

APPEAL	NABC+ SIX
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) - Tempo
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Whitehead Women's Pairs
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	March 19, 2009

BD#	<b>6</b>
VUL	<b>E/W</b>
DLR	<b>East</b>

<b>Jerry Jungmichel</b>	
♠	A T 9 3
♥	K T 8 5 3
♦	2
♣	8 7 4

<b>Barbara Sartorius</b>		<b>Spring 2009 Houston, TX</b>	<b>Sharon Hait</b>	
♠	K Q 7		♠	J 8 6 5 4
♥	J		♥	A 9 6 4
♦	A 4		♦	T
♣	A K Q J T 5 2		♣	9 6 3

<b>Shirley George</b>	
♠	2
♥	Q 7 2
♦	K Q J 9 8 7 6 5 3
♣	

West	North	East	South
		Pass	5♦
6♣ <sup>1</sup>	Pass <sup>2</sup>	Pass	6♦
Dbl	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	<b>6♦ doubled by South</b>
Opening Lead	<b>♣K</b>
Table Result	<b>Down 1, N/S -100</b>
Director Ruling	<b>6♦ dbld S, down 1, N/S -100</b>
Committee Ruling	<b>6♦ dbld S, down 1, N/S -100</b>

(1)	Break in Tempo (BIT).
(2)	Break in Tempo (BIT).

**The Facts:** The director was called initially after the 6♦ bid and returned after the hand had been played to conclusion. N/S said that West bid 6♣ immediately. West said she paused 10-12 seconds and East said West paused appropriately. E/W said that North had a long BIT over 6♣. North said that she had something to think about.

**The Ruling:** The director judged that a BIT over 6♣ by North would not demonstrably suggest that South bid – it would demonstrably suggest a double or pass. Therefore, since there was no violation of Law16, the director allowed the table result of 6♦ doubled by South down one, N/S minus 100 to stand for both sides.

**The Appeal:** E/W appealed the director's decision. All four players attended the hearing. E/W stated that there was a 10-12 second hesitation over 6♣ by North. N/S agreed that the hesitation was no longer than 10-12 seconds. N/S stated that the auction required some thought by North. N/S further stated that the BIT suggested that South refrain from doing anymore bidding, since North was probably not considering bidding 6♦ but doubling. A player in South's position should, perhaps, bend over backwards to bid after North's BIT.

The Decision: The committee judged that there was at least a slight BIT by North but not an unduly long one. The auction did require some thought – whether to double, and, if so, what to lead, etc.

While the committee thought a pass by South may have been a logical alternative, it did not think that the BIT demonstrably suggested bidding 6♦. If anything, the BIT suggested that South pass.

Therefore, the committee upheld the director's decision to allow the table result of 6♦ doubled by South down one, N/S minus 100 to stand for both sides.

The committee determined that the appeal had merit.

**The Committee:** Tom Peters (Chair), Tom Carmichael, Mike Kovacich, Jim Thurtell and Bob White.