

The background of the slide features a high-speed photograph of water splashing, creating numerous droplets and bubbles. This central image is framed by vibrant, flowing abstract shapes in shades of red, orange, yellow, green, and blue, which appear to be liquid or smoke-like in texture.

Misinformation and its relationship to UI

by Maurizio Di Sacco
Belfast Workshop 2020



Contents

1. Terminology
2. Relevant Laws
3. Bidding Understandings
 1. Misexplanations and Misbids
 2. When to correct
4. Convention Disruption
5. Examples from actual play

+ note the Principles for every TD ruling

Terminology

**Any other
deliberate
misinformation**
is unethical
and possibly cheating
and not
part of
this lecture.

Mistaken Explanation

Unintentional

Incorrect, misleading or incomplete

Bidding eg Alert or failure to alert

Play eg 47E telling wrong opponent to lead

Mistaken Call (or Misbid)

Unintentional

Not consistent with agreed method

Misunderstanding or Forgetting

Deviation from System

Intentional

Not consistent with agreed method

Psyche

Intentional

Grossly misstates either/both honour strength or suit length

The Lawbook

We use the term "understandings"

This includes agreements, conventions and treatments

Laws 16 and 75

A mistaken explanation or a mistaken call often leads to unauthorised information(UI). A psyche that is not unexpected by partner may also lead to an adjusted score

Law 20, 21 & 40

The how, when, who and what of explanations, convention cards, alerting, announcing, asking and answering questions about system

Partnership understandings - explicit & implicit 40A1(a)

Be wary of "no understanding or agreement" statements from experienced partnerships in routine situation

Principle of "full disclosure"

Give certain rights to Regulating Authorities

Law 47

Permits changes to a card played

Mistaken Explanation

EXAMPLE: A pair who by agreement can open 1NT with a singleton must state this – it is not sufficient to state only the point count.

EXAMPLE: A pair who describes their 2♥ opening as 5-5 in hearts and a minor would be guilty of misexplanation if their agreement includes an occasional 4 card minor suit. However opening with 5-4 in certain situations (such as in 3rd seat) is general bridge knowledge.

IF there is only partial disclosure this is an infraction.

EXAMPLE: An explanation such as “Bergen” is not acceptable. The correct explanation is, for example, “7-10 points with 4+hearts, says nothing about clubs.”

Bidding Understandings Mistaken Call

It is not an infraction

- to make a mistake when bidding (or when playing)
- to forget the system
- to deviate from system

But they can lead to UI, or sanction for repeated misuse of agreements.

- **EXAMPLE:** South opens 2♦ with a long weak diamond suit. North correctly alerts as multi. South forgot. **The bid is not an infraction.** No adjustment. However, the alert passes UI. **To take advantage is an infraction and may lead to an adjusted score.**
- **EXAMPLE:** South opens 2♦ with a long diamond suit. North forgets and alerts it as multi. Now the explanation is incorrect. **This is an infraction and may lead to an adjusted score.** Again South has UI which may lead to an adjusted score.

Mistaken Explanation or Misbid?

- Law 75
- A TD is to assume mistaken explanation and not mistaken bid if there is any doubt
 - If players cannot agree, or there is no evidence of system. Evidence is not limited to convention cards and system notes.
 - eg previous use of the understanding can be evidence

Weighted adjustments are common following misinformation.

Bidding Understandings When to correct?

**CHANGE
in 2017 Laws**

3 possible scenarios -

- Own mistake – Call TD **at any point before the end of the clarification period** Law 20 F 4(a)
- Partner
 - Declaring side – **after the final pass (before the opening lead is faced)** Law 20F 5 (b)(ii)
 - Defending side - **only after play of the hand has concluded.** Law 20F 5(b)(i)



Bidding Understandings Law 21B

- Two necessary conditions
 - Partner has not subsequently called
 - TD judges that the call may have been influenced by the misinformation

Take players away from the table – asking why and what they want to call now and what call they would have made earlier without the MI

- Withdrawn calls become
 - authorised information (AI) to non-offending side;
 - unauthorised information (UI) to offending side Law 16C



Bidding Understandings Law 21B EXAMPLES

- North opens 1NT, South alerts or announces 15-17, East passes and now South says "Oops, it should be 12-14." East can withdraw their pass and make any other call (with no other rectification).

A withdrawn Pass is UI for NS but AI for EW Law 16C

- North opens 1NT . East passes. Partner announces 15-17. South bids 2♣ and then remembers they are playing 12-14 NT so corrects the previous explanation. West has not bid subsequent to East's pass, so East can make any call. If East still passes, South's 2♣ bid stands and the bidding continues normally. If East changes, South may change, with no other rectification.

