

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	Case:	N7
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

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

Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	2	N	Mark Gordon	
Dealer	E	♠ J109753		
		♥ 3		
Vul	N/S	♦ K1085		
		♣ 108		
W	Jacek Jerzy Kalita		E	Michal Nowosadzki
♠	(void)		♠	42
♥	Q54		♥	KJ9862
♦	Q943		♦	A2
♣	Q97543		♣	AK2
		S	Pratap Rajadhyaksha	
		♠	AKQ86	
		♥	A107	
		♦	J76	
		♣	J6	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♥X by E	Made 5	E/W +650	♠ K

Facts Determined at the Table

South called the director after West's 5♣ bid. He said there was a break in tempo before East's double of 4♠. South claimed it was a hesitation of approximately 30 seconds, North said 15 seconds and East/West both said 10–15 seconds. East did not think he exceeded the skip-bid time allotted. E/W said that they played 2♦ as a weak heart raise, so West's 2♥ bid was a constructive raise showing values. E/W further said that, over 4♠, it was not a forcing pass situation.

Director Ruling

Despite no Stop card being used, the director decided there was a BIT. Although E/W play a slightly different system, previous polling on the same hand in response to a director call was considered sufficient and pass was judged a logical alternative under Laws 16B & 12C. The result was adjusted to 4♠ doubled by South, 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 all four players attended the hearing. N/S felt the BIT was long enough to signify doubt and that West's trump void (indicating the likelihood that partner has a trump trick) and his three-card heart holding would make pass a logical alternative.

West raised the issue that according to their system, in which a 2♦ bid would have been a weaker way to raise, his 2♥ bid suggested more defensive cards than he actually held. The director, who was present at the hearing, informed the Committee that North's failure to make any skip-bid Announcement did not damage his side's equity.

Committee Findings

The AC considered three issues separately:

Was there a break in tempo? In a reenactment, both sides agreed that the pause lasted about 13-15 seconds. Furthermore, West testified that eight seconds was simply not enough time to consider a problem like this (thereby indicating that his thought processes required more time than he usually takes, even with a jump bid in front of him). The director at the hearing stated that the actual number of seconds does not automatically confirm or deny a tempo break. The Committee determined that there was a BIT. Whether it took 10, 15 or more seconds for East to double, the timing constituted a BIT.

Did the fact that West had misrepresented the strength of his heart raise give him the right to bid despite the BIT? Again the Committee determined that it did not.

Was South to be allowed to make 4♠ doubled when the defense might be able to take two club tricks and two diamond tricks? The Committee felt that the ♥4 was the most likely lead after which declarer would strip the hand and lead a club. Either East or West is end played, which allows declarer to hold his diamond losers to one. However, if a club was led, declarer would likely make the hand by finessing East for both the ♦Q and the ♦9.

Based on the above, the Committee decided that the table ruling was correct: 4♠ doubled by South, making four, N/S +790.

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

Committee Members

Chairman	Gail Greenberg
Member	David Caprera
Member	Scott Stearns
Member	Ray Miller
Member	Patty Tucker