

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2013-XX	Unauthorised information	Spring National Open Teams
Stage	Round	Date
Qualifying	2	2013-10-23
CTD	M. McManus	
Committee	B. Neill (c), A. Mill, B. Coles	
Scribe	S. Yuen	

Board 8
Dealer W
Vul Nil
Scoring Teams,imps converted to VPs on 2012 WBF 20-bd scale

North

♠ Q
♥ AQ962
♦ AQ
♣ AQT43

West

♠ JT83
♥ -
♦ JT8754
♣ K86

East

♠ 52
♥ 54
♦ K9632
♣ 9752

South

♠ AK9764
♥ KJT873
♦ -
♣ J

West	North	East	South
Pass	1H	Pass	5D(1)
Pass	6C(2)	Pass	6H(3)
Pass	7H	All pass	

- (1) Exclusion Roman Keycard Blackwood
- (2) Two keycards outside diamonds and the HQ
- (3) Agreed pause before bidding 6H

Table result	7H= by North, NS +1510
Director's ruling	6H+1 by North, NS +1010
Committee's ruling	6H+1 by North, NS +1010

The Director: Was called to the table at the end of play. The players agreed that South's 6H bid had been slow and out of tempo. North explained that he had sufficient extra values to bid 7H, even after the slow 6H bid.

The Chief Tournament Director polled three top players, giving them the North hand, the auction, and the explanations of 5D and 6C. All three chose to pass.

Pass was therefore ruled to be a logical alternative to the 7H call chosen at the table, as defined under Law 16B1(b). The unauthorised information created by the break in tempo suggested bidding 7H over Pass, and the score was therefore adjusted to 6H+1 by North, NS +1010.

The appellants: Explained their exclusion keycard responses over 5D: 5H = no keycards, 5S = one, 5NT = two without the trump queen, 6C = two with the trump queen. North can deduce that South must have two keycards, as South must be prepared for a 5S response showing only one.

South must also have a control in each black suit to avoid two top losers in 6H. North therefore has enough information, combined with the extras in his hand, to bid 7H.

The appeals advisor had been consulted. The appellants were advised that the appeal had merit, but some players had been polled who thought that Pass was a logical alternative.

The respondents: Noted that the slow 6H suggested that all keycards were held, allowing North an easy raise to 7H. Had 6H been bid in tempo, North might have been worried that a keycard was missing (e.g. the HK).

The appeals committee: Questioned the appellants about the details of their agreements. North-South had played together for about three years, although not frequently.

North said that had he been 100% certain that 5D was exclusion keycard, he would have bid 7H directly rather than showing his keycards. Since he was almost certain of his agreements, he decided to bid 6C; he could bid 7H next, unless partner bid 6D, in which case he could reconsider.

East-West pointed to hypothetical hands for South such as AKJTxxx-JTxxx-void-K, or KJTxxxx-KJTxx-void-K. South asserted that she would have bid 1S on these hands, and would not have regarded either as sufficiently good for 5D. The committee agreed, however, that the appellants had not demonstrated a clear partnership agreement that the 5D bid promised two keycards.

While North-South had a convincing argument that they would have bid 7H regardless of the break in tempo, the definition of “logical alternative” imposed by Law 16B1(b) asks whether “the *class of players* in question and using the methods of the partnership” would give serious consideration to the alternative action (in this case, Pass), and whether some might in fact select it. The committee agreed that the way in which the Director’s poll had been conducted had demonstrated that this condition was met.

The poll therefore established Pass as a logical alternative. As a result, the committee ruled that the Director’s decision should stand, NS +1010.