

Subject of Appeal:	Unauthorized Information	Case:	N3
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Nail Life Master Pairs	Event DIC	Ken Van Cleve
Date	11/25/2016	Session	Second Qualifying


Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	1♠ ¹	Pass
2NT ²	Pass	3♣ ³	Pass
3♥ ⁴	Pass	3♠ ⁵	Pass
4♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Natural, 14-20 HCP
2: Spade Raise
3: Relay
4: Two Keycards
5: Slam invitational

Hand Record

Board	13	N	Larry Sealy		
Dealer	N	♠	87		
		♥	KQ1094		
Vul	Both	♦	Q75		
		♣	Q94		
W	Gökçen Yilmaz			E	Bülent Kaytaç
♠	1094			♠	AQJ532
♥	72			♥	A65
♦	AK2			♦	J9
♣	K8763	♣	A5		
		S	Jim Foster		
		♠	K6		
		♥	J83		
		♦	108643		
		♣	J109		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♠ by E	Made 5	E/W +650	♥ J

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the end of the hand. N/S had asked about each bid as the auction proceeded. E/W stated that 4♠ showed no extras (values for limit raise only) and no interest in slam. They clarified their system for the TD, stating that 2NT had been a mistaken bid. Their explanation of the auction (confirmed by system notes):

2NT shows a balanced spade raise with an even number of keycards.

3♣ asks for more information.

A 3♦ response would have shown any hand with no keycards; 3♥ showed two keycards and 8-9 points (the minimum for 2NT), whereas 3♠ would have shown two keycards with 10-11 points.

3♠ by East showed slam interest, but 4♠ showed the hand to have nothing extra.

Director Ruling

The TD found the explanation of the E/W system adequate, and thought West had made a mistaken bid when he bid 2NT. He judged there was no reason to adjust the score.

Director's Ruling	4♠ by E, Made 5, E/W +650
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Review

N/S requested a review of the ruling. They believed that the TD had received a different explanation of the E/W system from what they heard at the table. What they heard at the table suggested that West gained an advantage from the UI contained in E/W's answers to N/S's questions about their system.

The reviewer obtained the E/W system notes, and he found them to agree with what E/W had told the TD. He spoke to two expert players, who helped him draw a different conclusion from these facts. The specific part of the UI was that East expected one more keycard than West had, which demonstrably suggested not cooperating with a slam try by making a control bid of 4♣ or 4♦. That control bid would likely have led to a slam - East already expects the ♠K and ♦A to be in West's hand. East would have been able to find out about West's minor suit kings and bid to 6♠.

Panel Findings

West was in possession of UI from the explanations of 2NT and 3♥ as showing two keycards. This information suggested that bidding 4♠ would be more successful than 4♣ or 4♦, which were logical alternatives. Therefore, per Laws 16B1, 73C, and 12C1c, the contract was changed to 6♠ by East, down one, N/S +100. The appeal was deemed to have merit.

Experts Consulted: Jan Martel, Paul Lewis

Panel Decision	6♠ by E, Down 1, N/S +100
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Committee Members

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