

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	Case:	N4
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Silver Ribbon Pairs	Event DIC	Gary Zeiger
Date	03/13/2016	Session	Second Qualifying


Auction

West	North	East	South
	1♠	Pass	Pass
1NT ¹	Pass	2♦ ²	Pass
2♥ ³	Pass	2NT	Pass
3NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 11-16 HCP
2: Transfer to ♥
3: Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	1	N	Bob Sanner		
Dealer	N	♠ Q9742			
		♥ K2			
		♦ Q82			
Vul	None	♣ A82			
W	Om Chokriwala			E	Martin Blain
♠	AKJ1053			♠	8
♥	A			♥	QJ1063
♦	K6			♦	AJ107
♣	J643			♣	975
		S	Ronald Powell		
		♠	6		
		♥	98754		
		♦	9543		
		♣	KQ10		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by W	Made 4	E/W +430	♠ 4

Facts Determined at the Table

North/South called the director following the 3NT bid by West. West had taken several seconds prior to bidding 2♥ (North felt almost 30 seconds, while West allowed 8-10 seconds). The E/W partnership agreement was that the balancing NT showed 11-16 HCP, but should be in the higher part of the range when over a Major suit bid.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director gave East's hand, the E/W systemic agreements, and the auction to several players to determine what action they would take with the hand and what they believed the slow 2♥ bid suggested. The results were varied and inconclusive to any one action.

Director Ruling

Law 16 does not permit a player to choose from among logical alternatives any action that is demonstrably suggested by UI provided by their partner. As the player poll did not indicate that any one action was suggested over another by the BIT, the director ruled that table result stood.

Director's Ruling	3NT by W, Made 4, E/W +430
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S appealed the ruling and they, along with West, attended the hearing. N/S believed that the BIT suggested West was thinking about some other action than just accepting the transfer, most likely some form of a super-accept. This suggested taking additional action was more likely to be successful to East. West countered that since the NT call could be made on as much as 16 HCP, the 2NT invitation was just standard bridge and the BIT was irrelevant.

Committee Findings

The Appeals Committee determined that there was a BIT that created UI. What had to be determined was what action, if any, did the UI suggest. The AC decided to poll additional players concerning the situation. This second poll also had mixed results, but it did indicate that the BIT suggested that some bid would be more successful than passing and that passing was a logical alternative. Therefore, the AC changed the results to 2♥ by West, making 2, E/W +110.

Committee Decision	2♥ by W, Made 2, E/W +110
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chair	Richard Popper
Member	Craig Allen (scribe)
Member	Ray Miller
Member	Eugene Kales
Member	Greg Herman