

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

Event	Keohane NA Swiss Teams	Event DIC	Tom Marsh
Date	12/01/2017	Session	First Qualifying

Auction

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♦	1♥	DbI
2♦	2♠	3♥	Pass
Pass	3♠	Pass	Pass
4♥	Pass	Pass	DbI ¹
Pass	4♠	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Agreed Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	28	N	Steve Ramos		
Dealer	W	♠	A10864		
		♥	10		
Vul	N/S	♦	AJ9742		
		♣	9		
W	Robert Cappelli			E	Frank Treiber
♠	752			♠	KQ
♥	KJ543			♥	A98762
♦	Q6			♦	10
♣	KQ6			♣	J1053
		S	Murat Veysoglu		
		♠	J93		
		♥	Q		
		♦	K853		
		♣	A8742		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♠ by S	Made 4	N/S +620	♦10

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after North bid 4♠ and was told that South's second double was after a pause of thirty seconds. All of the players agreed to the long hesitation. He instructed the pairs to play the hand, and then call him again if they believed they had been damaged.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled six players on North's action after the double. Three passed and three bid 4♠, although none of the polled players duplicated North's first four calls of the auction. The director also polled the defense to 4♥X and found that four out of four players found the club ruff necessary to beat that contract.

Director Ruling

The director determined that the unmistakable hesitation before South's second double suggested doubt and provided Unauthorized information. Law 16B states that a player may not choose a call that is demonstrably suggested over another by unauthorized information if the other call is a logical alternative. The poll showed that pass was a logical alternative, so the contract was adjusted to 4♥X by East, down one, N/S +100, per Law 12C.

Director's Ruling	4♥X by E, Down 1, N/S +100
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Review

N/S appealed the director's ruling. All four players attended the review. N/S's written reason for appealing was:

"North had a very distributional hand that was unsuitable for defense and he did not base his decision to bid 4♠ on the hesitation prior to South's double."

The reviewer explained to the appellants that according to regulation the burden was on them to demonstrate that the director's ruling was flawed in some way and if that could not be shown the appeal would likely fail.

In going over the facts with the players, it was confirmed that South's original double ostensibly promised four spades; 2♦ promised heart support; 3♥ showed extra length; and there was a thirty second pause before South's second double.

North said he was hoping his partner would bid 4♠ when 4♥ was passed around to him, but he was prepared to live with a pass. When South doubled, North said that showed extra values he thought would make 4♠ more likely to make. He said he did not want to bid 4♠ earlier as many of the polled players did because he did not want to overstate his hand and cause partner to bid a bad slam.

Panel Findings

The panel decided to try to find peers of North who would duplicate his first four actions. Many players were asked, but none were found who agreed with how he bid the hand to the point of South's second double. One player was found who agreed with his first three calls, but that person bid 4♠ directly over 4♥. When that person was asked what they would do if they had chosen to pass at their fourth turn and partner had doubled, they said they would pass.

While it proved impossible to poll the hand perfectly, the panel did not find evidence to overturn the original ruling and in fact found some evidence to support it. The panel thought it was significant that unlike almost all of his peers, North had shown a willingness to defend 4♥ undoubled when he passed 4♥.

The ruling of 4♥X by East, down one, was upheld. Due to the difficulty finding peers of this North, the appeal was found to have merit.

Panel Decision	4♥X by E, Down 1, N/S +100
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Smith
Member	Jenni Carmichael
Member	Kevin Perkins