

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Four
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Patty Holmes
Event	Friday/Saturday KO Teams – Bracket 3
Session	Finals
Date	March 15, 2008

BD#	6
VUL	E/W
DLR	East

606 Masterpoints	
♠	Q x x
♥	Q x
♦	K Q J 9 x x
♣	x x

521 Masterpoints		Spring 2008 Detroit, MI	755 Masterpoints	
♠	J		♠	A K x x x x
♥	7		♥	K x x x
♦	T 8 6 5 3 2		♦	
♣	K Q J 9 8		♣	x x x

766 Masterpoints	
♠	T x x
♥	A J T x x x
♦	A
♣	A x x

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

Final Contract	5♠ doubled by E
Opening Lead	♥A
Table Result	Down 3, E/W -800
Director Ruling	5♠ dbld E down 3, E/W -800
Panel Ruling	5♠ dbld E down 3, E/W -800 to E/W 4♥ dbld N down 3, N/S -500 to N/S

(1)	Negative
(2)	Alerted
(3)	Before passing asked for an explanation of 3♦ and was told it was a cue bid in support of hearts

The Facts: The director was called at the end of the auction. 3♦ was Alerted and explained as above. However it was determined that N/S had no agreement. West claimed that she would have passed 4♥ doubled had she been given the correct information.

The Ruling: The director judged that there was misinformation but that the damage was not the direct result of the MI. Therefore, since law 40 C does not apply, the table result of 5♠ doubled by East, E/W minus 800 was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: E/W said that there was MI without which West would never bid 5♦ citing either pass or 4NT as alternative actions.

N/S said they hadn't talked about this auction. North thought 2 spades would have been a cue bid. They felt that West should have worked out it could not be correct to bid 5♦.

The Decision: The panel determined that there was MI in the auction. In order to determine whether the damage to E/W was the direct result of the MI, five players in the 300-500 masterpoint range (new Life Masters) were polled. When given the auction with the MI included all five players passed. (I "knew" that 3♦ was not a cue bid was a common statement.)

Thus, the panel determined that the damage was not the direct result of having been misinformed. So, the panel allowed the table result of 5♠ doubled by East, E/W minus 800 to stand for E/W.

However, the panel decided that N/S should not be allowed to benefit from their infraction (misexplanation). It was determined that if N/S were to play in 4♥ doubled that they would win seven tricks, five hearts, the club ace and a club ruff in dummy.

Therefore in accordance with laws 12 C 2 and 40 C, the result of 4♥ doubled down three, N/S minus 500 was assigned to N/S.

The Panel: Mike Flader (Reviewer), Jay Albright and Jean Molnar.

Commentary:

Polisner I disagree with the panel and E/W minus 800 for both sides should be the result. Since everyone agreed that the result was not the result of the MI but of West's insane action (which would have broken the chain between the MI and the result in any event), the table result should stand.

Rigal The ruling here seems harsh to someone -- I'm just not sure who. West, relatively inexperienced, made a bad call of 5♦, but one that was surely made more attractive by the MI. Did they stop playing bridge? Possibly; but I'd need to know more about experience-level. masterpoints do not tell the whole story. N/S might have received a penalty and kept their score. Reverting the contract to 5♥ also seems harsh. Still, just to encourage the others I suppose I can live with both halves of the ruling. It's nice to see bad bridge being punished once in a while (just so long as it's not MY bad bridge).

Smith This kind of case is very difficult to resolve. A player gets MI, but the decision he later makes that causes damage seems to have so much more to do with that player's poor judgment than with the MI he received. I suppose I can live with a split score in this case (clearly West would not have bid 5♦ had he been told that 3♦ was natural), but my inclination in general is to apply law 40C simply: "If the Director decides that a side has been damaged through its opponents' failure to explain the full meaning of a call or play, he may award an adjusted score." That law instructs the director to decide what caused the damage before any thought of a score adjustment is made. Was it the MI? Was it poor judgment? Only after making the determination that damage resulted from MI is it correct to then use the standard of 12C2 in awarding different scores for each side. Otherwise we would always adjust an offending side's score when they get a good score after MI is given, and I don't think that is the intent of the law. What if West had pulled the double to 7NT? Would we still want to adjust the E/W score? I don't think so. And by the way, I think the panel should have taken the extra step of polling the result of 4♥ doubled.

Wildavsky The panel improved upon the director's ruling. All that was missing was the legal basis for their ruling, which I believe is Law 72B1. This will be made clearer in the 2007 Laws, scheduled to take effect in the ACBL in September 2008.

Wolff Two significant crimes, both heavily penalized, but since this game was a knockout it may have tended to even out. I like these kinds of rulings which tend to emphasize wrongdoing and the punishment for it. It will eventually make bridge a better game for these players.