

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Thirteen
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Chris Patrias
Event	Mini-Spangold 0-5000
Session	Round of 8 Segment 1
Date	July 26, 2007

BD#	<b>3</b>
VUL	<b>E/W</b>
DLR	<b>S</b>

<b>3,020 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	A 7 2
♥	T 7
♦	A K T 8 5
♣	Q 6 4

<b>4,816 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	K Q 9 5
♥	A 9 5
♦	4
♣	K J T 9 2

<b>Summer 2007 Nashville, Tennessee</b>	
<b>4,412 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	T 6 4
♥	K Q J 3 2
♦	Q J 7 3 2
♣	

<b>3,400 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	J 8 3
♥	8 6 4
♦	9 6
♣	A 8 7 5 3

West	North	East	South
			Pass
1♦ <sup>1</sup>	2♦ <sup>2</sup>	Pass	3♥ <sup>3</sup>
Pass	3♠ <sup>4</sup>	Pass	4♣
Dbl	5♦	Pass	6♦
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Final Contract	<b>6♦ by North</b>
Opening Lead	<b>♣A</b>
Table Result	<b>6♦ N, Made 6, NS +920</b>
Director Ruling	<b>6♦ N, Made 6, NS +920</b>
Panel Ruling	<b>6♦ N, Down 2, EW +100</b>

(1)	Guarantees at least a 4-card major (Alerted).
(2)	Natural.
(3)	Not Alerted. East was told it could be a splinter – delayed explanation. West was told it was a “fit” jump.
(4)	West told it was ambiguous, control or natural.

**The Facts:**

East claimed that he would have led a spade had he known that the 3♥ bid was a fit jump and not a splinter.

**The Ruling:** The director ruled that the MI of the 3♥ bid did not damage E/W. Several leading players were consulted about this hand. They all agreed that despite either explanation of the 3♥ bid, they would always lead the ♣A. Table result stands. Law 40C.

**The Appeal:** Behind screens West was told by South that 3♥ was a fit showing jump. North did not Alert East but volunteered 3♥ “might be a splinter.” Both of N/S’s convention cards clearly state they play fit showing jumps in many situations, including this one. E/W play a big club system. The 1♦ bid promised zero or more diamonds and at least one four-card major.

East said he led a club because partner had doubled 4♣ and South shouldn’t be short in hearts and clubs. If he had known that 3♥ was fit showing, he would have assumed 4♣ showed shortness. He would have led a spade since if South had hearts, West had spades.

South said, at this level, East should have been able to work out that, with five of his own clubs, West and North couldn’t both have clubs. If West wanted a club lead, say with KQx or whatever, South’s cuebid must show shortness since East himself had the ace.

**The Decision:** Nine of East’s peers were given his opening lead problem, with full system information and correct information about South’s fit-showing jump. Six players led a Club, either ace or small, and would not have changed their lead if 3♥ was a splinter. Three players led a spade. One spade leader would lead a spade regardless of the meaning of the 3♥ bid. Two of the spade leaders would have led a club if 3♥ was a splinter. Their reasoning duplicated that of East. Since N/S had clearly violated Law 40C, E/W were entitled to redress if a better result met the standards required by Law 12C2. Based on player input, a spade lead was obviously sufficiently “likely.” Since two of the three spade leaders followed the same logic demonstrated by East, the panel was satisfied that E/W were entitled to redress under 12.C.2 The panel assigned a result of 6♦ by North, down two, E/W plus 100.

The panel was aware the explanation of “splinter” should have seemed strange to East since nine hearts would have to have been shared by North and West. None of the players consulted about the hand picked up on this inference, so the panel did not consider holding East liable for not considering it.

**The Panel:** Gary Zeiger (Reviewer), Bernie Gorkin and Jean Molnar.

**Players Consulted:** Several leading players by the table director. Nine players with about 3,400 masterpoints by panel reviewer.

### **Commentary:**

**Polisner** With 3,400 masterpoints, a player should be able to deduce that 3♥ was not a splinter especially with the ambivalent explanation. One of the problems with these types of polls is that the “peers” may not take the time required to come to the conclusion that is obvious. Table result stands.

**Rigal** I think the reasoning the panel used to point out the nine hearts between North and West is a fair one. But I think the initial ruling might have gone the other way, since there was an infraction and some doubt, and the final verdict had to go the way of the non-offenders because of the player's comments. This is the sort of case that might be best handled by a law 12C3 adjustment or a reciprocal procedural penalty (PP) -- since the Mini-Spingold is an expert event in everything but name.

**Smith** A very thorough and good job by the panel.

**Wildavsky** Both rulings seem reasonable. When did West learn that 3♥ showed a fit? It's possible he wouldn't have doubled 4♣ had he known. With screens he probably should have asked with or without an Alert – the bid has no standard meaning.

**Wolff** I agree. Wrong description---BIG PENALTY. GOOD!