

APPEAL	NABC+ SIXTEEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Nancy Boyd
Event	North American Swiss Teams
Session	Second Semifinal
Date	December 5, 2009

BD#	<b>4</b>
VUL	<b>Both</b>
DLR	<b>West</b>

<b>Peggy Kaplan</b>	
♠	K 8 7 5
♥	A K 2
♦	A
♣	A Q J 8 2

<b>Andreas Babsch</b>		<b>Fall 2009 San Diego, CA</b>	<b>Martin Schifko</b>	
♠	A 3		♠	T
♥	9 6 5		♥	Q J T 7 4 3
♦	Q T 7 6		♦	8 5 3 2
♣	K 7 4 3		♣	T 6

<b>Claude Vogel</b>	
♠	Q J 9 6 4 2
♥	8
♦	K J 9 4
♣	9 5

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♣	2♥	Pass <sup>1</sup>
3♥	Pass <sup>2</sup>	Pass	3♠
Pass	4♥	Pass	5♦
Pass	6♠	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	<b>6♠ by South</b>
Opening Lead	<b>♥5</b>
Table Result	<b>Made 6, E/W +1430</b>
Director Ruling	<b>4♠ S made 6, E/W + 480</b>
Committee Ruling	<b>6♠ S made 6, N/S + 1430</b>

(1)	Claimed to be slow but only presented as evidence after ruling was delivered and not agreed to by North.
(2)	Agreed break in Tempo (BIT)

**The Facts:** There was an agreed BIT over 3♥. Peer polling was conducted of four players with over 2000 masterpoints. None passed 2♥ with the South hand so further polling is necessarily hypothetical. With an enforced pass over 2♥, all bid 3♠. All but one bid 4♠ over 4♥. The player who bid 5♦ said he would not bid 5♦ if partner had broken tempo as indicated above. North stated that she would make another move over 4♠, even though she chose a call over 3♥ that could have ended the auction.

**The Ruling:** The director determined that the BIT by North demonstrably suggested the 5♦ call over a less successful logical alternative of pass. The result was changed for both sides to 4♠ by South making six, N/S plus 480.

**The Appeal:** N/S appealed the director's decision. North and South were the only players to attend the hearing.

N/S said that after 1♣ (2♥): 2♠ shows 10+ HCP and 3♠ is preemptive. North said she had such a strong hand that she would likely have made another slam try even over 4♠. South said he had extras for his 3♠ bid.

**The Decision:** While South's first pass was alleged to be slow, this was not agreed. It was suggested late on and the E/W pair was not present to explain this. Therefore, the committee accepted there was no adequate evidence of any BIT by South over 2♥. It was agreed that North broke tempo before passing over 3♥, so UI was available to South.

The committee judged that there were no logical alternatives to 3♠ by South. However, 4♠ over 4♥ was a logical alternative to 5♦. This was supported by the director poll, though there was some feeling among the committee members that 5♦ was a very clear action.

However, it was felt that North had such a strong hand she would almost certainly bid again over 4♠ and slam would be reached anyway. In fact, 5♦ opposite her singleton ace was not necessarily more encouraging than 4♠. Thus, E/W were not damaged by South's choice of 5♦ over 4♠ and the table result of 6♠ by South making six, N/S plus 1430 was restored for both sides.

**The Committee:** Gail Greenberg (Chair), Ellen Kent, Ed Lazarus, Chris Moll and David Stevenson (Scribe).

### **Commentary:**

**Goldsmith** OK, I'll buy the argument that if North was willing to drive to slam over 5♦, the second-least encouraging action South can make over 4♥; then she would not have passed 4♠. Once she bids past game, South will drive to slam.

**Polisner** Good work by all.

**Rigal** I don't think the right question was asked or answered. Given that South is deemed to be allowed to bid 3♠ and North can then freely bid 4♥, does the earlier break in tempo make the 5♦ call more attractive? I don't think it has any bearing on the bid in the very slightest. As South you showed a weakish hand; thus partner has a VERY strong hand flawed for a take-out double of 3♥...bridge logic, not the tempo, tells you that. You can do what you like now, regardless of the tempo. Hence a sensible committee decision, though I would have reached it from a different direction.

**Smith** I find the analysis of the committee compelling. Good job.

**Wildavsky** I prefer the committee's ruling to the director's. If the director thought it was close, though, I'm pleased that he ruled in favor of the non-offenders.

**Wolff**

Although every bid taken could be justified (it is a little too much to stomach) and although E/W should be minus 980, normal playing luck (NPL), two BITs seem to demand that N/S should be ruled back to plus 480. If this scoring could be implemented successfully I would choose it to apply. Others will not agree with me, but on this hand I do not see a reason to break tempo and then pass with either hand. With South's hand if I passed it would be in tempo and with North's hand I would not consider passing 3♥ and either bid 3♠ or 3NT. Once I studied it would be even more so.