

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Twelve
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Marilyn Wells
Event	Wednesday Daylight Open
Session	Second
Date	July 26, 2007

BD#	34
VUL	N/S
DLR	E

245 Masterpoints	
♠	T 8 4
♥	9
♦	J T 6 4
♣	A Q T 4 2

2,700 Masterpoints		Summer 2007 Nashville, Tennessee	4,000 Masterpoints	
♠	A Q 5		♠	K 9 3 2
♥	T 8 7 4		♥	Q J 5
♦	Q 5 3		♦	A 7 2
♣	J 7 6		♣	9 8 5

345 Masterpoints	
♠	J 7 6
♥	A K 6 3 2
♦	K 9 8
♣	K 3

West	North	East	South
		Pass	1♥
Pass	1NT ¹	Pass	2♣ ²
Pass	3♣	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	3♣ by South
Opening Lead	♣6
Table Result	3♣ by S Made 3, N/S +110
Director Ruling	3♣ by S Made 3, N/S +110
Panel Ruling	3♣ by S Made 3, N/S +110

(1)	Forcing.
(2)	Not Alerted as could be a 2-card suit.
(3)	E/W contended but N/S disagreed that the auction had actually gone as shown below:

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

The Facts: E/W were not Alerted that the 2♣ call could be on two cards as 2♦ guarantees 4 cards. West says he wouldn't have led a club if he knew it could be as short as two cards. When the ruling was delivered, West said he would have led a spade since partner bid them. This evidence was not presented until that time. The opponents, individually, confirmed the auction that is displayed first above.

The Ruling: Lack of Alert did not cause the choice of opening lead to allow contract to make. Law 40C does not apply. The table result of 3♣ by South making three, N/S plus 110 was allowed to stand

The Appeal: N/S had said at the table that they had the agreement 2♦ would show four diamonds. At the hearing South said she had been told that this was standard. West was adamant about his version of the auction, but had no explanation for why the table director was given the original auction. He claimed, if he had known that South could have had only two clubs, a spade lead would be automatic, because spade tricks could disappear.

N/S were adamant that 3♣ had been bid immediately and spades had never been bid. North would have expected at least three diamonds for a 2♦ bid.

The Decision: Five of West's peers were given West's opening lead problem with correct information about the 2♣ bid. While the choice of leads varied, none said different information would make the slightest difference as to what was led. These players were also given each version of the auction, and the opening leads remained the same. No player led a spade under either version of the auction. The panel was uncertain if the agreement about the 2♣ rebid really existed but was convinced it was not germane to the choice of opening lead. The panel upheld the director's decision of the table result 3♣ making three N/S plus 110. The panel gave E/W an appeal without merit warning (AWMW) since they should have known the possibility of a doubleton club in South wasn't relevant to the choice of opening lead and because they failed to articulate any reason why the panel should see a connection.

The Panel: Gary Zeiger (Reviewer), Bernie Gorkin and Jean Molnar.

Players Consulted: Five players with 2,500-3,000 masterpoints.

Commentary:

Polisner Excellent ruling and decision.

Rigal Excellent ruling and AWMW; no need to waste trees here – miserable and pettifogging appeal (MAPA) five.

Smith Again a very good decision following good methodology. AWMW richly deserved by players of this experience.

Wildavsky The AWMW was harsh. N/S committed an infraction, and it's reasonable to suppose it might influence the opening lead. The differing auctions lead us into the "Twilight Zone." The panel was able to avoid entering the Zone by determining that the ruling would be the same on either auction. I'm a little surprised that no one polled would have led partner's suit.

Wolff Everyone was "right on" in this appeal.