

2013 Fall NABC Appeals Casebook



Subject of Appeal:	Unauthorized Information	Case:	N1
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Nail Open LM Pairs	Event DIC	Nancy Boyd
Date	11/29/2013	Session	Second Qualifying


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-19 Balanced, or 12-14
2: Stayman
3: Natural, Alerted
4: No Alert, Spade Support

Hand Record

Board	9	N	John Adams
Dealer	N	♠ 63	
		♥ KJ862	
Vul	E/W	♦ J632	
		♣ 82	
W	Bulent Kaytaz		
♠	KJ97		
♥	A4		
♦	K108		
♣	AJ65		
		S	Sylvia Shi
		♠	852
		♥	Q105
		♦	975
		♣	9743
		E	Tezcan Sen
		♠	AQ104
		♥	973
		♦	AQ4
		♣	KQ10

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♠ by E	Made 6	E/W +1430	♦ 5

Facts Determined at the Table

North called the director when West announced at the end of the bidding that the 3♥ bid showed spade support. Away from the table, North said he would have made a lead-directing double. South would not have done anything differently.

At the end of the play, North said the lead made no difference, but that he now felt that West may have bid based on unauthorized information. West said that when East bid 3NT, he realized East had forgotten the meaning of the 3♥ bid. When director asked a follow-up question with West, he said when East bid 3NT he knew his partner had the 15-19 point hand, otherwise East would have rebid clubs. North/South felt that if West was interested in slam, he would have bid 4♣ after the 3NT bid since he had already set the suit and that he couldn't bid 4NT for fear partner would leave him in 4NT.

Director Ruling

The 3NT bid showing 15-19 points gives West the information to choose between 3NT and spades. With West's 16 HCP hand, he is not using unauthorized information to make the 6♠ bid. Accordingly, the table result stands, 6♠ by East, making 6, E/W +1430.

Director's Ruling	6♠ by E, Made 6, E/W +1430
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

North/South appealed the ruling and attended the hearing. At the end of the auction, North told the director that he would be doubled 3♥ had it been Alerted which might have confused the East/West auction.

At the end of the play, West said that he bid 6♠ because East's failure to alert 3♥ followed by his 3NT bid told him that East did not know that West had a good hand with spade support

Committee Findings

The Appeals Committee had numerous questions: Was 1♣ forcing? 2♣ was “like Stayman,” but what was the strength that it promised or the suit length confirmed or denied? 2♠ was Alerted, but not asked about: did it show spades with 15–19? Would a 2♣ opener have been natural? Was West’s understanding of his 3♥ bid the actual partnership agreement, or just what West thought? Would 3NT be a serious or non-serious slam try in spades? Unfortunately, the Committee had no way of obtaining any information about the E/W methods.

West might logically have bid 4NT over 3NT as key card Blackwood, over which East would almost surely have gone on to slam. Alternatively, West might have invited slam with 5♠, which East would have accepted.

A double of 3♥ by North would have changed the auction, but the opening lead made no difference and it is not at all clear how a double of 3♥ would have harmed the E/W auction.

The Committee judged that E/W were highly likely to reach slam and that N/S were not damaged by East’s failure to Alert 3♥ or by West’s use of the UI from the failure to Alert. However, based on West’s hand and his statement at the end of play, West made blatant use of UI when he chose to bid 6♠. Therefore, the Committee assigned a ¼-board procedural penalty to E/W for this violation. The result was 6♠ by East, making six, N/S -1430; E/W +1430 less a ¼ board procedural penalty.

Committee Decision	6♠ by E, Made 6, E/W +1430 E/W – ¼ board PP
---------------------------	--

Committee Members

Chairman	Douglas Doub
Member	Hendrik Sharples
Member	Ray Miller
Member	David Caprera
Member	Marc Rabinowitz


Subject of Appeal:	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	Case:	N2
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Nail Open LM Pairs	Event DIC	Nancy Boyd
Date	11/29/2013	Session	Second Qualifying

Auction

West	North	East	South
	1♥	Pass	2♦
Pass	3♣	Pass	3♥
Pass	4♥ ¹	Pass	4NT ²
Pass	5♦ ³	Pass	6♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Hand Record

Board	17	N	Margaret Norris
Dealer	N	♠ K75	
		♥ KQ862	
		♦ 7	
Vul	None	♣ QJ104	
W	Michael Polowan		
♠	983		
♥	53		
♦	43		
♣	K87632	E	Adam Wildavsky
		♠	A642
		♥	J94
		♦	108652
		♣	9
		S	Mike Christensen
		♠	QJ10
		♥	A107
		♦	AKQJ9
		♣	A5

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo
2: RKC Blackwood
3: 1 or 4 Keycards

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♥ by N	Made 6	N/S +980	♠ A

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned to the table after South bid 4NT. North admitted to a slight break in tempo (BIT) saying that she "did not take a full 10 seconds, but I did think." North further told the director she was considering whether 3♥ showed two or three card support.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled other players and determined that pass was not a logical alternative, so the small BIT did not play a role in South's decision to bid on. As to the question of whether or not 4NT was suggested by the BIT, the poll revealed that some players would have bid 5♣ which then prompts further action to get to 6♥.

Director Ruling

The director determined that the BIT did not suggest 4NT. Further, the BIT did not imply which king (spade or club) that North held. Accordingly, the table result was allowed to stand, 6♥ by North, making six, N/S +980.

Director's Ruling	6♥ by N, Made 6, N/S +980
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling and East attended the hearing. East stated the following reasons for the appeal:

- 1) The hesitation may have caused South to bid 4NT instead of 5♣. A bid of 5♣ may have been followed by 5♥ and then pass would be a logical alternative.
- 2) The director didn't consider the one key card response to the 4NT bid. North–South could be off an ace and the ♥Q.
- 3) When South put his hand down as dummy, he stated that he took “a flyer.” He should not be allowed to do this opposite the BIT since 5♣ and 5♥ were logical alternatives.

When the director was called to the table by E/W for the hesitation by North, North stated that she agreed that there was a 5–9 second hesitation before the bid, but she opined that she was allowed up to 10 seconds to think before making a call. North further stated that she was trying to figure out whether the 3♥ bid guaranteed three hearts.

