

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	N10
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----

Event	Wernher Open Pairs	Event DIC	McKenzie Myers
Date	07/28/2016	Session	Second Final

Auction

West	North	East	South
Pass	Pass	1♦	Dbl
1♥	Pass	1NT ¹	Pass
2♣	Dbl	Pass	Pass
2♦	Pass	Pass	3♣
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-17 HCP, no Alert
2: Alerted, forces 2♦, to play

Hand Record

Board	20	N	Meyer Kotkin		
Dealer	W	♠ 864	♥ 875		
Vul	Both	♦ 974	♣ K532		
W	Jiun-Ming Chen			E	Chris Lin
♠	J93			♠	AK10
♥	J643			♥	Q9
♦	A532			♦	J1086
♣	109			♣	AJ84
		S	Robert Heitzman		
		♠	Q752		
		♥	AK102		
		♦	KQ		
		♣	Q76		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♣ by S	Down 4	E/W +400	

Facts Determined at the Table

When dummy came down, South asked West about the 1NT and was informed that East showed a strong no trump. South called the director, and claimed that he would not have balanced if he had known that East had a strong no trump.

Director Ruling

The ruling, after discussion, was that the result would stand. The failure to alert was felt to have caused less damage than the actual double of 2♣ by North, which most probably led South to take action. Law 40B4 says that a side damaged as a consequence of its opponents' failure to explain their agreements is entitled to an adjusted score. Event staff deemed that North's double was the source of the damage rather than the failure to alert 1NT.

Director's Ruling	3♣ by S, Down 4, E/W +400
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S requested a review of the ruling. South admitted that the 3♣ bid was a rather poor choice, but that, with the right information he would never have bid 3♣. South felt that even if his side had to keep their score, E/W should not be able to keep the table result.

Panel Findings

The reviewer polled players with North's hand. All passed at every turn in the auction. When asked about the option of doubling 2♣, all thought it was a very poor choice. One said it was "asking for trouble". The reviewer then polled players with South's hand. All of those polled agreed with the initial double, none considered bidding at any point during the bidding. When asked about bidding 3♣, all thought it was extremely risky vulnerable. When asked about whether knowing that the 1NT rebid showed a strong NT affected the decision, all felt it made very little, if any difference. When asked how much is very little, all felt bidding was so likely to be wrong it was hard to judge.

The reviewer's polling showed that the misinformation was not the cause of N/S's damage. As such, the table result must stand. The reviewer felt that the initial poll may not have been conducted correctly. More importantly, event staff did not explain to N/S why the poll led to their ruling. As such, the appeal was deemed to have merit.

Panel Decision	3♣ by S, Down 4, E/W +400
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Kevin Perkins
-----------------	---------------