Birmingham Appeals

Appeals Case 1

Subject: Tempo:

Event: Life Master Open Pairs, 16 November, Second Qualifying Session

Board 15
N/S vul.
Dealer South

WEST
♠ A 10 6 5
♥ Q
♦ A J 8 7 6 2
♣ 6 3

SOUTH
♠ K Q J 9 7 2
♥ A K 2
♦ 10
♣ A J 10

NORTH
♠ 3
♥ J 8 4 3
♦ K 9 5 4 3
♣ Q 7 5

EAST
♠ 8 4
♥ 10 9 7 6 5
♦ Q
♣ K 9 8 4 2

Bill Hagenberg - 2♦ Pass All Pass
Terry Michaels - - 3NT Pass
Dennis Goldston - - Pass
Don Blum 1♠(1) 3♠(1) 4♠(1)
(1) Break in tempo

The Facts: 4♣ made four, +620 for N/S. The opening lead was the ♥Q. The Director was called to the table after the 3♠ bid. E/W objected to South’s long hesitations before opening, bidding 3♠ and bidding 4♠. South said the pause before opening 1♠ was to allow the others time to sort their hands. The Director ruled that the 3NT bid was not suggested by the break in tempo, but by the strength South had shown with his rebid. The Director allowed the table result to stand (Law 16).

The Appeal: E/W appealed the Director’s ruling. There had been a slow initial pass by South. (This was the first round.) E/W claimed that the slow pass and slow 3♠ bid in combination implied extras, making 3NT a more attractive action. N/S said that the slow 3♠ bid could have been based on all sorts of reasons. Extras was one possibility but not the only (or obvious) reason. Just for clarification North’s 3NT was not slow. There was no suggestion by E/W that South’s 4♠ bid was based on an out-of-tempo action by North.

The Committee Decision: The Committee quickly established that the Director had correctly ruled that the initial break before 1♠ was irrelevant and that the slow 3♠ bid pointed in no direction. The Committee members were all in agreement that the 3NT bid was not made more attractive by the slow 3♠ bid. To their minds it was unattractive whatever the tempo of the 3♠ bid. Given that the Director had made the correct ruling and that E/W had brought no new facts to the hearing, an appeal without merit warning was issued to East and West.

DIC of Event: Henry Cukoff

Committee: Barry Rigal (chair), Dick Budd, Barbara Nudelman, Marlene Passell, Riggs Thayer

Appeals Case 2

Subject: Tempo

Event: Life Master Open Pairs, 18 November, First Final Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board 14</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dealer East</td>
<td>♠ A 9 8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♥ J 8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ 9 5 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♣ A 9 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♠ 10 5</td>
<td>♠ K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♥ - - -</td>
<td>♥ K 10 7 4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ A Q J 8</td>
<td>♦ K 7 6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣ K Q J 10 8 5 2</td>
<td>♣ 6 4 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOUTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♠ Q J 7 6 4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♥ A Q 9 6 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ 10 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣ - - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jeff Meckstroth                  Dave Treadwell                  Perry Johnson
  -                                  -                                  Bob Schwartz
  3♣(2) Pass                           2♦(1) Pass                           3♠ Pass
  4♣ Pass(3) Pass                     Pass 4♥ Pass                     Dbl 4♠ Pass
  Dbl All Pass                        4♠ Pass

(1) Alerted; weak two-bid in either major

(2) Alerted; non-forcing

(3) Break in tempo

The Facts: 4♠ doubled made four, +590 for N/S. North hesitated before passing 4♣ and South called the Director to note the hesitation. The Director ruled that unauthorized information was available to South and that pass was a logical alternative. The contract was changed to 4♣ made five, +150 for E/W.

