

APPEAL	NABC+ THREE
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Bobby Nail LM Open Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	November 27, 2009

BD#	15
VUL	N/S
DLR	South

Ishmael Delmonte	
♠	A J T
♥	J 8 7 5
♦	J 6 5
♣	Q 9 2

Bev Drill		Fall 2009 San Diego, CA	Arnold Drill	
♠	8 6 4		♠	5
♥	A 4 2		♥	9 6 3
♦	K Q 8 4		♦	A 9 3 2
♣	K T 5		♣	A J 8 7 3

Ashley Bach	
♠	K Q 9 7 3 2
♥	K Q T
♦	T 7
♣	6 4

West	North	East	South
			2♠ ¹
Pass	Pass	2NT ²	Pass
3♦	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	3♦ by W
Opening Lead	♦6
Table Result	Making 5, E/W +150
Director Ruling	3♦ W made 5, E/W +150
Committee Ruling	4♦ W made 5, E/W +150

(1)	8-11 HCP and 6 spades.
(2)	E/W agreement is minors. There was no Alert.

The Facts: The director was called at the end of the auction. North said that he would have bid 3♠ with the correct information.

The Ruling: There was misinformation. In the director's judgment the MI did not result in damage. Therefore, in accordance with Laws 21B3 and 75B the table result of 3♦ by West making five, E/W plus 150 was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: N/S appealed the director's decision. North was the only player to attend the hearing.

North explained that it was far less attractive to bid 3♠ over a natural 2NT call. In 3♠ declarer would know how to locate cards after the unusual notrump. He thought his opponents would never double 3♠ and any trump finesse was likely to work.

The Decision: The committee judged that there was a reasonable case that North-South had been damaged by the MI. North might well have bid 3♠ after a timely Alert. However, that call was not likely to end the auction.

A case could be made that the player who bid only 3♦ would not bid 4♦ but the main negative of West's hand, the three small spades, would be ameliorated by the spade raise. The committee judged that 4♦ making five was both the most favorable result likely for N/S and the most unfavorable that was at all probable for E/W. Thus the committee adjusted the result for both sides to 4♦ by West making five, E/W plus 150.

The committee determined that the appeal had substantial merit.

The Committee: Richard Popper (Chair), Dick Budd, Ellen Kent, Barry Rigal (Scribe) and Riggs Thayer.

Commentary:

Goldsmith The basis for the ruling seems sound. N/S's score is easy; it is surely not likely that West would sell to 3♠. Is it at all probable? It's a 4333 12-count. Partner bravely balanced them up to a level we might beat. Nah. In fact, it's closer to a 5♦ bid than a pass now that we suspect partner is short in spades.

Polisner I don't think that North did enough to protect himself before passing 3♦. An international player of North's stature should appreciate that a 3♦ bid is likely to be a transfer which would have required an Announcement or an Alert. I would have retained the table result for the reason that the UI did not cause damage and not what the rest of the auction might have been.

Rigal Even if MI was properly established and damage from that MI, how could N/S really believe that West would let 3♠ play? The committee felt this was closer to a frivolous appeal and an appeal without merit warning (AWMW) than an adjustment.

Smith I think the committee did a good job on this case.

Wildavsky I prefer the committee's ruling to the director's, even though both led to the same score. After the director's ruling N/S could rightly feel put upon. After the committee's I hope they'd feel their case was given proper consideration, even if they didn't agree with the ruling.

Wolff Correct decision, but little to be learned since most roads led to the table result.