

**2017 Spring NABC**

**Appeals Casebook**



**COOL JAZZ...HOT BRIDGE!**  
*NORTH AMERICAN BRIDGE CHAMPIONSHIPS*

**Jazz it Up**  
*IN KANSAS CITY*  
*MARCH 9-19, 2017*



American Contract  
Bridge League

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b> Misinformation	<b>Case:</b> N1
--	-----------------

<b>Event</b>	Baldwin North American Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Kevin Perkins
<b>Date</b>	03/09/2017	<b>Session</b>	First Final


### Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	1♣ <sup>1</sup>	1♦
2♦ <sup>2</sup>	2♥	3NT	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Strong, Artificial, Forcing
2: No Alert, positive with five ♥

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	5	N	Richard Zucker		
<b>Dealer</b>	N	♠	KJ98		
		♥	K10953		
<b>Vul</b>	N/S	♦	1042		
		♣	6		
W	Brian Ellis			E	Bernie Greenspan
♠	A75			♠	32
♥	QJ762			♥	A84
♦	J73			♦	A6
♣	J3			♣	AKQ974
		S	Ethan Stein		
		♠	Q1064		
		♥	(void)		
		♦	KQ985		
		♣	10852		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
3NT by E	Made 5	E/W +460	♦Q

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called before the opening lead was made. The table director indicated that no Alert was due as 2♦ was a cuebid. Further review was requested, and the DIC of the tournament was asked about the Alertability of 2♦. He indicated that in our Alert procedure 2♦ is Alertable – the 2♦ bid was not chosen because it was the opponents' suit, but because it was a transfer to hearts.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The table director then gave the North hand to several players. They considered different calls over 2♦, but all of them asked what 2♦ was before answering.

### Director Ruling

Staff determined that although there was misinformation from the failure to Alert, it did not cause the damage. Alert procedures state that an opponent who actually knows or suspects what is happening, even though not properly informed, may not be entitled to redress if he or she chooses to proceed without clarifying the situation. All of this player's peers asked about 2♦; staff decided this player needed to ask as well.

Law 40B4 says that a side that is damaged as a consequence of failure to explain a call or play is entitled to an adjusted score; staff concluded that the source of the damage was a player of this level not asking a question when he needed the answer to make his decision.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3NT by E, Made 5, E/W +460</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

## The Review

N/S requested a review of the ruling. North was the only player who spoke to the reviewer. He felt he had been misinformed, and that with the proper information he would have bid a lead-directing 2♣ rather than 2♥, planning to raise diamonds later.

The reviewer spoke to six national-champion level players. He gave the North hand as a bidding problem. All six asked what 2♦ was; two were vehement that it was critical, as it could be nearly anything. They suggested Pass, 2♠ and 3♦ were among the calls they would consider.

When the reviewer asked how much sympathy they would have for a player who did not ask about 2♦, two said that they could sympathize, although at the table they themselves would always ask. One of those two indicated that it never would have occurred to him that 2♦ was hearts. The other four had no sympathy at all; one suggested that over a natural or artificial 1♣, so many pairs play transfer structures in competitive auctions that it would never occur to him to proceed without clarifying the situation.

## Panel Findings

The reviewer concluded that the above-cited provision in the Alert procedure did indeed cover this situation – even if this player did not suspect that this auction was anything special, all his peers did. He was expected to protect himself. Law 21A says no redress is due a player who acts on the basis of his own misunderstanding; there was no legal basis to apply Law 40B4 (see above). The table result was allowed to stand. As the initial ruling was delivered on an incorrect application of the Alert rules, this review was deemed to have merit.

Experts Consulted: Billy Miller, Chris Moll, Jerry Helms, Bob Hamman and two others.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>3NT by E, Made 5, E/W +460</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
-----------------	--------------


<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N2
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Lebhar IMP Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Date</b>	03/11/2017	<b>Session</b>	First Final

**Auction**

West	North	East	South
1♣	Pass	1♠	Pass
1NT	Pass	2NT <sup>1</sup>	Pass
3♣	Pass	3NT	Pass
Pass	Pass		

**Hand Record**

<b>Board</b>	4	N	Brian Glubok		
<b>Dealer</b>	W	♠	QJ5		
		♥	J64		
		♦	Q1086		
<b>Vul</b>	Both	♣	A32		
W	Ray Jotcham			E	Richard Chen
♠	K76			♠	10983
♥	A1092			♥	Q8
♦	K95			♦	AJ7
♣	Q76			♣	KJ108
		S	David Treitel		
		♠	A42		
		♥	K753		
		♦	432		
		♣	954		

**Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention**

1: Alerted as relay to ♣

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
3NT by W	Made 4	E/W +630	♦6

**Facts Determined at the Table**

The director was called after play of the hand had ended. East had intended his 2NT bid as a natural invitational bid. East/West play a system where 2NT is a transfer to clubs; invitational notrump hands are bid another way. East had unauthorized information by the unexpected alert of his invitational 2NT bid.

**Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table**

Five players were polled with the East hand. All bid as East the first two rounds. On the third round, one player passed, while the other four bid 3NT. Three of the players who bid 3NT said the auction was impossible, while the fourth said that, although the 3♣ bid is possibly natural in theory, East's holding in clubs made it clear that West couldn't hold strong enough clubs for this to be the case. This player did not believe West could hold a club suit such that he would be trying to "escape" from 2NT to a "safer" part score in clubs.

