

APPEAL	NABC+ NINE
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Steve Bates
Event	Jacoby Swiss Teams
Session	First Qualifying
Date	March 15, 2008

BD#	30
VUL	None
DLR	East

Craig Huston	
♠	J 8 7 4 3
♥	Q T
♦	J 7 6 5 3
♣	3

Jeff Smith		Spring 2008 Detroit, MI	David Sabourin	
♠	A Q 9		♠	K 6 2
♥	K J 9 8 6		♥	A 5 4 3
♦	9		♦	8 4
♣	A K 8 2		♣	Q J 5 4

Ed Freeman	
♠	T 5
♥	7 2
♦	A K Q T 2
♣	T 9 7 6

West	North	East	South
		1♣ ¹	1♥ ²
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Final Contract	1♥ by S
Opening Lead	♥6
Table Result	Down 6, N/S -300
Director Ruling	6♥ W making 6, E/W +980
Committee Ruling	4♥ W making 6, E/W +480

(1)	Polish Club (10-12 balanced, 12+ club length or strong artificial).
(2)	Not Alerted but agreement is either spades or both minors.

The Facts: The director was called at the end of the auction. The correct meaning of the 1♥ call was disclosed. The director offered East the opportunity to change his call based on the correct information. East declined. West, away from the table, told the director that he [*passed because he, Editor*] expected a reopening double and possibly a redouble by South.

The Ruling: The director judged that E/W were damaged by the failure to Alert at the proper time. The director considered that a possible auction of: 1♣ - 1♥ - 2♥ - P
3♥- P - 4NT - P
5♦ - P - 6♥

Therefore, in accordance with laws 21, 40 C and 12 C 2, the score was adjusted to 6♥ by West making six, E/W plus 980.

The Appeal: Only N/S were present. East, West and South were at the table before North. It was established that E/W were playing Polish Club or a variant thereof, which the appeals committee (AC) established with the help of the director does NOT require a pre-Alert. South decided that this meant his side would be playing their defense to a strong or artificial club but did not tell his partner.

The Decision: On the above the AC established that we were dealing with a misexplanation not a misbid. South had been derelict in his duty in not discussing his methods before the match started.

It was also determined that West had no reason other than to pass and await developments; East had had a second bite at the cherry when he established the true state of affairs. The AC determined that there was a strong case for a reopening double to cater for the near-certainty that West had a penalty double of hearts; but that East had not stopped playing bridge when he failed to make that call.

Once this was established, the AC had to reopen the auction to see what might happen had there been proper and timely Alerts. West would surely have bid 2♥ (assumed natural and forcing although many Polish partnerships play 2♥ non-forcing - since E/W were not present it seemed unreasonable to assume this pair would treat 2♥ as non-forcing).

The auction would go 1C (1♥) 2♥ Pass**
3♥ Pass ??

West, facing what we know is a possible minimum HCP of 10, would not drive to slam, and any cue-bidding auction would see East signing off at every turn. To presume E/W would misbid via Blackwood so as to guess to reach a slam off a key-card and the trump queen was being unduly charitable to the non-offenders.

The possibility of a split ruling, to give N/S minus 980 and E/W plus 480 and average the results was not seriously considered.

The committee adjusted the result to 4♥ by West making six, for both sides, E/W plus 480 and N/S minus 480.

** (In real life North would never pass if he remembered the methods -- bouncing to 4♠ would make the E/W task far more difficult.

The Committee: Barry Rigal (Chair), Tom Carmichael, Fred King, Mike Kovacich and Chris Moll.

Commentary:

Goldsmith The committee's ruling seems right on target. To judge that reaching 6♥ is at all probable seems like a major stretch to me. Nice work.

Polisner Certainly the MI caused damage and the decision to alter the director's adjustment is a decision that getting to 6♥ was not at all likely.

- Rigal** I'm not sure how much it was appropriate to penalize N/S here. A split ruling giving them the slam, but not awarding it to E/W would certainly have been possible.
- Smith** I won't second guess the committee's judgment on the likelihood of E/W arriving in slam. I am glad that the committee did not seriously consider a split score and average it since that would have been an illegal ruling. Had the committee decided to award a split score, there is no reason in law that the result would have to be averaged (law 86B). Averaging is necessary in knockout play, but not at any other form of scoring (Swiss teams included).
And by the way, the fact that North might have made an obstructive bid had he remembered his methods is irrelevant, and I hope the committee did not allow itself to be influenced by that. E/W are entitled to know what South's bid meant even while North continued to forget. North is allowed information from the legal auction but nothing else, and the possibility of a 2♥ bid on his right would not necessarily wake him up to what was happening.
- Wildavsky** The director ruling was reasonable, and the committee ruling improved upon it. The "In real life" comment at the end of the write-up is not relevant. E/W are entitled to know the actual N/S agreement whether or not North knows it himself.
- Wolff** Convention disruption (CD) again! I tend to agree with the committee that 480 is much fairer than 980. Again if this committee, tournament director and all in the bridge world continue to be happy with what CD brings, far be it from me to disallow this travesty. I realize I am wasting my breath as no one seems to be the slightest bit interested in correcting anything, even as horrible as CD has always been.