

<b>Appeal #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Event</b>
2007-11	Misinformation	ANC Women's Teams
<b>Stage</b>	<b>Round</b>	<b>Date</b>
RR2	4	2007-07
<b>Committee</b>	E. Ramshaw (c), B. Folkard, M. Abraham	

**Board** 21  
**Dealer** N  
**Vul** NS  
**Scoring** Imps, capped, teams

**North**

♠ 654  
♥ JT84  
♦ K3  
♣ 9732

**West**

♠ AKQT82  
♥ 6  
♦ AJ75  
♣ Q4

**East**

♠ 3  
♥ 97532  
♦ Q9642  
♣ 85

**South**

♠ J97  
♥ AKQ  
♦ T8  
♣ AKJT6

West	North	East	South
-	Pass	Pass	1NT
X	2♥ (1)	Pass	2♠
Pass	Pass	3♦	Pass
4♠	Pass	5♦	All pass

(1) Described as a transfer to spades; South then withdrew the explanation in favour of "not sure" while bidding 2♠

<b>Table result</b>	5♦-2 by East, EW -100
<b>Director's ruling</b>	4♠-1 by West, EW -50
<b>Committee's ruling</b>	4♠-1 by West, EW -50

**The Director:** When called to the table, informed East that if she had been given misinformation and the auction was passed out, the correct explanation would be given and East would be allowed to retract the final pass in favour of an alternate call. In any case, if the misinformation had damaged East-West earlier in the auction, the result would be reviewed. East chose to call, eventually reaching 5♦-2.

Determined that the misinformation had damaged East-West in the later part of the auction, and adjusted the score to 4♠-1, EW -50.

**The appellants:** East needed to know whether or not 2♥ was a transfer – she would certainly pass if it showed spades, and would be inclined to bid otherwise (since partner had doubled the strong 1NT opening for penalties).

The director's offer of a pass with a correction if the bid was not a transfer was not appropriate, as East only wanted to bid if 2♥ was a transfer. In fact, it showed both majors. On the proper information, South would have played in 3♠, going down four for NS -400.

**The respondents:** Made no written submissions.

**The appeals committee:** Felt that the East-West actions were doubtful, but the auction was not forcing. Decided that East's 3♦ bid broke the nexus between the misinformation infraction and the potential damage. Director's decision upheld.