

APPEAL	NABC+ TWELVE
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	Final
Date	November 29, 2007

BD#	16
VUL	E/W
DLR	West

Shannon Cappelletti	
♠	A Q
♥	8
♦	A J 9 8 7
♣	A K Q J T

Mike Passell		Fall 2007 San Francisco, CA	Drew Casen	
♠	J 9 6 3		♠	T 5 4
♥	A Q T 7 6 5		♥	K J 9 4
♦	T		♦	K 6 4 2
♣	7 3		♣	9 4

David Walker	
♠	K 8 7 2
♥	3 2
♦	Q 5 3
♣	8 6 5 2

West	North	East	South
2♥	3NT	4♥	Dbl
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Final Contract	4♥ doubled by West
Opening Lead	♣A
Table Result	Down 2, E/W -500
Director Ruling	3NT N, -2, N/S -100
Committee Ruling	4♥ doubled by W -2, E/W -500

The Facts: The director was called after the hand. The 3NT call was not Alerted as showing the minors because South had forgotten the agreement. East stated that he might not have bid 4♥ had he had the correct information.

The Ruling: The players polled by the director thought 4♥ much more attractive over a natural 3NT. Therefore, in accordance with laws 40 C and 12 C 2, the result was adjusted to 3NT by North, down two, N/S minus 100.

The Appeal: E/W did not attend the hearing. North said that E/W's treading into possible minus 800 territory versus a non-vulnerable 3NT was not "much more attractive" than to do so versus a strong minor-suited auction. Therefore, while East was misinformed by the failure to Alert the 3NT bid, the misinformation was not the source of the damage to E/W. It was East's decision to bid in any case.

The Decision: The committee was surprised at the director's poll findings, especially in light of the vulnerability. However, the committee is responsible for exercising its own judgment. In general, the player polls are more helpful in determining logical alternatives than in determining relative attractiveness of calls. In this case, East chose, at unfavorable vulnerability, to give up any chance of defeating 3NT and to position himself for a minus score worse than 3NT making. The committee determined that 4♥ was not more attractive versus a natural 3NT than interfering with a minor-suit auction. This action was risking the same penalty but giving up any likelihood of defeating the N/S minor suit game.

Therefore, the committee restored the table result of 4♥ doubled by West down two, E/W minus 500.

The Committee: Michael Huston (Chair), Abby Heitner, Jacob Morgan, Aaron Silverstein and Riggs Thayer.

Commentary:

Goldsmith What did 3NT really show? Normally, it shows a long suit, usually a minor, and close to nine tricks. While we are supposed to assume MI rather than misbid, 3NT for minors outside of a long-standing partnership seems rather unlikely. It'd be reasonable for the appeals committee (AC) to find misbid, hence no adjustment.

Their ruling does not seem obvious. If 3NT is really a long minor and an ace or two, East knows that minor is clubs and thinks his ♦K is working. Moreover, declarer rates to have seven clubs and two aces, so 3NT is making.

I don't see many constructions, however, where 4♥ is down only one; moreover, it's likely that if N/S bid 4NT, that'll be a make, so 4♥ appears to be giving the opponents a fielder's choice. On the other hand, If North has both minors, the bidding may die in four of a minor, which is cheaper than 4♥ doubled. All in all, it seems roughly equivalently bad to bid 4♥ over either meaning of 3NT, which is what the AC ended up ruling.

It's close though, and it's tough to rule on this sort of case, because an AC must think as someone who would take an action they wouldn't, especially after seeing the result.

Polisner It seems as the directors need training as to how to conduct a poll. For example, "assuming that 3NT is natural, what would you do?" and "assuming that 3NT is unusual, what would you do?" Further, East made no effort to protect himself by asking South what 3NT was in spite of the lack of an Alert as many players are not aware of which uncommon bids are or are not Alerts. In any event, the AC came to the right conclusion.

- Rigal** Sensible committee ruling, after a strange set of opinions garnered by the tournament directors. I agree entirely with the AC; over a 'semi-natural' 3NT you pass, expecting to have a shot to set it. Over an unusual 3NT bid you know you won't defend 3NT so you might bid. Had the decision initially gone the other way this would be AWMW territory.
- Smith** Although I agree that director polling in MI cases is not as effective as in UI cases, I think committees need to take director polls more seriously before they overrule them. I think the directors got this one right due to the opinions of the players polled. I will apologize if all the other commentators on this case agree with the committee.
- Wildavsky** I'll buy that E/W were injured primary through East's call, which some might consider wild or gambling. I agree with those polled, though, that the call would have been less attractive opposite a 3N showing the minors. N/S's score ought to have been adjusted, per law 72 B 1.
- Wolff** Excellent ruling.