

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	Case:	R1
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Wednesday AM Side Game	Event DIC	Jean Molnar
Date	12/03/2014	Session	


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo
2: Intended as Gerber
3: RKC for Clubs - two w/o Q

Hand Record

Board	4	N	470 MP		
Dealer	W	♠	AQ9		
		♥	AK8		
Vul	Both	♦	A104		
		♣	Q965		
W	5800 MP			E	3030 MP
♠	K85			♠	J10742
♥	J742			♥	95
♦	J953			♦	Q76
♣	82			♣	J103
		S	430 MP		
		♠	63		
		♥	Q1063		
		♦	K82		
		♣	AK74		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♥ by S	Made 6	N/S +1430	♦ 3

Facts Determined at the Table

All parties agreed that South paused for about 20-30 seconds before bidding 3NT. North then asked for aces and drove to slam. The table director was called after North's 4♣ bid. North told the director he was always going to bid a slam. When the director asked why North didn't just bid the slam if he was always going to bid it, he responded "I had to find out what he had."

Director Ruling

The table director ruled South's break in tempo showed extra values. The BIT therefore could demonstrably have suggested that going on past 3NT was more likely to be successful than pass, which was deemed a logical alternative to North's 4♣. Therefore, per Law 16B1a and Law 12, the score was adjusted to 3NT by North making 6 for +690 N/S.

Director's Ruling	3NT by N, Made 6, N/S +690
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

North/South appealed the ruling and all four players attended the hearing. North said that they were a pickup partnership and had only played together once previously. North said that his partner's tempo was erratic and that he had not taken any inference from the BIT. North felt that he had enough extra from his previous bidding to go to slam if partner had the missing ace which he felt was confirmed by the fact that all the North/South pairs in the section scored 12 tricks. South concurred, stating that his partner's values were all prime.

East-West felt that North had stated the full value of his hand with his 2NT rebid and that the break in tempo had shown extras and influenced North to bid on.

Panel Findings

Eight players between 50 and 1100 masterpoints were polled as to what they would bid with the North hand after the 3NT call. All passed. Although three of the players were not sure if South's break in tempo before his 3NT bid suggested anything, the others felt strongly that South's BIT indicated he was considering bidding more than 3NT and that the BIT made a decision to go on more likely to be successful. None of the polled players agreed with the N/S assessment that North had extra values that had not been shown by his previous bidding.

The panel agreed with the table director's assessment and allowed the ruling to stand, 3NT by North, making 6, N/S +690. Because the panel felt that N/S had not provided a strong argument in their defense, the pair were issued an Appeal without Merit Warning (AWMW).

Panel Decision	3NT by N, Made 6, N/S +690
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Panel Members

Chair	Eric Bell
Member	Charlie MacCracken
Member	Kenneth Van Cleve