

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Fourteen
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Mike Flader
Event	Flight AX Swiss Teams
Session	Playthrough
Date	July 23, 2006

BD#	33
VUL	None
DLR	North

Paul Stern	
♠	9
♥	Q J T 6 4 3 2
♦	T 2
♣	A Q 9

Deborah Murphy		Summer 2006 Chicago, Illinois	Gary Donner	
♠	A J 6 3 2		♠	K Q T 4
♥	8		♥	A 9 5
♦			♦	A K Q 7 3
♣	K J 8 6 5 4 3		♣	7
Margaret Salazar				
♠	8 7 5			
♥	K 7			
♦	J 9 8 6 5 4			
♣	T 2			

West	North	East	South
	Pass	1♣ ¹	Pass
2♣ ²	3♥ ³	Pass	3♠
4♣	Pass	4♦	Pass
4NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	4NT by West
Opening Lead	♥Q
Table Result	4NT by W down 3, N/S +150
Director Ruling	4NT by W down 3, N/S +150
Panel Ruling	4NT by W down 3, N/S +150

(1)	Strong – Alerted.
(2)	Natural and positive.
(3)	Announced as a transfer.

The Facts: N/S play transfer responses versus a strong club only directly over the 1♣ opening according to North. Only North's card was marked with this agreement although South erroneously Announced 3♥ as a transfer. When West was asked what she would have done with the correct information, she said she would have still bid 4♣.

The Ruling: There was MI. There was no direct connection between the MI and the damage. Therefore, the table result of 4NT by West down three, N/S +150 was allowed to stand. (Law 40C)

The Appeal: West was asked on several occasions, both by the table director and the screener, whether, given the proper information that 3♥ was natural and not a transfer to spades, she would have made a call other than 4♣. On the fourth occasion, several hours after the actual hand had been played, she said she might have doubled instead. She did not seem to grasp that the 3♠ bid had been made and that we could not change that.

When asked later about the meaning of 4NT, she stated that it was probably RKCB for clubs and this was simply her response.

East was asked if he would have made a different call over 3♥ if he had the proper information at the time. He stated that he suspected that 3♥ was natural given the quality of his spades. He did not want to double 3♥ because he thought he would have the opportunity to double 4♥ instead.

The Decision: Several partnerships of 2,000 to 2,500 masterpoints were asked to bid after the sequence of: 1♣ Pass 2♣ 3♥
Pass 3♠

None were able to reach a spade slam, although all would have doubled 3♠.

E/W's bad result occurred because of their bidding, not because of MI given by N/S. If West had doubled 3♠, it would have led to a better result. But, without West stating that she would have doubled 3♠, it seems clear that the panel could not protect E/W.

The panel judged that law 40C did not apply. The table result of 4NT by West down three, N/S +150 was allowed to stand, and a procedural penalty of 2 victory points was assessed against N/S for:

1. Failing to Alert properly (announcing a transfer when an Alert was required).
2. Not having two properly completed and matching convention cards.

The Panel: Harry Falk (Reviewer), Candy Kuschner and Gary Zeiger.

Players Consulted: Several partnerships considered E/W peers.