

APPEAL	NABC+ FIFTEEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Steve Bates
Event	Reisinger BAM Teams
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	November 30, 2007

BD#	16
VUL	E/W
DLR	West

Marc Umeno	
♠	Q 7 4
♥	A K 9 6
♦	A K Q 7 2
♣	4

Kenneth Zuckerberg		Fall 2007 San Francisco, CA	Drew Becker	
♠	A T 6 3		♠	J 9 8 5 2
♥	Q J T 3		♥	8 7 4 2
♦	5 3		♦	9 8 4
♣	T 7 6		♣	Q

Josh Sher	
♠	K
♥	5
♦	J T 6
♣	A K J 9 8 5 3 2

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♦	Pass	2♣ ¹
Pass	2♥ ²	Pass	3♣
Pass	3♦	Pass	5♣ ³
Pass	6♣	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	6♣ by S
Opening Lead	♠A
Table Result	Made 6, N/S +920
Director Ruling	5♣ S, +6, N/S +420
Committee Ruling	6♣ S, +6, N/S +920

(1)	Game forcing.
(2)	Some extra values.
(3)	Break in Tempo (BIT) agreed by all.

The Facts: The director was called after the hand had been played. N/S contended that all bids after 1♦ were slow and that 1♦- pass – 3♣ would have been invitational.

The Ruling: Several players were polled. All passed 5♣. When asked if a slow 5♣ suggested bidding on, half thought it did and half did not. Therefore, in accordance with law 16 and 12C2, the result was adjusted to 5♣ by South making six, N/S +420.

The Appeal: South had several options open at his third turn:

3♠ = fourth suit.

4♣ = long clubs.

5♣ = good suit.

Did no 3♠ bid by South imply spade shortage? South said that he did not bid 3♠ then clubs because he thought that would show the ace of spades.

The N/S system notes suggest that fast arrival was not in use. Picture bidding – jumps to game suggest very good trumps in the context of the auction.

The Decision: The committee accepted that the jump to 5♣ showed very good trumps. The system file (not seen by the director) documented this. The committee though felt that there were two lines of argument that would serve to allow the 6♣ call.

The first was that South's failure to try for 3NT at BAM scoring almost guaranteed spade shortness. No hand worth a two over one could be missing a spade control with broken clubs. Any hand with solid clubs would check out 3NT via fourth suit forcing.

The second approach was that the committee (and clearly the consulted players) were not convinced a slow 5♣ call demonstrably suggested 6♣. The doubt could be about strain as well as level.

Hence, the table result of 6♣ by South making six, N/S plus 920 was restored.

The Committee: Barry Rigal (Chair), Ed Lazarus, Chris Moll, Hendrick Sharples and Adam Wildavsky.

Commentary:

Goldsmith If half the players consulted thought that the BIT encouraged bidding on, and half didn't, is that "demonstrably suggesting?" Doesn't seem like it to me. I also suspect that the polled players didn't get "you do not play fast arrival; 5♣ is a slam try showing good clubs." Given that, I think that the BIT actually slightly suggests NOT bidding on, that a reason for the BIT is that the club suit isn't good enough for the jump.
Good job, appeals committee..

Polisner Here again, the directors confessed that they do not know how to use a poll. In this case, the results of the poll only established that a slow 5♣ bid did not suggest that bidding would be more successful than passing. This was not a logical alternative (LA) issue wherein an evenly divided poll would suggest that a LA exists. The appeals committee got it right.

Rigal I don't object to the tournament director ruling (particularly when they had not seen the system file) but the arguments for the committee ruling still seem strong to me.

Smith I think the committee did a thorough job and arrived at a good decision.

Wildavsky Had the tournament director known that N/S were not using "Fast Arrival" he might have ruled differently. He should have enquired, but the "Fast Arrival" style is so popular nowadays that many don't realize there's any alternative.

Wolff Excellent ruling.