

# 2015 Fall NABC Appeals Casebook





<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N1
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----


<b>Event</b>	Nail LM Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Ken Van Cleve
<b>Date</b>	11/27/2015	<b>Session</b>	Second Qualifying

### Auction

West	North	East	South
	2♣ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	2♦ <sup>2</sup>
Pass	2♠ <sup>3</sup>	Pass	3♣ <sup>4</sup>
Pass	4♣ <sup>5</sup>	Pass	4♥ <sup>6</sup>
Pass	5♦ <sup>6</sup>	Pass	6♣ <sup>7</sup>
Pass	7♣	Pass	Pass
Pass			

1: Strong
2: Game Forcing
3: Natural
4: Natural, good suit
5: Club Support
6: Cuebid
7: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	25	N	Steve Caplan
<b>Dealer</b>	N	♠ AKQ932	
		♥ 5	
<b>Vul</b>	E/W	♦ A	
		♣ K10754	
W	Leo Bell		
♠	J875		
♥	K97432		
♦	K54		
♣	(void)	E	Jan Jansma
		♠	64
		♥	QJ
		♦	Q98732
		♣	Q82
		S	Gary Bernstein
		♠	10
		♥	A1086
		♦	J106
		♣	AJ963

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
7♣ by N	Made 7	N/S +1440	♥ J

### Facts Determined at the Table

East called for the director at the end of the auction. East stated that the 6♣ bid was made in an irregular tempo. When asked for a time frame, East initially refused to state exactly how long the bid had taken; but eventually said he guessed it took 10 seconds. West said that it was 6-7 seconds. Both North and South denied there had been a hesitation, noting that the 2♣ opening bid took longer than the 6♣ bid.

### Director Ruling

Based on the information made available by the players, the director determined there had been a 6-7 second hesitation; it was, however, determined not to be a break-in-tempo (BIT) given earlier bids and the level of the auction. Accordingly, the table result was allowed to stand, 7♣ by North, making seven, N/S +1440.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>7♣ by N, Made 7, N/S +1440</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling. West attended the hearing. West stated that the hesitation prior to the 6♣ bid stood out starkly from the rest of the auction not because it was so slow, maybe 5-6 seconds, but because the rest of the auction was so fast. There was not the slightest pause before any of the other bids.

## Committee Findings

With the new rules requiring the Appeals Committee (AC) to start from the director's ruling rather than from scratch, there would need to be clear evidence that there was a BIT in order to overturn the ruling in this case.

South's hand suggests he had no problem. With North's hand, it seems reasonably normal to bid 7♣. In slam auctions, it is pretty normal to pause for a few seconds before making a call that can be passed. All in all, the AC did not see compelling evidence to overturn the ruling. Because there appears to have been some change in tempo, this appeal was found to have substantial merit. The director's ruling was upheld, 7♣ by North making seven, N/S +1440.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>7♣ by N, Made 7, N/S +1440</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chairman</b>	Jeff Goldsmith
<b>Member</b>	Scott Stearns
<b>Member</b>	Mike Passell
<b>Member</b>	Fred King
<b>Member</b>	John Lusky

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b> Misinformation	<b>Case:</b> N2
--	-----------------

<b>Event</b> Nail LM Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b> Ken Van Cleve
<b>Date</b> 11/28/2015	<b>Session</b> Second Final


### Auction

West	North	East	South
2NT <sup>1</sup>	3♣ <sup>2</sup>	DbI <sup>3</sup>	Pass
3♠	Pass	3NT	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 20-21 HCP
2: No Alert
3: Negative

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b> 4	N	Stephen McConnell	
<b>Dealer</b> W	♠ A10832		
	♥ J96532		
<b>Vul</b> Both	♦ 2		
	♣ 9		
W	Andrea Manno		E
	♠ J754		Massimiliano Di Franco
	♥ A7		♠ KQ
	♦ AKQJ5		♥ KQ108
	♣ KQ		♦ 8763
			♣ J63
	S	Robert Giragosian	
	♠ 96		
	♥ 4		
	♦ 1094		
	♣ A1087542		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
3NT by W	Made 5	E/W +660	♥ 5

### Facts Determined at the Table

East/West summoned the director at the end of the hand. There had been no Alert of North's 3♣ bid, so they had both assumed it was natural. They stated if they had known it was for the majors, they would have doubled any contract in which North/South eventually settled, earning a better result by defending.

South stated that he did not Alert because they did not have an artificial agreement for 3♣ over 2NT. North stated that he thought either South would read what he meant by the bid or he could run to 3♥ if he was doubled. The N/S agreement for defending 1NT has 2♣ showing the majors.

### Director Ruling

South could tell from his own hand that 3♣ was not natural, but was under no obligation to disclose this. There was no evidence that North bid assuming an agreement was in place. As there was no evidence of a partnership agreement that required disclosure, no Alert was required. Per Law 40, there was no misinformation, and no adjustment to the table result was required.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3NT by W, Made 5, E/W +660</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling and both pairs attended the hearing. E/W believed that N/S had to have some sort of agreement.

## Committee Findings

As there was no evidence of a partnership agreement, there was no evidence of misinformation. The committee confirmed the director's ruling. The committee did not issue an Appeal without Merit Warning.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>3NT by W, Made 5, E/W +660</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chairman</b>	Dick Budd
<b>Member</b>	Joel Wooldridge
<b>Member</b>	Don Kern
<b>Member</b>	Jan Jansma
<b>Member</b>	Fred King



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Played Card	<b>Case:</b>	N3
---------------------------	-------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Mitchell Open BAM	<b>Event DIC</b>	Candace Kuschner
<b>Date</b>	11/30/2016	<b>Session</b>	Second Final

**Auction**

West	North	East	South
	1♣	1♦	1♥ <sup>1</sup>
Pass	2♣	2♦	3NT
Pass	Pass	Pass	

**Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention**

1: Spades

**Hand Record**

Board	1	N	Vanessa Reess	E	Wafik Abdou
Dealer	N	♠	K	♠	Q8
Vul	None	♥	AQJ8	♥	653
		♦	42	♦	AQ9853
		♣	QJ10942	♣	A8
W	Peter Rank	S	Joanna Zochowska		
♠	J76542	♠	A1093		
♥	742	♥	K109		
♦	106	♦	KJ7		
♣	K6	♣	753		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by S			♦ 10

**Facts Determined at the Table**

The play had gone ♦10 to the Jack, with East encouraging. South led a low club, with West rising with the King. He returned his last diamond, East winning the Ace. East now led another diamond, Declarer winning with the King. Declarer led a low spade to the King, and then called for a card from Dummy. East played the ♣A, and the director was called at this point.

