



American Contract  
Bridge League

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N1
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Nail Life Master Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Ken Van Cleve
<b>Date</b>	11/25/2016	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifying

Auction			
West	North	East	South
		Pass	Pass
1♣	1♥	Pass	4♥
5♣	Dbl <sup>1</sup>	Pass	5♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	

#### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Tossed nonchalantly, shrug

Hand Record			
<b>Board</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>N</b>	Frederick Wills
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠ KQJ ♥ AK1042 ♦ Q1043 ♣ 5	
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>		
W	Michael Polowan		E Jared Lilienstein
♠ 1043 ♥ (void) ♦ K75 ♣ AKQ10943		♠ 97 ♥ Q863 ♦ J82 ♣ J762	
	S	Betty Parker	
	♠ A8652 ♥ J975 ♦ A96 ♣ 8		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♥ by N	Made 5	N/S +650	♣ J

#### Facts Determined at the Table

West called the director at trick two, when clubs were continued and there was a ruff and discard. West claimed that North tossed the double card to the table with a shrug. He felt it was clear North's hand would have extra values but not a penalty double. Since he felt that Pass was clear by South, he thought that showed South indeed gained from the unauthorized information. North said he didn't think that he doubled any differently from other calls.

#### Director Ruling

The table director discussed the table action with event staff. None found that the alleged toss and shrug demonstrably suggested Pass, so there was no legal basis to adjust the score. Therefore, the table result of 5♥ by North, making 5, N/S +650, was confirmed.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>5♥ by N, Made 5, N/S +650</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

#### The Review

E/W requested a review of the ruling. They felt that South was indeed in possession of UI, and that it did indeed demonstrably suggest bidding 5♥, in spite of the table director's determination otherwise.

#### Panel Findings

The reviewer found five players who were playing in a top-bracket regional KO. He gave them the auction and the South hand. They all disagreed with the 4♥ bid, preferring something more constructive. All five of them chose Pass after

North's double. The reviewer then demonstrated the shrug-tossed double card and asked what they thought they'd been suggested to do. Four said they couldn't make out what it meant. The fifth said he thought his partner would want him to think it was a penalty double, so partner wanted him to pass.

The reviewer concluded that this did not meet the standard of a "demonstrable suggestion," so South's action could not be restricted by Law 16B1. The ruling was upheld. The appeal was deemed to have merit, because the TD did not poll actual players.

Experts Consulted: David Gold, David Bakhski, Mustafa Cem Tokay, Alfredo Versace, Antonio Sementa

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>5♥ by N, Made 5, N/S +650</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

### **Panel Members**

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
-----------------	--------------