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# Winners \& Losers 



German's Cristina Giampietro collects her scores from the new system designed by the PBU

## Mixed Teams

On a day of exciting finishes, several big guns fell, notably Lavazza, Brogeland and Hauge.

## Mixed Pairs

Renata Dancewicz and Tomasz Winciorek gave our hosts something to cheer about as they led the field at the end of day one, comfortably ahead of their compatriots, Cathy Baldysz and Piotr Tuszynski and Malgorzata Jeleniewska and Piotr Lutostanski.

## Mixed Pairs Qualification

70 pairs will advance to the semifinal, together with drop ins from the teams championship.

Maurizio Di Sacco - Championship Manager

## Today's - Schedule

I 0.00 Mixed Pairs Qualification (R6)
I 0.00 Mixed Teams Round of 8 (RI)
I 2.00 Mixed Pairs Qualification (R7)
I 2.30 Mixed Teams Round of 8 (R2)
I 5.30 Mixed Teams Round of 4 (RI)
I 6.30 Mixed Pairs Semi-final A\&B (RI)
I 8.00 Mixed Teams Round of 4 (R2)
I 8.30 Mixed Pairs Semi-final A\&B (R2)
budimex
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## MIXED TEAMS

| ROUND OF 32 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  | Ist | 2nd | total |
|  | GOLDCAT | 37 | 13 | 50 |
|  | HANSEN | 17 | 52 | 69 |
| 2 | GOTTLIEB | 16 | 33 | 49 |
|  | MAHAFFEY | 25 | 51 | 76 |
| 3 | LAVAZZA | 7 | 23 | 30 |
|  | BALTI | 30 | 3 | 33 |
| 4 | PAYEN | 14 | 26 | 40 |
|  | HARDING | 31 | 14 | 45 |
| 5 | CHINA TRINERGY | 4 | 30 | 34 |
|  | KHANDELWAL | 26 | 50 | 76 |
| 6 | VRIEND | 36 | 46 | 82 |
|  | ROSSARD | 4 | 25 | 29 |
| 7 | BROGELAND | 16 | 11 | 27 |
|  | DE BOTTON | 39 | 47 | 86 |
| 8 | COUPLES | 19 | 26 | 45 |
|  | GREEN EYES | 17 | 34 | 51 |
| 9 | CONNECTOR | 21 | 41 | 62 |
|  | BADGER | 31 | 38 | 69 |
| 10 | HAUGE | 25 | 62 | 87 |
|  | GEWANNA | 18 | 17 | 35 |
| 11 | RUSSIA | 23 | 53 | 76 |
|  | AKIN | 18 | 26 | 44 |
| 12 | DUCK N DALES | 21 | 45 | 66 |
|  | AUSTRIA | 20 | 28 | 48 |
| 13 | FINLAND | 24 | 24 | 48 |
|  | LAST ARRIVAL | 23 | 32 | 55 |
| 14 | ZIMMERMAN | 23 | 44 | 67 |
|  | PENFOLD | 10 | 6 | 16 |
| 15 | CALANDRA | 28 | 34 | 62 |
|  | PONY | 29 | 35 | 64 |
| 16 | WILD GRIFFINS | 29 | 54 | 83 |
|  | ZARKESH | 15 | 11 | 26 |


| ROUND OF 16 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  | Ist | 2nd | total |
|  | HANSEN | 4 | 28 | 32 |
|  | MAHAFFEY | 52 | 31 | 83 |
| 2 | HARDING | 22 | 53 | 75 |
|  | BALTI | 40 | 19 | 59 |
| 3 | KHANDELWAL | 12 | 24 | 36 |
|  | VRIEND | 21 | 33 | 54 |
| 4 | GREEN EYES | 27 | 50 | 77 |
|  | DE BOTTON | 44 | 29 | 73 |
| 5 | BADGER | 37 | 20 | 57 |
|  | HAUGE | 4 | 37 | 41 |
| 6 | DUCK N DALES | 2 | 6 | 8 |
|  | RUSSIA | 52 | 25 | 77 |
| 7 | LAST ARRIVAL | 9 | 21 | 30 |
|  | ZIMMERMAN | 27 | 41 | 68 |
| 8 | WILD GRIFFINS | 32 | 25 | 57 |
|  | PONY | 33 | 19 | 52 |
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## Mixed Teams Swiss Round 3

by Jos Jacobs

In this round, three or four boards caused havoc in many of our featured matches. Let's have a look at some of the proceedings in the ChinaTrinergy v. Penfold match first.


Nobody had anything more to say after East's two-suited opening bid and possibly rightly so.

Ivanova went down two in peace: +100 to China Trinergy.


Anna Gulevich, Russia

| West <br> Kang | North <br> Senior. | East <br> Yan | South <br> Penfold |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $2 \vee$ | Pass |
| $4 \varnothing$ | Pass | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Dbl | $5 \&$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dbl | Pass | Pass | $5 \diamond$ |
| Dbl | All Pass |  |  |

After the same opening bid by East, her partner elected to make a cunning (?) raise to game. When $4 \checkmark$ came round to South, she decided this was the moment for action. However, she first ran into West's side suit and then into East's. The net costs were a mere IIOO. The swing thus amounted to 15 Imps to China Trinergy.

In the Wild Griffins v. Couples match, there also was a major accident at one of the tables:

| West <br> Busse $P$ | North <br> Orlov | East <br> Busse G | South <br> Dikhnova |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $2 』$ | Pass |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{3}$ |
| Dbl | $3 N T$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dbl | All Pass |  |  |

Here too, East opened to show her two-suiter but North balanced when this came round to him. South then introduced her spades only to find out soon that she had chosen the wrong moment for it. North came to her rescue but that did not help him very much either. West clearly had the last word in this auction and it will be no surprise to you to learn that the contract went four off. Couples +800 .

At the other table, the bidding followed a different route:

| West <br> Khven | North <br> Nowosadzki | East <br> Gulevich | South <br> Dufrat |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \Omega$ | $3 \Omega$ | All Pass |  |

East also opened $2 \triangle$ but here, West thought he was strong enough to show his spades. This did not deter North from showing his suit but it did deter first South and then West effectively.

As a result, North quietly went four off in 30 to add another -200 to his teammates' disaster. Total costs for the Wild Griffins: I 5 Imps.

On the next board, it was bingo again for the Couples:

Board I5. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

- AQ654

ค109875
-
Q 107

| Q 183 | N | - K 97 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 4$ |  | $\bigcirc$ AKQ 2 |
| $\checkmark$ A 1042 | W E | $\diamond$ Q 853 |
| 2 AKJ64 | S | -92 |
|  | - 102 |  |
|  | QJ63 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ KJ976 |  |

\& 853

| West <br> Busse P | North <br> Orlov | East <br> Busse G | South <br> Dikhnova |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 18 | $2 \triangleleft$ | Dbl | Pass |
| Pass | Redbl | Pass | $2 』$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dbl | All Pass |

Maybe, the North hand is too weak for a majors-showing overcall red v. green but I am sure EW won't agree. South's pass showed diamonds but North was not interested, understandably so.

When South ran to 29 , East woke up again and the defence collected another 800 when West found the trump lead, often the best choice against doubled partscores.

The hand still might have been a push, had West been a little more patient:


Yanhong Wang, China

| West <br> Khven | North <br> Nowosadzki | East <br> Gulevich | South <br> Dufrat |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | $2 \diamond$ | Dbl | 2 |
| 3 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

When North made the same risky overcall, South ran to $2 \checkmark$ freely after the double, so maybe West was under the impression that no penalty, let alone a juicy one, was there for the taking.

3NT was duly made but at this vulnerability, it was only worth half the value of the undertricks at the other table. So a swing of 400 or 9 Imps was registered by Couples, to add to the 12 from the previous board.

In the China Trinergy-Penfold match, the Chinese scored a game at both tables on this one:

Board I8. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

- K Q 10876
$\bigcirc 75$
$\diamond$ -
- Q 10652

| - 3 <br> - K 984 <br> $\diamond A 1065$ <br> - AJ 97 |  | - AJ <br> Q1 1032 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | E | $\checkmark$ QJ8432 |
|  | S |  | - 3 |
|  | - 9542 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 6 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 97 |  |  |
| ¢ K 84 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Ivanov | Sun | Ivanova | Wang |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 2. |
| Dы | 4 | Dы | All Pass |

Well, a club lead to the ace and a club ruff, followed by the §J sinks this contract but when West inserted the Jack on his partner's low club lead, that was the end of the defence. China Trinergy +790 .

Even going down in 4 would have been a satisfactory result as 5$\rangle$ easily makes for EW - actually, it's a slam on two working finesses.

| West <br> Kang | North <br> Senior. | East <br> Yan | South <br> Penfold |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | I $\downarrow$ | Pass |
| I $\varangle$ | $3 \Phi$ | Pass | $4 \Phi$ |
| Dbl | Pass | $4 N T$ | Pass |
| $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

...As was proved in the other room. China Trinergy thus scored another +420 ; 15 Imps more to them.