A withdrawn Pass or 2♣ bid is UI for NS, AI for EW

- North plays 3NT. East leads face down. South says partner gave a wrong explanation. The last defender may withdraw their pass and substitute any call. If so, the face-down lead is withdrawn and bidding continues. The same UI/AI conditions described above apply, but EW still retain rights for an adjusted score if the MI could have affected an earlier call.



CARDING & PLAY

It is an infraction causing misinformation to:

- Mistakenly inform an opponent to lead
- Give a wrong explanation of a carding agreement
- Give incomplete or partial disclosure of carding agreements

Not having any signaling agreement is not allowed, especially with experienced partnerships, where implicit understandings have been formed.



Convention Disruption

It is not an infraction to forget.
Even though some think it should be!

Convention disruption is the term used when a
player forgets a convention or understanding s/he
is playing.

This is not considered an infraction by the laws.

Example 1:

Board 13

North Deals

Both Vul

♠ A J 4
♥ K 4
♦ 8 6 5 4
♣ 10 9 7 2

♠ K 8 6 5 3
♥ A 10 5 3 2
♦ 10
♣ A 5



♠ Q 9 7 2
♥ 9 7
♦ A K 9 7 3
♣ J 8

♠ 10
♥ Q J 8 6
♦ Q J 2
♣ K Q 6 4 3

West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	1♦ ¹
2♦ ²	Pass	3 NT	Pass
4♥	All pass		
4♥ by West			
Made 4 — EW +620			

¹ 1♦ better minor

² East explains 2♦ as natural, diamond suit. (West thought 2♦ showed both majors)

North leads a diamond. South plays Ace and king intending to then give partner a ruff.

NS are not happy and call the TD.

EW say 4♥ makes on any lead.

Either: 2♦ shows both majors,

or: 2♦ is natural is the correct explanation

In both cases, the opening lead was face down, and the explanation was not corrected.

BUT WAIT THERE'S more!



Example 1:

Did the Misinformation cause Unauthorised
information(UI) Law 75A?

It is our job to consider what the players do
not. You may be called for one infraction.

It is your duty to consider all aspects.

SO...

A poll may very often be required to determine Logical Alternative (LA) after a misexplanation

West has no reason to do other than PASS after 3NT

Unless they have used information from the different explanation

Board 13

North Deals

Both Vul

♠ K 8 6 5 3
♥ A 10 5 3 2
♦ 10
♣ A 5

♠ A J 4
♥ K 4
♦ 8 6 5 4
♣ 10 9 7 2

♠ N
♥ W
♦ E
♣ S

♠ 10
♥ Q J 8 6
♦ Q J 2
♣ K Q 6 4 3

♠ Q 9 7 2
♥ 9 7
♦ A K 9 7 3
♣ J 8

West	North	East	South
	Pass	Pass	1♦ ¹
2♦ ²	Pass	3NT	Pass
4♥	All pass		
4♥ by West			
Made 4 — EW +620			

¹ 1♦ better minor

² East explains 2♦ as natural, diamond suit. (West thought 2♦ showed both majors)

Now:

- ⊙ 1. Correct explanation is "Majors".
 - > Against 3NT South has an automatic small diamond lead, which leads to at least down 4 (four diamonds, three spades and one heart), and down five is fairly possible (If declarer keeps the ♠K second).
- ⊙ 2. The correct explanation is "Diamonds".
 - > The normal lead is a spade, which leads to the same outcome after the obvious diamond switch.

Example 2: WYTC Beijing 2008

Board 8
West Deals
None Vul

♠ 9 8 7	♠ K 10 6 3 2	♠ Q J
♥ A Q 8 5	♥ 9	♥ 7 6 4 2
♦ 10	♦ K 9 7 4	♦ 8 3 2
♣ A 10 6 3 2	♣ K 8 4	♣ Q J 7 5

♠ A 5 4	♠ 9
♥ K J 10 3	
♦ A Q J 6 5	
♣ 9	

West	North	East	South
CHN	ITA	CHN	ITA
Pass	Pass	Pass	1 NT
2 ♣ ¹	Db1 ²	2 ♥	Db1

All pass
2 ♥ × by East: Lead 9 ♣ Down 2
At other table: 4 ♠ +1 on ♣ Q lead

- 1: West & South (SW) Clubs + M
East & North (NE) both majors (correct explanation)
- 2: If 2 ♣ is ♣ + M then x is TO
If 2 ♣ is M + M then x is penalty of one major

South – bidding damage:

For me, North's double is for takeout, and would show a maximum of 4 in a major. With explanation that West has both majors, North's double would be penalty of spades, and I may then bid spades to play in 5/4 fit against 4 or even 5 spades in West. 10 or 11 tricks in spades is easy. Also with correct information I would not double 2 ♥ and we might play 5 ♦.

