

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Five
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Millard Nachtwey
Event	LM - 5000 Pairs
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	July 20, 2007

BD#	24
VUL	None
DLR	West

2235 Masterpoints	
♠	K J 5
♥	7
♦	A Q J 9
♣	K J 7 6 3

653 Masterpoints	
♠	A Q 6 3
♥	9 4 3 2
♦	4
♣	T 9 4 2

Summer 2007 Nashville, Tennessee	
---	--

2030 Masterpoints	
♠	7 2
♥	A K 6
♦	T 8 5 2
♣	A Q 8 5

624 Masterpoints	
♠	T 9 8 4
♥	Q J T 8 5
♦	K 7 6 3
♣	

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

Final Contract	2♦ by North
Opening Lead	♠2
Table Result	2♦ down 1, N/S -50
Director Ruling	2♦ down 1, N/S -50
Panel Ruling	2♦ down 1, N/S -50

The Facts: E/W agreement is to lead low from two or four cards. The play started with the ♠2 to the ♠A, and ♠3 returned. North looked at the E/W convention card, saw second and fourth in the leads area, and played the ♠K. He then played ♦A and ♦Q and went down one. He claimed the E/W convention card did not have the "low from doubleton" circled. E/W disputed this, and produced a correct convention card five rounds later. Declarer claimed that if he had known of the probability of xx, he might have played the ♠J.

The Ruling: Despite the failure to pre-Alert, declarer had enough knowledge of the E/W agreement that he should have asked the key question – "what do you lead from xx?" The damage was not a direct result of the failure to Alert, thus the table result of 2♦ down one, N/S minus 50, stands.

The Appeal: North was the only player to attend the hearing. He reiterated that he might have played the ♠J had he known of the possibility of a low lead from a doubleton. He did not explain what he thought second and fourth meant.

The Decision: The play went ♠2 to the ♠A and the ♠3 to the ♠K. Declarer played the the ♦A and Q, got the news of the 4-1 break, then led a heart to the king, and East led a trump. Declarer won in hand, ruffed a club, and led a spade to attempt (unsuccessfully) to end play East.

Four players with 2,000-2,500 masterpoints were consulted. All played the ♠K, saying it was too risky to finesse. One pointed out that any gain from a successful finesse is illusory as you will never get a second spade trick if you play a crossruff. All four led a heart at trick three.

While Law 40C was violated, the panel ruled the table result of 2♦, down one, stands. While there was a failure to Alert, the risk of taking no spade tricks if declarer finesse is so high and the potential gain from a successful finesse so low that the panel deemed it not to be “likely” under Law 12C2. To determine a correct score for E/W, the panel also looked at the end result after taking successful spade finesse at trick two. If declarer were to play the ♠J, play two rounds of diamonds and lead a heart, East will win and return a trump. Declarer can win and play the ♠K with East pitching to avoid the end play. Declarer can now ruff a club and lead a heart to the ace. East can get out with a diamond leaving this end position with North on lead:

	North	
	♣ K J 7	
West		East
♠ Q		♣ A Q 8
♣ T 9		
	South	
	♠ T	
	♥ J T	

When shown this end position, declarer did not point out that he could take one more trick by leading the ♣K or ♣J. Thus the panel concluded that minus 90 did not meet the “most unfavorable result that was at all probable” criteria under 12C2.

The director’s ruling of 2♦ down one, N/S minus 50, was upheld.

The Panel: Charles MacCracken (Reviewer), Matt Smith, and Gary Zeiger.

Players Consulted: Four players with 2,000 – 2,500 masterpoints.

Commentary:

- Polisner** I am afraid that the panel used Law 12C2 incorrectly. That law is used only when awarding an assigned adjusted score - not to decide if a play or call was “likely” or “at all predictable”. I would have awarded a split core of down one for N/S and minus 90 for E/W which does use 12C2 to adjust the score
- Rigal** Let’s focus on the real issues here. Eight tricks are trivially cold after two rounds of spades won by the king. Declarer leads a heart and wins the trump return, and has six tricks on a cross-ruff (or can even ruffing finesse in hearts and STILL make eight tricks). Any damage to North was done by his own stupidity, not by the opponents’ leads.
By the way a propos the lead style; ‘second and fourth‘ does NOT mean low from a doubleton. It means fourth from honors and second from three or four cards. So there WAS MI -- but no damage.
I’m going to keep a MAPA record (Miserable And Pettifogging Appeal by someone trying to get something for nothing). This is MAPA1
- Wildavsky** Good work all 'round.
- Wolff** I think N/S should keep minus 50 in 2♦ down one, and E/W get a procedural penalty of between 1/4 and 1/2 of a board for not calling attention to the agreement of leading low from a doubleton. Let the punishment always fit the crime.