

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	R11
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	-----

<b>Event</b>	Mini-Spingold Flight II	<b>Event DIC</b>	Kenneth Van Cleve
<b>Date</b>	07/21/2014	<b>Session</b>	Round of 32


### Auction

West	North	East	South
		Pass	Pass
1♣	1♦	1♥	Dbl <sup>1</sup>
Rdbl	1♠	2♠	3♠
4♥	Pass	Pass	4♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: No Alert; ♠ and ♦ support

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>26</b>	N	1270 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠	Q984		
		♥	983		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>	♦	KJ973		
		♣	8		
W	710 MPS			E	510 MPS
♠	(void)			♠	AJ32
♥	AK10			♥	QJ6542
♦	Q842			♦	5
♣	AJ7654	♣	Q10		
		S	840 MPS		
		♠	K10765		
		♥	7		
		♦	A106		
		♣	K932		

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

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after the auction was completed and South said there was a failure to alert his double.

### Director Ruling

While South's double technically did not require an alert, South expected one so its absence gave him UI (Law 16B1a). Without the alert, he can feel assured that partner has four spades for her 1♠ call. The director polled players also playing in the Mini Spingold Flight II. Half of the players passed 4♥, therefore pass was deemed a logical alternative and the result was adjusted to 4♥ by East, making 4.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>4♥ by E, Made 4, E/W +620</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Appeal

North/South appealed the ruling and all four players involved attended the hearing. South described his rationale for bidding 3♠ followed by 4♠ as an attempt to buy the contract for 3♠. He said he thought 4♠ would be a good sacrifice and always planned to bid 4♠ if the opponents bid 4♥.

### Panel Findings

The Reviewer conducted her own poll of South's peers, not only to determine whether passing 4♥ was a logical alternative, but also to see if peers would bid on knowing their partner promised four spades. Four players were

consulted, and none bid 4♠. After being told partner promised four spades, one considered bidding 4♠ but still passed. The other consultants passed. One said the additional information didn't affect the choice to bid 4♠. Another thought partner's free bid of 1♠ already promised four. The last consultant felt it was partner's choice since he had already shown his hand. Although South was in possession of UI, the consulted peers showed that this information did not demonstrably suggest bidding 4♠. Therefore Law 16B1a does not apply, and the table result was restored.

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

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Jenni Carmichael
<b>Member</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Member</b>	Gary Zeiger