

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Break In Tempo	<b>Case:</b>	R3
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	10K Knockout Teams	<b>Event DIC</b>	Kenneth Van Cleve
<b>Date</b>	03/25/2014	<b>Session</b>	Round of 16


### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Strong, Artificial, Forcing
2: 6+ ♠, invitational+
3: Slam try
4: Cuebid (control)
5: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

Board	20	N	5700 mps	
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠ J983		
		♥ AQ7		
		♦ K9		
		♣ AKQ5		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>			
W	460 mps		E	2650 mps
♠ 654			♠ (void)	
♥ J105			♥ K9842	
♦ J105			♦ AQ74	
♣ J1064			♣ 9732	
		S	4250 mps	
		♠ AKQ1072		
		♥ 63		
		♦ 8632		
		♣ 8		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♣ by N	Made 6	N/S +1430	♦ A

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned after the 6♣ bid and at the conclusion of play of the hand. East/West stated that North had broken tempo prior to bidding 4♣. E/W estimated the hesitation as about 20 seconds. North/South agreed to a hesitation, but of only 10-15 seconds.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

In order to determine if pass by South over 4♣ was a logical alternative, the hand was given as a bidding problem to four players from the same event who were all familiar with forcing club systems. All four passed. .

### Director Ruling

The director decided that an unmistakable hesitation had occurred and that it demonstrably suggested not passing 4♣. Based upon the polling data, the director adjusted the contract to 4♣ by South. Since the lead of the ♦A did not seem likely against a contract of 4♣, the score was assigned as eleven tricks for N/S +650 (Laws 16 and 12).

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>4♣ by N, Made 5, N/S +650</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Appeal

N/S appealed the director's ruling, and all four players attended the review. All confirmed to the reviewer that the hesitation was lengthy and noticeable by all (and perhaps even longer than the director was told).

N/S told the reviewer that they play Turbo over positive responses to a forcing club, but there was some partnership confusion about whether it applied here since the 2♥ bid did not guarantee game-going values. North thought it applied, but South did not. When it does apply, over the 3♠ slam try, South is expected to bid 3NT with two key cards; bid 4♠ with none; and cue bid with an odd number.

South said that when her partner did not cue bid either 4♦ or 4♥ over 4♣, she knew he must be thinking Turbo applied (N/S said they cuebid first and second round controls indiscriminately in this situation). At the end of the auction, they did explain to the opponents that a possible misunderstanding about whether Turbo applied had probably occurred

### Panel Findings

The panel agreed that there was unauthorized information from North's slow 4♠ bid and that the information suggested not passing. The South hand was given to three experts as a bidding problem (Bart Bramley, Geoff Hampson, and Pamela Granovetter).

One said pass was not possible. Another said it was, and cited a hand of Jxx-Kx-KQ-AKQJ10x as a possible North hand. The third mentioned a very similar hand as the second consulted expert and actually did pass 4♠. The last two experts were not persuaded that either the stated cuebidding methods of the pair were relevant or that South would necessarily work out what North was thinking by the very fact of his 4♠ bid.

The panel combined the polling conducted by the table director to its own polling to decide that pass was a logical alternative. The panel also concurred with the table director on the number of tricks that should be assigned in a 4♠ contract. As the non-offending side, E/W are entitled to the most favorable result that was likely had the irregularity not occurred (Law 12C1e), which would include the strong likelihood of a different lead being made against the assigned contract of 4♠. The lead of the ♦A was not close to being judged a "serious error" which would have cost E/W its right to redress (Law 12C1b), so the panel confirmed the adjustment of 4♠ by North, making five, N/S +650.

The appeal was found to have merit since the original director poll may have been conducted with incomplete knowledge of the N/S methods and arguments, and because one of the consulted experts was adamant that pass was not a possible action over 4♠.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>4♠ by N, Made 5, N/S +650</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Smith
<b>Member</b>	Eric Bell
<b>Member</b>	Kevin Perkins