

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Eleven
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Harry Falk
Event	Thursday AM Side Game
Session	Morning - Only
Date	July 26, 2007

BD#	<b>2</b>
VUL	<b>N/S</b>
DLR	<b>E</b>

<b>261 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	A Q J 6
♥	A 9 4
♦	K Q J T 4
♣	2

<b>1,026 Masterpoints</b>		<b>Summer 2007 Nashville, Tennessee</b>	<b>1,614 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	K T 9 8 7		♠	4 2
♥	2		♥	Q 8 5 3
♦	9 7 5 2		♦	Void
♣	Q J 7		♣	A K T 6 5 4 3

<b>3,218 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	5 3
♥	K J T 7 6
♦	A 8 6 3
♣	9 8

West	North	East	South
		1 ♣	1 ♥
1 ♠	4 ♥ <sup>1</sup>	Pass	Pass
4 ♠	Dbl	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	<b>4 ♠ Dbl by West</b>
Opening Lead	<b>♣ Ace</b>
Table Result	<b>4 ♠ Dbl, down 5 N/S +1100</b>
Director Ruling	<b>4 ♠ Dbl, down 5 N/S +1100</b>
Panel Ruling	<b>4 ♠ Dbl, down 5 N/S +1100</b>

(1)	Explained as “pre-emptive” as per agreement
-----	---

**The Facts:** West asked the meaning of the jump to 4♥ at her second turn to bid. West was told “Pre-emptive.” N/S convention card agrees. West chose to bid 4♠. After the hand was played East said he would have run to 5♣ had he known the nature of North’s hand.

**The Ruling:** No violation of Law 40 – Result stands.

**The Appeal:** West said she never would have bid 4 ♠ if she knew North could have a good hand. She admitted South could have had a better hand instead. West confirmed her 1 ♠ bid showed five or more spades.

East said he would have bid 5 ♣ over 4 ♣ doubled if he had known that North could have a good hand. When the reviewer mentioned his diamond void and doubleton spade he was still adamant he would have bid 5 ♣.

North bid 4♥ instead of 2♠ because LHO had opened the bidding and RHO had responded, so he gave up on slam and chose not to divulge his hand.

The N/S convention cards both said jump raises were weak.

**The Decision:** Based on the matching convention cards and North's reasonable rationale for bidding 4♥, the panel found no basis to conclude N/S had a different understanding about the meaning of 4♥.

Absent misinformation or some other violation of Law the panel had no reason to consider an adjusted score. The panel considered whether the appeal had merit and assigned an appeal without merit warning (AWMW) to E/W. Prior to convening the panel the Reviewer asked four of West's peers what they would have bid at West's second turn. All four players passed and said they didn't care what North might have for the 4♥ bid.

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

**Players Consulted:** Four players with about 1,000 masterpoints.

**Commentary:**

**Polisner** Let's see now. West bid 4♠ on air contending that the alleged preemptive nature of the 4♥ bid inspired this absurd bid and then wants redress. An AWMW doesn't seem anywhere near enough to teach this so-called bridge player a lesson.

**Rigal** Excellent ruling and AWMW; no need to waste trees here – Miserable and pettifogging appeal (MAPA) four.

**Smith** Good, including the AWMW.

**Wildavsky** I have no doubt that East would have run had he known the nature of North's hand. Unfortunately for East, bridge is played with closed cards. No merit.

**Wolff** More unbelievable naiveté. Lack of education is running rampant.