

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Three
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

1558 Masterpoints	
♠	A T 7 6 4
♥	K Q J 9
♦	8
♣	T 4 3

1133 Masterpoints	
♠	8 3 2
♥	T 7 6 5 2
♦	A J 5 4 2
♣	

3282 Masterpoints	
♠	K J 5
♥	4 3
♦	K Q 9 7 6 3
♣	J 7

1074 Masterpoints	
♠	Q 9
♥	A 8
♦	T
♣	A K Q 9 8 6 5 2

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

Final Contract	5♦ by East, doubled
Opening Lead	♣A
Table Result	5♦, dbled down 1, N/S + 100
Director Ruling	6♣, making 6, N/S +920
Panel Ruling	6♣, making 6, N/S + 920

(1)	E/W had differing convention cards, one showing "McCabe", lead directing with fit
(2)	South asked about the 3♣ bid before his 4♠ bid and was told there was no conventional meaning

The Facts: South stated that he would have bid 6♣ had he had the correct information that the 3♣ bid might not show clubs naturally.

The Ruling: N/S should have had an opportunity to bid clubs naturally given the correct information. Differing convention cards represent misinformation. The result was adjusted to 6♣ making six, N/S plus 920 per Law 21A3, 40C and 12C2.

The Appeal: E/W were the only players to attend the hearing. E/W felt that given the auction generated by N/S (the raise to 4♠), this pair was unlikely to find 6♣.

The Decision: Five people in the N/S peer group were consulted and agreed that a natural 4♣ bid by South would have been made with correct information. Since some pairs bid to 6♣, the 4♣ bid could lead to a 6♣ contract. The opponents' convention cards did not agree – only West's had "McCabe." Differing cards constituted MI. The director's ruling was upheld, N/S plus 920, E/W minus 920 per Laws 21A3, 40C and 12C2. The appeal was found to have merit.

The Panel: Bernie Gorkin (Reviewer) and Candy Kuschner

Players Consulted: Five of N/S's peers.

Commentary:

Polisner The differing convention cards, in and of itself, is not MI. It could be the basis of determining what the conventional agreement was or wasn't as in the absence of convincing evidence, the presumption is MI rather than a misbid.

It is inconceivable that any player with 1,074 Masterpoints would believe that, on this auction, LHO was bidding clubs naturally, with a maximum holding of JT743. Table result should have been retained. Again, why only a two-person panel?

Rigal The appeal clearly had merit so long as the player who bid 3♣ had McCabe on his card -- please note that if EAST had McCabe only on his card, the assumption would be that they were NOT playing it. I'm in a quandary here. My instinct is to let the table result stand but I'd need to ask West what she intended 3♣ as. Without that information I can't decide what to do -- why wasn't that question (and answer) noted in the write-up? [PS Would South's 4C call be natural here anyway, or a cuebid for spades? And with any North who 'only' bids 3♣ at his first turn why assume he won't pass 4♣?]

Smith If one card showed "McCabe", then there is enough to presume that N/S were misinformed about the meaning of 3♣. The panel's polling indicates that N/S were damaged by the misinformation, so the adjustment looks right. Although it was moot due to the ultimate ruling made, West had UI from his partner's explanation. Maybe without the UI he might have been happy to be up on the field with a club lead against 4♠.

Wildavsky I agree with the rulings. I see no merit to the appeal. If E/W want to find out what contract their opponents would reach given correct information their best course is to provide correct information.

Wolff Convention disruption sometimes leads to a liars paradise and here is another example of it.

