

<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		E	Kyoko Shimamura
♠	AQJ42		♠	K9653
♥	10		♥	K53
♦	1062		♦	J87
♣	Q932		♣	J10
		S	Ron Smith	
		♠	108	
		♥	AQ8642	
		♦	Q3	
		♣	AK6	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
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 thought 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