

Subject of Appeal:	Unauthorized Information	Case:	R1
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

Event	10K Swiss Teams	Event DIC	Peter Wilke
Date	11/26/2016	Session	Second Qualifying

Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, four ♠, Limit Raise

Hand Record

Board	9	N	1140 MP		
Dealer	N	♠ KJ	♥ 42		
Vul	E/W	♦ 854	♣ AK9432		
W	7480 MP			E	3840 MP
♠	A10985			♠	Q2
♥	AQ7			♥	J98
♦	106			♦	AQJ3
♣	1076	♣	QJ85		
		S	9050 MP		
		♠	7643		
		♥	K10653		
		♦	K972		
		♣	(void)		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by E	Made 3	E/W +600	♦ 2

Facts Determined at the Table

This was the fifth board of a seven board match. The director was approached after the match had been compared and reported. He was asked to consider whether East's 3NT bid was legal in light of hearing West's explanation that his 2NT bid was a four card limit raise. East told the director that at the point he bid 2NT he forgot that his agreement was as West described.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled three players with East's hand without mentioning the alert or explanation of 2NT. All three players passed 3♠. Additional players were polled who confirmed the explanation suggested bidding rather than passing.

Director Ruling

According to law and regulations pursuant to it, the request for a ruling was timely since it was requested within 30 minutes of the scores being made available for inspection (Law 92B). Based upon the player polls, the director determined that pass was a logical alternative to bidding 3NT, and further decided that the unauthorized information from the explanation suggested not passing 3♠. The score was changed to 3♠ by West, down one, N/S +100, per Laws 12 & 16B.

Director's Ruling	3♠ by W, Down 1, N/S +100
--------------------------	---------------------------

The Review

E/W appealed the director's ruling. East and North attended the review, as did the entire director panel. E/W's written reason for the appeal was: "We think that the 3NT call was not made because of the alert of 2NT, but because it was likely that South had a shapely hand and could get a ruff." During the review, East added that 3NT rated to be as likely to make as 3♠ since partner did not make a weak jump overcall of 2♠ at his first turn so he rated to have a good hand.

The panel confirmed with East that at the point he bid 2NT he had forgotten his methods and his bid was intended as natural and invitational. The actual agreement was that 2NT was a spade raise.

The reviewer explained the law, how the director arrived at the ruling, and the appeal process to East and asked him what errors he thought were made or what was wrong with the ruling. He said he did not find any error in what the director did, but believed that bridge logic dictated that 3NT was the correct bid. When the reviewer explained that the ruling assumed that the unauthorized information suggested not passing 3♠, East did not rebut that assumption.

The panel asked about the play to 3NT and was told that the diamond lead went to declarer's jack; the ♠Q was led and lost to North's king; a high club was cashed after which North switched to a heart won in dummy; declarer cashed the ♠A from dummy dropping North's jack.

Panel Findings

The panel found that East had not offered any relevant arguments as to why the director's ruling was erroneous. The panel confirmed that the director had asked appropriate questions of appropriate peers, the process easily established pass as a logical alternative, and the secondary conducted poll confirmed that the unauthorized information suggested not passing 3♠. The panel considered that the director's assignment of eight tricks in 3♠ seemed correct, but did not poll that point. The director's ruling of 3♠ by East, down one, N/S +100, was therefore upheld. Since E/W essentially brought nothing new to the hearing, E/W and the team captain were assessed an Appeal without Merit Warning.

Panel Decision	3NT by N, Made 6, N/S +690
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Smith
Member	Eric Bell
Member	Gary Zeiger