The Appeal: N/S appealed the Director’s ruling. South knew North had taken extra time. Some of that time was absorbed by North reading the Defense to Artificial Conventions booklet, but North also took some 10-15 seconds to call after reading it. South said he needed to find as little as Kxxx in either major and a doubleton in the other to go down one against a making 4♣. South also stated (in screening) that he thought he could expect even more in his partner’s hand from the authorized information of the auction itself. West believed that bidding was dangerous since he could easily have strength and length in one major, his partner in the other. He further stated that in his opinion slow passes almost always were marginal raises and not close penalty doubles.

The Committee Decision: The Committee focused on two issues: whether unauthorized information from the slow pass demonstrably suggested that bidding would be more successful than passing; and whether pass was a logical alternative to bidding. In discussing whether there was message content in North’s hesitation, the Committee agreed that North might have been debating between pass and double or between pass and bidding. The Committee then focused on what holding would cause an out-of-tempo action and concluded that this would almost always be “hard values,” e.g. aces and kings, not queens and jacks. From South’s perspective, aces and kings rated to be good and transferable to offense. Thus, the conclusion was that the slow pass did suggest that North would have useful values for offense, even if the alternative considered was double. The Committee also concluded that had North passed in tempo; a pass by South was a logical alternative. The Committee then considered whether East had “failed to continue to play bridge” when he did not bid 5♣ over 4♣. They decided that his action did not constitute such a failure. Therefore, the contract was changed to 4♣ made five, +150 for E/W.

DIC of Event: Henry Cukoff

Committee: Henry Bethe (chair), Lowell Andrews, David Berkowitz, Ed Lazarus, Peggy Sutherlin

Appeals Case #3

Subject: Tempo

Event: Open BAM Teams, 19 November, First Session
Board 30
Dealer East

NORTH
♠ Q 9 5 3
♥ K J
♦ A 5 3
♣ A K 9 3

WEST
♠ A 10 7 6 4
♥ A 9 4
♦ Q 10 4
♣ 10 6

EAST
♠ J 8 2
♥ 10 8 6 5 3
♦ 8 6
♣ Q 8 2

SOUTH
♠ K
♥ Q 7 2
♦ K J 9 7 2
♣ J 7 5 4

WEST
Rose Meltzer
Roy Welland
Kyle Larsen

NORTH
- - 1 NT Pass

EAST
Pass

SOUTH
Pass

3 NT

The Facts: 3 NT went down two, +100 for E/W.

The opening lead was the ♠ 2. The play was as follows; (underlined card is led):

WEST
♠ A
♠ 6
♥ 4(1)
♦ Q
♣ 4
♥ A

NORTH
♠ 3
♠ Q
♥ K
♦ 3
♠ 5
♥ J

EAST
♠ 2
♠ 8
♥ 2
♦ 6
♠ J
♥ 5

SOUTH
♠ K
♣ 4
♥ 3
♦ J
♣ 5
♥ 7
The Director was called when the hand was over. West had hesitated before following small to trick three. E/W estimated it had taken her 5 seconds to play and N/S estimated the time was 8-10 seconds. The Director decided that East had unauthorized information that West had the ♥A, which suggested his play of the ♥5 at trick six. The Director ruled that a club shift was a logical alternative and that it was not probable that declarer would play the ♠J. The contract was changed to 3NT down one, +50 for E/W (Laws 12C2 and 16).

The Appeal: E/W appealed the Director’s ruling.

West did not attend the hearing. East said that when the ♥K was led and the suit abandoned, he thought that North held the king and jack, as he did. Therefore, when he was on lead with the ♠J, he didn’t think to continue with any other suit: the heart lead looked as if it would be most successful or, at least, not harmful. Since the return was so clear, the table result should stand. North said that the hesitation made it unmistakably clear that West held the ♥A and that shifting to either minor offered logical alternatives. North said that if East led a club, there was a reasonable chance that he would have risen with the ♠J and made four.