**Director Ruling**

Although E/W did not agree on the meaning of 2NT, the question was one of Unauthorized Information for East rather than misinformation for N/S. Based upon the poll results, the director ruled that Pass was not a Logical Alternative under Law 16B2 and ruled that the table result stood.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	3NT by W, Made 4, E/W +630
--------------------------	----------------------------

## The Review

North/South requested a review of the ruling. They believed, based on the poll finding one player that would pass and another that felt that 3♣ was possibly natural in this auction, that pass was a logical alternative. The reviewer conducted his own poll.

In polling, similar results to the original poll were gathered. Of the seven players polled, only one was found that would pass. Follow up questions were asked of the player that passed. It was found that the player that passed was unfamiliar with the methods used by E/W. The player was also unable to construct a hand for partner that would bid as given. Many of those polled that bid also play the methods of this pair, and some questioned whether this pair played the rest of the system that accompanies this bid being a relay.

## Panel Findings

Although it was found that some players might pass, it was determined that it was likely to only be those unfamiliar with the methods of E/W. Without the Alert, a player that plays the methods given would most likely realize that the 3♣ was unusual enough to determine that the 2NT bid was misinterpreted and bid again. Therefore, the table result was allowed to stand. Due to the finding of a pass in the original ruling, the appeal was deemed to have merit.

Experts Consulted: Janice Seamon-Molson, six players of the E/W masterpoint level

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>3NT by W, Made 4, E/W +630</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Kevin Perkins
-----------------	---------------

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Break in Tempo, Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N3
---------------------------	--	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Lebhar IMP Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Date</b>	03/11/2017	<b>Session</b>	Second Final


### Auction

West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	1♦
Pass	3♦ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	3♠
Pass	3NT <sup>2</sup>	Pass	4♦
Pass	5♦	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Weak, Alerted
2: Break in Tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	21	N	Michael Schreiber
<b>Dealer</b>	N	♠ KQ8	
		♥ J105	
<b>Vul</b>	N/S	♦ K9865	
		♣ 97	
W	Billy Cohen		
♠	1092		
♥	A3		
♦	742		
♣	Q10652	E	Gary Cohler
		♠	J64
		♥	KQ9642
		♦	(void)
		♣	K843
		S	Mark Bartusek
		♠	AJ52
		♥	87
		♦	AQJ103
		♣	AJ

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
5♦ by S	Made 5	N/S +600	♣2

### Facts Determined at the Table

East/West called the director at the end of play. There was an agreed break in tempo prior to the 3NT bid by North. E/W believed this influenced South's decision to bid further.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled two players with the South hand. Both passed over 3NT.

### Director Ruling

It was ruled that the break in tempo suggested bidding, and passing was a logical alternative per Law 16. The auction was adjusted to 3NT by North. The director polled the same players as to their likely lead with the East hand. Both said it was a tossup between leading a high or a low heart. Based on this, it was determined that half of the time North would make five in 3NT, and half of the time North would go down two. Giving sympathetic weight to the non-offending side, an assigned score of 60% of down two, and 40% of making five was given, per Law 12C.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	60% 3NT by N, Down 2, E/W +200 40% 3NT by N, Made 5, N/S +660
--------------------------	--

## The Review

E/W requested a review of the ruling. East thought that the weighting given was not appropriate. East claimed that he would always lead fourth best, and that a poll would find many more leading low than high. He thought not enough players were polled. The reviewer polled seven additional players with the East hand and the auction to 3NT. Four of the players led a high heart, while only three led a low heart.

## Panel Findings

A more thorough poll supported the original ruling that it is a close decision, and the weighting given was not out of line with this. Therefore, the original ruling was allowed to stand. Due to the limited and informal poll used to determine the weighting, the appeal was found to have merit.

Experts consulted: Justin Lall, Diego Brenner, five additional expert level players

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>60% 3NT by N, Down 2, E/W +200 40% 3NT by N, Made 5, N/S +660</b>
-----------------------	--

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Kevin Perkins
-----------------	---------------

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	N4
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Lebhar IMP Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Date</b>	03/11/2017	<b>Session</b>	Second Final

### Auction

West	North	East	South
		1♦ <sup>1</sup>	2♦ <sup>2</sup>
3♣	Pass	5♣	5♥
Pass	5♠	Dbl	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Alerted, Precision
2: Explained as "likely Natural"

### Hand Record

Board	14	N	Dan Morse
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠ 5432	
		♥ J84	
		♦ Q1065	
		♣ J5	
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>		
W	Paul Holmes		E Eric Gettleman
♠	87		♠ AK
♥	532		♥ 6
♦	K7		♦ AJ98432
♣	AK10942		♣ Q76
		S	John Sutherlin
		♠	QJ1096
		♥	AKQ1097
		♦	(void)
		♣	83



<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
5♠X by N	Down 2	E/W +300	♣6

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after the final pass. When West had asked North about the meaning of South's 2♦ bid, North had answered, "Undiscussed, but over a short suit, it is probably natural." N/S had not discussed what a cuebid of a "could be short" minor suit opening would mean. E/W felt this provided South Unauthorized Information when the auction came back around to him. The director instructed the pairs to play out the hand and call him back after the play if E/W believed they were damaged, which they did.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The TD polled six players, giving them the South hand. All either bid 2♦ or accepted it as a normal bid. Four of the six players passed 5♣.

### Director Ruling

Based upon the player poll, it was ruled that pass was a logical alternative. The director ruled that South had made use of the UI, and per Laws 16B & 12C, the result was adjusted to 5♣ by West, making 5, E/W +400.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>5♣ by W, Made 5, E/W +400</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Review

E/W requested a review of the ruling. They claimed the director did not address the fact that they were given misinformation. They contended that the director was wrong in assigning only 11 tricks in 5♣. With the correct information,



West would be too strong to bid only 3♣, non-forcing over a Michaels bid. Under their system, West would cuebid 2♥, showing clubs. The auction would continue as it did after that, but then East would play the hand. With East as declarer, a diamond ruff is improbable, and diamonds can be set up to take 12 tricks. They also wanted to address the possibility of bidding the slam.