East/West alleged that Declarer had called for a club from Dummy, while South said she had called for a heart and Dummy had played the ♥8. East said that he had not seen a card played, but he might have missed it.

**Director Ruling**

The director ruled that, given that a heart was presumably moved into place, clearly a heart was called, and therefore the ♣A was a major penalty card. When Declarer ran the hearts, East was forced to play the Ace on the last round, and Dummy's club suit was now good. Therefore, the contract made five, N/S +460.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3NT by S, Made 5, N/S +460</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

**The Appeal**

East appealed the director ruling and appeared before the committee. He stated that at trick six, both he and his partner believed they heard Declarer call for a club, and he played his Ace, although he had not seen the card played by Dummy. East stated that his partner confirmed that Dummy had not played a card prior to his play of the ♣A, and it was not until after his play that South called for a heart and the ♥8 was advanced to the played position. He had told this to the

table director after the round concluded. The table director stated they had investigated with N/S after the round, and they stated that the heart had been played immediately after South called for it.

## Committee Findings

While this case appears to be a classic “he said/she said” circumstance on the surface, there are two points that stand out. The first point is that when South called for a card from Dummy (and South has a thick accent), East did not, by his own admission, look to see which card Dummy played. Had he done this and seen the ♥8 put in the played position, he could have called the director and explained that he had heard a call for a club. Regardless of the outcome, he would not have played his ♣A, creating a penalty situation. If Dummy played no card, again he could have called the director and would not have lost his Ace as a penalty card.

Since the committee was not at the table, they had no way of knowing what card was called by the Declarer. But the second point, bridge logic, says that Declarer was in the process of cashing out her winners for down 1. It would be illogical to call for a club at this point. Because of this, the committee found no reason to overturn the director’s ruling, 3NT by South, making 5, N/S +450.

The committee also judged that the appeal was without merit, and therefore issued an Appeal without Merit Warning to East. While the committee had sympathy for East, no new facts or bridge logic was presented as part of his appeal, and the case was more bridge law than anything else. When you go to a director and say, “this is point 1 and this is point 2, how do you rule?”, you cannot then simply say that you want to appeal because you do not like the ruling.

To appeal with merit, there must be some question about the bridge logic or some new fact about the case worthy of consideration. You should not go to an appeal committee and say, “this is the same point 1 and the same point 2, and I want you to come up with a different ruling because I do not like the one the director gave.”

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>3NT by S, Made 5, N/S +460</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chairman</b>	Aaron Silverstein
<b>Member</b>	Scott Stearns
<b>Member</b>	James Thurtell
<b>Member</b>	Ed Lazarus
<b>Member</b>	Rui Marques

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N4
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Blue Ribbon Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Harry Falk
<b>Date</b>	12/01/2015	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifying


### Auction

West	North	East	South
		Pass	1♥
1♠	Dbl <sup>1</sup>	3♠	Pass <sup>2</sup>
Pass	4♥	4♠	Dbl
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: No explanation
2: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

Board	2	N	Linda Smith
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠ 7	
		♥ J97	
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>	♦ AK954	
		♣ 8754	
W	Russell Samuel		
♠	AQJ42		
♥	10		
♦	1062		
♣	Q932		
		S	Ron Smith
		♠	108
		♥	AQ8642
		♦	Q3
		♣	AK6
		E	Kyoko Shimamura
		♠	K9653
		♥	K53
		♦	J87
		♣	J10

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
4♠X by W	Down 3	N/S +500	♦ K

### Facts Determined at the Table

At the conclusion of the auction, E/W summoned the director concerning South's break in tempo. The director instructed play to continue and to call again if East/West felt that they had been damaged. At the conclusion of play, E/W summoned the director again as they felt that North did not have the values for her 4♥ bid. They felt the hesitation influenced her decision to bid. North explained that her Double was intended as part of a sequence to show a limit raise in hearts

### Director Ruling

Per Law 16B, a player may not choose from between logical alternatives one that could demonstrably have been suggested by extraneous information provided by their partner. The BIT suggested doubt about defending 3♠ therefore bidding 4♥ was a suggested alternative. The director changed the result to 3♠ by West, down 2, N/S +100.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3♠ by W, Down 2, N/S +100</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Appeal

North/South appealed the ruling and attended the hearing. In screening, the director polled a player from a regional team event with the North hand and the auction. The player bid 4♥, but though that pass might be more successful. Based upon this, the director considered changing the ruling, but decided the information gained from the player was ambivalent enough that the committee should make the final decision.

In the hearing, North explained that, at her first call, a 2♠ bid would have shown a limit raise with 4+ card support. She had made a negative double, intending to support hearts at her next turn in order to show a three card limit raise. It is



standard practice, when holding invitational values and support but cannot show it, to bid game rather than taking a weaker action. North did not consider pass to be a logical alternative to bidding 4♥. The N/S opening bid style is moderately aggressive.

### Committee Findings

The judgment of the committee was that the North hand – with a singleton spade, invitational values and undisclosed heart support – presented a clear 4♥ bid. They believed that few, if any, players of North's caliber and experience would seriously consider passing 3♣. Thus, pass was not a logical alternative to bidding and the table result of 4♠X by West, down 3, N/S +500 was restored.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>4♠X by W, Down 3, N/S +500</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

### Committee Members

<b>Chairman</b>	Douglas Doub
<b>Member</b>	James Thurtell
<b>Member</b>	Ed Lazarus
<b>Member</b>	Hendrik Sharples
<b>Member</b>	Mark Bartusek

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N5
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Blue Ribbon Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Harry Falk
<b>Date</b>	12/01/2015	<b>Session</b>	Second Qualifying


### Auction

West	North	East	South
1♠	Pass	Pass	1NT <sup>1</sup>
Pass	2NT <sup>2</sup>	Pass	3♦
Pass	3NT	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 11-16 HCP
2: Explained as Diamonds

### Hand Record

Board	4	N	Bill Staats		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠ Q54			
		♥ 865			
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>	♦ QJ3			
		♣ AQ93			
<b>W</b>	Mark Dahl			<b>E</b>	Lloyd Arvedon
♠	A10873			♠	J92
♥	A2			♥	K1074
♦	854			♦	1096
♣	K76			♣	J54
		<b>S</b>	Bill Heid		
		♠	K6		
		♥	QJ93		
		♦	AK72		
		♣	1082		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by S	Made 3	N/S +600	♠ 7

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned at the end of the auction. 2NT had been explained as showing a diamond suit. The actual partnership agreement over a balancing 1NT was natural and invitational. North/South do not use transfers at the 2 level over a balancing 1NT. Over an opening 1NT, the N/S agreement was that 2NT showed diamonds, and 3♦ accepts a game try. East/West stated that they would have made the same calls if the Alert and mistaken explanation had not been made, but they believed that the Unauthorized Information from the Alert might have influenced North to bid 3NT.

