

Subject of Appeal: Misinformation	Case: N10
--	------------------

Event	Truscott Senior Swiss Teams	Event DIC	Tom Marsh
Date	07/22/2014	Session	Second Final

Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: No Alert

Hand Record

Board	13	N	William Wickham		
Dealer	N	♠	QJ108762		
		♥	7		
		♦	J		
Vul	Both	♣	Q965		
W	Elaine Landow			E	Craig Robinson
♠	A9			♠	K
♥	AQ52			♥	KJ64
♦	72			♦	Q854
♣	J10874			♣	AK32
		S	Jeff Miller		
		♠	543		
		♥	10983		
		♦	AK10963		
		♣	(void)		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♠X by N	Made 4	N/S +790	♣ K

Facts Determined at the Table

After the opening lead was faced and dummy tabled, East asked South if they played McCabe, to which South replied affirmatively. East called the director as South qualified his confirmation with "over Weak Twos". South stated he had made a tactical bid hoping to get a club ruff. The director instructed the players to continue play and returned to the table after play of the hand was over.

East questioned South's bid, and West objected to North's rebid of spades. Away from table, North stated he expected 4♣ to promise spade tolerance, but not necessarily to show clubs. His spade rebid was made knowing his partner could safely correct to 5♣. N/S is an established partnership of over 30 years' experience together.

Director Ruling

Upon consultation with the Director in Charge and another senior director, it was determined that the 4♣ bid after the Double constituted a partnership understanding per Law 40A1a. As such, there was misinformation based upon the failure to alert the 4♣ call, per Law 40A1b. E/W were damaged as East's Double was based on the MI. Per Laws 21B1, 21B3 and 40B4, the director adjusted the result to 4♠ by North, making 4, N/S +620.

Director's Ruling	4♠ by N, Made 4, N/S +620
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

Both pairs appealed the director's ruling, and North and East attended the hearing. East argued that he believed the failure to Alert the artificial 4♣ call made it impossible for E/W to find the sacrifice in 5♣ on their cards.

North argued that he had assumed his partner's call to be natural, forcing, and suggestive of a spade fit. It was on the basis of that presumed fit that he went on to 4♠.

Committee Findings

The Committee judged that West damaged her side's potential for playing in 5♣ when she did not double 4♣. However even if she had, and in fact the partnership was then aware of their club fit, it still would have been quite likely that E/W would not have elected to sacrifice. E/W had 27 high card points between their hands, which included the ace and king of spades. A double of 4♣ would still be suggested.

North said after the fact that his partner probably intended his 4♣ bid as lead directing, even though they had no such special agreement. If doubled in 4♣, he had an easy retreat to 4♠. When questioned as to how established was their partnership, it was admitted that they play regularly together but that their only agreement is that the 4♣ bid was forcing. Believing this to be so, the committee agreed that even had they been more informed about the ambiguous 4♣ bid, it was likely that either East or West would double 4♣. The Committee believed that 4♣X was a very likely result, and since N/S did not commit an infraction, they were entitled to that score. Therefore, the Committee restored the table result, 4♣X by North, making 4, N/S +790.

Committee Decision	4♣X by N, Made 4, N/S +790
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chair	Gail Greenberg
Member	David Caprera
Member	Fred King
Member	Joann Sprung
Member	Tom Peters