


APPEAL	NABC+ TEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Candace Kuschner
Event	Silodor Open Pairs
Session	Second Final
Date	March 20/2015

BD#	6
VUL	E/W
DLR	E

Drew Becker	
♠	72
♥	Q4
♦	AQ10
♣	KQ9642

Danny Sprung	
♠	1085
♥	9876
♦	9764
♣	103



David Joyce	
♠	QJ643
♥	KJ3
♦	J82
♣	J5

Joann Sprung	
♠	AK9
♥	A1052
♦	K53
♣	A87

West	North	East	South
		1♣ ⁽¹⁾	1♠
P	2♣⁽²⁾	X	P
P	P		

Final Contract	2♣X by North
Opening Lead	♠K
Table Result	Made 3, N/S +280
Director Ruling	2♣X by N, Made 3, N/S +280
Comm. Decision	2♣X by N, Made 3, N/S +280

(1)	Could be short, natural
(2)	Agreed break in tempo

The Facts: The director was summoned at the conclusion of the auction. There had been an obvious break in tempo prior to North's bid of 2♣. East felt that South's normal bid, if 2♣ showed a limit raise in spades, would have been to bid 2♠, and that the hesitation suggested passing to allow North to clarify. West said that he asked the meaning of the North's bid following South's Pass. N/S did not remember the request.

The Ruling: The break in tempo was not judged to have suggested South's Pass, as he was simply allowing North to further describe his hand. As no action had been taken by South based upon Unauthorized Information (Law 16), no adjustment was required. The table result of N/S +280 was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: East/West appealed the director's ruling and appeared at the hearing. They stated that the long hesitation by North showed doubt about his bid and that made the Pass by South more attractive. They also said that when West asked, North described South's pass of 2♣X as showing a defensive minimum.

The Decision: The committee found that there was UI that North had a problem. However, the UI did not suggest any particular action by South. Furthermore, the appealing side had said that the Pass showed a defensive minimum and that was in fact the type hand that South held. Accordingly, the Committee ruled as the Director had, N/S +280 for both sides.

The Committee: Adam Wildavsky (chair), Scott Stearns, Gale Greenberg, Michael Huston, Craig Allen (scribe)

Commentary:

Marques – Nothing to add, except maybe that a poll regarding South's call would have been reinforced the arguments of the TD and of the AC. At the table, East's double took South off the hook. Also, West said that he asked about the meaning of two clubs. Did West get an answer (according to him)? That is not clear on the report. Any possible damage on this hand was just self-inflicted by East's actions.

Kooijman – I would like to know where the committee found the substantial merit for this appeal.

Goldsmith – The UI from the BIT was that North didn't know if 2♣ was natural or a spade raise. Pass certainly caters to each case and is therefore suggested over other LAs. But if N/S's agreement is that 2♣ is a spade raise, and passing the double shows a defensive minimum while bidding 2S shows an offensive minimum, I don't think anything but passing is a LA.

On the other hand, we need to know N/S's agreements. Obviously, North is in doubt about them. Why didn't the TD find out the systemic meaning of 2♣? It looks as if he assumed that 2♣ was a spade raise, but that is not even remotely clear.

Woolsey – I totally agree. There is nothing about the huddle which suggests that South should pass. Why should the huddle signify a club suit?

It is nice to see committees which don't always shoot the hesitation.

Wildavsky – I chaired this case. I have nothing to add.

Martel – Acceptable.