In the Rossard v. Brogeland match, the score stood at I2 after 7 boards. On this same board 18, the Brogeland team came close to scoring a game in both rooms as well.

| West <br> $T$ Helness | North <br> Kowalski | East <br> G Helness | South <br> Miszewska |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \$$ |
| Pass | 14 | Dbl | 24 |
| $4 \searrow$ | $4 \infty$ | $5 \diamond$ | Dbl |

South's le was Polish, as you can imagine. $5 \diamond$ just suggested an alternative contract but Tor Helness was quite happy to pass when it got doubled. The contract made with an overtrick, of course: Brogeland +650 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Frukacz | B Brogeland | Nastase | $T$ Brogeland |
|  |  | Pass | 19 |
| $1 \diamond$ | 18 | 2\% | 24 |
| 3\% | $4 \diamond$ | $5 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| Pass | 54, | All Pass |  |

$I \triangleleft$ by Brogeland showed spades. When his opponents also reached $5 \diamond$, Boye then quite rightly bid on. Nobody doubled, so on the lead of the A , Tonje quietly went one down for a loss of 100 points and a gain of II Imps to take a clear lead in their match: 12-2.

The Brogeland team lost that handy lead, and the match as well, on the final board:

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

- K 862
©AK 1042
$\diamond$ Q 105
\& 5


| West <br> $T$ Helness | North <br> Kowalski | East <br> G Helness | South <br> Miszewska |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3 \mathbf{3 i s}$ | Dbl | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{~ A l l ~ P a s s ~}$ |

A straightforward auction to a straightforward contract. Club lead taken, spade to the King and Ace, heart back, ruffed by West but after that, only the $\diamond A$ was there for the defence. Rossard +620.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Frukacz | B Brogeland | Nastase | T Brogeland |
| 3e | Dbl | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

3NT on this flat distribution might well have been the proper spot, but not this time. On the lead of the $\mathbf{e}$, correctly overtaken by East, declarer had no chance to get to more than 5 tricks. So another +400 and 14 Imps to Rossard who thus won the match 16-14 in V.P.

Believe it or not, in the China Trinergy cv. Penfold match the auctions at the two tables were almost exact copies of what we saw in the Rossard-Brogeland match.

| West <br> Ivanov | North <br> Sun | East <br> Ivanova | South <br> Wang |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3 \%$ | Dbl | Pass | $4 \Phi$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The play was different, however. Declarer won the club lead and led a trump to dummy's King which held. Another trump went to the 10 and Jack but after this, the defence at this table as well could not get anything more than their two pointed aces. China trinergy +620 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kang | Senior. | Yan | Penfold |
| 3\% | Dbl | Redbl | 3NT |

Penfold, faced with the same dilemma as Tonje Brogeland in our other featured match,m made the same unhappy choice and also went the expected four down. So 14 Imps foor China Trinergy as well, who thus won their match 4725 or 21-9 V.P.


Gunn Helness, Norway

## Revenge postponed

by Brent Manley

In their round-robin match against Duck $n$ Dales in the Mixed Teams, the Sandra Penfold squad came out on the short end of a 26 -II score. They had a chance for revenge in the fifth round of the Swiss portion of the event when they faced the English team a second time. It was not exactly satisfying for Penfold.

Penfold played with Brian Senior. Their teammates were Atanas Ivanov and Steliana Ivanova. Duck n Dales is Brian Callaghan, Christine Duckworth, Susan Stockdale and Simon Cope.

Things started well for Penfold.
Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.
\& K 103
คJ8432
$\diamond$ J 2

- 1054

| $¢ 85$$>9$$>10964$ | ¢ J 942 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | W | - AQ765 |  |
|  |  | E $\quad \stackrel{\mathrm{K}}{ } \mathrm{Q} 8$ |  |
| ¢ K Q 9863 |  | \& A |  |
| ¢ A Q 76 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 10$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ A 753 |  |  |  |
| ¢ 72 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Callaghan | Senior | Duckworth | Penfold |
|  | Pass | 18 | Dbl |
| Redbl | Pass | Pass | 1s |
| Pass | Pass | 2NT | All Pass |

Callaghan's apparently psychic redouble did not work out well for his side when Duckworth overbid to 2NT.

Penfold started with a low diamond to Senior's jack and Duckworth's king. Duckworth cashed the eA and continued with the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$, making it easy for Penfold to withhold the ace. More challenging would have been a low diamond. To block the suit, Penfold would have had to rise with the ace - a disaster if Senior had started with QJ doubleton - and if she played low, Duckworth would have ended up with at least nine tricks.

Senior had played the 10 when Duckworth cashed the A, indicating something in spades, so when Penfold took the $\diamond A$ on the third round of the suit, she got out with a low spade. Senior won the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ and returned the 10 , covered by the jack and queen. Penfold cashed the $s \mathrm{~A}$ and exited with a spade.

Duckworth then played a low heart from hand. Penfold won the 10 and continued with the 8 K . Duckworth could have saved a trick by playing low because Penfold would have had to play a minor suit at that point, and dummy had all good cards. Duckworth won, however, and eventually had to surrender a trick to Senior. That was two down, minus 100 .

At the other table, Ivanova declared 29 from the East seat, making 10 tricks for plus 130. Penfold was ahead 6-0.
The lead didn't survive the next board, however.
Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A Q } 73 \\ & >\text { Q } 1054 \\ & \diamond 543 \\ & \text { Q } 7 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -19652 | N | - K 84 |
| 8 - |  | PJ9876 |
| $\checkmark 1096$ |  | $\diamond 87$ |
| 2) 10963 | S | - A 52 |
|  | -10 |  |
|  | PAK 32 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AKQJ 2 |  |
|  | 2 K 84 |  |


| West <br> Ivanov | North <br> Cope | East <br> Ivanova | South <br> Stockdale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $1 \oslash$ | Pass | $3 \$$ |
| Pass | $4 \oslash$ | All Pass |  |

Ivanova started with the $\diamond 7$, taken by the ace in dummy. The $\triangle A$ revealed the foul break. Cope continued with a club to the queen and ace, and won the diamond exit in dummy. He played a third high diamond, ruffed by Ivanova, who continued with the $\Phi$ K. Cope won, cashed the $\Phi Q$ and was soon claiming 10 tricks.

Penfold was one level higher at the other table.

| West <br> Callaghan | North <br> Senior | East <br> Duckworth | South <br> Penfold |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2\& | Dbl | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  | $3 \Omega$ | 58 |

Callaghan started with ej, taken by Duckworth with the ace. The contract is doomed by a club continuation, but Duckworth gave Penfold a chance by switching to a diamond. Penfold won the $\diamond A$ and cashed the $\vee A$. The $5-0$ split
meant no overtricks, but she could still have made it by playing a spade to the ace, ruffing a spade, entering dummy with the e (the vital entry that could have been taken out at trick two) and ruffing another spade. Now Penfold could cash a diamond, the 8 K and the sK, followed by another high diamond. Down to all trumps, East would have had to ruff and lead into the Q Q 10 at the end for plus 650.
Penfold, however, played a club to the queen at trick four and could not avoid one off for a I2-IMP loss.

The score was 16-7 for Duck $n$ Dales, when this deal came along.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
4 K Q 862

- Q 652
$\diamond 6$
Q Q 65

| $\pm$ AJ | N | ¢ 974 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 10743$ |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{KJ}$ |
| $\diamond$ AK 92 |  | $\diamond$ J 873 |
| \& 872 | S | ¢ AK 94 |
|  | ¢ 1053 |  |
|  | ®A 98 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 1054 |  |
|  | \% J 103 |  |


| West <br> Ivanov | North Cope | East Ivanova | South Stockdale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | I $\diamond$ | Pass |
| 18 | 14 | Pass | 24 |
| Db | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3 3 | All Pass |  |  |

Despite the bad break in trumps, Ivanova was able to get home with nine tricks for plus IIO.
Penfold and Senior had to defend against a game contract at the other table.

| West <br> Callaghan | North <br> Senior | East <br> Duckworth | South <br> Penfold |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | INT | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \boxtimes$ | Pass |
| 3 NT | All Pass |  |  |

Callaghan's $2 \triangleleft$ apparently showed four hearts, and $2 \triangleleft$ denied a major.

Penfold started with the ${ }^{2}$, taken by Duckworth with the ace. She played the $\diamond 7$ from hand and let it run. When it held, she continued with the $\diamond$ J, covered by the queen and ace. On this trick, Senior discarded the 96 , and the contract could no longer be defeated. Declarer played the covered by the queen and king. A diamond went to the 9 , and the $\diamond K$ was cashed. Now a club went to Penfold's 10 and she exited with a spade. Duckworth took the ace and
had to guess the heart suit to make her contract. She played a low heart to the jack to score up plus 600 and a I0-IMP gain.

Late in the session, Senior made a nice bid in competition that led to a profitable save.

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.


| West <br> Ivanov | North <br> Cope | East <br> Ivanova | South <br> Stockdale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3 \boldsymbol{3}$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |
|  |  | $4 \varrho$ | All Pass |

Ivanov had no trouble taking II tricks. He won the opening lead of the sK in hand, ruffed a club in dummy and ran the $\Phi$ Q. When that held, he played a heart to the king, a heart to the ace and ruffed a heart. He cashed the A , then


Susan Stockdale, England
played his diamond to dummy's ace and called for the $\vee \mathrm{J}$. South could take only his two trump tricks.
At the other table:

| West <br> Callaghan | North <br> Senior | East <br> Duckworth | South <br> Penfold |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass |
| $2 \&$ | $2 N T$ | Pass | $5 \%$ |
| Dbl | All pass |  |  |

Senior's 2NT showed lots of cards in the minors, catching Penfold with five of his second suit. Against 5\% doubled, Callaghan led his singleton diamond. Dummy's suit was set up after declarer played low and Duckworth took the ace. She tried a diamond back, but Penfold ruffed with the 8, and although Callaghan eventually got a heart ruff, the damage was just 500, good for a 4-IMP gain.

