

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	N2
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	von Zedtwitz Life Master Pairs	Event DIC	McKenzie Myers
Date	07/22/2017	Session	First Semifinal


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 12-14 HCP
2: Hearts and a minor
3: Explained as Natural

Hand Record

Board	11	N	Adam Wildavsky
Dealer	S	♠ Q4	
Vul	None	♥ Q109862	
		♦ (void)	
		♣ A9832	
W	John Jones		
♠	K1082		
♥	AKJ3		
♦	853		
♣	Q6	E	Rick Roeder
		♠	AJ765
		♥	7
		♦	AKJ1097
		♣	5
		S	Ron Gerard
		♠	93
		♥	54
		♦	Q642
		♣	KJ1074

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♠X by E	Made 6	E/W +790	♥5

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the end of the auction. East explained that 3♣ was actually transfer Lebensohl showing diamonds. South was offered the chance to change his final pass; he declined to do so. The director spoke to South away from the table to see what he would have done over a properly-alerted 3♣. He said he would not have bid 3♦. The director also spoke to North away from the table. He said he would not have doubled 4♠ with the right information.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Director Ruling

The director determined that there had been misinformation, and that with the proper information the auction would have gone somewhat differently. She judged that E/W would still get to 4♠, but it would not be doubled. Therefore, per Laws 21B3, 40B4, and 12C1c, the contract and result were changed to 4♠ by East, making six, +480.

Director's Ruling	4♠ by E, Made 6, E/W +480
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Review

N/S requested a review of the ruling. Each pair spoke to the reviewer separately. E/W did not add considerable information; they felt that N/S were trying to have a bad score repaired by the director.

N/S made several points. They felt the director did not explore enough possibilities when making the ruling. They felt that if South had passed 3♣, it might have been the final contract. They also felt that with the right explanation, E/W

would reach 4♠ by East; N/S would now bid 5♣ and either play in 5♣X or defend 5♣X. They would defeat 5♣X by a trick after two diamond ruffs, using the ♣K as an entry for the second ruff. Another possible scenario included South's bidding 5♣ over 3♣ which might have led to 5♦ or 5♣X being the final contract.

Panel Findings

The reviewer spoke to several experts to explore the many avenues presented by the appellants. None thought the auction would end in 3♣; few considered bidding 5♣. They focused on double or 4♣. All thought the auction would continue as N/S described—the double or club bid would be passed back to East who would bid 3♣ or 4♣. They thought a 5♣ bid by South was quite likely, and that when that happened E/W would invariably compete to 5♣. North's double would make it certain that NS would indeed defeat 5♣X as suggested with two diamond ruffs and the ♣K scoring the first three tricks.

While results other than 4♠, making six (no chance to double meant N/S would likely defend as they did at the table), and 5♣X, down one, had non-trivial probability, the reviewer elected to amalgamate these outliers into a ruling of 80% of 5♣X by East, down one, N/S +100 and 20% of 4♠ by East, making six, E/W +480.

Panel Decision	80%: 5♣X by E, Down 1, N/S +100 20%: 4♠ by E, Made 6, E/W +480
-----------------------	---

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Koltnow
Member	David Mecalf
Member	Matt Smith