

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	R3
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Young 5K Life Master Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Mike Roberts
<b>Date</b>	07/24/2016	<b>Session</b>	Second Final

### Auction

West	North	East	South
		1♠	Pass
2♥	Pass	3♣	Pass
3♠	Pass	3NT <sup>1</sup>	Pass
4♦ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	5♣ <sup>2</sup>	Pass
5♥ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	6♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Trump Cuebid, No Alert
2: Control Cuebid

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>N</b>	2930 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠	942		
		♥	Q5		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>	♦	Q109876		
		♣	106		
<b>W</b>	1520 MPS			<b>E</b>	3320 MPS
♠	K76			♠	AQJ105
♥	AKJ1087			♥	64
♦	K			♦	J4
♣	Q94			♣	AK32
		<b>S</b>	4680 MPS		
		♠	83		
		♥	932		
		♦	A532		
		♣	J875		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
6♠ by E	Made 7	E/W +1460	♠ 3

### Facts Determined at the Table

At the end of the auction, 3NT was explained as a trump cue bid (not alerted). South inquired about the 4♦ bid, which was explained as a cue bid. When South inquired further, East described the 4♦ bid as first round control.

At the end of the hand, South summoned the director and claimed he would have led the ♦A if he had been told it could be a second round control. East/West insisted the explanation was correct. When pressed further by the table director as to why West bid 4♦, he replied, "Because it seemed like the best bid."

### Director Ruling

The legal question for the table director was if the explanation provided correlates with the partnership agreement. East/West's first line of defense that they correctly explained the agreement was by pointing to the lack of Italian cue bids on the card. That was not sufficient for the table director, who originally concluded that the explanation was incorrect.

Later on, however, East/West produced system notes that explicitly demonstrated the 4♦ bid showed first round control. Based on the production of system notes, the director ruled there was no misinformation or other legal infraction, and the table result was allowed to stand (Law 75C).

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>6♠ by E, Made 7, E/W +1460</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Appeal

North/South appealed the ruling. All players appeared at the review. Only South disputed the ruling (North said nothing unless asked a specific question of fact by the reviewer). South did not dispute that the system notes were consistent with the explanation of the 4♦ bid proffered by East.

When asked by the reviewer why in South's opinion the director was incorrect in his ruling, South said that first round control was not the agreement. When presented with the system notes, South said that since West bid 4♦, that means first round control cannot be their agreement. When asked by the reviewer if it was South's belief that a player can never deviate from a partnership agreement, he restated that it cannot be their agreement if West bid 4♦.

### Panel Findings

The Panel upheld the ruling of 6♠ by East, making 7, E/W +1460. South's position that East/West did not properly state their agreement, not only belies the best evidence that East/West did in fact accurately describe their agreement (the system notes) but also ignores the law that explicitly allows a player to deviate from his announced understandings always, provided the partner has no more reason to be aware of the deviation than the opponents (Law 40C1). Moreover, no player has any obligation to disclose to his opponents that he has deviated from his announced methods (Law 40C2). South's argument, taken to its logical conclusion, means that once a partnership reaches an agreement, the partners are never allowed to make a call contrary to the agreement. The laws specifically allow players to deviate from their agreements. Such a deviation does not vitiate the agreement.

The panel considered whether the appeal had merit. South did not contest the contents of the system notes; South simply refused to accept the director's ruling. South presented no new information or evidence that the ruling was incorrect. Thus, the panel issued an Appeal without Merit Warning to North/South.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>6♠ by E, Made 7, E/W +1460</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Scott Humphrey
<b>Member</b>	Eric Bell
<b>Member</b>	Kevin Perkins