

APPEAL	Non NABC+ SIX
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Doug Grove
Event	Red Ribbon Pairs
Session	First Final
Date	March 16, 2007

BD#	7
VUL	Both
DLR	South

1,129 Masterpoints	
♠	K J
♥	8 5 3 2
♦	A J 8 6
♣	J T 7

416 Masterpoints		<b>Spring 2007</b> <b>St. Louis, Missouri</b>	419 Masterpoints	
♠	T 4 3		♠	A Q 9 8 6 2
♥	K 9		♥	J T 7 6 4
♦	K 7 3		♦	
♣	Q 9 4 3 2		♣	8 5

343 Masterpoints	
♠	7 5
♥	A Q
♦	Q T 9 5 4 2
♣	A K 6

West	North	East	South
			1NT <sup>1</sup>
Pass	3NT	Pass <sup>2</sup>	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	<b>3NT by South</b>
Opening Lead	♠T
Table Result	<b>3NT S, down 2, N/S -200</b>
Director Ruling	<b>3NT S, made 4, N/S +630</b>
Panel Ruling	<b>3NT S, made 4, N/S +630</b>

(1)	15-17 HCP.
(2)	Agreed break in tempo. Pause of about one minute.

**The Facts:** All players agreed that East hesitated about one minute before passing over East's 3NT bid. No stop card was available but North did make a stop gesture when he bid 3NT.

**The Ruling:** The BIT demonstrably suggested a short suit opening lead (because it suggested the presence of a long suit in the West hand) over a logical alternative (LA) of leading from West's long suit.

Therefore, in accordance with laws 16 and 12, the result was adjusted to 3NT making four (with a club lead), N/S plus 630.

**The Appeal:** E/W said that they felt the auction of 1NT – pass – 3NT – all pass called for a major suit lead independent of their holding in the minors. They acknowledged that they generally make standard fourth best leads against notrump contracts.

Even though they initially told the table director that there was a BIT before East passed over North's 3NT bid, they told the screener the BIT was 10-12 seconds. When questioned further, they said it could have been as much as 20 seconds.

N/S said the BIT was about 60 seconds.

**The Decision:** Six players with 300-400 masterpoints were queried all of whom played in a Regional Open Pair that used different hand records so no player had played this hand. Two said that they would lead a spade and four said that they would lead a small club (fourth or fifth best according to method). Therefore, a club lead was considered a LA. The two red kings also suggested a club lead, since they could be entries. If East held as little as JTx, E/W could set up three club tricks. If West had no outside entries, a non-club lead might have been more attractive.

The hesitation clearly indicated that East had a suit or suits that East considered bidding suggesting a short suit lead such as a spade. Therefore, in accordance with laws 16 A1 and 12 C2, the score was adjusted to the score that would have been obtained after a club lead by West – 3NT by South making four, N/S plus 630.

The panel was unanimous in believing that this appeal had no merit. Given the relative inexperience of the appellants (400 masterpoints each), it was felt that education about their obligation not to take inferences from a BIT by partner would be more useful than a penalty for an appeal without merit. Therefore, no appeal without merit warning (AWMW) was issued.

**The Panel:** Peter Marcus (Reviewer), Olin Hubert and Charles MacCracken.

**Commentary:**

**Polisner**      Good decision.

**Rigal**            The decision was appropriate – but again, where are the procedural penalties (PP)? If the offenders bring this case to appeal the very least they deserve is a PP. I can understand the directors not giving one. And again, as clear an AWMW as you could ask for.

**Smith**            Well done. With more experienced players involved an AWMW, a penalty, and a player memo would have been appropriate.

**Wildavsky** I agree with the TD and panel rulings. The decision not to award an AWMW was unfortunate. The panel confessed their desire to educate, and the AWMW is the best way to achieve that. And what's this about relative inexperience? I don't think it's relevant, but suppose it were. Relative to whom? They were playing in the Red Ribbon Pairs!

**Wolff** An outrageous attempt by relatively inexperienced players to take advantage. A good decision by the panel, but not nearly strong enough against E/W. They should be flat told that East was being unethical and his partner West completed the 'hoped for' heist. Not only should West have led a club, but he should then tell East how bad his hesitation and pass really were.