### Panel Findings

The reviewer examined the E/W agreements, and concluded that it would be likely to have East declaring in clubs. With the contract being played by East, 12 tricks would be taken by fairly easy play. Five new players were polled with the adapted auction using the E/W methods over Michaels. The auction for all reached to 5♣, but none bid on to slam. All thought 12 tricks would be taken. Therefore the contract was adjust to 5♣ by East, making six, E/W +420.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>5♣ by E, Made 6, E/W +420</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Kevin Perkins
-----------------	---------------

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N5
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Platinum Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Terry Lavender
<b>Date</b>	03/11/2017	<b>Session</b>	First Final


### Auction

West	North	East	South
		Pass	Pass
1♣	Pass	1♥	Pass
1NT	Pass	2♣ <sup>1</sup>	Pass
Pass	Dbl	2♦	2♠
3♦	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Intended Relay to ♦

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>26</b>	N	Robert Levin		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠	A1098		
		♥	K97		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>Both</b>	♦	J32		
		♣	AJ8		
W	Michael Polowan			E	Haig Tchamitch
♠	KQ6			♠	53
♥	J8			♥	Q432
♦	KQ10			♦	A9764
♣	Q6542			♣	K9
		S	Michael Golden		
		♠	J742		
		♥	A1065		
		♦	85		
		♣	1073		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
3♦ by E	Made 3	E/W +110	♠2

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the completion of play. East/West play 2♣ as a relay to diamonds in the sequence that occurred in the auction, but the agreement is for an unpassed hand. They had not discussed if it applied by a passed hand. North claimed he would pass rather than double if he knew East's bid was meant to be a relay, and might have passed if he knew they had no agreement.

### Director Ruling

The director ruled that North was given misinformation from the failure to alert the 2♣ bid. With this information, he would have passed. The score was adjusted to 2♣ by West, making 2, EW +90, per Laws 21B & 12C.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>2♣ by W, Made 2, E/W +90</b>
--------------------------	---------------------------------

### The Review

E/W requested a review of the ruling. West claimed they don't have a relay agreement if made by a passed hand. He claimed it doesn't make sense to play it, because the related 2♦ artificial game-force is not logical by a passed hand. East claimed he had not thought of the implications of a passed hand and West's reasoning. The reviewer polled several players about their methods in this type of sequence. Of all who played the checkback system employed by E/W, none played it by a passed hand, nor would consider it to be on by default by a passed hand.

## Panel Findings

Based on the polling of players as to the methods in question, it was determined that East had misbid, applying a system that was not in agreement in the actual auction. Therefore, there was no misinformation and no adjustment was warranted. Law 75C states that there is no infraction and no adjustment due if the opponent's methods have been accurately given to the other side following a mistaken call. The table result was reinstated.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>3♦ by E, Made 3, E/W +110</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Kevin Perkins
-----------------	---------------


<b>Subject of Appeal:</b> Misinformation	<b>Case:</b> N6
--	-----------------

<b>Event</b>	Leventritt Silver Ribbon Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Harry Falk
<b>Date</b>	03/12/2017	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifying

### Auction

West	North	East	South
		1NT <sup>1</sup>	Pass
3♣ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	3♦ <sup>3</sup>	Pass
3♥ <sup>4</sup>	Pass	3NT	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	6	N	Bob Feller		
<b>Dealer</b>	E	♠	AJ10862		
		♥	74		
<b>Vul</b>	E/W	♦	10542		
		♣	K		
W	Barry Bragin			E	
				Fred King	
♠	54			♠	KQ3
♥	652			♥	KJ8
♦	K63			♦	AQJ8
♣	AQJ92			♣	1064
		S	Mark Bennett		
		♠	97		
		♥	AQ1093		
		♦	97		
		♣	8753		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-17 HCP
2: Puppet Stayman
3: Alerted, no five-card major
4: "Something in hearts"

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
3NT by E	Made 4	E/W +630	♥ Q

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the end of the play. Before making the opening lead, South asked about 3♦. West described 3♦ as no five-card major and concern about one of the majors. South asked about 3♥, and West described his hand as having "something in hearts." Declarer won the opening lead with the ♥K and took a losing club finesse. North returned the ♠J.

South said he would have led the ♥10 had he known that "something in hearts" could be as little as three small. North said he would have known to return a heart had partner led the 10. He said he returned a spade because East's hand was described as being "concerned" about one major suit.

### Director Ruling

Staff concluded that North/South had received a correct explanation of the E/W agreements. They felt East's 3♦ call was mistaken (he said he forgot that 3♦ expressed concern about a major), and that West's explanation was also a correct description of their agreement. As such, there was no legal justification to adjust the score.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3NT by E, Made 4, E/W +630</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Review

N/S requested a review of the ruling. They felt that they had been misinformed and that with the right information, they would have defeated 3NT. The reviewer spoke with both sides together. E/W brought system notes which supported West's description of the East hand; they described the 3♥ bid as showing a "helpful fragment" in hearts.

## Panel Findings

The reviewer spoke first to seven national champion level players. None felt that 6-5-2 was a combination they would regard as a “helpful fragment” or “something,” terms which they considered to be equivalent. One of the six did indicate that he did not take “something” literally – he felt that the sequence simply suggested that West was not concerned by hearts. He wanted East to bid 3NT if he could stop spades.

