

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	N13
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----

Event	Spingold Knockout Teams	Event DIC	Matt Smith
Date	08/16/2015	Session	1 st Session, Finals

Auction

West	North	East	South
		Pass	1♠
Pass	2♣ ¹	Pass	2♠
Pass	2NT ²	Pass	3♥ ³
Pass	4♠	Pass	4NT ⁵
Pass	5♥ ⁵	Dbl	6♣
Pass	6♠	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 2+ ♣, Game Forcing
2: Relay
3: 6+ ♠
4: Keycard
5: Two Keys, no ♠Q

Hand Record

Board	2	N	Pierre Zimmermann
Dealer	E	♠ A6	
		♥ J982	
Vul	N/S	♦ Q97	
		♣ AJ52	
W	Alfredo Versace		
♠	1094		
♥	7654		
♦	1052		
♣	1073	E	Lorenzo Lauria
		♠	J5
		♥	AQ103
		♦	J643
		♣	Q64
		S	Franck Multon
		♠	KQ8732
		♥	K
		♦	AK8
		♣	K98

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
6♠ by S	Made 7	N/S +1460	♥ 5

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned at the conclusion of play of the hand. When the bidding tray returned to the North/East side of the screen following the 3♥ call, East asked for an explanation of the Alerted bid. North wrote "6♠=3♥" on his pad. East took this to mean that South held six spades and three hearts. He tried to clarify this verbally upon receiving the note, but did not receive any additional explanation. The VuGraph operator did not notice the incident and could not provide any evidence. East felt they were damaged by the incorrect explanation.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Eight players were polled as to their interpretation of the notation North had provided East. Most understood it to mean that the 3♥ call showed that South held six spades. Those who were unsure said they would have asked for additional clarification. One of the players was asked about the play of the ♥10 to the first trick, and believed it to be a good play.

Director Ruling

Based upon the player poll and Law 40B4, the director ruled that the table result would stand. East was not damaged by misinformation but rather by his own misunderstanding.

Director's Ruling	6♠ by S, Made 7, N/S +1460
--------------------------	----------------------------

The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling, and all players, as well as the E/W team captain attended the committee. The screening director noted that the TD staff had applied the spirit of the ACBL regulation that "Players who, by experience or expertise, recognize that their opponents have neglected to Alert a special agreement will be expected to protect themselves."

East believed he had been informed that South showed six spades and three hearts. He presumed the South hand was something like:

♠ KQxxxx
♥ K76
♦ A
♣ Kxx

with or without the ♠10.

He played the ♥10 in order to make it more difficult for declarer to read the distribution. East also noted that the E/W partnership rarely double cuebids because they have found that it tends to provide an advantage to the opponents and that he did so here only because he knew that declarer held three hearts. He explained that he had asked about the auction twice. East then asked the committee rhetorically how many times they were expected to ask their opponent to repeat information that had already been given.

North explained that, in response to East's question about the 3♥ bid, he wrote "6♠", then in an attempt to clarify added the "= 3♥". He noted that, in the N/S methods, the 2♣ bidder cannot hold as many as five hearts, so it would not make sense for South to be able to show three hearts. North explained that all of the communications with his screen mate were written, as his partner (properly) objects whenever he gives an oral explanation.

South suggested that with the hand East was playing him to hold, with 15 HCP, he would not have been strong enough to use Blackwood over 4♠. On the S/W side of the screen, South had written the explanation "3♥ = 6♠".

6♠ could be made with any trick one play, by ruffing out the ♥Q10. The likelihood of this was a separate matter, and would depend on whether East chose to double 5♥.

Committee Findings

The committee was shown the explanation written by North in a "blind preview" before seeing the deal and before the players arrived. Some members judged that it likely meant that the 3♥ call showed six spades, others that it showed six spades and three hearts.

*2⊕ After Resubmit at least 3
5+4, 11+H, 64 = 3♥
↓
No 4 Club*

After hearing the testimony and deliberating, a 3-2 majority of the AC members judged that North had provided accurate information, and that if it was ambiguous, East needed to request a written clarification. While East was clearly convinced within his own mind, he needed to do more to protect himself in order to receive redress. If there was no MI, there could be no reason to adjust the score, so the AC upheld the director's ruling.

The appeal was found to have substantial merit.

Committee Decision	6♠ by S, Made 7, N/S +1460
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chair	Gail Greenberg
Member	Danny Sprung
Member	Chris Moll
Member	Jan Jansma
Member	Kit Woolsey