

APPEAL	NABC+ FIVE
Subject	Misinformation (MI) and Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Gary Zeiger
Event	Silver Ribbon Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	March 14, 2010

BD#	23
VUL	Both
DLR	South

Norman Rubin	
♠	T 6 2
♥	7 5
♦	4
♣	K 9 8 6 5 4 2

Rick Roeder		Spring 2010 Reno, NV	Gary Soules	
♠	Q J 7 5		♠	A K 8 3
♥	Q T 8		♥	K J 4 3
♦	J 5 3		♦	A 8 7
♣	A Q 3		♣	J 7

Jonathan Green	
♠	9 4
♥	A 9 6 2
♦	K Q T 9 6 2
♣	T

West	North	East	South
			1♦
Pass	3♣ ⁽¹⁾	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	3♣ by North
Opening Lead	♠ A
Table Result	Down 3, N/S - 300
Director Ruling	3NT W made 4, E/W + 630
Committee Ruling	3NT W made 4, E/W + 630

(1)	Preceded by a break in tempo (BIT).. Alerted and explained as natural and invitational.
-----	--

The Facts: The director was called after the play of the hand was completed. South's convention card showed "3♣/1♦ invitational." North's did not. Both convention cards had "weak jump shifts not in competition" checked. All four players agreed there was a BIT before the 3♣ bid. North stated that his BIT was from attempting to remember their agreement for 3♣ and whether a weak 3♣ was reasonable at this vulnerability.

The Ruling: It was determined that N/S had no agreement based on the evidence and Law 21B1(b) applied. In accordance with Laws 21B3 and 12C1(e) an adjusted score was awarded to both sides of 3NT by West making four, E/W plus 630.

The Appeal: N/S appealed the director's decision. All four players attended the hearing. South stated that he misinformed E/W of the meaning of the 3♣ bid. North stated when the bidding was over that he had made a mistake in the bidding – i.e. that the 3♣ bid (which he meant as preemptive) was not part of the N/S agreement. South had his card marked “3♣/1♦ inv.” but North did not. North said he couldn't remember their agreement. North subsequently changed his convention card to agree with South's. N/S felt that, if they were ruled against for misinformation to E/W, a different score should be assigned other than 3NT making four. N/S felt that E/W could have reasonably arrived at 4♠, a much inferior contract.

E/W said that if the 3♣ had been Alerted and explained properly, East would have doubled. West felt that with 4333 distribution and the AQ of clubs that he would have bid 3NT.

The Decision: The committee found that the screening director had fully and properly explained the law to the players. The committee judged that the reason for the appeal was without foundation. The committee considered a result of 3♣ doubled by North down three (N/S – 800). However, in screening it never occurred to West to pass 3♣ doubled, so that result was not considered to be at all probable.

The committee found that the contract of 3NT by E/W was “at all likely” per Law 12c1e(ii). Therefore, the committee adjusted the result for both sides to 3NT W made four, E/W plus 630.

An appeal without merit warning (AWMW) was issued to North and South.

The Committee: Ed Lazarus (Chairman), Abby Heitner, Eugene Kales, Ellen Kent and Jim Thurtell.

Commentary:

Goldsmith Well done

Polisner Was this a misbid or MI? I don't see where the MI (if any) comes into play. The TD correctly rules MI rather than misbid based on N/S being unable to overcome the burden of proving that it was a misbid. The AWMW was warranted.

Rigal Excellent decision all round. It seems as if N/S did not understand that once the infraction had taken place they get the worst of it and their opponents get the best of it. I think the fact that E/W did not mention the possibility of defending should not prevent the committee from considering it on their behalf. After all the auction was one that did not actually occur at the table.

Wildavsky No merit -- good work all around

Wolff It is okay for N/S to go minus 630 since their alert procedure had broken down with improper convention disruption (CD), however it does seem that E/W did not deserve better than what they achieved at the table plus

300. For East not to have made a takeout double is hard to accept and also their plus 300 would be much better than they would have gotten for down at 4♠ (a very possible final contract). To give them plus 630 is not logical, not equitable and not protecting the field (PTF). WE NEED TO CHANGE AT LEAST IN THIS AREA (which would, of course, mean changing the wording of the laws).