The final board put and end to Penfold's hopes of revenge for the round-robin loss.

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.

- J 86
$\checkmark$ A Q 74
$\diamond$ Q 9
\& AK 83


At both tables, the contract was $4 \oslash$ by North.
Against Senior, Duckworth led the $\mathbf{~} 7$ : jack, queen, ace. He cashed the $\vee A$ and followed with the $\vee Q$. Senior then played a low club to dummy and followed with a low diamond to his queen. When he played the eK, Duckworth ruffed and switched to a low spade. Callaghan won the king and continued with the e9, ruffed in dummy. Senior had no way to avoid losing two more tricks for one down.

At the other table, Ivanova started with a low heart to the jack and declarer's ace. A heart went to the king in dummy, and declarer played a diamond to the queen. The $\diamond 9$ drew West's ace, and if he had played on spades, the contract would have been defeated, but Ivanov switched to a low club, which declarer ran to dummy. The $\diamond K$ was good for one spade discard from the North hand, and when the $\diamond$ J fell, declarer was able to discard a second spade. East ruffed with a natural trump trick, too late for the defense. Cope lost only one spade, one diamond and one heart for plus 620 and another 12 IMPs in a 39-18 victory.

## Championship Diary

BBO is doing a magnificent job covering the Championships, but with so many tables on line at once it is difficult to find commentators. Searching for an analogy to convey the lack of expertise that one occasionally encounters Tacchi suggested Henry Cooper attempting to comment on Ballet. If you have an idea, send it to me at: markhorton007@hotmail.com

There is no shortage of excellent restaurants in Poznan. If you discover one on your travels let us know and we will pass it on.

I have a huge number of reporters at my disposal. That makes me mindful of the Duke of Wellington's famous remark before the Battle of Waterloo, 'I don't know if my troops scare the enemy, but by God they frighten me.'

Mentioning that famous battle reminds me of an exchange between the Duke and his second in command, Lord Uxbridge. Substituting the Duke and the Lord for the NPC of a bridge team and the assistant NPC favoured by some countries it would go along these lines:
'In the next round we are playing Lavazza.'
'I know.'
'Just in case anything happens to you, what are your plans?'
'To beat the Italians.'
Renata Dancewicz is perhaps the most famous film actress in Poland. She also happens to be a talented bridge player and is doing rather well in the Mixed Pairs. She is currently starring in a series on Polish TV - when she arrived yesterday several members of staff asked her to reveal what happens in the next episode!


## Mixed Teams Round of 32, first half

by Jos Jacobs

This review will be about a few highlights in the first half of four of the matches played in the round of 32: Zimmermann v. Penfold, Brogeland v. De Botton, Mahaffey v. Gottlieb and Calandra v. Penfold

Zimmermann was the first of those teams to register a sizeable swing and they did so in an unorthodox way:

Board 3. Dealer South. E/WVul.

- 10952
$\bigcirc 9$
$\triangleleft$ Q 1052
\& 752
- 7

คA 10763
$\diamond 864$

- Q 943


A AK6 3
© K QJ 54
$\diamond 3$

- AK 6

| West <br> Ivanov | North <br> Multon | East <br> Ivanova | South <br> Willard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | Dbl | Redbl |
| Pass | Pass | IS | Dbl |
| INT | Dbl | All Pass |  |

Multon showed his maximum pass of $I \oslash$ by making an aggressive double of West's INT. This proved the right decision as there was no game on for his side. On a heart lead, the defence had little trouble in establishing a third spade trick as the setting trick as declarer could never again reach his hand. Heart to the Jack and Ace, diamond to the Jack, $>\mathrm{K}$ getting the bad news and another heart. South won and simply played three rounds of clubs, allowing declarer to score his before exiting in hearts and being locked in dummy when South led a low spade. Down one, Zimmermann +200 .

| West <br> Zimmermann | North <br> Senior | East <br> Cronier | South <br> Penfold |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | I 8 |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | Pass | $5 \$$ |
| Pass | 54 | All Pass |  |

When North made a response, South produced a splinter raise and then felt she had enough for another forward
move. In a sense, she was right but the final contract had no chance whatsoever. As nobody doubled and 44 would not have made either, the extra penalty for being in 5as a mere additional 50 points. Anyway: 8 Imps to Zimmermann.

Board 5 was interesting because NS had to avoid their 44 fit in hearts as there are only nine tricks available in that denomination. As the hand with the long clubs does not hold a quick entry, 3NT was the place to be.
This is why there was a game swing in the Brogeland-De Botton match. Here are the two auctions.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

- K 43

ค8753
$\diamond$ K 63

- Q 102

4 Q 96
ค 1096
$\diamond 72$
\&) 9643


- A 72
$\bigcirc 42$
$\diamond$ JIO 854
- AK 8
- J 1085
$\bigcirc$ AKQJ
$\diamond A$ Q 9
\& 75


Franck Multon, France

| West <br> Sandqvist | North <br> $T$ Helness | East <br> $N$ Senior | South <br> Helness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | Dbl |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | $2 \boxtimes$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

On the normal diamond lead by East, declarer could hardly go wrong. Brogeland +600 .

| West <br> Brogeland | North <br> Malinowski | East <br> Brogeland. | South <br> DeBotton |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | I $\diamond$ | INT |
| Pass | 29 | Pass | $2 \boxtimes$ |
| Pass | $4 \Omega$ | All Pass |  |

At the other table, NS duly found out about their 4-4 heart fit but soon found out as well that nine tricks were the maximum. Brogeland another +100 and 12 Imps . It would remain the team's only major swing in this half.

A more unusual swing occurred in the Zimmermann-Penfold match.

| West <br> Ivanov | North <br> Multon | East <br> Ivanova | South <br> Willard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | I $\diamond$ | Dbl |
| Pass | INT | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

In the Open Room, the French NS quickly reached the proper spot. Zimmermann +600.

At the other table, we saw the weak NT in operation:

| West <br> Zimmermann | North <br> Senior | East <br> Cronier | South <br> Penfold |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| }{} | Pass | INT | Dbl |
|  | Dbl | All Pass |  |

It is arguable if sitting the double of 20 is right, even more so when North made the unlucky lead of a low spade which ran to declarer's Queen. Zimmermann now played a heart to South who returned a trump to the ten and dummy's King. A diamond was led from the board, taken by South who continued a trump to the eight in dummy when North correctly withheld his Queen. Now, another diamond went to North's King and a heart came back, South winning and returning a spade. Dummy's ace won and declarer next could have played a diamond, ruffing in hand and then cross to dummy with the last trump to enjoy the winners in the suit and even make an overtrick. He adopted another line, however, which led to one down. It did not matter very much, as -IOO still was worth II Imps to his team.

Playing in your own suit or in partner's was the issue and
the reason for several swings on board 9:

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

$$
\text { Q Q } 108752
$$

$\checkmark 5$
$\diamond$ J 10652

- 4


| West <br> Ivanov | North <br> Multon | East <br> Ivanova | South <br> Willard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | 38 |
| All Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | Pass | 48 |

With at least one loser in each suit, this contract could not be handled successfully. One down, +50 to Penfold. After the NA lead and the return of the $\oslash \mathrm{J}$, declarer conceded a trump trick to East who returned another club. Declarer ruffed this and led the \$K. When West won his $\Delta \mathrm{A}$ immediately, declarer could use the Q as a safe entry to lead diamonds from dummy. The fall of the Jack made life much easier for her...

| West <br> Zimmermann | North <br> Senior | East <br> Cronier | South <br> Penfold |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | Pass | $3 \Omega$ |
|  | $3 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | All Pass |  |

Playing safe, Senior made exactly nine tricks but that was all he needed for a swing of 5 Imps to his team.

In the Brogeland-De Botton match too, South's suit won, even opposite a three-level opening bid:

| West <br> Sandqvist | North <br> $T$ Helness | East <br> N Senior | South <br> Helness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Pass | 39 | Pass | $4\ulcorner$ |

One down here too, De Botton +50.

| West <br> Brogeland | North <br> Malinowski | East <br> Brogeland. | South <br> DeBotton |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\$}$ |

De Botton correctly raised 3s to game in that denomination. On the lead of the 0 , declarer had no problem whatsoever. De Botton another +420 and 10 Imps back to them.

And in the Mahaffey-Gottlieb match:

| West <br> Mahaffey | North <br> Larsson | East <br> Radin | South <br> Andersson |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 2 NT |
| All Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |
|  |  |  |  |

Here, declarer even went down two on the lead on the A and another, as the defenders now came to all their possible tricks. Mahaffey +100 .

| West <br> Fredin | North <br> Pszczoła | East <br> Michielsen | South <br> Seamon |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | Pass | 4 |

Well bid and easily made on a heart lead when declarer took the finesse of dummy's Queen to get rid of the club loser. Mahaffey another +420 and II Imps.

