| APPEAL | NABC+ ONE |
| :--- | :---: |
| Subject | Tempo - Unauthorized Information (UI) |
| DIC | Henry Cukoff |
| Event | Life Master Pairs |
| Session | Second Final |
| Date | July 16, 2006 |


| BD\# | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| VUL | Both |
| DLR | West |
| Laurie Kranyak   <br>  $\mathbf{s x}$ A K J 2 <br> $\mathbf{h x}$ J T 9 6 3  <br>  $\mathbf{d x}$  <br>  $\mathbf{c x}$ J 7 4 3 |  |



| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1dx | Dbl | Pass | 1NT |
| 3dx | Pass | Pass | Dbl $^{1}$ |
| Pass | 3hx | Pass | Pass |
| Pass |  |  |  |


| Final Contract | 3hx by North |
| :--- | :---: |
| Opening Lead | dx5 |
| Table Result | N/S -100 |
| Director Ruling | 3dx by W, doubled, E/W +670 |
| Comm. Ruling | 3dx by W,doubled, E/W +670 |


| (1) | After a break in tempo |
| :---: | :---: |

The Facts: There was a break in tempo (BIT) before South doubled 3dx - all players agreed to it.

The Ruling: The Director ruled that South’s BIT suggested that a double was marginal. This in turn suggested that North bid with her hand. Passing with the North hand was considered a logical alternative (that would have been less successful). Therefore, a pass was imposed on North. The Director determined that nine tricks would be taken in 3dx doubled; therefore the score was adjusted to 3dx by West, doubled, E/W +670.

The Appeal: North addressed one issue in presenting her case: whether there was a logical alternative to bidding 3hx. She contended that she was too weak to pass and that she had an undisclosed five-card suit that she had not bid earlier. South's 1NT bid showed 6-9 high card points (perhaps as many as 10). North reasoned that E/W likely have the balance of power on the hand. West's power bidding, combined with North's own weakness in high card points, convinced North that a 3hx bid was not only good bridge judgment, but was legal (i.e. there was no logical alternative).

The Decision: The Committee decided that there was a logical alternative to bidding 3hx. There were several slight variations in the holdings of the other three hands which would have been consistent with the auction but would have led to contracts of both 3dx and 3hx failing.
The Committee reviewed several lines of play to determine the number of tricks E/W would have taken in 3dx doubled. There were chances that ten tricks would be made, but the Committee deemed that they were not sufficiently likely or probable to adjust the score based on them. Accordingly, the Committee adjusted the score to 3dx, doubled making nine tricks, $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}+670$.
The Committee further decided that this was a case of sufficient clarity that a player of North's expertise should know that the appeal had no merit. Therefore, an AWMW was issued.

The Committee: Jeffery Goldsmith (chairperson), Abby Heitner, Dr. E. Kales, John Lusky, Aaron Silverstein.

