



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N2
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Nail Open LM Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Nancy Boyd
<b>Date</b>	11/29/2013	<b>Session</b>	Second Qualifying

### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

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

### Hand Record

Board	17	N	Margaret Norris
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ K75	
		♥ KQ862	
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>	♦ 7	
		♣ QJ104	
W	Michael Polowan		
♠	983		
♥	53		
♦	43		
♣	K87632	E	Adam Wildavsky
		♠	A642
		♥	J94
		♦	108652
		♣	9
		S	Mike Christensen
		♠	QJ10
		♥	A107
		♦	AKQJ9
		♣	A5

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
6♥ by N	Made 6	N/S +980	♠ A

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned to the table after South bid 4NT. North admitted to a slight break in tempo (BIT) saying that she "did not take a full 10 seconds, but I did think." North further told the director she was considering whether 3♥ showed two or three card support.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled other players and determined that pass was not a logical alternative, so the small BIT did not play a role in South's decision to bid on. As to the question of whether or not 4NT was suggested by the BIT, the poll revealed that some players would have bid 5♣ which then prompts further action to get to 6♥.

### Director Ruling

The director determined that the BIT did not suggest 4NT. Further, the BIT did not imply which king (spade or club) that North held. Accordingly, the table result was allowed to stand, 6♥ by North, making six, N/S +980.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>6♥ by N, Made 6, N/S +980</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling and East attended the hearing. East stated the following reasons for the appeal:

- 1) The hesitation may have caused South to bid 4NT instead of 5♣. A bid of 5♣ may have been followed by 5♥ and then pass would be a logical alternative.
- 2) The director didn't consider the one key card response to the 4NT bid. North–South could be off an ace and the ♥Q.
- 3) When South put his hand down as dummy, he stated that he took “a flyer.” He should not be allowed to do this opposite the BIT since 5♣ and 5♥ were logical alternatives.

When the director was called to the table by E/W for the hesitation by North, North stated that she agreed that there was a 5–9 second hesitation before the bid, but she opined that she was allowed up to 10 seconds to think before making a call. North further stated that she was trying to figure out whether the 3♥ bid guaranteed three hearts.

### **Committee Findings**

The Appeals Committee reasoned that there was unauthorized information but that the unauthorized information did not demonstrably suggest further action. The slight hesitation by North was due to her trying to figure out what to bid with her hand. The 4♥ bid said nothing about a spade control. While 5♣ may have been a more effective bid, the Committee was of the opinion that South's peers would have bid 4NT. The BIT did not suggest that a 5♣-5♥ sequence should be passed. Therefore, the Committee ruled that the table result should stand: 6♥ by North, making six, N/S +980. Furthermore, the Committee determined that the appeal was without merit and awarded E/W an Appeal without Merit warning.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>6♥ by N, Made 6, N/S +980</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

### **Committee Members**

<b>Chairman</b>	Richard Popper
<b>Scribe</b>	Ed Lazarus
<b>Member</b>	Boye Brogeland
<b>Member</b>	Ellen Kent
<b>Member</b>	Jerry Gaer