

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	N2
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	von Zedtwitz LM Pairs	Event DIC	Chris Patrias
Date	08/02/2013	Session	First Qualifying


Auction

West	North	East	South
Pass	Pass	1♦	Pass
1♥	Pass	1NT ¹	Pass
2♣ ²	Pass	2NT ³	Pass
3NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 16 – 18 HCP
2: New Minor Forcing
3: Explained as maximum

Hand Record

Board	4	N	Andrew Stark		
Dealer	W	♠	97643		
		♥	QJ		
Vul	Both	♦	K3		
		♣	QJ97		
W	Abe Paul			E	Charles Hubert
♠	K52			♠	A108
♥	K10753			♥	96
♦	Q1092			♦	A874
♣	2			♣	AK105
		S	Franco Baseggio		
		♠	QJ		
		♥	A842		
		♦	J65		
		♣	8643		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by E	Made 3	E/W +600	♠ Q

Facts Determined at the Table

North/South summoned the director after play of the hand had ended. At the end of the auction, South had asked about the bids. West made it clear that they had no firm agreement, but said that past experience led him to believe that 2NT showed a maximum. North asked how East would show a minimum and West said that he thought 2♦ would be weaker.

West led the ♠Q. Declarer won the ace and ran the ♥9 to North's queen. The ♣Q return was won by declarer, who played another heart to the 10 and jack. The spade exit went to the jack and dummy's king. Declarer called for dummy's ♥K (North pitching a spade) and South won the ♥A. At trick seven, South exited with the ♦5 to the 10, king and ace. East took three spades, four diamonds and two clubs to make the contract.

Director Ruling

East should have attempted to clarify their partner's explanation. South was in a position at trick seven where he could have defended properly if he played declarer to have 15 HCP rather than 18 HCP. Accordingly, the director assigned a score of 3NT by East, down one, North/South +100.

Director's Ruling	3NT by E, Down 1, N/S +100
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling, and South, East and West appeared before the committee. West made it clear that E/W had no firm agreement about the auction, and East confirmed this. East thought that, had he bid 2♦, it would have shown five diamonds. Further, East thought the position of the ♠10 was clear, and it could not cost for South to take their other heart winner and play a club.

South did not think it so clear that E/W had no agreement about 2♦, but that West thought that East had a maximum. Given that East had a maximum, he would have the ♦AK, and a diamond lead could not cost a trick. A club lead was dangerous, because North would have continued clubs with Q-J-10-x. South did not think it clear that East had the ♠10. A diamond lead would make East work for their tricks.

The screening director determined that the lead of the ♠Q showed the ♠K or shortness in the suit (at most two cards). N/S use upside-down count and attitude.

Committee Findings

The Committee determined that East/West had no firm agreement about whether 2NT showed a maximum or minimum as stated by West. East was under no obligation to tell the opponents what his hand was.

Additionally, if East had held the hand that South feared (♠Axx ♥9x ♦AKxx ♣AK10x), it would have been trivial for declarer to play the ♦10 on South's diamond switch, guaranteeing two diamond entries to the dummy to set up and use the long heart, as well as four sure diamond tricks, making 3NT.

The Committee decided that North/South were not damaged by the misinformation and the table result was restored, 3NT by East, making 3, E/W +600.

Committee Decision	3NT by E, Made 3, E/W +600
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chair	Douglas Doub
Member	Eugene Kales
Member	Michael Huston
Member	James Thurtell
Member	Mark Bartusek