

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo, Unauthorized Information	Case:	R8
---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------	----

Event	10K Mixed Swiss	Event DIC	Terry Lavender
Date	07/26/2014	Session	First Qualifying

Auction

West	North	East	South
		1♦	Pass
2♣	2♥	Pass	Pass
Dbl	Pass	2NT	Pass
3♣	Pass	3NT ¹	Pass
4♦	Pass	5♣	Pass
6♣	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alleged Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	22	N	3860 MPS		
Dealer	E	♠	873		
		♥	AJ7642		
Vul	E/W	♦	A3		
		♣	65		
W	4000 MPS			E	2770 MPS
♠	AJ96			♠	KQ10
♥	(void)			♥	Q985
♦	Q76			♦	K1094
♣	AKJ743	♣	Q2		
		S	7700 MPS		
		♠	542		
		♥	K103		
		♦	J852		
		♣	1098		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♣ by W	Made 6	E/W +1370	♥ A

Facts Determined at the Table

After the 3NT bid, North asked the table if everyone agreed that there had been a break in tempo before the 3NT bid and thought the table had agreed. East/West later said they did not hear the question and had not agreed to a break in tempo. North/South called the director after the hand was completed.

Director Ruling

The table director ruled that E/W were in a forward-going sequence, and that despite the UI from a possible break in tempo, Pass was not a logical alternative for West. The table result was allowed to stand.

Director's Ruling	6♣ by W, Made 6, E/W +1370
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S appealed the ruling, and all four players plus the E/W captain attended the review. N/S estimated the length of the break in tempo as approximately 20 seconds. East said that he did take "some time to think" before bidding 3NT but that it was not anywhere close to as long as 20 seconds. He was unable to estimate how long he had taken.

E/W stated that they were a first-time partnership. West said that she did not think her partner had broken tempo before his 3NT bid, and she would not have known what it meant with a first-time partner even if he had. West felt she had taken control of the auction and was always planning to bid over 3NT.

N/S argued that East's slow 3NT suggested doubt that 3NT should be the contract. This demonstrably suggested bidding would be more successful than passing.

Panel Findings

The panel judged that a break in tempo had most likely had occurred, given East's comment that he had taken time to think and his inability to estimate how long he had been thinking.

Five peers (approximately 3000-5500 MPs each) and one expert player were consulted concerning the West hand. All five peers passed over 3NT. Two of the peers (and the expert) felt that West's bidding to that point indicated that West was trying for slam in clubs and that partner's 3NT was denying interest; but a slow 3NT bid indicated partner was less sure of that decision than an in-tempo 3NT.

Given the poll results, the panel ruled that pass was a logical alternative to bidding over 3NT and that the break in tempo demonstrably suggested that bidding would be more successful than passing (Law 16B1). Therefore, the panel adjusted the score to 3NT by East, making three, E/W +600, per Law 12C1e.

Expert Consulted: Geoff Hampson

Panel Decision	3NT by W, Made 3, E/W +600
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Eric Bell
Member	Kenneth Van Cleve
Member	Matt Koltnow