

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	Case:	N12
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	-----

Event	Reisinger BAM Teams	Event DIC	Matt Koltnow
Date	12/04/2015	Session	First Qualifying


Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
Pass	1♣	Dbl	Pass
1♦	1NT	2♦	Dbl ¹
Pass	3♣	Pass ²	Pass
3♦	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Takeout
2: Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	23	N	Bobby Levin		
Dealer	S	♠	94		
		♥	K32		
Vul	Both	♦	A10		
		♣	AKQ1074		
W	Carlos Hoyos			E	Jorge Barrera
♠	Q72			♠	AKJ3
♥	Q4			♥	A1095
♦	75432			♦	QJ86
♣	J86			♣	2
		S	Steve Weinstein		
		♠	10865		
		♥	J876		
		♦	K9		
		♣	953		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♦ by W	Made 4	E/W +130	

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called by North/South following the 3♦ bid and again at the end of play. Both sides agreed that East had hesitated noticeably prior to passing over 3♣.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Five players were polled with the West hand. All five bid 3♦. Pass was not deemed to be a logical alternative.

Director Ruling

As there was no logical alternative to bidding, the UI from the BIT was deemed to be immaterial and no adjustment was necessary.

Director's Ruling	3♦ by W, Made 4, E/W +130
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S appealed the ruling, and South and West attended the hearing. South argued that North's 1NT rebid was not explained in the player poll as showing an 18-19 HCP hand. West had the opportunity to bid 3♦ over South's double, and South believed that ethically, West should have passed once his partner hesitated.

West stated that he and his partner were aware that the 1NT rebid showed 18-19 HCP. He passed the double to wait and see what North did. He would have been willing to defend against 2♠, and maybe 2♥ (he was still deliberating

that notion). Also, he believed his partner's 2♦ bid showed short clubs and extra values, since it was bid over an 18-19 1NT bid.

Committee Findings

The Committee agreed with West that the 2♦ bid likely showed short clubs and extra values. The other possibility was that East may have held five diamonds instead. Under either alternative, the committee agreed with the player poll that defending against 3♣ with the West hand was not a logical alternative. Therefore, the director's ruling was confirmed.

Committee Decision	3♦ by W, Made 4, E/W +130
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chairman	Richard Popper
Scribe	Joel Wooldridge
Member	Thomas Carmichael
Member	Ed Lazarus
Member	Rick Rowland