

APPEAL	NABC+ SEVEN
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	NABC+ Fast Open Pairs
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	July 24, 2008

BD#	21
VUL	N/S
DLR	North

Mary Dresser	
♠	T 5 3 2
♥	9 6 4
♦	A Q 6
♣	Q 8 7

Mike Dorn Wiss		Summer 2008 Las Vegas, NV	Chris Diamond	
♠	K 6 4		♠	A J 7
♥	3		♥	A J 8 7 5
♦	J T 9 4 2		♦	8 3
♣	J T 9 4		♣	A 5 2

William Peters	
♠	Q 9 8
♥	K Q T 2
♦	K 7 5
♣	K 6 3

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

Final Contract	2♠doubled by N
Opening Lead	♦8
Table Result	Down 1, N/S -100
Director Ruling	1NT W, down 2, E/W -100
Committee Ruling	1NT W, down 2, E/W -100

(1) Agreement is forcing but there was no Announcement.

The Facts: The director was called prior to the opening lead. East started to speak up to inform opponents of his partner's failure to Announce that 1NT was forcing. The director instructed the table to play the hand. South stated that had he known that 1NT was forcing that he would not have balanced.

The Ruling: The director determined that there was MI because of the failure to Announce in a timely manner. In accordance with Laws 75 and 12C2, the result was adjusted to 1NT by West down two, E/W minus 100.

The Appeal: All four players attended the hearing. E/W stated that the difference between a forcing and non-forcing 1NT seemed so slight that it ought not matter that the other side was misinformed.

The Decision: The committee felt that doubling 1NT was a hairline decision. Many players would double on some days and not others. That the 1NT call could have been stronger was, therefore, relevant. It pushed the tight decision a little bit in the successful option's direction. Therefore, the committee judged that the MI damaged the N/S pair. The next question was whether N/S's bad result was due directly to the MI or to North's decision to bid rather than pass the double. While many of us would pass without pause, the committee learned that both North and South thought the double was takeout of hearts - not penalty. Given N/S's experience level and given that they appeared to be on the same (albeit unusual) wavelength, the committee judged that the damage was a consequence of the infraction, not simply due to N/S's misjudgment.

The number of tricks E/W will take in 1NT was difficult to decide. Deep Finesse calculated and the director judged five. Some lines of play will lead to four. Whether those lines are likely enough to invoke Law 12C2's "at all probable" standard is another matter.

Because this was a Fast Open Pairs (i.e. players wanted to get their final scores and leave for the day), the committee decided not to try to guess that and concurred with the director's adjustment of 1NT by West, down two, E/W minus 100.

Since the bridge judgment was close, E/W were not assessed an appeal without merit warning (AWMW).

The Committee: Jeff Goldsmith (Chair), Steve Robinson and Kevin Wilson.

Commentary:

Goldsmith Random case. Ruling either way is fine. Personally, I don't agree with the committee's (AC) judgment, but the other two felt fairly strongly about it. That's why we have more than one player on a committee. This is one in which five-person ACs are likely to produce more reliable results than three-person ACs.

Polisner I definitely would not have adjusted N/S's score as the difference between a forcing and a non-forcing INT is so slight as to not be terribly significant. I may have been convinced to have E/W be down two in INT.

Rigal If the double was agreed as take-out why did South double? If it was penalties – as it appears -- North's decision to remove was what cost the partnership. I'd leave the non-offenders with their table-result, and give the adjusted result only to E/W, the offenders.

Smith Normally I would agree with the idea that the difference between a forcing and non-forcing 1NT response is so slight that it wouldn't lead to a score adjustment if MI occurred. But I won't second guess the committee in this case.

Wildavsky Note that the actual agreement must have been "semi-forcing," not "forcing," though that doesn't affect the case. The director and appeals committee decisions are reasonable – I can see them going the other way too. This was a close case.

Wolff Good overall ruling and the non-Alert did contribute to the problem.