

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N18
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	-----

<b>Event</b>	Roth Open Swiss Teams	<b>Event DIC</b>	Kevin Perkins
<b>Date</b>	07/31/2016	<b>Session</b>	Second Final

### Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
Pass	2♠	4♣ <sup>1</sup>	Pass
4♠	Pass	5♠ <sup>2</sup>	Pass
6♣ <sup>3</sup>	Pass	7♣	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Clubs & Hearts, Forcing
2: Cuebid, looking for grand slam
3: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	3	N	Dan, Wolkowitz		
<b>Dealer</b>	S	♠	KQ10952		
		♥	84		
<b>Vul</b>	E/W	♦	KJ9		
		♣	84		
W	Kevin Rosenberg			E	Ben Kristensen
♠	A87643			♠	(void)
♥	2			♥	AKJ10965
♦	A52			♦	3
♣	J72			♣	AKQ93
		S	Kyoko Shimamura		
		♠	J		
		♥	Q73		
		♦	Q108764		
		♣	1065		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
7♣ by E	Made 7	E/W +2140	

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called during the post-match score comparison. North/South sought a ruling on the slow 6♣ bid and 7♣ continuation.

The director collected facts regarding the tempo of the auction. West stated that he thought he had taken 15-30 seconds to bid 6♣. On the opposite side of the screen, North and East agreed that they had acknowledged at the time there had been a break in tempo, which East estimated after the match could well have been 30-45 seconds. Under newly-adopted screen procedures, much more weight is given to statements of the players on the opposite side of the screen from the source of any UI, such as a break in tempo.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director gave the East hand to three players. Over 6♣, two passed. One wanted to bid 7♣ over 4♠.

### Director Ruling

The player poll established Pass as a LA, so, according to Laws 16B1 and 12C1c, the contract and result were adjusted to 6♣ by East, making 7, EW +1390.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	6♣ by E, Made 7, E/W +1390
--------------------------	----------------------------

## The Appeal

E/W requested a review of the ruling. East said he was always bidding 7♣; West thought the BIT was not long enough to be an unmistakable hesitation, particularly in a high-level auction such as this..

### Panel Findings

The reviewer was concerned about the integrity of the poll, as the table director had limited time and resources. She had only been able to poll three players.

The reviewer polled four additional players with the East hand. All wanted to show a strong hand with clubs and hearts and accepted the 4♣ bid. Over 4♣, three chose 5♣ and one bid 5NT, but he thought 5♣ was a good choice as well. All four passed 6♣. The three who were asked said that a slow 6♣ suggested doubt about whether 6♣ should be the final contract; it made 7♣ more attractive to them.

Separately, two players were asked about how much the screen itself masked the source of the UI. They suggested that if players had been careful to move the tray more slowly during earlier rounds of bidding, this break in tempo might not have been noticeable. They felt in this case that it was clear that only West could have hesitated. The reviewer felt that his research showed the table ruling had indeed been correct. By new ACBL appeals procedure, the table ruling is required to stand unless a procedural error or misapplication of Law is discovered.

Experts consulted on screen environment: David Bakhshi, David Gold

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>6♣ by E, Made 7, E/W +1390</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
-----------------	--------------