South – lead problem: If North's double shows spades, I would lead a spade. My club lead gave EW an extra trick. TD decision?

- Screens may lead to different Law applications – here 75B and 75C

- North received the correct explanation according to the system, thus no damage can ever be considered. On the other hand, South received the wrong one, but his bid would not change: he would double for penalty instead of doubling for take-out, with exactly the same result.
- Result stands

Board 8
West Deals
None Vul

♠ 9 8 7	♥ A Q 8 5	♦ 10	♣ A 10 6 3 2
♠ K 10 6 3 2	♥ 9	♦ K 9 7 4	♣ K 8 4

♠ Q J	♥ 7 6 4 2	♦ 8 3 2	♣ Q J 7 5
♠ A 5 4	♥ K J 10 3	♦ A Q J 6 5	♣ 9

West	North	East	South
CHN	ITA	CHN	ITA
Pass	Pass	Pass	1 NT
2 ♣ ¹	Dbl ²	2 ♥	Dbl

All pass
 2 ♥× by East: Lead 9♣ Down 2
 At other table: 4♠+1 on ♣Q lead

Example 3: Different Explanations

¹: East explains as hearts + minor 5-5

Board 2

East Deals

N-S Vul

♠ Q 6 3

♥ A 5

♦ K J 7 6 3

♣ K 10 3

♠ A K 5 4

♥ K J 8 3 2

♦ Q 4

♣ A 4

W

N

E

S

♠ J 10 9 8 2

♥ Q 7 6

♦ A 10 5

♣ 9 2

♠ 7

♥ 10 9 4

♦ 9 8 2

♣ Q J 8 7 6 5

West

North

East

South

Pass

Pass

Pass

Pass

1 ♥

2 ♦

2 ♥

Pass

3 ♥¹

Pass

4 ♥

All pass

4 ♥ by West: Lead ♠ 3

Result: 4 ♥ = Score EW -420

Result at other table: 4 ♥ +1 by West -450

North calls TD after play saying she would not have led a spade if East had described the hand as majors.

TD determines that correct explanation is that 3 ♥ is natural.

(TD reminds West that explanation should be corrected before opening lead is faced.)

- 
- ◉ All leads are possible with the correct explanation. Should a TD decide which lead to assign?

ABSOLUTELY NOT!

- **Polling is useful for a TD in misinformation rulings**

Our TD polled and discovered - with “natural” explanation 3 players considered both a club and A♥ lead, but chose A♥. One player thought he would lead a club, but perhaps may lead A♥.

- What to do with this information?
- **A TD with some bridge knowledge should still consult an expert to determine other bridge play factors before making a ruling**

In this case a weighted ruling seems the likely decision

One hand:

3

Misinformation
rulings!

Case 1

Example 3: 21st European Youth Teams Jesolo 2007

Board 5

North Deals

N-S Vul

♠ 10 9 8 7 5 3	♠ Q 2	♠ K J 6
♥ K Q J 5 2	♥ —	♥ A 10 8 7 3
♦ 8	♦ A J 6 5 3 2	♦ K 10
♣ 6	♣ K Q 10 7 4	♣ 9 5 2



♠ A 4
♥ 9 6 4
♦ Q 9 7 4
♣ A J 8 3

West	North	East	South
	1♦	1♥	2♣
3 N ¹	5♣	Pass	5♦ ²
5♥	7♣	Pass	Pass
7♥	Dbl	All pass	

Result: 7♥x by East

Down 3 - EW -500

¹ 3NT – explained as “to play” by both sides

² 5♦ - NE slam try, control in diamonds. Support in diamonds

(Correct Explanation: agreed by North - slam try with support in diamonds).

East calls TD. He claims that he passed 7♣ holding K10♦ under the control. If he knew that ♦ A was before him, he would double 7♣ not only because it probably would not make but also to prevent partner from sacrificing 7♥.

- Issue 1: Psyche
 - It was clear to all from the outset the real meaning of 3NT
- Issue 2: Misinformation influencing the auction
 - > East's claim is not entirely correct: the right explanation would not have told him the location of the \heartsuit A, but only that not necessarily was in South.

