

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo/Unauthorized Information/Misinformation	Case:	N6
---------------------------	---	--------------	----

Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs	Event DIC	Harry Falk
Date	12/01/2015	Session	Second Qualifying

Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Diamonds, no alert
2: Break in Tempo
3: Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	17	N	Irene Baroni		
Dealer	N	♠	54		
		♥	KJ10		
Vul	None	♦	KQ76532		
		♣	6		
W	Allan Falk			E	John Lusky
♠	A109876			♠	KQJ3
♥	62			♥	943
♦	8			♦	J9
		♣	A732	♣	K1095
		S	Andrea Manno		
		♠	2		
		♥	AQ875		
		♦	A104		
		♣	QJ84		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♦X by N	Made 6	N/S +650	♠ K

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned after each break in tempo, at the end of the auction when North explained that 2♣ should have been Alerted and then at the end of play. South stated that 2♣ by an unpassed hand would show diamonds, but was uncertain if that was the partnership agreement for a passed hand. That was why he did not Alert the bid and raised clubs at his next turn to call. Both North and South agreed that South's double was systemically not for penalty. East/West felt they "had no chance to get this right."

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

As the ruling came in the last rounds of the session, the director had limited time for polling. He polled four players regarding the North hand and the auction through South's double. All four bid 4♥ over the double, with none considering pass. Two of the players were given the next three bids and both bid 5♦.

Director Ruling

Based upon the player poll, the director ruled that North did not choose, from amongst logical alternatives, one demonstrably suggested by the Unauthorized Information (Law 16B). Therefore, the table result was confirmed

Director's Ruling	5♦X by N, Made 6, N/S +650
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling, and East, North and South attended the hearing. East argued that with the misinformation about the hand, he and his partner had no chance to make sensible decisions in the auction. With correct information, he would not have doubled the final contract, and likely would have competed in spades over the 4♥ bid.

North/South provided their system notes which confirmed that 2♣ did show diamonds, as well as confirming that South's Double was systemically for takeout. They did not believe that South's slight hesitation before doubling was out of tempo in passout seat.

Committee Findings

Both UI and MI were present at multiple times throughout the auction, and resulted in a complex case. Due to the hand occurring at the end of the evening session, the director did not have time to poll as extensively as would have been preferred, particularly concerning the South hand following North's hesitation over 3♠. The committee deliberated at length about South's action at this point in the auction, concerning the UI from the BIT.

The committee judged that Pass, Double and 4♣ were all possible actions by South, and that double was demonstrably suggested by the UI. While the committee considered pass as an alternative, they all viewed 4♣ as the more likely call. After a lengthy deliberation, they ruled Pass to not be a logical alternative for a player of South's caliber.

The committee then considered the auction following a 4♣ bid, and concluded that the auction would have proceeded similarly to the auction examined by the director in his poll, with there being no LA to North bidding 4♥. At this point, considerations to the MI implications from the 2♣ call enter the analysis. The N/S system notes confirmed the systemic agreement that 2♣ showed a diamond holding by North, thus MI did exist. The committee judged that, with the correct information, East would not double over 4♥, and that South would likely pass. West would then likely bid 4♠, which North would double.

Based upon the standards defined in Law 12C1e ("at all probable" and "likely"), the committee judged that West would take nine tricks in 4♠X, and that result was assigned. The committee believed, based upon South's double and 4NT bid, that South was aware of the possibility that North might have diamonds, but did not disclose this during the auction. The committee discussed whether a procedural penalty would be appropriate, but decided to not assess one.

Committee Decision	4♠X by W, Down 1, N/S +100
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chairman	Richard Popper
Scribe	Greg Herman
Member	Don Kern
Member	Joel Wooldridge
Member	Patty Tucker