

Subject of Appeal:	Break in Tempo, Unauthorized Information	Case:	N9
---------------------------	--	--------------	----

Event	Rockwell Mixed Pairs	Event DIC	McKenzie Myers
Date	03/15/2017	Session	Second Final


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: STOP Card used
2: No hesitation
3: Hesitation

Hand Record

Board	25	N	K Fung		
Dealer	N	♠ Q4	♥ J1075		
Vul	E/W	♦ KJ	♣ AQ932		
W	Ida Groenkvist			E	Haig Tchamitch
♠	AK2			♠	J109876
♥	94			♥	Q
♦	A1095			♦	8764
♣	KJ87			♣	54
		S	Erez Hendelman		
		♠	53		
		♥	AK8632		
		♦	Q32		
		♣	106		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♠ by E	Down 1	N/S +100	♥K

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after the play of the hand. East had placed the STOP card on the table before his 3♠ bid, and left it there for approximately five seconds. When he removed the card, South bid with minimal hesitation (approximately one second). West then took about 10-15 seconds before his double. South asked East at the time if he agreed to a break in tempo. East responded that West did "take a little time".

Director Ruling

South is expected to pause when a skip bid is made. This is to protect both sides, who may need extra time to think due to the elevation of the auction. When South bids before taking the requisite 10 seconds, West may still need time to think. At this level of the auction, it is expected for the tempo to be slower. Given the amount of time all players felt was taken by the South and West players, it was determined that no unmistakable hesitation occurred. Therefore, the table result was ruled to stand, 4♠ by East, down one, N/S +100.

Director's Ruling	4♠ by E, Down 1, N/S +100
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Review

N/S asked for a review of the ruling. They felt that East agreed to a break in tempo at the time, and only later questioned the lack of pause by South.

Panel Findings

The appellants provided no new evidence and no error in procedure was found. Therefore, the ruling by the table director was upheld. The appeal was found to have no merit, and an Appeal Without Merit Warning was assigned.

Panel Decision	4♣ by E, Down 1, N/S +100
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Kevin Perkins
-----------------	---------------