

APPEAL	NABC+ TWO
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Bobby Nail LM Open Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	November 27, 2009

BD#	30
VUL	None
DLR	East

Carolyn Timmerman	
♠	Q 7 3
♥	J 8 7 5
♦	J 5 3
♣	K 9 5

Linda Friedman		Fall 2009 San Diego, CA	Dan Friedman	
♠	T 6 2		♠	J 9 5
♥	Q 4 3		♥	A K T 6
♦	Q 9 4 2		♦	A K T 6
♣	8 4 2		♣	A 3

Cherif Khoury	
♠	A K 8 4
♥	9 2
♦	8 7
♣	Q J T 7 6

West	North	East	South
		1♦	1♠
Pass	2♠	Dbl	Pass
3♦	Pass ¹	Pass	3♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Final Contract	3♠ by S
Opening Lead	♦2
Table Result	Down 1, N/S -50
Director Ruling	3♦ E made 3, E/W +110
Committee Ruling	3♠ S down 1, N/S -50

(1)	Before passing, North reached toward bid box, pulled her hand back and thought briefly.
-----	---

The Facts: The director was called after the 3♠ call and again after the play of the hand was completed. The director determined that North's actions noted above were UI, which arose from her body actions and not so much from her tempo.

The Ruling: The director judged that the UI demonstrably suggested action over inaction and that a pass over 3♦ was a logical alternative for South. Therefore, he adjusted the result for both sides to 3♦ by East making three, E/W plus 110.

The Appeal: N/S appealed the director's decision and all four players attended the hearing.

East maintained that North moved her hand toward the bidding box, withdrew her hand, and then reached for and pulled out a pass card.

The Decision: The committee determined that North had a physical handicap that prevented her from reaching the pass card on her first try, and that accordingly there was no UI. With no infraction there was no basis to adjust the score. The table result of 3♠ by South down one, N/S minus 50 was restored for both sides.

The Committee: Richard Popper (Chairman), Dick Budd, Ellen Kent, Barry Rigal and Riggs Thayer.

Commentary:

- Goldsmith** The basis of the ruling is impossible to judge from a distance, but seems weird. North has a handicap that requires her to think with her hands? And didn't say something at the table when it caused a problem? And didn't tell the director when he was summoned? Can anyone imagine E/W's even calling the director if North had just said, "sorry, I'm having trouble with my hands?" On the other hand, it looks as if North didn't, in fact, have anything to think about.
I wonder why East didn't double 3♠. Five quick tricks, a trump piece, a non-preempting partner, and they can make it? If so, they can make it doubled. If 100 and 110 were exactly the same matchpoints (they almost certainly were not), it'd be reasonable to maintain E/W's score at minus 50 for the failure to double. If, as seems very likely, minus 110 was far worse than minus 100, then East's failure to play bridge was not the reason for his bad score, so he gets protection, assuming, of course, that there was UI.
- Polisner** No UI - no adjustment.
- Rigal** However bizarre you might think the 3♠ bid is, the descriptions by the players of what happened at the table all suggested that in fact North had not behaved in a way to suggest that a bid of 3♠ by South was more attractive than it was (viz., not at all!). And the North hand suggests no reason to pause. While the combination of 'hitch' plus aggressive bid might appear to make a prima facie case for adjustment, North did not reach towards a bid (as opposed to a pass) and did not bid out of tempo.
- Smith** I would need more information before I agreed with the committee on this case. If North did actually reach for the bid box and move her hand away before going back for the pass card, I can't see how that doesn't transmit UI even if North has some sort of handicap. Did the committee decide that East was wrong in describing what happened? Why did the director believe it to be true? While we are at it, I would have liked to hear South's rationale for that remarkable 3♠ bid.

Wildavsky I'd like to know more about this case. The committee's judgment seems unremarkable, but if the table action was due to a physical handicap I'd have expected the director to rule the same way. One way or another something doesn't add up.

Wolff A really weird one since neither North nor South, according to their hands, had the slightest reason to compete to the three level, but because of the opponent's hands and slight misdefense they only went down one. Might East have doubled at matchpoints and then beaten it two? Because of that conflicting evidence I would let the table score count minus 50 N/S in 3♠.