

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ One
Subject	Misinformation (MI)/Unauthorized Information (UI)
DIC	Steve Bates
Event	Flight B GNT
Session	First
Date	July 17, 2007

BD#	12
VUL	N/S
DLR	West

1035 Masterpoints	
♠	A Q 9 5
♥	9 8 7
♦	A Q 5
♣	J 7 3

936 Masterpoints		Summer 2007 Nashville, Tennessee	1881 Masterpoints	
♠	K J		♠	T 8 4 3 2
♥	K 5 3 2		♥	T
♦	4 3		♦	K J T 9 7 2
♣	Q T 9 5 4		♣	8

907 Masterpoints	
♠	7 6
♥	A Q J 6 4
♦	8 6
♣	A K 6 2

West	North	East	South
Pass	1♣	2♦ ⁽¹⁾	Dbl
2♥	Pass	3♦	Dbl
3♥	Pass	Pass	Dbl
Pass	Pass	3♠	Pass
Pass	Dbl	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	3♠, doubled, by East
Opening Lead	♣A
Table Result	3♠ doubled, down 3, N/S +500
Director Ruling	3♥ doubled, down 6, N/S +1400
Panel Ruling	3♥ doubled, down 6, N/S +1400

(1) 2♦ explained as both majors. Intended as natural which both convention cards support.

The Facts: The 2♦ bid was intended as natural, but explained as weak with majors.

The Ruling: 3♥ doubled, down six, N/S plus 1400.

The Appeal: All four players attended the hearing. East was asked why he bid 3♦ over 2♥. He said clearly his partner didn't realize he had diamonds. When asked if his partner could have had six plus hearts and chosen to pass in first seat, he said yes, if he had less than five HCP. His partner admitted that he confused this auction with their agreement to jump to 2♦ when partner opens one club.

The other side felt that the table result of 3♠ doubled, resulting in plus500 for them was unfair on two counts. With proper information, they would reach 4♥ making four for plus 620. They felt that defending three hearts by E/W would easily be down six for plus 1400 for their side.

The Decision: The panel seriously considered a procedural penalty for East's three diamond bid. A serious discussion with East occurred instead. East asked what he should have done, thinking that he should be able to bid something. He was told that he would have been allowed to bid two spades, but that he had already showed a weak diamond hand with his two diamond bid.

The reviewer spoke to six peers who were playing in the Flight B GNTs. Five players bid two spades and then passed three hearts doubled. One player passed two hearts. The director's ruling was upheld, three hearts doubled, down six, plus 1400 for N/S, per Law 16A and 12C2.

An appeal without substantial merit warning (AWMW) was given to E/W. The panel felt the three diamond bid was tainted by the erroneous explanation of the two diamond bid. West by rebidding 3♥ confirmed heart length, and East has no legitimate reason to bid. Based on East's masterpoints (1881) and experience the panel felt he should have known that the appeal would have no merit.

The Panel: Candy Kushner (Reviewer) and Harry Falk.

Players Consulted: Six peers of E/W playing in the Flight B GNT.

Commentary:

Polisner Excellent all around.

Rigal The AWMW is obviously appropriate; how could this case have reached a committee? Why was not East advised of his entering the territory of Procedural Penalty (PP)? He clearly did not understand his obligations but the best way to impose them (particularly when an offender brings an appeal of this sort) is to give a PP.

Smith Good job by all.

Wildavsky Good work all 'round.

Wolff This first hand has suggested to me that we handle these impossible to adjudicate convention disruption (CD) hands in a different manner. Instead of sifting through the four-digit doubled penalties so often imposed on forcing the declarer to play a contract with his side holding less than a majority of trumps and usually high cards, why not artificially impose a score of 0-10% of the board's worth (depending on the severity), but only give (in match points) 50-100% to the non-offenders. Also if the offenders deserve worse, give it to them in the form of a PP. This scoring change will prevent what happened here when the non-offenders insisted that they get enough to offset a possible plus 620 which they (by their opponent's CD) were prevented from achieving themselves. To not follow this suggestion will result in our continuing to wallow around in total ridiculousness of deciding just what four-digit penalty should be given. By following this suggestion at least it calls attention to what we are involved with and why it must be gone.

