

APPEAL	<b>Non-NABC+ Three</b>
Subject	<b>Misinformation (MI)</b>
DIC	<b>Charlie McCracken</b>
Event	<b>Strati-Flighted A/X Pairs</b>
Session	<b>First Session</b>
Date	<b>Saturday, July 19, 2008</b>

BD#	<b>8</b>
VUL	<b>None</b>
DLR	<b>West</b>

<b>Alex Kornel</b>	
♠	4 2
♥	J 9 6 4 2
♦	A 9 8 5
♣	8 3

<b>Cindy Goatz</b>		<b>Summer 2008 Las Vegas, NV</b>	<b>Phil Goatz</b>	
♠	K Q 7		♠	T 8 5
♥	K T 5		♥	Q 7
♦	Q T 7		♦	K J 6 4 2
♣	A 5 4 2		♣	K J T

<b>Barbara Seagram</b>	
♠	A J 9 6 3
♥	A 8 3
♦	3
♣	Q 9 7 6

West	North	East	South
1♦	Pass	3♦ <sup>1</sup>	3♠
Pass	Pass	Double	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	<b>3♠ Doubled by South</b>
Opening Lead	<b>♦7</b>
Table Result	<b>Down 3, N/S -500</b>
Director Ruling	<b>3♦ W, Made 3, E/W +110</b>
Panel Ruling	<b>3♦ W, Made 3, E/W +110</b>

(1)	Alerted as preemptive and guaranteeing 5 Diamonds
-----	---

**The Facts:** East said he had no other bid. Can't bid NT without the majors and could not bid 2♦ as they play inverted. Agreement was 3♦ was preemptive with a nine loser hand.

**The Ruling:** The director judged that the partnership agreement was not fully explained as the hand could be as good as the hand that was held. In accordance with Laws 75C and 12C2 the result was changed to 3♦ by West making three, E/W plus 110.

**The Appeal:** The appealing side said their inverted minor agreement is that 1♦-Pass-2♦ is game forcing. They have no call to show an invitational raise. West stated that East has never bid 3♦ with this good a hand.

South stated that she would never have bid 3♠ if informed that 3♦ could be as strong as the hand held.

The reviewer found that E/W have no way to show an invitational hand that is unsuitable for bidding a new suit or 2NT. According to their agreements the West hand was not opened 1♣ because 1♣-Pass-1♦ is artificial showing 6 HCPs and less than three clubs and responder cannot bid 1♦ naturally.

**The Decision:** Misinformation occurred in the failure to fully explain that since 1♦-Pass-2♦ is game forcing and they have no conventional call to show an invitational raise, their 3♦ call can be significantly stronger than “preemptive” would reasonably suggest. South’s 3♠ call, while aggressive and not as flexible as double, was not deemed to be egregious. In accordance with Laws 40C and 12C2, the panel upheld the director’s adjustment of 3♦ by East, making three, E/W plus 110.

**The Panel:** Jay Albright (Reviewer), Nancy Boyd and Gary Zeiger.

**Commentary:**

**Rigal** South has a hand on which 3♠ is the normal action. While E/W deserve some penalty (no Alert of 1♣ either?) South is not due the double shot here. I would consider either a split ruling or a procedural penalty (PP) to E/W with the table result standing.

**Smith** I am offended at the explanation offered by West. It wasn't even close to good enough to describe what E/W were really doing. Maybe that feeling biases me in favor of the ruling and panel decision, but even at that I sure would have liked to have seen a poll of players with the South hand given an accurate description of 3♦. There is bridge judgment involved in this case. How much does it matter to peers of South that the upper end of 3♦ is higher than was expected at the table? A panels is supposed to poll such matters.

**Wildavsky** A closer decision than it might seem. "Preemptive" is not a synonym for "weak," and, were 2♦ a limit raise or better, East might still have chosen 3♦. If the actual agreement were "less than a limit raise," I'd let the score stand. Since the actual agreement seems to have been "less than a game force," I agree with the director's and panel's rulings.

**Wolff** My inclination, admittedly harsh, would be to leave N/S with its minus 500 in 3♠ doubled, but adjust E/W's score to plus 110 in 3♦. E/W's home brew 1♦ opening was the proximate cause of N/S's disaster, but South made a very dangerous 3♠ overcall (considering that her partner had not overcalled). Sometimes those aggressive tactics get punished and this was one of those times. Let the bridge determine the result, however, E/W were not deserving of either plus 500 or plus 400 in 3NT because of their lack of "full disclosure."