



Subject of Appeal:	Unauthorized Information	Case:	N12
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	-----

Event	Reisinger BAM	Event DIC	Matt Koltnow
Date	12/06/2013	Session	First Qualifier


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: No Alert, ♦ & ♠

Hand Record

Board	20	N	Fred Stewart
Dealer	W	♠ 10	
		♥ AJ108653	
Vul	Both	♦ KQ	
		♣ Q32	
W	Alfredo Versace		
♠	A9832		
♥	742		
♦	9		
♣	J1085	E	Lorenzo Lauria
		♠	KJ
		♥	KQ9
		♦	A754
		♣	K764
		S	Kit Woolsey
		♠	Q7654
		♥	(void)
		♦	J108632
		♣	A9

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
2♠ by W	Down 3	N/S +300	

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned in the middle of play. North sent South away from the table during the hand to explain to East/West that he had failed to alert the 2♦ bid. The director had the players complete play, and then discussed with each what they would have done if the bid had been properly Alerted and explained. West stated he would have passed, and North said he would have bid 2♥, which then would have been passed out.

Director Ruling

The director initially ruled down two in 2♥, based upon the lead of the ♦A. N/S believed that would not be a common lead and asked the director to conduct a poll. The director polled six players with the East hand and none would lead the ♦A. The director therefore adjusted the ruling to only down one, per Laws 12C and 16B.

Director's Ruling	2♥ by N, Down 1, E/W +100
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

E/W appealed the ruling and South and West attended the hearing. West would not have bid 2♠ had he known South had at least five spades, but he might have taken some action over 2♦ or 2♥. West did not think an adjustment to down one was equitable, given that most of the field was in 3♥, down at least two tricks.

South argued that the most likely contract without the misinformation was 2♥ by North. He cited the poll results to show that it was unlikely for East to lead the ♦A.

Committee Findings

E/W were misinformed by North's failure to alert, and were thereby damaged. As the non-offending side, they were entitled to the most favorable result that was likely. The committee judged that by far the most likely contract was 2♥ by North. Additionally, East was highly unlikely to lead the ♦A. North would then be able to take seven tricks. Thus, E/W were assigned the result of 2♥ by North, down 1, E/W +100. E/W were unable to achieve a score of +200 because North judged to not bid 3♥ at their table, unlike what happened at other tables.

The adjustment for N/S comes under a different standard. They are to be assigned the most unfavorable result that is at all possible. This has been quantified at a level of at least one in six. A majority of the committee estimated that North would be doubled in 2♥ about one in six times, but that East would rarely lead the ♦A. Thus, N/S were assigned a result of 2♥X by North, down 1, E/W +200.

Dissent by the minority:

West has no reason to think that his side can make anything above 2♥, that 2♥ might go down, or that his partner would be able to find an effective opening lead. He therefore would have no reason to double. At many tables, 3♥ was played undoubled. It is not at all probable that 2♥ would have been doubled. The assigned score for both sides should have been 2♥ by North, down 1, E/W +100.

Committee Decision	N/S: 2♥X by N, Down 1, E/W +200 E/W: 2♥ by N, Down 1, E/W +100
---------------------------	---

Committee Members

Chairman	Douglas Doub
Member	Gary Cohler
Member	Bob Hamman
Member	Aaron Silverstein
Member	Gail Greenberg