

APPEAL	NABC+ SIX
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Ron Johnston
Event	Vanderbilt Knockout Teams
Session	Round of 16 – Third Quarter
Date	March 12, 2008

BD#	15
VUL	N/S
DLR	South

Fulvio Fantoni	
♠	K 8 6 3 2
♥	T 6 4
♦	5
♣	K T 5 4

Gunnar Hallberg	
♠	Q 5
♥	A K 7
♦	A Q 3
♣	Q 9 7 6 2

Spring 2008 Detroit, MI	
Claudio Nunes	
♠	A 7
♥	Q 9 5
♦	K J 8 7 2
♣	A J 8

Jim Mahaffey	
♠	J T 9 4
♥	J 8 3 2
♦	T 9 6 4
♣	3

West	North	East	South
			1♣ <sup>1</sup>
1NT	Dbl	2♣ <sup>2</sup>	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	2♣ by E
Opening Lead	♥5
Table Result	Down 2, E/W -100
Director Ruling	2♣ E down 2, E/W -100
Committee Ruling	-300 for E/W and +100 for N/S

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| (1) | 14+ Natural (at least 4 clubs) or 15+ Balanced and may have only 2 clubs.          |
| (2) | Alerted and explained as Stayman by East to North and as natural by West to South. |

**The Facts:** The director was called after the play of the hand. East explained the 2♣ bid to North as Stayman and West explained the 2♣ bid to South as natural. South said that to double a natural 2♣ bid he needed more clubs. He said he could have doubled had the 2♣ bid been for the majors.

**The Ruling:** The director determined that there was MI but that it was unlikely that the MI led to the decision to double or not. Therefore, in accordance with law 21 B 1, the table result of 2♣ by East, down two, E/W minus 100 was allowed to stand.

**The Appeal:** N/S reiterated that a double of a natural 2♣ in this situation showed clubs and a double of an artificial 2♣ shows values, so South could not double. With the correct information, he might not have led a heart.

West thought East misbid. He also said 2♥ is only down one. After being questioned, he said 1NT-Dbl-2♣ would be Stayman.

**The Decision:** There was definitely MI and N/S were damaged by it as a result (law 40 C), so the committee adjusted the score per law 12 C 2.

The committee assessed the likelihood of the various contracts and results that might have been reached had N/S been properly informed. Had South doubled, for example, East might have bid 2♦ or redoubled. The committee judged that minus 300 for E/W met the standard of “the most unfavorable result that was at all probable” for the offending side, while the “most favorable result that was likely” for the non-offending side was plus 100. (Some percentage of Souths would not double, some would play 2♥ and some would go down in 2♦ doubled.)

Therefore, the committee judged to award a split score: plus 100 to the non-offending side (N/S) and minus 300 to the offending side (E/W).

**The Committee:** Aaron Silverstein (Chair), Gail Greenberg, Mike Kovacich, Michael Rosenberg and Bob White.

### **Commentary:**

**Goldsmith** What was the actual agreement? No one mentioned this, so I'll assume that "the director determined that there was MI" meant that E/W agreed that 2♣ was Stayman. If they had no agreement, the ruling would have quoted law 75 to rule MI rather than mistaken bid.

East knew that it was likely that his partner thought 2♣ was natural; after all, he passed it. He really ought to have said something before the opening lead, since he knows South was likely to have been misinformed. The laws don't say he must do this, but it would have been a good move on his part and would have given him a better shot at a good score. Of course, not many would think of it.

I don't see how the MI affected the auction. South's pass shows his hand; he has a minimum for the pass, both in high cards and in major suit defense. Double doesn't look like a realistic option, regardless of the meaning of 2♣. If he had been told the correct information, that 2♣ was Stayman, then he'd never double, as passing shows the balanced hand; doubling shows clubs. I don't understand what everyone is arguing here--- the MI made it more reasonable for South to double, not less so.

MI did, however, affect the opening lead and defense. Either a club or a diamond would have been led with correct information. I don't see a probable defense to nine tricks, but eight seems likely enough, so give reciprocal 150s.

- Polisner** A difficult case to determine what would have happened. I would like to know what, if any, documentation E/W provided to prove West's contention that 2♣ was natural. Of course, without such proof, MI is presumed. I don't think that it is at all probable that East would have sat it out in 2♣ doubled and would either played in 2♦ or 2♥ doubled. Since 2♦ doubled would have been at "all probable," I would have adjudicated the result to that contract for both sides. I am less than sympathetic to N/S's position. North knew that South either had four clubs or 15+ balanced with at least two clubs, which would make a 2♠ bid likely. I could live with plus 100 for N/S and minus 100 for E/W.
- Rigal** This seems a harsh ruling to N/S. I'd think minus 300 was fair for E/W but I'd have to be convinced that it was also not the fair ruling for N/S. Once MI is determined, E/W look likely to play diamonds not hearts.
- Smith** A tough case well handled by the committee. The fact that N/S quietly subsided to 2♣ on those hands convinces me that the MI contributed to their damage. All bases seem to have been covered, and the law was applied properly to the conclusions drawn by the committee.
- Wildavsky** What did the director and appeals committee (AC) decide was the actual E?W agreement, or did they conclude that there was none? We need to know, since it affects the decision.  
Let's suppose that "Stayman" was the E/W agreement. I'm not sure it's even at all probable that South would have doubled. He's promised 14 and he has 15 -- that doesn't sound like extra values to me. I'd want to know more about the N/S agreements.  
This one is close between the director and AC decisions, both of which were reasonable.
- Wolff** My nose tells me that when West heard his partner bid 2♣, after North had doubled 1NT for penalties, he was hoping that clubs would be as good as any other suit and maybe not even be doubled. This happened, and I think that N/S were not deserving more than plus 100, (obviously North could have doubled 2 clubs since his partner was balanced and he himself had 4 clubs). I further think that with North being minimum for his penalty double he was happy to go plus, which 2♣ would allow him and which either of the red suits may not. Again, convention disruption (CD) (or, in this case just general confusion) makes everything tough, but I would only allow plus 100 N/S.