### Director Ruling

Due to time constraints at the end of the evening session, the director was unable to conduct a player poll regarding the auction and North's hand. After discussion amongst the directors, it was decided that although North had UI from the Alert, there was no logical alternative to North bidding 3NT, regardless of whatever meaning could be ascribed to 3♦. Therefore, the table result of 3NT by South, making 3, N/S +600, was confirmed.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3NT by S, Made 3, N/S +600</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling and attended the committee hearing. They argued that the UI suggests bidding 3NT, as the explanation told North that they might be playing in a 3-3 diamond fit. Without the UI, it was possible that South had a weak hand with a five card or longer diamond suit and was pulling to a safer contract. Pass would be a logical alternative in such a case, and here would produce a less successful result.

## Committee Findings

The committee acknowledged that there was UI due to the Alert and explanation, and the UI does demonstrably suggest bidding 3NT over 3♦ since there may not be a diamond fit. Pass was the only other alternative to 3NT.

However, the committee judged that 3♦ could not possibly be a correction of the part score strain with a minimum balancing no trump and long diamonds. Since North held a spade honor, diamond support and was very no trump oriented, Pass was not a logical alternative to 3NT. Therefore, the committee upheld the director ruling, 3NT by South, making 3, N/S +600.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>3NT by S, Made 3, N/S +600</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chairman</b>	Richard Hopper
<b>Scribe</b>	Greg Herman
<b>Member</b>	Joel Wooldridge
<b>Member</b>	Patty Tucker
<b>Member</b>	Don Kern

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information/Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	N6
---------------------------	---	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Blue Ribbon Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Harry Falk
<b>Date</b>	12/01/2015	<b>Session</b>	Second Qualifying


### Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	1♥
1♠	2♣ <sup>1</sup>	2♥	3♣
3♠	Pass <sup>2</sup>	Pass	Dbl <sup>3</sup>
Pass	4♥	Dbl	4NT
Dbl	5♦	Dbl	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Diamonds, no alert
2: Break in Tempo
3: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

Board	17	N	Irene Baroni		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ 54	♥ KJ10		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>	♦ KQ76532	♣ 6		
<b>W</b>	Allan Falk			<b>E</b>	John Lusky
♠	A109876			♠	KQJ3
♥	62			♥	943
♦	8			♦	J9
♣	A732			♣	K1095
		<b>S</b>	Andrea Manno		
		♠	2		
		♥	AQ875		
		♦	A104		
		♣	QJ84		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♦X by N	Made 6	N/S +650	♠ K

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned after each break in tempo, at the end of the auction when North explained that 2♣ should have been Alerted and then at the end of play. South stated that 2♣ by an unpassed hand would show diamonds, but was uncertain if that was the partnership agreement for a passed hand. That was why he did not Alert the bid and raised clubs at his next turn to call. Both North and South agreed that South's double was systemically not for penalty. East/West felt they "had no chance to get this right."

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

As the ruling came in the last rounds of the session, the director had limited time for polling. He polled four players regarding the North hand and the auction through South's double. All four bid 4♥ over the double, with none considering pass. Two of the players were given the next three bids and both bid 5♦.

### Director Ruling

Based upon the player poll, the director ruled that North did not choose, from amongst logical alternatives, one demonstrably suggested by the Unauthorized Information (Law 16B). Therefore, the table result was confirmed

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>5♦X by N, Made 6, N/S +650</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

## The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling, and East, North and South attended the hearing. East argued that with the misinformation about the hand, he and his partner had no chance to make sensible decisions in the auction. With correct information, he would not have doubled the final contract, and likely would have competed in spades over the 4♥ bid.

North/South provided their system notes which confirmed that 2♣ did show diamonds, as well as confirming that South's Double was systemically for takeout. They did not believe that South's slight hesitation before doubling was out of tempo in passout seat.

## Committee Findings

Both UI and MI were present at multiple times throughout the auction, and resulted in a complex case. Due to the hand occurring at the end of the evening session, the director did not have time to poll as extensively as would have been preferred, particularly concerning the South hand following North's hesitation over 3♣. The committee deliberated at length about South's action at this point in the auction, concerning the UI from the BIT.

The committee judged that Pass, Double and 4♣ were all possible actions by South, and that double was demonstrably suggested by the UI. While the committee considered pass as an alternative, they all viewed 4♣ as the more likely call. After a lengthy deliberation, they ruled Pass to not be a logical alternative for a player of South's caliber.

The committee then considered the auction following a 4♣ bid, and concluded that the auction would have proceeded similarly to the auction examined by the director in his poll, with there being no LA to North bidding 4♥. At this point, considerations to the MI implications from the 2♣ call enter the analysis. The N/S system notes confirmed the systemic agreement that 2♣ showed a diamond holding by North, thus MI did exist. The committee judged that, with the correct information, East would not double over 4♥, and that South would likely pass. West would then likely bid 4♠, which North would double.

