

APPEAL	Non NABC+ TEN
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	Ken Van Cleve
Event	Sunday A/X Swiss
Session	First Session
Date	July 25, 2010

BD#	7
VUL	BOTH
DLR	S

Tim Baird	
♠	AJ9
♥	T64
♦	KQ96532
♣	

Louk Verhees		Summer 2010 New Orleans, LA	Jeff Wolfson	
♠	T8642		♠	Q75
♥	AJ975		♥	3
♦	74		♦	J
♣	8		♣	KQJ95432

Jay Sloofman	
♠	K3
♥	KQ82
♦	AT5
♣	AT76

West	North	East	South
			1N ¹
2♣ ²	2N ³	3♣	3♦ ⁴
P	4♥ ⁵	5♣	Dbl
5♥	DBL	P	P
P			

Final Contract	5♥ Doubled by West
Opening Lead	♥6
Table Result	Down 6, NS +1700
Director Ruling	5♥ doubled down 6, NS +1700
Panel Ruling	5♥ doubled down 6, NS +1700

(1)	15-17 HCP
(2)	Alerted but not asked about
(3)	Alerted as a transfer to diamonds
(4)	Alerted and explained as "likes diamonds"
(5)	Alerted and explained as splinter, but the actual agreement was Blackwood

The Facts: East alerted the 2♣ bid but the opponents chose not to ask about the meaning. 2N was alerted as a transfer to diamonds and 3♦ was alerted as liking diamonds. 4♥ was alerted and explained as a splinter but intended as Blackwood. The Director at the table determined that Blackwood was the actual agreement.

The Ruling: The Director determined that there was misinformation and a violation of Law 40 but that the 5♣ and 5♥ bids were unrelated to the misinformation. The table result of 5♥ doubled down 6 for EW -1700 was allowed to stand.

The Appeal: EW appealed the Director's ruling and all four players agreed to the facts of the case as the first session of the A/X Swiss Teams ended. After lunch, during the second session the Panel heard the case. EW argued that the improper alert of 4♥ (improperly made; no alerts above 3NT after the first round of bidding), and explanation of 4♥ as a splinter influenced West to bid 5♥ because he believed a fit in hearts had been found.

The Decision: The Panel found that the misinformation was unrelated to the result. West's 2♣ bid showed the majors but partner still bid clubs naturally and freely at the three and five levels. West's bid at the five level on limited values vulnerable caused the damage not the explanation of heart shortage. The table result of 5♥ doubled by West down 6 for EW -1700 was allowed to stand.

The Panel: John Gram (Chairman), Charley McCracken, and Bernie Gorkin.

Commentary:

Bramley: Agree. Thanks for no procedural penalty. I assume 2♣ showed majors, but I would like to know for sure. Just because N/S did not ask is no excuse to keep us all in the dark. Another example of the willingness of many players to expose their own hideous bids in pursuit of worthless appeals.

Goldsmith: No Merit.

Rigal: West's argument for bidding 5♥ was based on assuming partner could not work out that he had hearts in support of partner. Not a very good case to bring to appeal. A la lantern – or if you prefer, AWM.

Wildavsky: Good ruling. I see no merit in the appeal.

Wolff: Since this hand came from a Swiss Team we cannot use what was mentioned in 9 to determine the penalties. Everything considered and with CD also being present (but decided by the TDs as irrelevant) there is some justification in allowing 5♥X down 6, -1700 to stand. If it then was decided that since West (a very good player) was taken in by that CD perhaps a different decision of a fairly normal result (if it could be determined) to have occurred. Another in the continuing line of "When CD occurs, bridge stops".