

APPEAL	NABC+ FIVE
Subject	Misinformation (MI) and Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Rockwell Mixed Pairs
Session	Second Final
Date	March 12, 2008

BD#	1
VUL	None
DLR	North

Lynne Feldman	
♠	8 6 4 3
♥	A Q 8 6
♦	9 6 2
♣	4 2

Valerie Gamio		<b>Spring 2008 Detroit, MI</b>	Carlos Pellegrini	
♠	K Q J T		♠	9 7 5
♥	9 7 3		♥	K J 5 4 2
♦	A T 8 7		♦	Q J 3
♣	8 6		♣	K 9

Barry Schaffer	
♠	A 2
♥	T
♦	K 5 4
♣	A Q J T 7 5 3

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

Final Contract	4♣ by S
Opening Lead	♠K
Table Result	Down 1, N/S -50
Director Ruling	3♣ by S, made 3, N/S +110
Committee Ruling	3♥ by E, down 1, N/S +50

(1)	Alerted and explained as responsive showing spades.
(2)	North passed originally. After explanation of double was changed to penalty of 1♥, North was permitted to change her call to 3♠.

**The Facts:** The director was called after the auction was concluded at 3♥, because the explanation of East's double was changed to penalty rather than responsive showing four spades. North was permitted to change her call. The director was called back after the play. N/S argued that the pull of the double of 2♣ may have been based on UI. If East had passed, South would have pulled to 3♣, which would likely have ended the auction because East had described his values.

**The Ruling:** The director determined that the MI did not damage N/S. However, it was determined that the UI caused had an affect on the outcome. Therefore, in accordance with laws 16 A and 12 C 2, the director adjusted the score to 3♣ by South making three, N/S plus 110 and E/W minus 110.

**The Appeal:** South said he did not bid 3♣ on the second round of bidding because he wanted to be able to cuebid spades in an effort to get his side to 3NT if North could bid it. If he had known East's double showed hearts, then he would probably have opted for 3♣ on the second round, which may have frozen East out of the auction. South felt that with the poorly placed ♣K, East may not have bid.

The committee asked East why he pulled the double of 2♠. He could provide no explanation other than that he thought playing the hand in 3♥ was clear-cut opposite a take-out double.

**The Decision:** This is a complicated case of combined MI and UI. The committee affirmed the director's finding that pulling the double of 2♠ was an infraction of law 16 and that the Alert and explanation of East's previous double was MI to N/S. However, the committee disagreed with the appropriate adjustment. The committee found that had South, with the correct information, had bid 3♣ on the second round of bidding, it was very unlikely that East would pass, even with the poorly positioned ♣K (which contributes to the likelihood that South will make his contract). The vulnerability and form of scoring both make East's passing unlikely and improbable.

Furthermore, in that auction North's eccentric bid of 3♠ would never have occurred. The committee also considered other likely auction had the first double been properly explained and found that the most favorable result N/S was likely to achieve was 3♥, down one, N/S plus 50.

The committee considered the possibility that North's 3♠ bid broke the chain of causality from infraction to damage. It found that the MI early in the hand regarding spades made South's 2♠ call sufficiently ambiguous that North's bid of 3♠ did not break the chain. The committee also considered East's pull of West's double of 2♠ to be apparently predicated on the UI he had from West's explanation of the double of 1♥. The committee adjusted the result to 3♥ by East, down one, N/S plus 50.

The committee was divided on whether to issue a procedural penalty (PP) but ultimately declined to do so.

**The Committee:** John Solodar (Chair), Huston (Scribe), Jerry Gaer, Ed Lazarus and Tom Peters.

## Commentary:

- Goldsmith** Yes, this seems complicated with both UI and MI. The first UI issue occurred at East's third turn. 2♥ seems like a normal action; passing is not a LA. The next problem was MI. South would never have bid 2♠ without MI; he'd have bid 3♣. He might have bid 3♥, which would lead to the making of 3NT, but he said he wouldn't, so we can believe him. After this start, the possible results seem to be 3♣, 3♥ doubled or not, and 4♣ doubled or not. I don't see anyone's hitting 4♣, but I think all the other results are at least at all probable. So by law 12C2, E/W gets the worst of those, which is minus 110 for 3♣. I think 3♣ is also a likely result, so N/S get plus 110.  
It's complicated enough that we should not give an AWMW even though the director got it right. The director ought, however, have put extra effort into explaining his ruling this time.  
East abused UI pretty blatantly when he bid 3♥. If he is an experienced player, 1/4 board might help wake him up to his responsibility.
- Polisner** I think the director got this one right. The combination of East bidding 3♥ knowing that West can make such a light takeout double, the poorly placed ♣K and the known poor heart break would make a 3♣ final contract more likely. Also, at the minimum, the committee should have assumed that 3♥ doubled would be the final contract if it decided to assume that East would compete to 3♥.
- Rigal** I'm inclined to leave the contract in 3♣. Given North's heart bid and the doubleton club king, I'm not sure why East has to compete over 3♣ here. Once we establish UI and MI, I certainly think that even if N/S are only due plus 50, E/W might be due minus 110.

- Smith** I'm not as sure as the committee that East would never sell out to 3♣ no matter how N/S got there, but the committee decision is reasonable.
- Wildavsky** It seems to me it might be "at all probable" that East would allow South to play 3♣ on some auctions. I won't fault the director or the committee decisions -- I'd say this one is too close to call.  
I don't understand, though, why the committee failed to issue a procedural penalty. East had a clear pass over 2♠, the UI strongly suggested the pull, and East offered no reason for his 3♥ call.
- Wolff** A reasonable decision, especially so with the difficult facts involved. In cases such as these all a tournament director or a committee can do is to try and establish equity, and I think this committee did that. Of course, convention disruption (CD) always creates problems, as it did here, so as far as I am concerned, any doubt should go against the CDers. An alternate decision could be plus 50 N/S and minus 110 E/W which would reflect the above thought (protect the field).