

APPEAL	Non NABC+ Eight
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Diane Beyer
Event	Bracketed Knockout – Bracket Six
Session	Third
Date	July 21, 2008

BD#	17
VUL	None
DLR	North

1,135 Masterpoints	
♠	8 7 4 2
♥	
♦	K Q J 8 7 6
♣	A Q 7

242 Masterpoints		Summer 2008 Las Vegas, NV	155 Masterpoints	
♠	K Q T 6 5		♠	A 9 3
♥	K J 8 6		♥	A 9 5 4
♦	9 2		♦	A 5 3
♣	9 6		♣	K 8 4

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

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

Final Contract	2♥ by West
Opening Lead	♦K
Table Result	Making 3, E/W +140
Director Ruling	3NT E, making three, E/W +400
Panel Ruling	3NT E, making four, E/W +430

(1)	No Announcement, actual agreement is transfer.
(2)	No Announcement – actual agreement is transfer (stolen bids on)

The Facts: The director was called at the end of the auction. When asked about the 2♦ bid, North said that it was support for diamonds. West's bid of 2♥ was not Announced as a transfer. The director gave South the opportunity to change the terminal pass due to the lack of Announcement of West's bid. South chose not to do so.

After the play, West said that she would have bid 3NT had the 2♦ call been properly Announced in a timely manner.

The Ruling: There was MI that damaged E/W. Therefore, in accordance with Laws 21B3 and 12C2, the table result was adjusted to 3NT by East, making three, E/W plus 400.

The Appeal: All players attended the review.

N/S didn't think it fair that an arbitrary score of plus 400 should be given to E/W. West didn't mention 3NT until after she had seen all four hands. She first said she would bid 3NT. Then said maybe she'd transfer first. The director said that 4♠ makes; but, if North knows 2♥ is a transfer, North will double for a heart lead. N/S believe 4♠ will go down. Contract the other table was 4♠ and it did go down one trick.

West said part of the problem was the failure to Alert 2♦ as a transfer to hearts. If this is Alerted, the 2♥ call will be clear to partner as a transfer to spades. When partner overcalled 1NT, she was always going to drive to game in spades or NT.

The Decision: The panel determined that North's failure to recognize South's 2♦ bid as a transfer was the direct cause of E/W's failure to get to game. If North does double 2♥ for a heart lead and a heart is led against 3NT, East will make four. Therefore, in accordance with Laws 21B3 and 12C2, the result was adjusted to 3NT by East, making four, E/W +430.

As Life Masters, N/S should have realized that the failure to know their system was the direct cause of the mix-up by E/W. Since they were clearly the offending side, the appeal had no basis and no merit. An appeal without merit warning (AWMW) was issued to North and South.

The Panel: Jean Molnar (Reviewer), Bernie Gorkin and Charlie MacCracken.

Commentary:

Rigal Although it seems rather unfair to N/S that a pair that forgets its system might benefit in this way, they had the rationale for the director ruling properly explained to them; yes, E/W got lucky but they would never have had this accident if the Alert procedure had been properly followed. Given that the situation was explained to them, the AWMW is appropriate.

Smith What a mess! I'll bet South didn't want to change his last pass! The write-up implies without being specific that the information about the 2♦ bid did not come to light until after the hand. I assume it was not discovered before the lead or East should have also been given the chance to change his last pass.

Obviously the failure to Alert had something to do with the E/W accident. But as large or maybe even a larger contributor was their own basic misunderstanding about the meaning of West's 2♥ bid. West thought their agreement was that it was a transfer (I assume regardless of the meaning of 2♦), while East did not. Now if they actually had different agreements depending on the meaning of 2♦ I would have a different opinion. But in the absence of that, I think E/W caused their own bad score and they should keep it. I would adjust the N/S score down, however.

This principle was implied in the old laws (under which this tournament was run) and expanded upon by our Laws Commission. But it is explicit in the new Laws as part of Law 12C1(b): "If, subsequent to the irregularity, the non-offending side has contributed to its own damage by a serious error (unrelated to the infraction) or by a wild or gambling action, it does not receive relief in the adjustment for such part of the damage as is self-inflicted.

The offending side should be awarded the score that it would have been allotted as the consequence of its infraction only." So split bad score is my preference in this case. Therefore I obviously think the appeal had merit. And by the way, on a heart lead against 3NT isn't it pretty easy to make eleven tricks? Even as it is, I think adjusting from 3NT making 3 to 3NT making 4 was a bit of piling on against N/S.

Wildavsky Nice work by the panel, taking North at his word when he claimed he would double 2♥ for a heart lead. Any non-diamond lead against 3NT would result in 11 tricks, though, not 10, since declarer will know to play for the ♣A onside. In any case, the AWMW was well deserved.

Wolff Both sides practiced convention disruption so neither should benefit. The score for E/W should be plus 140 instead of plus 400 or 430 and for N/S minus 400 or 430. Since it was a KO event instead of a pair game, each team might have its IMPs score lessened, but nevertheless I think it would be fairer to do it the way I suggest.