The Committee Decision: There was no dispute about the ♥4 being played after a noticeable hesitation at trick three. There was no credible argument presented that the slowness did not suggest that West held the ♥A. If it had been played at a less revealing speed, East may have had to consider that North might have played the ♥K from HAKJx just to pose a problem for East. West’s carding, the ♠4 at trick five, and the ♥4 at trick three, did not suggest a heart lead. In fact, it suggested a club from East. The fact that West did not win the ♥A, while still possessing a diamond entry, also suggested that West did not have the ♥A which simply reinforced that the carding suggested a club lead. In the Committee’s judgment, the fact that two clubs had already been discarded from the South hand made it reasonably likely that North would play the ♠J at trick six and take ten tricks (four clubs, four diamonds, one heart, and one spade). The Committee found that 3NT made four was the most favorable result that was likely for N/S and the most unfavorable result that was at all probable for E/W. The contract was changed to 3NT made four, +430 for N/S.

DIC of Event: Henry Cukoff Committee: Michael Huston (chair), Doug Doub, Simon Kantor, Becky Rogers, Michael White

Appeals Case #4

Subject: Misinformation

Event: Open BAM Teams, 19 November, First Qualifying Session
Board 27  
Dealer South  

**North**  
♠ K 9 5 4 3  
♥ 5  
♦ K J 9 7 3  
♣ K 7

**West**  
♠ Q J 8  
♥ J 10 9 6  
♦ A 2  
♣ A 10 6 2

**East**  
♠ A 7 6  
♥ A 8 7 4 3 2  
♦ 4  
♣ Q 9 8

**South**  
♠ 10 2  
♥ K Q  
♦ Q 10 8 6 5  
♣ J 5 4 3

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shawn</td>
<td>Mel</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Janet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Colchimaro</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Colchimaro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1NT(1)</td>
<td>2♣(2)</td>
<td>2NT(3)</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3♣(4)</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>3♥(5)</td>
<td>All Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Announced; 10-13  
(2) Not Alerted; spades and a minor  
(3) Lebensohl  
(4) Forced  
(5) Not forcing  

**The Facts:** 3♥ made four, +170 for E/W. The opening lead was the ♠10. The Director was called after the hand was over and was told that the 2♣ bid had not been Alerted. The Director allowed the table result to stand (Laws 40C and 12C2).

**The Appeal:** E/W appealed the Director’s ruling. East stated that had he known that 2♣ showed spades and a minor he “might” have invited with 3♥ instead of signing off via Lebensohl. Also, he might have made five if he had known that North had a five-card minor. He could win the ♠A, play the ♥A, diamond to the ace, ruff a diamond and duck a club to North.

**The Committee Decision:** The Committee believed that North’s hand type should not have had an effect on East’s decision. If North had a one-suiter, say 6-2-3-2, then East could hope for a doubleton spade opposite and for reasonable breaks. If North was known to have five-five, then West was more likely to have a third spade and suits could be breaking badly. True, if North’s minor was diamonds, then East’s singleton diamond was an asset. East did make that last point, but he also said, in effect, “I’m not sure if I’d have been worth an invite if given the correct information, but I figured I’d let the Committee decide.” The Committee decided that not only should East have invited in either case, but that the misinformation had absolutely no relation to his decision. He was trying to get in Committee what he couldn’t get at the table. Therefore, the Committee allowed the table result to stand and found the appeal lacking in merit. East, West, and the E/W team captain were assessed an appeal without merit warning point. As for the play in 3♥, it was irrelevant since the other E/W pair (BAM scoring) was in 4
♥; thus +170 or +200 for E/W was the same loss on the board. There was no reason to penalize N/S since their infraction did not affect the result.