The reviewer spoke next to three additional national champions, giving the North hand as a single dummy defense problem. The first player returned a heart. When asked if he thought he would still work out the problem had partner led the ♥10 to declarer’s jack, he said he thought that increased the likelihood from very likely to certain. The second player returned the ♠J; he felt that he was no better off with the lead of the ♥10. He felt it was still just as reasonable to return a spade instead of heart. The third player returned a heart, saying that it was not at all clear, but that it was more attractive. He felt that the lead of the ♥10 would have made it more challenging to return a heart; after the lead of the queen, partner just needs one higher card in the suit for hearts to be right. After the lead of the 10, partner needs two higher cards.

The reviewer concluded that N/S had indeed been given misinformation about the West hand. As it was far from certain that N/S would choose a defense that would lead to down two, the reviewer assigned a score of one-third of 3NT, down two, N/S +200, and two-thirds of 3NT, making four, E/W +630, by Laws 40B4 and 12C1c.

Experts consulted: Paul Lewis, Jason Feldman, Gary Cohler, Aaron Silverstein, Will Ehlers, Kevin Dwyer, Jacek Kalita, Michal Nowosadzki, Zack Grossack and Adam Grossack.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>1/3 - 3NT by E, Down 2, N/S +200 2/3 - 3NT by E, Made 4, E/W +630</b>
-----------------------	--

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
-----------------	--------------

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Tricks Scored	<b>Case:</b>	N7
---------------------------	---------------	--------------	----


<b>Event</b>	Rockwell Mixed Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	McKenzie Myers
<b>Date</b>	03/14/2017	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifying

### Auction

West	North	East	South
1♠	Pass	2♠	Pass
3♣	Pass	3♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention


### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>N</b>	Jill Marshall		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠	J63		
		♥	A102		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>E/W</b>	♦	Q1093		
		♣	AQ7		
<b>W</b>	Marti Malcolm			<b>E</b>	Chuck Malcolm
♠	AKQ954			♠	1082
♥	98			♥	QJ6
♦	5			♦	A8642
♣	K983			♣	102
		<b>S</b>	Joe Degaetano		
		♠	7		
		♥	K7543		
		♦	KJ7		
		♣	J654		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
3♠ by W	Down 2	N/S +200	♠3

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after the hand was over. There was a disagreement on the number of tricks scored. Both sides had agreed on a result of down two, but E/W said they had agreed to down two having miscounted earlier tricks.

The two sides agreed on the play of the first 11 tricks, but there was a dispute as to the facts regarding what happened on the last two tricks. N/S described the last two tricks as the defense having led a diamond, on which declarer discarded the ♣9. Her last card was the last trump.

E/W say that she ruffed the diamond at trick 12 and led the club at trick 13, expecting it to lose. All the players agreed that declarer did not think the club was a winner, perhaps having forgotten dummy's 10. Declarer had lost a trick earlier to one of South's small clubs. East told the director that West could not be compelled to make a stupid play; no one would discard at trick 12 to retain a trump for trick 13.

### Director Ruling

The director ruled that the N/S description of what happened sounded more reasonable. By Law 85A, he directed that the score be recorded as 3♠ by West, down two, N/S +200.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3♠ by W, Down 2, N/S +200</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Review

E/W requested a review of the ruling. All four players attended the review. E/W said that the director made the wrong ruling as he misunderstood the facts. Declarer had never played to trick 12; she claimed by showing both cards. The declaring side asked that the table director be asked specifically whether a claim had been made.

The reviewer asked the table director whether anyone had ever indicated a claim was made. The director said that the only evidence was dummy's suggestion that the director could not compel declarer to take a stupid line of play (discarding the club at trick twelve).

### Panel Findings

The reviewer considered both sides' arguments, and he felt that it was unclear which set of facts accurately described what happened. One possibility was the original ruling, where declarer discarded the club and won trick 13. The other possibility was that there was a claim made during trick twelve after the diamond lead.

Even if West's actions were to be understood as a claim, the Reviewer would then need to apply Law 70A to resolve it. As there was no original claim statement, Law 70D1 prohibits the director from accepting a line of play not previously mentioned if there is an alternative normal line of play that would be less successful. Normal is defined as including careless. The reviewer felt that any player who did not know the ♣9 was a winner might carelessly discard it at trick 12.

What actually happened at the table can never be known with certainty. However, the reviewer was convinced that either path led to down two, and the original ruling was upheld. As E/W felt their version of the facts was never understood or considered by the director, the review was deemed to have merit.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>3♠ by W, Down 2, N/S +200</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Consultant</b>	David Metcalf

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	N8
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Rockwell Mixed Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	McKenzie Myers
<b>Date</b>	03/14/2017	<b>Session</b>	First Qualifying


### Auction

West	North	East	South
			1NT <sup>1</sup>
2♥ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	Pass	3♣
Pass	Pass	3♥	Pass
Pass	4♣	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: 15-17 HCP
2: Alerted as ♥ & a minor

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>N</b>	Ala Hamilton-Day		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>S</b>	♠	Q92		
		♥	3		
		♦	K10975		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>None</b>	♣	J1098		
<b>W</b>	Sherman Gao			<b>E</b>	Weiling Zhao
♠	J103			♠	K8754
♥	K109654			♥	J82
♦	J3			♦	AQ64
♣	Q6			♣	3
		<b>S</b>	Buddhadeb Biswas		
		♠	A6		
		♥	AQ7		
		♦	82		
		♣	AK7542		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
4♣ by S	Made 4	N/S +130	♥10

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the end of play. West explained his bid showed just hearts, not hearts and a minor. South stated that, with the correct information, he would have played the diamond suit differently as he believed West to hold at least four cards in the suit.

