

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation/Unauthorized Information	Case:	N12
---------------------------	-----------------------------------------	--------------	-----

Event	Roth Open Swiss Teams	Event DIC	Kevin Perkins
Date	07/29/2016	Session	Second Qualifying

Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Explained as natural
2: Break in Tempo

Hand Record

Board	35	N	Alan Watson		
Dealer	S	♠	AK53		
		♥	KQ9		
Vul	E/W	♦	K854		
		♣	63		
W	Michal Nowosadzki			E	Jacek Kalita
♠	9764			♠	QJ
♥	A432			♥	J76
♦	A73			♦	J
♣	K7			♣	AJ109542
		S	Melody Bi		
		♠	1082		
		♥	1085		
		♦	Q10962		
		♣	Q8		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by W	Down 5	N/S +500	♠ A

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the end of the hand. South had intended her 2♣ call as Stayman. E/W felt they were damaged by a mistaken explanation of 2♣ and perhaps by unauthorized information.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Ten players were given the South hand. After 2♣ was doubled, six passed and four bid 2♦. Of the passers, some considered North had a club suit of his own, others thought he might have psyched 1NT. Even if those who thought partner had psyched are excluded, Pass is a logical alternative. Players who were asked what they thought the UI suggested said that it made 2♦ more attractive. Four players were given the North hand and an auction where South passed 2♣X; all four passed.

Director Ruling

South had UI from North's explanation of 2♣ as natural, and the player poll showed that pass was a logical alternative to bidding. E/W made the statement that if 2♣X did get redoubled, they would then play the club suit correctly (drop the ♠Q) in 3NT, as North would never run from 2♣X with ♠Qxx. The contract and result were adjusted to 2♣X by South, down four, E/W +800, per Laws 16B1 and 12C1c.

Director's Ruling	2♣X by S, Down 4, E/W +800
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S requested a review of the ruling. South said she could understand playing in 2♣ undoubled, but the implied diamond fit (as partner had overcalled 1NT over 1♦) had to be a better place to play. North said he was comfortable passing 2♣ undoubled, particularly at this vulnerability, but that he was never going to pass 2♣X. He mentioned East's break in tempo before doubling gave him ample reason to believe 2♣X was not a good spot for N/S.

Panel Findings

The reviewer conducted further polling. His first concern was the element of the ruling that South would not work out that N/S were having an accident absent the UI. The first consultant indeed passed 2♣X, so he felt the original poll was likely valid. His second concern was the element of the ruling that North would not work out that N/S were having an accident. North has no UI; evidence was collected to gauge the likelihood that North would pass 2♣X. Four players were polled, given what was known of the N/S system. Two redoubled, saying that it was clear we were having some sort of accident and there had to be a better place to play. One passed and assumed that we were in the right place or partner would have bid differently. One thought pass was correct unless he suspected we were having an accident; if it was more than a small possibility of that, he would redouble.

The reviewer assembled a panel of TDs and presented the facts of the original ruling and the supplemental polling. The panel felt it was certain that if North redoubled, E/W would reach 3NT and would make either nine or ten tricks there. The panel felt North would work out that N/S were having an accident about half the time. They also felt EW would take nine tricks or ten tricks each about half the time. Therefore the contract and result were changed to 50% of 2♣X by South, down 4, EW +800, 25% of 3NT by East or West making 3, E/W +400, and 25% of 3NT by East or West making 4, E/W +430, per Laws 16B1, 40B4, and 12C1c.

Experts Consulted: David Bakhshi, Nick Jacob, Roger Lee, David Grainger

Panel Decision	50% 2♣X by S, Down 4, E/W +800 25% 3NT by W, Made 3, E/W +400 25% 3NT by W, Made 4, E/W +430
-----------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Koltnow
Member	Ken Horwedel
Member	Eric Bell
Member	David Metcalf