

APPEAL	NABC+ FIVE
Subject	Tempo, UI
DIC	Kevin Perkins
Event	Jacoby Open Swiss
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	March 21, 2015

BD#	5
VUL	N/S
DLR	N

Barbara Heller	
♠	6
♥	K10
♦	K6
♣	AKJ109642

Julie Arbit	
♠	KQ
♥	Q965
♦	AJ94
♣	Q87

	
Barbara Kasle	
♠	AJ972
♥	AJ73
♦	107
♣	53

Jonathan Fleischmann	
♠	108543
♥	842
♦	Q8532
♣	(void)

West	North	East	South
	1♣	P	1♠
X	3♣	3♦	P⁽¹⁾
P	3NT	P	P
P			

Final Contract	3NT by North
Opening Lead	♦2
Table Result	Made 6, N/S +690
Director Ruling	3NT by N, Made 6, N/S +690
Comm. Decision	5♣ by N, Made 6, N/S +620

(1) Agreed Slow Pass by South

The Facts: East/West called for the director at the end of the play of the hand. Both sides agreed to the slow pass by South and further agreed that South reached in to the bidding box after East's 3♦ call. South stated she reached for the 3♦ bid before she noticed East had already bid 3♦. North stated that she thought her bid was appropriate as her partner had bid spades and she had two red kings and an eight-card suit. North stated her intention was to always bid again if the opponents competed over 3♣.

The Ruling: Several players and other directors were polled and all bid either 3NT or 4♣ over 3♦. The Director ruled that North held a hand with which passing 3♦ is not a logical alternative. Accordingly, the table result stands, 3NT by North, making six, N/S plus 690.

The Appeal: East/West appealed and were the only attendees. E/W stated that since North had only bid 3♣ originally, she must have been worried that 3NT would not make until the BIT demonstrably suggested that bidding on would be successful. E/W stated that because of the BIT, North should not be allowed to bid anything over 3♦.

The Decision: The committee determined that beyond the BIT, North had even more UI available because of South's reach in to the bidding box and admitted (at the table) attempt to bid 3♦ before she noticed that East had already bid 3♦. The committee judged that the UI that was available demonstrably suggested not only that North bid over 3♦, but also demonstrably suggested bidding 3NT, a vulnerable game, over 3♦.

While passing 3♦ would be a less successful alternative to North's bidding 3NT over 3♦, the committee judged that the North hand was so skewed toward offense that passing 3♦ was not a logical alternative for this class of player after the UI, even though North had originally only bid 3♣ over the double. The committee ruled that 4♣, however, was a logical alternative.

This meant that 3NT was an irregularity and could not be allowed. Law 12C requires assigning to N/S the "most unfavorable result that was at all probable had the irregularity not occurred." The committee judged that had North not bid 3NT, she would almost certainly have bid 4♣ rather than passing since her hand was so skewed toward offense. Over 4♣ South, holding two aces, has a clear raise to 5♣. In the absence of careless play, North should make six clubs on any lead after testing clubs and discovering the bad break.

The committee judged that in the absence of the irregularity it was not at all probable that N/S would fail to bid 5♣ and make six. This was also the most favorable result for East/West that was likely so the committee assigned a result of 5♣ by North making six, N/S plus 620, to both sides.

The Committee: Barry Rigal (chair, non-voting), Mark Bartusek, Chris Moll, Meyer Kotkin (scribe)

Commentary:

Kooijman – I would like to know how many players were polled and how often 4♣ was bid. If 4♣ appears to be a logical alternative the committee had no other choice. My feeling is that 3NT wins by a landslide. An educational remark: in case of yes or no following UI, giving a weighted score is not appropriate.

Goldsmith – South passed 3♦ when she was looking at game forcing values. Someone who does that does not get credit for bidding 5♣ later. Furthermore, did the poll takers find players to poll who would have bid 3♣ with North's hand? Of course most Norths would bid again over 3♦, but it's not at all clear that a North who would bid only 3♣ would. I understand how it might be difficult to find a player who would bid 3♣, but to conduct the poll properly; the director must try to find some. If none can be found, letting N/S bid game when they each have made calls which rated to cause them to miss game is overly generous. N/S +170 in 4♣ is surely at all probable. I'll buy that selling to 3♦ is not. I think it's even likely that South will pass 4♣. She thinks that there are two

diamond losers and that clubs are not solid (no 3NT rebid), so why ought she offer to go minus?

On a spade lead, North would probably only take 11 tricks, but a spade lead isn't at all probable on this auction. I'd award reciprocal 170s.

Does North get a PP for abuse of UI? It's hard to give one for an action which is so clear that it ought to have been made a round earlier, so I'll guess not.

Woolsey – If the committee had ruled that pass was a LA and reverted the contract to 3♦ that I could understand, although it would not be my bridge judgment since I don't think pass is a LA. There is no question that the UI suggests bidding over passing, so that would be a consistent ruling.

But that is not what the committee did. The committee agreed with me that pass is not a LA. I do agree that 4♣ is a LA to 3NT. But while the UI suggests taking some action, in no way does the UI suggest bidding 3NT as opposed to bidding 4♣. The committee simply lost the thread here. This error of not first seeing if the action taken is suggested (vs. the LA) by the UI is a common error by committees. The director understood the rules better than the committee on this hand.

Wildavsky – The AC ruling was a small improvement on the TD's, but it's not clear to me that a South who passed over 3♦ would bid 5♣ over 4♣. Surely at least one time in six such a South would pass, making +170 the most unfavorable result that was at all probable for N/S.

Martel – Director was wrong, as committee noted, but acceptable conclusion.

Marques – Some players in the poll bid 3NT, others bid 4♣. It would be interesting to know the reasoning used by the 3NT bidders. My guess is that they would replicate North's reasoning. However, given the fact that 3NT and 4♣ are both logical alternatives, and that the 3♦ “non-bid” by South strongly suggests that 3NT is likely to be more successful, this seems like a very good AC decision.