

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	Case:	R6
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

Event	1 st Saturday ABC Pairs	Event DIC	Dianne Barton-Paine
Date	07/23/2016	Session	Second Session

Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	5	N	7030 MPS		
Dealer	N	♠ 1093	♥ A108		
Vul	N/S	♦ AQ1087	♣ 74		
W	3100 MPS			E	16,800 MPS
♠ Q874				♠ K65	
♥ 62				♥ QJ9	
♦ 5				♦ J64	
♣ AQ9853			♣ J1062		
		S	10,360 MPS		
		♠ AJ2			
		♥ K7543			
		♦ K932			
		♣ K			

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♣X by W	Down 3	N/S +500	

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called during the auction, and again at the end of play. East felt that there was a break in tempo prior to South's second call. East stated he believed there was a 5-6 second break before the pass. N/S agreed on the time, but felt that it was not a BIT, considering the level of the auction.

Director Ruling

The directing staff determined that, even though the BIT was only 5-6 seconds, for this auction it was a BIT. They polled players with similar masterpoint holding as North who would either bid 3♣ with the hand or would be comfortable doing so. From the poll, the directors determined that the BIT suggested that action would be more profitable than inaction, and that pass was a logical alternative. They adjusted the result to 4♣ by West, down two, N/S +100.

Director's Ruling	4♣ by W, Down 2, N/S +100
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling, believing that the minimal hesitation was not a significant BIT at this level of the auction.

Panel Findings

The panel deferred to the table director's determination that, for this auction, the 5-6 second break was a break in tempo. Once the panel determined that, it considered the polling results. Of the eleven players polled (masterpoints

between 4000 and 18,000), two were not counted as they could not “buy into” this auction, five passed with the North hand when the auction came back to them, and four doubled.

The panel determined that pass was a logical alternative and bidding 4♦ was demonstrably suggested by the tempo of South’s pass (Law 16B). North’s 3♣ bid was intended to show a limit raise of South’s 1♥ opener and when South passed 4♣ “slowly”, he was declining the invitation. The North hand has no more than it said that it had originally. The panel upheld the original table ruling of 4♣ by West, down 2, N/S +100.

Panel Decision	4♣ by W, Down 2, N/S +100
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Marilyn Wells
Member	Eric Bell
Member	Kevin Perkins