

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	R4
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	2 nd Thursday Fast Pairs	Event DIC	Charles MacCracken
Date	08/11/2015	Session	First

Auction

West	North	East	South
	1♥	Pass	1NT ¹
Dbl	3♥ ²	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Forcing
2: Alerted – Very Good Hand

Hand Record

Board	1	N	4130 MPS		
Dealer	N	♠ 8	♥ KQJ10653		
Vul	None	♦ AQ32	♣ 3		
W	7250 MPS			E	7550 MPS
♠ AK105				♠ J972	
♥ A9				♥ 7	
♦ K54				♦ 10876	
♣ AJ109			♣ K842		
		S	6940 MPS		
		♠ Q643			
		♥ 842			
		♦ J9			
		♣ Q765			

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3♥ by N	Made 3	N/S +140	♠ 2

Facts Determined at the Table

East/West called the Director at the end of play and stated they had been misinformed. The North hand was not nearly as strong as they had been led to believe. They had been told that the 3♥ rebid showed a very good hand, not quite as strong as a 2♣ opener. If West had known the North hand could have been this weak, they would have doubled again.

Director Ruling

The table result stands. The North hand is a 4/5 loser hand, less than a 2♣ opener, but a very good hand, thus E/W had not been misinformed.

Director's Ruling	3♥ by N, Made 3, N/S +140
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

All four players attended the review. North/South had these agreements.

- 1) An opening 2♦ bid is 18-19 HCP, with no singleton or void.
- 2) They have two ways of showing a standard 1M-1NT-3M type hand, with shortness.
 - a. 1♥-1NT-2NT-3?-3♥ shows a weaker version of a standard 3♥ rebid.
 - b. 1♥-1NT-3♥ shows the top end of their range.

North judged that the trick taking power of this hand put it in the upper range.

E/W said they were told North would have at least 15-16 HCP. If West had known the HCP could be lowered with compensating tricks, he would have reopened with a double. N/S did not dispute that South's explanation had included 15-16 HCP.

Panel Findings

Six of West's peers were polled. They were given a precise explanation of the N/S agreements, and all doubled again. They were then given the explanation given at the table.

Three said they would still double, but were less optimistic about the hand. Two said they didn't care about the explanation. One peer actually changed the call to a pass.

Based on this input, the Panel decided that MI was present, and that E/W had been damaged by the MI. Three peers were polled about South's action if West had reopened with a double, and East had bid 3♠. Two would have passed, citing ♠Qxxx as useless on offense, but valuable on defense. The Panel adjusted the contract to 3♠ by East, making 3, E/W +140.

Panel Decision	3♠ by E, Made 3, E/W +140
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Gary Zeiger
Member	David Metcalf
Member	Kevin Perkins