

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b> Misinformation	<b>Case:</b> N5
--	-----------------

<b>Event</b>	Kaplan Blue Ribbon Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Harry Falk
<b>Date</b>	11/29/2016	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifying


### Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	1♥
2♥ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	2♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Spades and a minor

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>N</b>	Freida Dohrman		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠	AK85		
		♥	QJ		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>	♦	Q742		
		♣	1043		
<b>W</b>	Larry Cohen			<b>E</b>	Steve Weinstein
♠	QJ1097			♠	432
♥	3			♥	87652
♦	K8			♦	A96
♣	AJ762			♣	K9
		<b>S</b>	Barbara Steffek		
		♠	6		
		♥	AK1094		
		♦	J1053		
		♣	Q85		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
2♠ by E	Made 3	E/W +140	♥ A

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called during the next hand. This is the point where East figured out N/S use upside-down carding. The play had gone: after the ♥A held trick one, South led the ♦J, which declarer won with the ace. Declarer led a trump, and North won. North led another diamond to dummy's king. Declarer led another high trump; North ducked and South discarded a heart. Declarer led a small club to the king; North played the 4, South the 5. Declarer now led a small club toward the jack; South played the 8, North the 3. Declarer looked at North's convention card (he was planning to play this defender for having given true count). The card was marked for no carding agreements, so he assumed they played standard. He ruffed a club and took nine tricks. If he had led trumps instead, he could have taken 10 tricks by playing for clubs to break 3-3, which they did.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The TD polled four players who said they didn't care what the carding agreement was; they would play for clubs 3-3 or 4-2 based on other information available to them. South's convention card had no markings for defensive carding; North's was completely filled-out, including the check box for upside-down count and attitude.

### Director Ruling

The TD ruled that the misinformation did not cause the damage, so he could not adjust the score per Laws 21C3 and 40B4.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	2♠ by E, Made 3, E/W +140
--------------------------	---------------------------

## The Review

E/W requested a review of the ruling. East said that he had every reason to expect North would give true count, and she did. The only reason he went wrong was that he was misinformed as to the N/S carding agreement. He said a poll of players was irrelevant. The reviewer spoke to six national and world champions to ask what they would do if they picked up a convention card and saw no markings for defensive carding. All of them said they would either look for the other defender's convention card or ask a question. When asked whether it was reasonable to assume the opponents were using standard carding methods, all six said it was not.

## Panel Findings

N/S were in violation of regulations and conditions of contest which require two completely filled-out convention cards. At the same time, the Alert procedures require players to protect themselves. East did not protect himself adequately; he would have received the correct information with a question or by looking at a filled-out convention card. The table ruling was upheld. The appeal was deemed to have merit. While the appellants' argument was not successful, they accurately described the flaw in the table director's ruling - he had not polled the correct element of the ruling.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>2♠ by E, Made 3, E/W +140</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
-----------------	--------------