APPEAL	NABC+ NINE		
Subject	Misinformation (MI)		
DIC	Henry Cukoff		
Event	Wernher Open Pairs		
Session	Second Final		
Date	July 25, 2007		



west	INOTUI	East	Soum	Final Contract	S≣ DY NUITH
	Pass	Pass	1♣	Opening Lead	A
1♦	1♠	Dbl ¹	2♠	Table Result	3 ≜ N making 3, N/S +140
3♦	3♠	Pass	Pass	Director Ruling	3 ≜ N making 3, N/S +140
Pass				Committee Ruling	3 N making 3, N/S +140

(1) Explained as showing hearts. Actual agreement is diamond raise with an A, K or Q.

The Facts: The director was called after the play was completed and East had corrected the explanation of the double. North said she would have made a game try with the correct information. Had game been reached she would not have misplayed the hand.

The Ruling: The director determined that North was not damaged as a consequence of the misinformation; therefore, there was no adjustment indicated and the table result of 3♠ by North making three, N/S plus 140 was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: Only North and East attended the hearing.

North felt that with a correct explanation she would have doubled $3 \blacklozenge$, which her partnership plays as a game try. South would have accepted. North stated that she misplayed the hand because of distress at missing game.

East was asked why West did not bid hearts at her second turn. East speculated that she was tired and confused.

The Decision: The committee judged that N/S received misinformation but that the misinformation did not substantially affect the value of the North hand. Further, the committee considered that North was not very likely to play the hand more effectively in 4⁺ at matchpoints.

While the committee was concerned about the disconnect between West's explanation and her action of $3 \blacklozenge$, there was no basis to believe anything improper had taken place. Therefore, the director's decision to allow the table result of $3 \clubsuit$ by North making three, N/S plus 140 was affirmed.

The committee narrowly believed that the appeal had merit.

The Committee: Robb Gordon (Chair), Mark Bartusek, Michael Huston, Chris Moll and Aaron Silverstein.

Commentary:

- **Goldsmith** This isn't a judgment case. "I would have played the hand better in game," is the best argument N/S could give? Yeah, right. AWMW. You want to be able to bid game? Sure, no problem, E/W minus 140, N/S minus 100.
- Polisner Agree and agree.
- **Rigal** Still stuck in the slough of despond miserable and pettifogging appeal three; nice excuse for misplaying a hand, though. Maybe that was why the committee did not give N/S the AWMW they richly deserved.
- Smith Surely we should never accept an argument that a player would play a hand better at a higher level if not for reasons solely of "mental distress". The committee made all the arguments for the correct application of an AWMW without actually awarding it.
- **Wildavsky** Fair enough. I would have adjusted the E/W score or assessed a procedural penalty to avoid any possibility that they profited through their infraction.
- **Wolff** While the decision to not change what was bid and made at the table, N/S plus 140, is good, there are other questions to ask. Why with a 7-4 hand, after Alerting that her partner's double showed hearts, wouldn't she jump to 4Ψ ? There is something rotten in the state of the Wernher Open Pairs and we need to consult with either the melancholy Dane, or whoever, to find out what.
- Zeiger The committee can relax, West's 3♦ bid was due to nervousness and inexperience, some 400 masterpoints, most earned with a much more experienced partner. Not sure why the committee thought the appeal had merit, even if barely. Maybe it was just carryover concern about West's inconsistent bidding. One has nothing to do with the other, of course. In fact the appeal was truly meritless.