

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	R2
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	Bruce Life Master Pairs	Event DIC	Mike Roberts
Date	07/22/2016	Session	First Qualifying


Auction

West	North	East	South
			1♣
1♦	1♠	Dbl ¹	Rdbl ²
Pass	Pass	2♣	Pass
2♦	2♠	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Explained as penalty
2: Three card ♠ support

Hand Record

Board	23	N	2000 MPS		
Dealer	S	♠	A10963		
		♥	K83		
		♦	1097		
		♣	104		
Vul	Both			W	2650 MPS
				E	900 MPS
				♠	874
				♥	Q10754
				♦	K
		♣	K953		
		S	2350 MPS		
		♠	K52		
		♥	A62		
		♦	AJ3		
		♣	Q876		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
2♠ by N	Made 2	N/S +110	♦ K

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the conclusion of the play. At the end of the auction, North asked what the E/W agreement was concerning East's double. He was told that it was a penalty double. East had intended the call to show hearts. During the play, North finessed East for the ♠Q and claimed he would be less likely to make that play had he not received that explanation.

Director Ruling

There was not sufficient documentation provided by E/W to serve as evidence that the double was penalty by agreement (Law 75C: "the Director is to presume mistaken explanation, rather than mistaken call, in the absence of evidence to the contrary."). The directors ruled that the misinformation provided resulted in damage to N/S, and adjusted the score to 2♠ by North making three, N/S +140 (Laws 47E2b and 12C1).

Director's Ruling	2♠ by N, Made 3, N/S +140
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

E/W appealed the director's ruling. All players attended the review. The reviewer discovered that North's question actually occurred after dummy was spread. The play had been ♦K won in dummy with the ace; low spade to West's jack and declarer's ace; ♠9 from declarer ducked around to West's queen. Declarer lost that trick, the ♦Q and a diamond ruff by East, and two clubs.

E/W are a long-standing and regular partnership. Their convention cards were fully completed. Responsive doubles were noted. West thought they had discussed that responsive doubles applied only when the same suit was raised, therefore the default for East's double was penalty; East did not recall such a discussion. East intended his double as responsive showing hearts, not specifically Snapdragon. There was no notation of Snapdragon doubles on the convention cards.

North told the reviewer that when he saw dummy he wondered if the double was Snapdragon, thus prompting his question. When asked what he thought of the auction with that explanation he said he thought it made sense even though it looked a bit weird. He thought it was possible that the double could have been made on a four card suit headed by the queen, and the redouble sent East running. He maintained he would not have played the spade suit the way he did if he had not been told the double was penalty.

E/W were asked why they were appealing the director's ruling. West said that they believed the convention cards supported that their real agreement for the double was penalty.

Panel Findings

The panel first addressed whether there had been any misinformation. Given that East's understanding of what his double meant was different than West's, and that he did not recall a discussion about what it meant in the situation where RHO bids a different suit than opener, the panel agreed with the directors that misinformation occurred. West told North that an agreement existed and that it was penalty when in fact no such agreement seemed to exist.

The panel then decided to investigate whether the misinformation caused damage to North in the play to 2♠. The reviewer gave the hand as a single dummy problem to two peers of North. Both assumed without asking that the double showed hearts, but did not think it unusual to ask. When each was told that the double was described as penalty, neither found the explanation unusual. Both won the diamond ace and played a spade to the ace and ducked the ten through East losing to West's queen. When told afterward that there really was no such agreement, neither wanted to finesse East for the spade queen for fear of a diamond ruff.

Based on this information, the panel concluded that North was damaged by the misinformation he received and that he would have made nine tricks in its absence. The panel upheld the directors' ruling. The appeal was found to have merit.

Panel Decision	2♠ by N, Made 3, N/S +140
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Smith
Member	Jenni Carmichael
Member	Brian Weikle
Member	Matt Koltnow