

Acta Crystallographica Section E Structure Reports Online

ISSN 1600-5368

4-Allylmorpholin-4-ium bromide

Meng Ting Han

Ordered Matter Science Research Center, College of Chemistry and Chemical, Engineering, Southeast University, Nanjing 211189, People's Republic of China Correspondence e-mail: saltfish777@gmail.com

Received 21 February 2012; accepted 12 March 2012

Key indicators: single-crystal X-ray study; T = 293 K; mean σ (C–C) = 0.006 Å; R factor = 0.039; wR factor = 0.099; data-to-parameter ratio = 23.4.

The title compound, $C_7H_{14}NO^+ \cdot Br^-$, was formed by reaction of 4-allylmorpholine and hydrogen bromide. In the crystal, molecules are connected *via* $N-H\cdots Br$ and $C-H\cdots Br$ hydrogen bonds, forming a three-dimensional network.

Related literature

For selected sources of ferroelectric materials, see: Haertling (1999); Homes *et al.* (2001); Fu *et al.* (2009); Hang *et al.* (2009).



$C_7H_{14}NO^+ \cdot Br^-$	c = 8.7948 (18) A
$M_r = 208.10$	$\alpha = 66.43 \ (3)^{\circ}$
Triclinic, P1	$\beta = 82.14 \ (3)^{\circ}$
a = 7.4115 (15) Å	$\gamma = 85.78 \ (3)^{\circ}$
b = 7.9727 (16) Å	$V = 471.75 (17) \text{ Å}^3$

organic compounds

 $0.33 \times 0.28 \times 0.20 \text{ mm}$

T = 293 K

 $R_{\rm int} = 0.043$

Z = 2Mo $K\alpha$ radiation $\mu = 4.30 \text{ mm}^{-1}$

Data collection

Rigaku SCXmini diffractometer Absorption correction: multi-scan (*CrystalClear*; Rigaku, 2005) $T_{min} = 0.252$, $T_{max} = 0.423$ 4897 measured reflections 2155 independent reflections

Refinement

 $R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.039$ $wR(F^2) = 0.099$ S = 1.072155 reflections

reflections intensity decay: none

1786 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$

2 standard reflections every 150

92 parameters H-atom parameters constrained $\Delta \rho_{max} = 0.59$ e Å⁻³ $\Delta \rho_{min} = -0.42$ e Å⁻³

Table 1	
Hydrogen-bond geometry (Å, °).	

$D - H \cdots A$	D-H	$H \cdot \cdot \cdot A$	$D \cdots A$	$D - \mathbf{H} \cdot \cdot \cdot A$
$N1 - H1C \cdots Br1^{i}$ $C1 - H1A \cdots Br1^{ii}$ $C5 - H5B \cdots Br1^{iii}$	0.91 0.97 0.97	2.31 2.93 2.86	3.218 (2) 3.846 (4) 3.796 (3)	175 158 162
Symmetry codes: -x, -y + 1, -z + 1.	(i) $-x + 1$, -y+1, -z+1;	(ii) <i>x</i> , <i>y</i> –	1, z + 1; (iii)

Data collection: *CrystalClear* (Rigaku, 2005); cell refinement: *CrystalClear*; data reduction: *CrystalClear*; program(s) used to solve structure: *SHELXS97* (Sheldrick, 2008); program(s) used to refine structure: *SHELXL97* (Sheldrick, 2008); molecular graphics: *SHELXTL* (Sheldrick, 2008); software used to prepare material for publication: *SHELXTL*.

The authors are grateful to the starter fund of Southeast University for financial support to buy the X-ray diffractometer.

Supplementary data and figures for this paper are available from the IUCr electronic archives (Reference: MW2056).

References

- Fu, D. W., Ge, J. Z., Dai, J., Ye, H. Y. & Qu, Z. R. (2009). Inorg. Chem. Commun. 12, 994–997.
- Haertling, G. H. (1999). J. Am. Ceram. Soc. 82, 797-810.
- Hang, T., Fu, D. W., Ye, Q. & Xiong, R. G. (2009). Cryst. Growth Des. 9, 2026–2029.
- Homes, C. C., Vogt, T., Shapiro, S. M., Wakimoto, S. & Ramirez, A. P. (2001). Science, 293, 673–676.
- Rigaku (2005). CrystalClear. Rigaku Corporation, Tokyo, Japan.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (2008). Acta Cryst. A64, 112-122.

