

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	R4
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	2 nd Saturday Daylight Pairs	Event DIC	Susan Doe
Date	12/07/2013	Session	First Session


Auction

West	North	East	South
		Pass	1♣ ¹
2♣ ²	3♣ ³	3♥	4♦
Pass	(5♣) ⁴ Pass	Pass	

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Strong, Artificial, Forcing
2: Explained as Majors
3: Transfer to ♦
4: Retracted bid

Hand Record

Board	10	N	4630 MPS		
Dealer	E	♠	J10		
		♥	J8		
Vul	Both	♦	974		
		♣	AJ10432		
W	3960 MPS			E	2300 MPS
♠	84			♠	975
♥	K765			♥	Q10432
♦	AK			♦	10862
♣	KQ765	♣	8		
		S	5970 MPS		
		♠	AKQ632		
		♥	A9		
		♦	QQJ53		
		♣	9		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♦ by S	Down 1	E/W +100	♣ K

Facts Determined at the Table

North inquired about 2♣ before he bid and was told it showed both majors. Originally, North bid 5♣ in response to South's 4♦ bid. At that point, East stated to the table that she had explained her partner's bid incorrectly, and that it was natural. The table director took North away from the table, and he said that he would not have bid either 3♣ or 5♣ if he had received the correct explanation. The table director allowed North to retract his 5♣ call (Law 75B), and a pass was substituted, for a contract of 4♦.

Director Ruling

In the follow-up of the ruling, the explanation of Michaels was deemed to constitute a mistaken explanation, and appeared to directly damage N/S. The board was adjusted to 4♣ by South, making 4, for N/S +620, the most likely favorable result (Law 12C).

Director's Ruling	4♣ by S, Made 4, N/S +620
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

East/West appealed the table ruling. During the review, there was disagreement as to whether North used the alert strip, or any other physical action in conjunction with a verbal alert of 1♣. North inquired as to the meaning of 2♣, and was told that it was Michaels. North then bid 3♣. This was alerted and explained as a positive response showing diamonds. North bid 5♣ in response to the 4♦ call. East then announced that she had given the wrong explanation of 2♣; that it actually is natural over an artificial 1♣ bid, and she missed the alert of 1♣. Her explanation of Michaels was correct over a natural 1♣.

Panel Findings

The panel determined that North had failed to follow regulation in ensuring that his opponents were properly alerted to South's opening, which caused this situation. The panel overturned the director's ruling, and reverted to the table result of 4♦ by South, down 1, E/W +100.

Panel Decision	4♦ by S, Down 1, E/W +100
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Panel Members

Reviewer	Bill Michaels
Member	Matt Smith
Member	Gary Zeiger