

APPEAL	NABC+ FIVE
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Blue Ribbon Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	November 27, 2007

BD#	2
VUL	N/S
DLR	East

Ai-Tai Lo	
♠	9
♥	T 6 4
♦	A 6 4 2
♣	A Q 9 7 5

Jim Munday		Fall 2007 San Francisco, CA		Bill Hall	
♠	A Q 8 7 2	♠	J 5 4 3		
♥	A Q 9 3 2	♥	8 7		
♦	7 5	♦	Q J T		
♣	6	♣	J T 8 2		

Alan Schwartz	
♠	K T 6
♥	K J 5
♦	K 9 8 3
♣	K 4 3

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

Final Contract	4♠ doubled by E
Opening Lead	♦8
Table Result	Down 1, N/S + 100
Director Ruling	4♠, dbld, -1, N/S +100
Committee Ruling	4♠, dbld, -1, N/S +100

The Facts: The director was called after the auction. After leading (face-down), South explained that the 3♣ bid was a transfer to diamonds. No other player at the table heard an Alert. Therefore, it was considered to be a failure to Alert. West stated that he would not have bid 4♠ had there been a timely Alert and explanation.

The Ruling: In accordance with law 40 C, it was decided that the lack of correct information did not cause any damage. Therefore, the table result of 4♠ doubled by East down one, N/S plus 100 was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: Only E/W attended the hearing. The Committee agreed that there was misinformation, especially since South was known by one member of the Committee to occasionally mumble an Alert. E/W played strong and weak Michaels' Cue Bids. West opted to treat his hand as a strong Michaels' hand. West asserted he bid 4♠ as a tactical bid since he believed a standard 3♣ bid was forcing and that North would reopen if he passed.

Decision: The committee felt that no experienced partnership that played 3♣ as natural in this situation would play the above method. The committee found that West bid 4♠ because of his decision to bid 2♦ initially and because 4♠ would have a good play opposite many East hands that would bid 3♠. Accordingly, the MI was not the cause of E/W's bad result. The committee allowed the table result of 4♠ doubled by East down one, N/S plus 100 to stand.

The Committee: Richard Popper (Chair), Mike Kovacich and Hendrick Sharples.

Commentary:

Goldsmith I don't understand the first sentence of the decision. I agree that the non-offending side's bad result was caused by East's overbid. On the other hand, if East had been told that 3♣ was a transfer to diamonds, he is more likely to have passed thinking he may get an opportunity to bid 3♠ over 3♦. In fact, that is what would happen. In that case, applying law 12 C 2 is hard. Probably, North passes 3♦ and East bids 3♠. North might double, pass, or bid 4♦. I think doubling is likely enough to award reciprocal scores of 530. Should E/W get their good result? If 3♠ is a wild gambling action, they keep their table result. I think it qualifies. So N/S minus 530, E/W minus 100.

Polisner The fact that South volunteered that North's response was a transfer clearly indicates that he had neglected to Alert earlier. Be that as it may, the MI did not have any affect on the auction and the table result should be retained. The appeals committee should have asked West why he would not have bid 4♠ had he been properly Alerted. Absent a cogent reason, an AWMW should have been issued.

Rigal We have to persuade players (with all possible force, including AWMW) that infractions do not equal damages. Here E/W were not damaged because West's second call was unlinked to the meaning of 3♣ (and note that playing 3♣ as NON-forcing here is as likely as playing it forcing) so that if West really was thinking about bidding to catch North out, he needed to find out whether the opponents were having a forcing auction or not. AWMW territory, to my mind.

Smith I don't see any connection between the MI and West's decision to bid 4♠, and I don't see (and didn't read) how East's actions may have been affected, so I agree with the directors and the committee.

Wildavsky Good work all 'round. I see no merit to the appeal, but perhaps it's close.

Wolff Good ruling.