On the next board, the Gotards found an interesting defence to beat $4 \oslash$ after declarer adopted a very curious line:

| Board 10. Dealer East. All Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - K 10975 |  |  |  |
| Q J 742 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ AK |  |  |  |
| - K 9 |  |  |  |
| - 43 | N |  | Q QJ 86 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 106 |  | $\bigcirc$ A 5 |  |
| $\checkmark 76532$ |  | $\checkmark$ Q 109 |  |
| \& 172 | - A 2 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | -K983 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 84 |  |  |
|  | 9 A Q 63 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Gotard_To | Madala | Gotard_B | Rimstedt |
|  |  | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ |
| Pass | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | 28 |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |

$1 \diamond$ showed spades and $2 \diamond$ was a further relay. East led a club to the Jack and King. Madala went on to run the

99 successfully before cashing the $\diamond A K$ followed by the 4 and When he tried to cash the next, West did not ruff but discarded his last spade instead. Now, West could ruff the spade from dummy and exit in diamonds. Declarer ruffed and led a low heart from hand, inserting dummy's eight rather than the King. West won the ten, let his partner ruff a diamond with the ace of trumps and then scored his 8 Q when East returned another spade. Nicely executed, one down and +100 to Pony.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ferraro | Th Gotard | Duboin | Eggeling |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \mathbf{2}$ |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{4}$ | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $2 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $3 \vee$ | Pass | $4 \oslash$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

2. was a further investigation and the normal contract was reached here as well. On the lead of $\vee A$ and another, there were no problems, +650 and 13 Imps to Pony.

Judging the right moment to throw in the towel was the problem on board II:

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.

|  | - AJ985 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AKJ 97 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 8$ |  |  |
|  | -87 |  |  |
| , - | N |  | ¢ 6 |
| QQ 10652 |  | $\bigcirc$ | 843 |
| $\diamond$ Q 9763 |  | E - |  |
| \& J 64 | S |  | K 10952 |
|  | - KQ107432 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K J 2 |  |  |
|  | * Q 3 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sandqvist | T Helness | N Senior | Helness |
|  |  |  | 14 |
| Pass | 2NT | 3\% | Pass |
| 5\% | D | Pass | 5 |
| Pass | $6{ }^{1}$ | All Pass |  |

In the Brogeland-De Botton match, the Helness couple was a little optimistic. 2NT was a good spade raise and passing would normally show higher aspirations too. This makes the eventual raise to 6 quite understandable, though not a shade less mistimed.

Down two, De Botton + 100 .

| West <br> Brogeland | North <br> Malinowski | East <br> Brogeland. | South DeBotton |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 19 |
| Pass | 2NT | 39 | 49 |
| 4NT | 5 | $6 \diamond$ | Dbl |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

When West could produce a two-suited fit-bid, East liked her hand so much that she even went for a slam. With 54 not on, this was a mistimed action too, albeit one even more spectacular than at the other table. Down three, another +500 and 12 Imps to De Botton.

In the Calandra-Pony match, there also was a big swing but not as a result of any serious misjudgement.

| West <br> Gotard_To | North <br> Madala | East <br> Gotard_B | South <br> Rimstedt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ | $4 \Omega$ | $5 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass |
| Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{e}$ | All Pass |  |

Two Spades showed 6+ and 10-14 hcp and South's Pass over 3\% showed aspirations. So Madala's 5eems the logical conclusion of the auction. One down, nevertheless, +50 to Pony.

Asking for aces is another way of treating the North


Marion Michielsen, Netherlands
hand. That's what Thomas Gotard (jr.) did with considerable success, as it induced a heart lead from West.

| West <br> Ferraro | North <br> Th Gotard | East <br> Duboin | South <br> Eggeling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 12 |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | $5 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | All Pass |  |

After this lead, Eggeling could draw trump and let a club loser disappear, thus making her contract in comfort. Pony +450 and a gain of II Imps to take the lead.

The auctions took different turns in the Mahaffey-Gottlieb match:

| West <br> Mahaffey | North <br> Larsson | East <br> Radin | South <br> Andersson |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2 2 |
| Pass | 2NT | $3 \Omega$ | 38 |
| 3NT | 49 | Dbl | Pass |
| $5 \%$ | Dbl | All Pass |  |

Well judged by Larsson (and by his partner as well). One down with 5 not on for them. Gottlieb +100 .

| West <br> Fredin | North Pszczoła | East <br> Michielsen | South <br> Seamon |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 19 |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | 34 | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |

Complete silence from EW made it easy for NS to find their proper spot. Mahaffey +420 and 8 Imps to them.

Board 13 showed the effect of an unorthodox lead. At most tables, West led a spade against the normal contract of 3NT by South. When declarer ducked this in dummy, the King would appear, solving all problems.

Board I3. Dealer North. All Vul.
\& AQ94
$\bigcirc 8$
$\diamond$ Q J 105
\& 9754

```
- J 10852
- J 92
\(\checkmark K 62\)
- 106
```


© K
○K 653
$\diamond 9874$
\& Q 832
¢ 763
$\checkmark$ A Q 1074
$\diamond A 3$
\& AKJ

| West <br> Sandqvist | North <br> $T$ Helness | East <br> $N$ Senior | South <br> Helness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | $1 Q$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

Sandqvist tried the effect of a low diamond lead. The Queen won in dummy and now, declarer left to her own resources, led a club to the Jack successfully. When the ex next drew the ten from West, she reverted to spades, dummy's Queen losing to the blank King. East returned a diamond putting South into trouble. She won the Ace perforce, cashed the 2 K and crossed to the c A , getting the bad news.A diamond then went to West's King. Three more spades then meant one down...De Botton +100 for this nice defence.

| West <br> Brogeland | North <br> Malinowski | East <br> Brogeland. | South <br> DeBotton |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | I 8 |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

At the other table, Boye Brogeland also led a low diamond to dummy's Queen but De Botton next played a heart to her Queen. A spade to the Queen and King followed and East returned a diamond. Another spade was led by declarer, West splitting his equals and declarer letting him hold the trick to make a favourable return. West did in fact return a low spade but declarer now inserted dummy's nine, cashed the last spade and played a club to the Jack.


Nevena Senior, England

Nine tricks. De Botton +600 and 12 Imps more to them, on their way to a big victory.

The last board of the set produced a big swing for Calandra when Mrs. Gotard found a rather unsuitable dummy:

Board I4. Dealer East. None Vul.

- A 8

QQJ 972
$\diamond 108742$
$\because 5$
¢K 10652
$\bigcirc 4$
$\diamond 6$
\& K J 9432

\& 94
$\odot$ AK 10653
$\diamond$ AKJ 5
28
© Q J 73
$\bigcirc 8$
$\diamond$ Q 93
\& A Q 1076

| West | North Madala | East <br> Gotard B | South <br> Rimstedt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 19 |  |
|  |  |  | Dbl |
| 14 | 2 - | Dbl | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dbl | All Pass |  |

The adverse auction strongly suggested diamond shortness in dummy but alas, there were also very few trumps. On the actual distribution, North had an easy double and the contract went down three, in spite of the favourable diamond lead. Calandra +500 .

| West <br> Ferraro | North Th Gotard | East Duboin | South <br> Egaeling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 18 | Dbl |
| 14 | $2 \triangleleft$ | Dbl | Pass |
| 3\% | Pass | 38 | Pass |
| 30 | All Pass |  |  |

Ferraro was not to be silenced that early with his pleasant two-suiter but when nobody doubled his activities, all was well for his side. He quietly went two down for 100 to Pony, but his side had recouped an all-important 9 Imps to trail by IImp at halftime. You will be able to read more about this match in a separate story in the Bulletin.


## Fast starters

by Brent Manley

Jeff Meckstroth already has a World Mixed Pairs title under his belt, and he came to Poznan hoping to add another Mixed Pairs gold medal to his collection playing with his wife, Sally Chapleau. They got off to a roaring start in the event, scoring nearly $70 \%$ in the opening session.
Before the session started, Meckstroth had one thing to say to his partner: "Go for the goal line, Honey. We want touchdowns, not field goals."
The first board out of the box would definitely have had the referee raising his arms.

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

|  | $\pm 965$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K 109 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 84 |  |
|  | \% Q 942 |  |
| ¢ K 1082 | N | ¢ 743 |
| QJ 84 |  | $\bigcirc$ A 7532 |
| $\checkmark$ Q 952 |  | $\diamond$ J 106 |
| 9 63 | S | ¢ AK |
|  | - A Q J |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 6 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 73 |  |
|  | ¢ J 10875 |  |
| West | North East | South |
|  | Meckstroth | Chapleau |
|  |  | INT |

Meckstroth and Chapleau play an opening INT range as 14-16, which worked out splendidly on this deal. At most tables, the bidding no doubt started with lo by South, ending with North as declarer in notrump. The opening heart lead would have solved the suit for declarer, but with two entries in clubs, it would have been easy for the defense to come to at least five tricks, more likely six.
Against INT by Chapleau, West started with a low spade, giving her the timing to get home with nine tricks.
She took the first trick with the jack and played a low club to dummy's queen. A spade back went to the queen and king, and West cleared the suit. Another club went to East's king. Chapleau won the diamond switch in hand and cashed her clubs, West discarding a low heart on the third round of clubs. Chapleau then guessed hearts, playing low to the 9 and East's ace. In the end, when she played the QK from dummy, dropping her queen, she also dropped West's jack. Plus 150 was good for $93.56 \%$ of the matchpoints.

