

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	Case:	R5
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

Event	AX Swiss Teams	Event DIC	Marie Killoran
Date	08/09/2013	Session	First


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-17 HCP
2: One Suited Hand
3: Stayman
4: Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	29	N	1000 MPS
Dealer	N	♠ QJ10 ♥ A ♦ AQ5 ♣ K97652	
Vul	Both		
W	4200 MPS		E 3300 MPS
♠ 642 ♥ J76432 ♦ 10832 ♣ (void)			♠ AK9853 ♥ K9 ♦ 97 ♣ AJ10
		S 750 MPS	
		♠ 7 ♥ Q10853 ♦ KJ64 ♣ Q843	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
2NT by N	Made 2	N/S +120	♠ 8

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the time of South's BIT, and they instructed the table to continue play. After the opening lead, North won the jack, and then played four rounds of diamonds. East discarded two spades. North scored one spade, one heart, four diamonds, and two clubs, for eight tricks. East did not find the shift to the heart nine, when in with the ♣A..

Director Ruling

The director ruled that South's BIT conveyed UI which demonstrably suggested that North not pass 2S. After polling some experts, the director also ruled that passing 2S was a logical alternative, not suggested by the UI. The contract was adjusted to 2♠ by East, making 2 following a trump lead, E/W +110, per Laws 16B and 12C1e.

Director's Ruling	2♠ by E, Made 2, E/W +110
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S appealed the director's ruling, and all of the players attended the review. The facts were agreed to as above, with N/S stipulating that even if South's BIT was not that long, his interest in the auction and its meaning made it clear that he did not have a weak hand with both majors. If South had held a bad hand, he would never have entered the auction, once East bid 2♣. He clearly held invitational values. N/S stated that while the UI from the BIT suggested values, it duplicated Authorized Information from the auction itself.

E/W claimed South might still have entered the auction with a weak hand, if he was very distributional. The BIT ruled this out, suggesting values and that bidding would be more successful than passing.

East also said she had difficult pitches on the run of the diamonds. North could have held five spades, and West a singleton. East also said a trump lead against 2♠ wasn't clear, and their side might have made nine tricks.

Panel Findings

Since the event TD had polled experts, the Reviewer polled peers of North. Obtaining a reasonable polling sample was made more difficult by the somewhat eccentric opening bid, but eventually some appropriate players were found. None would have passed 2♠. They differed on calls, including 2NT, 3♣, and double, but none would have passed. They all agreed a BIT by South suggested some sort of balanced, invitational hand.

The Panel decided that, for this player's peer group, passing 2♠ was not a logical alternative. There was some thought among the Panel that the 2NT call was demonstrably suggested by the UI, whereas a 3♣ call was not. Since a 3♣ contract would have resulted in ten tricks for N/S, for +130, this result was not considered. The Panel restored the table result of 2NT by North, making 2, N/S +120.

Panel Decision	2NT by N, Made 2, N/S +120
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Gary Zeiger
Member	Kevin Perkins
Member	Matt Koltnow