

Subject of Appeal:	Unauthorized Information	Case:	N6
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Truscott Senior Swiss Teams	Event DIC	Tom Marsh
Date	08/11/2015	Session	Second Final


Auction

West	North	East	South
1NT ¹	Pass	Pass	2♦ ²
Pass	Pass	Db1 ³	2♥
Db1 ³	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 12 -14 HCP
2: Intended as Transfer
3: Penalty

Hand Record

Board	28	N	Craig Jacobson		
Dealer	W	♠	Q1098		
		♥	Q9		
Vul	N/S	♦	10862		
		♣	K108		
W	Michael Efraim			E	Hirsh Schnayer
♠	KJ4			♠	A53
♥	A765			♥	43
♦	74			♦	KJ95
♣	AJ52	♣	Q974		
		S	Alexander Weiland		
		♠	762		
		♥	KJ1082		
		♦	AQ3		
		♣	63		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
2♥X by S	Made 4	N/S +1070	♠ 4

Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was summoned at the end of the hand. South's 2♦ bid was intended as a transfer to hearts, but the actual North/South agreement is that in the balancing seat it is natural. East asked about the 2♦ bid prior to doubling. South did not ask the meaning of the double.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Four expert players were polled by being given the South hand without the MI and all four passed after the double by East.

Director Ruling

East/West received the correct explanation so there was no misinformation (MI). However, South had unauthorized information (UI) when partner failed to alert 2♦. Per Laws 12C1 and 16B1, the Director adjusted the result to 2♦X by South, down 1, E/W +200

Director's Ruling	2♦X by S, Down 1, E/W +200
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

North/South appealed the ruling and all four players attended the hearing. South assumed that the double of 2♦ was for penalty without asking. He felt that on that basis there was authorized information that his partner had not interpreted 2♦ as a transfer, since he would have at most four diamonds and not the 6-card suit necessary to fail to accept

the transfer. North said that he passed the double of 2♥ because he was not sure that South had diamonds and hearts and was allowing for a misunderstanding. North/South also questioned whether East/West's defense to 2♥X, allowing two overtricks instead of holding it to two, would affect the result in 2♦X if that were the assigned contract.

Committee Findings

The Appeals Committee (AC) determined that both the failure to alert and the explanation of "natural" were UI to South. The AC did not agree that North needed 6 diamonds to pass 2♦ if transfers were in effect, especially since 5-card length was apparently acceptable for the real suit. There were holdings such as 3-0-5-5, 4-0-5-4 and perhaps even 4-1-5-3 where North might pass 2♦ rather than bid 2♥. Furthermore, it was entirely possible that East's double was negative, in which case North could have 6 diamonds and would deliberately pass the transfer. By failing to ascertain what East's double meant or what the minimum trump holding would be for a penalty double, South clearly acted on the basis of UI in removing to 2♥. Therefore, the table ruling was affirmed, 2♦X by South, down 1, N/S -200.

The AC judged that the number of tricks taken against 2♥X was not relevant in assigning a score in 2♦X. No favorable result was available for East/West in 2♥X (therefore, the concept of "egregious error" by the non-offending side did not apply) and under Law 12.C the normal result of down one in 2♦X met the standards for both the offending side and the non-offending side. The AC determined that North/South presented no evidence as to why the Director's ruling should be overturned and issued an Appeal without Merit Warning.

Committee Decision	2♦X by S, Down 1, E/W +200
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chair	Ron Gerard
Member	Greg Herman
Member	Scott Stearns
Member	Patty Tucker
Member	Ed Lazarus