**DIC of Event:** Henry Cukoff

**Committee:** Larry Cohen (chair), Sid Brownstein, Phil Brady, Corinne Kirkham, Judy Randel

**Appeals Case #5**

**Subject:** Played Card

**Event:** Flight B/C Swiss, 19 November, First Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♠ 10 x x</td>
<td>♠ A K x</td>
<td>♠ Q 8 x x</td>
<td>♦ J x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♥ K Q 10 x x</td>
<td>♥ A J x x</td>
<td>♥ x x</td>
<td>♥ x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ K x</td>
<td>◆ J 10 x x</td>
<td>◆ A Q 9 8</td>
<td>◆ x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♡ 10 x x</td>
<td>♡ A x</td>
<td>♡ K x x</td>
<td>♡ Q J x x x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1NT</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>3NT</td>
<td>All Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The opening lead was the ♥K which held. North switched to the ♠10, won by declarer’s ace. The ♦J won, followed by the ♠A and three more diamond tricks. Declarer cashed the ♦K and played the ♠K. Declarer then led her last spade toward the dummy and called “Spade.” East fidgeted and asked “Which one?” Declarer said she had meant to call for the ♠Q. The Director was called and ruled that the ♠8 was played (Law 46B2). South won the ♦J and cashed three clubs to defeat 3NT one trick, +100 for N/S.

The Appeal: E/W appealed the Director’s ruling. West stated that when she played her small spade, she called for a spade from dummy without designating which was to be played. A moment later she heard what she had said and stated her intent was to play the queen. East, her partner, fidgeted when she called for a spade and said he asked “Which one?” N/S agreed that West had called for a spade without designating the rank and at that point East had fidgeted and eventually asked “which one?” At that point West noticed what was happening and said she wanted to play the queen.

The Panel Decision: The Panel pointed out that accidents happen. People revoke, pull the wrong cards, etc. The fact that the SAK were not cashed in order gives rise to the possibility that declarer had a lapse in concentration, perhaps thinking that she had played a high spade from her hand rather than a low one. The Panel decided that the burden of proof that declarer’s intention was incontrovertible rested with the declarer, and that based on her arguments she had not proved this. In addition, since her partner’s body language may have called attention to her error, she was deprived of the opportunity to correct her play without taint. The Panel allowed the table result of 3NT down one, +100 for N/S to stand.

DIC of Event: Susan Patricelli

Panel: Mike Flader (Reviewer), Charlie MacCracken, Chris Patrias

Players consulted: none reported

Appeals case #6

Subject: Misinformation

Event: Open BAM Teams, 19 November, First Qualifying Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board 4</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dealer West</td>
<td>♠ 9 7 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♥ Q 10 4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ A Q 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♣ J 6 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♠ A 10 6</td>
<td>♠ K Q J 5 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♥ 9 8 6 5 3</td>
<td>♥ K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ 7 5 3</td>
<td>♦ J 9 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣ A K</td>
<td>♣ Q 8 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOUTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♠ 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♥ A J 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ K 10 6 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣ 10 9 7 5 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Facts: 2♣ made three, +140 for E/W. The Director was called at the end of the auction because the 2♣ bid had not been Alerted. When given a chance by the Director to substitute another call for his final pass North declined to do so. South said he would have bid 2NT for the minors if the 2♣ bid had been Alerted. The Director decided that further bidding would have led to a contract of 3♠. The table result was therefore allowed to stand (Law 40C).

The Appeal: N/S appealed the Director’s ruling. South had suspected that 2♣ had been Drury but did not want to ask or look at the convention card (both cards were on the other side of the table) because it might have tipped off E/W. Had he known that 2♣ was Drury he would have bid 2NT for the minors and by agreement North had to bid 3♣ with equal length. North didn’t intend to balance, but he suspected that the 2♣ bid had been Drury and believed that his partner might want the auction backed up, so he started to ask questions.

The Director ruled that North had already passed and gave him the option of changing his call. South had told the Director away from the table that he would have bid 2NT had he been properly Alerted. East said that he had forgotten their agreement to play Drury (both convention cards had Drury marked on them). West said that he would have bid 3♣ if N/S had competed to 3♣. E/W said that North had called the Director and that sometime during the Director’s trip to the table and the Director’s comments, North had said “I pass anyway” or he had put a Pass Card on the table.

