

Subject of Appeal:	Misinformation	Case:	N12
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----

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


Auction

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

Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Explained as Penalty

Hand Record

Board	11	N	Uday Ivatury
Dealer	S	♠ A3	
		♥ J9875	
Vul	None	♦ 76	
		♣ 8732	
W	Marvin Rosenblatt		
♠	K752		
♥	1043		
♦	Q932		
♣	Q6	E	Lynda Rosenblatt
		♠	J86
		♥	AK
		♦	AJ1085
		♣	A94
		S	Christal Henner
		♠	Q1094
		♥	Q62
		♦	K4
		♣	KJ105

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
2NTX by E	Down 2	N/S +300	♥ 2

Facts Determined at the Table

The director was summoned by East/West at the end of play. South had intended her double as support for hearts. East said that due to the misinformation, she had played South to hold a better hand, and went down two on the hand. North stated the partnership agreement was that the double was for penalty. The play had gone as follows:

Trick 1: ♥ 2 – 3 – 7 – K
 Trick 2: ♦ A – 4 – 2 – 7
 Trick 3: ♦ 5 – K – 3 – 6
 Trick 4: ♥ Q – 4 – 5 – A
 Trick 5: ♠ 6 – 4 – K – A

The defense proceeded to cash three hearts and three spades for down two. East had reasoned that South had to hold the ♠A in order to have bid so strongly.

Director Ruling

E/W had 24 HCP, leaving 16 for N/S. If South had a better hand, then North's would have been worse. North had pulled the first double, but then doubled 2NT, so he must have possessed some values. East could have cashed her diamonds and the ♠A for seven tricks, then considered playing spades. The misinformation was not the cause of the damage, so no adjustment to the table result necessary.

Director's Ruling	2NTX by E, Down 2, N/S +300
--------------------------	------------------------------------

The Appeal

East appealed the ruling, she appeared before the committee. She repeated her reasoning that she had played South to hold all the values on the hand because she had apparently made a penalty double of 1NT.

Committee Findings

East was faced with opponents who had a total of sixteen high card points between them, yet both bid and both had made penalty doubles of no trump bids. East had every reason to believe that South held three hearts based upon the plays at tricks one and four. East should have been able to deduce that South's double of 1NT was not penalty since other assumptions about the auction (the penalty double by North) would not make sense if it was.

East could have cashed out for down one, but instead chose to try and win the board by finding the ♠A onside. This is not an irrational play, but it is not a play without risk. The damage on the hand was a result of her choice of play, not of misinformation. Accordingly, there was no basis for adjustment to the table result.

The connection between the infraction and any damage was tenuous at best. East had a difficult choice of plays, but playing North to have no values was not rational following their penalty double. The screening director had explained the rationale for the table ruling, and East presented no new evidence to counter the ruling. Therefore, the AC gave her an Appeal without Merit Warning.

Committee Decision	2NTX by E, Down 2, N/S +3
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Committee Members

Chair	Michael Huston
Member	Blair Seidler
Member	Craig Allen
Member	Chris Moll