

APPEAL	NABC+ SEVEN
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Wernher Open Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	July 24, 2007

BD#	8
VUL	None
DLR	West

Shelly Dunietz	
♠	K 7
♥	A J 8 6 4
♦	Q 8 7 2
♣	T 3

Elise Parish		Summer 2007 Nashville, Tennessee	Dan Parish, Jr.	
♠	J 9 5 2		♠	Q 8
♥	K T 5		♥	Q 9 3
♦	A 6		♦	J 9 4
♣	A Q 5 2		♣	J 8 7 6 4

Erez Hendelman	
♠	A T 6 4 3
♥	7 2
♦	K T 5 3
♣	K 9

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

Final Contract	1NT by West
Opening Lead	♠K
Table Result	Made 3, E/W + 150
Director Ruling	1NT W made 3, E/W + 150
Committee Ruling	1NT W made 3, E/W + 150

(1) Announced as, "Could be short."

The Facts: The director was called at the end of the play of the hand when it was discovered that West had only 14 HCP for her 1NT rebid. E/W play a strong club system with 10-13 notrump openings. There was no discussion at the table about E/W agreements pertaining to notrump opening bids or rebids or about E/W's system.

The Ruling: The director determined that E/W did not have an agreement that the 1NT rebid showed 14-16 HCP. Since there is no requirement to pre-Alert the fact that E/W were playing a strong club opening, the director judged that there was no infraction – misinformation. The table result was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: N/S claimed that whenever a pair plays a strong club and 10-13 one notrump opening bids, they are always pre-Alerted everywhere else they play. Additionally, a director informed them that there is a requirement to Announce a 1NT rebid following responders's suit bid if the rebid shows the equivalent of a strong one notrump opening bid. North stated that she would have bid again if she had known the 1NT could be so weak.

E/W stated that they always Announce (*Editor's note: A strong 1NT rebid by opener after a one-level response by partner requires an Alert not an Announcement.*) a 1NT rebid as 14-16 if responder bids at the one-level. East stated that they have no agreement about this apparently illogical auction in their system, and that he even considered whether partner might be trying to show some sort of minor-suited hand. The director confirmed that pre-Alerting a strong club system is not required by ACBL regulations and that players are expected to be prepared to handle various commonly used systems. Additionally, there is no requirement to Alert the 1NT rebid in this auction. There is a requirement to Alert the range of a strong 1NT rebid after responder bids a suit at the one-level

The Decision: The committee determined that the E/W convention cards were visible on the table and that N/S had never bothered to inspect the convention cards. N/S had regularly played together for a couple of years with North having 2,000 masterpoints and South having about 7,500 (5,000 of which were eligibility points assigned to players who have experience from playing in non-ACBL bridge organizations). Since the committee determined that N/S were experienced enough to protect themselves in a situation such as this, the committee allowed the table result to stand.

The committee judged that the appeal did not have substantial merit and issued an appeal without merit warning (AWMW).

The Committee: Mark Bartusek (Chair), Fred King, Chris Moll, Jim Thurtell and Patty Tucker.

Commentary:

Goldsmith 10-12 or 10-13 NTs create Alerts on 1NT rebids. 1NT was alertable. The rule is "1NT rebids are Alertable if strong." 14-16 is strong, therefore Alertable. The Alert Chart doesn't say anything about if responder passes, so it looks like a 1NT rebid in this position showing 18-19 (standard with strong NT) is Alertable. That's probably wrong and ought to be dealt with, but given the wording of the Alert Chart, this 1NT rebid is Alertable. This is a technicality, but that's the way things go sometimes. Edgar liked to rule using favorable technicalities and ignore unfavorable ones---I'll follow his lead on this one.

- Polisner** I am not comfortable with this result. This is ambiguous to E/W playing Kaplan/Sheinwold and the 1NT rebid would show 18+ which would be a required Alert. Since E/W stated that they always Alert 1NT as 14-16, why is this auction different? I am not sure what would have happened if East had Announced the rebid as 14-16, but I think that should have been the focus of the case.
- Rigal** We are back in to the territory of tree-wasting and miserable and pettifogging appeals. Just what (if anything) were N/S thinking during the bidding, play, and appeal process?
- Smith** Good job by the director and the committee.
- Wildavsky** I think this appeal had merit. In Standard American this sequence would show 18-19 HCP. West may not have known what 1NT showed, but he knew that West held fewer than 17 HCP. ARGUABLY, N/S were entitled to an Alert to clue them in.
N/S did not argue their case well, so the write-up covers some points that are irrelevant.
- Wolff** It would be nice, not to mention ethical, for E/W to volunteer to N/S after the 1NT rebid that it showed 14-16, but I agree that the rules don't require it so what else is new? N/S should have protected themselves by South, who could have rebid 2♦, holding an ace and two kings and hearing her partner overcall 1♥. I agree with the decision.