APPEAL	NABC+ TWO
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Doug Grove
Event	Platinum Pairs
Session	2 <sup>nd</sup> Qualifier
Date	March 15, 2013

BD#	23		Venkatrao Koneru			
VUL	Both		<b>^</b>	K32		
DLR	S		<b>Y</b>			
			<b>♦</b>	K9653		
			<b>*</b>	A10973		
Jo	aquin Pa	careu		Spring	Ale	jandro Bianchedi
<b>♠</b> J	976			2013\NABC	<b>•</b>	A84
<b>Y</b> A	\J743			March 14-24	<b>Y</b>	KQ65
<b>•</b> 7	7			Bridge to the Next	<b>♦</b>	A102
<b>*</b> (	Q65			LSt. Louis	<b>♣</b>	KJ4
				Stephen Landen		
			•	Q105		
			<b>Y</b>	10982		
			<b>♦</b>	QJ84		
			<b>♣</b>	82		

West	North	East	South
			P
P	1♦	1NT	2 <b>(</b> 1)
P	2♠	P	P
X	P	P	3♦
X	P	P	P

Final Contract	3♦X by North
Opening Lead	<b>♦2</b>
Table Result	Making 3, N/S +670
Director Ruling	2♠X by North, Down 4, N/S -1100
Committee Ruling	3♦X by North, Making 3, N/S +670

## (1) Alerted and explained as showing the majors

The Facts: The Director was summoned after the dummy was tabled. During the auction, South's 2♦ bid was duly alerted and explained by North as takeout for the majors. This agreement was specifically listed on the North/South convention card.

The Ruling: The Director ruled that North's explanation of "Majors" constituted unauthorized information. Law 16 states that a player may not choose from among logical alternatives one which may have been demonstrably suggested by the UI. The explanation of "majors" demonstrably suggested that 3♦ would be a more attractive contract than 2♠X. Accordingly, the Director adjusted the result to 2♠X by North, down 4, N/S -1100.

**The Appeal:** North/South appealed the ruling and attended the hearing. South stated that he had forgotten their methods which were clearly marked on their convention card (as verified by the ruling Director). He knew that the "train had gone off the tracks" and passed 2♠ with a known

poor fit. After West doubled 2♠ he felt that bridge logic demanded that he return to the known 8+ (probably 9) card diamond fit.

The Decision: The Appeals Committee discovered that North/South were playing Standard with 1♦ generally promising four cards in the suit. Based upon the appellants' convention card it was clear that the alert and the explanation of the 2♦ bid were correctly given. The only appeal issue was South's bid of 3♦ after 2♠ had been doubled. South had already passed 2♠ when the UI had suggested otherwise. However, the double changed the likelihood of salvaging an acceptable result from playing in a fit that is either 4-3 or 3-3. The AC decided that there was no logical alternative to running to 3♦ after 2♠ had been doubled, especially when the diamond fit was known to be at least 4-4 and maybe better. The actual table result was merely the "rub of the green" for East/West. Thus, the AC adjusted the result back to the original table result of 3♦X by North, N/S +670.

**The Committee:** Mark Bartusek (Chair), Craig Allen, Chris Moll, David Caprera and Marc Rabinowitz