

APPEAL	NABC+ THIRTEEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) and Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Lebhar IMP Pairs
Session	First Final
Date	March 16, 2007

BD#	7
VUL	Both
DLR	South

Yi Zhong	
♠	K J
♥	8 5 3 2
♦	A J 8 6
♣	J T 7

Karl Gohl		<b>Spring 2007</b> <b>St. Louis, Missouri</b>	Neil Kimelman	
♠	T 4 3		♠	A Q 9 8 6 2
♥	K 9		♥	J T 7 6 4
♦	K 7 3		♦	
♣	Q 9 4 3 2		♣	8 5

Hailong Ao	
♠	7 5
♥	A Q
♦	Q T 9 5 4 2
♣	A K 6

West	North	East	South
			1NT <sup>1</sup>
Pass	3NT	4♣ <sup>2</sup>	Dbl
Pass	Pass	4♠	Pass
Pass	Dbl	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	<b>4♠ doubled by East</b>
Opening Lead	<b>♣A</b>
Table Result	<b>4♠ dbl'd E made 4, E/W +790</b>
Director Ruling	<b>4♣ dbl'd E down 3, E/W -800</b>
Committee Ruling	<b>4♦ S made 4, N/S +130</b>

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| (1) | 15-17 HCP.  |
| (2) | Actual agreement is majors, one longer than the other. Not Alerted. |

**The Facts:** The director was called after the 4♠ bid and again after the play of the hand. South asked the meaning of 4♣ at his turn and was told, "clubs." He told the director away from the table that he would have bid 4♦ if he had been told the actual agreement. E/W play that after 4♣ that 4♦ asks for the longer major – there were no other agreements. E/W play "Hello" versus a strong 1NT opening.

**The Ruling:** Six players were polled on East's action: three passed the double with the E/W agreements; two bid 4♠ and one was unsure between 4♠ and pass. The UI demonstrably suggested action over a pass and pass was deemed to be a logical alternative (LA). In accordance with laws 16 and 12, the result was adjusted to 4♣ doubled down three, N/S plus 800. The MI was deemed to be moot.

**The Appeal:** It was unreasonable to pass 4♣ even though there was definitely UI from partner's explanation.

N/S agreed with the facts as presented.

**The Decision:** If South had been given proper information, he stated he would have bid 4♦ over 4♣. This seems eminently reasonable and would, probably, have ended the auction. West would, if aware of the meaning of 4♣, have most likely led the ♥K. If still unaware of the meaning, he would likely have led a club. Both leads result in 4♦ making four. The table result of E/W plus 790 was in part because MI stopped South from taking his most likely action. The adjudicated result of 4♣ doubled down three, E/W minus 800 was deemed unrealistic by the committee. The result of 4♦ by South making four, N/S plus 130 gives the most favorable result that was likely to N/S – if proper information had been proffered at the correct time.

**The Committee:** Dick Budd (Chair and Scribe), Abby Heitner, Jeff Meckstroth, Chris Moll and Eddie Wold.

## Commentary:

- Goldsmith** Did the appeals committee (AC) really deliberate in as ad hoc a manner as the write-up suggested? Given their vast experience, probably not, but the write-up makes it sound as if they did. They came to a reasonable answer, but if they'd followed precise procedure, maybe they would have found a better one, or at least have been more convincing about their choice. Let's start with the UI case. Is passing 4♣ doubled a LA? It depends on what West's pass means. If it's to play 4♣, then passing is easy. If it means, "bid your longer major," then passing is silly. If E/W have no agreement, East will never take the deep view to pass. Since they appear not to have an agreement, passing is not a LA, despite the poll, so East is allowed to bid 4♠. Good job by the AC to reject the poll. Were N/S damaged by the MI? Yes. South's 4♦ will definitely lead to a better result for N/S than his double did. So we must adjust and use L12C2. What are the at all probable results? 4♦ +130, 4♦ -100, 4♠ doubled -790, 5♦ -200, 5♦ -100, 5♠ doubled +200, all scored from the N/S perspective. I reject 4♣ -300, as South felt very sure he'd bid 4♦. Which are likely? Probably any except N/S's taking only 9 tricks at diamonds or 4♣'s getting passed out. In particular, is 5♠ doubled likely? If South bids 4♦, North is likely to bid 5♦; the conditions are vulnerable at IMPs. Why can't partner have Axx/xx/KQxxxx/AK? Once East has heard the opponents bid to game in his void, he might well bid five over five; he has, after all, already committed to the four-level, and the AI strongly suggests that bidding is much more likely to be successful than it was the previous round. All in all, this is a tough one---judging which of those six results are likely and which are at all probable is difficult. My choice is that N/S +200 is likely, so I rule reciprocal 200s. My second choice, if 5♠ isn't likely, is E/W -200, and N/S -100. I don't think it is likely that the auction will end in 4♦, and while it is certainly at all probable, there is a worse at all probable result for the offending side. What about MI in the UI context? Can we rule that West would have bid 5♣ over 4♦, since South gets the right information, but West doesn't? That'd lead to N/S +1100. No, N/S only get redress from damage from the MI, not the opportunity to continue the auction as it was with the right information.
- Polisner** I am surprised that the director did not consider the fact that South would have bid 4♦ with the correct explanation of 4♣ and ruled +130 for N/S. If I considered East's action of bidding 4♠ egregious enough being in possession of UI, I would have awarded E/W minus 800. I think it is close.
- Rigal** What a bizarre decision to award minus 800. No bridge player would consider passing 4♣ here; the pass of 4♣ says nothing about wanting to play that contract. I like the idea of the auction ending in 4♦ (whether North or East would actually pass here is another matter!) Reasonable decision in a complex position.

- Smith** I disagree strongly with the committee on this one. There existed on this hand both UI and MI. N/S were not damaged by MI. Doubling rather than bidding 4♦ did not damage them, and law 40C tells directors and committees to adjust due to MI only when damage results. The damage to N/S occurred from UI. They were scheduled to and entitled to plus 800 if not for the 4♠ bid by East. Since the polling by the director seems clearly to establish pass as a logical alternative, then that should have been the adjustment.
- Wildavsky** For starters the AC ruling is incomplete. They needed to specify the most unfavorable result that was at all probable for the offenders. The director supervising the appeal should not accept such a decision from the AC. There were two infractions, MI and UI. As in case nine, with two infractions by the same side, the TD and AC should chose to adjust based on the infraction that gives the offenders the worst score. That's what the TD did. The TD's ruling was better than the AC's, and I see no merit to the appeal.
- Wolff** Typical happening of a committee wallowing around trying to determine a score adjustment because of convention disruption. Impossible and not even fun to do.
- Zeiger** Curious. East wouldn't have had the opportunity to act on the UI if South didn't have MI. I like the committee's style, but I don't think the reasoning is correct. In real life, N/S were not damaged by the MI. They were damaged by use of UI. Since the 4♠ bid is actually what caused the damage to N/S, the fact that South would have bid 4♦ with correct information is irrelevant. The TD ruling was correct.