



Subject of Appeal:	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	Case:	N5
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs	Event DIC	Bernie Gorkin
Date	12/03/2013	Session	Second Qualifier

Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Could be short, <15 HCP
2: Support; 3 card ♠
3: Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	24	N	Migry Zur Campanile
Dealer	W	♠	K753
		♥	9864
		♦	862
Vul	None	♣	43
W	Zane Brown		
♠	964		
♥	KQ72		
♦	AK1054		
♣	7	E	Stephen Goldstein
		♠	QJ102
		♥	A10
		♦	J973
		♣	1062
		S	Nancy Katz
		♠	A8
		♥	J53
		♦	Q
		♣	AKQJ985

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♦ by W	Made 4	E/W +130	♣ 4

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called to the table at the end of the auction. West's 1♦ bid had been explained as 13-15 HCP balanced with 2+ diamonds, or 11-15 HCP unbalanced with 4+ diamonds. At his third turn to call, West had paused for about 20 seconds before passing, with North saying that he expressed frustration (denied by West).

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled three players regarding the East hand and the E/W partnership agreements. All three passed, as it was not obvious that 3♦ would be successful based solely on the auction. The UI from the hesitation suggested bidding would be more successful.

Director Ruling

Based upon the player poll and Laws 16B & 12C, the director ruled that East had chosen from amongst logical alternatives one suggested by the UI. They adjusted the results to 3♣ by South, making 3, N/S +110

Director's Ruling	3♣ by S, Made 3, N/S +110
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling, and all of the players attended the committee. East stated that South had bid 3♣ promptly, by which he inferred that South had especially long and strong clubs. Based upon this, he felt 3♣ was likely to

make and he planned to bid 3♦, as West was a strong favorite to hold four diamonds. In which case, this made 3♦ a good non-vulnerable sacrifice or even a make.

N/S countered that, based upon the auction, West's shape could have been 3-4-3-3 or even 3-4-2-4, in which case 3♦ would be a very poor contract. West's BIT over 3♣ suggested extra shape, and made East's bid more attractive.

Committee Findings

There was a BIT at West's third turn to bid, and the BIT demonstrably suggested that East's bid of 3♦ would be more successful than passing. The player poll conducted by the directors confirmed that pass was indeed a logical alternative to the suggested bid. Therefore, the committee upheld the director's ruling of 3♣ by South, making 3, N/S +110.

Additionally, it should have been obvious to E/W that pass was a logical alternative to the suggested 3♦ bid, especially after hearing that all three players polled passed with the East hand. The appeal was judged to be without significant merit, and E/W were assigned an Appeal without Merit Warning.

Committee Decision	3♣ by S, Made 3, N/S +110
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chairman	Douglas Doub
Member	Ray Miller
Member	Patty Tucker
Member	Scott Stearns
Member	Ed Lazarus