

Appeal #	Issue	Event
2007-09	Misinformation	Australian Playoffs (Women's)
Stage	Round	Date
RR2	2	2007-03
Committee	D. Stern (c), I. Del'Monte, A. Wilsmore	

Board 4
Dealer W
Vul All
Screens NE/SW
Scoring Imps converted to VPs, Butler pairs

North

♠ KJT8
 ♥ 76
 ♦ AJ6
 ♣ AJ92

West

♠ 9632
 ♥ J5
 ♦ QT9743
 ♣ 5

East

♠
 ♥ AKQ842
 ♦ K82
 ♣ KT64

South

♠ AQ754
 ♥ T93
 ♦ 5
 ♣ Q873

Contract: 4♥x by East
Lead: ♦5

West	North	East	South
-	1NT	2♥ (1)	Pass
2♠	Pass	4♥	X
All pass			

(1) East to North: Natural; West to South: hearts and spades with longer hearts

Table result	4♥x+1 by East, EW +990
Director's ruling	4♥+1 by East, EW +650
Committee's ruling	NS: 3♠= by South, NS+ 140 EW: 4♠x-1 by South, EW +200 3 IMP penalty to EW for misinformation

The Director: Different explanations of the 2♥ call were given by East and West, with East's explanation the systemically correct one. South led the ♦5, which North won with the ace. At this point, North switched to a heart, and the contract made 11 tricks. A diamond return would have defeated the contract.

North has no misinformation. The directing staff believed that North-South are in the most favourable contract for their side and should have taken advantage of this. South said that given the correct explanation of 2♥ he would not have doubled 4♥. Adjusted the score to 4♥ undoubled by East making 11 tricks, EW +650.

The appellants: Because of the misinformation, South did not bid 2♠. North would then invite with 3♠, and this would lead to North-South playing in 4♠. This may well make, depending on the defence; 10 tricks were made in spades [*Ed: in 3♠*] at the other table.

The respondents: Agreed that South was misinformed; 2♥ is natural by agreement. However, there are numerous leads to beat 4♥, including the diamond lead that was found, and the contract would have been easily defeated if North returned a diamond at trick 2.

After the director was called, North-South said they would not have doubled 4♥. There was no mention of bidding 4♠ as an alternative contract. The defence to beat 4♠ is easy to find.

The appeals committee: Believed that with the correct explanation, South would bid 2♠ (natural, non-forcing), and could play 3♠ or 4♠.

I.D. enquired as to the speed of play at trick 1, when North won the ace of diamonds.

North believed the double showed trumps or values. West asserted that South should have known there was a problem since they held five spades, dummy had four, and their partner had opened 1NT. East did not realise there had been a problem until the discussion after the hand.

I.D. raised the issue of North's actions being guided by her belief of the type of hand their partner had for their actions.

Although 4♠-1 was possible, the misinformation created an impossible situation for North-South. Thus, the committee adjusted the score to NS +140 for North-South, being the likely table result. For East-West, the committee adjusted to 4♠x-1, EW +200, a likely table result, and applied a 3-imp penalty for misinformation.