

APPEAL	NABC+ ONE
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) -Tempo
DIC	Mike Flader
Event	Life Master Women's Pairs
Session	Second Final
Date	November 18, 2006

BD#	2
VUL	N/S
DLR	East

Esta VanZandt	
♠	8 7 6 5 4 2
♥	A Q J
♦	J
♣	7 3 2

Migry Zur-Campanile		Fall 2006 Honolulu, Hawaii	Miriam Varinne	
♠	T 3		♠	K Q J
♥	9 6 5 3		♥	8 4 2
♦	K T 7 3 2		♦	A 9 8 4
♣	K 5		♣	Q 9 4

Pat Levy	
♠	A 9
♥	K T 7
♦	Q 6 5
♣	A J T 8 6

West	North	East	South
		1♦	2♣
2♦	2♠	Pass	Pass
3♦	4♣	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	4♣ by South
Opening Lead	♦3
Table Result	4♣ making 4, N/S +130
Director Ruling	3♦ by East down 1, E/W -50
Committee Ruling	4♣ making 4, N/S +130

(1) Break in tempo (BIT)

The Facts: N/S admitted that there was a noticeable hesitation (BIT) before South passed. E/W were not present at the hearing and the director provided no estimate of the duration of the hesitation. N/S said that the hesitation was not extensive but was noticeable.

The Ruling: The director ruled that South's hesitation made the 4♣ bid more attractive and was demonstrably suggested by the BIT and that passing 3♦ was a less successful logical alternative (LA). Accordingly, in accordance with laws 16 and 12 C2, the director adjusted the table result to 3♦ by East, down one, E/W minus 50.

The Appeal: N/S, the only players to appear before the Committee, said that in their methods a change of suit by advancer shows a hand with either a good suit or a suit with support for the overcaller. North said that when she bid 2♠, she was committed to bidding again in a normal non-game forcing sequence. South added that if the auction had been passed back to her, she would have bid 3♠, which could not be beaten.

The Decision: The committee, working from the premise that there had been a BIT, started their reasoning with consideration of whether the BIT suggested a line of action to North. Suggestions that South might have been considering bidding 2NT seemed remote. It was clear that if South had a minimum 2♣ overcall without some spade support or tolerance, South would probably not have broken tempo at all. Therefore, it appears that the hesitation suggested further action – since South probably had extra shape or a little extra in HCP.

The committee then considered whether there was a LA to North's bidding 4♣. Clearly, bidding 3♠ was a logical alternative, but since that bid would have achieved a superior result (+140), that alternative was discounted. The committee was split on whether pass was a logical alternative. However, this issue was rendered moot because it was determined that even if North had passed, the committee decided that South would clearly have bid 3♠. Thus the N/S pair would have arrived at an unbeatable and higher scoring contract. Therefore, if a pass had been forced on North, South's further action would have resulted in a superior result for the offenders. Accordingly, the committee restored the table result.

The Committee: Barry Rigal (chair), Darwin Afdahl, Ed Lazarus, Lou Reich, Jim Thurtell.