

APPEAL	Non NABC+ NINE
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Rick Mueller
Event	Side Game Series
Session	Afternoon
Date	July 17, 2006

BD#	10
VUL	Both
DLR	East

1,420 Masterpoints	
♠	9 5
♥	K 8 5
♦	A T 5
♣	Q 7 6 5 4

1,040 Masterpoints	
♠	K T 7 6
♥	A 9
♦	8 2
♣	A K J 9 3

1,420 Masterpoints	
♠	9 5
♥	K 8 5
♦	A T 5
♣	Q 7 6 5 4
Summer 2006 Chicago, Illinois	
6,500 Masterpoints	
♠	A J 8 4 2
♥	J 2
♦	K Q 9 7 6
♣	8

3,450 Masterpoints	
♠	Q 3
♥	Q T 7 5 4 3
♦	J 4 3
♣	T 2

West	North	East	South
		Pass	1♠
1NT	Dbl	2♦ ¹	Pass
Pass	Dbl	2♥	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	2♥ by E
Opening Lead	♣8
Table Result	2♥ by E making 2, E/W +110
Director Ruling	2♥ by E making 2, E/W +110
Panel Ruling	3♦ by N making 3, N/S +110

(1)	Intended as a transfer – not Announced or explained. Card is marked systems on after overcalls and over double and 2♣.
-----	--

The Facts: South asked about the 2♦ and West said he didn't think they played transfers in this sequence. North said he would not have done anything different with the correct information. South said he would have doubled 2♦. South believed that had he doubled 2♦ that the auction would not have ended at 2♥.

The Ruling: The table result stands, since neither law 40C3 nor 16 applies.

The Appeal: South said he would have doubled 2♦ if told it was a transfer. He could not double when told it wasn't a transfer since that would cause E/W to run from 2♦. He could not bid 3♦ over 2♥ as this would prevent his partner from doubling 2♥ if North had long/good hearts. South felt that, if he were told 2♦ was a transfer, he would double it.

Then, after; 2♦ Dbl Pass Pass

 2♥ Pass Pass, his partner could bid 3♦.

West did not feel it was clear North would bid 3♦ even if South doubled 2♦. South could have only four diamonds for his double.

The Decision: Three expert players were polled given South's hand. One felt that passing 2♦ was taking a position assuming it was not a transfer and doubling, whatever it meant, could be right. Having passed, however, he felt there was a bid possible over 2♥ since partner could have good hearts and want to double. He was understanding of, but not convinced, that the failure to Announce the transfer affected South's auction.

The other two were both firm and said immediately that it was right to pass 2♦ if natural and double if a transfer. As such, they felt the missed Announcement clearly prevented South from doubling, which would be the correct call if the agreed agreement had been Announced.

The panel decided that MI had been given by the failure to announce the transfer as the agreement on the convention card was that it was a transfer. Based on the polling, the panel found that: 1) South's call was based on MI and 2) South would have doubled with the correct information (law 40C). As such the panel awarded an adjusted score. In accordance with law 12C2, 3♦ by North was determined to be the most favorable result likely for the non-offending side, and this result also was determined to be the most favorable result at all probable for the offending side. As such, 3♦ by North making three, N/S +110 was the score assigned by the panel for both sides.

The Panel: Peter Marcus (Reviewer), Candy Kuschner and Charles MacCracken

Players Consulted: Mark Lair, Tom Smith and Adam Zmudzinski.

Commentary:

Gerard The first expert was right. South passed because he was hoping for a misunderstanding, which you get to do but not complain about later. If 2♦ was indeed natural, it would never become the final contract unless South doubled (and maybe not then - just think what North would hold). And how bad would it be to double 2♦ if North held a 2-5-1-5 average-count. Nope, it's like not raising partner's overcall when a negative double doesn't get alerted. You want to hoist them on their own petard, assume the risk. I don't care how firm and immediate the misguided majority was, they weren't as thoughtful as the other guy. However, the right adjustment was minus 110 for everybody. South's contributory negligence doesn't wipe away all damage from the offenders' slate.

Goldsmith Good job, panel, including the consideration of likely and at all probable results. A minor quibble: write-ups ought to mention unauthorized information (UI) issues in MI cases, though this time it was very unimportant; East has authorized information from partner's pass that there has been a bidding misunderstanding. It's best, however, to state that this was considered and was found to be irrelevant, just so we know that good practices were used.

- Polisner** A poor director's ruling and good decision by the Panel. The analysis should always start by viewing the problem from the standpoint of the player who had MI giving that side the benefit of any questionable action.
- Rigal** Correct procedure followed by the panel, and the right ruling given as a result. I'm a little surprised at the initial ruling; where there is doubt, it surely should go to the non-offenders.
- Smith** I'm a bit surprised that the polling results supported South's argument (I would have expected players to double 2♦ absent the Announcement.), but that is why we do polling. Did the table director conduct a poll? If so, it should be described in the write-up and considered by the panel. Given the information the panel got from its poll, I think the adjustment to 3♦ seems right in law. Again, though, I would like to have seen some analysis from the panel of the play to 3♦.
- Wildavsky** I don't understand the tournament director's ruling. There was an infraction and it led to damage. Surely a score adjustment was warranted - - the only question in my mind is which one. The Panel's ruling seems reasonable to me.
- Wolff** I think the panel, not the floor director, got it right. However, this is another nasty case of convention word (CD) where the opponent's are totally disadvantaged when everything changes and all because of the selfishness and incompetence of their opponents. Many people do not like to call the director, much less go to a committee, so can we imagine just how many cases of CD are not reported. Why wouldn't devious people want to use weak hand conventions just so they can increase their chances of winning? As we waste our bridge time there are players developing their poison gas labs right here in River City. Not that many do it, but why should we tempt them to, instead of running them out of town? Let's see who the enemy is. Up to now it has been us.