

Subject of Appeal: Misinformation	Case: N7
--	-----------------

Event	Kaplan Blue Ribbon Pairs	Event DIC	Harry Falk
Date	11/29/2016	Session	Second Qualifying

Auction

West	North	East	South
Pass	1NT ¹	Pass	3NT
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 14+ - 17 HCP

Hand Record

Board	4	N	Jason Feldman		
Dealer	W	♠	A964		
		♥	72		
Vul	Both	♦	Q104		
		♣	AKJ7		
W	Larry Robbins			E	Maurizio Di Sacco
♠	10732			♠	Q8
♥	103			♥	AQJ95
♦	AJ3			♦	952
♣	9543			♣	1062
		S	Mark Feldman		
		♠	KJ5		
		♥	K864		
		♦	K876		
		♣	Q8		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by N	Down 1	E/W +100	♥ Q

Facts Determined at the Table

North called the director at the completion of play. Following the opening lead, North asked E/W about their leads and carding. He was told they play Rusinow leads and coded 9s and 10s. Since the ♥K was in dummy, he asked what combinations the queen could be from. Specifically, he asked about AQJ and was told from that combination, East would lead the jack, which is what was marked on the convention card. North played the king at trick one, hoping to break communication between the defenders. When it turned out that East had led from AQJ95, the defense was able to score a diamond and four hearts for down one.

Director Ruling

The director determined that North had been given a correct explanation of the E/W lead agreements. East had simply not followed them. Therefore, there were no legal grounds to adjust the score.

Director's Ruling	3NT by N, Down 1, E/W +100
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Review

N/S requested a review of the ruling. South maintained that North's play was correct based on the information he had, but that it would have been right to duck if he had known that East was leading from AQJxx. He was playing for a combination such as QJ10 alone in the East hand.

East said he did not think that Rusinow applied to AQJ, so he thought their agreement was to lead the Queen from this combination. West thought it did, and that they lead the jack, which is what the E/W convention card said.

Panel Findings

The reviewer found several groups of experts in order to help him determine whether the information North received about the E/W lead agreements caused the damage. There were some different card combinations where experts differed on whether the king at trick one would be correct, but the combination which was common to all the expert testimony was that it would always be correct to play the king at trick one if the lead had been from QJ alone. The experts unanimously felt it was extremely unlikely a defender had led from QJ alone in this auction, so they all determined the opening lead had been from another combination where holding up was correct. The panel's analysis of the appellants' statements and the expert consultants led them to conclude that the description given did not cause the damage, and the table result was allowed to stand.

Panel Decision	3NT by N, Down 1, E/W +100
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Koltnow
Member	David Metcalf
Member	Gary Zeiger
Member	Kevin Perkins