Committee Findings

The Appeals Committee reasoned that there was unauthorized information but that the unauthorized information did not demonstrably suggest further action. The slight hesitation by North was due to her trying to figure out what to bid with her hand. The 4♥ bid said nothing about a spade control. While 5♣ may have been a more effective bid, the Committee was of the opinion that South's peers would have bid 4NT. The BIT did not suggest that a 5♣-5♥ sequence should be passed. Therefore, the Committee ruled that the table result should stand: 6♥ by North, making six, N/S +980. Furthermore, the Committee determined that the appeal was without merit and awarded E/W an Appeal without Merit warning.

Committee Decision	6♥ by N, Made 6, N/S +980
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chairman	Richard Popper
Scribe	Ed Lazarus
Member	Boye Brogeland
Member	Ellen Kent
Member	Jerry Gaer

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	Case:	N3
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Mitchell Open BAM	Event DIC	Candace Kuschner
Date	12/01/2013	Session	First Qualifying


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	22	N	Daniel Friedman
Dealer	E	♠ A10	
		♥ 72	
Vul	E/W	♦ AKJ742	
		♣ 1098	
W	David Lindop		
♠	8		
♥	K94		
♦	953		
♣	AQJ532		
		S	Linda Friedman
		♠	J96543
		♥	1086
		♦	106
		♣	K7
		E	Robert Lebi
		♠	KQ72
		♥	AQJ53
		♦	Q8
		♣	64

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♥ by E	Made 4	E/W +620	♦ 10

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned at the start of the next round by North/South. They stated that there was a substantial pause before the 3NT bid, which East/West later agreed to. The director had seen West pause to think about 10-15 seconds before bidding 4♥, but had not been present at East's bid.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled 10 players from the Super Senior Pairs as to West's decision over 3NT. Three of the 10 chose to pass, establishing Pass as a logical alternative.

Director Ruling

The player poll established pass as a logical alternative, and the UI from the BIT demonstrably suggested bidding would be more successful than passing. Therefore, the results were changed to 3NT by E, down 3, N/S +300

Director's Ruling	3NT by E, Down 3, N/S +300
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling and attended the hearing.

At screening, the directors polled an additional seven players from the Open BAM event, giving them the West hand. Five bid 4♥, one passed and one thought it very close but leaned toward bidding 4♥. As to whether the BIT suggested bidding 4♥, four thought no, two believed yes, and one had no opinion.

West believed his hand qualified as a game force, in part because of the singleton spade. It was possible for West to hold only two hearts with an awkward hand for his 3♥ call. With three hearts and the singleton spade, it was clear to correct 3NT to 4♥. Additionally, East was not necessarily thinking of bidding 4♥ when he hesitated before bidding 3NT. Upon further questioning by the Appeals Committee, E/W revealed that a bid of 2NT at West's first turn to call would have shown a three card limit raise or better.

Committee Findings

There was an agreed break in tempo by East before they bid 3NT. Although East could have been considering doubling 3♠, at the given vulnerability, it was most likely that East was choosing between 3NT and 4♥. Thus, the BIT demonstrably suggested that West bid on.

Would passing be a logical alternative to the suggested 4♥ bid? For that to be the case, a significant number of West's peers would have to seriously consider pass, and some would actually consider that the proper call. Three players from the Super Senior Pairs would have passed, as well as one player polled from the Open BAM. One member of the committee judged that he would pass, and two others strongly considered it a possible action.

The West hand has moderate high card strength, but a source of tricks in the club suit. It is easy to construct hands where 3NT would be more successful than 4♥ because of different factors, or the contracts could be equally successful. Swap the ♥2 ♦J and the ♥J ♦8 between the North and East hands, and 3NT makes while 4♥ fails.

Thus, the committee determined that Pass was a logical alternative to the suggested 4♥ bid at West's third turn to call. Accordingly, the table director's ruling was confirmed.

Committee Decision	3NT by E, Down 3, N/S +300
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chairman	Douglas Doub
Member	Scott Stearns
Member	Ray Miller
Member	Aaron Silverstein
Member	Chris Moll

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	N4
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	Mitchell Open BAM	Event DIC	Candace Kuschner
Date	12/02/2013	Session	First Final


Auction

West	North	East	South
			1♠
2♣	Pass	3♥ ¹	3♠
4♥	4♠	5♥	Pass
Pass	5♠	Dbl	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Explained as Fit Showing

Hand Record

Board	11	N	Mark Itabashi
Dealer	S	♠ J4	
		♥ 953	
		♦ KJ62	
Vul	None	♣ 10872	
W	Zane Brown		
♠	K106		
♥	K104		
♦	95		
♣	KQJ53	E	Stephen Goldstein
		♠	7
		♥	AQJ872
		♦	A1087
		♣	94
		S	Chris Larsen
		♠	AQ98532
		♥	6
		♦	Q43
		♣	A6

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♠X by S	Down 2	E/W +300	♣ K

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called to the table at the end of the hand. During the auction, West Alerted the 3♥ bid and explained it was a fit-showing jump. Although both convention cards showed fit-showing jumps, East maintained that they do not play fit-showing jumps after overcalls. West strongly believed that the agreement did extend to overcalls, and that East simply misbid. As a result, the director determined that the East/West pair had no firm agreement about 3♥. North said he would have passed 5♥ if he did not think E/W had a double fit.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director conducted a player poll regarding the North hand and what would be bid with correct information. The poll suggested that 5♠ is the wrong bid with the correct information that E/W had no agreement.

Director Ruling

Per Law 75, West's explanation was deemed misinformation. Based upon the player poll and Laws 21B3 & 12C1e, the contract and result were adjusted to 5♥ by East, down one, N/S +50.

Director's Ruling	5♥ by E, Down 1, N/S +50
--------------------------	---------------------------------

The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling. The screening director noted that when East said that his 3♥ bid did not necessarily show a club fit, West came out of his chair in surprise saying, "What?"

East, West and South attended the appeal hearing. E/W had two identical computer generated convention cards, both marked fit-showing jumps (FSJ) after overcalls. E/W's system notes stated that with a good hand without a fit, advancer should cuebid in response to an overcall. E/W's agreement about fit-showing jumps is that they show five-plus cards in the bid suit and three-plus cards in the overcaller's suit.

