.)

Polisner Correct ruling and decision. I would have thought that two prominent members of the Appeals Committee would not have brought this appeal and would have issued an AWMW.

Rigal I think the committee was right but did not have to work so hard or exercise their consciences before adjusting. Good players just have to bite

the bullet here. I do sympathize with West but unless he believed that the tempo did not point towards a 5♣ call he was supposed to pass here.

Wildavsky A close call. I have no quarrel with the decisions. I could see this one going the other way easily enough.

Wolff Best done hand of the group, if for only one reason. The reason is that star power did not adversely influence the decision. Congratulations to the TD and the committee.