

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b> Misinformation	<b>Case:</b> R2
--	-----------------

<b>Event</b>	10K IMP Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Peter Wilke
<b>Date</b>	11/30/2015	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifying

### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 10-12 HCP
2: Strong, 15-17 HCP
3: Explained as minors

### Hand Record

Board	17	N	5600 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ 652	♥ K32		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>	♦ Q32	♣ KQ65		
<b>W</b>	1900 MPS			<b>E</b>	400 MPS
♠ A87	♥ AQJ104			♠ KJ4	♥ 98
♦ 1098	♣ 87			♦ AK6	♣ A10942
		<b>S</b>	5700 MPS		
		♠ Q1093	♥ 765		
		♦ J754	♣ J3		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4NT by E	Down 1	N/S +50	♥ 7

### Facts Determined at the Table

The opening lead was ducked to the king, and the ♠K return was also ducked. A low club exit by North was ducked to South's jack. South played a diamond to the queen and ace. Declarer then played the club ace. When South showed out, the director was called.

North/South stated that they use their defense to a strong 1NT opening as their runout over a penalty double of their 10-12 1NT. South stated he forgot their agreement when he bid 2♣, which he meant as the start of a scramble sequence. However, the agreement that 2♣ showed both minors over a double of 1NT could not be verified on the N/S convention cards, and they did not have system notes.

### Director Ruling

The table director initially ruled that South had forgotten the agreement that 2♣ showed both minors. Since this would not be an infraction of law per Law 75C, he allowed the table result to stand. However, because North/South could not provide evidence of this agreement, the director then presumed that the explanation was incorrect rather than the call and changed his ruling per Laws 75B, 75C, and 12B1 to 4NT by East, making 4, E/W +430.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>4NT by E, Made 4, E/W +430</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Appeal

North/South appealed the ruling and attended the review, although East and West both spoke with the reviewer prior to the review. North/South felt that their explanation of 2♣ was correct according to their understanding, and that the Declarer's play of the hand should not have been affected by the meaning of the 2♣ bid.

## Panel Findings

The Panel noted that after the return of the ♣K, ten tricks were available by winning the king with the ace and driving out the remaining club honors, since all other suits were still at least double-stopped. They polled five players ranging between 1100 and 8000 MP, and all five players won the ♣K with the ace at trick two and made 4NT. None of the polled players indicated that either possible explanation of the 2♣ bid had any impact on the chosen line of play.

The Panel therefore ruled that although there was misinformation given to East as defined in Law 75B, the damage to E/W was self-inflicted and unrelated to the misinformation. The Panel therefore restored the table result of 4NT by East, down one, N/S +50.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>4NT by E, Down 1, N/S +50</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Eric Bell
<b>Member</b>	Matt Smith
<b>Member</b>	David Metcalf