East's hand was too strong for a non-forcing 2♥ bid. East was concerned that if he bid 2♠, N/S might bid aggressively in spades, making it awkward for East to show his heart suit. E/W had been playing together for four and a half years and had been playing fit showing jumps throughout. Nevertheless, East did not appear to be comfortable with fit-showing jumps on this auction (after a two level overcall).

South maintained that his partner bid 5♠ because all of his values would be useful for offense in view of the double fit. Defending would be more attractive if East did not promise a fit for clubs. One expert player was polled. He judged that 5♠ was a 10% action with the misinformation, but a 0% action had the opponents not been playing fit-showing jumps.

Committee Findings

The Appeals Committee determined that despite the "FSJ" on the E/W convention cards and their system notes, East's bid of 3♥ and his comments indicated that E/W did not have a firm agreement about fit-showing jumps. Thus, because the explanation of 3♥ mischaracterized an agreement, there was misinformation. To adjust the score, however, it must be determined that N/S was damaged as a direct consequence of that misinformation.

North's actions of pass followed by 4♠ showed a weak hand with values that would be much more useful on offense than on defense. South, at his third turn to act, possessed that information and chose to defend 5♥. With the 6-5 or 7-4 distribution that North appeared to play him for, South would have been inclined to compete with a bid of 5♠. East could have held five hearts and three clubs instead of 6-2 in the suits, and his bids would have been consistent with West's Alert and explanation. If that were the case, South could have had three cards in hearts and clubs, making it a significant chance that both sides would be down at the five level.

The Committee determined that N/S were not damaged by the misinformation and the table result was restored, 5♠X by South, down two, E/W +300.

Committee Decision	5♠X by S, Down 2, E/W +300
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chairman	Douglas Doub
Member	John Lusky
Member	Richard Popper
Member	Scott Stearns
Member	Marc Rabinowitz

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	Case:	N5
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs	Event DIC	Bernie Gorkin
Date	12/03/2013	Session	Second Qualifier


Auction

West	North	East	South
1♦ ¹	Pass	1♠	2♣
Dbl ²	Pass	2♠	3♣
Pass ³	Pass	3♦	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Could be short, <15 HCP
2: Support; 3 card ♠
3: Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	24	N	Migry Zur Campanile
Dealer	W	♠ K753	
		♥ 9864	
		♦ 862	
Vul	None	♣ 43	
W	Zane Brown		
♠	964		
♥	KQ72		
♦	AK1054		
♣	7	E	Stephen Goldstein
		♠	QJ102
		♥	A10
		♦	J973
		♣	1062
		S	Nancy Katz
		♠	A8
		♥	J53
		♦	Q
		♣	AKQJ985

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♦ by W	Made 4	E/W +130	♣ 4

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called to the table at the end of the auction. West's 1♦ bid had been explained as 13-15 HCP balanced with 2+ diamonds, or 11-15 HCP unbalanced with 4+ diamonds. At his third turn to call, West had paused for about 20 seconds before passing, with North saying that he expressed frustration (denied by West).

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled three players regarding the East hand and the E/W partnership agreements. All three passed, as it was not obvious that 3♦ would be successful based solely on the auction. The UI from the hesitation suggested bidding would be more successful.

Director Ruling

Based upon the player poll and Laws 16B & 12C, the director ruled that East had chosen from amongst logical alternatives one suggested by the UI. They adjusted the results to 3♣ by South, making 3, N/S +110

Director's Ruling	3♣ by S, Made 3, N/S +110
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling, and all of the players attended the committee. East stated that South had bid 3♣ promptly, by which he inferred that South had especially long and strong clubs. Based upon this, he felt 3♣ was likely to

make and he planned to bid 3♦, as West was a strong favorite to hold four diamonds. In which case, this made 3♦ a good non-vulnerable sacrifice or even a make.

N/S countered that, based upon the auction, West's shape could have been 3-4-3-3 or even 3-4-2-4, in which case 3♦ would be a very poor contract. West's BIT over 3♣ suggested extra shape, and made East's bid more attractive.

Committee Findings

There was a BIT at West's third turn to bid, and the BIT demonstrably suggested that East's bid of 3♦ would be more successful than passing. The player poll conducted by the directors confirmed that pass was indeed a logical alternative to the suggested bid. Therefore, the committee upheld the director's ruling of 3♣ by South, making 3, N/S +110.

Additionally, it should have been obvious to E/W that pass was a logical alternative to the suggested 3♦ bid, especially after hearing that all three players polled passed with the East hand. The appeal was judged to be without significant merit, and E/W were assigned an Appeal without Merit Warning.

Committee Decision	3♣ by S, Made 3, N/S +110
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chairman	Douglas Doub
Member	Ray Miller
Member	Patty Tucker
Member	Scott Stearns
Member	Ed Lazarus

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		
♠	(void)		
♥	Q54		
♦	Q943		
♣	Q97543		
		S	R. Jay Becker
		♠	AKQ86
		♥	A107
		♦	J76
		♣	J6
		E	Sandra Rimstedt
		♠	42
		♥	KJ9862
		♦	A2
		♣	AK2

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

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		
♠	(void)		
♥	Q54		
♦	Q943		
♣	Q97543		
		S	Pratap Rajadhyaksha
		♠	AKQ86
		♥	A107
		♦	J76
		♣	J6
		E	Michal Nowosadzki
		♠	42
		♥	KJ9862
		♦	A2
		♣	AK2

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

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	N8
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	Senior Mixed Pairs	Event DIC	Susan Doe
Date	12/04/2013	Session	Second Qualifier


Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	2NT	Pass
3♣	Pass	3♦	Pass
3♠ ¹	Pass	3NT	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: No Alert; Explained as
5 ♠ & 4 ♥

Hand Record

Board	13	N	Dennis McGarry		
Dealer	N	♠ 843	♥ Q9864		
Vul	Both	♦ QJ5	♣ 73		
W	June Pocock			E	Michael Yuen
♠ Q9				♠ A76	
♥ 7532				♥ K10	
♦ K1093				♦ A876	
♣ 1054				♣ AKQ6	
		S	Molly O'Neill		
		♠ KJ1052			
		♥ AJ			
		♦ 42			
		♣ J982			

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by E	Made 3	E/W +600	♣ 2

Facts Determined at the Table

Before the opening lead, South inquired as to the meaning of the 3♣ bid. East explained that it showed five spades and four hearts. When the dummy was tabled, it was revealed that West forgot the agreement and had intended 3♣ to show a four card heart suit, as in a puppet Stayman auction. The E/W convention card did not have puppet Stayman marked, nor did it indicate that they play Smolen. N/S claimed that had they known West had only two spades, the opening lead would have been a spade, which would then have resulted in down four.

