

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	N8
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Wernher Open Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Candace Kushner
<b>Date</b>	08/12/2015	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifying

### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 14-17 HCP
2: Initially explained as Majors

### Hand Record

Board	8	N	Ed Rauch
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠ K974	
		♥ 96	
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>	♦ A87543	
		♣ Q	
<b>W</b>	Alan Osofsky		
♠	A8		
♥	QJ1083		
♦	Q102		
♣	AJ9	<b>E</b>	Phillip Alder
		♠	Q52
		♥	A542
		♦	9
		♣	107653
		<b>S</b>	Peter Jargowsky
		♠	J1063
		♥	K7
		♦	KJ6
		♣	K842

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♣ by S	Down 2	E/W +100	♦ 9

### Facts Determined at the Table

Following the 3♣ call, South corrected the explanation of the 2♦ call from showing the majors to the correct partnership agreement of showing Diamonds and a Major. West summoned the Director following the corrected explanation, and stated that he wanted protection later as his Double had been based upon the misinformation. He then passed, which meant the Director could not roll back the auction to offer East the chance to change his bid based upon the corrected explanation (Law 21B1a). Following the conclusion of play, West contended that he would have bid 3♥ over 2♠, rather than Double, if he had received the correct explanation of the opponents' methods.

### Director Ruling

As West had elected to pass over 3♣ instead of bidding when they had the correct information about the opponents' methods, it was deemed unlikely that they would have bid 3♥ over 2♠ with the proper information. Therefore, the table result (3♣ by South, down 2, E/W +100) stood.

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

### The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling and attended the Committee hearing. West stated that he would have taken a different action at his second turn to call if he had not been misinformed as to the opponents' methods. West did not believe that he needed to bring hearts into the auction once he received the correct information, which is why he passed following 3♣.

## Committee Findings

West stated that he would have taken a different action if he had received proper information at his second turn to call. However, at his third turn to call, with proper information and little new information, he elected to not take the action he had claimed he wished to have taken at the earlier opportunity. West did not claim that bidding 3♥ at his third turn would have been inconsistent with his initial double as a rationale for passing, despite being given an opportunity to do so. East did not mention a desire to have changed his call when provided with the correct information.

Thus, while the indicated actions by E/W may have happened had the correct information been available from the start, their actual actions at the table were not consistent with that scenario. This suggests that the proposed actions were unlikely. Also, it was considered likely that N/S would have still reached 3♠ even with the heart overcall. Therefore, the table result was confirmed.

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

## Committee Members

<b>Chair</b>	Chris Moll
<b>Member</b>	James Thurtell
<b>Member</b>	Greg Herman