

APPEAL NABC+ FOURTEEN
Subject: Misinformation (MI)
DIC: Steve Bates
Event: Jacoby Open Swiss
Session: 2nd Qualifying, April 8, 2006

Board #4 Diane Walker
Vul: Both ♠ Q T 8 5
Dlr: West ♥ 4
 ♦ K T 9 8
 ♣ J 8 7 2

Mel Colchamiro	Janet Colchamiro
♠ K 7 4	♠ 6 2
♥ A Q J 8 2	♥ 9 7
♦ 3	♦ A 6 5 2
♣ K Q 6 5	♣ A T 9 4 3

Ellen Cherniavsky
♠ A J 9 3
♥ K T 6 5 3
♦ Q J 7 4
♣

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

- (1) Forcing, 15-21 HCP
- (2) 6+ HCP
- (3) When asked, told that it was “takeout”
- (4) Game forcing

The Facts: N/S play Mathe but claim that it does not apply in this seat. South said she meant it as a takeout and would convert clubs. Neither convention card had anything about Mathe in immediate seat only. Both sides said that “double = takeout” makes no sense. “Mathe” was not mentioned at the table. The final contract was 5♥, down three on the lead of the ♠5, E/W -300.

The Ruling: The director adjusted the score to +600. The director said that Laws 21B3 and 40C both apply. If E/W had been aware that N/S play Mathe in direct seat, they might have avoided the ♥ contract and played 5♣ instead.

The Appeal: South said that she and her partner hadn't discussed playing Mathe after 1♣ – Pass – 1♦. She explained that, when she doubled, she wanted her partner to bid something. North said that she would not expect less than 4-3 in the majors. E/W said that they would have looked for 3NT if they had the information that the double showed the majors.

The Decision: The Committee found no evidence of an agreement other than a general “bid something.” Therefore, we felt that “takeout” was a good approximation. Therefore, there was no misinformation. The Committee Chairman felt the auction went off the rails with the 3♥ bid and that the 4NT bid was a vast overbid. Accordingly, the table result of 5♥, down three; E/W -300 was restored.

The Committee: Jeff Meckstroth (Chair), Aaron Silverstein and Bob White.

Commentary:

Goldsmith Good ruling, AC. We ought to be able to give AWMWs for calling the director when, on appeal, the director's ruling is overturned.

Polisner My recollection of the Mathe convention when Lew Mathe invented it was that it only applied to the 1♣ bid. It was later that players expanded it to the 1♦ response and even later that some players used it over strong 2♣ openers. The ACBL does not have an official definition of conventions and since the word “Mathe” was not used at the table, there was no MI and should not have resulted in an adjusted score. Good work by the AC.

Rigal A generous ruling for N/S, but the committee obviously felt that if there was any damage it was subsequent to any MI and not consequent from it. My own instincts are that N/S have an obligation to know what they play against a strong club – but the fact that South did have a hand that was take-out of diamonds (admittedly into the majors only rather than the majors plus clubs) maybe gets them off the hook.

Wildavsky Good work by the AC.

Wolff OK, I guess. When "strange" is playing "strange" let them fight it out. Whatever happens, strange will win.

Zeiger If East's 2♣ was natural and game forcing, not clearly stated, I have zero sympathy for EW. They were told "takeout." They uncovered their club fit. What did they think South had for a "takeout" double? I'm not

impressed with the Committee's reasoning, or the write up, but their decision was correct.

By the way, if $2\clubsuit$ wasn't natural, why in the world didn't East raise clubs?