Director Ruling

The director maintained that N/S received a correct explanation of the E/W agreement about the meaning of 3♣, and that this was a case of a mistaken call rather than a mistaken explanation. Per Law 75C, there was no infraction and the table result was allowed to stand, 3NT by East, making three, E/W +600

Director's Ruling	3NT by E, Made 3, E/W +600
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S appealed the ruling and attended the hearing. They felt that with a correct explanation, South would have led a spade, which would have defeated the contract.

Committee Findings

Prior to the opening lead, West should have summoned the director and stated that in her opinion, there had been a failure to alert the 3♠ bid (Law 20F5b). Because this infraction caused damage to the non-offending side, the contract and result were changed to 3NT by East, down one, N/S +100

Committee Decision	3NT by E, Down 1, N/S +100
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

Committee Members

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

Subject of Appeal:	Unauthorized Information	Case:	N9
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs	Event DIC	Bernie Gorkin
Date	12/05/2013	Session	First Final


Auction

West	North	East	South
	(1♣) ¹	(Pass) ¹	Pass
2♠	Pass	Pass	3♣
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Cancelled Call

Hand Record

Board	11	N	Robb Gordon
Dealer	S	♠ K87	
		♥ AJ74	
Vul	None	♦ Q86	
		♣ A102	
W	John Solodar		
♠	AJ10962		
♥	1052		
♦	K542		
♣	(void)	E	Paul Swanson
		♠	543
		♥	K83
		♦	A107
		♣	J754
		S	Linda Gordon
		♠	Q
		♥	Q96
		♦	J93
		♣	KQ9863

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♣ by S	Made 4	N/S +130	♥ 2

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned when the bidding tray was passed to the South/West side for the first time. North had bid 1♣ and East passed out of turn. Per the Bidding Box and Screen Regulations (Appendix G of the Conditions of Contest), the director removed both calls, instructed everyone that the calls were unauthorized information for both sides, and started the auction with South. At South's second turn to call, she asked the director what rights did she have at this point and was informed that she should make the call she would normally make without the UI. After the play completed, East/West asked for a ruling, as they felt South acted on the UI that her partner had an opening hand.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director gave the South hand and the authorized part of the auction to seven top level players from other events. Five bid 3♣ and two passed. Three of the five bidders were hesitant about bidding, and when told of the UI, said they would have passed.

Director Ruling

Based upon the player poll, pass was a logical alternative to bidding, and the UI did suggest that bidding was more likely to be successful than passing. Therefore, per Laws 16D and 73C, the director adjusted the results to 2♠ by West, making 3, E/W +140.

Director's Ruling	2♠ by W, Made 3, E/W +140
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S appealed the ruling and attended the hearing. South stated that she asked the director about her options before bidding 3♣ in order to confirm the correct procedures in this situation. She elected to bid, as she felt Pass was not a logical alternative and that double would be taking advantage of the UI.

Committee Findings

The AC was instructed by the directors that Screen procedures require that the original North and East bids be cancelled and that the respective sides are subject to the restrictions under Law 16 concerning unauthorized information. Upon deliberation, the Committee agreed with South that pass was not a logical alternative and that bidding 3♣ was preferable to double based upon the burden of the UI. The AC gave less credence to the player poll than usual as South's peers, playing in the finals of a major national matchpoint event, would very rarely pass. Therefore, the original table result was restored: 3♣ by South, making 4, N/S +130.

Committee Decision	3♣ by S, Made 4, N/S +130
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chairman	Gail Greenberg
Member	Ed Lazarus
Member	Scott Stearns
Member	Dick Budd
Scribe	Chris Moll

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	N10
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----

Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs	Event DIC	Bernie Gorkin
Date	12/05/2013	Session	First Final


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-17 HCP
2: Different Explanations

Hand Record

Board	25	N	Kevin Bathurst	E	Thomas Weik
Dealer	N	♠	108	♠	Q932
Vul	E/W	♥	A1085	♥	763
		♦	42	♦	J95
		♣	87543	♣	K62
W	Elliot Shalita			S	Daniel Zagorin
♠	A754			♠	KJ6
♥	92			♥	KQJ4
♦	KQ763			♦	A108
♣	A10	♣	QJ9		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
2♠X by E	Made 2	E/W +670	♥ K

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after the play of the hand. During the auction, West had described his double to South as showing a four card major and a five card minor. On the other side of the screen, East described the double to North as Penalty. North's 2♣ bid was explained to East as showing clubs and a higher suit, based upon the penalty description of the double. South explained the bid to West as Stayman, based upon the explanation for the double he had received.

The play of the hand had proceeded with the ♥K winning the first trick, followed by the ♣Q, won in Dummy with the Ace. The ♠4 was led to the 8, 9 and Jack. South led another heart to the Ace, and North returned another club, won by Declarer with the King. East now led a low spade toward Dummy, ducked to North's ♠10. North returned a heart, trumped in Dummy. The ♦K was led, won by South with the Ace. South could have now set the contract by leading his final club. However, under the impression that North had used Stayman, South thought his partner might have three spades as well as four hearts, and that East had balanced with only three spades. He therefore led the ♠K, as that would lead to setting the contract additional tricks based upon the image he had of the deal.

Director Ruling

Under the Screen Regulations, "(a)fter three consecutive passes, all players remove their bidding cards. At this point, the declaring side may offer information about their own explanations." Had this happened, South would be aware that North's 2♣ bid showed clubs and another suit, as East had provided North with misinformation. South would not then have played North for three spades. After conferring with several top level players, it was determined that South's defense, while not optimal, was thoughtful and entitled to redress. Per Laws 75 & 21, the result was changed to 2♠X by East, down 1, N/S +100.

