

Subject of Appeal: Misinformation	Case: N1
--	-----------------

Event	von Zedtwitz LM Pairs	Event DIC	Harry Falk
Date	07/22/2016	Session	First Qualifying

Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Explained as 4 Controls

Hand Record

Board	27	N	Jan Jansma		
Dealer	S	♠	J94		
		♥	KJ5432		
		♦	843		
Vul	None	♣	4		
W	Jeffrey Juster			E	Martin Fleisher
♠	AQ873			♠	K2
♥	108			♥	Q7
♦	AKQ2			♦	J107
♣	AQ			♣	KJ7532
		S	Jay Borker		
		♠	1065		
		♥	A96		
		♦	965		
		♣	10986		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♥X by N	Down 4	E/W +800	

Facts Determined at the Table

West's explanation of East's 3♣ bid as four controls (Ace=2, King=1) was misinformation. The actual partnership agreement was "natural and positive". The director was called at the end of the hand, which was the first legal time to do so, as E/W were on defense. South told the director that he would not have bid 4♥ if he had known 3♣ was natural.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Seven players with similar masterpoint holdings to South were polled. Five players said they would pass with either set of information; the other two said they would bid 3♥ with either set of information.

Director Ruling

There was no evidence that South's call would be different without the misinformation; therefore, the score was not adjusted per Laws 21B3.

Director's Ruling	4♥X by N, Down 4, E/W +800
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S requested a review of the ruling as they felt the poll results were invalid. South says he is a stronger player than his masterpoints might suggest. He cited results in NABC+ events to make his case.

The reviewer conducted a new poll of NABC champions. Seven players were polled. Five players said that they would never bid 4♥ or that it could never be right. One suggested that 4♥ might be right, but if it were, he would do it with

either set of information. One said he could see choosing from among Pass, 3♥ and 4♥; moreover, he felt he would be inclined to be less aggressive on the information in the correct explanation.

Panel Findings

The review panel considered the new poll results and how to apply them. They felt that while there was evidence to support South's argument, it was from a minority of one. The majority not only considered the action chosen at the table to be poor, they felt the misinformation did not affect their own decision. Therefore, the panel felt there was not sufficient reason to change the table result.

Experts Consulted: Rich DeMartino, Adam Grossack, Zack Grossack, Dan Korbel, Michael Seamon, Aaron Silverstein and Kit Woolsey

Panel Decision	4♥X by N, Down 4, E/W +800
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Koltnow
Advisor	Matt Smith