### Director Ruling

The director determined that there had been misinformation, as the actual E/W agreement was that 2♥ shows just hearts. After winning the opening lead with the ♥Q, South played a diamond toward dummy. He asserted that he would have played the 10 rather than the king with the right information. This would result in an extra trick, allowing a spade to be discarded on a diamond. The result was adjusted to 4♣ by South, making five, N/S +150.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	4♣ by S, Made 5, N/S +150
--------------------------	---------------------------

### The Review

E/W requested a review of the ruling. They felt the correct information would not have made the play of the ♦10 more attractive. West believed that, with the correct information, the king would be the more reasonable play to limit the losers in diamonds to only one.



## Panel Findings

The reviewer spoke to two expert players to see how they would have played 4♣ with the right information. One played a spade toward the queen at trick two. When asked whether a diamond to the 10 (or running the eight) was attractive, he stated that was not an option he would consider.

The other expert said he would always play a diamond to the king. He said he would make 11 tricks on a ruffing finesse, playing East for the queen based upon restricted choice as West did not split.

The reviewer then gave the hand to three peers of South. Two played a diamond toward the king. One took the ruffing finesse, giving the same reasoning as the expert. Another tried to ruff out diamonds playing for 3-3, which would have led to 10 tricks. The third played a diamond to the king, playing for 3-3. She felt if West was likely to be two-suited, running the ♦8 was a better play.

For no player was the play of the ♦10 more attractive with the correct information. Therefore, there was no legal justification to adjust the score, and the table result of 4♣ by South, making four, N/S +130, was restored.

Experts consulted: Mikael Rimstedt, Diyan Danailov

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>4♣ by S, Made 4, N/S +130</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Koltnow
-----------------	--------------

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Break in Tempo, Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N9
---------------------------	--	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	Rockwell Mixed Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	McKenzie Myers
<b>Date</b>	03/15/2017	<b>Session</b>	Second Final


### Auction

West	North	East	South
	1♣	Pass	1♥
Dbl	2♥	3♠ <sup>1</sup>	4♥ <sup>2</sup>
Dbl <sup>3</sup>	Pass	4♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: STOP Card used
2: No hesitation
3: Hesitation

### Hand Record

Board	25	N	K Fung		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>N</b>	♠ Q4	♥ J1075		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>E/W</b>	♦ KJ	♣ AQ932		
W	Ida Groenkvist			E	Haig Tchamitch
♠	AK2			♠	J109876
♥	94			♥	Q
♦	A1095			♦	8764
♣	KJ87			♣	54
		S	Erez Hendelman		
		♠	53		
		♥	AK8632		
		♦	Q32		
		♣	106		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
4♠ by E	Down 1	N/S +100	♥K

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called after the play of the hand. East had placed the STOP card on the table before his 3♠ bid, and left it there for approximately five seconds. When he removed the card, South bid with minimal hesitation (approximately one second). West then took about 10-15 seconds before her double. South asked East at the time if he agreed to a break in tempo. East responded that West did "take a little time".

### Director Ruling

South is expected to pause when a skip bid is made. This is to protect both sides, who may need extra time to think due to the elevation of the auction. When South bids before taking the requisite 10 seconds, West may still need time to think. At this level of the auction, it is expected for the tempo to be slower. Given the amount of time all players felt was taken by the South and West players, it was determined that no unmistakable hesitation occurred. Therefore, the table result was ruled to stand, 4♠ by East, down one, N/S +100.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>4♠ by E, Down 1, N/S +100</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Review

N/S asked for a review of the ruling. They felt that East agreed to a break in tempo at the time, and only later questioned the lack of pause by South.

## Panel Findings

The appellants provided no new evidence and no error in procedure was found. Therefore, the ruling by the table director was upheld. The appeal was found to have no merit, and an Appeal Without Merit Warning was assigned.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>4♠ by E, Down 1, N/S +100</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Kevin Perkins
-----------------	---------------


<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Break in Tempo, Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	N10
---------------------------	--	--------------	-----

<b>Event</b>	Machlin Women's Swiss	<b>Event DIC</b>	Charlie MacCracken
<b>Date</b>	03/19/2017	<b>Session</b>	First Final

### Auction

West	North	East	South
		Pass	1♥
Pass	2♣	Pass	2♥
Pass	2♠	Pass	3♠ <sup>1</sup>
Pass	4♣ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	4♥ <sup>2</sup>
Pass	5♦ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	5♠ <sup>3</sup>
Pass	6♠	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	22	N	Pamela Nisbet		
<b>Dealer</b>	E	♠	A1042		
		♥	(void)		
<b>Vul</b>	E/W	♦	AK86		
		♣	A9754		
W	Wei Wang			E	Shuoyan Liu
♠	J86			♠	Q3
♥	8642			♥	QJ105
♦	Q103			♦	J94
♣	K62			♣	J1083
		S	Ru Hong Terajewicz		
		♠	K975		
		♥	AK973		
		♦	752		
		♣	Q		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Four-card support
2: Control bids
3: Break in tempo

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
6♠ by N	Made 6	N/S +980	♦4

### Facts Determined at the Table

The director was called at the end of play. Screens were in use, with North/East and South/West as screen mates. The director was told that the tray had been noticeably delayed on the S/W side at the point of the 5♠ bid and the following pass. All players agreed to that fact.

