



American Contract
Bridge League

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	N6
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

Event	Spingold Knockout Teams	Event DIC	Olin Hubert
Date	08/06/2013	Session	Round of 64, First Session

Auction

West	North	East	South
1NT ¹	Pass	Pass	2♦ ²
Pass	2NT ³	Pass	3♦
Pass	3♥	Pass	4♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 14-16 HCP
2: One Major
3: Invitational

Hand Record

Board	16	N	Mitch Dunitz
Dealer	W	♠ Q543 ♥ Q10 ♦ QJ63 ♣ AQ8	
Vul	E/W		
W	Uday Ivatury		E Christal Henner
♠ AK96 ♥ AK5 ♦ 74 ♣ 7532		♠ 1087 ♥ J2 ♦ 1052 ♣ J10964	
		♠ J2 ♥ 987643 ♦ AK98 ♣ K	

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♥ by N	Made 5	N/S +450	♣ J

Facts Determined at the Table

East/West summoned the director at the end of play. There had been no questions during the auction itself, but before East made her opening lead, she inquired about auction. North explained that they play re-transfers but that this was not one of the sequences where it would apply. East/West contend that North/South stated that South "could have spades." N/S agreed that description might have been given, but it was in relation to the initial 2♦ call. East stated that the comment dissuaded her from making a spade lead.

Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled three players concerning the East hand, the auction and explanations for the both diamond calls, without the comment concerning spades. All three indicated they would lead a club. After they stipulated the club lead, they were all asked if the spade statement would have effected their decision and all replied negatively.

Director Ruling

The player poll showed that the lead of the ♣J was a natural choice amongst experts, even with the possibility that South held spades. As there was dispute about the timing and applicability of the spade comment, it was determined that any misinformation from the comment was not the cause of damage. Accordingly, there was no basis for adjustment.

Director's Ruling	4♥ by N, Made 5, N/S +450
--------------------------	----------------------------------

The Appeal

East/West appealed the ruling, and all of the players attended the committee. Before making her opening lead, East had asked about the 3♦ bid. She stated that North's reply was, "South could have hearts or spades; we play re-transfers but not on this sequence; South might have a diamond fragment." Since West had not doubled 3♦ for lead direction, East was going to lead a black suit. North's statement that South might have spades dissuaded her from a spade lead, toward the unsuccessful club lead.

North/South maintained that the explanation that South could hold hearts or spades only applied to the 2♦ bid. North denied saying that 3♦ might have shown spades.

Committee Findings

The rambling nature of the N/S response to the question about the meaning of 3♦ should have made it clear that N/S did not have a firm agreement regarding the bid. When South raised 3♥ to four, it was clear from the auction that he held long hearts.

East had a blind guess as to which black suit would be more successful, and she selected her stronger, solid sequence to lead. She was not damaged by misinformation, and the table result was allowed to stand.

It should have been clear by North's answer and by the way he answered the question about South's 3♦ bid that South had not shown spades. Thus, there was no misinformation and there was no basis on which to appeal the result of the deal. Therefore, E/W were assigned an Appeal without Merit Warning.

Committee Decision	4♥ by N, Made 5, N/S +450
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chair	Douglas Doub
Member	Craig Allen
Member	James Thurtell
Member	Chris Moll
Member	David Berkowitz