Based upon the standards defined in Law 12C1e ("at all probable" and "likely"), the committee judged that West would take nine tricks in 4♠X, and that result was assigned. The committee believed, based upon South's double and 4NT bid, that South was aware of the possibility that North might have diamonds, but did not disclose this during the auction. The committee discussed whether a procedural penalty would be appropriate, but decided to not assess one.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>4♠X by W, Down 1, N/S +100</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chairman</b>	Richard Popper
<b>Scribe</b>	Greg Herman
<b>Member</b>	Don Kern
<b>Member</b>	Joel Wooldridge
<b>Member</b>	Patty Tucker



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N7
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Blue Ribbon Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Harry Falk
<b>Date</b>	12/01/2015	<b>Session</b>	Second Qualifying


### Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1NT <sup>1</sup>	Pass	2♥ <sup>2</sup>	Pass
3♣ <sup>3</sup>	Pass	4NT <sup>4</sup>	Pass
5♥ <sup>5</sup>	Pass	5NT	Pass
6♣	Pass	6♠ <sup>6</sup>	Pass
7♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-17 HCP
2: Transfer to spades
3: Super accept, with clubs
4: Keycard Blackwood
5: Two Keys, denies ♠Q
6: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

Board	23	N	Ira Herman		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>S</b>	♠ 6	♥ Q9542		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>	♦ KQ6	♣ J1062		
<b>W</b>	Joann Glasson			<b>E</b>	Bob Glasson
♠	KJ102			♠	AQ875
♥	K7			♥	AJ10
♦	105			♦	AJ84
♣	AKQ75			♣	3
		<b>S</b>	G. Margie Gwozdzinsky		
		♠	943		
		♥	863		
		♦	9732		
		♣	984		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
7♠ by E	Made 7	E/W +2210	♠ 3

### Facts Determined at the Table

North/South called the director when West bid 7♠. There had been a marked hesitation by East, agreed to by all, prior to his 6♠ bid. N/S believed the hesitation constituted unauthorized information suggesting West bid the grand slam.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled five players with the West hand and the auction. All viewed 6♣ as exploring for a grand slam in No Trump, and when East bid 6♠ denying interest, they resigned themselves to bidding the grand in spades.

### Director Ruling

As the player poll showed there was no logical alternative to bidding 7♠, Law 16 was not violated, and the table result was confirmed.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>7♠ by E, Made 7, E/W +2210</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Appeal

N/S appealed the ruling, and North attended the hearing. He stated that while he would have had no problem with a direct jump to 7♠ over 5NT, he felt that, following the hesitation, West should not raise over 6♠.

## Committee Findings

The committee judged that 6♣ was clearly the correct bid at matchpoints, as there were many hands that East could hold that would make 7NT a laydown (J10 of clubs, for example), and not looking for 7NT in this form of game would be poor strategy. Given that West could easily have bid 7♠ directly over 5NT, not bidding it after 6♣ was ruled to not be a logical alternative. Therefore, the committee confirmed the director ruling regarding the table result.

The committee discussed the merit of the appeal. As there were some issues with the paperwork, and North had not been warned by the screening director that the appeal might not have merit, the committee did not assign an Appeal without Merit Warning.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>7♠ by E, Made 7, E/W +2210</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chairman</b>	Thomas Carmichael
<b>Scribe</b>	Hendrik Sharples
<b>Member</b>	James Thurtell
<b>Member</b>	Ed Lazarus
<b>Member</b>	Scott Stearns

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	N8
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Blue Ribbon Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Harry Falk
<b>Date</b>	12/02/2015	<b>Session</b>	First Semifinal


### Auction

West	North	East	South
		1NT	Dbl <sup>1</sup>
2♦ <sup>2</sup>	2♠	3♥	Pass
4♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Explained 4 Major/5 minor
2: Transfer to Hearts

### Hand Record

Board	22	N	Jacek Pszczola		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠	KJ8743		
		♥	(void)		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>E/W</b>	♦	J10762		
		♣	53		
<b>W</b>	Chris Willenken			<b>E</b>	Alison Wilson
♠	AQ5			♠	1096
♥	J10853			♥	AK976
♦	Q9			♦	A85
♣	1062			♣	A4
		<b>S</b>	Jared Lilienstein		
		♠	2		
		♥	Q42		
		♦	K43		
		♣	KQJ987		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♥ by E	Down 2	N/S +200	♣ K

### Facts Determined at the Table

East/West summoned the director after play of the hand was over. North had explained South's double as showing a four card major and a five card minor. The actual partnership agreement was a one suited hand. As North/South were defenders, South could not correct the misinformation until after play had finished. When asked if there would have been any change in the bidding if the proper explanation had been given, all at the table agreed that the auction would have been the same. West stated that East would have taken a different line of play with the correct information. East made no statement regarding how she would have played the hand.

The play had gone ♣K to the Ace, followed by the Ace and King of hearts. Declarer now led a low diamond, won by South with the King. He first cashed the ♥Q and the ♣Q then led the ♣J, which was ruffed by Declarer. She now led the ♠10 through to North's Jack. North returned a diamond, which East won with the Ace, overtaking the Queen, so she could repeat the Spade finesse. East had played all the low hearts in Dummy under the Ace, King & Queen.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled several players concerning the play of the hand. While all agreed the incorrect explanation provided misinformation, they faulted Declarer's poor management of the trump suit as being the real culprit for the result achieved on the hand. If she had unblocked a high heart in Dummy under either the King or Queen, she would have been able to win the ♦Q, come to her hand with the ♥9, and then cash the ♦A to pitch a spade in Dummy before taking the finesse. This line would result in no worse than down one, regardless of the distribution of the spade suit.



## Director Ruling

While there was misinformation on the hand, the player poll showed that the damage was the result of Declarer's decisions in the play of the hand rather than a result of the misinformation. As East's play of the trump suit in Dummy was deemed the cause of the damage, and that was not related to the irregularity, per Law 12C1b, no adjustment was necessary. The table result of 4♥ by East, down 2, N/S +200 stands.

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

## The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling and West and North attended the committee. West argued that with proper information, there were many lines by which East could have certainly come to at least nine tricks. With the MI, she felt the double finesse in Spades to be the percentage play, as South should have four spades and the honors would likely be split.

## Committee Findings

The committee agreed that MI was given. However, the play by Declarer was so poor that it severed the link between the MI and the result. When you have ten card trump suit, split five-five between Dummy and Declarer's hand, you should be able most times to maintain communication between the two hands. This is what Declarer failed to do and what caused the result. This had no connection to the misinformation during the auction.

