

APPEAL	Non NABC+ SIX
Subject	Tempo – Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Su Doe
Event	Senior Pairs
Session	First
Date	July 17, 2006

BD#	26
VUL	Both
DLR	East

2,500 Masterpoints	
♠	6 5
♥	T 4 3
♦	Q 4 2
♣	K J T 7 3

875 Masterpoints		Summer 2006 Chicago, Illinois	580 Masterpoints	
♠	A K J T		♠	7 4
♥	A J 2		♥	Q 9 8 7 5
♦	A J 8 7 5		♦	K T 6 3
♣	4		♣	9 8

2,750 Masterpoints	
♠	Q 9 8 3 2
♥	K 6
♦	9
♣	A Q 6 5 2

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

Final Contract	4♥ by East
Opening Lead	♦9
Table Result	4♥ by E making 5, E/W +650
Director Ruling	2♣ by S making 2, N/S +90
Panel Ruling	2♣ by S making 2, N/S +90

(1)	Forcing.
(2)	Alleged break in Tempo (BIT).

The Facts: The director was called at the end of the auction. West said she bid deliberately in all cases and didn't hesitate. East agreed and didn't notice any BIT. North said that there was a short BIT before the pass of 1♠ and a longer one before the pass of 2♣. See laws 16A2 and 12C2.

The Ruling: The UI (BIT) demonstrably suggested action over inaction. Pass was determined to be a less successful logical alternative (LA). Therefore, the table result was adjusted to 2♣ by South making two, N/S +90.

The Appeal: E/W were interviewed initially. West maintained that she was a deliberate bidder and thought before all bids. She was asked if she would think with a 4-3-3-3 yarrowborough. She said “No” at first and then changed to “Probably.” Her partner agreed that she was deliberate in all her bids and said she (East) didn’t take any notice or inference from partner’s tempo. West said her initial pass and second pass had the same tempo. Both East and West did not feel that West had indeed had a BIT. So, no score adjustment due to a BIT and subsequent inferences being taken was appropriate. E/W were told that on the issue of BITs that deliberate bidding could not be used as an explanation or excuse. East said she felt that other players would pass with her hand, but she didn’t feel that any special BIT had influenced her decision to bid. North said that there was a short BIT before West’s first pass and a noticeably longer one before the second pass.

The Decision: An examination of West’s hand convinced the panel that a BIT was likely to have occurred.

Three players with about 600 masterpoints were given East’s hand and the auction up to 2♣-pass-pass. Two passed and one bid but said it was close. Since two of three players passed, pass was considered to be a LA, which would have ended the auction at 2♣.

The panel further felt that the BIT by West demonstrably suggested action by East and specifically suggested that East show her two-suited hand by doubling. As the BIT by West suggested East’s chosen action and pass was determined to be a less successful LA for E/W, the director’s ruling reverting the contract to 2♣ resulting in plus 90 for N/S was upheld. This was in accordance with laws 16A2 and 12C2.

Players were advised that, in the appeal process, players of similar ability would be interviewed to determine if there were LAs to the chosen action. East acknowledged at the interview that some players would pass with her hand. Therefore, an Appeal Without Merit Warning (AWMW) was issued.

The Panel: Peter Marcus (Reviewer), Harry Falk and Candy Kuschner.

Players Consulted: Three players with about 600 masterpoints.