

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b> Misinformation	<b>Case:</b> R10
--	------------------

<b>Event</b>	10K Swiss Teams	<b>Event DIC</b>	Harry Falk
<b>Date</b>	08/16/2015	<b>Session</b>	Second Final

### Auction

West	North	East	South
		1♠	Pass
2♠	2NT <sup>1</sup>	4♠	Dbl
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Explained as two suits

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>N</b>	7710 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠	J9		
		♥	J53		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>	♦	K976543		
		♣	7		
<b>W</b>	8480 MPS			<b>E</b>	9950 MPS
♠	9432			♠	AKQ85
♥	K109			♥	A642
♦	J102			♦	8
♣	Q1042			♣	AJ5
		<b>S</b>	450 MPS		
		♠	1076		
		♥	Q87		
		♦	AQ		
		♣	K9863		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
4♠X by E	Down 1	N/S +100	♥ 7

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called by East/West at the end of the hand, as it had become apparent that North's hand did not conform to the explanation given by South. The Heart lead was won by East, capturing the Jack. Declarer led a Diamond, losing to South's Queen, who then led the Ace, ruffed by Declarer in hand. A Heart was led, successfully finessing South's Queen. Declarer next finessed in Clubs, losing to South, who lead back a Club, ruffed by North. North then led a Diamond, Declarer pitching a Club, ruffed by South. Declarer then won the rest of the tricks.

### Director Ruling

When the director arrived, North/South dominated the conversation with the director, insisting that North had sorted their hand improperly, and thought they had both red suits. The director accepted this, and ruled that there had been a mistaken bid, and not misinformation, and therefore, per Law 75C, the table result was allowed to stand.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>4♠X by E, Down 1, N/S +100</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Appeal

East/West were a foreign pair, and there were language issues. They tried to tell the table director that North had insisted that her 2NT bid did not show two suits, but showed a one suited hand, weaker than a direct bid. The table director would not address this, merely saying that North had misbid, and so there was no MI. They were told they could fill out a player memo. They wanted to appeal the ruling, and finally were directed to the reviewer.

## Panel Findings

When this issue was finally addressed, the event was over, and the North/South pair was no longer present. The issue of whether or not they had the agreement of 2NT showing two suits, one suit, or no agreement was not addressed properly at the table.

Attempts to contact them were initially unsuccessful, and East/West deserved redress if there was MI, so an initial decision was made to adjust the score to 4♠X making. This was the likely result if East had been given the explanation of no agreement, as East would not assume during the play that North had both minors.

Attempts to contact North/South finally proved successful, and after conversations with North and South separately, the actual N/S agreement was determined to indeed be a two suited hand. In light of this, the table ruling of no adjustment was upheld.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>4♠X by E, Down 1, N/S +100</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Kevin Perkins
-----------------	---------------