

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	Case:	N10
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	-----

Event	Roth Open Swiss	Event DIC	Gary Zeiger
Date	08/14/2015	Session	Second Final


Auction

West	North	East	South
	2♠ ¹	3♥	4♠
Pass ²	Pass	4NT	Pass
5♥	5♠	Pass	Pass
6♥	Pass	Pass	6♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Spades & a minor, weak
2: Break in Tempo (1 minute)

Hand Record

Board	29	N	Ai-Tai Lo		
Dealer	N	♠	Q109xx		
		♥	(void)		
Vul	Both	♦	AQ10xx		
		♣	Qxx		
W	Rodrigo Garcia Da Rosa			E	Carlos Pellegrini
♠	xxx			♠	x
♥	AQJ10			♥	K8xxxxx
♦	xxx			♦	J
♣	xxx			♣	AK102
		S	Alan Schwartz		
		♠	AKJx		
		♥	xx		
		♦	Kxxx		
		♣	Jxx		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♠ by N	Down 1	E/W +100	♣ K

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned at the conclusion of play of the hand. North/South explained that there had been an obvious break in tempo of almost a minute following the 4♠ call by South before West passed. East/West agreed to the BIT.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Four expert players were given the East hand and the auction without the BIT, in order to determine if there was a logical alternative to bidding. Most were in favor of bidding, but agreed that the BIT clearly made the choice easier.

Director Ruling

While the poll showed that bidding on was certainly a possibility, based solely on the East hand, the BIT clearly suggested that bidding would be more successful than passing. Accordingly, per Laws 16B1 and 12C1e, the results were changed to 4♠ by North, making 5, N/S +650.

Director's Ruling	4♠ by N, Made 5, N/S +650
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling, and they along with the North player attended the committee hearing. East felt his hand stood on its own merits, and it was obvious to bid 4NT in order to show a four card minor suit.

Committee Findings

The AC agreed with the polled players that taking action with the East hand after 4♠ was about a 75% action. However, the lengthy hesitation by West suggested values and that action rather than inaction would probably be the winning call by East. Per Law 16, a player may not choose from amongst logical alternatives one suggested UI. The AC therefore upheld the director ruling that Pass was a logical alternative over 4♠, with the result of making five, N/S +650. As bidding was considered a high percentage action, the appeal was judged to have merit.

Committee Decision	4♠ by N, Made 5, N/S +650
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chair	Gail Greenberg
Member	James Thurtell
Member	Ellen Kent
Member	Scott Stearns
Member	Chris Moll