

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------|-----|
| Subject of Appeal: | Misinformation/Unauthorized Information | Case: | N14 |
|---------------------------|---|--------------|-----|

| | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Event | Roth Open Swiss Teams | Event DIC | Kevin Perkins |
| Date | 07/30/2016 | Session | First Semifinal |

Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

| |
|----------------------------|
| 1: 15-17 HCP |
| 2: Penalty |
| 3: Explained as a transfer |
| |
| |
| |
| |

Hand Record

| Board | 25 | N | Neil Silverman | | |
|---------------|-----------------|--|----------------|----------|-----------|
| Dealer | N | ♠ | J8654 | | |
| | | ♥ | 54 | | |
| Vul | E/W | ♦ | Q754 | | |
| | | ♣ | 76 | | |
| W | Joel Wooldridge |  | | E | John Hurd |
| ♠ | KQ | | | ♠ | 10972 |
| ♥ | K1076 | | | ♥ | Q932 |
| ♦ | AJ102 | | | ♦ | 6 |
| ♣ | QJ9 | | | ♣ | A1083 |
| | | S | Jeff Wolfson | | |
| | | ♠ | A3 | | |
| | | ♥ | AJ8 | | |
| | | ♦ | K983 | | |
| | | ♣ | K542 | | |

| Final Contract | Result of Play | Score | Opening Lead |
|----------------|----------------|----------|--------------|
| 2♥ by S | Down 4 | E/W +200 | |

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the end of the auction. North told the director that 2♦ should have been explained as diamonds and a major. Away from the table, East said he would have doubled 2♦ for takeout with that information.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Staff followed up on the claim of MI. Players who were asked found a takeout double a very reasonable action by East. Staff considered auction continuations after South bid 2♥, as he felt he was accepting the transfer. One continued 2♥-Dbl-2♠-Dbl-All Pass; another possibility was 2♥-Dbl-2♠-Dbl-3♦-Dbl-All Pass. Three experts were consulted to analyze the play in 2♠X and 3♦X. They felt it overwhelmingly likely that each contract would be down two.

Director Ruling

Based upon the player poll, the directors judged that the MI had damaged E/W. Accordingly, the director assigned the score of 50% of 2♠X by North, down two, E/W +300 and 50% of 3♦X by North, down two, E/W +300, per Laws 40B4, 21C3, and 12C1c.

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Director's Ruling | 50% 3♦X by N, Down 2, E/W +300 50% 2♠X by N, Down 2, E/W +300 |
|--------------------------|--|

The Appeal

N/S requested a review of the ruling. They felt the play in 2♠ was not analyzed correctly.

Panel Findings

The reviewer felt the table director did not address the unauthorized information aspect of the ruling, so he began the ruling process anew.

North was in possession of UI from partner's explanation of 2♦ as a transfer. The reviewer asked three players about what an auction of Pass-Pass-1NT-Dbf-2♦-Pass-2♥-Pass-2♠ might show.

One said it was not possible that North was trying to show an invitational hand (because of the penalty double), but two indicated that this sequence might well have a conventional meaning to N/S and could easily lead to a large penalty playing a doubled contract at the three-level. Five players were polled with the North hand after partner's 2♥ call; all of them bid 2♠ and questioned how anyone could ever bid anything else, having shown diamonds and a major, with partner's 2♥ bid being pass-or-correct. Three additional players were given the South hand. All of them bid 2♥ and corrected 2♠ to 3♦, feeling that it was clear N/S were having an accident and that North held diamonds and spades.

Lastly, several players assisted in the analysis of 3♦X. The Reviewer accepted the analysis of the expert who felt that while six or eight tricks were possible about 10% of the time, a result of seven tricks was a clear majority result. The reviewer elected not to give any weight to those two scores and adjusted the score to 3♦X by North, down two, E/W +300. based upon Laws 16B and 12C1c.

Experts consulted: several; Barry Rigal was the Reviewer's play analyst.

| | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Panel Decision | 3♦X by N, Down 2, E/W +300 |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|

Panel Members

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