

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Fourteen
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Kevin Perkins
Event	Flight A Swiss Teams
Session	Playthrough
Date	August 3, 2009

BD#	12
VUL	N/S
DLR	West

Corey Krantz	
♠	6
♥	A T 5 3
♦	9 6 5 3 2
♣	Q 7 5

Howard Einberg		<b>Summer 2009 Washington D.C.</b>	Larry Fox	
♠	A K 8 6 4 3		♠	J T 9 7
♥	K J		♥	
♦	A Q		♦	K J T 8
♣	A T 5		♣	K J 6 3 2

Loretta Westler	
♠	Q 2
♥	Q 9 8 7 6 4 2
♦	7 4
♣	9 4

West	North	East	South
1♠	Pass	4♠ <sup>(1)</sup>	Pass
6♣	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	<b>6♣ by West</b>
Opening Lead	<b>♥A</b>
Table Result	<b>Made 7, E/W + 1010</b>
Director Ruling	<b>6♣W made 7, E/W + 1010</b>
Panel Ruling	<b>6♣W made 7, E/W + 1010</b>

(1)	Break in tempo (BIT) of about 20 seconds.
-----	---

**The Facts:** The director was called after the play of the hand. Everyone agreed with the fact that there was a 20 second BIT before East bid 4♣.

**The Ruling:** The director determined that East had made UI available to West. However, the director deemed that a pass over 4♣ by West was not a logical alternative at this form of scoring. Therefore, the table result of 6♣ by West making seven, E/W plus 1010 was allowed to stand for both sides.

**The Appeal:** N/S appealed the director's decision and all four players attended the hearing.

N/S felt that passing a weak 4♣ bid was a logical alternative. East is a player who just restarted playing after a long hiatus (0 masterpoints recorded) and was going over how to bid this hand.

West believed that 4♣ had indicated shortness somewhere.

**The Decision:** Six players with from 3,500 to 6,000 masterpoints were polled. All bid on with 5♣ or 4NT planning on bidding a slam. Eight players at N/S level of expertise were polled and three of them did pass.

The panel judged that pass was not a logical alternative for a player with 4,000 masterpoints. Therefore, the table result of 6♠ by West making seven, E/W plus 1010 was allowed to stand for both sides.

Since almost half of N/S's peers passed, the appeal was determined to have merit.

**The Panel:** Bernie Gorkin (Reviewer) and Bill Michael.

**Commentary:**

**Polisner**      Okay.

**Rigal**            I'm shocked that the decision to bid on was so clear-cut from experts but live by the panel poll die by the panel poll. I'd have expected the vote to be the other way round

**Smith**            It would have been nice if we had been told what level of experience N/S had so we could evaluate those eight answers (including three passers). But assuming as we were told that the poll was done solely for the purposes of deciding whether to issue an AWMW and not for the purposes of determining whether pass was a logical alternative, then good for the panel. I do have some concerns that West's choice of non-pass (6♠) perhaps should have had more scrutiny. It looks to me to be an action demonstrably suggested by the UI as opposed to a simple slam try. Probably E/W would have arrived at slam even after a slam try by West, but the panel should have examined the issue.

**Wildavsky**      An interesting use of polling to determine merit. I have no quarrel with the finding.

**Wolff**            I agree and not close with any aspect. Why should a slow jump from 1♠ to 4♠ show a better hand than a fast jump or an in tempo jump? N/S, like the N/S in the previous hand appear to be troublemakers and worth being censured. To not act against frivolous appeals tends to damage the whole process.