

Subject of Appeal:	Unauthorized Information	Case:	N4
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

Event	von Zedtwitz LM Pairs	Event DIC	Chris Patrias
Date	08/04/2013	Session	First Final


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 10 - 16 HCP, unbalanced
2: Explained as weak, ♣ & ♦

Hand Record

Board	18	N	David Caprera		
Dealer	E	♠	J4		
		♥	J102		
		♦	J76		
Vul	N/S	♣	QJ954		
W	Zygmunt Marcinski			E	Nicolas L'Ecuyer
♠	Q82			♠	K1076
♥	KQ8			♥	7
♦	AQ95			♦	K8432
♣	1032			♣	A76
		S	Anne Brenner		
		♠	A953		
		♥	A96543		
		♦	10		
		♣	K8		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by W	Made 5	E/W +460	♥ J

Facts Determined at the Table

North/South summoned the director after play of the hand concluded. The opening bid of 1♦ by East, shows 10-16 HCP, unbalanced, and could be made with no diamonds. An opening bid of 2♦ would be 10-16 with six diamonds, QJ9xxx or better.

West's 2NT was Alerted and explained as showing a weak hand with both minors. The actual partnership agreement was that it showed five of the other major plus five in either minor, invitational. The director determined that West had forgotten their agreement and bid 2NT as an invitation.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled five players and found that four of the five passed 3♦ after making an invitational 2NT bid. This poll established that pass was a logical alternative to bidding 3NT.

Director Ruling

The director found that the unauthorized information (UI) from the explanation of the 2NT bid suggested bidding 3NT. Pass was a logical alternative to bidding 3NT. Accordingly, the director ruled that the result be adjusted to 3♦ by East, making four, E/W +130.

Director's Ruling	3♦ by E, Made 4, E/W +130
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

East-West appealed the ruling, and West appeared at the hearing. He stated that if East had known the 2NT bid was invitational, his partner's bid of 3♦ improved his hand enough to bid 3NT. He now knew his side had at least five tricks in diamonds, two in hearts and could most likely find one or two more in the other suits.

Committee Findings

The Committee determined that there was a substantial set of hands on which East would have bid game over the 2NT invitational bid. Since East had Alerted and explained the 2NT bid as weak with both minors, the UI told West that East could have many holdings where he would have bid 3NT if he had treated 2NT as invitational. Therefore, the UI suggested bidding 3NT. Because the Appeals Committee further found that pass was a logical alternative, it declined to change the previous adjustment, 3♦ by East, making four, E/W +130. An Appeal without Merit Warning was given..

Committee Decision	3♦ by E, Made 4, E/W +130
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chair	Adam Wildavsky
Member	Craig Allen
Member	James Thurtell
Member	Richard Popper
Member	Aaron Silverstein