

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	R2
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Wednesday Daylight Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Steve Kaessner
<b>Date</b>	03/16/2016	<b>Session</b>	First

### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Preemptive
2: Multiple questions about 4♣

### Hand Record

Board	4	N	1170 MPS
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠ 72	♥ K97652
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>	♦ AJ92	♣ 2
<b>W</b>	15040 MPS		
♠ A96		<b>E</b>	4830 MPS
♥ A84		♠ KQJ43	♥ QJ103
♦ KQ108		♦ (void)	♦ (void)
♣ 1064		♣ KQJ7	♣ KQJ7
		<b>S</b>	1071 MPS
		♠ 1085	
		♥ (void)	
		♦ 76543	
		♣ A9853	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♠ by E	Down 2	N/S +200	♣ A

### Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was called after the hand was played. Following South's double, North asked several question about the 4♣ bid. E/W questioned whether the club lead should be allowed after North's questions.

### Director Ruling

North's questions about the 4♣C bid created unauthorized information for South. Per Law 16B1, "After a player makes available to his partner extraneous information that may suggest a call or play, as for example, by a remark, a question, a reply to a question... the partner may not choose from among logical alternatives one that could demonstrably have been suggested over another by the extraneous information." A poll of South's peers indicated a diamond lead was not only a logical alternative, but the majority choice. The Director adjusted the result to 4♠S, by East, making 5, after a diamond lead, E/W +650, per Law 12C1e.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>4♠ by E, Made 5, E/W +650</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Appeal

N/S appealed, and all four players attended the Review. Both sides agreed to the following description of what occurred at the table.

North questioned the 4♣ bid. The first reply was "cuebid." North requested further clarification. West said the partnership had not discussed whether the cue showed first round control, or could be second round. North asked if it could be a suit. West shrugged, saying the bid promised a control, nothing about length.

North said that because of his stiff club, he was concerned that 4♣X might make, resulting in a worse score than a 4♥X sacrifice. The players all agreed that North thought for several seconds more before finally passing. North said he

actually wanted a diamond lead, through dummy, so he could shift to a club through declarer. South said she didn't want to lead a diamond because that was dummy's suit.

E/W argued that, after the 4♣ bid, a club lead might be a disaster, setting up declarer's king, except for the UI generated by the questions asked.

### Panel Findings

The Director's poll had clearly established a non-club lead as a logical alternative, as did the results on the board, which were making five, 30 out of 35 times that 4♣ was the contract. The salient issue was whether a club lead was suggested, for this class of player, by the UI.

Ten peers of South were consulted. All were taken through the auction. Only one would have doubled 4♣, especially since this hand would likely be on lead, but all were fine with the call. Seven of the ten led a diamond or a spade, two led the ♣A. After choosing a lead, all were asked if questions by partner would help them make a lead decision. Five out of ten deduced that partner's questions and thought before passing 4♣X were indications that partner might be short in clubs, making the ♣A a more attractive lead.

Based on this information, the Panel decided that North's questions had created UI, which demonstrably suggested a club lead. Per Law 16B1, the Panel assigned a result of 4♣ by East, making 5 after a diamond lead, E/W +650.

Since the Director hadn't properly addressed whether the questions asked actually demonstrably suggested the club lead, the Panel decided it was reasonable for N/S to think they didn't, and to therefore pursue an appeal. For this reason, the Panel decided the appeal had merit.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>4♣ by E, Made 5, E/W +650</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Gary Zeiger
<b>Member</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Member</b>	Kevin Perkins