The committee also judged that the appeal lacked merit because this was the original ruling and no additional information or bridge logic was introduced as part of the appeal. Therefore, E/W was assigned an Appeal without Merit Warning.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>4♥ by E, Down 2, N/S +200</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chairman</b>	Richard Popper
<b>Scribe</b>	James Thurtell
<b>Member</b>	Meyer Kotkin
<b>Member</b>	Greg Herman
<b>Member</b>	Scott Stearns

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N9
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Blue Ribbon Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Harry Falk
<b>Date</b>	12/02/2015	<b>Session</b>	First Semifinal


### Auction

West	North	East	South
	1NT <sup>1</sup>	Pass	2♦ <sup>2</sup>
Dbl <sup>3</sup>	2♥	2♠	3♥
3♠	4♥	Pass <sup>4</sup>	Pass
Dbl	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 14-16 HCP
2: Transfer to hearts
3: Lead directive
4: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

Board	25	N	Louk Voorhees		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ 82	♥ AQ2		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>E/W</b>	♦ Q3	♣ AQ10954		
<b>W</b>	Tarek Sadek			<b>E</b>	Ahmed Hussein
♠	Q973			♠	AK1064
♥	74			♥	103
♦	AK1094			♦	876
♣	76			♣	KJ2
		<b>S</b>	John McAllister		
		♠	J5		
		♥	KJ9865		
		♦	J52		
		♣	83		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♥X by N	Down 2	E/W +300	♦ 8

### Facts Determined at the Table

North/South summoned the director at the end of the auction. East broke tempo over North's 4♥ bid, approximately seven seconds or so. West stated that East was a sound bidder, and should have around 10 HCP for his 2♠ bid. As West held 9 HCP, the auction gave sufficient authorized information that made his double the only logical alternative considering the vulnerability on the deal.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Six players were polled with the West hand and the auction. Two bid 4♠, while the rest passed over 4♥. This confirmed pass as a logical alternative.

### Director Ruling

West had unauthorized information from East's BIT, which suggested that action would be more successful than passing. The player poll established pass as a logical alternative, barring the UI. Therefore, per Laws 12 & 16, the director adjusted the result to 4♥ by North, down 2, E/W +100.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	4♥ by N, Down 2, E/W +100
--------------------------	---------------------------

## The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling, and they alone attended the committee. West's double of 2♦ was lead directing; it could have been made on as little as ♦KQ109xx. East is a sound bidder, and West expected him to have a good five card suit (not six, as he would have acted over 1NT), at least 10 HCP, and inferentially, some kind of diamond tolerance.

South's 3♥ bid was competitive, which within the context of the auction meant that he did not expect to make game. West expected 3♠ to make when he bid it, and his diamonds would not only be a good lead for East, but also two fast tricks on defense against hearts, which his partner could not expect. The knowledge that South did not expect to make the contract, combined with the defensive strength of West's diamond holding and the expected strength of East's hand, made it clear to West that he must double 4♥ to protect his plus score in 3♠ as best as he could.

### Committee Findings

There was an agreed BIT following the 4♥ bid. Most slow passes suggest bidding rather than doubling, and a 4♣ bid by West would certainly not be allowed following a BIT. However, a slow pass also suggests extra values, and that East expected 3♠ to make. Thus, the BIT made it demonstrably more attractive for West to double in order to protect a positive score from 3♠.

West's arguments were both logical and attractive, and many strong players might choose to double. However, East's bidding might have been predicated on good diamond support (Qxx or QJxx), and North might have bid 4♥ because he held either xxx or Axx in spades and believed he had a perfect fit with partner. If that was the case, 4♥ could easily be making, and doubling could turn a 30-35% result into a zero, while turning plus 50 into plus 100 for down one would not adequately compensate for making plus 140 in 3♠.

Although double appears to be the percentage action, since North might often be bidding 4♥ as a cheap save against 3♠, the committee judged that pass was a logical alternative. Therefore, the director ruling was confirmed, 4♥ by North, down 2, E/W +100.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>4♥ by N, Down 2, E/W +100</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

### Committee Members

<b>Chairman</b>	Douglas Doub
<b>Member</b>	Gail Greenberg
<b>Member</b>	David Caprera
<b>Member</b>	Aaron Silverstein
<b>Member</b>	Don Kern

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	N10
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----

<b>Event</b>	Blue Ribbon Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Harry Falk
<b>Date</b>	12/02/2015	<b>Session</b>	Second Semifinal


### Auction

West	North	East	South
		1♣	1♥
Dbl <sup>1</sup>	2♦ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	2♥
2♠	Pass	Pass	3♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Explained as 4 or 5 spades
2: Weak heart raise

### Hand Record

Board	26	N	Michael Polowan		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠ J106			
		♥ A963			
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>	♦ J85			
		♣ 1054			
<b>W</b>	Rose Yan			<b>E</b>	Jiang Gu
♠	Q87542			♠	K9
♥	10			♥	QJ5
♦	AQ94			♦	732
♣	72			♣	AQJ86
		<b>S</b>	Tom Townsend		
		♠	A3		
		♥	K8742		
		♦	K106		
		♣	K93		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♥ by S	Down 2	E/W +200	♣ 7

### Facts Determined at the Table

South called the director at the beginning of the next round to claim misinformation. He stated that had he known it was possible for West to hold six spades, he would have found the correct play to only go down one on the hand. West stated, that while East/West do have a partnership agreement that would allow her to show six spades, she did not believe her hand to be strong enough to apply it.

### Director Ruling

As East did not bid spades at his second turn to call and West bid Spades on her own at her second turn, it could be inferred from the available information of the auction that the likely spade split was six-two. Per Law 40C, "a player may deviate from his side's announced understandings always, provided that his partner has no more reason to be aware of the deviation than have the opponents." Therefore, any damage was due to the choices made by Declarer, not from any lack of information provided by the opponents.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3♥ by S, Down 2, E/W +200</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Appeal

N/S appealed and were the only players to attend the committee. They argued that the explanation of the double by West was that it specifically showed four or five spades. The fact that West could have a sixth spade and not show it was not mentioned.

