

APPEAL	NABC+ TEN
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Terry Lavender
Event	Whitehead Women's Pairs
Session	Second Qualifying
Date	March 18,2010

BD#	<b>16</b>
VUL	<b>E/W</b>
DLR	<b>West</b>

<b>Carole Minor</b>	
♠	J 7 4
♥	Q J 9 2
♦	J T
♣	K J 6 5

<b>Tatiana Ponomareva</b>		<b>Spring 2010 Reno, NV</b>	<b>Victoria Gromova</b>	
♠	A T 5		♠	K Q 9
♥	A 8 7 6 4		♥	K 5 3
♦	Q 8 5		♦	A 6
♣	A 7		♣	Q T 8 4 2

<b>Cynthia Balderson</b>	
♠	8 6 3 2
♥	T
♦	K 9 7 4 3 2
♣	9 3

West	North	East	South
1♥	Pass	2♣ <sup>1</sup>	Pass
2NT <sup>2</sup>	Pass	3♥ <sup>3</sup>	Pass
3♠ <sup>4</sup>	Pass	4♥	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	<b>4♥ by West</b>
Opening Lead	♠ 4
Table Result	<b>Made 4, E/W + 620</b>
Director Ruling	<b>4♥ W made 4, E/W + 620</b>
Committee Ruling	<b>4♥ W down 1, E/W - 100</b>

(1)	Artificial game force.
(2)	Top of minimum opening (14-15).
(3)	Asking Bid.
(4)	Shortness in spades.

**The Facts:** The director was called after the play of the hand was completed. At the end of the auction, West attempted to correct the explanation but Dummy (East) was the only player to understand. East and West are Russian and this contributed to the lack of communication. When the director arrived, North claimed that with the correct explanation, she would lead the ♦J. East claimed that 3♠ systemically shows shortness but may only have evidence in Russian to support that claim.

**The Ruling:** Several players were polled; all led the ♦J with either explanation. All felt that the difference in information made the lead of a spade neither more nor less attractive.

As E/W couldn't provide evidence that shortness is the correct explanation, misexplanation (and MI) is deemed to have occurred. However, when the MI causes no damage to the non-offending side and does not advantage the offending side, as the polling indicates, there is no adjustment. Therefore the table result of 4♥ by West making four, E/W plus 620 was allowed to stand for both sides.

**The Appeal:** N/S appealed the director's decision, and North and South were the only players present at the hearing.

North stated that she felt that the jack of diamonds was a possibility and was going to be her lead until it was explained that 3♠ showed shortness. Then it seemed to her that a spade lead through dummy would combine safety with the potential for tapping declarer.

**The Decision:** The committee found that the directors correctly assessed the MI aspect of this case. However, we judged that North was less likely to have led a spade with correct information. The poll result made no sense – a spade lead is clearly more attractive when declarer has shown short spades. Accordingly the committee changed the score for the offending side. In considering the result for the non-offending side, we found that a spade might be inferior but did not meet the standard of a serious error per Law 12c1(b), so we adjusted their score as well.

The committee adjusted the result for both sides to 4♥ by West down one - E/W minus 100 and N/S plus 100.

**The Committee:** Aaron Silverstein (Chairman), Abby Heitner, Ed Lazarus, Tom Peters and Jeff Roman.

### **Commentary:**

**Goldsmith** Why is a spade inferior given the explanation? North planned a tapping defense, and her hand makes it look like it ought to work. N/S were clearly damaged. Good job, AC.

West needed to correct the explanation unless she was 100% certain that the explanation was correct, and that she could prove it. If E/W had system notes in Russian that proved it, why didn't the director get a translator? There were plenty of Russian-speaking players at the tournament.

If, in fact, 3S didn't systemically show shortness, then E/W are due a 1/4 board PP for failing to speak up before the opening lead. They are quite sufficiently experienced to know their responsibility here.

**Polisner** N did nothing to protect herself when it was obvious that W was trying to tell them something which was about 95% likely (in my opinion) to be about her 3 S bid as explained. I agree with the ruling and would only be

slightly inclined to award a split score leaving N/S with the table result and E/W with -100.

**Rigal**            Excellent decision and although I hate to over-rule the poll it was clearly in error; a spade lead is made far more attractive if West is known to be short.

**Wildavsky**    The AC corrected an injustice

**Wolff**            This ruling seems correct since I think CD needs to be penalized out of existence. Playing a fancy system only makes it imperative that both partner's NEVER give a wrong explanation, but if so they will pay the price.