

APPEAL	NABC+ FOURTEEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Whitehead Women's Pairs
Session	Second Final
Date	March 16, 2007

BD#	2
VUL	N/S
DLR	East

Elaine Said	
♠	K 9 3 2
♥	5 3
♦	A Q 5 4 2
♣	T 7

Gigi Weinstein		Spring 2007 St. Louis, Missouri	Janice Seamon-Molson	
♠	8 5		♠	T 7 6
♥	T 7 6		♥	K Q J 9 8 4
♦	8 7		♦	K
♣	K Q 6 4 3 2		♣	A J 8

Jacqueline Sincoff	
♠	A Q J 4
♥	A 2
♦	J T 9 6 3
♣	9 5

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

Final Contract	3♠ by North
Opening Lead	♥K
Table Result	3♠ N made 3, N/S +140
Director Ruling	3♠ N made 3, N/S +140
Committee Ruling	3♠ N made 3, N/S +140

(1) A hesitation alleged by E/W but denied by N/S.
--

The Facts: The director was called at the conclusion of play. E/W contended that there was a hesitation by South prior to passing 3♥. South and North disagreed. South contended that the pause over 3♥ was no longer than the pause over 1♥.

The Ruling: Even if there were an unmistakable hesitation, it was deemed that there was no logical alternative (LA) to bidding 3♠.

The Appeal: E/W observed a pause by South before she passed East's 3♥ bid. A takeout double of 1♥ does not promise four spades, but South's hesitation suggested bidding 3♠. Although North had the strength for another bid, double and 4♦ were LAs to the 3♠ bid. North thought that it was very clear for her to bid again and that the opponents would agree when they saw her hand. South thought that North should have bid more at her first turn. N/S did not think that 4♦ was a reasonable alternative to 3♠ or double. South denied that she hesitated at all over 3♥. She is a deliberate bidder and uses her (awkward) left hand to pull the bidding cards. Both her initial double and subsequent passes took several seconds.

Before the opening lead, East pointed out South's tempo over 3♥. North said it will not be a problem. Not admitting a hesitation but certain that she had plenty in reserve for 3♠.

The Decision: It appeared to the committee that South took slightly longer to bid over 3♥ than over 1♥, but it was not clear whether South's tempo constituted an unmistakable hesitation.

However, given North's hand, South's tempo was a moot point. At matchpoints, North would never seriously consider selling out to 3♥ and 4♦ is not an attractive alternative. Either double or 3♠ would result in a contract of 3♠. Therefore, the table result was allowed to stand.

The committee considered the merit of the appeal and decided that there was just enough for E/W to avoid an appeal without merit warning (AWMW).

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chair and Scribe), Ed Lazarus, Aaron Silverstein, Riggs Thayer and Jim Thurtell.

Commentary:

Goldsmith I'd short-circuit the whole problem. What about South's hand suggests that she had any problem over 3♥? Nothing whatsoever; she has a totally obvious pass. When there is a disagreement about whether a hesitation occurred, and the hand held strongly supports one of the sides, go with that. So no BIT, no adjustment, simple case.

Was the appeal with merit? It's obvious that E/W thought there was a hesitation. If there were, there'd be a case. So no AWMW.

Polisner My only comment relates to the lack of an AWMW when there was not even an unmistakable BIT which is the primary component for a claim of UI. Even disregarding that issue, it should be clear to a world champion that 3♠ was 100% after seeing the hand.

Rigal N/S got lucky here. Yes North has an entirely normal 3♠ call at her first turn (some might bid 4♠) and would surely have acted again even if there were a break in tempo. But South's hand suggests that E/W did have a case regarding a pause. Still, after a double by North, South would have bid 3♠. Might North have bid 4♦? That argument is enough to let E/W off any possible AWMW.

- Smith** Another surprising appeal resolved well by the committee.
- Wildavsky** It seems likely to me that South hesitated over 3♥. I would have! With her unexpected shape and opposite a conservative partner South might well be worth a 3♠ bid.
The hesitation certainly suggests the 3♠ bid, so what are North's logical alternatives? In particular, what would be logical for a player who chose to bid 2♠ at his first turn? One way to find out would be to take a poll -- I suspect it would show that pass is a LA.
- Wolff** Why was not an AWMW given? There was no new evidence, although the committee may have overruled the director. So, from a logical viewpoint we are encouraging players to bring appeals since there is no downside not to do so. Wildly inconsistent!
- Zeiger** Since none of us would ever seriously consider selling out to 3♥, as the committee properly observed, and since 4♦ is a poor choice, why did the committee see any merit to this appeal? Not a chance in Hades that East would have ever sold out with the North hand, so why should she think someone else should? Zero merit.