North claimed South's 5♠ bid denied possession of both the ace and king of hearts; South was unable to confirm that agreement and said she didn't know how to proceed further over 5♦. N/S were not an experienced partnership.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The director polled seven players from the Jacoby Swiss final and the regional A/X swiss. Four players passed 5♠, three of whom said no other action deserved consideration. Two other players bid 6♠ and said it was clear cut. One other bid 6♠ but said it was a close choice and would consider passing. Two of the players who passed were asked after they chose their action if they thought a slow 5♠ would suggest bidding on and they said it did.

### Director Ruling

Per Law 16B1, the director determined from the poll result that the hesitation "demonstrably suggested" not passing 5♠ and that pass was a logical alternative. Thus, per Law 12C, the score was adjusted to 5♠ by North, making six, N/S +480.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	5♠ by N, Made 6, N/S +480
--------------------------	---------------------------

## The Review

N/S appealed the ruling. All four players attended the review (which was recorded). The reviewer explained to N/S the steps the director had taken to arrive at the ruling, and that for the panel to overturn it some fault would have to be found with the ruling.

All players confirmed to the reviewer that there was a significant delay before the tray returned after 5♠-Pass. The reviewer explained the rationale for the ruling and how the law operates in this kind of case.

North disputed that the slow 5♠ bid suggested bidding six. She also explained that her partner's previous actions suggested strength due to the fast arrival methods they play, and that her own bidding was therefore aimed at deciding whether or not to bid a grand slam. She said she always intended to bid at least a small slam. She said that her partner was not as experienced a player as she was and that she had been bidding slowly all week so her tempo did not mean anything to her in this auction. She thought, by the methods she uses, her partner had denied both the ace and king of hearts with her 5♠ bid, so she had to have a card somewhere else, thus making bidding the small slam clearly correct over 5♠. When the reviewer pointed out that her partner did not share that opinion of what 5♠ showed relative to hearts, she said she assumed during the bidding that she did.

## Panel Findings

While it seemed apparent who was hesitating in the auction, the reviewer decided to further poll the question of whether it demonstrably suggested bidding the slam. Two players were given North's hand and the auction. One bid six, and the other passed. Both believed a slow 5♠ bid suggested bidding slam.

The panel was satisfied that there was an unmistakable hesitation that suggested not passing, and found that the director polled appropriately to determine that pass was a logical alternative. Therefore, the table ruling was upheld.

N/S were issued an Appeal Without Merit Warning.

Players consulted by the reviewer: Cenk Tuncok, Jeff Miller

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>5♠ by N, Made 6, N/S +480</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Matt Smith
<b>Member</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Member</b>	Jenni Carmichael


<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Card Designation	<b>Case:</b>	R1
---------------------------	------------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	First Sunday AX Swiss Teams	<b>Event DIC</b>	Peter Wilke
<b>Date</b>	03/12/2017	<b>Session</b>	First Session

### Auction

West	North	East	South
Pass	2♦ <sup>1</sup>	2NT	Pass
3NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>28</b>	N	Ellen Kent		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>W</b>	♠	AQxxxx		
		♥	9x		
		♦	xxx		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>	♣	xx		
W	Frank Merblum			E	
				Jeff Juster	
♠	J8			♠	Kx
♥	QJx			♥	Axxxx
♦	KQJ10x			♦	Ax
♣	Qxx			♣	Axxx
		S	Robert Kent		
		♠	109x		
		♥	K10x		
		♦	xxx		
		♣	KJ10x		

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Multi 2♦ - Alerted

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
3NT by E	Made 3	E/W +400	♠10

### Facts Determined at the Table

The contract was 3NT by East. South led the ♠10 to the jack, queen, and king. Declarer then cashed the ♦A and played a diamond to the board, stating "run the diamonds." However, he called for the king and queen of diamonds individually and in both cases West waited for the card to be called before playing it to the trick.

After the third round of diamonds was played, North failed to turn over her card. North said that declarer told her to turn over her diamond. She thought that he had called for a card from the board, so she played the ♥9. East said that the ♥9 came down before he told North to turn over her card and the ♥9 was on the table face-up on top of the still-upturned diamond. N/S added that dummy had initially said he did not know if a card had been called or not but later changed to say that a card had definitely not been called. Dummy denied this.

### Director Ruling

The director ruled that the declarer had not named a card to be played to the fifth trick. The ♥9 was ruled to have been played and was a major penalty card. Declarer then led a club to the ace and a club towards the queen. When South won the ♣K, declarer required him to lead a heart (Law 49D2a) and made 3NT.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3NT by E, Made 3, E/W +400</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Review

N/S appealed the ruling and were the only players to meet with the reviewer. North remained adamant that she thought declarer had called a diamond from dummy. South said he could not explicitly remember whether East had called

for a card from dummy, but he suspected declarer had called a card since he is very conscious to warn North (who is visually impaired) that she is about to play incorrectly and did not do so in this case.

N/S also felt that if North's ♥9 had not become a major penalty card, there was no way for declarer to make 3NT.

### Panel Findings

The panel judged that, although declarer had called the diamonds individually, he had initially called for the run of the diamond suit from dummy. The reviewer confirmed with the table director that all four players had agreed on this. Therefore, although declarer may or may not have called for the fourth diamond from dummy, the panel ruled that declarer's intent was clear. Declarer had made no attempt to stop the run of the diamond suit, and the 3-3 diamond break could not have been an unpleasant surprise or have required declarer to rethink his plans. If North's ♥9 is discarded on the fourth round of diamonds, declarer can come to only eight tricks (the spade at trick 1, two aces, and five diamond tricks). Therefore, the panel adjusted the score to 3NT by East down 1, N/S +50.