Round three produced a bonanza of matchpoints for the Americans.

Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.

- 1097

คA87
$\diamond A J 93$
\& 543

- KQ 53
- Q 5
$\diamond$ Q 864
\& 1082


A 64

- K 42

1052
AK 96

- J 10963
$\diamond$ K 7
\& Q J 7

| West | North <br> Meckstroth | East | South <br> Chapleau |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pbl | Pass | $1 \mathbf{8}$ | 18 |
| $3 \$$ | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \vee$ |

Chapleau started with the 8 J and declarer played the queen. Meckstroth took the $\triangle \mathrm{A}$ and switched to a low diamond. Chapleau won the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ and continued the suit. Meckstroth took the $\triangleleft$ J, cashed the ace and continued with a fourth round of the suit. Declarer discarded a heart, and Chapleau ruffed. She got out with a spade, taken by declarer with the king. A club to declarer's ace fetched the queen from Chapleau, and declarer misguessed by playing a spade to dummy and running the 10 . That was two down for plus 100 , good for $91.18 \%$.
The next board was equally good - literally.
Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.


On this deal, $5{ }^{2}$ is cold, but 5$\rangle$ can be defeated by a heart lead. Against 54 doubled, Chapleau simply cashed her winners in clubs and hearts. Plus 100 gave them another $91.18 \%$ Heading into the final round, Meckstroth and Chapleau were standing at $65.49 \%$. It got better from there.

| Board 5. Dealer North. N/SVul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - K 54 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 853 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ A 96 |  |  |  |
| - K 43 |  |  |  |
| - A 108 | N |  | Q 19632 |
| $\bigcirc 1076$ |  |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{KJ}$ |
| $\checkmark$ K 1072 |  | E $\diamond$ | $\checkmark 183$ |
| - Q 72 | S |  | - A 98 |
| - Q 7 |  |  |  |
| P 942 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ Q 54 |  |  |  |
| * J 1065 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Meckstroth |  | Chapleau |
|  | 19 | 19 | Db |
| 2 | 3 | All Pass |  |

The opening spade lead went to the ace, and Meckstroth won the spade continuation in dummy with the queen. Meckstroth played the 8 A and a heart, ducked to East's king. East switched to the $\triangleleft$ : queen, king, ace. Meckstroth pulled the last trump with the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$, then discarded a diamond from dummy on the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$. He still had no legitimate way to make his contract, but when he played a low club from hand, East inexplicably went up with the ace to play a diamond to her partner. Meckstroth ruffed the diamond continuation in dummy and ran the to make plus 140 and $95.54 \%$ on the board.
On the final deal, the Americans dropped a trick on defense but still came out with a fine score.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
. 96
©KJ94

- 1042
- A 987


Meckstroth started with the 9 to the jack and queen. Chapleau cashed the $\mathbf{~ K}$ and could have assured two down for plus 500 by switching to a low club. Meckstroth could win the A, return a club to Chapleau's king and, with three trump tricks coming, North-South would score plus 500. Chapleau, however, continued at trick three with a low spade, on which declarer pitched a club. Meckstroth ruffed and cashed the $\mathbf{f A}$, so the result was plus 200 , good for $78.22 \%$.
In the second qualifying session, the Americans started slowly, although they did score very well on the third board of the set.

Board 19. Dealer South. E/WVul.

- 1083
$\bigcirc 832$
$\diamond 9875$
- QJ 7

$$
A 754
$$

$\otimes 9654$
$\diamond 2$
$+A 543$

\& K 962

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Meckstroth |  | Chapleau |
|  |  |  | 2 |
| Pass | 3 - | Dbl | $4 \diamond$ |
| 49 | Pass | 4NT | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | 5NT | Pass |
| 6\% | Pass | 69 | All Pass |

It's hard to blame East for getting excited by her partner's free bid of 4t after Chapleau cleverly furthered the preempt after her partner's raise. With the heart finesse wrong, however, there was no play for the slam. Plus 100 was good for $83.82 \%$ for North-South.

This board was not a winner for the Americans.

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

- A Q
© K Q J 62
$\diamond$ Q 10982
- 2
\& 104
$\vee$ A 873
$\diamond$ AK 64
$\&$ KJ 3

- 19875
$\bigcirc 9$
$\diamond 3$
A Q 8754

| West | North <br> Meckstroth | East | South <br> Chapleau |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INT | $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | $2 \boxtimes$ |
| Pass | $3 \triangleleft$ | All Pass |  |

Chapleau would have done better to try 24 rather than showing the heart preference with singletons in the red suits - and she can't have been happy to have been boosted to $3 \checkmark$ in her singleton.
West started with the $\diamond A$, switching to the $\$ 10$ at trick
two. The $₫ \mathrm{Q}$ lost to the king, and Chapleau won the club switch with the ace. She ruffed a club in dummy and ruffed a diamond with her singleton trump before playing a spade to the ace, followed by the $\triangle \mathrm{K}$. When she discarded on the $\bigcirc K$, all was clear to the defenders. West won the $\oslash A$, cashed the $\diamond K$ and gave his partner a diamond ruff. The result was two down for minus 200 and only $24.51 \%$ for North-South.

After two sessions, the two stood at $63 \%$.

## Another Dull Push?

## by Patrick Jourdain (Wales)

The Zimmerman team qualified for the round of 32 in the Mixed with 4 VP to spare. In scoring up their final match they knew only Board 2 was a "Push". It was only later that the full story of how it came about emerged:

|  | Board 2. Dealer East | N/S Vul. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - A Q 73 |  |
|  | -Q1054 |  |
|  | $\diamond 543$ |  |
|  | - Q 7 |  |
| - 19652 | N | - K 84 |
| $\bigcirc$ - |  | ¢J9876 |
| $\checkmark 1096$ | W E | $\checkmark 87$ |
| \& J 10963 | S | - A 52 |
|  | -10 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AK 32 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AKQJ 2 |  |
|  | \& K 84 |  |

Looking only at the North-South cards what contract would you wish to reach? Six Hearts and Six Diamonds both appear sensible, making on a reasonable lie in the red suits. Six Diamonds by North may be best as with hearts 4-I offside you can fall back on the spade finesse.
Philippe Cronier \& Catherine d'Ovidio, sitting NorthSouth for Zimmerman reached the sound spot of Six Hearts with this unopposed auction:

| South | North |
| :---: | :---: |
| d'Ovidio | Cronier |
| I $\downarrow$ | 18 |
| 3 c | $3 \vee$ |
| 38 | 3NT |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | 49 |
| 4NT | 5 |
| 68 | Pass |

D'Ovidio's $3 \oslash$ call only promised three-card support but when she removed $3 N T$ to $4 \checkmark$ it guaranteed four and a stronger hand than taking the faster route to game. Hence Cronier's reason for moving on.
With a final spot of Six Hearts by North, East cashed the ace of clubs and sat back, giving a sympathetic sigh when
declarer saw the trump lie. "Two down" acknowledged Cronier for 100 to East-West.
North-South at the other table had what seemed an inferior but more successful auction:

| South | North |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2\% | $2 \diamond$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | 49 |
| 4NT | 5 |
| Pass |  |

Actually the auction did not finish at Five Diamonds by North because when this came round to Pierre Zimmerman in theWest seat he made a smart double to conclude matters. The message was not lost on Benedicte Cronier in the East seat. She led her lowest heart. West ruffed and had no problem returning a club to East's ace. A second heart ruff set the impregnable-looking game by one trick. 100 to EastWest again.
Thanks in part to this "Push" Zimmerman won the match 24-6 and moved up eight places into a qualifying spot.


Philippe Cronier, France

## STRACONE SZANSE

Po eliminacjach teamów mikstowych, dwie nasze młode drużyny - Connector (Natalia Sakowska - Piotr Butryn, Danuta Kazmucha - Cezary Serek, Danuta Hocheker Mirosław Cichocki) oraz Couples (Grażyna Busse - Piotr Busse, Katarzyna Dufrat - Michał Nowosadzki, Joanna Taczewska - Mikołaj Taczewski) uplasowały się na wysokich pozycjach, co dało im szanse na w miarę sprzyjający wybór przeciwników w pierwszej rundzie play off, do której przystąpiło 32 drużyny.
Connector trafił na drużynę Badger, składającą się głównie z graczy z Wielkiej Brytanii. Już w pierwszym rozdaniu Polacy zarobili II imp:


Danuta Kazmucha, Poland

Para brytyjska wybrała jako kontrakt finalny 5 5 , obłożone na przebitce kier. Nasi znaleźli drogę do końcówki kierowej:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Butryn | Sakowska |  |  |
|  | Pas | IV | pas |
| 2\% | pas | $2 \diamond$ | pas |
| 24 | pas | 3 - | pas |
| 38 | pas | $4 \bigcirc$ | pas... |

Po naturalnym początku, $3 \diamond$ sprzedało układ 5-5, a 3 § było elastyczną odzywka, wskazująca wątpliwości, co do tego, w jaki kolor grać... Z kartą E takich wątpliwości nie było.

