

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo, Unauthorized Information	Case:	N6
---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Truscott Senior Swiss Teams	Event DIC	Tom Marsh
Date	07/21/2014	Session	Second Qualifying


Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1♠	Pass	2NT ¹	Pass
3♦ ²	Pass	3♥ ³	Pass
3♠ ⁴	Pass	4♠ ⁵	Pass
5♦ ⁶	Pass	5♥	Pass
5♠	Pass	6♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 4+ card forcing raise
2: Extras, unknown shortness
3: Asking about shortness
4: Unknown void
5: Break in Tempo, Sign off
6: Undiscussed

Hand Record

Board		11	N	Marlene Konik		
Dealer		S	♠ 86 ♥ KQ10764 ♦ Q43 ♣ 52			
Vul		None				
W	Bruce Tuttle				E	Bob Munson
♠	AQJ43				♠	K10952
♥	(void)				♥	A53
♦	AK1092				♦	J5
♣	J87				♣	K103
			S	Jack Bierig		
			♠ 7 ♥ J982 ♦ 876 ♣ AQ964			

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♠ by E	Made 6	E/W +980	♥ K

Facts Determined at the Table

South called the director following the 5♦ bid. He stated that there had been a break in tempo before East bid 4♠, to which agreed. The director instructed the auction to continue and advised N/S to call him back at the end of play if they felt they had been damaged. At the end of play, N/S summoned the director back, as they believed that the BIT had suggested the continuation over 4♠.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Two players and one director were given the West hand, and the auction through 4♠. One passed, one bid, and one felt it was a judgment call either way. An additional poll indicated that all asked did not feel the BIT demonstrably suggested any particular action, with all of the respondents feeling that they would have taken further action over 4♠ at the table.

Director Ruling

While the first poll indicated that pass was indeed a logical alternative, the second poll indicated that the BIT did not demonstrably suggest one action over another. The threshold established in Law 16B1a being not met, the table result was confirmed: 6♠ by East, making 6, E/W +980.

Director's Ruling	6♠ by E, Made 6, E/W +980
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S appealed the ruling, and all four players attended the committee. N/S argued that there was a significant hesitation by East prior to his 4♠ bid (to which East acquiesced before the table director), which demonstrably suggested that continuing the auction would be more advantageous than passing.

West believed that his hand, opposite a game forcing raise, merited exploring to slam. The BIT had not influenced his decision to bid past his partner's signoff.

Committee Findings

It appeared to the committee that this particular pair always asked about shortness, whether it was appropriate or not, and as such, the asking sequence in of itself did not convey any desire to bid beyond game. Therefore, the BIT did demonstrably suggest bidding over passing. Since passing was a logical alternative, the committee ruled that West could not choose bidding (which was suggested by the hesitation) over passing. Therefore, the committee assigned the results of 4♠ by East, making 6, E/W +480.

Committee Decision	4♠ by E, Made 6, E/W +480
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chair	Jim Thurtell
Member	Craig Allen
Member	Ron Gerard