

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	N4
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Lebhar IMP Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Date</b>	03/11/2017	<b>Session</b>	Second Final

### Auction

West	North	East	South
		1♦ <sup>1</sup>	2♦ <sup>2</sup>
3♣	Pass	5♣	5♥
Pass	5♠	Dbl	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, Precision
2: Explained as "likely Natural"

### Hand Record

Board	14	N	Dan Morse		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠	5432		
		♥	J84		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>	♦	Q1065		
		♣	J5		
<b>W</b>	Paul Holmes			<b>E</b> Eric Gettleman	
♠	87			♠	AK
♥	532			♥	6
♦	K7			♦	AJ98432
♣	AK10942			♣	Q76
		<b>S</b>	John Sutherland		
		♠	QJ1096		
		♥	AKQ1097		
		♦	(void)		
		♣	83		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♠X by N	Down 2	E/W +300	♣6

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after the final pass. When West had asked North about the meaning of South's 2♦ bid, North had answered, "Undiscussed, but over a short suit, it is probably natural." N/S had not discussed what a cuebid of a "could be short" minor suit opening would mean. E/W felt this provided South Unauthorized Information when the auction came back around to him. The director instructed the pairs to play out the hand and call him back after the play if E/W believed they were damaged, which they did.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The TD polled six players, giving them the South hand. All either bid 2♦ or accepted it as a normal bid. Four of the six players passed 5♣.

### Director Ruling

Based upon the player poll, it was ruled that pass was a logical alternative. The director ruled that South had made use of the UI, and per Laws 16B & 12C, the result was adjusted to 5♣ by West, making 5, E/W +400.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>5♣ by W, Made 5, E/W +400</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Review

E/W requested a review of the ruling. They claimed the director did not address the fact that they were given misinformation. They contended that the director was wrong in assigning only 11 tricks in 5♣. With the correct information,

West would be too strong to bid only 3♣, non-forcing over a Michaels bid. Under their system, West would cuebid 2♥, showing clubs. The auction would continue as it did after that, but then East would play the hand. With East as declarer, a diamond ruff is improbable, and diamonds can be set up to take 12 tricks. They also wanted to address the possibility of bidding the slam.

### Panel Findings

The reviewer examined the E/W agreements, and concluded that it would be likely to have East declaring in clubs. With the contract being played by East, 12 tricks would be taken by fairly easy play. Five new players were polled with the adapted auction using the E/W methods over Michaels. The auction for all reached to 5♣, but none bid on to slam. All thought 12 tricks would be taken. Therefore the contract was adjust to 5♣ by East, making six, E/W +420.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>5♣ by E, Made 6, E/W +420</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Kevin Perkins
-----------------	---------------