

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	N1
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	Smith Women's LM Pairs	Event DIC	Brian Russell
Date	11/28/2014	Session	Second Qualifying


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 14-16 HCP
2: 3+ ♣ & 5 card Major
3: Stayman
4: Intended as "Pick a Major"

Hand Record

Board	9	N	Cheri Bjerkan
Dealer	N	♠ J1043	
		♥ AQ92	
Vul	E/W	♦ 9842	
		♣ 9	
W	Judi Radin		E Stacey Jacobs
♠ AQ86			♠ K9
♥ 8			♥ J54
♦ A7653			♦ KQJ10
♣ QJ8			♣ A1074
		S Rozanne Pollack	
		♠ 752	
		♥ K10763	
		♦ (void)	
		♣ K6532	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by E	Down 1	N/S +100	♥ 6

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned at the conclusion of play of the hand. North explained that she had intended her 3♦ call as "Pick a Major" which had not been Alerted. South said that the partnership did have that agreement, but that she did not think it applied over a Double of her 2♣ call. East, when asked about her action if there had been an Alert, stated that she would have Doubled instead of passing. With this change in the auction, following the 3♥ bid by North, West would have bid 5♦, ending the auction.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Three players were polled concerning the decision to pass with the East hand over 3♦ without an Alert. All thought Pass was a poor choice, but not an egregious action. Three additional players were polled as to the likely lead from the North hand against a 5♦ contract, based upon the postulated auction if an Alert had been given. The majority choice would have allowed the contract to make.

Director Ruling

Per Law 75C, directors are instructed to assume a mistaken explanation and misinformation rather than a mistaken call, barring evidence to the contrary, in cases where the non-offending side fails to receive proper information about conventional calls. There was a failure to Alert, and based upon polling, it was deemed that damage did occur that was a direct result of the failure. Accordingly, per Laws 21B3, 12C1e, and 40B4, the result was changed to 5♦ by West, making 5, E/W +600.

Director's Ruling	5♦ by W, Made 5, E/W +600
--------------------------	---------------------------

The Appeal

The North/South players appealed the director's ruling, and were the only ones to attend the committee. In their methods, 3♦ in response to 2♣, without an intervening double, would ask partner to bid their major. North believed that it should apply over a double as well; South judged that it did not. The pair had not discussed whether the artificial meaning of 3♦ would apply following a double. They did have the agreement that, following a double, 2♦ would be natural. They felt that the result at the table was due to two poor bids by East: her failure to Double 3♦ and her decision to bid 3NT.

Committee Findings

When players adopt a convention, it is not at all uncommon for them to fail to discuss the meaning of their bids when the opponents intervene. Players then have to use judgment as to what a bid should mean and how their partner will interpret it. On this hand, North and South judged differently. They did not fail to Alert East/West of a confirmed partnership agreement, and thus were not guilty of misinformation. Therefore, the table result was restored.

Committee Decision	3NT by E, Down 1, N/S +100
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chair	Douglas Doub
Member	Lou Reich
Member	Fred King
Member	Patty Tucker
Member	David Stevenson