The Committee Decision: The Committee decided that N/S were responsible for their poor result. Surely North and South suspected that 2♣ was Drury. Even though there is an Alert procedure, it was reasonable to expect players of this experience level to glance at the opponents’ convention card to prevent this problem in such a basic situation.

South should have suspected that 2♣ was going to end the auction so he could have found out what the E/W agreement was. North tried to do so, but since the he had already passed, the auction could no longer be backed up to his partner. For N/S, the table result of 2♣ made three, +140 for E/W, was allowed to stand. Since E/W had given N/S misinformation, they were to be assigned the most “unfavorable result that was at all probable” (Law 12C2). The Committee decided that South would have bid 2NT had he been properly Alerted and that E/W might not compete to 3♣ since East wasn’t entitled to know about the spade fit and West couldn’t automatically compete to the three-level, vulnerable, with only three-card support, West might double 3♣, pass or bid 3♠. The Committee decided that pass was quite possible. A 3♣ contract might go down, but the Committee considered nine tricks to be “at all probable.” Therefore, for the E/W pair, the contract was changed to 3♣ made three, +110 for N/S.

DIC Event: Henry Cukoff

Committee: Larry Cohen (chair), Sid Brownstein, Phil Brady, Corinne Kirkham, Judy Randel

Appeals Case #7

Subject: Misinformation

Event: Flight B/C Swiss Teams, 19 November, First Session
The Facts: 3♣ went down one, +100 for N/S.

The opening lead was the ♦4. After the final pass North told the table that he had failed to Alert his partner’s double of 2♦. He realized his error after East had asked to see his convention card. Away from the table, East told the Director that he wouldn’t change his call. West said, away from the table, that he didn’t care what the double was. East knew South’s double wasn’t penalty and didn’t call the Director to adjudicate. He was willing to guess wrongly what his partner’s 3♣ bid was. The Director allowed the table result to stand (Law 9B1a).

The Appeal: E/W appealed the Director’s ruling. After the hand was over West said he did not care what the double was, unless it was penalty. He thought it was takeout. When it was pointed out that a support double is a form of takeout, he said he would have bid 3♣ if he had been Alerted.

West was asked what kind of vulnerable versus non-vulnerable overcalls his partner made if this were a penalty double. He replied that sometimes he overcalled four-card suits.

East stated that KJ9xx (the suit he held) was kind of on the weak side for a two-level overcall. East also said that since there had been no Alert, he thought his partner was making a runout bid and he had to respect it. When he was asked why he did not protect himself by calling the Director prior to passing 3♣ (when he knew South’s double was not penalty) he just repeated his statement about honoring partner’s runout. South said that after the Director left the table, West lit into East for not recognizing his cuebid in support of diamonds.

The Panel Decision: West was aware when he bid 3♣ that the double was not penalty. East saw the card was marked support double so he knew it was not penalty. Since East chose to bid on without calling the Director, he was entitled to the score he earned. Since both players
knew what was going on, there was no violation of Law 40C. The table result was allowed to stand. The Panel found that the appeal lacked merit, but decided to educate the players rather than assess an appeal without merit warning.

**DIC of Event:** Ron Johnston

Panel: Charlie MacCracken (Reviewer), Mike Flader, Chris Patrias, Susan Patricelli

Players consulted: none reported

**Appeals case #8**

**Subject:** Tempo

**Event:** Open BAM Teams, 20 November, First Final Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board 15</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/S vul.</td>
<td>♠ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer South</td>
<td>♥ 7 6 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ A 8 4 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♣ 10 9 8 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♠ 10 5 3</td>
<td>♠ A J 8 7 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♥ A 10 2</td>
<td>♥ K Q J 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Q J 6</td>
<td>♦ 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣ K Q 6 3</td>
<td>♣ A 5 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOUTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♠ K Q 9 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♥ 9 8 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ K 10 9 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣ J 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yi Zhong</td>
<td>Lorenzo Lauria</td>
<td>Rouyu Fan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1♠</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>1♠</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1NT</td>
<td>Pass(1)</td>
<td>2♣(2)</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2♣</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>3♥(3)</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3♣</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>4♣</td>
<td>Dbl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Pass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) Break in tempo.

