

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	N2
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

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

### Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1NT <sup>1</sup>	2♥ <sup>2</sup>	3♣ <sup>3</sup>	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		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>S</b>	♠	Q4		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>	♥	Q109862		
		♦	(void)		
		♣	A9832		
W	John Jones			E	Rick Roeder
♠	K1082			♠	AJ765
♥	AKJ3			♥	7
♦	853			♦	AKJ1097
♣	Q6			♣	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.

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

### 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.

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

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Member</b>	David Mecalf
<b>Member</b>	Matt Smith