

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	N8
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	Rockwell Mixed Pairs	Event DIC	McKenzie Myers
Date	03/14/2017	Session	First Qualifying


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-17 HCP
2: Alerted as ♥ & a minor

Hand Record

Board	11	N	Ala Hamilton-Day		
Dealer	S	♠	Q92		
		♥	3		
Vul	None	♦	K10975		
		♣	J1098		
W	Sherman Gao			E	Weiling Zhao
♠	J103			♠	K8754
♥	K109654			♥	J82
♦	J3			♦	AQ64
♣	Q6			♣	3
		S	Buddhadeb Biswas		
		♠	A6		
		♥	AQ7		
		♦	82		
		♣	AK7542		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♣ by S	Made 4	N/S +130	♥10

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the end of play. West explained his bid showed just hearts, not hearts and a minor. South stated that, with the correct information, he would have played the diamond suit differently as he believed West to hold at least four cards in the suit.

Director Ruling

The director determined that there had been misinformation, as the actual E/W agreement was that 2♥ shows just hearts. After winning the opening lead with the ♥Q, South played a diamond toward dummy. He asserted that he would have played the 10 rather than the king with the right information. This would result in an extra trick, allowing a spade to be discarded on a diamond. The result was adjusted to 4♣ by South, making five, N/S +150.

Director's Ruling	4♣ by S, Made 5, N/S +150
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Review

E/W requested a review of the ruling. They felt the correct information would not have made the play of the ♦10 more attractive. West believed that, with the correct information, the king would be the more reasonable play to limit the losers in diamonds to only one.

Panel Findings

The reviewer spoke to two expert players to see how they would have played 4♣ with the right information. One played a spade toward the queen at trick two. When asked whether a diamond to the 10 (or running the eight) was attractive, he stated that was not an option he would consider.

The other expert said he would always play a diamond to the king. He said he would make 11 tricks on a ruffing finesse, playing East for the queen based upon restricted choice as West did not split.

The reviewer then gave the hand to three peers of South. Two played a diamond toward the king. One took the ruffing finesse, giving the same reasoning as the expert. Another tried to ruff out diamonds playing for 3-3, which would have led to 10 tricks. The third played a diamond to the king, playing for 3-3. She felt if West was likely to be two-suited, running the ♦8 was a better play.

For no player was the play of the ♦10 more attractive with the correct information. Therefore, there was no legal justification to adjust the score, and the table result of 4♣ by South, making four, N/S +130, was restored.

Experts consulted: Mikael Rimstedt, Diyan Danailov

Panel Decision	4♣ by S, Made 4, N/S +130
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Koltnow
-----------------	--------------