

<b>Subject of Appeal:</b>	Misinformation	<b>Case:</b>	R1
---------------------------	----------------	--------------	----

<b>Event</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Sunday Daylight Open Pairs	<b>Event DIC</b>	Dianne Barton-Paine
<b>Date</b>	11/26/2017	<b>Session</b>	Second Session

### Auction

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

### Explanation of Special Calls and Points of Contention

1: Could be short
2: Limit raise or better for clubs
3: Stoppers in majors
4: No Alert, disputed meaning

### Hand Record

<b>Board</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>N</b>	9900 MPS		
<b>Dealer</b>	<b>S</b>	♠	987		
		♥	A1052		
		♦	A854		
<b>Vul</b>	<b>N/S</b>	♣	94		
<b>W</b>	400 MPS			<b>E</b>	400 MPS
♠	A432			♠	KQ5
♥	J876			♥	KQ3
♦	KJ2			♦	6
♣	KJ			♣	A108763
		<b>S</b>	13,900 MPS		
		♠	J106		
		♥	94		
		♦	Q10973		
		♣	Q52		

Final Contract	Result of Play	Score	Opening Lead
3NT by W	Made 4	E/W +430	♠9

### Facts Determined at the Table

North led the ♠9 and N/S called the Director as soon as dummy appeared. N/S said that East indicated that his bid showed shortness in diamonds. This was disputed by E/W who said that they had no agreement as to what 3♦ meant. South said away from the table that he would have doubled 3♦ if he had been Alerted that 3♦ was artificial. During the play of the hand, West guessed clubs incorrectly, finessing into South. N/S stated that if North had led a diamond in response to her partner's Double, and South made the same misguess in clubs, they would have defeated 3NT.

The Director later spoke to East and West individually, and both indicated that they thought the 3♦ bid asked for a stopper but that they had not discussed this bid. West indicated that she was as completely surprised as everyone else when her partner put down a singleton diamond.

### Director Ruling

The Director ruled that E/W did not have an agreement as to the meaning of the 3♦ bid, and therefore no misinformation had been given. The table result of 3NT by West, making 4, E/W +430, was ruled to stand.

<b>Director's Ruling</b>	<b>3NT by W, Made 4, E/W +430</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

### The Review

N/S appealed the ruling and were the only players who met with the Reviewer. South argued that East's hand indicated that he thought that the partnership had some understanding of what 3♦ was since he clearly did not mean the 3♦ bid as natural. N/S felt that East had an obligation to correct what he thought was a failure to Alert by his partner before the opening lead was made.

## Panel Findings

The Panel judged that East's hand, as well as East and West's both saying independently that they thought 3♦ asked for a diamond stopper, indicated that East likely thought that his 3♦ bid had a meaning which had not been disclosed by his partner. They therefore felt that East should have corrected what he thought was his partner's failure to Alert his bid, per Law 20F5b.

The Reviewer polled ten players of comparable experience level to South as to their bid over the 3♦ call:

- 1) when they were not told anything about 3♦;
- 2) when they were told East/West had no agreement as to what 3♦ was;
- 3) when they were told that 3♦ asked for a stopper.

Five players passed 3♦ in all three cases; two players doubled in all three cases; two players passed in case (1) but doubled in cases (2) and (3); and one player passed in cases (1) and (2) but doubled in case (3).

The Panel then considered whether a Double of 3♦ by South would tip West off to the correct play in the club suit. The Reviewer polled 5 players of comparable experience to West as a play problem in 3NT given the auction plus a Double of 3♦ by South. Three of the five players polled correctly finessed clubs into North—one specifically citing that South's Double indicated that he was likely the danger hand in diamonds—and two did not, taking the club finesse into South. Therefore the Panel considered that while the Double might make West more likely to take the correct line, it was not automatic.

The Panel awarded a weighted score per Law 12C1c: 70% of 3NT by West, making four, E/W +430, and 30% of 3NT by West, down 2, N/S +100.

<b>Panel Decision</b>	<b>70% 3NT by W, Made 4, E/W +430 30% 3NT by W, Down 2, N/S +100</b>
-----------------------	--

## Panel Members

<b>Reviewer</b>	Eric Bell
<b>Member</b>	Gary Zeiger
<b>Member</b>	Jenni Carmichael

## Commentary

**Goldsmith:** I think N/S's claims are totally ridiculous, bordering on a ZT violation. E/W are an inexperienced pair. They had no idea what they were doing and said so. East just figured that if he's forcing to game and not bidding 3NT, he probably doesn't have a diamond stopper by bridge logic. So he performed an experiment. His partner had an obvious 3NT bid no matter what 3♦ meant, so he did something normal.