Director's Ruling	2♠X by E, Down 1, N/S +200
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling and attended the hearing. East believed that the partnership agreement was that double was penalty in direct seat, and four card major/five card minor in balancing seat. Even when he saw dummy, he did not believe differently and therefore did not inform the opponents that there might have been misinformation given about the auction. E/W believed that the result at the table was due to errors in defense by N/S in the five card ending, not to misinformation

Committee Findings

The AC found that the differing explanations given by E/W for the double constituted misinformation as 1) they were different explanations; and 2) each described an agreement that did not exist. The committee noted that the E/W convention cards were not identical as to what the double over 1NT showed as evidence of this finding.

However, the AC decided that South's defense was sufficiently egregious to break the chain of causality between the misinformation and the bad result. South could have easily continued with his last club to assure defeat of the contract. This was the indicated play based upon the order of the spade spots played by North, which had indicated a doubleton.

The AC also considered whether the auction might have been influenced by the misinformation, but decided not to pursue this as N/S had not mentioned it as an issue when they asked for the initial ruling, and had not appeared at the hearing to present arguments. Therefore, the committee restored the original table result, 2♠X by East, making 2, E/W +670.

Committee Decision	2♠X by E, Made 2, E/W +670
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chairman	Adam Wildavsky
Scribe	Fred King
Member	David Caprera
Member	Ray Miller
Member	Michael Huston

Subject of Appeal:	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	Case:	N11
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	-----

Event	Reisinger BAM	Event DIC	Matt Koltnow
Date	12/06/2013	Session	First Qualifier


Auction

West	North	East	South
1♣	1♥	1♠ ¹	Pass
1NT	Pass	Pass	2♣
Pass	Pass	2♦ ²	Pass
2♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Relay to 1NT
2: Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	28	N	Sartaj Hans
Dealer	W	♠ A32	
		♥ J10742	
		♦ KJ107	
Vul	N/S	♣ 5	
W	Grzegorz Narkiewicz		
♠	KQ98		
♥	A93		
♦	Q8		
♣	J1086	E	Krzysztof Buras
		♠	1064
		♥	KQ65
		♦	A954
		♣	74
		S	Peter Gill
		♠	J75
		♥	8
		♦	632
		♣	AKQ932

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
2♠ by E	Made 2	E/W +110	♥ 8

Facts Determined at the Table

North/South called the director after the hand was over. They stated that East had hesitated significantly before bidding 2♦. East/West agreed to a break in tempo of about 10-15 seconds, but East did not think that excessive in balancing seat.

Director Ruling

While there was a BIT, it is not clear that the unauthorized information from that break demonstrably suggested the particular action taken by West. Therefore, West did not violate Law 16B1a and no adjustment was necessary.

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

The Appeal

N/S appealed the ruling and all four players attended the hearing. N/S argued that East would normally have a reasonable five card diamond suit for his 2♦ bid, and it would be logical for West to pass. The BIT suggested to West that it might be better to try a different spot.

West countered that a double of 2♣ by East would have been cooperative, showing three clubs. Thus, East could be expected to have a doubleton. West was confident that a 1NT contract would have been successful, and he judged that there would be "no matchpoints to be won in 2♦." Therefore, pulling to 2♠ was the correct tactical call, as East would return to 2NT if he only had two spades. By partnership agreement, West's 1♣ opening showed either 11-13 HCP balanced if minimum, or an unbalanced hand with clubs. They open all 11 counts.

Committee Findings

There was an agreed BIT prior to East's 2♦ bid. With a good five card suit, he would have made the bid in tempo, so the BIT demonstrably suggested that West should bid. But was pass a logical alternative to the suggested removal?

Although West's arguments for his 2♠ bid are logical, East's ruffing value in clubs would be expected to come into play in a diamond contract. 2♦ might be making while higher contracts would be unsuccessful. The committee determined that pass was a logical alternative to bidding, and changed the contract to 2♦ by East.

It is not obvious whether East would take five or six tricks in 2♦. However, when South shows up with all the club honors, declarer would not misguess the location of the ♠A or ♦K. The committee therefore assigned taking six tricks, for a result of down 2, N/S +100.

Committee Decision

2♦ by E, Down 2, N/S +100

Committee Members

Chairman	Douglas Doub
Member	Gary Cohler
Member	Bob Hamman
Member	Aaron Silverstein
Member	Gail Greenberg

Subject of Appeal:	Unauthorized Information	Case:	N12
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	-----

Event	Reisinger BAM	Event DIC	Matt Koltnow
Date	12/06/2013	Session	First Qualifier


Auction

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♥	1NT	2♦ ¹
2♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: No Alert, ♦ & ♠

Hand Record

Board	20	N	Fred Stewart		
Dealer	W	♠ 10	AJ108653		
Vul	Both	♥ KQ			
		♦ Q32			
W	Alfredo Versace			E	Lorenzo Lauria
♠	A9832			♠	KJ
♥	742			♥	KQ9
♦	9			♦	A754
♣	J1085			♣	K764
		S	Kit Woolsey		
		♠	Q7654		
		♥	(void)		
		♦	J108632		
		♣	A9		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
2♠ by W	Down 3	N/S +300	

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned in the middle of play. North sent South away from the table during the hand to explain to East/West that he had failed to alert the 2♦ bid. The director had the players complete play, and then discussed with each what they would have done if the bid had been properly Alerted and explained. West stated he would have passed, and North said he would have bid 2♥, which then would have been passed out.

Director Ruling

The director initially ruled down two in 2♥, based upon the lead of the ♦A. N/S believed that would not be a common lead and asked the director to conduct a poll. The director polled six players with the East hand and none would lead the ♦A. The director therefore adjusted the ruling to only down one, per Laws 12C and 16B.

Director's Ruling	2♥ by N, Down 1, E/W +100
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling and South and West attended the hearing. West would not have bid 2♠ had he known South had at least five spades, but he might have taken some action over 2♦ or 2♥. West did not think an adjustment to down one was equitable, given that most of the field was in 3♥, down at least two tricks.

South argued that the most likely contract without the misinformation was 2♥ by North. He cited the poll results to show that it was unlikely for East to lead the ♦A.

Committee Findings

E/W were misinformed by North's failure to alert, and were thereby damaged. As the non-offending side, they were entitled to the most favorable result that was likely. The committee judged that by far the most likely contract was 2♥ by North. Additionally, East was highly unlikely to lead the ♦A. North would then be able to take seven tricks. Thus, E/W were assigned the result of 2♥ by North, down 1, E/W +100. E/W were unable to achieve a score of +200 because North judged to not bid 3♥ at their table, unlike what happened at other tables.

