

APPEAL NABC+ THIRTEEN
Subject: Misinformation
DIC: Charlie McCracken
Event: Women's Swiss
Session: 2nd Qualifying, April 8, 2006

Board #14 Karen McCallum
Vul: None ♠ K Q J 9 7 2
Dlr: East ♥ 8 4
 ♦ T 9 5 3
 ♣ K

Linda Perlman	Kathleen Sulgrove
♠ T 8	♠ A 6
♥ Q J T 9	♥ A 7 6 3 2
♦ A K J 6 2	♦ Q 4
♣ A 9	♣ Q T 5 2

Kerri Sanborn
♠ 5 4 3
♥ K 5
♦ 8 7
♣ J 8 7 6 4 3

West	North	East	South
		1♥	Pass
2NT ¹	3♠	Dbl ²	Pass
4NT	Pass	5♥	Pass
6♥	All Pass		

- (1) Jacoby 2NT, first time partnership – not discussed.”
- (2) Explained before opening lead as, “not sure, probably her singleton, first time partnership – not discussed.

The Facts: 6♥ made six for a score of +980 E/W, after the lead of the ♣3. Declarer made no statement before the opening lead to confirm that the sequence was completely undiscussed.

The Ruling: The director found that declarer's failure to fully clarify that the meaning of the double was completely undiscussed was a violation of Law 40. With a spade lead, lines of play may or may not lead to twelve tricks. Per Law 12C2, the non-offenders get the most favorable score likely to have occurred had the infraction not occurred. Therefore, the director adjusted the score for both sides to 6♥ down one, N/S +50.

The Appeal: East contended that since her partnership agreement had been correctly explained, she was not obliged to make any further statement. Furthermore, she thought that she might well have made the hand - even with a spade lead.

N/S stated that since East's hand did not match her partner's statement "Probably a singleton," East was required to correct that explanation. N/S also stated that they thought it was likely that E/W would go down on a spade lead.

The Decision: Players are required to explain their partnership agreements. West's statement "first time partnership, not discussed" made it clear that "probably her singleton" was simply her guess at what her partner might mean by the double. East is under no obligation to tell her opponents what her hand is, only their agreements. The statement, "First time partnership, not discussed," gave N/S all the information to which they were entitled. The committee restored the table result for both sides - 6♥ making six, E/W +980.

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chair), Mike Kovacich and Jeff Roman.

Players consulted on line of play with a spade lead: Jacqui Mitchell and Judi Radin.

Commentary:

Gerard Wow, what irony! N/S stated that since East's hand did not match her partner's statement, East was required to correct that explanation. And yet North more than anyone else is single-handedly responsible for the opposite legal principle. When faced with an accurate description of her hand but not her agreement against Garozzo in Miami, she corrected the explanation and has been almost unanimously upheld over the years. People really are blind when it comes to the merits of their own case.

Goldsmith Good ruling, AC. Why did the director get this wrong?

Polisner East's obligation would have been to correct West's explanation IF it were incorrect (MI). If it was correct that there was no discussion as would be expected in a first-time partnership, it is unnecessary for East to say anything. Poor ruling - excellent decision.

Rigal This was a harsh ruling against the non-offenders, but it seemed to me that South went out on a limb, when she did not lead the suit her partner had told her to. Then in a sense she tried to win both ways. The committee's decision that East was not obligated to do any more than she did leaves me a little uncomfortable, but I can live with it. What WAS the double anyway?

Wildavsky Good work by the AC.

Wolff A decision made by the committee that basically states "one should not rely on a speculative opinion made by the partner of the bidder." Obviously the partner should have merely said "not discussed". A good time for a precedent on this subject as the facts are clear as to what happened. A precedent should keep the next committee from making a contrary opinion based on similar facts. The only legitimate reason not to make it a precedent would be to give the next committee unlimited power to decide for whomever they thought was truthful or "bite my tongue" whomever they liked better.

Zeiger I agree with the Committee, not the director. Granted West should not even have conjectured, but her qualifying statement made it clear that's what she was doing. N/S don't get a second bite at the apple.