



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N11
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	-----

<b>Event</b>	Reisinger BAM	<b>Event DIC</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Date</b>	12/06/2013	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifier

### Auction

West	North	East	South
1♣	1♥	1♠ <sup>1</sup>	Pass
1NT	Pass	Pass	2♣
Pass	Pass	2♦ <sup>2</sup>	Pass
2♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Relay to 1NT
2: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>28</b>	N	Sartaj Hans		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠	A32		
		♥	J10742		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>	♦	KJ107		
		♣	5		
W	Grzegorz Narkiewicz			E	Krzysztof Buras
♠	KQ98			♠	1064
♥	A93			♥	KQ65
♦	Q8			♦	A954
♣	J1086			♣	74
		S	Peter Gill		
		♠	J75		
		♥	8		
		♦	632		
		♣	AKQ932		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
2♠ by E	Made 2	E/W +110	♥ 8

### Facts Determined at the Table

North/South called the director after the hand was over. They stated that East had hesitated significantly before bidding 2♦. East/West agreed to a break in tempo of about 10-15 seconds, but East did not think that excessive in balancing seat.

### Director Ruling

While there was a BIT, it is not clear that the unauthorized information from that break demonstrably suggested the particular action taken by West. Therefore, West did not violate Law 16B1a and no adjustment was necessary.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>2♠ by E, Made 2, E/W +110</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Appeal

N/S appealed the ruling and all four players attended the hearing. N/S argued that East would normally have a reasonable five card diamond suit for his 2♦ bid, and it would be logical for West to pass. The BIT suggested to West that it might be better to try a different spot.

West countered that a double of 2♣ by East would have been cooperative, showing three clubs. Thus, East could be expected to have a doubleton. West was confident that a 1NT contract would have been successful, and he judged that there would be "no matchpoints to be won in 2♦." Therefore, pulling to 2♠ was the correct tactical call, as East would return to 2NT if he only had two spades. By partnership agreement, West's 1♣ opening showed either 11-13 HCP balanced if minimum, or an unbalanced hand with clubs. They open all 11 counts.

## Committee Findings

There was an agreed BIT prior to East's 2♦ bid. With a good five card suit, he would have made the bid in tempo, so the BIT demonstrably suggested that West should bid. But was pass a logical alternative to the suggested removal?

Although West's arguments for his 2♣ bid are logical, East's ruffing value in clubs would be expected to come into play in a diamond contract. 2♦ might be making while higher contracts would be unsuccessful. The committee determined that pass was a logical alternative to bidding, and changed the contract to 2♦ by East.

It is not obvious whether East would take five or six tricks in 2♦. However, when South shows up with all the club honors, declarer would not misguess the location of the ♠A or ♦K. The committee therefore assigned taking six tricks, for a result of down 2, N/S +100.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>2♦ by E, Down 2, N/S +100</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

## Committee Members

<b>Chairman</b>	Douglas Doub
<b>Member</b>	Gary Cohler
<b>Member</b>	Bob Hamman
<b>Member</b>	Aaron Silverstein
<b>Member</b>	Gail Greenberg