

APPEAL	NABC+ FOURTEEN
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Gary Zeiger
Event	NABC Swiss Teams
Session	Second Final
Date	July 27, 2008

BD#	31
VUL	N/S
DLR	South

Jiun-Ming Chen	
♠	Q 9 4 2
♥	K 8 6 5
♦	A 7 5 2
♣	9

Ton Bakkeren		Summer 2008 Las Vegas, NV	Huib Bertens	
♠	K 8		♠	A J 7 6
♥	J T 7 2		♥	Q
♦	Q J 9 4 3		♦	K T 8 6
♣	Q 3		♣	J T 6 4

Albert Hsiao	
♠	T 5 3
♥	A 9 4 3
♦	
♣	A K 8 7 5 2

West	North	East	South
			1♣
1♦	Dbl	2♣	3♣
Pass	Pass	3♦ ¹	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	3♦ by West
Opening Lead	♣9
Table Result	Down 1, E/W -50
Director Ruling	3♦ W down 1, E/W -50
Committee Ruling	3♦ W down 1, E/W -50

(1)	Before this call, East asked the meaning of North's double and was told it denied four-card major(s).
-----	---

The Facts: The director was called after the play of the hand. South had mis-explained North's double. The mis-explanation could have been the result of a language problem. West discovered at trick two that North had at most five cards in the minors (eight or more in the majors). East claimed that he would pass over 3♣ with the correct explanation.

The play of the hand was as follows.

1. Club lead to the king.
2. Ace of clubs (heart discarded by N).
3. Low club, ruffed high, with a heart discarded by North.
4. Low heart to South's ace.
5. Club ruffed high, with North discarding a spade.
6. Diamond to the king, winning, South discarding a club.
7. Spade to the king.
8. Spade to the Queen and ace.
9. Spade ruffed high.

The Ruling: The director judged that the misinformation did not cause damage in the play. Declarer needs to play three rounds of spades starting at trick four to be able to score a small trump in hand. E/W should have asked to see the convention cards. In accordance with Law 40C, the table result of 3♦ by West down one, E/W minus 50 was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: South was the only player not attending the hearing. East argued that he could be almost certain that the opponents had missed an eight-card heart fit, and that with correct information, he would pass out 3♣ (or possibly even double), reading his partner for a doubleton club.

Additionally, after North showed out on the second round of clubs, West asked South about the double, and South confirmed that it was a negative double, denying as many as four cards in either major. West knew that North's hand did not conform to South's description, but thought that the double might have been a transfer, showing five or more hearts. With correct information, declarer would not have led a diamond at trick seven, leaving himself better placed to make his contract.

South suggested that West had simply mis-guessed the play, and the incorrect information was not material. N/S did not play transfers over suit bids.

The committee discovered that the N/S convention card described North's double as negative.

The Decision: The committee did not think that the misinformation had an impact on East's bidding decision. East had stronger diamonds than clubs, and he knew that his side had at least a nine-card diamond fit. Additionally, the singleton heart figured to be more of an offensive rather than a defensive asset.

As to the play, West would have been better placed to trust the N/S convention card and place North with 4-4 in the majors. Had North turned up with five hearts and three spades, and the double been a conventional transfer, he would likely have a better chance to receive redress.

More importantly, in the play, declarer had reached a four-card end position with the lead in the East hand. North was known to have A75 of diamonds and one major suit card.

The actual cards were:

<p>♠ 9 ♥ ♦ A 7 5 ♣</p>	<p>♠ J 7 ♥ ♦ T 8 ♣</p>
<p>♠ ♥ T x ♦ 9 3 ♣</p>	<p>♠ T ♥ 9 x ♦ ♣ x</p>

N/S have taken three tricks. If North's remaining major suit card is a heart, declarer will go down one whether he ruffs a spade low OR high. If North's remaining major suit card is a spade, declarer must ruff low, so ruffing low is the only chance to make the contract. Since it was obvious to West that South was confused about the meaning of North's double, the committee was not inclined to offer redress. Moreover, West had an opportunity to make his contract by making a play in a simple end position that could never lose a trick. The committee ruled that any damage suffered by E/W was a result of its own misjudgments and not misinformation. Since the misinformation that South gave did not materially affect the result, the table result of 3♦ by West down one, E/W minus 50 was allowed to stand for both sides.

The Committee: Doug Doub (Chair), Tom Carmichael, Blair Seidler, Patty Tucker and Michael White.

Commentary:

- Goldsmith** Sound ruling, but to nitpick: The argument about the play doesn't really follow. If the non-offending side's (NOS) bad result stemmed from their own error subsequent to the infraction, then a split score is awarded. If the NOS was not damaged by the infraction, then the table result is awarded. So to argue that E/W's bad result is due to West's poor play and not give a split ruling is misleading. Perhaps the committee ought to have introduced that discussion by "Incidentally," instead of by "More importantly," and concluded it with something like, "so even if E/W had been damaged by the infraction, they would have kept their bad result. Because they were not, N/S keeps its good result as well."
- Polisner** Very keen analysis by the directors and committee. Another example of players looking for relief when none is warranted.
- Rigal** Sensible ruling; well done by the committee in a situation where it might have been easier not to spend the time and trouble to work out what was going on in both the bidding and play.
- Smith** E/W are a world class pair. Their arguments didn't make any sense to me at the time, and I am no more convinced several months later after reading this case.
- Wildavsky** An especially thorough job by the appeals committee.
- Wolff** Well done by the committee and the tournament director, except that N/S might get a procedural penalty for its improper misinformation.