

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	Case:	N16
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	-----

Event	Roth Open Swiss Teams	Event DIC	Kevin Perkins
Date	07/30/2016	Session	First Semifinal

Auction

West	North	East	South
		Pass	Pass
1♦	Pass	1♥	Pass
1♠	Pass	3♦	Pass
3NT	Pass	Pass	Pass ¹

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	2	N	May Sakr		
Dealer	E	♠ 97	♥ QJ10		
Vul	N/S	♦ Q1073	♣ 10432		
W	Andy Bowles			E	Shireen Mohandes
♠	AK82			♠	QJ
♥	4			♥	K876
♦	AK85			♦	J642
♣	Q986			♣	K75
		S			
		♠	106543		
		♥	A9532		
		♦	9		
		♣	AJ		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by W	Down 2	N/S +100	♥ Q

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called when the opening lead was made. West stated there had been an unmistakable hesitation before South's final pass. North and South agreed there was a small hesitation; South said it was probably ten seconds.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director deemed that ten seconds was enough to rule there had been an unmistakable hesitation, so he proceeded to poll players to determine whether there was damage from use of that UI. The director polled four players with North's opening lead problem. One led a club, and the other three led a heart. All four thought the break in tempo suggested leading a heart. The three players who led a heart all told the director that they would lead a club if South had broken tempo.

Director Ruling

Based upon Laws 73C and 16B1 and the player poll, the TD imposed a club lead on North. He got expert analysis of the play in 3NT, and the experts believed down one was a very likely result, and making three would happen a small percentage of the time. Accordingly, per Law 12C1c, he adjusted the score to 75% of 3NT by West, down one, N/S +50, and 25% of 3NT by West, making three, EW +400.

Director's Ruling	75% 3NT by W, Down 1, N/S +50 25% 3NT by W, Made 3, E/W +400
--------------------------	---

The Appeal

N/S requested a review of the ruling. North thought no reasonable player would choose a lead other than the ♥Q; she was concerned players were not informed of the E/W bidding system. E/W were playing ACOL with a strong no trump; West's 1♠ rebid suggested an unbalanced hand pattern, making a heart lead automatic.

Panel Findings

The reviewer was concerned about the integrity of the poll results. A director asks questions about actions a player would choose, other actions which are attractive, and the value of UI which might be present. The table director asked questions in a way that those polled were effectively making the ruling, rather than giving their expert bridge opinion. Using that poll information might have led the TD to draw an incorrect conclusion.

The reviewer accepted the original poll's finding that the UI suggested a heart lead. He was concerned that those polled did not have an accurate description of the E/W bidding system. He gave the hand to eight players. All eight players led the ♥Q and felt no reasonable player would choose any other lead. On this information, the Review panel felt that Law 16B1 did not apply—while there was UI that suggested a heart lead, there was no logical alternative. The Panel restored the table result of 3NT, down two, N/S +100.

Panel Decision	3NT by W, Down 2, N/S +100
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Koltnow
Advisor	Gary Zeiger
Advisor	David Metcalf