Niestety, chwilę później nastąpiła strata 10 imp. Popatrzmy... Przeciwnik z lewej otwiera $\ \diamond$, partner wchodzi IBA w niekorzystnych założeniach. Co licytujemy z kartą: ¢K43 88753 〇K63 © Q 102 Cezary Serek spasował, a Brytyjczyk zainwitował. Oto całość rozdania:

Rozdawał N NS po partii
, K 43
ค 8753
$\diamond$ K 63
\& Q 102

- Q 96

ค 1096
$\diamond 72$
59643

Po ataku w trefla 3BA z ręki $S$ nie idzie -W musi dojść do fort treflowych pikiem... Ale trudno dziwić się, że $S$ inwit przyjął, a Piotr Butryn zaatakował w karo. Po tym wiście rozgrywający miał prostą drogę do 9 lew. 10 imp straty.

Obserwowałem to rozdanie w meczu Lavazza - Balti. Obaj gracze $N$ - Bocchi i Sarkanas zalicytowali 3BA.Wydaje się to lekkim przelicytowaniem, ale partner wchodzi w niekorzystnych, a końcówka popartyjna...

Do przerwy Connector przegrywał 10 imp. W pierwszych 13 rozdaniach drugiej części odrobili wszystkie straty, prowadząc przed ostatnim 62-57.

Drugi z naszych młodych teamów - „Couples" - zmagał
się z dwoma mikstami z Rumunii. Po 14 rozdaniach było 1917 dla naszych. Druga połowa była bardziej dynamiczna. Już w pierwszym rozdaniu nasi dołożyli 6 imp dzięki lepszej grze w strefie częściówki:


II lew, I50 dla Couples

| West | North | East <br> J.Taczewska |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |



Joanna Taczewska, Poland

8 lew, 90 i 6 imp dla Couples
Potem nastąpił gruby, aczkolwiek nie bardzo zasłużony zysk w dynamicznym rozdaniu 25 :

Rozdawał NWE po partii

- A Q 8
$\bigcirc 10$
$\diamond$ JIO 964
\& 8753

| $\begin{aligned} & \perp K J 97654 \\ & \vee A K 843 \end{aligned}$ | N |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | W E | - QJ 9 |
| $\diamond$ - |  | $\diamond$ AKQ 8 |
| -6 | S | \& $\mathrm{AKOJ}^{2}$ |
|  | - 32 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 7652$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 7532$ |  |
|  | \& 1094 |  |

Rumuni wybrali sobie nie najlepszy kolor do gry:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P.Busse | G.Busse |  |  |
| Pas | 2\% | pas |  |
| 24 | pas | 3 3 | pas |
| 38 | pas | 3BA | pas |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | pas | 5 | pas |
| 5BA | pas | 64 | pas.. |

Dwie lewe atutowe się należałł... 100 dla WE.
Taczewscy byli tu bardzo ostrożni:

| West <br> M. Taczewski | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pas | $1 \%$ | pas |
| 19 | pas | 2\% | pas |
| 21 | pas | $3 \checkmark$ | pas |
| 34 | pas | 3BA | pas... |

ale zwycięzców się nie sądzi, przynajmniej nie w tym momencie. W każdym razie w tym rozdaniu Couples wygrali 13 imp .

W tym momencie prowadziliśmy 45-27, a do końca zostało tylko trzy rozdania. Można było być jak najlepszej myśli, ale...

## Duplimate Discounts

The Duplimate dealing machines used at these championships will be sold at the end of the event with a $20 \%$ discount. Visit the Jannersten Bookshop on the first floor.

Rozd.26. Rozdawał E. Obie po partii.

|  | ¢ K 5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 93 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 9752$ |  |
|  | - A 1032 |  |
| - J 64 | N | ¢ Q 32 |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 10$ | W E | $\bigcirc$ A 4 |
| $\diamond 8643$ |  | $\checkmark$ AKJ 10 |
| 2KJ97 | S | \& Q 654 |
|  | ¢ A 10987 |  |
|  | ¢ J 87652 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q |  |
|  | 98 |  |


| West | North <br> P.Busse | East | South <br> G.Busse |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2\& |  | IBA | pas |
| 2BA | pas | $2 \triangleleft$ | pas |
|  | pas | 3BA | pas... |

Grażyna Busse zaatakowała w kiera. Rozgrywająca wzięła na asa, ściągnęła asa karo, z zadowoleniem notując spadnięcie damy i zagrała trefla do waleta. Być może po przepuszczeniu miałaby większe szanse nie trafić, gdzie jest długość treflowa, gdyż S, który miał singla karo, nie wkroczył do licytacji... N jednak zabił i ponowił kiera. Król ze stołu, po czym kara... Teraz trefl do króla wyjaśnił problem trefli -


Piotr Busse, Poland
swoje. 600 dla Rumunów.

| West <br> M.Taczewski | North | East <br> J.Taczewska | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| ktr. | $2 \vee$ | IBA | $2 \mathbf{p a s}^{\prime}$ |
| 2BA | pas | pas | pas |
|  |  | $3 \mathbf{2}$ | pas... |
| I) starsze |  |  |  |

Rozgrywająca zaimpasowała w pierwszej lewie kara i w efekcie tego przegrała bez jednej. 12 imp dla Rumunii. Przed ostatnim rozdaniem nasi nadal prowadzili, ale już tylko różnicą 6 imp.

Popatrzmy na nie; było ono brzemienne w skutkach w obu meczach:


Na obu stołach grano 3BA z ręki N.Taczewska wistowała po nieinformacyjnej licytacji i zaatakował w kolor swojej lepszej czwórki - kiery. Rozwiązało to wszystkie problemy rozgrywającego. Na drugim stole S sprzedała układ 54 i E wyszła siódemką trefl. Dama, król, i Busse przepuścił. W kontynuował trefla. Rozgrywający wziął i zagrał cztery razy w karo, a $W$ po lewie na waleta zagrał bezlitośnie w pika, kładąc kontrakt bez jednej.

W drugim meczu to rozdanie było równie brzemienne w skutki. Serek rozgrywał 3BA z ręki N po ataku treflowym i przepuścił króla, położonego na damę. W kontynuował trefle i rozgrywający, przed karami, postanowił zwiększyć nieco swoje szanse, grając asa kier i kiera... gdy nie trafił, impasując waleta, wobec podziału kar 4-2, kontrakt został przegrany. Na drugim stole kontrakt był grany z ręki S i W zaatakował w trefle, dając od razu dziewiątą lewę... 12 imp dla przeciwników...

W ten sposób to rozdanie zakończyło marzenia obu naszych teamów o medalach... Ale może dzień odpoczynku przed parami poprawi szanse w tym turnieju?

## MIXED TEAMS ROSTER

ADAMS FAMILY
AKIN
ALBERTI
APACHE
ASPE TEAM
ASYA
AUBONNET
AUSTRIA
BADGER
BAILEY
BALTI
BATOV
BERIK
BILSKI
BINDERKRANTZ
BIRMAN
bLUE ROSE
BROGELAND
BURLA
CALANDRA
CEDEVITA
CHINA TRINERGY
CK ZYRARDOW
CMN
COMHAR
CONNECTOR
COUPLES
CZAJKA
DE BOTTON
DENMARK
DESPERATE BRIDGEWIVES
DHONDY
DUCK N DALES
ECHO
EIDE
FANTONI
FINLAND
FISCHER
FOX \& FOXY
GEWANNA
GOLDCAT
GOTTLIEB
GREEN EYES
HALSINGLAND

