

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Eighteen
Subject	Misinformation (MI) and Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Ron Geagley
Event	Second Friday Daylight Open Pairs
Session	Second
Date	July 25, 2008

BD#	<b>9</b>
VUL	<b>E/W</b>
DLR	<b>North</b>

<b>1,349 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	Q 6 5 4
♥	A J 6 2
♦	T 9 5
♣	8 4

<b>733 Masterpoints</b>		<b>Summer 2008 Las Vegas, NV</b>	<b>695 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	K 9		♠	J
♥	K 8 7 4		♥	Q 9 5 3
♦	A 8 7		♦	K J 6 4 3
♣	A Q T 9		♣	K J 7

<b>3,420 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	A T 8 7 3 2
♥	T
♦	Q 2
♣	6 5 3 2

West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	2♠
Dbl	Pass	2NT <sup>1</sup>	Pass
3NT	Pass	4♥	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	<b>4♥ by East</b>
Opening Lead	<b>♣3</b>
Table Result	<b>Down 1, E/W -100</b>
Director Ruling	<b>4♥ W down 1, E/W -100</b>
Panel Ruling	<b>3NT W down 3, E/W -300</b>

(1) Explained as values and spade stopper, actual agreement is Lebensohl.

**The Facts:** The director was called before the final pass. It was determined that the meaning of 2NT was explained incorrectly.

**The Ruling:** The director judged that the UI from the misexplanation did not demonstrably suggest the 4♥ call but rather the fact that partner had made a takeout double rather than overcalling 2NT. Therefore, the table result of 4♥ by West, down one, E/W minus 100 was allowed to stand. The MI had no affect on the outcome.

**The Appeal:** Only North and South attended the review.

N/S think that East took advantage of UI (when her partner told the opponents she had a balanced hand with a spade stopper) by bidding over 3NT. West could have held a hand with KQx of spades that was strong enough to double and then bid 3NT. They both felt that pass was a logical alternative to bidding 4♥ over 3NT.

E/W chose not to attend the review. They had already told the table director that they play a form of Lebensohl where a direct bid of a suit after a double by partner is weaker than 2NT, forcing 3♣, and then a suit bid – the latter promises an invitational hand.

**The Decision:** The panel agreed unanimously that East's 4♥ bid was demonstrably suggested by West's explanation of the 2NT bid. West could have had a strong hand with spade stoppers and simply wanted to play 3NT. East has no bridge reason to bid 4♥. At 3NT, the panel determined that, after a spade lead, down three was both the most likely favorable result for the non-offenders and the worst result at all probable for the offenders. Therefore, the result was changed to 3NT by East down three, E/W minus 300 for both sides in accordance with 16A and 73C.

**The Panel:** Jean Molnar (Reviewer), Mike Flader and Candy Kuschner.

**Commentary:**

**Rigal** Appalling director ruling ably corrected by the panel; well done.

**Smith** The director had a blind spot, but the panel corrected it. That East hand looks more like a slam try than a sign off in 4♥ to me, but in any case surely the UI suggests not passing 3NT. I'm sure the panel's conclusions on the auction and the play were correct, but the panel is supposed to gather player opinions before rendering a decision involving bridge judgment.

**Wildavsky** Good work by the panel to correct an injustice.

**Wolff** In order to protect the field (PTF), I would prefer the ruling to be N/S plus 100, E/W minus 300. N/S still got the best of it, since E/W could easily make 4♥ and E/W claimed to play reverse Lebensohl. East got confused and then corrected the contract. Let both justice and PTF rule the day.