

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	N3
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Silver Ribbon Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Gary Zeiger
<b>Date</b>	03/13/2016	<b>Session</b>	Second Qualifying

### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Could be short
2: Shows Hearts
3: Explained as no agreement

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	11	N	Stephen Castellino
<b>Dealer</b>	S	♠ 1098	
		♥ K8532	
<b>Vul</b>	None	♦ J93	
		♣ K8	
W	Anne Brenner		E David Caprera
♠ A72			♠ KJ654
♥ 1064			♥ AQ7
♦ Q854			♦ A762
♣ 1042			♣ 9
		S	Michael Heymann
		♠ Q3	
		♥ J9	
		♦ K10	
		♣ AQJ7653	

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
3♣ by S	Down 2	E/W +100	♠ A

### Facts Determined at the Table

East/West summoned the director before the opening lead and after play of the hand. East had asked about the meaning of 2NT before passing. He had been told by South that there was “no agreement for this particular sequence. I don’t think it makes sense to play 2NT.” After the auction, North explained that he had intended this bid to be “good/bad like”. East believed his side was damaged by the lack of alert and the explanation they received.

### Director Ruling

While N/S had an agreement to play good/bad NT in other sequences, this was not one that they had an explicit agreement where it applied. Still, from partnership experience, South should have been aware it was possible that North thought it might apply and have informed E/W of this implicit agreement (Law 40B1b). However, the actual explanation that South gave (that he believed it was not to play) and the type hand implied by a good/bad NT bid are sufficiently similar that any damage to E/W was not due to misinformation (Law 40B4). Therefore, the table result was not adjusted.

<b>Director’s Ruling</b>	<b>3♣ by S, Down 2, E/W +100</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling and East, North and South attended the hearing. At screening, the director determined that East had been offered by the table director the opportunity to change their final pass once North explained that he had intended 2NT as good/bad, but East declined.

East argued that it was dangerous to bid 3♣ if 2NT was natural, since his partner might only have 4 or fewer HCP. In 3♣, the likely opening lead would be the ♥J. As the opening lead was not a club, he could inferentially place one of the

top honors in North's hand, which meant South would need the ♠Q for his opening bid. East was therefore likely to drop the Queen in order to make ten tricks. He did not recall being offered the opportunity to change his final pass.

N/S had not encountered a good/bad 2NT in the same context as this auction, but South did tell East that he did not believe the bid was natural. North did explain before the opening lead that he intended his bid as good/bad. Both North and South confirmed that the director did offer to allow East to change his final pass.

### Committee Findings

South had explained 2NT as "not to play" during the auction, and North explained it as "good/bad" prior to the opening lead. East was therefore aware that the bid was not a natural bid. He was offered the opportunity to change his final pass after being provided full disclosure but elected to not make use of the opportunity. The damage E/W suffered on the board was due to East's decisions, not to any failing by N/S to provide accurate information. Therefore the table result stands.

The AC could find no reason why this appeal was made. Accordingly, they assigned E/W an Appeal without Merit Warning.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>3♣ by S, Down 2, E/W +100</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

### Committee Members

<b>Chair</b>	Douglas Doub
<b>Member</b>	James Thurtell
<b>Member</b>	Don Kern
<b>Member</b>	Ellen Kent
<b>Member</b>	Fred King