

APPEAL	NABC+ THREE
Subject	Break in Tempo
DIC	Su Doe
Event	IMP Pairs
Session	Second Qualifier
Date	March 15, 2013

BD#	24
VUL	None
DLR	W

Carl Sharp	
♠	KJ10983
♥	42
♦	97
♣	A32

Lloyd Arvedon	
♠	A42
♥	KQJ965
♦	QJ4
♣	K



Glenn Robbins	
♠	5
♥	107
♦	K1053
♣	J108764

Steven Kreiner	
♠	Q76
♥	A83
♦	A862
♣	Q95

West	North	East	South
1♥	1♠	P	2♥
3♥	P	P	3♠ ⁽¹⁾
P	4♠	P	P
P			

Final Contract	4♠ by North
Opening Lead	♥10
Table Result	Making 4, N/S +420
Director Ruling	4♠ by North, Making 4, N/S +420
Committee Ruling	4♠ by North, Making 4, N/S +420

(1) Break in Tempo

The Facts: The Director was called after the play of the hand was complete. All four players agreed there had been a noticeable hesitation before South's 3♠ bid.

The Ruling: The Director ruled that there was unauthorized information available to North from South's hesitation, but that a slow bid of 3♠ did not demonstrably suggest bidding 4♠. Accordingly, no adjustment was made. The table result stands, 4♠ by North, making 4, N/S +420.

The Appeal: East/West appealed the ruling and attended the hearing. E/W contended that when someone pauses to think in a position like this, they are always thinking about bidding more. Further, they asserted that no one who has made a limit raise sells out at the three-level so it is impossible that South was thinking of passing.

The Appeals Committee determined that the BIT lasted 10-20 seconds.

The Decision: With such clear agreement on the facts, the only question was whether the BIT demonstrably suggested bidding 4♠ over passing. Since it appears that South was actually considering passing 3♥, the appellants' claims seem incorrect. The AC judged that, from North's perspective, South could have been considering passing, doubling or bidding 4♠. In the AC's experience, "Slow shows extras," but at IMPs, many people just bid game in close decisions. So, the chances that South was considering bidding game are reduced and the ambiguity of the hesitation is increased.

Under the old rules, where the BIT only had to "suggest" a line of action, perhaps this case would fit the criteria; but with the new rule, since the suggestion is only one of a group and is not the dominant element thereof, 4♠ is allowed. The table result stands, 4♠ by North, making 4, N/S +420.

The appeal was found to have sufficient merit.

The Committee: Jeff Goldsmith (Chair), Michael Huston, Aaron Silverstein, Ed Lazarus and Jim Thurtell