



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tempo/Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	R3
---------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Mini-Blue Ribbon Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Doug Grove
<b>Date</b>	12/05/2013	<b>Session</b>	Second Final

### Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	2♦	Dbl
4♦	4♠	Pass <sup>1</sup>	Pass
5♦	Pass	Pass	Dbl
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>5</b>	N	3660 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ A1096			
		♥ 32			
		♦ 62			
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>	♣ A10987			
W	2520 MPS			E	3110 MPS
♠ J85				♠ 72	
♥ AQ104				♥ K95	
♦ KQJ5				♦ A109874	
♣ Q6				♣ 43	
		S	4050 MPS		
		♠ KQ43			
		♥ J876			
		♦ 3			
		♣ KJ52			

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
5♦X by E	Down 2	N/S +300	♠ K

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after West's 5♦ bid, and again at the end of the hand. Following North's 4♠ bid, East had hesitated before passing. East agreed to this, but West said he did not notice a hesitation.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled four players about the West hand and the auction. Two peers of West (holding 2000-2500 masterpoints) were not sure what they would do over double, but were comfortable with 4♦. Both would have passed 4♠ and would have been surprised to hear a 5♦ call from partner. Two players with over 10,000 points would not have bid 5♦ having bid 4♦, although one of them did not think 4♦ was a good choice.

### Director Ruling

Staff determined that East's tempo after 4♠ was an "unmistakable hesitation" which is unauthorized information to West. They felt that the break in tempo suggested 5♦ would be more successful than passing. If East was considering anything other than pass having already preempted, then West should be understood already to have made the suggestion of a 5♦ sacrifice to East. East's pass was deemed to indicate a preference for defense, so Pass was deemed to be a logical alternative to bidding. This was confirmed by the players polled. Law 16B1 empowers the director to adjust the score, which he did by Law 12C1e to 4♠ by North, making 4, N/S +620.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>4♠ by N, Made 4, N/S +620</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

## The Appeal

E/W appealed the director's ruling. North, South, and West attended the review just after the evening session of the event. In confirming the facts with the players, the Reviewer found out that the Stop card had been used on the 2♦ bid. When the Reviewer asked about the tempo of the rest of the auction, all three players present verified that South's double and North's 4♠ bid came after 4-5 seconds. West added that East has physical issues and is well known to be a slow player.

## Panel Findings

The panel felt that neither North nor South had taken the 10 seconds expected of them after skip bids made by the opponents. As such, they felt it inappropriate to characterize a short but noticeable break in tempo by East as an "unmistakable hesitation," the remainder of the time from at least the second skip bid belonging now to East. With no unauthorized information, there was no infraction and no cause to adjust the score. The panel restored the table result of 5♦X by East, down 2, N/S +300.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>5♦X by E, Down 2, N/S +300</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Member</b>	Gary Zeiger
<b>Member</b>	Ken Van Cleve
<b>Member</b>	Patty Holmes