

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2007-06	Misinformation	Gold Coast Congress Open Pairs
Stage	Round	Date
Final	2	2007-02-19
Committee	R. Grenside (c), M. Ware, N. Francis, A. Braithwaite	

Board 19
Dealer S
Vul EW
Scoring Matchpoint pairs

North

♠ QT6532
 ♥ Q3
 ♦ 8643
 ♣ 5

West

♠
 ♥ J7
 ♦ AKQJ5
 ♣ KQ9864

East

♠ 87
 ♥ T98642
 ♦ T2
 ♣ T73

South

♠ AKJ94
 ♥ AK5
 ♦ 97
 ♣ AJ2

West	North	East	South
-	-	-	2♦ (1)
3♣	P	P	3♠ (2)
4♦	4♠	5♣	X
All pass			

- (1) Weak major, balanced 21-22, or strong 4441
 (2) Strong 4441, stiff club

Trick	West	North	East	South
1	♣ <u>x</u>	♠x	x	K
2	♦ <u>A</u>	x	x	x
3	♦ <u>K</u>	x	x	x
4	♦5	x	♣T	♣ <u>J</u>

Table result	5♣x-2 by West, EW -500
Director's ruling	5♣x-2 by West, EW -500
Committee's ruling	75% of 5♣x-2 by West, EW -500 25% of 5♣x-1 by West, EW -200

The Director: Was called after the play of the hand. West was concerned that a misexplanation was given of the 3♠ bid. North insisted that the explanation was correct (system notes at home), but South was unsure. West claimed that he would not have bid 4♦ given a different explanation.

After consultation with other directors, the consensus was that 3♠ was a misbid, and the explanation was correct. The score was therefore not adjusted. Any damage was due to an inferior line of play.

The appellants: Made no written submissions. During the hearing, agreed with the Director's recitation of facts.

The respondents: Made no written submissions.

The appeals committee: Questioned West concerning the line of play in 5♣x, who conceded that he misplayed the hand (playing North for ♣Axx and South holding the singleton J), and that on this layout, a small diamond to the ten would have safeguarded against a singleton ace.

Felt that there was no specific agreement after interference over the 2♦ opening. West is entitled under law to a correct explanation of the agreement, namely balanced 21-22, and with the incorrect information stood very little chance of finding the winning line to go only one down. However, the committee felt that West's play was the prime factor contributing to the bad result and may have gone down two even with the correct explanation. Thus the committee adjusted the score to 75% of 5♣x-2, EW-500, and 25% of 5♣x-1, EW -200.