

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Eight
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Marie Killoran
Event	299er Swiss Teams
Session	Second
Date	July 24, 2007

BD#	32
VUL	E/W
DLR	West

231 Masterpoints	
♠	A Q 7
♥	T 8
♦	K T 9 5 4
♣	9 7 5

222 Masterpoints	
♠	T 8
♥	9 7 5 3 2
♦	J 7 3
♣	8 3 2

Summer 2007 Nashville, Tennessee	
---	--

283 masterpoints	
♠	K J 9 4 3
♥	A
♦	A Q 8 6
♣	Q 6 4

167 Masterpoints	
♠	6 5 2
♥	K Q J 6 2
♦	2
♣	A K J T

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

Final Contract	3NT by North
Opening Lead	♠4
Table Result	3NT down 3, N/S -150
Director Ruling	3NT down 3, N/S -150
Panel Ruling	3NT down 3, N/S -150

The Facts: The play went ♠4 to the ten and queen. ♥T to the ace, ♠K ducked and another spade to the ace, West pitching the ♣2. North now asked what signaling method E/W used and was told "odd-even". He then played a club to the ten and, since he plays suit preference with his odd-even discards, assumed West had to have the ♦A for her ♣2 play. He played a diamond to the king for down three.

The Ruling: Initial ruling was 3NT making three, N/S plus 400. After consultation, this was changed per Law 40C, which was not violated, so no redress for N/S and the table result was allowed to stand, 3NT down three, N/S minus 150.

The Appeal: North was the only player to attend the hearing. He was adamant that the only way to play odd-even discards was with suit preference. He then said “Bridge is a game of rules” and was very disappointed that the directors would not back him up. His opponents did not know how to play odd-even, so in their ignorance he was misinformed. He was lied to.

It was pointed out that after the club discard, all he had to do was cash the ♣A to see if the suit came home.

The Decision: The panel thought North to be rather disingenuous to trust his opponent’s carding. He had an easy route to nine tricks and the best he could do after the diamond play was break even. The panel restored the table result of N/S down three, minus 150. N/S were not given an appeal without merit warning (AWMW) because of the change of the initial table ruling.

The Panel: Charles MacCracken (Reviewer), Patty Holmes, Millard Nachtwey, Tom Whitesides and Gary Zeiger.

Players Consulted: None.

Commentary:

Polisner I thought that the directors consulted before issuing a ruling. If not, they should. If a correct ruling was given initially and then appealed, an AWMW would be warranted.

Rigal North has a point -- technically though it is a ‘Miserable And Pettifogging’ one. Odd-Even discards mean that odd cards are encouraging and even cards are discouraging and suit-preference. But, even if there was MI (and here there arguably was if West’s even cards are simply discouraging), there was no damage. There is no reason for declarer to do anything but test a second round of clubs before diamonds -- then he will know what he needs to do. (And West could have had the ♦Q instead of the ace). Had the initial ruling gone the other way this would be an easy AWMW.

Smith A clearly correct panel decision in a case that I'm sure required tactful handling.

Wildavsky Fair enough.

Wolff Certainly a correct ruling by the committee. Typical nerdy thinking by the declarer - e.g. he, the declarer, had the right to get the picture perfect signal from the opponents and if not and the signal was incorrect, the declarer was entitled to redress. I cannot imagine a person more off base, but, sadly, he probably represents a fair portion of what some people believe. Pity!