

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	R1
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	Grand National Teams, Flight B	Event DIC	Ken Van Cleve
Date	08/05/2015	Session	Qualifying Swiss, Match 2

Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	1♣ ¹
1NT ²	2♦ ³	Pass	2♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Strong, Artificial, Forcing
2: Explained - Natural, Strong
3: 5 -8 HCP, Natural

Hand Record

Board	17	N	2100 MPS		
Dealer	N	♠ 3	♥ 743		
Vul	None	♦ KQ976	♣ J743		
W	2230 MPS			E	2000 MPS
♠ 2	♥ J102			♠ AJ9765	
♦ J8	♣ AKQ10862			♥ 9865	
				♦ 104	
		S	1900 MPS		
		♠ KQ1084	♥ AKQ		
		♦ A532	♣ 5		
				♣ 9	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
2♠ by S	Made 2	N/S +110	♣ A

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the end of the hand. South asked about the 1NT overcall at his turn and was told it was natural and strong. He likely suspected this was not the actual agreement but did not seek further clarification. Both opponent convention cards were marked "DONT v. strong 1♣", with the actual agreement being a one suited hand.

Director Ruling

Law 40B4 states that, "a side that is damaged as a consequence of its opponents' failure to provide disclosure of a call or play as these Laws require is entitled to an adjusted score." While N/S received misinformation, it was their lack of understanding about 2♠ that caused the damage. South clearly intended 2♠ as forcing holding Axxx of diamonds; North chose not to bid again. This was the source of damage, therefore no adjustment.

Director's Ruling	2♠ by S, Made 2, N/S +110
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

N/S appealed the director's ruling. All players attended the review. N/S confirmed that 1♣ promised 16+ HCP. The reviewer confirmed what the table director saw on the E/W convention cards. Both East and West said that by prior agreement the notation of "DONT" meant 1NT promised a one-suiter. East said she simply forgot the agreement. There was no mention by East of the required point count for what she described as a strong 1NT overcall.

N/S said the explanation prevented them from bidding a making game. When asked what they thought of the explanation of 1NT, they said they were suspicious of it. When asked why, if they were suspicious, they did not investigate further by looking at a convention card, North said they thought it would be rude to do so after hearing East answer a

direct question about it. South said they didn't believe they had to investigate further even in light of their doubts about the information they were given. They said they thought they only needed to investigate further if the answer was ambiguous, and this answer was not.

N/S were asked about their agreements regarding whether 2♠ was forcing. South said he believed it was; North obviously thought it was not. They said that the ostensibly unusual meaning of the 1NT bid caused them to have a misunderstanding that would not have occurred if they were given correct information. When asked if a rebid by opener in a different but analogous auction would be forcing (1♣-1♣-2♦-P-2♥), they did not seem to have a firm agreement. They did mention that the auction was different than the one presented to them at the table since the proposed auction would have a cuebid available as a force.

N/S were concerned that East's failure to bid at their turn was evidence that they were not sure of the agreement they described. East said they did not bid since they were not sure whether transfers applied or not, and did not want to risk an accident.

Panel Findings

The panel considered whether the damage to N/S was a consequence of the misinformation or mainly the result of a N/S bidding misunderstanding. Three Precision players were polled. One with 2700 points said he would have bid 3♣ with the North hand over 2♠. When asked if 2♠ was forcing to him, he said he was not sure since the N/S methods were not his own. An 1800 point player said he was very suspicious of the explanation of 1NT as strong. He thought 2♠ was probably not forcing, but also said the N/S methods were not his own. A third player with 200 points thought 2♠ was forcing, and said he believed the explanation of 1NT given at the table. All polled players said they would have an agreement about whether a new suit bid in this situation was forcing in their own partnerships. An expert expressed the same opinion when asked.

Although the panel had some sympathy with what happened to N/S, it believed the results of the polling indicated that the damage was the result of not having an agreement about whether 2♠ was forcing more than a result of the misinformation. Law 40B4 was not satisfied, so the director's ruling was upheld.

Panel Decision	2♠ by S, Made 2, N/S +110
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Smith
Member	Harry Falk
Member	Jeanne van den Meiracker