


APPEAL	NABC+ SEVEN
Subject	Misinformation
DIC	McKenzie Myers
Event	Mixed Pairs
Session	Second Final
Date	March 18, 2015

BD#	8
VUL	None
DLR	W

Sandy McCay	
♠	K
♥	63
♦	J762
♣	J106543

Serge Aronovich	
♠	AQ103
♥	1085
♦	A109
♣	AQ9

	
Dave Smith	
♠	6542
♥	KQ
♦	KQ8543
♣	2

Marianne Aronovich	
♠	J987
♥	AJ9742
♦	(void)
♣	K87

West	North	East	South
1NT ⁽¹⁾	X ⁽²⁾	2♦ ⁽³⁾	X
2♥	P	4♥	P
P	P		

Final Contract	4♥ by West
Opening Lead	♦6
Table Result	Made 4, N/S -420
Director Ruling	4♥ by W, Made 4, N/S -420
Comm. Decision	4♥ by W, Made 4, N/S -420

(1)	15-18 HCP
(2)	One minor or both majors (possibly strong with Spades)
(3)	Transfer to Hearts

The Facts: The director was summoned during the play. East had inquired about North's Double during the auction and the agreement had been explained at the time. The play had gone a diamond to the Queen and Ace, followed by a heart finesse to the Queen. A club was returned, won by Declarer in hand with the Ace. Another low heart was led, and when North followed, Declarer asked several questions concerning the strength shown by North's call before finessing again. West's questions and South's replies are as follows:

"How many HCP?" "The more distribution, the fewer HCP. She wants to compete with the hand." (Declarer stated he believed the response was different.)
 "Could she have a bust?" "No."

West also took the spade finesse, losing a third trick to the King. The table result was making four, N/S -620.

The Ruling: The N/S agreement did not promise a significant number of HCP in the North hand, and the explanation provided did not misrepresent that agreement. North was light for the call, certainly, but this, in of itself, is not an irregularity. As there was no irregularity, no adjustment was possible. Table result of 4♥ by West, N/S -420 stands.

The Appeal: E/W appealed the ruling, and North, South and West attended the hearing.

Statements made by the Appealing Side:

West felt that he was damaged by the explanation of North's call. He did not feel that a singleton king and two jacks were enough to make a call over his no trump opening. He also felt that, when asked if the call could be made on a bust, the response of no was misleading.

Statements made by the Non-Appealing Side:

South reinforced that their partnership agreement for the call did not define a strict point range, and that with better distribution, fewer high card values were needed.

The Decision: While the call by North was very light, this in itself is not a violation. South's statement concerning distribution and strength adequately described their agreement. Therefore, there was no violation and so the table result of 4♥ by West, making four, N/S -420 stood.

The Committee judged strongly, that had West been more experienced, then an Appeal with Merit penalty would have been appropriate. Due to his inexperience, the committee decided to treat this as an educational opportunity, explaining the situation, instead of issuing a penalty.

The Committee: Aaron Silverstein (chair), Migry Zur Campanile, Ray Miller, Bruce Rogoff, Jim Thurtell (scribe)

Commentary:

Woolsey – Perfect, including the decision to explain the situation rather than give an appeal without merit penalty. The purpose of the appeal without merit penalty is to dissuade players from making frivolous appeals in a “heads, they win/tails, they break even” situation. It is clear that the appellant here was not doing that.

Wildavsky – A serious error by the committee. A player experienced enough to bring an appeal is experienced enough to receive an AWMW. The AWMW is his education, one more effective than anything the AC may tell him. Failing to assess the AWMW for a

case without merit is in some sense a sign of disrespect, treating the appellant as something less than a full fledged competitor.

Martel – Acceptable.

Marques – Good decision by TD and AC. The only question relates to awarding an AWMW or not. Should E/W know better? Probably the best educational way, in this case, would have been for the AC to just award it.

Kooijman – Part of the TD job is to explain and educate the players in which case the Appeal without merit penalty should have been given.

Goldsmith – If declarer was willing to play North for not having the ♠K after knowing that North didn't have the ♥K, then I don't see why the information she got through questioning indicates why North must have the ♥K.

I agree that the appeal had no merit. Can we just say that anyone in the finals of a national event has to play by the same rules as everyone else regardless of experience level and award AWMWs when appropriate?