

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Four
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Jay Albright
Event	Bill Holt KO Bracket I
Session	Three
Date	November

BD#	14
VUL	None
DLR	East

Don Campbell	
♠	Void
♥	A 9 7
♦	9 8 6 2
♣	K J 9 8 6 4

Bob Morris		Fall 2007 San Francisco, CA	Rita Ellington	
♠	7 6		♠	A K Q 8 4
♥	J T 8 6 4 3		♥	K 5 2
♦	J 7		♦	K 4
♣	A 7 2		♣	Q 5 3

Sydney Hayes	
♠	J T 9 5 3 2
♥	Q
♦	A Q T 5 3
♣	T

West	North	East	South
		1♠	Pass
1NT ¹	2♣	2NT	Pass
3♦ ²	Pass	Pass	Dbl
3♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	3♥ by West
Opening Lead	Unknown
Table Result	3♥ by West, making 3, E/W +140
Director Ruling	3♦ by West, down 6, E/W -300
Panel Ruling	3♦ by West, down 6, E/W -300

(1)	Forcing.
(2)	Intended as transfer, no Alert or Announcement.

The Facts: 3♦ was meant as a transfer. East did not interpret as such but wasn't sure as bidding sequence had never occurred. South stated she wouldn't have doubled had she known 3♦ was a transfer.

The Ruling: In accordance with laws 12 C 2 and 40 C, since damage occurred because of the MI, the result was adjusted to 3♦ down six, E/W minus 300.

The Appeal: The appellants produced system notes that covered an uncontested auction of 1♠, pass, 1NT (forcing), pass, 2NT, pass, 3♦ as a transfer to hearts. They stated they had not discussed this sequence with interference. East stated that if she had been behind a screen, she would have told South that this auction was un-discussed. South stated that she had no reason to suspect that this was a transfer and surely would not have doubled if she had known this.

The Decision: The system notes demonstrated that West was not just "out on his own" when he bid 3♦. He had a reasonable expectation that he was bidding within the system, thus he expected to hear an Alert. Since the system notes did not explicitly state the structure was off after interference, MI was assumed. Using laws 21 B 3, 40 C and 12 C 2, the ruling of 3♦ down six, E/W minus 300 was upheld.

The Panel: Harry Falk (Reviewer), Mike Flader, Candy Kushner and Matt Smith.

Commentary:

Polisner If I understand the E/W system notes, the 3♦ bid would be a transfer in an uncontested auction. Doesn't that mean, by implication, that in a contested auction, it is not a transfer? The director should presume MI (rather than misbid) in the absence of sufficient evidence to the contrary. Good ruling and decision.

Rigal Seems reasonable. South is entitled to know the methods in use, though of course asking East both to explain correctly and pass is asking for the moon!

Wildavsky Good work. I see no merit in the appeal. What makes E/W think they ought to be able to profit from providing misinformation?

Wolff Again, I agree with the ruling, but in a pair game I would suggest that E/W get the matchpoints for down six in 3♦, but that N/S go minus 140 since South gambled with his greedy double and lost when West was given the opportunity to bail out. Sooner (I hope) rather than later, all committees will adopt this fairer (to the field) resolution.