

APPEAL	NABC+ THREE
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) and Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	November 21, 2006

BD#	8
VUL	None
DLR	West

Dick Bruno	
♠	Q 8 4 3
♥	2
♦	K Q 8 4
♣	A K 8 5

Barie Wall		Fall 2006 Honolulu, Hawaii	Ray Miller	
♠	A J 7 2		♠	K 9 5
♥	K Q T 5 4		♥	J 9 7 3
♦	6 2		♦	A J 3
♣	J 7		♣	Q T 9

Peggy Kaplan	
♠	T 6
♥	A 8 6
♦	T 9 7 5
♣	8 4 3 2

West	North	East	South
1♥	Dbl	2NT ¹	Pass
3♣	Pass	3♥	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	3♥ by East
Opening Lead	♣A
Table Result	3♥ making 3, E/W +140
Director Ruling	4♥ by E, down 1, E/W -50
Committee Ruling	4♥ by E, down 1, E/W -50

(1) Explained as a relay to 3♣.

The Facts: The opening bid by West was limited to 10-15 HCP. East claimed that the partnership opened all 11-counts and some 10-counts with five hearts. E/W play 2NT as limit or better in hearts. West confused two auctions and provided a mistaken explanation of 2NT without having been asked. The partnership agreement of the 3♣ bid is that it is a long-suit game try.

The Ruling: The director found that there was UI arising from the incorrect explanation of the agreement. After consulting several players, the director decided that bidding 4♥ was a less successful logical alternative (LA) for East, rather than bidding 3♥ which was demonstrably suggested by the UI. In accordance with laws 16A and 12C2, an adjustment was made to 4♥ by East down one, E/W minus 50.

The Appeal: East said that West opened all eleven HCP hands. 3♣ suggested 12-13 HCP, since with more West would have accepted the limit raise. South suggested that East's club fillers made his hand worth a raise to 4♥.

The Decision: The committee determined that West's misexplanation constituted UI under Law 16. Because E/W were playing Precision with light openings (even in the context of Precision) the committee felt that given that:

- (1) East had minimum high cards for the 2NT call, and
- (2) There was no LA to 4♥ over a 3♣ game try, but
- (3) If 3♣ meant nothing at all, then 3♥ became more attractive facing a severely limited opening;

the UI demonstrably suggested bidding only 3♥. The point was that since East possessed information suggesting that West might not have a game invitation, 3♥, as opposed to 4♥, was made more attractive given the form of scoring. So the questions to be answered at this point were whether there was a logical alternative to bidding 3♥ and whether there were any other calls, such as 3♦ or 3NT, to consider as LAs. The panel considered a minimum hand like Ax, KQTxx, xx, Kxxx where the game depended on a club finesse. The panel also noted that changing one of the kings to an ace or adding the ♣J would make 4♥ an excellent game. Therefore, the committee deemed 4♥ a LA to 3♥.

The committee decided that 3♦ (a counter game try which would have led to West passing and E/W going down three or four) was not a LA for East; and that 3NT should not be considered a LA since it would have led to a better result than E/W achieved at the table. Therefore, the committee adjusted the result to 4♥, down one, minus 50 E/W, plus 50 N/S.

The Committee/Panel: Jeff Goldsmith (Chair), Darwin Afdahl, Joann Sprung, Peggy Sutherlin and Jim Thurtell.