

APPEAL NON-NABC+ TWO

Subject: Misinformation (MI) and Unauthorized Information (UI)

DIC: Harry Falk

Event: Fast Open Pairs

Session: Monday, April 3, 2006, First Session

(2837 MPs)
Board #29 ♠ K T 3 2
Vul: Both ♥ 7
Dlr: North ♦ Q 9 8 6 5 3
♣ T 2

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| (10944 MPs) | (4637 MPs) |
| ♠ 5 4 | ♠ 8 7 |
| ♥ J 6 4 2 | ♥ A 8 5 |
| ♦ K 7 2 | ♦ A J T 4 |
| ♣ J 6 5 3 | ♣ A K 9 8 |

(2737 MPs)
♠ A Q J 9 6
♥ K Q T 9 3
♦
♣ Q 7 4

| West | North | East | South |
|----------|-------|------|-----------------|
| | Pass | 1NT | 2♥ ¹ |
| Pass | 3♦ | Pass | 3♠ |
| All Pass | | | |

(1) Alerted and explained as hearts and a minor.

The Facts: The 2♥ call was Alerted and explained as hearts and an unknown minor. South's convention card defined the 2♥ call as hearts and spades. The table result was three spades making five, +200 for N/S, after the opening lead of the ♣5.

The Ruling: While there was MI as the N/S agreement is majors, the MI was judged not to be a damaging factor. South had UI, which demonstrably suggested the 3♠ call. Pass was determined to be a less successful logical alternative (law 16). Therefore, the score for both pairs was adjusted to the result in a contract of 3♦ by N/S, which was down three, -300 for N/S (law 12 C 2).

The Appeal: South reiterated his statement that he felt his hand merited further action. He could almost make a game in his own hand.

The Decision: Three players were polled. They were given the information that the 2♥ call showed the majors. Two chose to pass. One chose to bid 3♥ as he hated to pass with a void in partner's suit and thought partner would work out that he had the majors. The panel decided that Pass is a logical alternative and that a 3♠ call is a blatant attempt to get partner's attention. The panel upheld the director's decision in assigning a result of 3♦ down three, -300 for N/S and +300 for E/W. Since, in the discussion with the reviewer, the appellants were informed of the poll taken of other players and continued to support the 3♠ call, the panel imposed an Appeal Without Merit Warning (AWMW).

The Panel: Patty Holmes (Reviewer), Bernie Gorkin and Charlie MacCracken

Players consulted: Cam Doner, Fred Hamilton and Barry Harper.

Commentary:

- Polisner** Perfect except for no penalty point to South for blatant use of MI.
- Rigal** Excellent AWMW here; too easy to use South's rationale for bidding while not acknowledging that the UI was what made you do it – as opposed to bidding 3H say if you were not going to pass. Probably into procedural penalty territory.
- Wildavsky** The TD and panel rulings were both reasonable and coincidentally led to the same adjustment. The basis for both rulings was that there were logical alternatives to 3♠, and that 3♠ was demonstrably suggested by the UI. This ought to have been crystal clear to the appellants, so the AWMW was well deserved. A procedural penalty in addition would not have been out of place.
- Wolff** More convention disruption and again I think the committee ruled it right, but players (especially inexperienced ones) needed to have it explained to them why and so, consequently, the AWMW was too much.