supporting information

Acta Cryst. (2012). E68, o1089 [https://doi.org/10.1107/S1600536812010793]

4-Allylmorpholin-4-ium bromide

Meng Ting Han

S1. Comment

At present, much attention in ferroelectric material field is focused on developing ferroelectric pure organic or inorganic compounds (Haertling *et al.* 1999; Homes *et al.* 2001). Recently we have reported the synthesis of a variety of compounds (Fu *et al.*, 2009; Hang *et al.*, 2009), which have potential piezoelectric and ferroelectric properties. In order to find more dielectric ferroelectric materials, we investigate the physical properties of the title compound (Fig. 1). The dielectric constant of the title compound as a function of temperature indicates that the permittivity is basically temperature-independent (dielectric constant equaling to 0.6 to 1.42), suggesting that this compound should be not a real ferroelectrics or there may be no distinct phase transition occurred within the measured temperature range. Similarly, below the melting point (408 K) of the compound, the dielectric constant equaling to 0.6 to 1.42). Herein, we report the synthesis and crystal structure of the title compound.

As can be seen from the packing diagram (Fig. 2), molecules are connected *via* intermolecular N—H…Br and C— H…Br hydrogen bonds to form a three-dimensional network. Dipole–dipole and van der Waals interactions are also operative in organizing the molecular packing.

S2. Experimental

A mix of 4-allylmorpholine (0.762 g, 0.006 mol) and hydrogen bromide (1.212 g, 0.006 mol) in water (20 ml) was stirred until clear. After several days, the title compound was formed and recrystallized from solution to afford red prismatic crystals suitable for X-ray analysis.

S3. Refinement

H atoms were positioned geometrically and refined using a riding model, with C—H = 0.97 Å and $U_{iso}(H) = 1.2_{eq}(C)$.



Figure 1

Perspective structure of the title compound, showing the atom-numbering scheme. Displacement ellipsoids are drawn at the 30% probability level.



Figure 2

The crystal packing of the title compound viewed along the a axis showing the hydrogen bonding network. Some of the H-atoms have been ommitted for clarity.

4-Allylmorpholin-4-ium bromide

Crystal data
$C_7H_{14}NO^+ \cdot Br^-$
$M_r = 208.10$
Triclinic, $P\overline{1}$
Hall symbol: -P 1
a = 7.4115 (15) Å
<i>b</i> = 7.9727 (16) Å
<i>c</i> = 8.7948 (18) Å
$\alpha = 66.43 \ (3)^{\circ}$
$\beta = 82.14 \ (3)^{\circ}$
$\gamma = 85.78 \ (3)^{\circ}$
$V = 471.75 (17) \text{ Å}^3$

Z = 2 F(000) = 212 $D_x = 1.465 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$ Mo K α radiation, $\lambda = 0.71073 \text{ Å}$ Cell parameters from 2158 reflections $\theta = 2.3-27.5^{\circ}$ $\mu = 4.30 \text{ mm}^{-1}$ T = 293 KPrismatic, red $0.33 \times 0.28 \times 0.20 \text{ mm}$ Data collection

Rigaku SCXmini	2155 independent reflections
diffractometer	1786 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$
Radiation source: fine-focus sealed tube	$R_{\rm int} = 0.043$
Graphite monochromator	$\theta_{\rm max} = 27.5^{\circ}, \ \theta_{\rm min} = 3.5^{\circ}$
ω scans	$h = -9 \rightarrow 9$
Absorption correction: multi-scan	$k = -10 \rightarrow 10$
(CrystalClear; Rigaku, 2005)	$l = -11 \rightarrow 11$
$T_{\min} = 0.252, \ T_{\max} = 0.423$	2 standard reflections every 150 reflections
4897 measured reflections	intensity decay: none

Refinement

Refinement on F^2	Hydrogen site location: inferred from
Least-squares matrix: full	neighbouring sites
$R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.039$	H-atom parameters constrained
$wR(F^2) = 0.099$	$w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0469P)^2 + 0.0113P]$
S = 1.07	where $P = (F_o^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$
2155 reflections	$(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} = 0.001$
92 parameters	$\Delta \rho_{\rm max} = 0.59 \ {\rm e} \ {\rm \AA}^{-3}$
0 restraints	$\Delta \rho_{\rm min} = -0.42 \text{ e} \text{ Å}^{-3}$
Primary atom site location: structure-invariant direct methods	Extinction correction: <i>SHELXL97</i> (Sheldrick, 2008), $Fc^*=kFc[1+0.001xFc^2\lambda^3/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$
Secondary atom site location: difference Fourier	Extinction coefficient: 0.193 (10)
man	

