| APPEAL | Non-NABC+ Four |
| :--- | :---: |
| Subject | Unauthorized Information (UI) |
| DIC | Chris Patrias |
| Event | Mini Blue Ribbon Pairs |
| Session | Second Qualifying Session |
| Date | November 25, 2008 |


| BD\# | $\mathbf{1 8}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| VUL | N/S |
| DLR | East |
|  |  |


| 3259 Masterpoints |  | Fall 2008 <br> Boston, MA | 3715 Masterpoints |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 8743 |  | - | T9652 |
| $\checkmark$ | J 5 |  | $\checkmark$ | 84 |
| - | Q J 92 |  | - | T 8 |
| $\pm$ | J 63 |  | $\pm$ | K T 92 |


| 4661 Masterpoints |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\boldsymbol{~}$ | A K J |
| $\boldsymbol{\bullet}$ | K 9 2 |
| $\bullet$ | A 743 |
| $\boldsymbol{~}$ | Q 85 |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | 1 NT |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $4 \downarrow^{1}$ | Pass | $4 N T$ |
| Pass | $5 \downarrow^{2}$ | Pass | $6 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |


| Final Contract | $6 \vee$ by S |
| :--- | :---: |
| Opening Lead | Made $6, \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{S}+1430$ |
| Table Result | $6 \vee$ by S, made $6,+1430$ |
| Director Ruling | $6 \vee$ by S, made $6,+1430$ |
| Panel Ruling |  |

(1) Mild slam try in hearts
(2) North made an audible gasp, agreed upon at the table

The Facts: The director was called after the $6 \mathbf{v}$ call. North made a mild slam try by transferring at the two-level then raising to game. South then chose to bid Roman Keycard Blackwood,, and South gasped after (mistakenly) responding 5 $\mathbf{\downarrow}$. North raised to 6 .

The Ruling: Even though Law 16B concerning unauthorized information might suggest that North had the Q a and demonstrably suggest that South bid on, pass was not considered to be a logical alternative, since South knew the partnership had all five controls. Therefore, the table result of $6 \boldsymbol{v}$ by South, making 6, N/S plus 1430 was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: Since there is no source of tricks, bidding $6 \boldsymbol{V}$ is not clear and the unauthorized information could have influenced South.

The Decision: Two players were polled. Both disagreed with the 4NT bid. However, both felt that once bidding 4NT, they would never pass 5 when holding five key cards. Also, since the "gasp" could have meant something else than the $V Q$ (one ace for instance), the unauthorized misinformation did not demonstrably indicate bidding rather than passing. While Law 16B may have been violated, the panel felt that neither was pass a logical alternative, nor did the UI demonstrably indicate bidding over passing. Therefore, the table result of $6 \vee$ by South, making 6 , N/S plus 1430 was allowed to stand.

The Panel: Bernie Gorkin (Reviewer), John Ashton and Su Doe.

