

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	R5
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	10K Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Charlie MacCracken
<b>Date</b>	07/23/2016	<b>Session</b>	Second Qualifying


### Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
Pass	1NT <sup>1</sup>	2♣ <sup>2</sup>	Dbl <sup>3</sup>
3♣	3♠	Pass	4♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 11-14 HCP
2: Explained as DONT
3: Stayman

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>27</b>	N	3550 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>S</b>	♠	AJ103		
		♥	K103		
		♦	KJ		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>	♣	7642		
W	5800 MPS			E	5500 MPS
♠	984			♠	Q5
♥	J8652			♥	Q94
♦	105			♦	A86432
♣	KJ9	♣	A8		
		S	2900 MPS		
		♠	K762		
		♥	A7		
		♦	Q97		
		♣	Q1053		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
4♠ by N	Down 2	E/W +100	

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after play was over and East disclosed the actual partnership agreement of 2♣ as showing a one suited hand. North said that he would not have bid 3♣ had he been given a correct explanation of 2♣. He said that the auction with the given explanation marked his partner with very short clubs, which was no longer true with the correct explanation

### Director Ruling

The director ruled that E/W had gained an advantage because of the misinformation and awarded an adjusted score per Law 21B3 and Law 12. The director ruled that if North had passed 3♣, East would be required to pass because of the unauthorized information. It was judged that East would take four tricks in that contract. The score was adjusted to 3♣ by East, down 5, N/S +250.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3♣ by E, Down 5, N/S +250</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling and were the only players to attend the review. They said that North had no reason to assume his partner had four spades from the actual auction. They added that South did have the four spades that North had hoped for and that North/South were still too high because North overbid.

## Panel Findings

The reviewer polled 4 players between 3000 and 5000 masterpoints each. With the information given at the table, three of the players bid 3♣ with the North hand and one passed. When given the correct information, the three players who bid 3♣ with the North hand all changed their call to pass. All four players indicated that bidding with the North hand was much more attractive with the original explanation because South was now marked with short clubs. The panel therefore upheld the director's original ruling of 3♣ by East, down 5, N/S +250.

Because there was no player polling involved in the original ruling, and because the reviewer was not able to poll players until after he met with East/West, the panel judged the review to have merit.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>3♣ by E, Down 5, N/S +250</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Eric Bell
<b>Member</b>	Marilyn Wells
<b>Member</b>	Kevin Perkins