With the information that South had, the only shape possible for West after play to the first four tricks was 5-1-5-2, which would allow Declarer to escape for down one if East held Qx in diamonds. If South had known that the sixth spade was possible for West, then he would have a second possibility for down one, if East held a doubleton spade honor

### Committee Findings

The committee, after much discussion, ruled that the explanation provided was incomplete and therefore misinformation had been given. Because of the MI, Declarer was never afforded the opportunity to find the correct play, and accordingly was damaged and eligible for redress. The committee adjusted the result to 3♥ by S, down 1, E/W+100.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>3♥ by S, Down 1, E/W +100</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

### Committee Members

<b>Chairman</b>	James Thurtell
<b>Member</b>	Scott Stearns
<b>Member</b>	Becky Rogers
<b>Member</b>	Greg Herman
<b>Member</b>	Meyer Kotkin

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N11
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	-----

<b>Event</b>	North American Open Swiss	<b>Event DIC</b>	Tom Marsh
<b>Date</b>	12/04/2015	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifying


### Auction

West	North	East	South
		1♦	1♥
1♠	2♦	2♠	3♣
Pass	3♠	Pass	4♥
4♠	Pass <sup>1</sup>	Pass	5♥ <sup>2</sup>
Pass	6♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Hesitation, Forcing Pass
2: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	14	N	Piotr Tuczynski		
<b>Dealer</b>	E	♠ 9	♥ A85		
<b>Vul</b>	None	♦ AK832	♣ A974		
W	Wafik Abdou			E	Hussein Fouad
♠	Q108763			♠	KJ54
♥	64			♥	K
♦	10			♦	QJ764
♣	J1086	S	Bertosz Chmurski	♣	K32
		♠	A2		
		♥	QJ109732		
		♦	95		
		♣	Q5		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
6♥ by S	Made 6	N/S +980	♦ 10

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned before the opening lead. The auction had gone briskly until 4♠. The BIT over 4♠ did not convey unauthorized information as the pass was forcing. South took about 15 seconds to bid 5♥. East/West asked for a review to determine if 6♥ was in violation of Law 16.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Five players were polled with the North hand and the auction. All five believed that the pause before 5♥ did not suggest one action over another.

### Director Ruling

As the poll was unanimous that the BIT did not suggest a particular action, then Law 16 was not violated. The table result was confirmed.

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

### The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling and all four players attended the committee. E/W believed that the 15 second hesitations before 5♥ suggested bidding. The committee asked N/S as to what 4NT then 5♥ would show, but they had no agreement.

## Committee Findings

This was a close case. The committee was divided as to whether a 15 second hesitation was meaningful. The screening director opined that while the hesitation was likely meaningful, to violate Law 16 it had to demonstrably suggest one action that was advantageous over another. As the player poll indicated that the hesitation did not suggest a particular action, there was no reason to overturn the director's ruling.

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

## Committee Members

<b>Chairman</b>	Mark Bartusek
<b>Scribe</b>	Hendrik Sharples
<b>Member</b>	Don Kern
<b>Member</b>	Scott Stearns
<b>Member</b>	James Thurtell

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N12
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	-----

<b>Event</b>	Reisinger BAM Teams	<b>Event DIC</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Date</b>	12/04/2015	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifying


### Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
Pass	1♣	Db1	Pass
1♦	1NT	2♦	Db1 <sup>1</sup>
Pass	3♣	Pass <sup>2</sup>	Pass
3♦	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Takeout
2: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>N</b>	Bobby Levin		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>S</b>	♠ 94	♥ K32		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>	♦ A10	♣ AKQ1074		
<b>W</b>	Carlos Hoyos			<b>E</b>	Jorge Barrera
♠	Q72			♠	AKJ3
♥	Q4			♥	A1095
♦	75432			♦	QJ86
♣	J86			♣	2
		<b>S</b>	Steve Weinstein		
		♠	10865		
		♥	J876		
		♦	K9		
		♣	953		

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

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called by North/South following the 3♦ bid and again at the end of play. Both sides agreed that East had hesitated noticeably prior to passing over 3♣.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Five players were polled with the West hand. All five bid 3♦. Pass was not deemed to be a logical alternative.

### Director Ruling

As there was no logical alternative to bidding, the UI from the BIT was deemed to be immaterial and no adjustment was necessary.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3♦ by W, Made 4, E/W +130</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Appeal

N/S appealed the ruling, and South and West attended the hearing. South argued that North's 1NT rebid was not explained in the player poll as showing an 18-19 HCP hand. West had the opportunity to bid 3♦ over South's double, and South believed that ethically, West should have passed once his partner hesitated.

West stated that he and his partner were aware that the 1NT rebid showed 18-19 HCP. He passed the double to wait and see what North did. He would have been willing to defend against 2♠, and maybe 2♥ (he was still deliberating



that notion). Also, he believed his partner's 2♦ bid showed short clubs and extra values, since it was bid over an 18-19 1NT bid.

### Committee Findings

The Committee agreed with West that the 2♦ bid likely showed short clubs and extra values. The other possibility was that East may have held five diamonds instead. Under either alternative, the committee agreed with the player poll that defending against 3♣ with the West hand was not a logical alternative. Therefore, the director's ruling was confirmed.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>3♦ by W, Made 4, E/W +130</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

### Committee Members

<b>Chairman</b>	Richard Popper
<b>Scribe</b>	Joel Wooldridge
<b>Member</b>	Thomas Carmichael
<b>Member</b>	Ed Lazarus
<b>Member</b>	Rick Rowland



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b> Misinformation	<b>Case:</b> N13
--	------------------

<b>Event</b> North American Open Swiss	<b>Event DIC</b> Tom Marsh
<b>Date</b> 12/04/2015	<b>Session</b> Second Qualifying


### Auction

West	North	East	South
		1♣	Pass
1♥	1♠	1NT	Pass
2♣ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Intended as Artificial Force

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b> 34	N	Mike Cappelletti		
<b>Dealer</b> E	♠	AK73		
	♥	1093		
<b>Vul</b> N/S	♦	A83		
	♣	Q106		
W	Robert Bitterman		E	Robert Cappelli
♠	8642		♠	Q105
♥	AKQ74		♥	87
♦	J1064		♦	K95
♣	(void)		♣	AKJ98
		S	David Grainger	
		♠	J9	
		♥	J62	
		♦	Q72	
		♣	75432	

<b>Final Contract</b> 2♣ by E	<b>Result of Play</b> Made 2	<b>Score</b> E/W +90	<b>Opening Lead</b> ♣ 2
-------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------

### Facts Determined at the Table

North/South called the director at the end of play of the hand. West had intended 2♣ as artificial and forcing. East believed that the bid was natural after interference. The director asked to see the E/W convention cards and system notes, but these were never provided. In the play of the hand, the low club went to the Queen and Ace. Declarer crossed to the ♥A, and finessed the ♦J to the Queen. The defense took two spades, two diamonds and a spade ruff.

