

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	Case:	N7
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Truscott Senior Swiss Teams	Event DIC	Tom Marsh
Date	08/11/2015	Session	Second Final

Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Hearts & diamonds
2: Willingness to defend one
3: Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	27	N	Robert Cappelli		
Dealer	S	♠	A109		
		♥	Q10832		
		♦	Q		
Vul	None	♣	AK106		
W	Phillip Becker			E	Pierre Flatowicz
♠	Q2			♠	K7543
♥	K97654			♥	(void)
♦	K9843			♦	10752
♣	(void)			♣	9532
		S	Robert Katz		
		♠	J86		
		♥	AJ		
		♦	AJ6		
		♣	QJ874		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by N	Made 5	N/S +460	♦ 2

Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was summoned after North bid 3NT. South's Double over 3♦ had been slow, approximately ten seconds. North/South had the partnership agreement that the Double showed three good diamonds and suggested defending.

Director Ruling

As North held prime defensive cards and the partnership agreement suggested defending, the director ruled that Pass was a logical alternative to bidding 3NT. Per Laws 16B and 1C2, the Director adjusted the score to 3♦X by East, Down 2, N/S +300.

Director's Ruling	3♦X by E, Down 2, N/S +300
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

The North/South players appealed the director's ruling, and South and East attended the committee. N/S are a regular partnership. The double of 2NT showed a desire to penalize at least one of the red suits shown by West. N/S always open 1♦ with 3-3 in the minors and 1♣ with 4-5, unless the clubs are much better than diamonds. North knew the latter was not the case here based upon his own hand. The double of 3♦ showed three good diamond cards, which was the actual South holding, so any Unauthorized Information from the BIT was duplicated by the Authorized Information of the auction.

East believed that the tempo showed doubt, and that North should have passed.

Committee Findings

It was stipulated that there was a BIT before the double of 3♦. However, it was not clear to the AC that the BIT actually gave North UI, or that the UI demonstrably suggested that bidding would be more successful than passing.

A poll of six players had two taking some action in order to explore for a club slam, with the other four players passing. South's hand matched the partnership agreement for the double, so the slowness does not suggest that bidding 3NT would be more successful than passing. If South does not have good diamonds, then 3NT would be unmakeable and the hesitation would suggest exploring a club contract. North did not pursue a club contract, so he did not use any UI to follow a suggested alternative.

Since the UI did not demonstrably suggest that bidding 3NT would be more successful than passing, and the authorized information from the auction was the same as the UI, the AC decided that there was no cause to overturn the table results. They therefore restored the result to 3NT by North, making 5, N/S +460.

Committee Decision	3NT by N, Made 5, N/S +460
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chair	Richard Popper
Member	Eugene Kales
Member	Chris Moll
Member	Gail Greenberg
Member	Dick Budd