

APPEAL	NABC+ FOUR
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Harry Falk
Event	Marsha May Sternberg Womens' BAM
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	December 29, 2009

BD#	18
VUL	N/S
DLR	East

Joanna Stansby	
♠	5
♥	K Q 9 8 5 2
♦	K 8
♣	Q J 8 4

Jill Meyers		Fall 2009 San Diego, CA	Jill Levin	
♠	J 8 6 2		♠	T 9 4 3
♥	J T 4		♥	A 7
♦	A		♦	Q J 6 5 4 2
♣	A K T 6 2		♣	3

Pam Wittes	
♠	A K Q 7
♥	6 3
♦	T 9 7 3
♣	9 7 5

West	North	East	South
		Pass	Pass
1♣	2♥ ¹	Dbl	Redbl ²
3♠ ³	Pass	4♠	Dbl
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Final Contract	4♠ doubled by West
Opening Lead	♥K
Table Result	Down 1 E/W -100
Director Ruling	3♠ W made 3, E/W + 140
Committee Ruling	3♠ W made 3, E/W + 140

(1)	Intermediate.
(2)	A doubleton heart and willingness to compete.
(3)	May show extra values by distribution as well as by additional strength.

The Facts: The director was called when dummy first was displayed and again after the hand. 2♥ was not Alerted. East claimed that she would pass 3♠ with correct information. Peer polling indicated that many Easts would not bid game regardless of the meaning of 2♥, but those who did bid game on the un-alerted auction all considered not bidding with the correct explanation and some said they would not bid.

Before play continued East and West away from the table said they would have doubled and bid 3♠ respectively with the correct information.

The Ruling: The director judged that there had been misinformation and that E/W were damaged because of it. Therefore, the result was changed to 3♠ by West making three, E/W plus 140 for both sides.

The Appeal: N/S appealed the director's decision. Only North and West attended the hearing.

North said that she had no objection to rolling back the contract to 3♠. She had appealed because she believed that a trump lead was clear-cut against 3♠ but not against 4♠, and she explained her reasoning.

The Decision: The committee determined that there was no disagreement about the facts as presented and concluded that East would likely have passed 3♠ with the correct information.

The committee did not agree that a trump lead was likely against 3♠.

The committee ruled as the TD had and adjusted the score for both sides to 3♠ by West making three, E/W plus 140.

The committee determined that N/S had no reasonable basis for an appeal and so issued an appeal without merit warning (AWMW) to North and South.

The Committee: Jeff Meckstroth (Chair), Gene Kales, Ellen Kent, Ed Lazarus and Chris Moll (Scribe).

Commentary:

Goldsmith I'd like to see the argument why a trump lead was more indicated against 3♠ than against 4♠ doubled. I suspect I'd side with the committee and reject the argument, since the double suggests trump tricks, and if North wasn't going to lead a trump then, when would she? Even if the argument is reasonable, however, it's at least likely that North would not lead one, and Law 12C tells us that the proper adjustment is 140. So even without getting to know the basis of the appeal, I think the AWMW is justified. This theme will come up again; Law 12 doesn't allow the offending side to do something good in a contract their offense prevented being played. The committee apparently didn't consider the issue whether the MI suggested not bidding 4♠ vs. bidding it. I don't see how it matters where the opposing cards lie, but since each side was fine with 3♠ as a final contract, I guess that's okay, though I would probably rule that the MI did not cause damage and let the table result stand. It's certainly close enough that if N/S had appealed that decision, no AWMW would have been given.

Polisner N/S would have made a better case by contending that West would have bid 4♠ in any event. Just give West AKxx/xxx/Ax/ J10xx and 4♠ would have a decent play. At least such an argument would have avoided an AWMW which was automatic with the stated reason for the appeal that North would have led a spade against 3♠.

- Rigal** The proper procedure was followed and I agree with the committee's decision to award an AWMW. Regardless of how cogent the argument for a trump lead might be, it cannot be that convincing if you don't lead a trump against 3♠.
- Smith** Very good by the directors. I like to see that bridge issues have been polled where appropriate. So it seems clear in law to revert the contract to 3♠, and an experienced N/S should realize that when told by the director what the ruling was and why it was made. I wish the write-up told us why North thought a trump lead was clear-cut against 3♠ as opposed to 4♠, but obviously the committee disagreed in any case. Very good job by the committee, and I agree with the AWMW.
- Wildavsky** If anything, a trump lead seems more likely against 4♠ doubled than against 3♠. I agree that the appeal had no merit. Note, though, that this case may not have been screened, and I would hesitate to assess an AWMW in those circumstances. As a practical matter it is sometimes difficult to screen a case for a variety of reasons. We'll try to do better going forward.
- Wolff** Many self-serving statements were issued, but since 2♥ intermediate was not Alerted E/W should be allowed to back up to 3♠. This hand is like Swiss cheese, full of holes. A vulnerable preempt should be at least as strong as North's hand, which would, of course, be an argument in favor of not backing it up, but since it is a B-A-M event we probably should not give two different scores, E/W minus 100 and N/S minus 140 which would be my decision at matchpoints.