

APPEAL	Non-NABC+ Seven
Subject	Misinformation (MI)
DIC	Nancy Boyd
Event	Young LM-1500 Pairs
Session	First Final
Date	July 26, 2009

BD#	22
VUL	E/W
DLR	East

577 Masterpoints	
♠	K Q J
♥	A T 8 7
♦	A Q J 9
♣	4 2

496 Masterpoints		Summer 2009 Washington D.C.	503 Masterpoints	
♠	9 6 3		♠	A T 5 4
♥	Q 4		♥	J 9 6 2
♦	K 6 4 3		♦	8 7 6
♣	K 8 5 3		♣	Q 7

440 Masterpoints	
♠	8 7 2
♥	K 5 3
♦	T 2
♣	A J T 9 6

West	North	East	South
		Pass	Pass
Pass	1NT	Pass	2♣
Pass	2♥	Pass	2NT ¹
Pass	3NT	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Final Contract	3NT by North
Opening Lead	♦8
Table Result	Made 5, N/S + 460
Director Ruling	3NT N made 4, E/W + 430
Panel Ruling	3NT N made 4, E/W + 430

(1)	Not Alerted.
-----	--------------

The Facts: The director was called when dummy was exposed and also after the play was completed. N/S methods required the use of Stayman to invite game in notrump even without a four-card major. East stated that had she known, she would have made the normal lead of a spade.

The Ruling: The director determined that declarer must discard the jack or queen of diamonds on the run of the clubs in order to take eleven tricks. Therefore, failure to Alert the agreement damaged E/W and the result was adjusted to 3NT by North making four, N/S plus 430 for both sides.

The Appeal: N/S appealed the director's decision.

Nineteen pairs in this event played this hand in notrump. 11 took 11 trick and 7 took 9 or 10 tricks (besides the appellant). 6 of the 7 were polled. Two received a spade lead, played clubs and failed to unblock the diamonds; two received a spade lead, played clubs and neglected to cash the fifth club – one of these declarers finessed diamonds after defense ducked the first club; one received a heart lead and ducked it and one was played by South with a club lead.

North stated that on a spade lead, he would have led a club and if the queen was played (as happened at the table), he would win the ace and immediately finesse diamonds, avoiding the later discarding problem.

The Decision: Per Law 12C1(e), the fact that a substantial minority of declarer's peers (persons qualifying for third day of this event) made only ten tricks with a spade lead establishes this as the most unfavorable result that was at all probable for the offenders. The panel judged that it was also the most favorable result that was likely for the non-offenders. Therefore, the director's adjustment of 3NT by North making four, N/S plus 430 for both sides was upheld.

The appeal was judged to have merit.

The Panel: Jay Albright (Reviewer), Tom Marsh and Bill Michael.

Commentary:

Polisner Seems reasonable.

Rigal Reasonable ruling and decision; I can't get too worked up about this one (I like the decision but might have been persuaded to go the other way).
Good rationale for the decision here.

Smith N/S did two things wrong here. North did not Alert 2NT as required, and South did not speak up after the auction and before the lead as required by Law 20F5(b). The panel's research seems to demonstrate that a spade lead was reasonable (although I think a direct poll would have been more on point and more informative), so a prima facie case of damage seems to exist. Maybe I shouldn't be surprised at how many declarers actually failed to unblock diamonds, but I am. So I guess for those reasons the adjustment is correct for this event. But I wouldn't want to be the one to tell North that I didn't think he was smart enough to unblock the diamonds and make eleven tricks on a spade lead.

Wildavsky I would call what the directorss did fact-finding rather than a poll, but whatever it was the results were useful. North's assertions as to how he would have played the hand are not relevant after he's seen all the cards. If he wants to demonstrate his superior play against opponents who have correct information he must start by properly informing them of his side's agreements.

Wolff Okay ruling.