



<b>Subject of Appeal:</b> Misinformation	<b>Case:</b> R1
--	-----------------

<b>Event</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Sunday Open Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Olin Hubert
<b>Date</b>	12/01/2013	<b>Session</b>	Second Session

### Auction

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♠	2♠ <sup>1</sup>	Pass
3♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, Explained as ♥ & ♣

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>12</b>	N	9820 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠	AJ543		
		♥	A		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>	♦	AJ		
		♣	J9643		
W				E	300 MPS
♠	KQ1096			♠	87
♥	J92			♥	Q107654
♦	7643			♦	KQ95
♣	10			♣	K
		S	7400 MPS		
		♠	2		
		♥	K83		
		♦	1082		
		♣	AQ8752		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
3♥ by W	Down 1	N/S+50	♠ A

### Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was called after dummy was faced. The Director determined that the partnership agreement for 2♠ was Michaels (showing Hearts and an unknown minor, instead of Hearts and Clubs) as E/W's convention cards were marked as Michaels. Before play continued, the Director took South away from the table to ask what she would have done, had the correct explanation been given. South said she would have bid 3♣.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

Six players with between 4000 and 4500 masterpoints were polled with the N/S hands on several possible auctions. As a 3♣ bid by South over 2♠ seems very reasonable with the correct explanation, South had said she would bid it before the hand was played, and 3♣ definitely would not be bid after the explanation that was given, the South hand was not polled to determine the veracity of the 3♣ statement; it was accepted as a given in the auction.

Three players were asked what they'd bid after 3♣, holding the North hand. All three said 3♥. After the 3♥ bid, two South hand holders said they'd bid 4♣, one said 5♣. After 4♣, 2 said 4♦, and one said 5♣. All of these players said they'd like to go on, but wouldn't. After a 4♦ bid, all South hand holders bid 5♣.

### Director Ruling

The Director determined that there were two infractions of Law 75B by E/W on this hand. The first violation of law was the mistaken explanation. The second infraction was E/W's failure to let N/S know, before the opening lead, of the mistaken explanation. Based on the player poll, the board was adjusted to 5♣ by South, making 7, N/S +640.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>5♣ by S, Made 7, N/S +640</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

## The Appeal

North/South appealed the table director's ruling. They felt that the players polled did not accurately reflect their level of expertise, and they would have reached the club slam using their system methods.

### Panel Findings

South's decision to not take any action during the actual auction was discussed by the panel. While it was seen to be inferior to not bid, the panel was unanimous that under the circumstances of the misinformation, South never had a chance to fully recover.

The reviewer polled three additional players, all who held over 10,000 masterpoints, as to their actions with the North hand, using the N/S systemic agreements. The new players all would bid 3♥ in response to 3♣. After a 4♣ call by South, all three started keycard auctions. Due to the discrepancy of the polling data between the 4000-4500 MP players, and the actual MP holdings of N/S, the panel found the table director's polling data to be incomplete.

The most favorable result likely without the infraction(s) was found to be 6♣ by S, making 7, N/S +1390. Therefore, per Law 12C1e the panel adjusted the results to that score.

Note: Unfortunately, the non-appellants did not appear at the review. They were loosely told that there may be an appeal, but were not notified officially before they left the playing area.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>6♣ by S, Made 7, N/S +1390</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Bill Michaels
<b>Member</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Member</b>	Gary Zeiger