

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Thirteen
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Candy Kuschner
Event	Thursday-Friday Kos – Bracket Eight
Session	Second Session
Date	Thursday, July 24, 2008

BD#	6
VUL	E/W
DLR	East

200 Masterpoints	
♠	K 8
♥	J 5 2
♦	Q 7 6 4
♣	A Q 9 8

220 Masterpoints		Summer 2008 Las Vegas, NV	620 Masterpoints	
♠	6		♠	Q J T 9 5 4 3
♥	A Q 9 4 3		♥	7
♦	T 8 2		♦	A K 5 3
♣	7 6 4 3		♣	T

800 Masterpoints	
♠	A 7 2
♥	K T 8 6
♦	J 9
♣	K J 5 2

West	North	East	South
		1♠	Dbl
Pass	3♣ ¹	3♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	3♠ by East
Opening Lead	♣2
Table Result	Down 1, E/W -100
Director Ruling	3♠ E, Down 1, E/W -100
Panel Ruling	3♠ E, Down 1, E/W -100

(1) South volunteered 3♣ was weak

The Facts: East stated she had been about to pass 3♣ when South volunteered that 3♣ was weak.

The Ruling: The meaning of 3♣ was judged to have no bearing on whether East bid 3♠ or passed. Therefore, even though there has been MI, the table result of 3♠ by East, down one, E/W minus 100 was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: East and West were the only players to attend the review. East stated that she was about to pass when South volunteered that 3♣ was weak.

The Decision: Six players were polled. All six bid 3♣ and all six said the meaning of 3♣ was irrelevant. Therefore, the director's decision was upheld. The table result of 3♣ by East, down one, E/W minus 100 was allowed to stand.

The appeal was deemed without substantial merit but no appeal without merit warning (AWMW) was issued because:

This was the third board out of 12 that N/S had given MI to E/W. The entire procedure was rushed as this was the last match and most players had left. The players involved were inexperienced.

The Panel: Bernie Gorkin (Reviewer), Nancy Boyd and Terry Lavender.

Players consulted: Six of East's peers.

Commentary:

Rigal I'm not sure the excuse given for the non-award of an AWMW stands up but I do understand it and might have had sympathy...just a little, but not enough. The appeals procedure should be human and humane, I agree. When you have an obvious bid and make it you don't get a double shot like this.

Smith If N/S had given MI three times in twelve boards, the correct remedy is to give them a procedural penalty under Law 90. The correct remedy for an appeal without merit is an AWMW.

Wildavsky South volunteered an explanation when none was requested? That's a violation of procedure that ought to be well understood by a player with 800 masterpoints. It deserved a procedural penalty. Besides that I agree with the rulings.

Wolff Ruling of allowing the table result to stand would certainly be my choice. Plus 100 for N/S figures to be very good for N/S and, although E/W were given the wrong explanation, N/S got lucky.