

|                           |  |              |    |
|---------------------------|--|--------------|----|
| <b>Subject of Appeal:</b> | Break in Tempo, Unauthorized Information | <b>Case:</b> | R4 |
|---------------------------|--|--------------|----|

|              |                           |                  |                |
|--------------|---------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>Event</b> | Wednesday A/X Swiss Teams | <b>Event DIC</b> | Guy Fauteaux   |
| <b>Date</b>  | 11/29/2017                | <b>Session</b>   | Second Session |

### Auction

| West | North | East              | South |
|------|-------|-------------------|-------|
|      |       |                   | Pass  |
| 1♠   | Pass  | 2♠                | Dbl   |
| 4♠   | 5♥    | Pass <sup>1</sup> | Pass  |
| Dbl  | Pass  | Pass              | Pass  |
|      |       |                   |       |
|      |       |                   |       |
|      |       |                   |       |

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

|                         |
|-------------------------|
| 1: Agree Break in Tempo |
|                         |
|                         |
|                         |
|                         |
|                         |
|                         |

### Hand Record

|               |                  |  |                 |   |               |
|---------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|---------------|
| <b>Board</b>  | <b>27</b>        | N  | Markland Jones  |   |               |
| <b>Dealer</b> | <b>S</b>         | ♠  | 63              |   |               |
|               |                  | ♥  | K10654          |   |               |
| <b>Vul</b>    | <b>None</b>      | ♦  | A8              |   |               |
|               |                  | ♣  | Q1073           |   |               |
| W             | Bernie Greenspan |  |                 | E | Greg Michaels |
| ♠             | AJ1074           |  |                 | ♠ | Q952          |
| ♥             | (void)           |  |                 | ♥ | Q973          |
| ♦             | KQ432            |  |                 | ♦ | J6            |
| ♣             | A96              |  |                 | ♣ | K54           |
|               |                  | S  | Patricia Dovell |   |               |
|               |                  | ♠  | K8              |   |               |
|               |                  | ♥  | AJ82            |   |               |
|               |                  | ♦  | 10975           |   |               |
|               |                  | ♣  | J82             |   |               |

|                       |                       |              |                     |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| <b>Final Contract</b> | <b>Result of Play</b> | <b>Score</b> | <b>Opening Lead</b> |
| 4♥X by N              | Down 4                | E/W +800     | ♠2                  |

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after play of the hand was completed. All players agreed during the auction that East had demonstrably broken tempo before his pass of 5♥. N/S questioned West's call after the break in tempo. North said that he had played for the hearts to be in the West hand instead of in the East hand and went down one extra trick. The director determined that Pass in this situation was not forcing according to the E/W methods.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled five players with the West hand after 5♥ was passed around to them. All players took action: 4 players doubled 5♥ and the other bid 5♠.

### Director Ruling

Since no player in the poll passed, the director ruled that pass was not a logical alternative for West as defined by Law16B1. Polling did not indicate a clear reason why the break in tempo would suggest doubling 5♥ rather than bidding 5♠, so the director allowed the table result to stand.

|                          |                                   |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Director's Ruling</b> | <b>4♥X by N, Down 4, E/W +800</b> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|

### The Review

N/S appealed the ruling and all four players attended the review. North said that he understood why the table director had removed pass as an option, but he thought the hesitation automatically suggested doubling rather than

bidding 5♠ to cater to whatever holding East had. He also said that E/W had said that West's double was a "do something intelligent" action double (E/W confirmed this) and that had he known this, he would have played the hand a trick better. North said his primary interest was that he should be allowed to go -500 rather than -800 if E/W were allowed to double. North confirmed that he had not asked about E/W's agreements while he was declaring.

### Panel Findings

The reviewer polled seven additional players about their action with the West hand after 5♥ was passed around to them. All seven doubled. Four of the pollees said that they thought East's pass was forcing, but all players polled agreed they could not see defending 5♥ undoubled with the E/W cards whether pass was forcing or not. When asked if partner's break in tempo made double more attractive than 5♠ or vice-versa, five of those polled indicated they did not think it suggested one action over the other. The other two said it did not clearly suggest one action, but they thought if anything the break in tempo made 5♠ more attractive than double; they felt partner was more likely to be thinking about bidding 5♠ himself than doubling.

The panel did not feel that E/W's agreement that the double was "do something intelligent" was sufficiently highly unusual or unexpected as to warrant any kind of Alert for the declarer. Further, the declarer made no effort to find out about the E/W agreements before or while he was playing the hand. The panel therefore discounted North's argument that he should be allowed to go -500.

The table result was allowed to stand. The panel voted to assess an Appeal Without Merit Warning to N/S, whom they felt did not introduce any new information to support their decision to appeal.

|                       |                                   |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Panel Decision</b> | <b>4♥X by N, Down 4, E/W +800</b> |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|

### Panel Members

|                 |               |
|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Reviewer</b> | Eric Bell     |
| <b>Member</b>   | Matt Koltnow  |
| <b>Member</b>   | David Metcalf |