

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ THREE
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Gary Zeiger
Event	0-1500 LM Pairs
Session	First Qualifying
Date	7/23/10

BD#	2
VUL	NS
DLR	E

450 Masterpoints	
♠	96
♥	KJT9652
♦	5
♣	KQ3

1219 Masterpoints		Summer 2010 New Orleans, LA	1067 Masterpoints	
♠	Q5		♠	AJ42
♥	43		♥	AQ87
♦	32		♦	AT64
♣	AJT9754		♣	6

715 Masterpoints	
♠	KT873
♥	
♦	KQJ987
♣	82

West	North	East	South
		1♦	P
1N	2♥	Dbl ¹	2♠
P	3♥	Dbl	4♦
P	4♠	Dbl	P
P	P		

Final Contract	4♠ Doubled by South
Opening Lead	♦3
Table Result	Down 2, NS -500
Director Ruling	4♠ doubled down 2, NS -500
Panel Ruling	4♠ doubled down 2, NS -500

(1)	Card showing
-----	--------------

The Facts: North-South called the Director after the hand was completed. The Director determined that North asked about East's first double in the auction. West told North-South that East's first double was card showing, not penalty.

The Ruling: The Director ruled that it was not clear that there was misinformation. In addition, even assuming that there was misinformation, North's second call and South's subsequent calls were unrelated to the misinformation. Law 21 doesn't apply since any possible misinformation didn't influence North-South's actions.

The Appeal: North-South appealed the Director's ruling. All four players were present at the hearing. North argued that the first double should have been described as penalty, in which case he would have passed 2♠. East-West argued that the first double was card showing and East just happened to have hearts. West reported that he would have bid 3♣ if South hadn't bid 2♠.

The Decision: The Panel reported that they gave the North hand to four players in the 500-800 masterpoint range. All four players polled passed 2♠. All four players were also asked if the meaning of the first double was relevant to their decision, and all four reported that they would pass whatever the meaning of the first double.

Therefore, since bidding vs. passing was not deemed to be influenced by the meaning of the double, Law 21 Misinformation was not applied and the Director's ruling was upheld.

The Panel: Bernie Gorkin (Chairman), Bill Michael, and Peter Marcus.

Commentary:

Bramley: No merit. Hopeless whining. I can't believe they found four players who passed 2♠ doubled. South could not bid over 1♦, and North is looking at a pretty good suit of his own. Would the Panel have decided differently if all of the pollees had bid 3♥? Let's hope not.

Goldsmith: No Merit.

Rigal: I am not sure there was MI, and the polled players' decisions make the Panel's decision seem appropriate. In particular South's 4♦ call seems worthy of some special Darwin Award.

Wildavsky: Given West's interpretation of the double, it surprises me that he did not bid 3♣ over 2♠. That said, I have no quarrel with the TD and Panel rulings.

I don't see the merit in the appeal. The only reason I have to doubt that the explanation was accurate is West's failure to bid, and that it was not mentioned in the appeal. In any case, while misunderstandings about these doubles are common, out and out deceit is rare. Did NS really believe that EW had a secret agreement to play this double as penalty while explaining it as card showing?

Wolff: An Appeals committee should never be used in order to correct original bad bridge. Ruling is correct.