

APPEAL	Non NABC+ Nine
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Nancy Boyd
Event	Yuba City Stratified Pairs
Session	Second of Two
Date	March 17, 2010

BD#	16
VUL	E/W
DLR	West

28,000 Masterpoints	
♠	T
♥	K 9 7
♦	A K 7 6
♣	K J 8 7 3

1,250 Masterpoints		Spring 2010 Reno, NV	2,500 Masterpoints	
♠	A J 9 8 4 3		♠	K 7
♥	A 8 4 3		♥	2
♦			♦	Q J T 9 8 5
♣	A 9 2		♣	Q T 6 4

200 Masterpoints	
♠	Q 6 5 2
♥	Q J T 6 5
♦	4 3 2
♣	5

West	North	East	South
1♠	Dbl	3♦ ¹	3♥
4♠	Pass	Pass	5♥
Dbl	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	5♥ doubled by South
Opening Lead	♠ A
Table Result	Down 4, N/S – 800
Director Ruling	4♠ W down 1, E/W - 100
Panel Ruling	E/W: 4♠ W down 1, E/W – 100 N/S: 5♥dbld S down 4, N/S - 800

(1) Explained as invitational in spades.

The Facts: The director was called after the play of the hand had been completed. Inspection of the E/W convention cards revealed that the agreement is that 3♦ bid is weak and natural (showing long diamonds).

The Ruling: Although the directors unanimously felt that the 5♥ bid was ill-advised, a majority felt that, given the correct information, it would be even less attractive. Therefore, in accordance with Laws 21B3 and 12, the contract was adjusted to 4♠ by West with a result of down one assigned to both sides (E/W -100 and N/S +100).

The Appeal: E/W appealed the director's decision and all four players attended the review.

E/W felt the 5♥ bid was impossible, taking two bids at the three and five levels, after just a double by North. East said he could accept a ruling of minus 100 at 4♠ for his side and minus 800 for N/S because West had misexplained their agreement and they did not deserve a top for that. South said she felt that E/W had a nine-card spade fit from the misexplanation so they could make 4♠ vulnerable. North was unsure whether West said that 3♦ showed three or four spades.

The Decision: Four players with 110-300 masterpoints were given South's hand. Two bid 3♥ initially whether 3♦ was a spade raise or a weak diamond bid. The other two passed if it was a spade raise. However, having bid 3♦ initially, all four passed 4♠ regardless of the meaning of 3♦. Therefore, the panel felt that 5♥ was not based on the misinformation. There was some sentiment for a procedural penalty against E/W for MI, but the panel decided (2-1) to restore the table result to N/S and the director's adjustment (4♠ down one) to E/W.

The Panel: Peter Marcus (Reviewer), Candace Kushner, Tom Marsh and Bill Michael.

Commentary:

Rigal I really like the split ruling. N/S would not have saved without the wrong explanation so E/W must get the appropriate result in 4S...are we assuming a trump lead by the way? South's action was wild and gambling under any circumstances – isn't North supposed to know whether he has a spade void or not? Hence restore the table action and definitely no PP.

Polisner The standard of the quality of bridge required after being the victim of MI is very low. In a case like this, where N/S are at favorable, S having a reasonable belief, based on the MI, that N's void is Spades, with a reasonable likelihood that N/S possess a 9 card H fit, and S's singleton C, it is a poor decision to give N/S - 800. The TD's ruling of 4 S by W -100 for both sides is correct and even the thought of a PP is ridiculous.

Wildavsky 5H was not in my judgment a "serious error unrelated to the infraction" per law 12C1(b). Certainly the MI made it more attractive. The polling procedure seems flawed. First of all we are interested only in the opinion of those who would bid 3H over 3D, given that 3D showed a spade raise. Second we must discount the judgment of the players who would bid 3H when their RHO showed diamonds, but not when he showed spades -- that makes no sense at all. A more useful way to poll here would be to start by giving those polled the same information as the player at the table. Only afterwards should we ask which actions it makes more and less attractive. Perhaps that is the procedure that was followed -- we have no way of knowing. Only if the polls are taken in writing can information be given to

TDs, Panels, and ACs with the full context necessary to make the results useful in rendering a decision.

Here I prefer the TD's ruling to the Panel's.

Wolff

A truly magnificent ruling:

- A. NS keep their thoroughly deserved -800
- B. Because of the CD EW lose their +800, but are left with a few match points -100 in 4 Spades.

When committees (or TD's at the table) hear violations by players the combined matchpoints in pair events should not often add up to the total for that hand, but instead be less, all the way down to even minus match points on that board. This hand is a poster child for that caveat.