- Give the auction, explaining the various calls (offer only the correct 5 \heartsuit explanation). And ask:

- > What actions do you consider?"

- We can only rule after interviewing experts, and being open to all results.
(I suspect that only a minority would double 7 \clubsuit , but you never know).

Board 5
North Deals
N-S Vul

\spadesuit 10 9 8 7 5 3	\spadesuit Q 2	\spadesuit K J 6
\heartsuit K Q J 5 2	\heartsuit —	\heartsuit A 10 8 7 3
\diamondsuit 8	\diamondsuit A J 6 5 3 2	\diamondsuit K 10
\clubsuit 6	\clubsuit K Q 10 7 4	\clubsuit 9 5 2

\spadesuit A 4	\spadesuit A 4
\heartsuit 9 6 4	\heartsuit 9 6 4
\diamondsuit Q 9 7 4	\diamondsuit Q 9 7 4
\clubsuit A J 8 3	\clubsuit A J 8 3

West	North	East	South
	1 \heartsuit	1 \heartsuit	2 \clubsuit
3 N ¹	5 \clubsuit	Pass	5 \heartsuit ²
5 \heartsuit	7 \clubsuit	Pass	Pass
7 \heartsuit	Dbl	All pass	
Result: 7 \heartsuit x by East			Down 3 - EW -500

One hand:

3

Misinformation
rulings!

Case 2

Example 3: 21st

European Youth Teams Jesolo
2007

Board 5

North Deals
N-S Vul

♠ 10 9 8 7 5 3
♥ K Q J 5 2
♦ 8
♣ 6

♠ Q 2
♥ —
♦ A J 6 5 3 2
♣ K Q 10 7 4

N
W E
S

♠ K J 6
♥ A 10 8 7 3
♦ K 10
♣ 9 5 2

♠ A 4
♥ 9 6 4
♦ Q 9 7 4
♣ A J 8 3

West	North	East	South
	1♦	1♥	X ¹
2♣ ²	5♦	All pass	

Result 5♦ by North +620

- As per Law 40, psyches are part of the game. Score stands.

¹ Denies 4 spades

² both sides – natural

West, with both majors, and knowing the heart fit, decided to confuse matters, and succeeded for NS did not get to their minor suit slam.

NS called director about the psyche.

TD decision?

One hand:

3

Misinformation
rulings!

Case 3

Example 3: 21st

European Youth Teams
Jesolo 2007

Board 5
North Deals
N-S Vul

♠ Q 2
♥ —
♦ A J 6 5 3 2
♣ K Q 10 7 4

♠ 10 9 8 7 5 3
♥ K Q J 5 2
♦ 8
♣ 6

♠ K J 6
♥ A 10 8 7 3
♦ K 10
♣ 9 5 2

♠ A 4
♥ 9 6 4
♦ Q 9 7 4
♣ A J 8 3

West North East South
1♦ 1♥ 2♦¹
4♥ 5♦ X All pass
Result: 5♦x by North +1 = +950
Result at other table: 5♥x-2 by East +300

¹ 2♦, SW inverted (correct explanation)

NE no alert

East claimed that with the correct explanation he would not double 5♦.

TD decision?

- Issue: Self Protection

- Is failing to ask about 2♦ a lack of self protection?

- In modern bridge, the double over 5♦ is never for penalty, thus West would automatically remove it. If not, pass would be considered not just a serious error, but one of the worst ever seen.
- Just supposing that EW do play stone-age bridge, consider a lack of self protection. By definition, this depends on the level of the players. Certainly yes if it is the Bermuda Bowl, perhaps not at lower levels.
- Opinions.

Board 5

North Deals
N-S Vul

♠ Q 2
♥ —
♦ A J 6 5 3 2
♣ K Q 10 7 4

♠ 10 9 8 7 5 3
♥ K Q J 5 2
♦ 8
♣ 6



♠ K J 6
♥ A 10 8 7 3
♦ K 10
♣ 9 5 2

♠ A 4
♥ 9 6 4
♦ Q 9 7 4
♣ A J 8 3

West	North	East	South
	1♦	1♥	2♦ ¹
4♥	5♦	X	All pass

Result: 5♦x by North +1 = +950

Result at other table: 5♥x-2 by East +300

- 
- In Misinformation cases always :
 - Consider unauthorised information
 - Determine misexplanation or mistaken call/play
 - Appreciate self-protection
 - Consult to support adjustment weightings

Thank you.
Any Questions?