

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Four
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Millard Nachtwey
Event	LM-5000 Pairs
Session	First Qualifying Session
Date	July 21, 2007

BD#	10
VUL	Both
DLR	East

4904 masterpoints	
♠	J 9 4 3 2
♥	2
♦	9
♣	J T 9 5 3 2

972 Masterpoints	
♠	K 5
♥	A 8 4
♦	K 7 6 5 4 2
♣	8 6

4690 Masterpoints	
♠	Q T 8 6
♥	K 9 3
♦	A J 8
♣	K Q 7

2630 Masterpoints	
♠	A 7
♥	Q J T 7 6 5
♦	Q T 3
♣	A 4

West	North	East	South
		1♥	Dbl
1NT ¹	2♠	3♥	Pass
4♥	5♣	Dbl	5♠
Dbl	Pass	Pass	Pass

Final Contract	5♠ by North, doubled
Opening Lead	♥Q
Table Result	5♠ doubled, -2, N/S -500
Director Ruling	4♠ doubled, -1 N/S -200
Panel Ruling	4♠ doubled, -1 N/S -200

(1) Alerted in a timely manner (North did not ask as North knew the meaning) and explained, at South's second turn to bid as transfer to clubs.

The Facts: East's card was marked that 1NT in this sequence was a transfer to clubs. West's card was not marked. West intended 1NT as generic "forcing". North said he would have bid 2♣ without the Alert, and could then bid 4♠ later.

The Ruling: Adjust to 4♠ doubled by North down one, N/S minus 200, per Laws 21A3, 40C and 12C2. An auction like 1♥, double, 1NT, 2♣, 2♥, pass, 4♥, 4♠ is probable and likely without an Alert.

The Appeal: E/W stated that North should have known that it was not possible for West to hold such a hand, since he had so many clubs and South had to have tolerance for clubs, given his takeout double.

West stated that the relay meaning of the bid was indeed the agreement, but that she had forgotten it and thus had treated her hand as a standard 1NT forcing auction. West stated that she had not marked down the relay meaning since the convention card had been completed only an hour before game time, and she didn't know where to put it on the convention card.

North stated that his partner did not have to have a tolerance for clubs with his takeout double, as he might have a diamond/spade hand which he could show with a diamond advance bid (equal level conversion).

The Decision: Based upon the non-matching convention cards and West's manner of bidding the hand, East's Alert of the 1NT bid was deemed to be misinformation. North was unable to show the true nature of his hand based on the misinformation and, therefore, would have been able to do so had 1NT not been alerted.

Several players in the 4,000-5,000 peer group were consulted. Without an Alert of 1NT, at least three players would have bid clubs over the double with a plan to bid spades at a later point. It was clear from these polls that N/S had been damaged due to the fact they had been denied that opportunity based on misinformation.

E/W were in violation of procedure by not having two convention cards that matched. It should have been clear to them that they were at fault due to this and should not have pursued the issue. E/W are experienced players, and should have realized that N/S had been disadvantaged.

North did not ask the meaning of the Alerted 1NT bid. He was familiar with the relay to 2♣ meaning, as he played a similar system himself. In the absence of such an Alert, he would have bid 2♣, and then bid spades over a subsequent heart bid to show the shape of his hand.

An appeal without merit warning (AWMW) was given to E/W.

The Panel: Harry Falk (Reviewer), Candy Kuschner and Jean Molnar.

Players Consulted: Several players with between 4,000 and 5,000 masterpoints.

Commentary:

Polisner The writeup is unclear. Was 1NT conventionally a relay or a transfer to 2♣? North claimed that he didn't ask the meaning as he played this same method. Therefore, if it was a relay, North could have bid 2♣ and then spades as he claimed. I would not have adjusted the table result.

Rigal Harsh but fair on E/W. My guess (if I had to) was that West simply forgot -- i.e. psyched - but with the mismatching cards I like penalizing the offenders. As a separate issue; did North do the right thing by assuming his opponents had had this precise accident rather than asking questions? How did he know what 1NT really meant -- aren't there other possibilities than a transfer? Since he was right I guess he did know!

Smith Good and thorough job by the director and the panel.

Wildavsky I agree, this appeal had no merit.

Wolff Another impossible convention disruption (CD) adjudication. Sad evidence revolves around the CD'ers showing up at the committee hearing arguing for position. To me, this might mean they are not likely to do anything to prevent CD from happening again. How long might it be before all people involved in trying to improve the process will finally come together and eradicate CD by punishing it out of existence? Without CD, bridge is a wonderful, fair, highly competitive game. With it and when CD strikes, we might as well be playing another card game since all adjudication results in hypothetical artificiality having nothing to do with bridge.