

Subject of Appeal:	Break in Tempo, Unauthorized Information	Case:	R5
---------------------------	--	--------------	----

Event	2 nd Sunday Fast Pairs	Event DIC	Alex Bealles
Date	07/30/2017	Session	First Session

Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	1♥	Pass
2NT ¹	3♣	3♥	4♣ ²
5♣	Pass	6♥	Pass ³
Pass	7♣	Dbl	Pass
7♥	Dbl	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Jacoby 2NT raise
2: Asked about 3♥
3: Disputed Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	25	N	1600 MPS		
Dealer	N	♠	J1084		
		♥	(void)		
Vul	E/W	♦	A94		
		♣	QJ10742		
W	1400 MPS			E	3500 MPS
♠	K7			♠	AQ93
♥	A1098743			♥	KJ652
♦	KQ53			♦	J76
♣	(void)			♣	A
		S	1000 MPS		
		♠	652		
		♥	Q		
		♦	1082		
		♣	K98653		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
7♥X by E	Down 1	N/S +200	♣6

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after South's pass on the third round of the auction. West explained that South had asked several questions about East's 3♥ bid on the previous round before making her 4♣ bid. She had now broken tempo before passing following 6♥. N/S disputed the BIT.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Four players with similar masterpoint holdings were polled and all passed with the North hand. All felt that a BIT by South suggested bidding 7♣.

Director Ruling

Based upon the player poll, the Director ruled that North had violated Law 16B1 following the BIT. Per Law 12C, the director adjusted the result to 6♥ by East, making 6, E/W +1430.

Director's Ruling	6♥ by E, Made 6, E/W +1430
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Review

N/S appealed the ruling and all four players attended the hearing, which was held just before the start of the second session.

North said that South did not break tempo after 6♥. She asked for an explanation of 3H and then bid 4♣. He was going to go to 7♣ if the opponents bid 6♥ regardless because of the favorable vulnerability. South said she did not break tempo, she bid right away.

West said there was a BIT that was a lot longer than the 10 seconds required after a skip in the level of bidding – closer to 20 seconds. East agreed that there had been a long wait before South bid. At first he was a little uncertain when it happened, but eventually decided it was not after the 3♥ bid because of the questions South asked, so it had to be after the 6♥ bid.

Panel Findings

The reviewer polled three more players in the 1,000 to 1,500 masterpoint range and all passed 6♥. Two thought a BIT after 6♥ strongly suggested bidding 7♣. One agreed, but thought there might be a small possibility South was considering doubling.

The Panel was troubled by E's initial uncertainty about when the BIT happened, but eventually was convinced by his reasoning. No independent witness was at the table when the alleged BIT took place, so the Panel had to figure out what happened. Looking at the South hand and at the vulnerability it seems almost certain South would pause for some time before taking action. The Panel decided there was an unmistakable break in the tempo of the auction.

Therefore, the Panel confirmed the table director's ruling, 6♥ by East, making 6, E/W +1430. The appeal was judged to have merit because of E's uncertainty of when the BIT occurred.

Panel Decision	6♥ by E, Made 6, E/W +1430
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Charlie MacCracken
Member	Scott Humphrey
Member	Marc Labovitz