



Subject of Appeal:	Unauthorized Information	Case:	N1
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Nail Open LM Pairs	Event DIC	Nancy Boyd
Date	11/29/2013	Session	Second Qualifying


Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	1♣ ¹	Pass
2♣ ²	Pass	2♣ ³	Pass
3♥ ⁴	Pass	3NT	Pass
6♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-19 Balanced, or 12-14
2: Stayman
3: Natural, Alerted
4: No Alert, Spade Support

Hand Record

Board	9	N	John Adams
Dealer	N	♠ 63	
		♥ KJ862	
		♦ J632	
Vul	E/W	♣ 82	
W	Bulent Kaytaz		
♠	KJ97		
♥	A4		
♦	K108		
♣	AJ65	E	Tezcan Sen
		♠	AQ104
		♥	973
		♦	AQ4
		♣	KQ10
		S	Sylvia Shi
		♠	852
		♥	Q105
		♦	975
		♣	9743

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♠ by E	Made 6	E/W +1430	♦ 5

Facts Determined at the Table

North called the director when West announced at the end of the bidding that the 3♥ bid showed spade support. Away from the table, North said he would have made a lead-directing double. South would not have done anything differently.

At the end of the play, North said the lead made no difference, but that he now felt that West may have bid based on unauthorized information. West said that when East bid 3NT, he realized East had forgotten the meaning of the 3♥ bid. When director asked a follow-up question with West, he said when East bid 3NT he knew his partner had the 15-19 point hand, otherwise East would have rebid clubs. North/South felt that if West was interested in slam, he would have bid 4♣ after the 3NT bid since he had already set the suit and that he couldn't bid 4NT for fear partner would leave him in 4NT.

Director Ruling

The 3NT bid showing 15-19 points gives West the information to choose between 3NT and spades. With West's 16 HCP hand, he is not using unauthorized information to make the 6♠ bid. Accordingly, the table result stands, 6♠ by East, making 6, E/W +1430.

Director's Ruling	6♠ by E, Made 6, E/W +1430
--------------------------	----------------------------

The Appeal

North/South appealed the ruling and attended the hearing. At the end of the auction, North told the director that he would be doubled 3♥ had it been Alerted which might have confused the East/West auction.

At the end of the play, West said that he bid 6♠ because East's failure to alert 3♥ followed by his 3NT bid told him that East did not know that West had a good hand with spade support

Committee Findings

The Appeals Committee had numerous questions: Was 1♣ forcing? 2♣ was “like Stayman,” but what was the strength that it promised or the suit length confirmed or denied? 2♣ was Alerted, but not asked about: did it show spades with 15–19? Would a 2♣ opener have been natural? Was West’s understanding of his 3♥ bid the actual partnership agreement, or just what West thought? Would 3NT be a serious or non-serious slam try in spades? Unfortunately, the Committee had no way of obtaining any information about the E/W methods.

West might logically have bid 4NT over 3NT as key card Blackwood, over which East would almost surely have gone on to slam. Alternatively, West might have invited slam with 5♠, which East would have accepted.

A double of 3♥ by North would have changed the auction, but the opening lead made no difference and it is not at all clear how a double of 3♥ would have harmed the E/W auction.

The Committee judged that E/W were highly likely to reach slam and that N/S were not damaged by East’s failure to Alert 3♥ or by West’s use of the UI from the failure to Alert. However, based on West’s hand and his statement at the end of play, West made blatant use of UI when he chose to bid 6♠. Therefore, the Committee assigned a ¼-board procedural penalty to E/W for this violation. The result was 6♠ by East, making six, N/S -1430; E/W +1430 less a ¼ board procedural penalty.

Committee Decision	6♠ by E, Made 6, E/W +1430 E/W – ¼ board PP
---------------------------	--

Committee Members

Chairman	Douglas Doub
Member	Hendrik Sharples
Member	Ray Miller
Member	David Caprera
Member	Marc Rabinowitz