Appeal No. 4
Sweden v India

Appeals Committee:
J Gerard (Chairman,), G Endicott (Scribe,) J Auken, E d'Orsi, J Polisner

Bermuda Bowl, Round Robin
Round 5; Table 110

Board 9. Dealer North. East/West Vulnerable.

	♠ K 7 5 ♡ A K 4 ♢ K 6 4 3 ♣ Q 6 3	
♠ 10 8 3 ♡ 9 8 5 3 2 ♢ 10 7 ♣ 10 7 4		♠ J 9 6 ♡ J 6 ♢ A J 8 5 ♣ A K 5 2
	♠ A Q 4 2 ♡ Q 10 7 ♢ Q 9 2 ♣ J 9 8	

West	North	East	South
	1♢	Pass	1♠
Pass	1NT	Pass	3NT

Comments: --

Contract: 3NT by North

Opening Lead: ♣2

Play: ♣2 — 8 — 10 — Q; ♣3 — K — 9 — 4; ♠J > A; ♢Q >A; ♠9 > K; ♢3 > J; ♣A; ♣5

Result: 3NT — 1: N/S -50

The Facts: At trick 2 East hesitated before taking ♣K; after taking the K she closed the screen and asked questions

The Director:. Was called at the end of the play. North complained that he had been misled by the hesitation; believing that the clubs were blocked he tried for ♢3-3 and ♠ 3-3

Ruling: there was an agreed hesitation in the play from which North had drawn an incorrect inference. Adjudged that the requirements of Law 73F2 were met for the purpose of awarding an adjusted score. Score adjusted to 3NT = 9 tricks = N/S +400

Relevant Laws: 73F2; 12

East/West appealed.

Present: All players. Both Captains

The Players: East explained that the return of her own suit had caused her to hesitate, suspecting that there were possible problems for her in defence. Having taken the K after an appreciable pause, she had pursued some questions with the screen closed. North confirmed that he had interpreted the hesitation as indicating possibly ♣A10x in the West hand — the suit thus being blocked.

The Committee: Agreed with the Director that there had been a breach of temp and that there was no demonstrable bridge reason for this breach of tempo. East was always going to play K and should have done so without pause. East should be admonished. However, the Committee found that it was not the case that East could have known at the time of her action that the action could work to her benefit. On this final point the condition in Law 73F2 was not met.

The Committee's decision: This is not a situation in which a score adjustment under Law 73F2 is justified. Table score reinstated.

Deposit: Returned