The adjustment for N/S comes under a different standard. They are to be assigned the most unfavorable result that is at all possible. This has been quantified at a level of at least one in six. A majority of the committee estimated that North would be doubled in 2♥ about one in six times, but that East would rarely lead the ♦A. Thus, N/S were assigned a result of 2♥X by North, down 1, E/W +200.

Dissent by the minority:

West has no reason to think that his side can make anything above 2♥, that 2♥ might go down, or that his partner would be able to find an effective opening lead. He therefore would have no reason to double. At many tables, 3♥ was played undoubled. It is not at all probable that 2♥ would have been doubled. The assigned score for both sides should have been 2♥ by North, down 1, E/W +100.

Committee Decision	N/S: 2♥X by N, Down 1, E/W +200 E/W: 2♥ by N, Down 1, E/W +100
---------------------------	---

Committee Members

Chairman	Douglas Doub
Member	Gary Cohler
Member	Bob Hamman
Member	Aaron Silverstein
Member	Gail Greenberg

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation/Unauthorized Information	Case:	N13
---------------------------	---	--------------	-----

Event	Roth Open Swiss	Event DIC	Tom Marsh
Date	12/07/2013	Session	Second Semifinal


Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	2♣
3♦	Db1 ¹	Pass	4♥
Pass	4NT	Pass	5♦
Pass	6♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, Explained Negative

Hand Record

Board	17	N	Bill St. Clair
Dealer	N	♠ J963 ♥ J ♦ AQ82 ♣ Q954	
Vul	None		
W	Mark Tolliver		E
♠ KQ2			Marc Zwerling
♥ 2			♠ 8754 ♥ 653 ♦ 6 ♣ K10872
♦ KJ109543			
♣ J6			
		S	Seth Cohen
		♠ A10 ♥ AKQ109874 ♦ 7 ♣ A3	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♥ by S	Made 6	N/S +980	♠ Q

Facts Determined at the Table

South claimed after the opening lead, and East/West called the director. During the auction, when asked about North's double, South explained that it was a negative response after a simple overcall, but was in doubt as to the meaning over a jump overcall. North had intended the double as penalty. E/W felt that the Alert had provided North with Unauthorized Information, and he had thought for a moment before bidding 4NT.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The North hand and the auction with an explanation of penalty for the double were given to three players. All three passed over 4♥. When informed of the Alert and the explanation of a negative response given, they all believed the UI suggested continuing the auction.

Director Ruling

Based upon the player poll, the unexpected Alert of his double provided North with UI that suggested bidding would be more successful than passing over 4♥. Therefore, per Laws 73C, 16B & 12C, the results were changed to 4♥ by South, making 6, N/S +480.

Director's Ruling	4♥ by S, Made 6, N/S +480
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S appealed the ruling and all four players attended the hearing. N/S claimed that opposite a 2♣ opening bid, regardless of the meaning of the double of 3♦, the North hand had too much strength to not move towards slam. They also pointed out that a diamond lead by West would have set the contract. So, by appealing the contract, E/W had potentially given their side a two way shot at getting a good result.

E/W stated that while North's bid was likely what he would have bid under normal circumstances, under Law 73C following the improper Alert, he was required to carefully avoid taking advantage of any unauthorized information. Pass was sufficiently probable to prohibit his bidding on. They also believed that, with proper information, East might have doubled 6♥ for a diamond lead, which would have set the contract.

Committee Findings

The committee's decision was potentially to be divided into two parts. The first decision was whether it was legal or not for North to bid again over 4♥. If it was determined that North's bid was not in violation of Laws 16B & 73C, then and only then, would other likely outcomes be considered.

An additional player poll was conducted by the directing staff. They reported that 40% of the respondents would have passed with the North hand over 4♥, given the auction. Within a poll of the committee members, two of the five members thought they would have passed, or at least seriously considered passing. This confirmed pass as a logical alternative in the eyes of the committee, and North's decision to bid on was in violation.

Accordingly, the committee confirmed the table ruling, 4♥ by South, making 6, N/S +480.

Committee Decision

4♥ by S, Made 6, N/S +480

Committee Members

Chairman	Gail Greenberg
Member	Ed Lazarus
Member	Scott Stearns
Member	Ray Miller
Member	Dick Budd

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	R1
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	1 st Sunday Open Pairs	Event DIC	Olin Hubert
Date	12/01/2013	Session	Second Session


Auction

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♠	2♠ ¹	Pass
3♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, Explained as ♥ & ♣

Hand Record

Board	12	N	9820 MPS		
Dealer	W	♠ AJ543			
		♥ A			
Vul	N/S	♦ AJ			
		♣ J9643			
W				E	300 MPS
♠	KQ1096			♠	87
♥	J92			♥	Q107654
♦	7643			♦	KQ95
♣	10			♣	K
		S	7400 MPS		
		♠	2		
		♥	K83		
		♦	1082		
		♣	AQ8752		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♥ by W	Down 1	N/S+50	♠ A

Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was called after dummy was faced. The Director determined that the partnership agreement for 2♠ was Michaels (showing Hearts and an unknown minor, instead of Hearts and Clubs) as E/W's convention cards were marked as Michaels. Before play continued, the Director took South away from the table to ask what she would have done, had the correct explanation been given. South said she would have bid 3♣.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Six players with between 4000 and 4500 masterpoints were polled with the N/S hands on several possible auctions. As a 3♣ bid by South over 2♠ seems very reasonable with the correct explanation, South had said she would bid it before the hand was played, and 3♣ definitely would not be bid after the explanation that was given, the South hand was not polled to determine the veracity of the 3♣ statement; it was accepted as a given in the auction.

Three players were asked what they'd bid after 3♣, holding the North hand. All three said 3♥. After the 3♥ bid, two South hand holders said they'd bid 4♣, one said 5♣. After 4♣, 2 said 4♦, and one said 5♣. All of these players said they'd like to go on, but wouldn't. After a 4♦ bid, all South hand holders bid 5♣.

Director Ruling

The Director determined that there were two infractions of Law 75B by E/W on this hand. The first violation of law was the mistaken explanation. The second infraction was E/W's failure to let N/S know, before the opening lead, of the mistaken explanation. Based on the player poll, the board was adjusted to 5♣ by South, making 7, N/S +640.

