

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	N13
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----

Event	Spingold Knockout Teams	Event DIC	Matt Smith
Date	07/30/2016	Session	Semifinals

Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1♣	1♦	1♥ ¹	Dbl
4♦	Pass	4♠	5♦
Dbl	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Spades

Hand Record

Board	7	N	Alejandro Bianchedi
Dealer	S	♠ J105	
		♥ A1042	
Vul	Both	♦ K9875	
		♣ Q	
W	Pierre Zimmermann		
♠	A		
♥	K7653		
♦	(void)		
♣	K1087652	E	Franck Multon
		♠	KQ642
		♥	J98
		♦	QJ102
		♣	4
		S	Agustin Madala
		♠	9873
		♥	Q
		♦	A643
		♣	AJ93

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♦X by N	Down 2	E/W +500	

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the end of the auction. East had alerted North about the 1♥ bid immediately. West had forgotten, and did not alert the bid until after the tray was passed back to the North/East side following his 4♦ call. At the end of the hand, South told the director he would have bid 2NT, a good diamond raise, instead of doubling if he had been properly informed. He would not have needed to bid 5♦ later.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled seven players. Two were asked about 2NT, and they felt it looked to be the normal action South would take rather than double. They felt West would still bid 4♦. If South did not later bid 5♦, E/W were likely to be down three for -800 in a doubled five-level contract in either clubs or hearts. The seven were asked what they would do, having bid 2NT earlier: three bid 5♦ and four passed. Most thought it was a very close decision.

Director Ruling

Based upon the player poll, the contract and results were changed to 75% N/S +800 (in 5♣X by W or 5♥X by E) and 25% EW +500, for 5♦x by North down two (the table result), per Laws 40B4, 21C3, and 12C1c.

Director's Ruling	75% 5♣/♥X by W/E, Down 3, N/S +800 25% 5♦X by N, Down 2, E/W +300
--------------------------	--

The Appeal

N/S requested a review of the ruling. They felt that the poll results were invalid, as the polled players did not understand N/S's methods. According to N/S, in their methods after the 2NT bid, North would pass 4♦, which would show less interest in competing. After East's 4♠ bid, South would double. This double is not penalty; rather it suggests a sacrifice unless partner has reason to pass. South admitted that this would normally have been a route to 5♦X as it was in the actual auction. He was adamant that N/S would never get a chance to reach 5♦X as West would always bid over 4♠X, having shown support for the wrong suit earlier in the auction.

E/W raised four concerns. West said that if South passed 4♠, he would as well. West asserted that nine tricks (down two) was likely in either five-level contract. West suggested South's 2NT bid would wake him up to his forgotten agreement. West further felt that South could just as well have doubled in the auction as it unfolded.

Panel Findings

The reviewer first interviewed four players to gauge the veracity of N/S's statement of their agreements regarding double in this auction. All said that this was a treatment they had all played against, particularly among European players. The reviewer then polled seven additional players, giving them the South hand. All passed initially (although one would have preferred to open), all wanted to make a good diamond raise and accepted 2NT as the agreement. Six of the seven would have doubled and one passed, using this pair's methods.

The reviewer consulted three experts to analyze the play in 5♣X or 5♥X. They did not see any reasonable line of play for declarer to take as many as nine tricks. In fact, they found seven tricks to be a significant possibility in 5♣X, which was the only contract one of them thought reasonable.

The reviewer addressed E/W's counter-arguments. 4♠ undoubled was not a possibility, as polling showed South would always double 4♠ had he raised diamonds earlier. Scoring nine tricks declaring 5♣ or 5♥ was not an achievable result for E/W. South opted for 5♦ rather than doubling 4♠ in the actual auction because he needed to avoid a disaster: he had doubled 1♥, at the time thinking he'd shown spades. If he doubled 4♠, partner might misunderstand and think the suggested sacrifice was in 5♥ (which leads to 6♦X) because North did not know about the slow alert of 1♥ on the other side of the screen. Lastly, the director's initial poll combined with the video showing the tempo of West's 4♦ call gave no evidence he would have done anything other than bid 4♦, even over South's proposed 2NT.

The contract was adjusted to 5♣X by West, (75% of the time) down 3, N/S +800, and (25% of the time) down 4, N/S +1100 per Laws 21C3, 40B4, and 12C1c.

Panel Decision	75% 5♣X by W, Down 3, N/S +800 25% 5♣X by W, Down 4, N/S +1100
-----------------------	---

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Koltnow
-----------------	--------------