



Subject of Appeal: Misinformation	Case: R1
--	-----------------

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

Auction

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♠	2♠ ¹	Pass
3♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, Explained as ♥ & ♣

Hand Record

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

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
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.

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

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.

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

Panel Members

Reviewer	Bill Michaels
Member	Matt Koltnow
Member	Gary Zeiger



Subject of Appeal: Misinformation	Case: R2
--	-----------------

Event	Mini-Blue Ribbon Pairs	Event DIC	Doug Grove
Date	12/05/2013	Session	First Final

Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-17 HCP
2: ♦ and higher suit

Hand Record

Board	25	N	4240 MPS		
Dealer	N	♠	108		
		♥	A1085		
Vul	E/W	♦	42		
		♣	87543		
W	4000 MPS			E	1730 MPS
♠	A754			♠	Q932
♥	92			♥	763
♦	KQ763			♦	J95
♣	A10			♣	K62
		S	1030 MPS		
		♠	KJ6		
		♥	KQJ4		
		♦	A108		
		♣	QJ9		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
2♦ by W	Made 2	E/W +90	♦ 2

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the end of the hand. At his turn after 2♦, North looked at East's convention card and saw "D+H," which he understood to mean diamonds and hearts. North told the director he would have bid 2♥ over 2♦ if the card had been marked clearly as "diamonds and a major". In the pass out seat, South asked for an explanation of 2♦. North and South understood East to say "diamonds and hearts". East and West contend that he said "diamonds and a higher". South said that if he had understood the E/W agreement correctly, he would have reopened with a Double. The auction would continue Pass-2♥.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director conducted a poll to determine what East would do over 2♥. Six players were polled, three with about 2000 points, three with more. Four of the six, including all the 2000 point players passed 2♥, the other two bidding 2♠. No players were interested in an immediate 2♥ bid with the North cards. Regarding the opening lead, five of the six players polled led a diamond.

Director Ruling

Staff determined that N/S were misinformed as to the E/W agreement about 2♦. East did not speak clearly enough to be understood by N/S, and his convention card was not marked clearly enough to be understood by N/S. The convention card was marked D+Hi, which looked enough like D+H as to be misunderstood. His explanation of 2♦ as "diamonds and higher" sounded enough like "diamonds and hearts" that it was likely to be misunderstood as well. Laws 40B4 and 21B3 empower the director to award an adjusted score if he feels N/S were damaged or E/W gained an

advantage because of misinformation. Per Law 12C1e, the score was adjusted for both sides to 2♥ by North, making two, N/S +110.

Director's Ruling	2♥ by N, Made 2, N/S +110
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

E/W appealed the director's ruling. All four players attended the review just after the afternoon session of the event. The reviewer saw the E/W convention card, now corrected to say D+Higher, and recommended to E/W that the explanation "diamonds and a major" would be less likely to be misunderstood, the reviewer himself having had some trouble understanding East's explanation of the agreement.

Both sides presented the same facts they presented to the table director: N/S said they had been misinformed by a poorly-marked convention card and a hard-to-understand answer. E/W said they had explained their agreement correctly and felt they marked their convention card sufficiently. There was little discussion of the director's polling regarding other auctions and results.

Panel Findings

The panel felt that E/W had filled out their convention card ambiguously and that East chose his words carelessly when explaining the meaning of 2♦. This indeed was misinformation. The panel upheld the director's ruling and adjusted the score to 2♥ by North, making 2, NS +110.

Panel Decision	2♥ by N, Made 2, N/S +110
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Matt Koltnow
Member	Gary Zeiger
Member	Terry Lavender
Member	Olin Hubert