Lubomir IGNATOV,Todor KOSTADINOV, Pavlina MINEVA, Cvetanka NALBATSKA Sevil AKIN, Belis ATALAY, Fikret AYTOGDU, Krzysztof JASSEM, Andrzej WITKOWSKI Anja ALBERTI, Nikolas BAUSBACK, Martin LOEFGREN, Elke WEBER, Fried WEBER Alexander BUDAEV, Ferda CAKICI, Svetlana KOVTUN, Erdem OZTURK A. JAROSZ, I. JAROSZ, Cezary KRZEMINSKI, Marta OSTROWSKA, J. OSTROWSKI, M. PAWLOWSKA Mehmet Remzi SAKIRLER, Netsy SAYER, Umran SEMERCI, Zahari ZAHARIEV Brigitte AUBONNET, Christophe CARDE,Anne-Marie COLOMBARO, Jean-Yves DANIC Dietlind ANGEBRANDT, Peter LEITNER, Eva PICHLER, Bernard UTNER Jeffrey ALLERTON, Frances HINDEN, Paula LESLIE, Graham OSBORNE Kirsten BAILEY, Gavin BAILEY, Dick RUTTER, Jane RUTTER Giedre JANKUNAITE, Maija ROMANOVSKA, Karlis RUBINS, Giedrius SARKANAS Victor ARONOV, Vasil BATOV, Marina PILIPOVIC, Ahu ZOBU Dan BYLUND, Bengt-Erik EFRAIMSSON, Helena STROMBERG, Anna ZACK EINARSSON George BILSKI, Owen CAMP, Anisia SHAMI, Mischa SOLAR Nadia BEKKOUCHE, Trine BINDERKRANTZ, Johan UPMARK,Thomas VANG-LARSEN Daniela BIRMAN, David BIRMAN, Ewa SOBOLEWSKA, Marek SZYMANOWSKI Peycho CHOLAKOV, Beata CZACHOR, Stefan GEORGIEV, Svetla NENOVA Tonje Aasand BROGELAND, Boye BROGELAND, Tor HELNESS, Gunn HELNESS Monica AGHEMO, Andrea BURATTI, Cristina GOLIN, Massimo LANZAROTTI Emanuela CALANDRA, E. DUBOIN, Guido FERRARO,A. MADALA, Cecilia RIMSTEDT,A. SEMENTA Ben HANDLEY-PRITCHARD, S. HAVLICEK, Lara RUSO,T. SCEPANOVIC, Nikica SVER, Miro TESLA Meng KANG, Dong LU, Shaolin SUN, Yanhong WANG, Ru YAN Barbara JAROTA, Teresa OLCZYK, Lechoslaw PIOTROWSKI, Jaroslaw ROMANIUK Lars KORSHOLM, Claus LUND, Lone MORTENSEN, Maria Dam MORTENSEN Karel DE RAEYMAEKER, Anna ONISHUK, Lucy PHELAN, John PHELAN Piotr BUTRYN, M. CICHOCKI, D. HOCHEKER, Danuta KAZMUCHA, N. SAKOWSKA, Cezary SEREK Piotr BUSSE, Grazyna BUSSE, K. DUFRAT, M. NOWOSADZKI, J.TACZEWSKA, Mikolaj TACZEWSKI I. CZAJKA, Piotr ILCZUK, P. KLIMENTOWSKA, L. LESZCZYNSKA, B. SZULEJEWSKI,Witold TOMASZEK Janet DE BOTTON,Artur MALINOWSKI, Nicklas SANDQVIST, Nevena SENIOR Michael ASKGAARD, Bjarke FRIIS, Christina Lund MADSEN, Marianne RASMUSSEN Loek FRESEN, M. GROMOELLER, Anne GROMOELLER,A. KIRMSE, Ria KUERSCHNER, Waltraud VOGT H. DHONDY, Jeremy DHONDY, Olga DLUGOSZ, Ewa KATER,Tom TOWNSEND, Jakub WOJCIESZEK Brian CALLAGHAN, Simon COPE, Christine DUCKWORTH, Susan STOCKDALE C. BALDYSZ, M. JELENIEWSKA, H. KOWALSKA, P. LUTOSTANSKI, A. MAJCHER, Piotr TUSZYNSKI Margot ALFHEIM, Ivar M. ANFINSEN, Magne EIDE, Hilde LARSEN, Eli SOLHEIM, Trygve UNDEM Mihaela BALINT, Fulvio FANTONI, Jan JANSMA, Claudio NUNES, Iolanda RIOLO, Aida SALDZIEVA Tiina ELSINEN, Antti ELSINEN, Pia ERKKILA, Kauko KOISTINEN Valerie CARCASSONNE-LABAERE, Doris FISCHER, Alain LABAERE, Bernd SAURER Tuna ALUF, Namik KOKTEN, Mehves PISAK, M.Gokhan YILMAZ B. GIERULSKI, Ewa HARASIMOWICZ, M. LESNIEWSKI,A.SARNIAK, M. SAWICKA, Leszek SZTYRAK Lars GOLDBERG, Ulla-Britt GOLDBERG,Thomas MAGNUSSON, Catarina MIDSKOG Pia ANDERSSON, Peter FREDIN, Gary GOTTLIEB, B. KUZSELKA,Arne LARSSON, Marion MICHIELSEN Bogdan MARINA, Radu MIHAI, Geta MIHAI, Marina STEGAROIU Pernilla ANDREASSON, Kjell HOLMGREN, Per NETSMAN, Eva NETSMAN

HANNA
HANSEN
MANO
HARDING
HAUGE
HEARTS
HEIDEMARIE
HERBST
HOYLAND
ISTANBUL
ISTANBUL 2
JACOB
JANKOVA
KARL MORTEN LUNNA
KENNY
KHANDELWAL
LADY
LAMFORD
LANGER
LAST ARRIVAL
LAVAZZA
LEDGER
MAHAFFEY
MCGOWAN
MMMM
NEVE
NOR-WEST
NYA BRIDGESKOLAN
PAYEN
PENFOLD
PONY
ROSSARD
RUSSIA
SEALE
SLOVENIA
SONATA
STAHL
TEAM BANZAI
TEAM MATE
THE LOW COUNTRIES
VRIEND
VYTAS
WALSH
WILD GRIFFINS
ZARKESCH
ZIMMERMANN
L. BAROUDI, Nagib BAROUDI, F. FARHAT, Nahla HAMDAN,A. HANNA,A.M. NASR (npc), Charles NASR
A. BABSCH, H.BERGER, J. CAPPELLER, G. CAPPELLER, Renate HANSEN, Ulrike SCHRECKENBERGER-
I. CHAMMAA, R. DANCEWICZ, A.HYCNAR, K. MARTENS, R.WAJDOWICZ, Tomasz WINCIOREK Fiona BROWN, Tom HANLON, Marianne HARDING, Hugh McGANN
A.K. FUGLESTAD, R. HAUGE, Geir HELGEMO, A. MALINOWSKI, D. B. POPOVA, Erik SAELENSMINDE

Yury KHIUPPENEN,Vadim KHOLOMEEV,Tatiana NOKHAEVA,Tatiana TAZENKOVA
Hartmut KONDOCH, Pawel MALECKI, Joanna SROKA, Justyna STANKIEWICZ, Maria WUERMSEER
Ronnie BARR, Ilan HERBST, Michal NOSATZKI, Natali SAADA, Yaniv ZACK
J. FENESS, Lisbeth GLAERUM, M. HOMME, Egil HOMME, Sven Olai HOYLAND, Kjell Otto KOPSTAD Zeynep ALP, Okay GUR, Ismail KANDEMIR, Sevil NUHOGLU
Hakan PEYRET, Melih Osman SEN, Tezcan SEN, Inci SUT, Julide YARDIMCI
Susan HUMPHRIES, Tom JACOB, Stephanie JACOB, Nick JACOB
Jana JANKOVA, Michal KOPECKY, Milan MACURA, Jeanette REITZER
V. CHEDIAK, Liv Marit GRUDE, L.A. JOHANSEN, Even MORKEN, B. N. OIGARDEN, S. F. SIMONSEN Danielle AVON, Joan KENNY, Marshall LEWIS, Jean-Michel VOLDOIRE
D. FORGE, H. KHANDELWAL, Rajeev KHANDELWAL, J. SMEDEREVAC,V.VENTOS, Sascha WERNLE Claudia LUESSMANN, Ingo LUESSMANN, Michael SCHNEIDER, Gisela SMYKALLA
Paul LAMFORD, Roberta PEIRCE, Stefanie ROHAN, Lorenzo STOPPINI
Marek DRUKIER, Hans-Herman GWINNER, Uschi HUSTEN, Darina LANGER
Igor KHAZANOV, Edite KLIDZEJA, Maria LEBEDEVA, Dmitri PROKHOROV
Sabine AUKEN, N. BOCCHI, M. CUZZI, G. DUBOIN, Maria Teresa LAVAZZA, Massimo ORTENSI (coach) Maureen HANNAH, Sue LANE, Jimmy LEDGER, Paul TAPSTER

Sam LEV, Irina LEVITINA, Jim MAHAFFEY, Jacek PSZCZOLA, Judi RADIN, Janice SEAMON-MOLSON
David LIGGAT, Elizabeth (Liz) McGOWAN, Stephen PETERKIN, Sam PUNCH
Andrzej KUSION, Marzena KWIECINSKA-WILK, Magdalena LEPIARCZYK, Maciej STEFANIUK
Jean Francois ALLIX, Joanna NEVE, Vanessa REESS, Jerome ROMBAUT
Geir ENGEBRETSEN, Tove HAUGEN, Herold KRAAKENES, Jonill STOROY
Krister AHLESVED, Catharina FORSBERG, Per-Arne KARLSSON,Anna ROOS KARLSSON
Marion CANONNE, Daniele GAVIARD, Bernard PAYEN, Philippe SOULET, Patrick SUSSEL
Atanas IVANOV, Steliana IVANOVA, Sandra PENFOLD, Brian SENIOR
Marie EGGELING, B. GOTARD,T. GOTARD, Thomas GOTARD, Pony Beate NEHMERT, Michael YUEN W. FRUKACZ,A. KOWALSKI, Ewa MISZEWSKA, Giulia NASTASE, J. ROMANOWSKI, Martine ROSSARD Alexander DUBININ,Andrey GROMOV,Victoria GROMOVA,Tatiana PONOMAREVA David GOLD, Susanna GROSS, Neil ROSEN, Catherine SEALE
Milojka AMBROZ, Bojan AMBROZ, B. DRINOVEC DRNOVSEK, A. JESENICNIK, Tolja ORAC, M. ZADEL
Arunas JANKAUSKAS, Jurgita ROTOMSKIENE, Sonata SIMANAITIENE, Albertas TYLA
Birgit FAEHR, Ingrid GROMANN, Rob HELLE,WoIf STAHL
David A JACKSON, jill KULCHYCKY, Brendan J O BRIEN, Teresa RIGNEY
Mats ALLGOWER, Torbjorn KAREKE, Agneta KAREKE, Ella OLSSON
Tine DOBBELS, Linda MOLLE, Marco TER LAARE, Rutger VAN MECHELEN
Carla ARNOLDS, Ton BAKKEREN, Huub BERTENS, Anton MAAS, Martine VERBEEK, Bep VRIEND
A.ARLOVICH, S. BADRANKOVA, G. BREWIAK, E.A. GRABOWSKA, G. NARKIEWICZ,V.VAINIKONIS

