APPEAL	Non NABC+ Seven			
Subject	Misinformation (MI) and Unauthorized Information (UI)			
DIC	Nancy Boyd			
Event	nt Yuba City Stratified Open Pairs			
Session	First of Two			
Date	March 17, 2010			

BD#	3		3,500 Masterpoints		
VUL	E/W		★	T 8 5 2	
DLR	South		•	Q 3	
			•	AQ3	
			*	J973	
5 20	Mosto	mainte			

5,200 Masterpoints				5,500 Masterpoints	
٠	A Q 9 6 4	Spring 2010 Reno, NV		٠	K J 7 3
•	Т9			•	A K 8
٠	5			•	J 8 4
*	KT852			*	A 8 4
		6	5,500 Masterpoints		·
		٠			
		•	J76542		
		•	KT9762		

West	North	East	South	Final Contract	3NT by East
			Pass	Opening Lead	♦ T
Pass	Pass	1NT	$2 \bigstar^1$	Table Result	Down 2, E/W - 200
3NT	Pass	Pass	Pass	Director Ruling	3NT E down 2, E/W - 200
				Panel Ruling	3NT E down 2, E/W - 200

(1) Alerted as showing spades and a minor, which is the partnership agreement.

Q

The Facts: The director was called when dummy was faced and after the play was completed.

N/S's agreement above is documented on each player's convention card.

The Ruling: North has no UI. South has UI but it did not suggest a particular action. There was no MI.

Therefore, the table result was allowed to stand (Law 75C).

The Appeal: E/W appealed the director's decision and all four players attended the review.

West was told that South had spades and a minor. She did not want to "give away" her spade holding, so just bid 3NT. She had no response to a question about concern for the opponents having long diamonds and East not having, potentially, a diamond stopper. N/S play suction in NABC+ events where 2 shows hearts and diamonds. They play Cappelletti where 2 shows spades and a minor in General Chart (GC) events. They each had both convention cards, but the GC card was their visible card in each player's convention card holder. South had forgotten but North Alerted correctly. In screening West felt South had played an illegal convention (suction) and would not listen to, or read, an explanation of the difference between a mistaken bid and a mistaken xplanation.

The Decision: Since North properly explained N/S's agreement for the event in which they were playing, there was no MI. Further, the panel felt that West's 3NT bid was inexplicable. Three players with between 5,000 and 5,500 masterpoints were given West's hand and none bid 3NT. Two felt that it was bad bridge. One player passed, one doubled and one bid 3. The panel allowed the table result to stand. E/W had a difficult interaction with the table director, so the committee at the reviewer's urging, did not assess an appeal without merit warning (AWMW), even though all members agreed the appeal had no merit.

The Panel: Peter Marcus (Reviewer), Bernie Gorkin, Candace Kuschner and Jean Molnar.

Commentary:

- **Rigal** Something with a little boiling oil in it seems appropriate for East and West. Again the N/S accident rated to get them into -1100 territory; they got lucky and that's an end of it...except for the AWM.
- Polisner It is correct that there was no MI as the presumption is overcome by N/S's convention card. The issue of UI, as the TD ruled, did not affect N. However, I question that TD's conclusion that the UI gained from N did not suggest a particular action. My guess is that if the auction had proceeded behind screens, (assuming that the screen was misplaced and S and E were screen mates), a poll would reveal that at this vulnerability and a 6-6 hand, that S would take another bid. In light of the actual auction, and the previous message he has sent about Ss, it is much less likely that S would not think about bidding. So, if a significant number of peers would bid over 4 Ss, I would award E/W + 100 as it seems impossible for them to get into Spades + 650. If nobody would bid over 3NT with no UI, then the decision is correct.

Wildavsky I agree that this appeal had no merit

WolffWhen CD strikes, BRIDGE ALWAYS STOPS! Consequently, too many
unseemly things happen and we should restore the status quo, EW
Average NS Zero and an admonition about learning one's system.