

APPEAL	NABC+ THREE
Subject	Unauthorized Information (UI) and Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Henry Cukoff
Event	Silodor Open Pairs
Session	First Final
Date	March 10, 2007

BD#	8
VUL	None
DLR	West

Bob Jones	
♠	K Q J 7 3
♥	K Q 9 5 4
♦	Q 4
♣	9

Krzysztof Buras		Spring 2007 St. Louis, Missouri	Jaroslav Piasecki	
♠	A 6 5		♠	T 8
♥	T 6 2		♥	A J 8 7
♦	K T 3 2		♦	A J
♣	8 7 3		♣	K J 6 5 2

Aubrey Struhl	
♠	9 4 2
♥	3
♦	9 8 7 6 5
♣	A Q T 4

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

Final Contract	3♠ by North
Opening Lead	♣
Table Result	3♠ making 3, N/S +140
Director Ruling	3♠ making 3, N/S +140
Committee Ruling	3♠ making 3, N/S +140

(1)	Spade raise not Alerted.
(2)	North corrects explanation of 2♥.

The Facts: N/S have an agreement that 2♥ is a spade raise. North told the opponents that 2♥ was not natural after 3♠. East told the director he would not have done anything differently in the auction had 2♥ been Alerted in a timely manner.

The Ruling: There was misinformation (MI), but it was corrected prior to the end of the auction. Therefore, since the auction was unaffected by the MI, any damage is unrelated to the infraction. No adjustment as South's UI was judged not to affect the result. (law 40 C)

The Appeal: N/S had agreed to play transfers over 1♠ – double, with 2♥ as a constructive raise. North acknowledged at the table that he was initially uncertain whether 2♥ was a spade raise and that he initially failed to Alert the 2♥ bid. After North bid 3♥ and South bid 3♠, North became certain of the meaning of 2♥; so he Alerted and explained its meaning.

East led a club against 3♠, which resulted in North taking nine tricks. East contended that he would have led a trump if a timely Alert had been given.

Since E/W were fully aware of N/S's agreement before the defense, the director ruled that no adjustment was appropriate.

E/W appealed the ruling. All players except West attended the hearing. East contended that North's uncertainty in the auction had created the possibility that his 3♥ bid was intended as a "heart raise" rather than a game try, which made a trump lead less appealing than otherwise. East said he would have led a trump if given a timely Alert, making it clear that North's 3♥ bid was a game try rather than a raise.

The Decision: The committee considered this contention carefully, and it inquired closely about N/S's agreements regarding the auction including the values shown by the 2♥ bid and the type of game try (help suit) played by N/S.

The committee agreed with the director that there was no basis upon which to adjust the score because E/W had received accurate information about N/S's agreement before play of the hand began. In any case, it did not appear that a heart "game try" would be a substantially different hand type than a heart raise in N/S's methods.

The committee also considered whether South's second round call might have been affected by North's failure to Alert. The committee concluded that at matchpoint scoring, there was no logical alternative to South's 3♠ call, where South had shown "constructive raise" values through his 2♥ bid and had three poor trumps and no heart honor.

The committee considered whether the appeal had merit. It concluded that, in light of potential language difficulties with this E/W pair, it was reasonable for E/W to bring the matter before a committee to permit a careful examination and analysis of N/S's agreements. Accordingly, the committee declined to issue an appeal without merit warning (AWMW).

The Committee: John Lusky (Chair and Scribe), Dick Budd, Mike Passell, Aaron Silverstein and Riggs Thayer.

Commentary:

Goldsmith Everyone got this one right. Regardless of language difficulties, the appeal is reasonable enough. There could have been MI damage, and there could have been UI redress, and it isn't blatantly obvious that the correct ruling is result stands, so that's good enough for me not to award an AWMW, though the actual appeal statement is asking for something which the laws do not provide.

- Polisner** Just another case of a player looking for a better result in committee than able to achieve at the table. E/W were astute enough to consider the UI aspect, but the South hand could not even consider bidding more opposite a game try in hearts.
- Rigal** What a terrible appeal! Excellent decision to award an AWMW. I'm surprised that two experts of this caliber would bring an appeal like this, but the result was entirely appropriate.
- Smith** I think East wanted to know what North's understanding of the auction was when he bid 3♥, but in my opinion he is not entitled to that information. He is entitled only to an accurate description of the opponents' methods, and he got that information (although not in a timely manner). Anything else he infers from the way and the timing of any information given by the opponents is at his own risk. Since the late alert in itself did not harm him based on his statement to the director, he had no basis for an adjustment due to misinformation. The UI to South did not seem to suggest his 3♠ bid, so I agree with the directors and the committee.
- Wildavsky** I see no merit to this appeal.
- Wolff** This was a reasonable ruling but, convention disruption (CD) almost always causes problems by, at the very least, causing uncertainty by the opponents, if not with the bidding then possibly the opening lead and subsequent defense. Again N/S should pay some penalty for "confusing" E/W by contributing to not having a trump led. I would change the score to 3♠ down one, N/S minus 50.
- Zeiger** The write ups so far are excellent, but we are three for three in appeals with zero merit.