

APPEAL	Non NABC+ SEVEN
Subject	Unauthorized Information
DIC	Boyd
Event	0-5000 LM Pairs
Session	Second Semi-Final Session
Date	July 24, 2010

BD#	19
VUL	EW
DLR	S

350 Masterpoints	
♠	T53
♥	AKT
♦	QJ963
♣	A4

3737 Masterpoints		Summer 2010 New Orleans, LA	4924 Masterpoints	
♠	A876		♠	KQ94
♥	873		♥	Q
♦	75		♦	AK842
♣	QT95		♣	KJ7

2500 Masterpoints	
♠	J2
♥	J96542
♦	T
♣	8632

West	North	East	South
			P
P	1N ¹	Db1 ²	ReDb1 ³
P ⁴	P	P	

Final Contract	1NT Redoubled by North
Opening Lead	♦4
Table Result	Made 2, NS +760
Director Ruling	3♠ E made 4, EW +170
Panel Ruling	1NT Redoubled by N made 2, NS +760

(1)	14-16 HCP
(2)	Penalty
(3)	Not alerted; shows 5+ card suit (run-out)
(4)	West asked about the Redouble and was told "not sure but pass by South would be Non-Forcing"

The Facts: North reported that he could not remember the meaning of the redouble and failed to alert the redouble. South neglected to inform the opponents of the meaning of his redouble until after he laid down the dummy. East-West called the Director immediately after being informed of the meaning of the redouble.

The Ruling: The Director ruled that there was misinformation pursuant to Law 40. The Director also determined that this misinformation damaged East-West and therefore adjusted the board to 3♠ by East making 4 for +170.

The Appeal: North-South appealed and four players attended the Panel hearing. North reported that he forgot the meaning of the redouble during the auction. South said that he befuddled by the course of the auction and did not think to tell the opponents about his bid until he was putting the dummy down. South said East-West could have called the Director after the dummy came down but seemed happy until the outcome was known. North said it seems illogical that East-West would want to defend if dummy is strong but want to run out if dummy is weak. North said it seems like we are giving them a double shot at good result. East argued that if redouble was a weak one-suited run-out than the suit is probably hearts which was too dangerous to defend with a singleton.

The Decision: The Panel gave the hand to seven players (one with 975 MP, one with 35,000 MP, and the rest between 1800 and 4975 MPs). Those polled were asked “If redouble showed the balance of strength, what is your call?” They were also asked if “If redouble was a weak run-out, what is your call?” Two out of seven bid 2♦ when redouble showed the balance of strength, while none of those polled bid when redouble was a weak run-out.”

Therefore, the Panel went back to the original table result of 1NT redoubled making two for +760. The Panel decided to impose a procedural penalty against North-South for failing to clarify the situation before the opening lead was made.

The Panel: John Gram (Chairman), Jay Albright, and Peter Marcus.

Commentary:

Bramley: Rub of the green, thus a correct decision. However, I hate the procedural penalty, which should be given only for gross violations. This does not qualify, especially as South’s gaffe had no bearing on the outcome. Getting lucky is not a crime.

Rigal: I am glad that no one suggested any absurd concept such as convention Disruption would apply here. The point is that N/S got spectacularly lucky (I sympathize: I have been the beneficiary of this precise accident once myself) and E/W could not possibly have done anything different. In fact, bringing an appeal against a proper TD decision would have merited an AWM...but as we can see, the TD ruling was incorrect.

Goldsmith: The Panel is clearly right; the only issue is the PP. South clearly should announce the mis-explanation before the opening lead, which would allow the director to be called and East to have the option to retract his final pass. Since the violation of correct procedure allowed the director to mis-rule and hence caused the AC to have to meet, it is reasonable to award a PP.

Wildavsky: South caused this mess by his violation of proper procedure, so the procedural penalty was perfectly in order. Well done by the Panel for assessing it.

As for the score adjustment, the Panel decision was far superior to the TD's. The Panel has the reasoning exactly right. Correct information would not have made the winning action more attractive.

There is an inconsistency in the facts presented as to when the TD was called. Fortunately it does not affect the ruling here.

Wolff: The TD was wrong here and normal playing luck (NPL) should have allowed the actual result. Yes NS got very lucky but that is not illegal. Yes South should have found a way, perhaps asking his partner to leave the table and explain what he thought his bid meant, but I agree that by so doing would have made the passout of 1NT doubled even more likely. The rules should always cater to efforts by the maker of a confusing (meaning not totally known) bid to right the wrong and again respect honest efforts to help the opponents know what they have a right to know.