

APPEAL	Non NABC+ Seven
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Jeff Alexander
Event	Wed-Thu Compact Knockout
Session	First
Date	December 2, 2009

BD#	25
VUL	E/W
DLR	North

81 Masterpoints	
♠	J 9 7 2
♥	A Q J 4
♦	Q 5 2
♣	K 7

1,214 Masterpoints		Fall 2009 San Diego, CA	266 Masterpoints	
♠	6 5 4		♠	K Q T
♥	K 3		♥	7 6 5
♦	7		♦	A J T 9 4
♣	Q J 8 6 5 3 2		♣	A 9

2,707 Masterpoints	
♠	A 8 3
♥	T 9 8 2
♦	K 8 6 3
♣	T 4

West	North	East	South
	1♣ ⁽¹⁾	1♦	1♥
Pass	2♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	2♥ by South
Opening Lead	♦7
Table Result	Made 2, N/S + 110
Director Ruling	3♣ W made 3, E/W + 110
Panel Ruling	2♥ S made 2, N/S + 110

(1) Agreement is could be a doubleton – no Announcement.
--

The Facts: The director was called after dummy was faced and again after the play of the hand. N/S's agreements were such that a 1♣ opening could be as short as two clubs. A "Could be short" Announcement is required for this agreement. Away from the table, West said she would bid 3♣ if properly informed.

The Ruling: The director judged that E/W were damaged. The result was changed to 3♣ by West making three, E/W + 100 for both sides as the most favorable likely result for E/W and the most unfavorable result at all probable for N/S. Laws 40B4 and 12C1(e).

The Appeal: N/S appealed the director's decision and were the only players to attend the hearing.

N/S agreed that they had failed to Announce as required.

E/W were not present at the review as they had left. However, through several telephone calls with the West player, the Reviewer established that the set of facts were agreeable to all. The West player could not state a reason why a 3♣ bid became more attractive than a pass based upon a timely Announcement.

The Decision: Five players in the 800-1,200 masterpoint range were polled giving them the West hand and without a proper Announcement. Two would not bid and would not bid with an Announcement. Three bid 3♣ and would have done so with an Announcement.

The poll indicated that the choice of passing (not bidding 3♣) was not due to the failure to Announce the potential shortness but was due to the tendency of the West to remain silent in this type of auction.

Therefore, the panel determined that there was no damage and reinstated the table result of N/S plus 110 for both sides.

The Panel: William Michael (Reviewer), Matt Koltnow and Tom Marsh.

Commentary:

Polisner I disagree with the panel as 3♣ is more attractive with the correct information.

Rigal This cannot be right; regardless of what you think E/W are due, N/S's failure to Alert caused them to get their good result. They deserve no better than minus 110. Even if E/W get landed with the table result, (and I'd be sorely tempted to give them the benefit of the doubt) I think a split score must be put in place.

Smith Good methodology by the panel, and I agree with the conclusions that flow from it. I have yet to see a situation where I think it is right to adjust a score based on a failure to announce a "could be short" 1♣ opener that promises two or more. However, I do have little sympathy for N/S in not announcing it, and I would give them a penalty.

Wildavsky I prefer the director's ruling to the panel's. Whether West could articulate a reason or not, it's clear that the fewer clubs North needs the more room there is for clubs in East's hand. No poll is necessary to establish this.

Wolff This hand is a "poster child" as to why the Announcement of a possible doubleton club by the one club bidder is required. West should have had that Announcement made to him just in case he might want to have bid 3 clubs natural the second time around. I strongly favor the score to be either minus 110 or minus 130 N/S depending on whether West will finesse the club and guess the spade (North may lead a spade rather than the trick giving ace of hearts so I would give E/W making 4♣).