Special details

Geometry. All e.s.d.'s (except the e.s.d. in the dihedral angle between two l.s. planes) are estimated using the full covariance matrix. The cell e.s.d.'s are taken into account individually in the estimation of e.s.d.'s in distances, angles and torsion angles; correlations between e.s.d.'s in cell parameters are only used when they are defined by crystal symmetry. An approximate (isotropic) treatment of cell e.s.d.'s is used for estimating e.s.d.'s involving l.s. planes.

Refinement. Refinement of F^2 against ALL reflections. The weighted *R*-factor *wR* and goodness of fit *S* are based on F^2 , conventional *R*-factors *R* are based on *F*, with *F* set to zero for negative F^2 . The threshold expression of $F^2 > \sigma(F^2)$ is used only for calculating *R*-factors(gt) *etc.* and is not relevant to the choice of reflections for refinement. *R*-factors based on F^2 are statistically about twice as large as those based on *F*, and *R*- factors based on ALL data will be even larger.

Fractional atomic coordinates and isotropic or equivalent isotropic displacement parameters $(Å^2)$

	x	У	Ζ	$U_{ m iso}$ */ $U_{ m eq}$	
01	0.2009 (4)	0.5927 (3)	0.8606 (3)	0.0636 (7)	
N1	0.2630 (3)	0.2655 (3)	0.7998 (3)	0.0367 (5)	
H1C	0.3863	0.2567	0.7988	0.044*	
C1	0.1820 (5)	0.2637 (5)	0.9663 (4)	0.0509 (8)	
H1A	0.2179	0.1515	1.0548	0.061*	
H1B	0.0501	0.2684	0.9729	0.061*	
C2	0.2476 (6)	0.4268 (5)	0.9881 (5)	0.0620 (10)	
H2A	0.1941	0.4260	1.0955	0.074*	
H2B	0.3789	0.4176	0.9876	0.074*	
C3	0.2827 (5)	0.5971 (4)	0.7029 (4)	0.0573 (9)	
H3A	0.4141	0.5878	0.7018	0.069*	
H3B	0.2531	0.7132	0.6158	0.069*	
C4	0.2186 (4)	0.4436 (4)	0.6671 (4)	0.0468 (7)	
H4A	0.0880	0.4555	0.6626	0.056*	

supporting information

H4B	0.2773	0.4495	0.5596	0.056*	
C5	0.2028 (4)	0.1047 (4)	0.7716 (4)	0.0468 (8)	
H5A	0.2321	-0.0079	0.8630	0.056*	
H5B	0.0718	0.1119	0.7706	0.056*	
C6	0.2918 (5)	0.1003 (5)	0.6127 (5)	0.0550 (9)	
H6A	0.4171	0.0794	0.6028	0.066*	
C7	0.2073 (8)	0.1237 (6)	0.4856 (6)	0.0848 (14)	
H7A	0.0820	0.1449	0.4911	0.102*	
H7B	0.2721	0.1192	0.3889	0.102*	
Br1	0.29920 (3)	0.76037 (4)	0.22722 (4)	0.0524 (2)	

Atomic displacement parameters $(Å^2)$

	U^{11}	U^{22}	U^{33}	U^{12}	U^{13}	U^{23}
01	0.0796 (17)	0.0498 (14)	0.0661 (16)	0.0035 (12)	0.0026 (13)	-0.0323 (12)
N1	0.0285 (10)	0.0366 (13)	0.0429 (13)	0.0007 (9)	-0.0024 (9)	-0.0142 (10)
C1	0.0496 (17)	0.0539 (19)	0.0436 (18)	0.0032 (15)	0.0002 (14)	-0.0160 (15)
C2	0.070 (2)	0.072 (3)	0.051 (2)	0.001 (2)	-0.0022 (18)	-0.034 (2)
C3	0.070 (2)	0.0361 (17)	0.061 (2)	-0.0049 (16)	0.0035 (18)	-0.0178 (16)
C4	0.0537 (18)	0.0369 (16)	0.0455 (18)	-0.0008 (14)	-0.0055 (14)	-0.0121 (14)
C5	0.0414 (16)	0.0361 (16)	0.062 (2)	-0.0020 (13)	-0.0098 (14)	-0.0172 (15)
C6	0.0551 (19)	0.0498 (19)	0.069 (2)	0.0016 (16)	-0.0125 (17)	-0.0316 (18)
C7	0.110 (4)	0.075 (3)	0.086 (3)	0.007 (3)	-0.029 (3)	-0.044 (3)
Br1	0.0324 (2)	0.0604 (3)	0.0540 (3)	0.00297 (15)	-0.00786 (14)	-0.01133 (17)