### Director Ruling

Per Laws 20F5 and 75B, West should have explained at the end of the auction that East had failed to Alert their 2♣ bid. With proper information, South was likely to lead a spade. With that lead, it was judged likely that East would only come to seven tricks, so, per Law 12C, that result was assigned.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>2♣ by E, Down 1, N/S +50</b>
--------------------------	---------------------------------

### The Appeal

N/S appealed the director ruling, and presented their case to the committee. They argued that with a spade lead and a diamond shift, Declarer was likely to guess incorrectly in diamonds and go down a second trick.

## Committee Findings

The committee agreed that if correct information had been given, the opening lead was likely to be a spade. A diamond shift was also agreed to be a probable scenario. However, even with this defense, the committee found it completely unlikely that Declarer would go down more than one trick with seven tricks available for the taking. Therefore, the committee upheld the director's ruling of down one.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>2♣ by E, Down 1, N/S +50</b>
---------------------------	---------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chairman</b>	Aaron Silverstein
<b>Scribe</b>	James Thurtell
<b>Member</b>	Patty Tucker
<b>Member</b>	Greg Herman
<b>Member</b>	Mayer Kotkin

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N14
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	-----

<b>Event</b>	North American Open Swiss	<b>Event DIC</b>	Tom Marsh
<b>Date</b>	12/05/2015	<b>Session</b>	First Semifinal


### Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
Pass	1♥	3♠	Pass
Pass	Dbl	Pass	4♣ <sup>1</sup>
Pass	5♣	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

Board	15	N	Scott Stearns		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>S</b>	♠ 10	AK74		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>	♥ AK74	AJ62		
		♦ AJ62	AJ109		
		♣ AJ109			
<b>W</b>	Leonardo Cima			<b>E</b>	Valerio Giubilo
♠	A86			♠	KQJ7542
♥	J6532			♥	98
♦	K5			♦	1087
♣	Q54			♣	7
		<b>S</b>	Jay Segarra		
		♠	93		
		♥	Q10		
		♦	Q943		
		♣	K8632		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♣ by S	Made 6	N/S +620	

### Facts Determined at the Table

East/West called the director following North's 5♣ call. South had taken about two minutes before bidding 4♣, and E/W believed the long hesitation had influenced North's bid.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Several players were polled as to whether pass was a logical alternative with the North hand, and what did the long BIT suggest. Three strong players rattled off several choices that South may have been considering, but none of the players felt that any particular call was "demonstrably suggested" by the BIT. One player explicitly stated that South must have around 6 HCP (at least) on this auction.

### Director Ruling

As the player poll indicated that no action was deemed to have been demonstrably suggested by the BIT, the criteria under Law 16 for adjustment were not met. Therefore, the table result was confirmed.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>5♣ by S, Made 6, N/S +620</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

## The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling, and North, South, East and the E/W team captain attended the hearing. East argued that the BIT implied that South was trying to decide between bidding game or not bidding game. Since he decided to not bid game, pass was a logical alternative to bidding by North.

South stated that he was trying to decide between bidding 4♣ and 4♥, as he thought his partner had five hearts from their opening bid and his ♥Q10 might be all partner needed.

## Committee Findings

The committee agreed with the polled players that the BIT before 4♣ did not demonstrably suggest one logical choice over another. South could have been thinking about passing with four spades, bidding 4♥, or several other options. Therefore, North is free to bid anything he chooses as the Law 16 conditions were not met. The table result and director's ruling were upheld.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>5♣ by S, Made 6, N/S +620</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chairman</b>	James Thurtell
<b>Member</b>	Jeff Meckstroth
<b>Member</b>	Mike Passell
<b>Member</b>	Greg Herman
<b>Member</b>	Philippe Cronier

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Inadvertent Designation	<b>Case:</b>	R1
---------------------------	-------------------------	--------------	----


<b>Event</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Sunday AXY Swiss	<b>Event DIC</b>	Jenni Carmichael
<b>Date</b>	11/29/2015	<b>Session</b>	First

### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention


### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	5	N	2100 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	N	♠ 4	♥ 8765		
<b>Vul</b>	N/S	♦ J98	♣ J9653		
W	5100 MPS			E	7000 MPS
♠	KQ1076			♠	A953
♥	92			♥	KQ103
♦	A102			♦	Q76
♣	KQ8			♣	102
		S	2060 MPS		
		♠	J82		
		♥	AJ4		
		♦	K543		
		♣	A74		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
4♠ by W	Down 1	N/S +50	♣ 5

### Facts Determined at the Table

After winning the second round of clubs, Declarer cashed the King and Queen of spades drawing 2 rounds of trump then led a heart to the King, won by South. The ♠J was returned, Declarer playing low, North pitching a club and Declarer called "spade", then almost immediately corrected to "Ace of spades". The director was called by North/South to determine whether or not West was entitled to change the original designation of a small spade.

### Director Ruling

The director invoked Law 45C4b. While the change of call was made almost immediately, the standards for determining that the change was timely ("without pause for thought") had not been met. The burden of proof failed to meet the standard of overwhelming as directed by the Laws Commission.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	4♠ by W, Down 1, N/S +50
--------------------------	--------------------------

### The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling. There was virtually no dispute as to the facts. All four players agreed that the change of call happened quickly. The reviewer did ask Declarer why she did not finish pulling trumps as there appears to be no valid bridge reason for abandoning this line of play. The attempt was to find out if Declarer might have thought trumps were drawn and/or confused as to which hand contained the remaining high trump. Declarer offered no reason other than she wanted to knock out the ♥A.

