

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Break In Tempo	<b>Case:</b>	N3
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Rockwell Mixed Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Brian Russell
<b>Date</b>	03/25/2014	<b>Session</b>	Second Qualifying

### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Keycard for Diamonds
2: One keycard
3: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	14	N	Elaine Wood	
<b>Dealer</b>	E	♠ (void)		
		♥ AQJ3		
		♦ QJ9874		
<b>Vul</b>	None	♣ K64		
W	Brenda Bryant		E	Robert Katz
♠	105432		♠	96
♥	75		♥	K10984
♦	A102		♦	3
♣	1082		♣	QJ953
		S	Neal Perlman	
		♠	AKQJ87	
		♥	62	
		♦	K65	
		♣	A7	

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
6♦ by N	Made 6	N/S +920	♣ Q

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned at the conclusion of the auction. East explained that there was a hesitation by South prior to bidding 5♠, estimated as more than 20 seconds. North and South agreed to a hesitation, but no more than twenty seconds. South had bid 5♠ to play. There had been another slight break in tempo before the 5NT bid as well.

### Director Ruling

With both sides agreeing to the hesitation, the Director ruled that North had made use of the Unauthorized Information from the BIT to continue past 5♠ (Law 16B). The result was adjusted to 5♠ by South, down 1, E/W +50

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>5♠ by S, Down 1, E/W +50</b>
--------------------------	---------------------------------

### The Appeal

The North/South players appealed the director's ruling, and they, along with East, attended the committee.

North felt they had a good hand for their 2♦ bid, and believed that 5NT would have as good a chance of making as 5♠, with the advantage of scoring ten points more. They thought that if South had long, solid spades with other good values, they would have opened 2♣ rather than 1♠.

East suggested that 5♠ might easily be N/S's last making contract. As the Blackwood bidder, South was supposed to place the contract, and North was expected to accept that decision of where to play the hand. The break in tempo suggested that South was unsure of the final contract, and North acted on that.

## Committee Findings

South broke tempo before bidding 5♠, and that BIT demonstrably suggested that 5♠ might not be the best contract. There are a number of possible reasons for the hesitation: not off two aces, unsure whether to play in spades or diamonds, or concern about a control in an unbid suit are common possibilities.

North's bid of 5NT would be wrong, not only opposite an extreme South hand such as AKQJxxxx-x-Kxx-x, but also opposite a more common hand such as AKQJxx-Kxx-Kxx-x. This is especially true since South bid No Trump first, leaving the ♣K exposed on opening lead. Thus, pass was a logical alternative to 5NT or some other higher bid (such as 6♦) suggested by the BIT.

Against 5♠, West might lead either a club or a heart, with the ♥7 perhaps a bit more attractive. With fewer hearts, it is slightly more likely to set up a trick that will cash for the defense.

Declarer, receiving the ♥7 for an opening lead, will want to take the finesse in case the king is inside. There are many possible holdings where the seven is low from the king (K107, K97, K87, K987, along with others depending upon the opponent lead agreements, and since Declarer cannot afford a Heart loser if spades divide 5-2 (30+% occurrence), the Committee judged it was likely that the finesse would be taken on a heart lead. Upon winning the ♥K, East would shift to a diamond, gaining a ruff to set 5♠ two tricks.

The Committee felt the chance of this happening to be both "at all probable" for the offending side and "likely" for the non-offending side. Therefore, the table result was changed to 5♠ by South, down 2, E/W +100. In addition, the Committee felt that N/S should have recognized that pass was a logical alternative following the BIT, especially since the opponents might have taken the first five or six club tricks against 5NT. Thus, they should not have appealed the director's ruling. N/S were assigned an Appeal without Merit Warning.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>5♠ by S, Down 2, E/W +100</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chair</b>	Adam Wildavsky
<b>Member</b>	Douglas Doub
<b>Member</b>	Dave Caprera
<b>Member</b>	Marc Rabinowitz
<b>Member</b>	Ed Lazarus