

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2007-10	Unauthorised information	Barrier Reef Congress Swiss Teams
Stage	Round	Date
-	4	2007-06
Committee	A. Braithwaite, and two others	

**Board** 27  
**Dealer** S  
**Vul** Nil  
**Scoring** Imps converted to VPs, teams

**North**

♠ 3  
 ♥ AKT3  
 ♦ K954  
 ♣ QJ54

**West**

♠ 982  
 ♥ 87  
 ♦ AQJ82  
 ♣ T93

**East**

♠ AQ654  
 ♥ J654  
 ♦ T76  
 ♣ K

**South**

♠ KJT7  
 ♥ Q92  
 ♦ 3  
 ♣ A8762

**Contract:** 2♠x by East

**Lead:** ♦3

West	North	East	South
-	-	-	Pass
Pass	1♦ (1)	1♠	Pass (2)
2♠	X	All pass	

(1) Precision 1♦: artificial 11-15, 1+ diamonds

(2) Disputed break in tempo

<b>Table result</b>	2♠x-3 by East, EW -500
<b>Director's ruling</b>	3♣+1 by North, NS +130
<b>Committee's ruling</b>	3♣+1 by North, NS +130

**The Director:** Was called at the end of play by West. West maintained that over 1♠, South had thought for a noticeable period of time before passing. This was disputed by South (and North).

North argued that his double was automatic given his shape. When questioned, South said that even if North had passed, she herself would double with the South hand (however, North said he believed any double by South would still be takeout).

The directing staff ruled on the balance of probabilities (Law 85) that a break in tempo had occurred, and thus North was in possession of unauthorised information. Furthermore, Pass (rather than Double) was the non-suggested logical alternative action for North. Score adjusted to NS +130, commensurate with a contract of 3♣ making 10 tricks.

Relevant laws: 16A, 73C, 85.

**The appellants:** Claimed that there was no hesitation, as agreed by three people at the table. Also said that North's double was systemic – a mandatory reopening double.

**The respondents:** Made no written submissions.

**The appeals committee:** Felt that a hesitation probably did occur, and therefore North's choice to double was not clearcut (as it was a live auction). Director's ruling upheld.