Director's Ruling	5♣ by S, Made 7, N/S +640
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

North/South appealed the table director's ruling. They felt that the players polled did not accurately reflect their level of expertise, and they would have reached the club slam using their system methods.

Panel Findings

South's decision to not take any action during the actual auction was discussed by the panel. While it was seen to be inferior to not bid, the panel was unanimous that under the circumstances of the misinformation, South never had a chance to fully recover.

The reviewer polled three additional players, all who held over 10,000 masterpoints, as to their actions with the North hand, using the N/S systemic agreements. The new players all would bid 3♥ in response to 3♣. After a 4♣ call by South, all three started keycard auctions. Due to the discrepancy of the polling data between the 4000-4500 MP players, and the actual MP holdings of N/S, the panel found the table director's polling data to be incomplete.

The most favorable result likely without the infraction(s) was found to be 6♣ by S, making 7, N/S +1390. Therefore, per Law 12C1e the panel adjusted the results to that score.

Note: Unfortunately, the non-appellants did not appear at the review. They were loosely told that there may be an appeal, but were not notified officially before they left the playing area.

Panel Decision	6♣ by S, Made 7, N/S +1390
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Bill Michaels
Member	Matt Koltnow
Member	Gary Zeiger

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	R2
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	Mini-Blue Ribbon Pairs	Event DIC	Doug Grove
Date	12/05/2013	Session	First Final


Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	1NT ¹
2♦ ²	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-17 HCP
2: ♦ and higher suit

Hand Record

Board	25	N	4240 MPS		
Dealer	N	♠ 108			
		♥ A1085			
Vul	E/W	♦ 42			
		♣ 87543			
W	4000 MPS			E	1730 MPS
♠	A754			♠	Q932
♥	92			♥	763
♦	KQ763			♦	J95
♣	A10			♣	K62
		S	1030 MPS		
		♠	KJ6		
		♥	KQJ4		
		♦	A108		
		♣	QJ9		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
2♦ by W	Made 2	E/W +90	♦ 2

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the end of the hand. At his turn after 2♦, North looked at East's convention card and saw "D+H," which he understood to mean diamonds and hearts. North told the director he would have bid 2♥ over 2♦ if the card had been marked clearly as "diamonds and a major". In the pass out seat, South asked for an explanation of 2♦. North and South understood East to say "diamonds and hearts". East and West contend that he said "diamonds and a higher". South said that if he had understood the E/W agreement correctly, he would have reopened with a Double. The auction would continue Pass-2♥.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director conducted a poll to determine what East would do over 2♥. Six players were polled, three with about 2000 points, three with more. Four of the six, including all the 2000 point players passed 2♥, the other two bidding 2♠. No players were interested in an immediate 2♥ bid with the North cards. Regarding the opening lead, five of the six players polled led a diamond.

Director Ruling

Staff determined that N/S were misinformed as to the E/W agreement about 2♦. East did not speak clearly enough to be understood by N/S, and his convention card was not marked clearly enough to be understood by N/S. The convention card was marked D+Hi, which looked enough like D+H as to be misunderstood. His explanation of 2♦ as "diamonds and higher" sounded enough like "diamonds and hearts" that it was likely to be misunderstood as well. Laws 40B4 and 21B3 empower the director to award an adjusted score if he feels N/S were damaged or E/W gained an

advantage because of misinformation. Per Law 12C1e, the score was adjusted for both sides to 2♥ by North, making two, N/S +110.

Director's Ruling

2♥ by N, Made 2, N/S +110

The Appeal

E/W appealed the director's ruling. All four players attended the review just after the afternoon session of the event. The reviewer saw the E/W convention card, now corrected to say D+Higher, and recommended to E/W that the explanation "diamonds and a major" would be less likely to be misunderstood, the reviewer himself having had some trouble understanding East's explanation of the agreement.

Both sides presented the same facts they presented to the table director: N/S said they had been misinformed by a poorly-marked convention card and a hard-to-understand answer. E/W said they had explained their agreement correctly and felt they marked their convention card sufficiently. There was little discussion of the director's polling regarding other auctions and results.

Panel Findings

The panel felt that E/W had filled out their convention card ambiguously and that East chose his words carelessly when explaining the meaning of 2♦. This indeed was misinformation. The panel upheld the director's ruling and adjusted the score to 2♥ by North, making 2, NS +110.

Panel Decision

2♥ by N, Made 2, N/S +110

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Koltnow
Member	Gary Zeiger
Member	Terry Lavender
Member	Olin Hubert

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

Event	Mini-Blue Ribbon Pairs	Event DIC	Doug Grove
Date	12/05/2013	Session	Second Final


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	5	N	3660 MPS
Dealer	N	♠ A1096	
		♥ 32	
		♦ 62	
Vul	N/S	♣ A10987	
W	2520 MPS		
♠	J85		
♥	AQ104		
♦	KQJ5		
♣	Q6		
		S	4050 MPS
		♠	KQ43
		♥	J876
		♦	3
		♣	KJ52
		E	3110 MPS
		♠	72
		♥	K95
		♦	A109874
		♣	43

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♦X by E	Down 2	N/S +300	♠ K

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after West's 5♦ bid, and again at the end of the hand. Following North's 4♠ bid, East had hesitated before passing. East agreed to this, but West said he did not notice a hesitation.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled four players about the West hand and the auction. Two peers of West (holding 2000-2500 masterpoints) were not sure what they would do over double, but were comfortable with 4♦. Both would have passed 4♠ and would have been surprised to hear a 5♦ call from partner. Two players with over 10,000 points would not have bid 5♦ having bid 4♦, although one of them did not think 4♦ was a good choice.

Director Ruling

Staff determined that East's tempo after 4♠ was an "unmistakable hesitation" which is unauthorized information to West. They felt that the break in tempo suggested 5♦ would be more successful than passing. If East was considering anything other than pass having already preempted, then West should be understood already to have made the suggestion of a 5♦ sacrifice to East. East's pass was deemed to indicate a preference for defense, so Pass was deemed to be a logical alternative to bidding. This was confirmed by the players polled. Law 16B1 empowers the director to adjust the score, which he did by Law 12C1e to 4♠ by North, making 4, N/S +620.

