APPEAL	Non NABC+ EIGHT
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Millard Nachtwey
Event	0-5000 Spingold
Session	1 st Round – First Session
Date	July 17, 2006

18

N/S

East

BD#

VUL

DLR

	2,500 Masterpoints	
♦	T 9 8 x x x	
۲	9 x	
•	Jx	
*	J T x	

		**	JIA		
150 Masterpoints				1,500 Masterpoints	
٠				٠	K Q x
•	Тхххх		Summer 2006	•	A J x
•	Qxxxxxx		Chicago, Illinois	•	A T 9
*	Κ			*	Qxxx
		3	3,000 Masterpoints		

	· I
٠	A J x x
♥	K Q x
•	Κ
*	Axxxx

We	est	North	East	South	Final Cont
			$1NT^{1}$	Dbl^2	Opening L
24	3	Pass	Pass	Dbl	Table Res
3.	•	3♠	Pass	Pass	Director R
4	•	Pass	Pass	Dbl	Panel Ruli
Pa	SS	Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	4 ♦ doubled by West
Opening Lead	₹T
Table Result	4 doubled making 4, E/W +510
Director Ruling	4♠ by South, down 1, E/W +100
Panel Ruling	4♦ doubled making 4, E/W +510
	Opening Lead Table Result Director Ruling

(1)	15-17 HCP.
(2)	Penalty, as good or better than 1NT.
(3)	This was not Alerted and was explained after the 3♦ call with the director and West away from the table. At least one minor. Partner bids 2NT if he likes clubs and 3♣ if
	he likes diamonds.

The Facts: 2♠ was not Alerted. After the 3♦ bid, East asked West to leave the table and then explained that the 2♠ bid was obviously not natural. The director was called. The 2♠ bid was explained as a transfer for the minors. South said she would leave in her reopening double if told 2♠ was minors.

The Ruling: It was decided that South's double of $4 \blacklozenge$ was based on misinformation about the $2 \clubsuit$ bid. It was decided that with correct information that South would bid $4 \clubsuit$ rather than double. In accordance with laws 40C and 12C2, the director adjusted the score to $4 \clubsuit$ by North down one, N/S -100.

The Appeal: South said that she doubled 4♦ believing "transfer to minors" meant that West's 2♠ call showed both minors. She doubled because of her club holding in West's presumed second suit. If she had known that 2♠ only promised one minor, she would have bid 4♠ over 4♦. South maintained to the table director that she would reopen the auction in passout seat over 2♠ with a double had she been told that 2♠ showed at least one minor and was not natural. She repeated this statement twice to the screening director, then said she felt passing 2♠ would be better and she would not reopen with a double if properly informed.

E/W acknowledged the MI from not properly Alerting and explaining West's $2 \bigstar$ bid but felt their subsequent explanation should have clarified the auction for N/S. South's double of $4 \bigstar$ was made with full knowledge of the meaning of $2 \bigstar$.

The Decision: South is an experienced player with 3,000 masterpoints (partner has 2,500). South agreed she was very slow to realize her best action was to pass 2. not reopen with a double. She also agreed she could have asked to clarify the meaning of "transfer to minors" to see if it did, indeed, show clubs and diamonds. 24 was clearly not properly Alerted and explained. Had South said she would have passed 2♠ rather than reopening with a double, the panel would have accepted that and assigned a result of 2♠ by West, probably down four for N/S +200. However, South, an experienced player, told both the table director and the screening director that she would still have doubled over 24 if given the correct Alert and explanation, only much later changing her mind and realizing that passing 2♠ was the best action for her side. As such, she was judged not to have wanted to change her call in reopening seat. After the reopening double, the E/W auction was explained. The explanation "transfer to the minors" should have been understood by a player of South's experience. If yague, South should have asked for clarification about the issue of whether it showed both minors or just one. South's decision to assume a meaning for an ambiguous answer was South's responsibility and was not protected by law (21A). As such, the panel felt South's decision to double 4♦ rather than bid 4♠ was based on her own misunderstanding not the opponent's incorrect or unclear explanation. The table result of 4 + doubled making four, E/W +510 was restored as law 40C did not apply.

The Panel: Peter Marcus (Reviewer), Candy Kuschner, Charles MacCracken, Matt Smith and Gary Zeiger.

Players Consulted: None.