

Subject of Appeal:	Unauthorized Information	Case:	R4
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Sunday Daylight Pairs	Event DIC	John Gram
Date	07/20/2014	Session	Second

Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Strong, Artificial, Forcing
2: Natural, Game Forcing

Hand Record

Board	1	N	15,250 MPS
Dealer	N	♠ J9 ♥ AQ72 ♦ J10953 ♣ 65	
Vul	None		
W	5370 MPS		E 3410 MPS
♠ A2 ♥ J65 ♦ AK74 ♣ 10842			♠ 10743 ♥ 1043 ♦ Q2 ♣ J973
		S	15,600 MPS
		♠ KQ865 ♥ K98 ♦ 86 ♣ AKQ	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by S	Made 3	N/S +400	♦ 4

Facts Determined at the Table

Before West led to trick one, East asked if 2♦ was natural and game forcing. He was told it was. He also asked if 3♥ was natural. When West led the ♦4, the director was called.

Director Ruling

The director decided East's questions demonstrably suggested a diamond lead, even though East obviously had no such intent. A club lead was considered a logical alternative as defined under Law 16B1. After a club lead, South still could not make 10 tricks unless he ducked the second round of spades. This was not considered likely enough, under Law 12C1e to adjust the table result for either side. E/W were given a ¼ board procedural penalty for East's untimely and inappropriate questions, considering that no bid other than 1♣ had been alerted.

Director's Ruling	3NT by S, Made 3, N/S +400 E/W: ¼ Board Procedural Penalty
--------------------------	---

The Appeal

N/S appealed, and only North, the dummy, appeared at the review. South, a physician, had been asked by ACBL to examine a player and was unable to attend. North knew that E/W had been penalized, but was still upset that South, an expert with more than 15,600 masterpoints, did not get a chance to make an extra trick after a non-diamond lead. She agreed that ducking the second round of spades was the only play that might have netted an extra trick, but insisted that South might have found the duck.

Panel Findings

Three experts were consulted about the line of play in 3NT. All three said that ducking the second spade was not the correct percentage play. It would also expose declarer to being set. The experts were unanimous that a spade to the jack, and then back to the king, was correct. The panel allowed the table result to stand. Since South had not been available to sign the appeal form, and might well have not gone forward with the appeal, N/S were not given an AWMW..

Experts Consulted: Chip Martel, Eric Rodwell, Kit Woolsey

Panel Decision	3NT by S, Made 3, N/S +400 E/W: 1/4 Board Procedural Penalty
-----------------------	---

Panel Members

Reviewer	Gary Zeiger
Member	David Metcalf
Member	Matt Koltnow