APPEAL	Non NABC+ TWO
Subject	Tempo – Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Bill Wittmann
Event	Joan Hasch Stratified Pairs
Session	First
Date	July 14, 2006

BD#	**3**
VUL	**E/W**
DLR	**South**

10,367 Masterpoints	
♠	
♥	K 9 5 4 2
♦	A Q 8 7 4 3
♣	9 7

2,617 Masterpoints	
♠	A K Q 9 6
♥	7
♦	J 5
♣	K Q 6 5 4

Summer 2006
Chicago, Illinois

2,185 Masterpoints	
♠	T 8 7 4 3 2
♥	J 8 6 3
♦	T 9
♣	A

5,889 Masterpoints	
♠	J 5
♥	A Q T
♦	K 6 2
♣	J T 8 3 2

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1♠	2♠[1]	4♠	4NT[2]
Pass[3]	5♦	5♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	**5♠ by West**
Opening Lead	**♣9**
Table Result	**5♠ making six, E/W +680**
Director Ruling	**5♠ down one, E/W -100**
Panel Ruling	**5♠ down one, E/W -100**

(1)	Shows hearts and a minor.
(2)	What is your minor?
(3)	Slow.

The Facts: N/S called the director after the opening lead and claimed that East (dummy) had no bid over partner's slow pass. N/S also claimed that West went to the bidding box and fingered a bid before passing. N/S felt East was not entitled to bid 5♠; therefore, South would be able to bid 5♥ and get partner off to the correct lead and a subsequent contract of 5♠ would go down one instead of making six.

The Ruling: The 5♠ call was considered to be suggested by the break in tempo (BIT) and pass a less successful logical alternative (LA). After projecting a heart lead with an auction permitting South a bid of 5♥, the table result was adjusted to 5♠ by West down one, N/S +100.

The Appeal: East said that the auction told her to bid 5♠. She thought they were unlikely to lose more than three red suit tricks. With her complete lack of defense, she thought N/S were likely cold for 5♦.
Since E/W had acknowledged the BIT, South did not call for the director until she saw the dummy. N/S said that with a passed hand opposite the two-suiter, it was unclear whether 5♦ or 5♥ would make. N/S thought the BIT clearly encouraged the 5♠ bid.

The Decision: The panel found that E/W had played twice before this event. West's BIT demonstrably suggested action over inaction. Four peers of E/W were given East's hand to bid. All duplicated the 4♠ bid at East's first turn. Two of the four passed over 5♦, while two bid 5♠. The two players who passed bid 5♠ after a projected auction of 5♦ – Pass – 5♥ – Pass – Pass.
This information established pass over 5♦ as a LA, but also suggested that a final contract of 5♠ was possible. Based on peer input, the panel assigned an auction (from 4NT) of:

4NT	Pass	5♦	Pass
5♥	Pass	Pass	5♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

On this auction, South was able to bid 5♥, which made a heart lead at all probable. The possibility of a heart lead on this auction was confirmed by a poll of experts (see North's masterpoint holding), half of whom led a heart.
The panel assigned a contract of 5♠ by West, down one, N/S plus 100, after the lead of a small heart.
Since the player input suggested a final contract of 5♠ was likely after a pass by East over 5♦, the panel decided it was reasonable for E/W to believe the 5♠ bid should be allowed. Thus, the appeal was judged to have merit.

The Panel: Gary Zeiger (Reviewer), Patty Holmes and Peter Marcus.

Players Consulted: Dick Budd, Hjordis Eythorsdottir (Disa), John Herrman, Tony Kasday and four peers of E/W and four experts.