

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	R2
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	Grand National Teams, Flight C	Event DIC	Ken Van Cleve
Date	08/06/2015	Session	Round of 16, First Session


Auction

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1♦ ¹	2♦ ²	2♠ ³	3♥
Pass	Pass	3♠	Pass
3NT	Pass	4♠	Pass
5♦	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 11-15 HCP, could be short
2: Explained as Majors
3: Explained as ♦ Raise

Hand Record

Board	7	N	440 MPS
Dealer	S	♠ 10	
		♥ A952	
		♦ AJ1072	
		♣ Q109	
Vul	Both		
W	200 MPS s		
♠ 852		E	260 MPS
♥ KJ64		♠ AKQJ97	
♦ KQ9		♥ 8	
♣ KJ5		♦ 854	
		♣ 764	
		S	450 MPS
		♠ 643	
		♥ Q1073	
		♦ 63	
		♣ A832	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
5♦ by W	Down 4	N/S +400	♠ 10

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned at the conclusion of play of the hand. North/South did not have a clear agreement about 2♦ over a Precision 1♦ opening. Therefore, the explanation that 2♦ showed the majors was misinformation

Director Ruling

Law 40B4 states that for a score to be adjusted the damage must be a consequence of the misinformation; here the damage was a result of the E/W bidding misunderstanding. Law 40B4 was not satisfied, so the director did not adjust the score.

Director's Ruling	5♦ by W, Down 4, N/S +400
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

E/W appealed the director's ruling, and all of the players attended the review. N/S said they had not firmed up any agreements about whether 2♦ in this situation should be Michaels or not since they had not encountered this kind of 1♦ opening often before.

E/W said they believed the damage to them was the result of the erroneous explanation of the 2♦ bid. East bid 2♠ and only asked about the meaning of 2♦ after he did so (at his LHO's turn to call). West explained that he believed his partner's 2♠ bid showed a diamond raise; that his partner's 3♠ bid was probably a stopper ask for 3NT; and that 4♠ showed a spade void. Neither East nor West told the reviewer they did not believe the Michaels explanation.

Panel Findings

The panel considered whether the damage to E/W was a consequence of the misinformation or mainly a result of its own bidding misunderstanding. First of all, the panel noted that E/W were not entitled to an alert to 2♦ if it was Michaels in this auction. East bid 2♠ intending it as natural apparently before he knew 2♦ was Michaels, and he made no subsequent attempt to call the director for relief if he believed he was misinformed at the point he made that choice. The fact that he did not follow correct procedure by asking about the 2♦ bid at LHO's turn actually gave him a chance to recover before it was too late. The path to the E/W misunderstanding was therefore initially completely unrelated to any misinformation. All subsequent actions and misunderstandings flowed from that. In addition to the first misunderstanding about the 2♠ bid, E/W had two more bidding misunderstandings thereafter.

The panel was therefore of the opinion that the damage to E/W was not primarily a consequence of any misinformation and upheld the director's ruling. Polling players did not seem to be a useful exercise in this case. It was noted that East had unauthorized information from his partner's explanation of 2♠ as a diamond raise, but that point became irrelevant to the ruling given the table result. As well, the unauthorized information North received from his partner's explanation of his bid as the majors did not seem to play a part in the outcome.

Panel Decision	5♦ by W, Down 4, N/S +400
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Smith
Member	Kevin Perkins
Member	Jeanne van den Meiracker