Furthermore, N/S were not damaged. Let's say South doubled and got a diamond lead. Declarer would cross to a spade and get clubs right, finessing through the danger hand. This produces 11 tricks, six clubs, four spades, and a diamond.

The Panel miscounted declarer's tricks. This appeal ought to get two AWMWs.

**Marques:** I have some problems with this one. First, both East and West stated that they had no agreement about the meaning of 3♦. I don't think that a player who makes an undiscussed call hoping that his partner will understand it, and manages to catch partner on the same wavelength, has an obligation to disclose what he meant if, in fact, they had no agreement about it. The proper course of action is, IMHO, a player memo recording the coincidence.

Also, and this is my main issue with the case, I find it very hard to believe that a very experienced South expects 3♦ to be natural. I think that the poll should be planned aiming to establish what do the pollees think when they were not told about the meaning of 3♦. Did they ask questions? Did they assume it was asking for a stopper? Did they think it was natural? I made my small private poll, and the most frequent answers were "singleton," or "asking for a stopper." Even when told that the player in question had only 400 MPs, nobody believed it to be natural.

South claims damage from the lack of alert. I don't think there is any damage, but even if there was, the TD got it right, in my opinion.

**Meiracker:** E/W both said that the 3♦ bid asked for a stopper, so N/S were right to appeal the ruling, there is an agreement. The Reviewer polled 10 players and it resulted in a weighted score.

**Wildavsky:** At first, I preferred the Panel's decision to the TD's, but Chris and Rui's comments convince me that I was mistaken. East and West each guessed the meaning of 3♦ at the table. Their guesses happened to agree, but that does not mean that they had an agreement beforehand. If they have never discussed the call then not only do they not need to

alert it, they should not alert it. It would not have been improper for East to say something before the opening lead, but he was under no obligation to do so.

Even if one preferred the Panel's decision, their weighting is incorrect. If the declarer guesses clubs successfully he will score 11 tricks, not 10. If the resulting weighted matchpoint score for N/S is less favorable than the result they achieved at the table then the score would not be adjusted, matching the effect of the TD's ruling.

Also, it is not the Double that would clue declarer in to the winning play in clubs, but the diamond lead itself. South is now the danger hand regardless of whether 3♦ was doubled.

**Willenken:** This level of player generally has no idea what is standard after the first round of the auction or so, and they are certainly unlikely to have any specific agreements. Therefore I prefer no adjustment here-- when beginners fix experienced players, that is the rub of the green.

**Woolsey:** South certainly got MI. While it isn't etched in stone that South would have doubled 3♦, he might have. Had he done so, North presumably would have led a diamond. After the auction was over, East should have spoken up about the meaning of his 3♦ call. Therefore, a potential adjudication is called for. The Director's ruling is wrong.

This is exactly the sort of hand that may call for a weighted score, since it is not clear how the play would have gone in 3NT. The Panel made a reasonable attempt to judge this from polling, and came up with reasonable percentages.

There is one major flaw, however. If declarer gets a diamond lead and gets the clubs right (which he can do by crossing to a spade, leading a club to the jack, cashing king of clubs, etc.), he won't make 10 tricks. He will make 11 tricks. Therefore, assuming that declarer will get the clubs right 70% of the time (a reasonable assumption considering that South will be the danger hand), the proper adjudication for N/S is 70% -460, 30% +100. If this weighted average produces a better matchpoint score for N-S than the table result, N/S get that better score (and E/W the reciprocal). If this weighted average produces a worse matchpoint score for N/S than the table then the table result stands, since the NOS cannot have their score be worse than the table result.

One further point, and this is an important point. E/W should get a procedural penalty for East not speaking up before the opening lead. This is what procedural penalties are for -- when somebody does something they know they shouldn't do. East knows he is supposed to speak up here. If Directors would start giving out procedural penalties when players fail to disclose their partner's failure to alert (when they are the declaring side) after the auction is over but before the opening lead is made, this kind of failure to speak up will stop quickly.