Geometric parameters (Å, °)

01—C2	1.407 (4)	С3—НЗА	0.9700	_
O1—C3	1.424 (4)	C3—H3B	0.9700	
N1-C4	1.483 (3)	C4—H4A	0.9700	
N1—C1	1.500 (4)	C4—H4B	0.9700	
N1—C5	1.508 (4)	C5—C6	1.474 (5)	
N1—H1C	0.9100	C5—H5A	0.9700	
C1—C2	1.511 (5)	C5—H5B	0.9700	
C1—H1A	0.9700	C6—C7	1.298 (5)	
C1—H1B	0.9700	C6—H6A	0.9300	
C2—H2A	0.9700	С7—Н7А	0.9300	
C2—H2B	0.9700	С7—Н7В	0.9300	
C3—C4	1.503 (5)			
C2—O1—C3	109.7 (3)	O1—C3—H3B	109.3	
C4—N1—C1	109.1 (2)	C4—C3—H3B	109.3	
C4—N1—C5	112.6 (2)	НЗА—СЗ—НЗВ	108.0	
C1—N1—C5	111.8 (2)	N1—C4—C3	109.7 (3)	
C4—N1—H1C	107.7	N1—C4—H4A	109.7	
C1—N1—H1C	107.7	C3—C4—H4A	109.7	
C5—N1—H1C	107.7	N1—C4—H4B	109.7	
N1—C1—C2	109.4 (3)	C3—C4—H4B	109.7	

$\begin{array}{l} N1 &C1 &H1A \\ C2 &C1 &H1B \\ N1 &C1 &H1B \\ C2 &C1 &H1B \\ O1 &C2 &H1B \\ O1 &C2 &H2A \\ C1 &C2 &H2B \\ C1 &C2 &H2B \\ H2A &C2 &H2B \\ O1 &C3 &C4 \\ O1 &C3 &H3A \\ C4 &C3 &H3A \\ \end{array}$	109.8	H4A—C4—H4B	108.2
	109.8	C6—C5—N1	111.6 (3)
	109.8	C6—C5—H5A	109.3
	109.8	N1—C5—H5A	109.3
	108.2	C6—C5—H5B	109.3
	111.7 (3)	N1—C5—H5B	109.3
	109.3	H5A—C5—H5B	108.0
	109.3	C7—C6—C5	124.5 (4)
	109.3	C7—C6—H6A	117.7
	107.9	C5—C6—H6A	117.7
	111.6 (3)	C6—C7—H7A	120.0
	109.3	C6—C7—H7B	120.0
	109.3	H7A—C7—H7B	120.0
C4—N1—C1—C2 C5—N1—C1—C2 C3—O1—C2—C1 N1—C1—C2—O1 C2—O1—C3—C4 C1—N1—C4—C3	-55.2 (3) 179.7 (3) -60.5 (4) 58.5 (4) 60.7 (4) 55.5 (3)	C5—N1—C4—C3 O1—C3—C4—N1 C4—N1—C5—C6 C1—N1—C5—C6 N1—C5—C6—C7	-179.8 (3) -58.9 (4) 60.5 (3) -176.4 (3) -113.9 (4)

Hydrogen-bond geometry (Å, °)

D—H···A	<i>D</i> —Н	H···A	$D \cdots A$	D—H···A
N1—H1C···Br1 ⁱ	0.91	2.31	3.218 (2)	175
C1—H1A···Br1 ⁱⁱ	0.97	2.93	3.846 (4)	158
C5—H5B···Br1 ⁱⁱⁱ	0.97	2.86	3.796 (3)	162

Symmetry codes: (i) -*x*+1, -*y*+1, -*z*+1; (ii) *x*, *y*-1, *z*+1; (iii) -*x*, -*y*+1, -*z*+1.