## Panel Findings

The Panel concluded that Law 46 (incomplete designation of a card from Dummy) was the more appropriate law to apply to this case. Being that the ♠J was the last outstanding trump, it had been led, and the Ace was in the Dummy, playing last to the trick, it was highly unlikely that Declarer could be thinking of leading a spade to the subsequent trick or taking a finesse. The Panel decided that the call of 'spade' had been incomplete and that the ♠A was the incontrovertible intent of Declarer. Furthermore, the Panel felt that if Law 46 was not applied to this case, there would be little point to having it at all.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>4♠ by W, Made 4, E/W +420</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Marc Labovitz
<b>Member</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Member</b>	Jeanne van den Meiracker



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	R2
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	10K IMP Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Peter Wilke
<b>Date</b>	11/30/2015	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifying


### Auction

West	North	East	South
	1NT <sup>1</sup>	Dbl <sup>2</sup>	2♣ <sup>3</sup>
3♣	Pass	3NT	Pass
4♥	Pass	4NT	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 10-12 HCP
2: Strong, 15-17 HCP
3: Explained as minors

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	17	N	5600 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	N	♠ 652			
		♥ K32			
		♦ Q32			
<b>Vul</b>	None	♣ KQ65			
W	1900 MPS			E	400 MPS
♠	A87			♠	KJ4
♥	AQJ104			♥	98
♦	1098			♦	AK6
♣	87			♣	A10942
		S	5700 MPS		
		♠	Q1093		
		♥	765		
		♦	J754		
		♣	J3		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
4NT by E	Down 1	N/S +50	♥ 7

### Facts Determined at the Table

The opening lead was ducked to the king, and the ♠K return was also ducked. A low club exit by North was ducked to South's jack. South played a diamond to the queen and ace. Declarer then played the club ace. When South showed out, the director was called.

North/South stated that they use their defense to a strong 1NT opening as their runout over a penalty double of their 10-12 1NT. South stated he forgot their agreement when he bid 2♣, which he meant as the start of a scramble sequence. However, the agreement that 2♣ showed both minors over a double of 1NT could not be verified on the N/S convention cards, and they did not have system notes.

### Director Ruling

The table director initially ruled that South had forgotten the agreement that 2♣ showed both minors. Since this would not be an infraction of law per Law 75C, he allowed the table result to stand. However, because North/South could not provide evidence of this agreement, the director then presumed that the explanation was incorrect rather than the call and changed his ruling per Laws 75B, 75C, and 12B1 to 4NT by East, making 4, E/W +430.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	4NT by E, Made 4, E/W +430
--------------------------	----------------------------

### The Appeal

North/South appealed the ruling and attended the review, although East and West both spoke with the reviewer prior to the review. North/South felt that their explanation of 2♣ was correct according to their understanding, and that the Declarer's play of the hand should not have been affected by the meaning of the 2♣ bid.



## Panel Findings

The Panel noted that after the return of the ♣K, ten tricks were available by winning the king with the ace and driving out the remaining club honors, since all other suits were still at least double-stopped. They polled five players ranging between 1100 and 8000 MP, and all five players won the ♣K with the ace at trick two and made 4NT. None of the polled players indicated that either possible explanation of the 2♣ bid had any impact on the chosen line of play.

The Panel therefore ruled that although there was misinformation given to East as defined in Law 75B, the damage to E/W was self-inflicted and unrelated to the misinformation. The Panel therefore restored the table result of 4NT by East, down one, N/S +50.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>4NT by E, Down 1, N/S +50</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Eric Bell
<b>Member</b>	Matt Smith
<b>Member</b>	David Metcalf



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	R3
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Monday AXY Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Doug Rankin
<b>Date</b>	11/30/2015	<b>Session</b>	First


### Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	3♣	3♠
4♥	4♠	5♥	5♠
6♥	Db1 <sup>1</sup>	Pass	6♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>21</b>	N	5000 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ K865	♥ 86		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>	♦ KQ6532	♣ 4		
<b>W</b>	8500 MPS			<b>E</b>	5200 MPS
♠ 3	♥ KQJ107432			♠ J	♥ A95
♦ 8	♣ A108			♦ 10	♣ QJ976532
		S	4300 MPS		
		♠ AQ109742	♥ (void)		
		♦ AJ974	♣ K		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
6♠ by S	Made 6	N/S +1430	♣ A

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called to the table at the end of play. The director determined that, before North's double of 6♥, there was a break in tempo. The North player confirmed that he thought for about 15 seconds before doubling.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Eight players of approximately equal level as the South player were polled, and, after North's double (but with no mention of a break in tempo), six of the eight polled would pass. The other two would bid 6♠.

### Director Ruling

According to Law 16B1a, "After a player makes available to partner extraneous information that may suggest a call or play, as for example ... by unmistakable hesitation ... the partner may not choose from logical alternatives one that could demonstrably have been suggested over another by the extraneous information." The Director ruled that the break in tempo may have demonstrably suggested bidding on rather than passing, and that pass was a logical alternative. The score was adjusted, therefore, to 6♥X doubled by West, down 1, for N/S +100.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	6♥X by W, Down 1, N/S +100
--------------------------	----------------------------

## The Appeal

The Reviewer met with all four players, and confirmed that the hesitation was approximately 15 seconds. Furthermore, while North/South claimed they bid slowly, all agreed that this was a longer time than the remaining bids in the auction.

N/S argued that, in a high-level competitive auction such as this one, a 15-second pause was normal tempo, that any player in such a position was entitled to consider carefully, and that the break therefore was not "out of tempo" for the auction. North stated that he was reviewing his system and what his bids meant in this situation, and this should not suggest any particular option to his partner. They claimed (but were unable to produce system notes supporting their claim) that at the 5 or 6 level, when their side was bidding to make their contract, then when the opponents compete, a pass would show that earlier bids were based on shape, while double would imply that they were based on values. They averred that a pass would not be forcing here - if both North and South were bidding based on shape, they were not required to double the opponents.

### Panel Findings

The Panel recognized that, as an auction reached high levels, particularly in competition, players do tend to bid more slowly. However, in an auction such as this one, while a break of 8-10 seconds might not convey information, fifteen seconds is a rather long time, and certainly expressed doubt. For example, if North's high cards had included a trump trick, then he would likely have been able to double significantly faster. North's actual tempo suggested that all of his values were outside of hearts, which made a 6♠ bid more attractive.

The Panel determined that the 15 second pause did constitute an unmistakable hesitation, and made South's 6♠ bid more attractive. The Director's poll established that Pass was a logical alternative, so the ruling of 6♥X by West, down 1, for a score of N/S +100, was upheld per Laws 16B1 and 12C1e.

Some consideration was given as to whether the appeal had merit: did the appellants bring to the appeal an argument not encompassed by the Director's initial decision? It was felt that the length of the break in a high-level auction was sufficient cause for the situation deserving a second look, so the appeal was found to have some merit

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>6♥X by W, Down 1, N/S +100</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	David Metcalf
<b>Member</b>	Matt Smith
<b>Member</b>	Gary Zeiger