

Subject of Appeal:	Break in Tempo, Unauthorized Information	Case:	N10
---------------------------	--	--------------	-----

Event	Machlin Women's Swiss	Event DIC	Charlie MacCracken
Date	03/19/2017	Session	First Final


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Four-card support
2: Control bids
3: Break in tempo

Hand Record

Board	22	N	Pamela Nisbet
Dealer	E	♠ A1042	
Vul	E/W	♥ (void)	
		♦ AK86	
		♣ A9754	
W	Wei Wang		
♠	J86		
♥	8642		
♦	Q103		
♣	K62	E	Shuoyan Liu
		S	Ru Hong Terajewicz
		♠	K975
		♥	AK973
		♦	752
		♣	Q
			♠ Q3
			♥ QJ105
			♦ J94
			♣ J1083

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♠ by N	Made 6	N/S +980	♦4

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the end of play. Screens were in use, with North/East and South/West as screen mates. The director was told that the tray had been noticeably delayed on the S/W side at the point of the 5♠ bid and the following pass. All players agreed to that fact.

North claimed South's 5♠ bid denied possession of both the ace and king of hearts; South was unable to confirm that agreement and said she didn't know how to proceed further over 5♦. N/S were not an experienced partnership.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled seven players from the Jacoby Swiss final and the regional A/X swiss. Four players passed 5♠, three of whom said no other action deserved consideration. Two other players bid 6♠ and said it was clear cut. One other bid 6♠ but said it was a close choice and would consider passing. Two of the players who passed were asked after they chose their action if they thought a slow 5♠ would suggest bidding on and they said it did.

Director Ruling

Per Law 16B1, the director determined from the poll result that the hesitation "demonstrably suggested" not passing 5♠ and that pass was a logical alternative. Thus, per Law 12C, the score was adjusted to 5♠ by North, making six, N/S +480.

Director's Ruling	5♠ by N, Made 6, N/S +480
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Review

N/S appealed the ruling. All four players attended the review (which was recorded). The reviewer explained to N/S the steps the director had taken to arrive at the ruling, and that for the panel to overturn it some fault would have to be found with the ruling.

All players confirmed to the reviewer that there was a significant delay before the tray returned after 5♠-Pass. The reviewer explained the rationale for the ruling and how the law operates in this kind of case.

North disputed that the slow 5♠ bid suggested bidding six. She also explained that her partner's previous actions suggested strength due to the fast arrival methods they play, and that her own bidding was therefore aimed at deciding whether or not to bid a grand slam. She said she always intended to bid at least a small slam. She said that her partner was not as experienced a player as she was and that she had been bidding slowly all week so her tempo did not mean anything to her in this auction. She thought, by the methods she uses, her partner had denied both the ace and king of hearts with her 5♠ bid, so she had to have a card somewhere else, thus making bidding the small slam clearly correct over 5♠. When the reviewer pointed out that her partner did not share that opinion of what 5♠ showed relative to hearts, she said she assumed during the bidding that she did.

Panel Findings

While it seemed apparent who was hesitating in the auction, the reviewer decided to further poll the question of whether it demonstrably suggested bidding the slam. Two players were given North's hand and the auction. One bid six, and the other passed. Both believed a slow 5♠ bid suggested bidding slam.

The panel was satisfied that there was an unmistakable hesitation that suggested not passing, and found that the director polled appropriately to determine that pass was a logical alternative. Therefore, the table ruling was upheld.

N/S were issued an Appeal Without Merit Warning.

Players consulted by the reviewer: Cenk Tuncok, Jeff Miller

Panel Decision	5♠ by N, Made 6, N/S +480
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Smith
Member	Matt Koltnow
Member	Jenni Carmichael