(2) Alerted; checkback.

(3) Forcing.

**The Facts:** 4♣ doubled went down one, +100 for N/S. The opening lead was the ♦J. The Director was called after the double of 4♣ and was told that North had hesitated 5-6 seconds before passing 1NT. N/S denied any hesitation. The Director ruled that there had been no unmistakable hesitation and allowed the table result to stand.

**The Appeal:** E/W appealed the Director’s ruling. The E/W team captain (George Jacobs) attended the hearing. E/W claimed that a hesitation of approximately 5-6 seconds occurred after the 1NT call and that South’s double might have been suggested by the hesitation. North said there was no reason for him to hesitate holding only four points vulnerable, with his partner not showing any values. He thought he had taken 2-3 seconds to bid over 1NT. N/S explained that at a previous regional, the Director had been called to the table because they had bid too quickly. The Director had suggested they hesitate briefly before each bid. N/S pointed out that this was a BAM event, and risking the double at BAM was a good gamble with South’s holding even if partner could not contribute to the defense, especially since, although East had shown extra values, West had rejected two game tries by East.

**The Committee Decision:** The question of the hesitation was discussed fully, and the Committee found no reason to find that there had been a hesitation by North. Therefore no infraction had occurred and there was no restriction on any action that South chose. The Committee also decided that this appeal was without substantial merit, and should not have come to Committee. East, West and the team captain were issued an appeal without merit warning.

**Committee:** Doug Heron(chair), Bart Bramley, Barbara Nudelman, Marlene Passell, Riggs Thayer.

**Appeals case 9**

**Subject:** Tempo

**Event:** Blue Ribbon Pairs, 21 November, First Qualifying Session

```
Board 23
Dealer South

NORTH
♠ K 10
♥ J 9 7 6 5 3
♦ A 10 7
♣ 3 2

WEST
♠ Q J 9 8
♥ K 8 4
♦ - -
♣ A K Q 10 9 6

SOUTH
♠ 5 2
♥ A 2
♦ K J 9 6 5 3 2
♣ 7 5

EAST
♠ A 7 6 4 3
♥ Q 10
♦ Q 8 4
♣ J 8 4
```
The Facts: 5♠ made six, +680 for E/W. The Director was called when East bid 4♠. There was at least a 20-second hesitation before West doubled 4♣. East did not bid 4♠ over 4♣ in case West wanted to cuebid hearts. He bid 4♣ over the slow double because he believed North wanted to play 4♥ doubled. He also knew that West could not be doubling with trumps. The Director ruled that East was allowed to believe his partner held the suits she had promised with her takeout double and that pass was not a logical alternative. The table result was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: N/S appealed the Director’s ruling. North did not attend the hearing. East stated that he had shown his spades when he doubled 3♠ and that he did not have any real values to suggest that 4♠ would be successful. He also wanted to give his partner the opportunity to cuebid hearts. South said he thought the out-of- tempo double suggested doubt and that pass was a logical alternative to 4♠.

The Committee Decision: The Committee discussed the bridge logic of the East hand. The double of 3♠ adequately described the hand and exposed the psychic. The 4♦ bid by North allowed East to get more information since partner might just pass with a minimum, bid 4♠, or bid 4♥. The reopening double showed better than minimum values and offered a choice to defend or bid 4♠. The Committee decided defending was not an option and that 4♠ was clearly the bid required by bridge logic. The Committee believed that N/S should have known that their psychic had been exposed and that after seeing the East hand should not have appealed the Director’s ruling. North and South each received an appeal without merit warning.

DIC of Event: Henry Cukoff
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