

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ THREE
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Bob Leonard
Event	Senior Pairs
Session	First
Date	March 14, 2007

BD#	17
VUL	None
DLR	North

345 Masterpoints	
♠	J 7 2
♥	K
♦	J 7 2
♣	K Q T 8 5 3

3,791 Masterpoints		Spring 2007 St. Louis, Missouri	3,221 Masterpoints	
♠	A 8		♠	K 6
♥	T 9 3		♥	A J 8 6 5 4
♦	Q 9 8 6		♦	A K T
♣	A 7 6 2		♣	J 4

207 Masterpoints	
♠	Q T 9 5 4 3
♥	Q 7 2
♦	5 4 3
♣	9

West	North	East	South
	3♣ ¹	3♥	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Final Contract	3♥ by East
Opening Lead	♣9
Table Result	3♥ made 6, E/W + 230
Director Ruling	3♥ made 6, E/W + 230 4♥ made 6, N/S - 480
Panel Ruling	3♥ made 6, E/W + 230 4♥ made 6, N/S - 480

(1)	Alerted and explained as clubs and 16-18 HCP.
-----	---

The Facts: The director was first called after the auction and returned after the play was completed. N/S have the agreement that an opening 3♥ or 3♠ bid shows 16-18 HCP and the suit bid. However, 3♣ and 3♦ openings are weak with the suit bid.

The Ruling: Law 40 C applies but deemed that E/W were sufficiently experienced so that the damage came from egregious judgment rather than the MI. The result for N/S was changed to 4♥ by East making six, N/S minus 480. E/W kept the result obtained at the table.

The Appeal: E/W maintain that East, at matchpoints, would have overcalled 3♥ with “only a heart suit,” i.e AKQJx, KQJxxx or KQJxx and an outside card. West stated that since the partnership couldn’t have more than 24 points between them, they couldn’t have a game. When she was told that a large number of players were polled and all bid 4♥ with her hand, she became very upset and wanted to leave saying, “If everyone wants to laugh at my bidding, I don’t need to be here.”

The N/S pair chose not to attend the hearing.

The Decision: In spite of the large number of masterpoints (see above), E/W didn’t appear to understand methods of hand evaluation other than HCP. West kept saying, “We had at most 24 HCP if North had 16-18, so we couldn’t have a game.”

Because of the overwhelming number of players (all 15-20 polled) who bid 4♥ with the West hand even when they thought North had 16-18 HCP, the panel decided the MI was not the cause of the poor E/W score. Their score of plus 230 was allowed to stand. N/S did not appeal their adjustment to minus 480 – that adjustment was allowed to stand.

Even though the appeal was found to be without merit, the committee felt E/W had been punished enough by their poor score (they would have won the event if the appeal had been resolved in their favor). There was a discussion about whether to issue an appeal without merit warning (AWMW). A decision was made not to impose an AWMW even though E/W were apprised of the result of the poll and still pursued the appeal..

The Panel: Jean Molnar (Reviewer), Candy Kushner and Peter Marcus.

Commentary:

Polisner It is interesting that many players believe that if they are given MI, it will automatically result in an adjusted score if they don’t achieve the optimum result. Here, the failure of West to bid 4♥ is poor enough bridge as to deny them an adjustment. An AWMW should have been given.

Rigal For non-experts I really don’t think the appeal was close to being without merit. If you pose the question “Were E/W less likely to bid 4♥ after the mistaken explanation?” I think you’ll see that they WERE damaged, and I’d have no problem in adjusting the score to 4♥ making six for both sides. Well done the panel/tournament director on giving N/S their minus 480.

Smith If E/W were apprised of the poll results prior to their appeal, and they continued to pursue it, then they should have been given an AWMW. Surely that information must mean something even to the most obstinate of appellants. I am also a bit uncomfortable about adjusting the N/S score to minus 480. Law 40C tells the director to adjust for MI when it results in damage to the other side. The ruling in itself seems to say that the damage was a result of West's quirky judgment, not the MI. Would we have adjusted at all if West's ♥3 were exchanged with North's ♥K and West had passed 3♥? I doubt it very much. Surely there comes a point where the only reasonable conclusion in deciding what caused the damage is that it was caused overwhelmingly by a player's poor judgment. I think this case falls into that category and the table result should have stood for both sides.

Wildavsky A good application of Kaplan's distinction between damage that is subsequent to an infraction and damage that is consequent to it. I believe this is embodied in Law 72B1. It would be nice if the TD and panel were to cite the laws under which they adjusted the score. The decision not to award an AWMW was misguided.

Wolff Another excellent appeals result except for the inconsistency of the AWMW. There need to be precedents set and adhered to in the awarding of AWMWs. If A to G would represent what constitutes an AWMW this case would be as high as a B. On another issue it shows how convention disruption (CD), particularly from home brew conventions, can absolutely devastate certain players. Since E/W were evidently point counters West decided that East probably was pushing with his 3♥ bid. The CD reached out and bit E/W, although it was somewhat naive of West to make his judgment. Again this appeal had the same three "Masters" satisfied as non-NABC+ case one.