

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	N10
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----

<b>Event</b>	Blue Ribbon Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Bernie Gorkin
<b>Date</b>	12/05/2013	<b>Session</b>	First Final


### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-17 HCP
2: Different Explanations

### Hand Record

Board	25	N	Kevin Bathurst
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ 108	
		♥ A1085	
<b>Vul</b>	<b>E/W</b>	♦ 42	
		♣ 87543	
W	Elliot Shalita		
♠	A754		
♥	92		
♦	KQ763		
♣	A10	E	Thomas Weik
		♠	Q932
		♥	763
		♦	J95
		♣	K62
		S	Daniel Zagorin
		♠	KJ6
		♥	KQJ4
		♦	A108
		♣	QJ9

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
2♠X by E	Made 2	E/W +670	♥ K

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after the play of the hand. During the auction, West had described his double to South as showing a four card major and a five card minor. On the other side of the screen, East described the double to North as Penalty. North's 2♣ bid was explained to East as showing clubs and a higher suit, based upon the penalty description of the double. South explained the bid to West as Stayman, based upon the explanation for the double he had received.

The play of the hand had proceeded with the ♥K winning the first trick, followed by the ♣Q, won in Dummy with the Ace. The ♠4 was led to the 8, 9 and Jack. South led another heart to the Ace, and North returned another club, won by Declarer with the King. East now led a low spade toward Dummy, ducked to North's ♠10. North returned a heart, trumped in Dummy. The ♦K was led, won by South with the Ace. South could have now set the contract by leading his final club. However, under the impression that North had used Stayman, South thought his partner might have three spades as well as four hearts, and that East had balanced with only three spades. He therefore led the ♠K, as that would lead to setting the contract additional tricks based upon the image he had of the deal.

### Director Ruling

Under the Screen Regulations, "(a)fter three consecutive passes, all players remove their bidding cards. At this point, the declaring side may offer information about their own explanations." Had this happened, South would be aware that North's 2♣ bid showed clubs and another suit, as East had provided North with misinformation. South would not then have played North for three spades. After conferring with several top level players, it was determined that South's defense, while not optimal, was thoughtful and entitled to redress. Per Laws 75 & 21, the result was changed to 2♠X by East, down 1, N/S +100.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>2♠X by E, Down 1, N/S +200</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

## The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling and attended the hearing. East believed that the partnership agreement was that double was penalty in direct seat, and four card major/five card minor in balancing seat. Even when he saw dummy, he did not believe differently and therefore did not inform the opponents that there might have been misinformation given about the auction. E/W believed that the result at the table was due to errors in defense by N/S in the five card ending, not to misinformation

### Committee Findings

The AC found that the differing explanations given by E/W for the double constituted misinformation as 1) they were different explanations; and 2) each described an agreement that did not exist. The committee noted that the E/W convention cards were not identical as to what the double over 1NT showed as evidence of this finding.

However, the AC decided that South's defense was sufficiently egregious to break the chain of causality between the misinformation and the bad result. South could have easily continued with his last club to assure defeat of the contract. This was the indicated play based upon the order of the spade spots played by North, which had indicated a doubleton.

The AC also considered whether the auction might have been influenced by the misinformation, but decided not to pursue this as N/S had not mentioned it as an issue when they asked for the initial ruling, and had not appeared at the hearing to present arguments. Therefore, the committee restored the original table result, 2♠X by East, making 2, E/W +670.

<b>Committee Decision</b>	<b>2♠X by E, Made 2, E/W +670</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

### Committee Members

<b>Chairman</b>	Adam Wildavsky
<b>Scribe</b>	Fred King
<b>Member</b>	David Caprera
<b>Member</b>	Ray Miller
<b>Member</b>	Michael Huston