Brian KEABLE, Kitty O SHEA, Joe WALSH, Maria WHELAN
Tatiana DIKHNOVA, Anna GULEVICH, Max KHVEN, Sergei ORLOV
Robert BOEDDEKER, Berthold ENGEL, Claudia VECHIATTO, Flora ZARKESCH
P. CRONIER, B. CRONIER, C. D OVIDIO, Franck MULTON, Sylvie WILLARD, Pierre ZIMMERMANN

## MIXED PAIRS - QUALIFYING

(standings after 5 sessions - subject to confirmation)

| Rank | Names Per | ercentage | 51 | S PETERKIN - S PUNCH | 53.41 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | R DANCEWICZ - TWINCIOREK | 64.55 | 52 | R RITMEIJER - M TICHA | 53.22 |
| 2 | C BALDYSZ - P TUSZYNSKI | 62.06 | 53 | M ASKGAARD - C L MADSEN | 53.17 |
| 3 | M JELENIEWSKA - P LUTOSTANSKI | 61.97 | 54 | G BREWIAK - G NARKIEWICZ | 53.17 |
| 4 | M GROMOELLER - R KUERSCHNER | 60.10 | 55 | P KARLSSON - A ROOS KARLSSON | 53.11 |
| 5 | D FISCHER - B SAURER | 60.09 | 56 | S GEORGIEV - S NENOVA | 53.10 |
| 6 | D BIRMAN - D BIRMAN | 59.93 | 57 | M MAJ-RUDNICKA - J MOSZYNSKI JR | 52.97 |
| 7 | A GROMOELLER - A KIRMSE | 59.42 | 58 | I GROMANN - R HELLE | 52.87 |
| 8 | A ARLOVICH - S BADRANKOVA | 59.41 | 59 | F CAKICI - E OZTURK | 52.81 |
| 9 | P BAHNIK - E BAHNIKOVA | 58.06 | 60 | B EFRAIMSSON - A ZACK EINARSSON | 52.78 |
| 10 | M R SAKIRLER - U SEMERCI | 57.85 | 61 | A KUPCZYK - R WACHOWIAK | 52.77 |
| 11 | N BEKKOUCHE - J UPMARK | 57.72 | 62 | M O SEN - I SUT | 52.77 |
| 12 | N FREY - J ROMBAUT | 57.61 | 63 | Z ALP - O GUR | 52.68 |
| 13 | E A GRABOWSKA -VVAINIKONIS | 57.33 | 64 | K LATOSZEWSKI - A MANDECKA | 52.54 |
| 14 | M S LUPU - S LUPU | 57.00 | 65 | T SCEPANOVIC - N SVER | 52.50 |
| 15 | M BALINT - C NUNES | 56.91 | 66 | D TOKAJ-WOJTCZUK - R WOJTCZUK | 52.46 |
| 16 | B AMBROZ - M AMBROZ | 56.90 | 67 | C GIAMPIETRO - Y YeNER | 52.42 |
| 17 | K DE RAEYMAEKER - A ONISHUK | 56.73 | 68 | T KACZANOWSKI-H SWIECH | 52.41 |
| 18 | E BANASZKIEWICZ - F SVINDAHL | 56.16 | 69 | $\checkmark$ BATOV - M PILIPOVIC | 52.39 |
| 19 | E MAUBERQUEZ -V REESS | 56.09 | 70 | J MACHOTKA - N MERCAN | 52.23 |
| 20 | E KONDAKCI SEN - T SEN | 55.81 | 71 | H DHONDY - J DHONDY | 52.22 |
| 21 | $\checkmark$ CARCASSONNE-LABAERE - A LABAERE | - 55.81 | 72 | P KARLYKOV - M TETYUSHEVA | 52.21 |
| 22 | E SOBOLEWSKA - M SZYMANOWSKI | 55.67 | 73 | T KOSTADINOV - C NALBATSKA | 52.10 |
| 23 | W KWIATKOWSKI - E MIELCARZEWICZ | 55.66 | 74 | O DLUGOSZ - J WOJCIESZEK | 52.09 |
| 24 | E KATER - T TOWNSEND | 55.58 | 75 | P CLAIR - C PAGNINI-ARSLAN | 52.06 |
| 25 | I KANDEMIR - S NUHOGLU | 55.50 | 76 | J YARDIMCI - H PEYRET | 52.03 |
| 26 | J JANSMA - A SALDZIEVA | 55.23 | 77 | B JAKUBOWSKA - P KORECKI | 51.97 |
| 27 | H KLUKOWSKA - M TERPILOWSKI | 55.19 | 78 | A BUCZEK - W SIUDA | 51.93 |
| 28 | A HYCNAR - R WAJDOWICZ | 55.09 | 79 | J O HENNEBERG - M KIRSTAN | 51.77 |
| 29 | M SAUTAUX - R SZCZEPANSKI | 55.00 | 80 | P ANDREASSON - K HOLMGREN | 51.69 |
| 30 | O SVOBODA - P SVOBODOVA | 54.95 | 81 | E HOMME - M HOMME | 51.60 |
| 31 | S CHAPLEAU - J MECKSTROTH | 54.90 | 82 | C LUND - M D MORTENSEN | 51.57 |
| 32 | M WOZNIAK - E RODZIEWICZ-BIELEWICZ | Z 54.77 | 83 | M DRUKIER - U HUSTEN | 51.54 |
| 33 | A KOWALSKA - M TYRAN | 54.74 | 84 | M FAYAD - G HARFOUCHE | 51.52 |
| 34 | V LESKELA - K VIRTANEN | 54.70 | 85 | J FENESS - K O KOPSTAD | 51.46 |
| 35 | B JAROTA - J ROMANIUK | 54.61 | 86 | D AVON - JVOLDOIRE | 51.37 |
| 36 | I CZAJKA - B SZULEJEWSKI | 54.61 | 87 | S HAVLICEK - M TESLA | 51.27 |
| 37 | D BYLUND - H STROMBERG | 54.60 | 88 | A JANKAUSKAS - J ROTOMSKIENE | 51.26 |
| 38 | S SIMANAITIENE - A TYLA | 54.53 | 89 | M AGHEMO - A BURATTI | 51.21 |
| 39 | Y KHIUPPENEN - T TAZENKOVA | 54.52 | 90 | S HUMPHRIES - N JACOB | 51.13 |
| 40 | R JUNIK - J ZIETARA | 54.17 | 91 | M ALLGOWER - E OLSSON | 50.98 |
| 41 | S DISSARD - G J PAULISSEN | 54.09 | 92 | L IGNATOV - P MINEVA | 50.91 |
| 42 | N SAADA - Y ZACK | 53.93 | 93 | J F ALLIX - J NEVE | 50.90 |
| 43 | C KRZEMINSKI - M OSTROWSKA | 53.85 | 94 | R PACHTMAN - R RONEN | 50.79 |
| 44 | R KOWALEWSKI - K TYSZKIEWICZ | 53.83 | 95 | $\checkmark$ CHEDIAK - E MORKEN | 50.76 |
| 45 | G BILSKI - M SOLAR | 53.77 | 96 | J JANKOVA - M MACURA | 50.75 |
| 46 | D A JACKSON - T RIGNEY | 53.73 | 97 | J KENNY - M LEWIS | 50.56 |
| 47 | C CURTIS - P FEGARTY | 53.56 | 98 | M LOEFGREN - EWEBER | 50.52 |
| 48 | H KOWALSKA - A MAJCHER | 53.54 | 99 | L KUZNIATSOVA - A TIMAKHOVICH | 50.44 |
| 49 | M KOPECKY - J REITZER | 53.54 | 100 | J KLIMCZAK - D KRUPNIK | 50.42 |
| 50 | T BESSIS -V BESSIS | 53.44 | 101 | L ATALIK - S ATALIK | 50.30 |

$\left.\begin{array}{lllll}\text { I02 } & \text { L SZKUDLAREK - O ZABULEWICZ } & 50.26 & 156 & \text { M CATELLANI - V BIANCHI } \\ \text { I03 } & \text { FVANHOUTTE - PVANHOUTTE } & 50.26 & 157 & \text { J ERDEOVA - J MASEK } \\ \text { I04 } & \text { C GOLIN - M LANZAROTTI } & 50.19 & 158 & \text { T OLCZYK - L PIOTROWSKI }\end{array}\right] 446.73$

0 Sthomectro.<br>$-{ }^{-}$
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[^0]:    The 5th European Open Bridge Championships
    

    Morning Snackbox:
    Take-away Snackbox, Coffee/Tea
    35 PLN
    Lunch:
    from $12^{30}$ until $14^{\circ 0}$ Lunch Buffet in Fusion
    Restaurant. Wide range of hot and cold dishes and non-alcoholic beverages

    Everyday from $18^{\circ 0}$ SomePlace Else invites you for a party!!!

    Live music, delicious Tex-Mex cuisine, SPEcial drinks and cocktails, open-air barbecue

    SHERATON POZNAN HOTEL
    Bukowska 3/9, ©0-809 Poznan
    Tel: (48) 61655 2000, Fax: (48) 616552001