Director's Ruling	4♠ by N, Made 4, N/S +620
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

E/W appealed the director's ruling. North, South, and West attended the review just after the evening session of the event. In confirming the facts with the players, the Reviewer found out that the Stop card had been used on the 2♦ bid. When the Reviewer asked about the tempo of the rest of the auction, all three players present verified that South's double and North's 4♠ bid came after 4-5 seconds. West added that East has physical issues and is well known to be a slow player.

Panel Findings

The panel felt that neither North nor South had taken the 10 seconds expected of them after skip bids made by the opponents. As such, they felt it inappropriate to characterize a short but noticeable break in tempo by East as an "unmistakable hesitation," the remainder of the time from at least the second skip bid belonging now to East. With no unauthorized information, there was no infraction and no cause to adjust the score. The panel restored the table result of 5♦X by East, down 2, N/S +300.

Panel Decision

5♦X by E, Down 2, N/S +300

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Koltnow
Member	Gary Zeiger
Member	Ken Van Cleve
Member	Patty Holmes

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	R4
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	2 nd Saturday Daylight Pairs	Event DIC	Susan Doe
Date	12/07/2013	Session	First Session


Auction

West	North	East	South
		Pass	1♣ ¹
2♣ ²	3♣ ³	3♥	4♦
Pass	(5♣) ⁴ Pass	Pass	

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Strong, Artificial, Forcing
2: Explained as Majors
3: Transfer to ♦
4: Retracted bid

Hand Record

Board	10	N	4630 MPS	E	2300 MPS
Dealer	E	♠ J10		♠ 975	
		♥ J8		♥ Q10432	
		♦ 974		♦ 10862	
Vul	Both	♣ AJ10432		♣ 8	
W	3960 MPS			E	2300 MPS
♠ 84				♠ 975	
♥ K765				♥ Q10432	
♦ AK				♦ 10862	
♣ KQ765				♣ 8	
		S	5970 MPS		
		♠ AKQ632			
		♥ A9			
		♦ QQJ53			
		♣ 9			

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♦ by S	Down 1	E/W +100	♣ K

Facts Determined at the Table

North inquired about 2♣ before he bid and was told it showed both majors. Originally, North bid 5♣ in response to South's 4♦ bid. At that point, East stated to the table that she had explained her partner's bid incorrectly, and that it was natural. The table director took North away from the table, and he said that he would not have bid either 3♣ or 5♣ if he had received the correct explanation. The table director allowed North to retract his 5♣ call (Law 75B), and a pass was substituted, for a contract of 4♦.

Director Ruling

In the follow-up of the ruling, the explanation of Michaels was deemed to constitute a mistaken explanation, and appeared to directly damage N/S. The board was adjusted to 4♣ by South, making 4, for N/S +620, the most likely favorable result (Law 12C).

Director's Ruling	4♣ by S, Made 4, N/S +620
--------------------------	---------------------------

The Appeal

East/West appealed the table ruling. During the review, there was disagreement as to whether North used the alert strip, or any other physical action in conjunction with a verbal alert of 1♣. North inquired as to the meaning of 2♣, and was told that it was Michaels. North then bid 3♣. This was alerted and explained as a positive response showing diamonds. North bid 5♣ in response to the 4♦ call. East then announced that she had given the wrong explanation of 2♣; that it actually is natural over an artificial 1♣ bid, and she missed the alert of 1♣. Her explanation of Michaels was correct over a natural 1♣.

Panel Findings

The panel determined that North had failed to follow regulation in ensuring that his opponents were properly alerted to South's opening, which caused this situation. The panel overturned the director's ruling, and reverted to the table result of 4♦ by South, down 1, E/W +100.

Panel Decision	4♦ by S, Down 1, E/W +100
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Bill Michaels
Member	Matt Smith
Member	Gary Zeiger

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

Event	2 nd Sunday Open Pairs	Event DIC	Donna Coker
Date	12/08/2013	Session	First Session


Auction

West	North	East	South
		1♣	1♠
Pass	3♣	5♣	Pass ¹
Pass	Dbl	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alleged Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	2	N	1300 MPS
Dealer	E	♠ 8643	
		♥ QJ632	
Vul	N/S	♦ A832	
		♣ (void)	
W	3600 MPS		
♠	K1052		
♥	875		
♦	J974		
♣	82		
		S	350 MPS
		♠	AQJ97
		♥	A9
		♦	Q106
		♣	976
		E	120 MPS
		♠	(void)
		♥	K104
		♦	K5
		♣	AKQJ10543

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♣X by E	Down 1	N/S +100	♥ A

Facts Determined at the Table

West called the director after North's double to say that South had hesitated before passing 5♣. East/West both told the director that South took more than 10 seconds to pass. North/South did not agree. The stop card was not used by East before the 5♣ bid.

Director Ruling

The director noted that South is entitled to 10 seconds after the skip bid whether or not the stop card was used. The director decided that there was insufficient evidence to determine that there was an "unmistakable hesitation" (Law 16B1a) before South's pass, so the table result was ruled to stand.

Director's Ruling	5♣X by E, Down 1, N/S +100
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

E/W appealed the director's ruling. All four players attended the review during the next session of the event. The reviewer confirmed that the stop card was not used before the 5♣ bid (and also learned it was not used before North's 3♣ bid). 3♣ was a limit raise of spades. N/S did not claim to be in a forcing auction. West stated that he thought that the hesitation suggested North's double, and that pass was a normal action.

West told the reviewer that South paused thirty seconds after 5♣. North/South denied any hesitation beyond what was expected after a skip bid. The reviewer used his watch to time each player's estimation of the time elapsed between the 5♣ bid and South's pass. North spoke up after eight seconds; South after 10 seconds; West after 15 seconds; East after 18 seconds.

Panel Findings

Before considering whether double by North was “demonstrably suggested” and/or whether pass was a “logical alternative”, the panel first needed to decide if there was an “unmistakable hesitation” by South that transmitted unauthorized information. Factors such as how rapidly the auction had escalated, the absence of the use of the stop card (that may have made any time taken by South seem longer to E/W), and the divergence of time stated by West compared to what he demonstrated to the reviewer, swayed the panel that an “unmistakable hesitation” had not occurred in context. The panel upheld the director’s ruling and maintained the table result.

Panel Decision

5♣X by E, Down 1, N/S +100

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Smith
Member	Ken Van Cleve
Member	Geoff Greene