

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	N3
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	Spingold Knockout Teams	Event DIC	Matt Smith
Date	07/25/2017	Session	Round of 64, First Quarter

Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	1♠
Pass	3♣ ¹	3♦	4♦
5♦	6♠	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Fit showing, No Alert

Hand Record

Board	5	N	Ron Bishop		
Dealer	N	♠	J10854		
		♥	9		
		♦	Q96		
Vul	N/S	♣	AK32		
W	Reese Milner			E	Hement Lall
♠	63			♠	(void)
♥	AQ62			♥	108543
♦	10874			♦	AKJ532
♣	1086			♣	74
		S	John Duquette		
		♠	AKQ972		
		♥	KJ7		
		♦	(void)		
		♣	QJ95		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♠ by S	Made 6	N/S +1430	♦

Facts Determined at the Table

East called the director after North bid 6♠. He took the director away from the table and told her that if 3♣ was spades, he wants to bid 7♦. If not, he wanted to Pass. The director asked East whether he asked what 3♣ was. He said he did not want N/S to exchange information. The director retrieved the N/S convention card and looked at it with East away from the table. Although fit-showing jumps were clearly marked in the Other Conventional Calls portion of the card, neither the director nor East were able to find it. The director indicated she did not have any more information than East had. East returned to the table and passed.

The director was later informed of an additional fact. At West's turn, before he bid 5♦, he turned to South to ask about the 3♣ bid. East interjected, "Don't ask, because it was not Alerted."

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled nine players regarding the UI available to North from South's failure to alert 3♣. None bid 6♠ immediately, but all felt a 5♥ cuebid was nearly automatic which would lead to 6♦ by South and 6♠ by North.

The director asked about East's decision to bid 7♦. All of them knew or suspected that 3♣ was a fit-showing jump. Half had sympathy for East's difficult decision; the other half felt he knew what he needed to before deciding whether to bid 7♦.

Director Ruling

As there were several opportunities for East to get the information he wanted from the opponents, the director felt it was not appropriate to go beyond helping East look at the convention card. Per the Alert Procedures and the General Conditions of Contest, a player, who by experience or expertise believes that the opponents have failed to properly Alert a

call, is required to protect themselves. The proper way to do this is to ask for an explanation as, per Law 16B, the explanation is Unauthorized Information for the opponents. The table result was allowed to stand.

Director's Ruling	6♠ by S, Made 6, N/S +1430
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Review

E/W requested a review of the ruling. East, North, and South attended the review. N/S felt the ruling spoke for itself. East felt that he did nothing wrong. When at the critical moment in the auction he asked for the director's help, he made it clear he was not trying to take a double-shot. He was willing to commit to either 7♦ or Pass upon confirmation of the meaning of 3♣. He suggested that a critical piece of information was whether 3♣ was an artificial spade raise or a fit-showing jump, even though the director had not understood that as part of his request for help. East felt let down; he asked the director for one piece of information, yet the director did not make it clear the onus was on him to make the determination which affected his choice of call.

Panel Findings

The reviewer spoke to six experts to find out whether East had done enough to protect his position. One player thought this player was being ethical—he called the TD at the critical point and made clear his intention to commit to one action versus another depending on a piece of information he wanted the TD to help him find. The other five were surprised that East did not recognize the fit-showing jump as standard expert practice. They ranged from surprised to appalled that a player would instruct his partner not to ask the question mid-auction, particularly when his next call might well depend on the answer to that question.

The reviewer convened a panel of three additional directors. They voted unanimously to rule 6♠ by South, making six. East simply did not ask the question whose answer he required. They voted unanimously to give E/W a procedural penalty of 4.5 IMPs for his illegal admonition to West to not ask a question during the auction. They voted 2-1 that the appeal was without merit.

Experts Consulted: Drew Cannell, Geir Helgemo, Tor Helness, Mark Itabashi, Dan Korbel, and Ulf Nilsson

Panel Decision	6♠ by S, Made 6, N/S +1430 E/W 4.5 IMP Procedural Penalty
-----------------------	--

Committee Members

Reviewer	Matt Koltnow
Member	Jenni Carmichael
Member	McKenzie Myers
Member	David Metcalf