

Subject of Appeal:	Unauthorized Information	Case:	R5
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Sunday Evening Side Swiss	Event DIC	Terry Lavender
Date	07/20/2014	Session	Only


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-17 HCP
2: Transfer to ♠
3: Agreed Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	12	N	1930 MPS		
Dealer	W	♠ 10xx	♥ Qx		
Vul	N/S	♦ xx	♣ KQxxxx		
W	1220 MPS			E	170 MPS
♠ AK92	♥ xx			♠ QJ87x	♥ xx
♦ AQJ10	♣ J97			♦ xxxx	♣ xx
				S	2070 MPS
		♠ 6	♥ AKJ9754		
		♦ K62	♣ A10		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♥ by S	Made 6	N/S +680	♠ K

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after North broke tempo prior to passing 3♠. South subsequently bid 4♥. East/West believed the BIT influenced South to bid.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Three players were polled with the South hand. Two wanted to bid 3♥ on the first round of bidding, but then passed 3♠. The third player doubled 2♥, then bid 3♥, and then passed 3♠.

Director Ruling

The director decided the BIT almost certainly suggested bidding 4♥. It was deemed unlikely that North was considering doubling when E/W were virtually certain to have at least nine spades between them. The director adjusted the contract to 3♠ by West, making three, E/W +140, per Laws 16B1 and 12C1e.

Director's Ruling	3♠ by W, Made 3, E/W +140
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S appealed and they and their team captain attended the review. The facts were agreed, although South said he hadn't noticed anything. South thought bidding 4♥ was clear, and that he probably should have done so over 2♠. North had been considering bidding 4♥ or 4♣.

Panel Findings

The Reviewer conducted his own poll of South's peers, not only to determine whether passing 3♠ was a logical alternative, but also to see if any peers thought the BIT meant partner was thinking of bidding, as opposed to doubling. Four players were consulted. None bid 4♥. After being informed of the tempo break, three thought that partner was considering bidding on. One peer thought partner might have been thinking of doubling.

The panel decided the BIT conveyed unauthorized information which demonstrably suggested the 4♥ bid. The panel also decided that passing 3♠ was a logical alternative. Per Laws 16B1 and 12C1e, the panel assigned a result of 3♠ by West, making three, E/W +140. An AWMW was not issued.

Panel Decision	3♠ by W, Made 3, E/W +140
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Gery Zeiger
Member	Kevin Perkins
Member	Eric Bell