

## Appeal Committee of the RBBF – October 28, 2017

### Ruling in question

U.A.E. 1 appeals the decision of the Director (Martijn Verstraelen) taken on board 2 of round 15 when U.A.E. 1 was playing Cercle Perron 1 in the Honour division.

### Present

Appeal Committee: Steven De Donder (presiding), Fred Carpentier, Tom Cornelis (secretary)

U.A.E. 1: Valérie Labaere

Cercle-Perron 1: Philippe Yans, Patrick Leboulengé

### Facts

see the report by Martijn Verstraelen:

<https://www.rbbf.be/sites/default/files/2017-10-28%20R15%20Ruling%20Perron1-UAE1.pdf>

### Appeal of the ruling taken by the TD

The TD was called by Valérie Labaere after the auction was finished and she said that there was a break in tempo. After the play, North called the TD again and claims that West was sighing when the break in tempo occurred. The TD investigated, took his decision and informed the players involved of his decision. He made a report of his ruling. U.A.E. 1 decided to appeal his decision, which was treated on the same day.

### Auditions

The session was opened at 19h15.

Valérie Labaere restated the facts, in particular the sighing of Philippe Yans. Philippe Yans denied he was sighing. Patrick Leboulengé stated that he was entitled to make his call regardless of the break in tempo. Valérie Labaere also stated that if UI could be used in this case, it would be easy for South to redouble to escape a penalty pass.

### Deliberations

The Appeal Committee noted the following:

- As the TD stated in his report, it could not be established who was hesitating, South could have been thinking about 3D in stead of redoubling.
- Nevertheless, East cannot use the break in the tempo to inform his decision, supposing it was his partner causing the break in the tempo.
- East explained that he had no agreement about the pass of his partner, but did allow that in that case it would be a penalty pass.
- As reported by the TD, the sighing only remarked upon after play, which suggests it wasn't meaningful or loud enough.
- Ultimately it depended on East capabilities to correctly judge the situation without a hesitation. With J4 in diamonds and a solid player in South redoubling, it would still be

clear cut to not take the risk of letting 2Dxx make, as decided by the TD. With a diamond singleton it would not have been so clear cut and the decision would have been different.  
- The Appeal Committee unanimously agreed this was a difficult case.

### Decisions

- The Appeal Committee maintains the TD's decision.
- The deposit is returned.

Tom Cornelis

Secretary of the Appeal Committee on October 28, 2017