

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Two
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Sam Stoxen
Event	Thursday Evening Int/Ed. Foundation Pairs
Session	First
Date	July 19, 2007

BD#	14
VUL	None
DLR	East

502 Masterpoints	
♠	A T 7 6 4
♥	K Q J 9
♦	8
♣	T 4 3

7625 Masterpoints	
♠	8 3 2
♥	T 7 6 5 2
♦	A J 5 4 2
♣	

482 Masterpoints	
♠	Q 9
♥	A 8
♦	T
♣	A K Q 9 8 6 5 2

2870 Masterpoints	
♠	K J 5
♥	4 3
♦	K Q 9 7 6 3
♣	J 7

**Summer 2007
Nashville, Tennessee**

West	North	East	South
		1NT ¹	3♣
3♥ ²	Pass	3♠	4♣
Pass	Pass	4♦	Pass
Pass	5♣	Pass	Pass
5♦	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	5♦ by East
Opening Lead	♣A
Table Result	5♦, down 1, N/S + 50
Director Ruling	5♣, making 6, N/S +420
Panel Ruling	To E/W: 5♣ S, making 6, E/W -420 To N/S: 5♦, down 1, N/S + 50

(1)	Announced as 10-12 HCP
(2)	Alerted incorrectly as transfer. Agreement is that 3♥ is natural

The Facts: The three heart bid was not a transfer. South stated that had she known that three hearts was not showing spades, she would have bid 5♣ directly over 3♠, since she would no longer think that the ♠Q would be a useless card. This information was given before the opening lead.

The Ruling: If South was given the correct information and had bid 5♣, E/W could not have found their diamond fit. Board adjusted to 5♣ N/S making six, N/S plus 420 per Laws 21A3, 40C and 12C2.

The Appeal: All four players attended the hearing. E/W felt that the MI should not affected South's bid, since she bid 5♣ ultimately. South said she would have given more weight to her ♠Q had she not thought her left hand opponent had a spade suit. Therefore, she would have jumped directly to 5♣ and E/W would not have found their diamond fit.

The Decision: The players consulted all bid 4♣ over 3♠ saying that the meaning of the 3♥ bid was immaterial. The panel concluded that E/W would find their diamond fit. The Panel decided some number of South's peers might bid 5♣, making a contract of 5♣ at all probable. The panel assigned a split score, the table result to N/S of 5♦ by E/W down one, N/S plus 50 and E/W the result of 5♣ by N/S, making six, E/W minus 420.

The panel used Law 12C2 for N/S, the most favorable result that was likely. For E/W, Law 40C and Law 12C2 were used, the most unfavorable result that was at all probable.

The Panel: Bernie Gorkin (Reviewer) and Candy Kuschner.

Players Consulted: Four of N/S's peers – Flight C players.

Commentary:

Polisner Since there was not even one peer who thought that 5♣ was a possible bid, a split score was not a good decision. Table result for both sides should have been the decision. Why only a two-person panel?

Rigal Really excellent decision, despite the disruption caused by E/W not knowing their conventions. South's argument is the typical hair-splitting of someone who wants something for nothing. Give E/W and N/S the worst of it -- that'll learn 'em!

Smith Something seems missing here. The panel's poll argues in favor of no adjustment at all, and that is what they applied to N/S. I don't see that any polling information was available to lead the panel to think some South's might bid 5♣ with correct information. I assume that North made no claim of damage from the MI or that possible source of damage would have been investigated.

Wildavsky What about North? Surely she would have raised clubs sooner had she not been told that her RHO held a spade suit. I prefer the tournament director's ruling to the panel's.

Wolff More very weak conniving notrump with a dash of convention disruption.