(There is a possibility that declarer will go down more than one—if he takes the heart finesse after running the diamonds in an attempt to make 3NT, North/South can win and cash five spades for down two. However, given that there was no Victory Point difference between down 1 and down 2, the reviewer did not revisit the issue with the panel.)

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>3NT by E, Down 1, N/S +50</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Eric Bell
<b>Member</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Member</b>	Scott Humphrey

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b> Misinformation	<b>Case:</b> R2
--	-----------------

<b>Event</b>	Wednesday A/X Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Hank Meyer
<b>Date</b>	03/15/2017	<b>Session</b>	First Session

### Auction

West	North	East	South
		Pass	2♠
Dbl	2NT	Pass	3♣ <sup>1</sup>
3♥	4♠	Pass	Pass
Pass			

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Explained feature, no Alert

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>N</b>	John Potter	
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>E</b>	♠	K6	
		♥	A107	
		♦	A8	
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>	♣	Q107532	
<b>W</b>	Tom Trachuk			<b>E</b> Andy Avery
♠	103			♠ Q94
♥	KQJ43			♥ 9652
♦	KJ5			♦ 10632
♣	AJ6			♣ K4
		<b>S</b>	Hugh Brown, Jr.	
		♠	AJ8752	
		♥	8	
		♦	Q974	
		♣	98	

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
4♠ by S	Made 4	N/S +620	♥K

### Facts Determined at the Table

Before the opening lead, West asked about the auction. He was told that 2NT was artificial and forcing, and that 3♣ showed a feature. South, who had intended his 3♣ bid as an Ogust response (bad hand, bad suit), did not speak up even though he believed Ogust to be the partnership agreement.

South won the ♥A, then led the ♣2 to the 4, 9 and jack. West switched to the ♦K. South crossruffed the red suits, ending in hand with the ♠AJ87 and the ♣8. South exited with his club. East, upon winning the king, was down to ♠Q94 and the ♥9, exited with the heart but was endplayed when South led a small trump, making 4.

### Additional Factors Determined Away from the Table

The Director polled three pairs, of varying abilities, to see how they would have defended the hand. All of the players with the West hand continued with the ♥Q at trick 3, with either explanation of the opponents' bidding.

### Director Ruling

N/S violated Law 40 when South did not correct North's explanation of their agreement. E/W were damaged by this, as West would have not switched to the ♦K if he did not think he had to kill the entry to the club suit in dummy. N/S were assigned down 1, -100, per Law 12C1c. Based upon the poll, the Director decided that West had committed a serious error when he switched to the ♦K, severing his right to redress, per Law 12C1b, so E/W received the table result.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>N/S: 4♠ by S, Down 1, E/W +100</b> <b>E/W: 4♠ by S, Made 4, N/S +620</b>
--------------------------	--



## The Review

Both sides appealed, and South and West attended the Review. South acknowledged that N/S were on different pages regarding rebids after 2NT. They had only one filled out convention card. South maintained that, regardless of the explanation of 3♣, he couldn't hold the ♣K, after trick 2.

West disagreed, positing that South could still hold the ♣K, if he started with K98. West acknowledged that, in this case, his best defense at this point would have been to play a small club, expecting East to ruff and exit with a diamond.

The Reviewer finally read Law 12C1b aloud.

*"If, subsequent to the irregularity, the non-offending side has contributed to its own damage by a serious error, (unrelated to the infraction) or by a wild or gambling action, it does not receive relief in the adjustment for such part of the damage as is self-inflicted."*

The reviewer told the players that his fellow Appeals panelists would have a difficult time convincing him that, even if West's switch to the ♦K had been a serious error, it was not in fact directly related to the MI.

## Panel Findings

The panel was unanimous that the Directors had misapplied Law 12C1b, since West's defense was clearly affected by North's explanation of 3♣. The panel assigned a result of 4♠ by South, down one, E/W +100 for both sides, per Laws 40B6b and 12C1c. Since the Directors had misapplied Law 12, and misunderstood the play, the panel decided that it was reasonable for both sides to request a review of the ruling.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>4♠ by S, Down 1, E/W +100</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Gary Zeiger
<b>Member</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Member</b>	David Metcalf

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Break in Tempo, Unauthorized Information	<b>Case:</b>	R3
---------------------------	--	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> Friday Daylight Open Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Bob Hendricks
<b>Date</b>	03/17/2017	<b>Session</b>	Second Session


### Auction

West	North	East	South
			1♦
1♥	Pass	1♠ <sup>1</sup>	2♦
Dbl <sup>2</sup>	3♦	Pass <sup>3</sup>	Pass
3♠	Pass	Pass	Pass

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Forcing one round
2: Intended support double
3: Break in tempo

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>N</b>	4500 MP		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>S</b>	♠	QJ		
		♥	J654		
		♦	Q643		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>E/W</b>	♣	982		
<b>W</b>	5700 MP			<b>E</b>	5500 MP
♠	K73			♠	A10985
♥	AKQ109			♥	32
♦	87			♦	K9
♣	653			♣	QJ104
		<b>S</b>	1400 MP		
		♠	642		
		♥	87		
		♦	AJ1052		
		♣	AK7		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
3♠ by E	Made 4	E/W +170	♣A

### Facts Determined at the Table

The Director was called after the 3♠ bid by West. It was agreed that East had first alerted West's double then when asked for explanation had taken back the alert. East had taken about 8-10 seconds before passing. East said he had to do a "reset" after realizing the double was not an alert, before making a bid.

