

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	R1
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Grand National Teams, Flight B	<b>Event DIC</b>	Ken Van Cleve
<b>Date</b>	07/20/2016	<b>Session</b>	Qualifying First Session

### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Natural, shows values
2: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>30</b>	N	2090 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠	8542		
		♥	J10		
		♦	AK9		
		♣	Q952		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>				
W	1330 MPS			E	660 MPS
♠	103			♠	KQJ976
♥	Q9875			♥	A63
♦	J1062			♦	84
♣	A4			♣	103
		S	1410 MPS		
		♠	A		
		♥	K42		
		♦	Q753		
		♣	KJ876		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
5♣ by N	Made 5	N/S +400	♠ K

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after the hand by West. West claimed that 3♥ was bid slowly (E/W said 15 seconds, N/S less than 10 seconds) and 5♣ was bid quickly, and that passing 5♣ was strange.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Six players were polled with the North hand. Five bid 5♦ as a cue bid, and one bid 5♥. Passing is not a logical alternative, and non-pass actions will result in N/S playing 6♣.

### Director Ruling

As the player poll confirmed that passing 5♣ was not a logical alternative and UI existed from the breaks in tempo, per Laws 16B and 12C, the result was changed to 6♣ by North, down 1, E/W +50.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>6♣ by N, Down 1, E/W +50</b>
--------------------------	---------------------------------

### The Appeal

N/S appealed. All four players attended the review. The reviewer asked the appellants if there was any law misinterpreted or procedure done in error concerning the Director's ruling. They could not come up with an answer to the question. They did say they did not like how the director handled the ruling.

North testified that the 3♥ bid could either be a strong heart hand or a cue bid in support of clubs. Over 4♥, he could have bid 4♣ or 4NT to show it was heart support. Therefore 5♣ had to be clubs, but he could not explain why 5♣ could not be support for hearts, which would be a normal treatment.

The panel tried further to get the appellants to explain how in their system this auction showed only clubs. For example, they were asked to explain the difference between the sequence of 2♣-Dbl-P-3♣C-P-3♥ and the sequence 2♣-Dbl-P-3♣-P-3♣. They answered only that the second sequence most likely was looking for 3NT.

### Panel Findings

The panel saw no errors in the director's ruling. The quick bid of 5♣ created UI (Law 73A: "calls and plays should be made without undue emphasis, mannerism or inflection, and without undue hesitation or haste"). North by passing 5♣ violated Law 73C ("he must carefully avoid taking any advantage from that UI"), which led to Law 16B and 12C. The ruling by the table director was therefore upheld, 6♣ by N, down 1, E/W +50. An Appeal without Merit Warning was also issued.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>6♣ by N, Down 1, E/W +50</b>
-----------------------	---------------------------------

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Jeff Jacob
<b>Member</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Member</b>	Ken Horwedel