

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	Case:	R3
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Mini-Spangold II KO Teams	Event DIC	Tom Marsh
Date	08/07/2013	Session	Quarterfinals, 1 st Session

Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo (30+ sec.)

Hand Record

Board	9	N	650 MPS		
Dealer	N	♠ J984	♥ K3		
Vul	E/W	♦ A105	♣ 10763		
W	270 MPS			E	340 MPS
♠ K65				♠ (void)	
♥ J865				♥ A742	
♦ 9642				♦ Q73	
♣ J8			♣ AKQ952		
		S	610 MPS		
		♠ AQ10732			
		♥ Q109			
		♦ KJ8			
		♣ 4			

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♠ by S	Made 4	N/S +420	♣ J

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after North's 4♠ bid, and again at the end of the hand. All agreed that South broke tempo after East's 4♥ bid. The N/S convention cards show that jump overcalls are weak. North told the table director he was never planning to sell out to 4♥ but hoped to buy the contract in 3♠. He said he was even considering bidding to the five level if necessary. E/W said they thought 4♠ was made more attractive by South's hesitation.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Two players of North's approximate experience were polled, and both passed 4♥. Therefore, the director determined that pass was a logical alternative according to Law 16B1.

Director Ruling

The director decided that there was unauthorized information and that it demonstrably suggested the 4♠ bid selected by North. Per Law 12C1e, he assigned the score of 4♥ by East, down two, NS +200.

Director's Ruling	4♥ by E, Down 2, N/S +200
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S appealed the director's ruling, and all four players attended the review. All players agreed that South's pause over 4♥ was at least thirty seconds and perhaps longer.

N/S confirmed to the reviewer that they play weak jump overcalls and that they have no special agreements about the bid beyond that. North reiterated that he never intended to let E/W play below the level of 4♣. He was thinking about bidding to the level of 5♣ if necessary, but he hoped to buy the contract for 3♣.

West stated that he believed passing 4♥ had to be reasonable since good bidding theory dictated that if a player is willing to compete to the level of four in this kind of case, he should do it immediately over the double of 2♣.

Panel Findings

The panel decided that there was an “unmistakable hesitation” and that any hesitation by a pre-emptor “demonstrably suggested” a 4♣ bid (Law 16B1). To determine whether pass was a “logical alternative” to the 4♣ bid selected by North, the panel conducted its own poll of peer players. Only those who agreed with North’s initial 3♣ bid were considered, so the first player polled who wanted to bid 4♣ over the double was ignored.

The next two players questioned both bid 3♣ over the double. One of them bid 4♣ when 4♥ came around to him, but he thought it was close between bidding 4♣ and passing. The other player passed and thought it was clear to do so.

Given that input, and given that a logical alternative according to Law 16B1b is “one that, among the class of players in question and using the methods of the partnership, would be given serious consideration by a significant proportion of such players, of whom it is judged some might select it”, the panel upheld the director’s adjustment to 4♥ by East and agreed with his assignment for both sides of down two for N/S +200 according to Law 12C1e. The appeal was found to have merit.

Panel Decision	4♥ by E, Down 2, N/S +200
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Smith
Member	Charlie MacCracken
Member	Chris Patrias