

Subject of Appeal:	Unauthorized Information	Case:	N9
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

Event	Freeman Mixed BAM	Event DIC	Steve Bates
Date	08/09/2013	Session	First Final

Auction

West	North	East	South
		1NT ¹	Pass
Pass	Dbl ²	Pass	2♣
Pass	3NT	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 10-12 HCP
2: Explained as minors

Hand Record

Board	2	N	Mike Cappelletti, Sr.		
Dealer	E	♠	KJ93		
		♥	AK75		
Vul	N/S	♦	AQ4		
		♣	85		
W	Kit Woolsey			E	Sally Woolsey
♠	Q4			♠	87
♥	943			♥	QJ106
♦	J863			♦	1097
♣	7432			♣	AKJ10
		S	Eileen Easterling		
		♠	A10652		
		♥	82		
		♦	K52		
		♣	Q96		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by N	Made 5	N/S +660	♣ K

Facts Determined at the Table

East/West summoned the director following the opening lead and dummy being displayed. The North/South convention cards both showed that Double showed the minors. North had meant the double to show values.

Director Ruling

South's alert and explanation provided Unauthorized Information to North. Per Law 75A, North has to continue to bid as if she had explained his double as a strong hand with penalty possibilities. Her 2♣ bid would therefore be a run out to her long suit. North used the UI to take action based upon his knowledge that she likely did not hold clubs. Therefore, the contract and result was changed to 2♣ by South, making 2, N/S +90, per Law 12C1

Director's Ruling	2♣ by S, Made 2, N/S +90
--------------------------	---------------------------------

The Appeal

North/South appealed the ruling, and they, as well as West, attended the committee. During screening, North explained that systemically, his double followed by a new bid showed 16+ HCP. His partner had not included this in her explanation at the table.

North explained that the partnership defense over a no trump opening was the same for both weak and strong no trumps. Following South's explanation, he was unsure whether she would remember their agreement that double and then bidding 2NT showed a balanced 16+ HCP hand, and therefore decided to gamble that she held some useful values and bid 3NT. His choices were between bidding either 2NT or 3NT. When asked what he would have done if his partner had explained his double as minors or a strong hand, he stated he would have bid 2NT.

West stated that the only explanation provided at the table was that the double was for the minors. East had asked for an explanation when the alert was made, and North made no attempt to correct this before the opening lead, nor when the director was called when dummy was displayed. West believed North had intended the double as penalty and ran to 3NT after his partner removed it. If their actual systemic agreement was to bid 2NT after the double to show a balanced 16+ HCP, then why depart from the system to bid 3NT? Bidding the correct systemic bid should be sufficient to prompt South to give the complete explanation of the systemic agreement.

Committee Findings

The Committee discerned from the facts that North had forgotten that the partnership agreement was for either a strong hand or the minors, and had been reminded by South's explanation. The failure to give a corrected explanation of the agreement prior to the opening lead, as required by Laws 20F5b and 75B, served as evidence that North forgot. His original intent for the double was likely to have been for penalty. Per Law 75A, North was required to continue to bid as if South had explained his double as penalty and that her 2♣ bid was to play. Pass would be a logical alternative in this situation, and it was the UI from the explanation that suggested bidding. Bidding 2NT or 3NT were both bids suggested by the UI, with 3NT being an egregious use. Based upon this judgment of the violation, an Appeal without Merit Warning was assigned and the matter referred to the Recorder. The director ruling of 2♣ by South, making 2, N/S +90, was upheld.

Committee Decision	2♣ by S, Made 2, N/S +90
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Committee Members

Chair	Richard Popper
Member	Patty Tucker
Member	Bruce Rogoff
Member	Michael Rosenberg
Member	Bruce Reeve