



Subject of Appeal:	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	Case:	N6
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs	Event DIC	Bernie Gorkin
Date	12/04/2013	Session	First Semifinal

Auction

West	North	East	South
		1♥	1♠
2♥	2♠	4♥	Pass
Pass	4♠	Dbl ¹	Pass
5♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	2	N	Brian Glubok		
Dealer	E	♠	J109753		
		♥	3		
Vul	N/S	♦	K1085		
		♣	108		
W	Irina Levitina			E	Sandra Rimstedt
♠	(void)			♠	42
♥	Q54			♥	KJ9862
♦	Q943			♦	A2
♣	Q97543			♣	AK2
		S	R. Jay Becker		
		♠	AKQ86		
		♥	A107		
		♦	J76		
		♣	J6		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♥ by E	Made 5	E/W +450	♠ K

Facts Determined at the Table

West summoned the director to the table before bidding 5♥. All sides agreed to a lengthy hesitation prior to East's double of 4♠. East/West are a very new partnership and West said that aside from this being a forcing pass situation, they have no other agreements.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The West hand was given to good players in the Senior Mixed Pairs, about half of whom bid and half of whom passed. Based on the polling, pass was judged a logical alternative.

Director Ruling

Based upon the player poll and Laws 16B & 12C, the director ruled that West had chosen from amongst logical alternatives one suggested by the UI. The contract was changed to 4♠X by South. The non-offending side was given credit for guessing diamonds and the table result was ruled as making four, N/S +790.

Director's Ruling	4♠X by S, Made 4, N/S +790
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling, and East, West and South attended the appeal hearing. West thought the auction did not make sense and that North, whose bridge ability she knew very well was trying to play 4♠ doubled. She bid 5♥ on her cards and her belief that N/S were trying to play 4♠ doubled.

South felt that even though almost all good players would bid 5♥, West was not permitted to do so under the Laws of Duplicate Bridge

Committee Findings

By agreement of all players at the table, there was a BIT that gave West unauthorized information. The UI demonstrably suggested that bidding 5♥ would be more successful than passing. After considering various possible hands consistent with this auction, the Appeals Committee was able to construct various layouts in which 4♠ would go down and 5♥ would not make. Therefore, pass was a logical alternative which under the Laws must be imposed on West. The appeal was found to have substantial merit. The Committee determined that 4♠ doubled would be made on the likely diamond finesse and upheld the director's ruling of 4♠ doubled by South, making four, N/S +790

Committee Decision	4♠X by S, Made 4, N/S +790
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chairman	Richard Popper
Member	Dick Budd
Member	Fred King
Member	Aaron Silverstein
Member	Ed Lazarus