

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Five
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Matt Koltnow
Event	Sat/Sun Bracketed KO
Session	Final
Date	November 26, 2007

BD#	33
VUL	None
DLR	North

888 Masterpoints	
♠	A K J 8 5
♥	K Q 6 4 2
♦	K
♣	63

714 Masterpoints		Fall 2007 San Francisco, California	654 Masterpoints	
♠	Q 9 6 2		♠	4 3
♥	J		♥	T 7 5
♦	8 2		♦	J 7 4 3
♣	Q T 9 8 5 2		♣	A K J 7

469 Masterpoints	
♠	T 7
♥	A 9 8 3
♦	A Q T 9 6 5
♣	4

West	North	East	South
	1♠	Dbl	ReDbl
3♣	Pass	Pass	3♦
Pass	3♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	3♥ by North
Opening Lead	♣A
Table Result	3♥, making 6, N/S +230
Director Ruling	4♥ by N, making 6, N/S +480
Panel Ruling	3♥ by N, making 6, N/S +230

The Facts: South was told that 3♣ was strong (10 pts). E/W claim that their agreement is that it is strong and West misbid.

The Ruling: Director ruled that there had been MI and adjusted to 4♥ making six, N/S plus 480 per Law 12 C 2.

The Appeal: N/S were asked about their understanding in an auction where North had opened in first seat, and, after a double by East, South had shown a good hand by redoubling and showing her own suit. They were depending upon the information given by the opponents. North could not imagine that the opponents could make a takeout double with such limited values and was concerned about the values West had shown. The auction was given to several players – the initial information that the reviewer was given was that this was in a very low bracket – so the players consulted were from the 0-200 masterpoint category. In three out of three cases, given the auction, all players bid game on the hand. They all basically ignored the 3♣ bid and based their decisions on the cards they held and on the information from partner’s bid. All felt that in a team game it was much more important to be in game.

The Decision: With well-placed honor cards behind the doubler, a fit with partner and a singleton club, South failed to evaluate her cards. She instead opted to rely on information that, intuitively, she knew could not be correct. She stated to the reviewer that partner would not open a flat ten point hand in first seat, so she knew that if partner was light in values, she was shapely. Given all of this information she still chose not to bid game.

The panel determined that this auction was undiscussed and that East should have answered “undiscussed;” therefore, there was MI, but the panel judged that the MI did not cause the bad result. South had chosen not to “play bridge” and believe partner when she knew that there had to be a problem when partner opened, RHO doubled, she had 10 HCP and LHO had 10 HCP.

The table result was restored - 3♥ by North making Six, N/S plus 230.

The Panel: Harry Falk (Reviewer), Su Doe and Candy Kuschner.

Players Consulted: Several of N/S’s peers.

Commentary:

Polisner Who in the modern era of bridge (say since bridge began) would play the 3♣ bid be anything but weak. The panel hit the nail on the head with its decision.

Rigal Tough decision for a non-NABC+ event, but I like the general concept that when a player ceases to play bridge they can’t expect the panel to play bridge for them. Where, as here, South knows the bid cannot be strong, it is a poor argument to say that you trust the opponents more than partner.

- Smith** Law 40 C states: “If the Director decides that a side has been damaged through its opponent’s failure to explain the full meaning of a call or play, he may award an adjusted score.” I agree with the panel that the main source of the damage to N/S was South's judgment and not the MI, and it was justified by the player poll. Probably South was more influenced by the fear that East's takeout double indicated a bad heart break than by the MI. That was quite a double by East. I wonder if his style of takeout doubles is so extreme as to require an Alert. It looks as if it might be, and he should have been questioned about it. I would have more sympathy for an adjustment on that basis than on the MI about the 3♣ bid.
- Wildavsky** The E/W score (only) should have been adjusted, per law 72B1. The 2007 laws will make this clearer. As for E/W's contention that their agreement was that 3♣ was strong, it is literally incredible.
- Wolff** Agree with the panel and when thought over it is similar to my suggestion about not allowing very poor bridge judgment (passing 3♥ by South here and in non-NABC+ case four doubling 3♦ by South) to ever be rewarded.