

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo, Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	R2
---------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Sunday AB Swiss	<b>Event DIC</b>	Donna Coker
<b>Date</b>	07/20/2014	<b>Session</b>	First Session


### Auction

West	North	East	South
	1♥	Pass	1♠
Pass	2♥	Pass	4NT <sup>1</sup>
Pass	5♣ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	5NT <sup>3</sup>
Pass	6♦ <sup>4</sup>	Pass	6♥ <sup>4</sup>
Pass	7♥ <sup>4</sup>	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: RKC Blackwood
2: 0 or 3 Keycards
3: Specific kings
4: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

Board	5	N	7880 MPS
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ 32	
		♥ AKJ987	
		♦ 65	
		♣ AQ9	
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>		
W	7280 MPS		E 15,170 MPS
♠ 97			♠ QJ106
♥ 105			♥ 642
♦ QJ974			♦ 10832
♣ 10654			♣ J2
		S	4000 MPS
		♠ AK854	
		♥ Q3	
		♦ AK	
		♣ K873	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
7♥ by N	Made 7	N/S +2210	♠ Q

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after the 7♥ bid and again at the end of the hand. E/W thought that the slow 6♥ bid suggested that North not pass and that pass was an option for him.

### Director Ruling

The director ruled that the hesitation prior to the 6♥ bid demonstrably suggested not passing, and that pass was a logical alternative for North (Law 16B1). The score was changed to 6♥ by North, making seven, N/S +1460 per Law 12C1e.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>6♥ by N, Made 7, N/S +1460</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Appeal

N/S appealed the director's ruling, and they attended the review. North told the reviewer that his 2♥ bid was as strong as it could possibly be, and that with as little as another jack, he would have rebid 3♥. When asked why he bid 6♦, he said he deliberately misbid to allow South room to bid 6♥. When he discovered that partner's bidding was based on a heart fit, he thought bidding 7♥ was automatic and what he always planned. He saw no danger to bidding 6♦, terming it a "safe" bid. South said he hesitated before bidding 6♥ while trying to work out what the "impossible" 6♦ bid meant. North and South both agreed that 5NT guaranteed possession of all controls.

## Panel Findings

The panel believed North's explanation of why he bid 6♦. Therefore, from his point of view the 6♦ bid almost certainly caused an expected problem for South if he held the diamond king. That problem and any hesitation that resulted from it were not useful in deciding whether to bid 7♥. Since the hesitation did not "demonstrably suggest" anything useful to North, he was free to choose whatever call he wanted regardless of whether logical alternatives existed (Law 16B1). The panel restored the table result of 7♥ by North making seven, NS +2210.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>7♥ by N, Made 7, N/S +2210</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Bill Michael
<b>Member</b>	Terry Lavender
<b>Member</b>	Candace Kushner