### Director Ruling

The table director ruled the break in tempo was not significant due to the circumstances of West's double being first alerted, then not alerted by East. The table result was ruled to stand.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3♠ by E, Made 4, E/W +170</b>
--------------------------	----------------------------------

### The Review

N/S appealed the ruling. N/S felt East's hesitation and its implications had not been given proper consideration in the Director's ruling.

West said he made the double thinking it was a support double, but realized immediately after he bid that was not their partnership agreement.

### Panel Findings

This hand occurred in the next to last round of a two session event, thus limiting the director's ability to gather additional facts or conduct any polls.

Four polls were taken by the reviewer. All the players polled had between 4200-6600 MPs  
Six peers were polled with the West's hand given the auction: 1♦-1♥-Pass-1♠-2♦-Double-3♦-Pass-Pass-, with the double explained as showing a good overcall. Four passed, one doubled, and one bid 3♠.  
Four of those polled players were asked the following questions in the order below.

Poll #2: What would double show in this situation? Two said cards, one said good hand, one said takeout.

Poll #3: In the above auction, if partner alerted, then after being asked unalerted, then takes eight seconds to pass, is this a hesitation? All four said yes.

Poll #4: What does the hesitation show? The answers were "Partner is unsure", "Partner has doubt", "Partner doesn't know what to do", "extras".

The panel determined there was a break in tempo which provided unauthorized information to partner (Law 73C); pass was a logical alternative (Law 16B1a); and that the unauthorized information demonstrably suggested not passing due to the results of Poll #4. Per Law 12C1c, the result was changed to 3♦ by South, down one, E/W +50.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>3♦ by S, Down 1, E/W +50</b>
-----------------------	---------------------------------

### Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Jeff Jacob
<b>Member</b>	Eric Bell
<b>Member</b>	Jenni Carmichael

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	R4
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> Sunday A/X/Y Swiss Teams	<b>Event DIC</b>	Jay Bates
<b>Date</b>	03/19/2017	<b>Session</b>	Second Session


**Auction**

West	North	East	South
		1♣	Pass
1♦	Pass	1♥	Pass
2♦ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	2♠	Pass
3♦	Pass	3NT	Pass
Pass	Pass		

**Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention**

1: Game Force, artificial

**Hand Record**

<b>Board</b>	10	N	11,800 MP		
<b>Dealer</b>	E	♠	J109x		
		♥	10xx		
		♦	K		
<b>Vul</b>	Both	♣	J10732		
W	2200 MP			E	5800 MP
♠	Axx			♠	KQxx
♥	Qxx			♥	KJxx
♦	AJ10xxx			♦	8x
♣	Q			♣	Kxx
		S	300 MP		
		♠	85		
		♥	Axx		
		♦	Q9xx		
		♣	A9xx		

<b>Final Contract</b>	<b>Result of Play</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Opening Lead</b>
3NT by E	Made 3	E/W +600	♠5

**Facts Determined at the Table**

Before the opening lead, South asked about East's likely shape. West said that East should be either 4-4-4-1 or have a hand with four hearts and five clubs. E/W were a first time partnership and had had not discussed this auction. East did not speak up to clarify there was no such understanding.

South's lead of the ♠5 was non-systemic. The play went:

- Trick 1: ♠5 - ♠small - ♠9 - ♠K
- Trick 2: ♦8 - ♦small - ♦J - ♦K
- Trick 3: ♣3 - ♣small - ♣A - ♣Q

South now led the ♦9, after which East made nine tricks. The Director was called after the hand. N/S asked for redress due to East's failure to speak up about West's description of her hand pattern.

**Director Ruling**

The Director determined that East had violated Law 20F5b when she did not correct West's statements about partnership agreements which did not actually exist. Per Law 12C1c, the Director decided that without the misinformation about the E/W agreements, South would have continued with a club at trick four 75% of the time (leading to down two), and shifted to a diamond 25% of the time (allowing East to make). Since the result at the other table was N/S +100, the director's ruling resulted in N/S -.5 IMPs.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	75% - 3NT by E, Down 2, N/S +200 25% - 3NT by E, Made 3, E/W +600
--------------------------	--

## The Review

E/W appealed, and North, East and West attended the Review. South was unable to attend due to his flight reservation. E/W confirmed their status as a first time partnership. East admitted that West's statements about her hand pattern were not based on any agreement or partnership experience. She said she didn't know she was supposed to say anything.

North stated that South's opening lead was "creative", not part of any defensive agreements. North said that she led a small club to trick 3, requesting that South continue the suit. She said that her partner would not have gone wrong at trick 4 without the misleading explanation of East's club length.

E/W said that South's shift to the ♦9 showed he was unaffected by the MI.

## Panel Findings

Three players were given the defensive problem with the same misinformation South received. Two of them were peers of South, and they each returned a club. Another player with a higher masterpoint holding returned a spade. None considered shifting to a diamond regardless of the information they had about E/W's bidding agreements. The panel noted that East could easily be 4-4-4-1, and a club continuation would still be correct if North held J10xx. The panel decided that, for this South, the misinformation about East's pattern did not cause his damage. Law 40B4 says that a side that is damaged as a consequence of its opponents' failure to provide disclosure of the meaning of a call as these Laws require is entitled to an adjusted score. The panel concluded that the damage was not a consequence of the misinformation, and restored the table result of 3NT by East, making 3, E/W +600.

The panel would have preferred to base its decision on more polling data, but because this ruling came on the last hand of the last session more players to poll were not available.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>3NT by E, Made 3, E/W +600</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Gary Zeiger
<b>Member</b>	Matt Koltnow
<b>Member</b>	Jenni Carmichael