

Subject of Appeal:	Break in Tempo, Unauthorized Information	Case:	R4
---------------------------	--	--------------	----

Event	Wednesday A/X Swiss Teams	Event DIC	Guy Fauteux
Date	11/29/2017	Session	Second Session

Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1♠	Pass	2♠	Dbl
4♠	5♥	Pass ¹	Pass
Dbl	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Agree Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	27	N	Markland Jones		
Dealer	S	♠	63		
		♥	K10654		
Vul	None	♦	A8		
		♣	Q1073		
W	Bernie Greenspan			E	Greg Michaels
♠	AJ1074			♠	Q952
♥	(void)			♥	Q973
♦	KQ432			♦	J6
♣	A96			♣	K54
		S	Patricia Dovell		
		♠	K8		
		♥	AJ82		
		♦	10975		
		♣	J82		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♥X by N	Down 4	E/W +800	♠2

Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was called after play of the hand was completed. All players agreed during the auction that East had demonstrably broken tempo before his Pass of 5♥. N/S questioned West's call after the break in tempo. North said that he had played for the hearts to be in the West hand instead of in the East hand and went down one extra trick. The Director determined that Pass in this situation was not forcing according to the E/W methods.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The Director polled five players with the West hand after 5♥ was passed around to them. All players took action: 4 players doubled 5♥ and the other bid 5♠.

Director Ruling

Since no player in the poll passed, the Director ruled that Pass was not a logical alternative for West as defined by Law16B1. Polling did not indicate a clear reason why the break in tempo would suggest doubling 5♥ rather than bidding 5♠, so the Director allowed the table result to stand.

Director's Ruling	5♥X by N, Down 4, E/W +800
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Review

N/S appealed the ruling and all four players attended the review. North said that he understood why the table Director had removed Pass as an option, but he thought the hesitation automatically suggested doubling rather than

bidding 5♠ to cater to whatever holding East had. He also said that E/W had said that West's Double was a "do something intelligent" action Double (E/W confirmed this) and that had he known this, he would have played the hand a trick better. North said his primary interest was that he should be allowed to go -500 rather than -800 if E/W were allowed to Double. North confirmed that he had not asked about E/W's agreements while he was declaring.

Panel Findings

The Reviewer polled seven additional players about their action with the West hand after 5♥ was passed around to them. All seven doubled. Four of the pollees said that they thought East's Pass was forcing, but all players polled agreed they could not see defending 5♥ undoubled with the E/W cards whether Pass was forcing or not. When asked if partner's break in tempo made Double more attractive than 5♠ or vice-versa, five of those polled indicated they did not think it suggested one action over the other. The other two said it did not clearly suggest one action, but they thought if anything the break in tempo made 5♠ more attractive than Double; they felt partner was more likely to be thinking about bidding 5♠ himself than doubling.

The Panel did not feel that E/W's agreement that the Double was "do something intelligent" was sufficiently highly unusual or unexpected as to warrant any kind of Alert for the declarer. Further, the declarer made no effort to find out about the E/W agreements before or while he was playing the hand. The Panel therefore discounted North's argument that he should be allowed to go -500.

The table result was allowed to stand. The Panel voted to assess an Appeal Without Merit Warning to N/S, whom they felt did not introduce any new information to support their decision to appeal.

Panel Decision	5♥X by N, Down 4, E/W +800
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Eric Bell
Member	Matt Koltnow
Member	David Metcalf

Commentary

Goldsmith: Good ruling. I don't like the AWMW. According to the silly rules the Directors claim are necessary for an appeal to have merit, the appellants did produce new evidence. They asked for -500 based on a non-alert. They had asked for this earlier, but the Director didn't address this issue.

That shouldn't be anything like the appropriate criterion for AWMWs. They should be given when most would think, "what a silly appeal," or when the appellants are the offending side, were ruled against, and tried to get an obvious infraction allowed.

Marques: Good ruling overall. I have some reservations just because it is not clear in the write-up if the TD analyzed the possibility of 5♥X-3 or not. The Panel did, and I agree with the conclusion that North should have protected himself by asking some questions about E/W methods. If the TD addressed this question, the AWMW is well deserved. Otherwise, it is not.

Meiracker: I agree with the TD and Panel, the Reviewer polled 7 additional players, they all doubled. The AWMW is a little bit too much after all the work the Panel did.

Wildavsky: E/W would likely have made 5♠, so the question of whether the hesitation suggested Double over 5♠ does not seem relevant. That said, the rulings look right to me, and I agree that the appeal lacked merit. If North wanted to know the meaning of the Double he could have asked. Holding 18 HCP between the two hands he would have been surprised not to have been doubled, regardless of where the outstanding trump were.

That said, the Reviewer's poll looks flawed. It does not matter whether those polled considered East's Pass forcing since E/W agreed that it was not. Per Law 16, logical alternatives are judged in the context of the methods of partnership.

I'd like to know how the play went. The appeal might have been circumvented by noting that on normal defense declarer will be down four even if he starts hearts with the king.

Willenken: If the Panel really believes that West's Double was 'do something intelligent', I have a nice bridge for sale here in NYC. Given the obvious dishonesty of that claim, I'd be loath to give E/W their full result, but I suppose the Laws require it here.

Woolsey: This is a perfect polling hand. If there were some passers (or even some who considered passing), that would indicate that pass is a LA. That appears not to be the case.

I would think that the UI suggested doubling over bidding 5♠. East could hardly have been thinking about bidding 5♠, so he must have been thinking about doubling. If there had been some votes for 5♠ then I would have adjudicated the result to 5♠. However, the overwhelming vote for Double settles the case.

I do not agree with AWMW in a situation like this. While the initial polling of a small number of players suggested that the Double was legit, a further polling might have led to a different conclusion.