

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Two
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Harry Falk
Event	Senior Pairs
Session	First
Date	March 8, 2008

BD#	<b>10</b>
VUL	<b>Both</b>
DLR	<b>East</b>

<b>11,187 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	A K Q 9 7 3
♥	A 8 6 2
♦	8 6
♣	J

<b>16,141 Masterpoints</b>		<b>Spring 2008 Detroit, MI</b>	<b>3,755 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	4		♠	T 8 5 2
♥	K Q T 9 3		♥	7
♦	K J 9 7 5 3		♦	A Q
♣	T		♣	A 9 8 7 6 2

<b>641 Masterpoints</b>	
♠	J 6
♥	J 5 4
♦	T 4 2
♣	K Q 5 4 3

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

Final Contract	<b>4♠ doubled by N</b>
Opening Lead	<b>♥7</b>
Table Result	<b>Down 1, N/S -200</b>
Director Ruling	<b>4♥ W, down 3, E/W -300</b>
Panel Ruling	<b>4♥ W, down 2, E/W -200</b>

(1)	Alerted and explained as Drury.
-----	---------------------------------

**The Facts:** The director was called after the play. The E/W agreement, which was clearly marked on the convention card, is that Drury does not apply in competition. North expected partner to be short in hearts given the information that 2♣ was a heart raise and would have passed 4♥ had he known that 2♣ was not Drury.

**The Ruling:** The director found that there was misinformation. Therefore, in accordance with laws 12 C 2, 21 B 3 and 40 C, the score was adjusted 4♥ by West, down three, E/W minus 300.

**The Appeal:** East felt that North “took his chances” by bidding 4♠. East also said North looked at her convention card before bidding it, so he should have known Drury was off in competition. West seemed resigned to the fact that the score should be adjusted but he thought three down was excessive. At first West said he could make 4♥; then he decided he would be down one.

North thought it was unfair to allow West to play the hand double dummy after the fact. South had no comment.

**The Decision:** Eight players were asked what they would do with the North hand given the information that 2♣ was Drury. Four bid 4♠ using the same reasoning as the North player (“Partner is short in hearts and is likely to hold some spades. If I don’t make this, it should be a good sacrifice.) 4♠ was less attractive if 2♣ was natural. The panel, therefore, agreed with the director’s decision to adjust to a contract of 4♥ by West in accordance with Laws 21 B 3, 40 C and 12 C 2.

The play in 4♥ presented a different problem. Several of West’s peers were polled and asked how many tricks they could take in 4♥. They thought a competent West could take eight or nine tricks depending on the defense. Since E/W was the offending side, the panel changed the director’s adjustment to 4♥ by West down two, E/W minus 200 as the most favorable result that was likely for N/S (the non-offenders) and the most unfavorable result that was at all probable for E/W (the offenders).

The appeal was found to have merit.

**The Panel:** Jean Molnar (Reviewer), Nancy Boyd and Mike Flader.

**Players Consulted:** Bidding: Fred Hamilton, John Kranyak and several others. Play: Grant Baze, Gary Cohler and Alan Sontag.

**Commentary:**

**Polisner** Well done.

**Rigal** Yes there was MI and the contract should be set back to 4♥; bidding 4♠ is the indicated action not a wild gamble. The normal defense of a top spade and a spade to the jack would see West pitch a diamond, and now a low club leaves declarer in very bad shape.  
A penalty of at least 200 seems right; maybe the adjustment is enough to save E/W an appeal without merit warning (AWMW). Maybe not!

**Smith** A good and thorough job by the panel.

**Wildavsky** Minus 200 seems closer to the correct adjustment than minus 300, though there was likely little or no matchpoint difference between the two scores. Had the panel left the score unchanged I hope it would also have found the appeal without merit.

**Wolff** The convention disruption was penalized severely and the only question is: Does the injured side deserve such a good board? The committee ruled that it did. I can accept that, but that question always needs to be asked.