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Final Destination


The Daily Bulletin's new proofreader

There is an old Russian proverb that says, 'lt is better to travel hopefully than to arrive'. That will come true for one of the finalists in today's Mixed Teams, as Zimmermann faces Vriend in what promises to be an exciting match. The losing semifinalists, Badger and Mahaffey receive the bronze medals.

Mixed Pairs Finals
Players eliminated from semifinals A \& B intending to play in Final B must register at least half an hour before the start of play. 21-27 Pairs will qualify from semifinal A to Final A and they will be joined by 3 Pairs from semifinal B.

Maurizio Di Sacco - Championship Manager

Today's - Schedule
10.00 Mixed Pairs Semi-final A\&B (R3)
10.30 Mixed Teams Final (RI)
12.00 Mixed Pairs Semi-final A\&B (R4)
14.00 Mixed Teams Final (R2)
15.00 Mixed Pairs Semi-final A\&B (R5)
16.40 Mixed Teams Final (R3)
17.00 Mixed Pairs Semi-final A\&B (R6)
19.00 Mixed Pairs Semi-final A\&B (R7)

## MIXED TEAMS

| ROUND OF8 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | Ist | 2nd | total |
|  | MAHAFFEY | 46 | 46 | 92 |
|  | HARDING | 18 | 8 | 26 |
| 2 | GREEN EYES | 17 | 23 | 40 |
|  | VRIEND | 45 | 19 | 64 |
| 3 | BADGER | 34 | 23 | 57 |
|  | RUSSIA | 33 | 18 | 51 |
| 4 | WILD GRIFFINS | 37 | 8 | 45 |
|  | ZIMMERMANN | 32 | 30 | 62 |


| ROUND OF 4 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Ist | 2nd | total |
| I | MAHAFFEY | 8 | 5 | 13 |
|  | VRIEND | 9 | 26 | 35 |
| 2 | ZIMMERMANN | 8 | 39 | 47 |
|  | BADGER | 10 | 18 | 28 |

## Did you read the Bulletin at brealkfast? <br> by Patrick Jourdain (Wales)

The first hand in yesterday's Bulletin referred to the player holding:
4 986432
$\bigcirc 74$
$\diamond$ K Q 874

At love all RHO opens a two-suited Two Hearts, raised to Four by LHO and Passed back to you. Do you bid? Much sympathy was expressed for the choice of Four Spades but, alas, LHO held both black suits and the opener had five diamonds, so the outcome was -II00.
For those who had read the Bulletin at breakfast they may have had a feeling of foreboding when the second board of play in the Mixed Teams quarterfinal presented West with this decision:


Graham Osborne, England

You hold

```
$ -
\ J 6
\diamondK6432
&1098643
```

At favourable vulnerability partner opens One Heart and then the auction goes Two Spades from South on your right raised to Four by North and passed back to you. Do you act? Undaunted, Graham Osborne of Badger in the match with Russia re-entered with Four Notrumps.
Osborne must have felt things were going badly when North doubled and partner selected Five Hearts which was also doubled. Your dummy does not look too useful. However this was the full deal:

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

- K 52
-A9 3
$\diamond A$ Q 98
- J 52
$4-$
8 J 6
$\diamond$ K 6432
21098643

- AJIO
$\bigcirc$ KQ 108752
$\triangleleft 75$
2 A
, Q 987643
$\checkmark 4$
$\diamond$ JIO
\& K Q 7
As you can see Four Spades is cold for North-South and worth 620 but both tables reached Five Hearts doubled.
On a trump lead Five Hearts doubled goes for 500 but at both tables a spade lead allowed declarer to escape for one down. The re-entry by Osborne achieved a flat board and a major improvement on allowing them to rest in Four Spades. Such decisions proved crucial in a match that was close from start to finish, with Badger emerging the victor by 4 IMPs.


## Vriend v Khandelwal Round of 16

by Mark Horton

Although these days I rarely have time to turn a card in anger (a considerable relief to many) it's always interesting to follow the fortunes of former partners and teammates. Austria's Sascha Wernle and Jovi Smederevac have the dubious distinction of falling into both categories, so I watched the first half of their team's match against Bep Vriend's powerful squad. Only three deals were significant:

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.


Q -
$\bigcirc$ A 85
$\diamond K J 1095$
\& A Q 982


| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bakkeren | Wernle | Arnolds | Smederevac |
|  |  | $4 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dbl | Pass | 5 |
| $5 \boldsymbol{s}$ | Pass | Pass | Dbl |
| All Pass |  |  |  |



Bep Vriend, Netherlands

Four Spades would not be everyone's choice and when South bid Five Hearts, West had an awkward decision to make. The combination of a spade lead and the trump position mean that ten tricks is the limit in hearts. Five Spades had four obvious losers, and the defenders made no mistake, +300 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Forge | Maas | Ventos | Vriend |
|  |  | 19, | $2 \bigcirc$ |
| 49 | 68 | All Pass |  |

Declarer ruffed the spade lead in dummy and cashed the ace of hearts. She came to hand with a club, ruffed a spade and played clubs, emerging with ten tricks, -200 and II IMPs.

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

| - A 10 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Q A Q 6432 |  |
| $\diamond 8$ |  |
| - 853 |  |
| N | ¢ K 753 |
|  | $\bigcirc 5$ |
| W E | $\checkmark$ AK 2 |
| S | 2KQJ96 |
| - QJ 62 |  |
| ¢ K 108 |  |
| $\diamond$ J 7654 |  |
| - 4 |  |

Open Room

| West <br> Bakkeren | North <br> Wernle | East <br> Arnolds | South <br> Smederevac |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 18 | Dbl | 19 |
| Pass | 48 | All Pass |  |

If you follow the style where a double of One Spade would show five spades (the idea being to expose a psych) then you are not too well placed on the West hand, your choice being to pass, as West did here, or bid a minor and with Five Clubs going only one down it happens to work well to bid Clubs.
East cashed the ace of diamonds and switched to her trump but declarer simply won and played a spade to the ten. East could win, but the was only one more trick for the defence, +420 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Forge | Maas | Ventos | Vriend |
| Pass | 18 | Dbl | $2 \bigcirc$ |
| Dbl* | $4 \bigcirc$ | Dbl | All Pass |

East knew partner held fewer than four spades and some values - is that enough to bid prefer Five Clubs to double? The jury is still out on that one, but +590 gaveVriend 5 IMPs.

| Board II. Dealer South. None Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - A 6 |  |  |  |
| PAJ96 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ K Q 42 |  |  |  |
| - 73 |  |  |  |
| - Q 985 | N |  | - 103 |
| $\bigcirc 832$ | W |  | $\bigcirc$ K Q 1074 |
| $\checkmark 5$ |  |  | 98 |
| \& KJ964 | W |  | 85 |
|  | - KJ742 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 5$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 10763$ |  |  |
|  | 4 AQ 2 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bakkeren | Wernle Arnolds |  | Smederevac |
|  | INT |  | Pass |
| Pass |  | Pass | 2)* |
| Pass | 2. | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The textbooks tell you that 5-4-2-2 hands are not suitable for INT and here North eventually paid a heavy price for missing the nine card fit in diamonds.
East led the queen of hearts and declarer won and played the king of diamonds. East won and switched to the eight of clubs, covered by the queen and king. West played a heart for the nine and ten and East switched to the five of clubs. Declarer took the ace and cashed his diamonds. Remarkably, West elected to discard two spades! Now declarer could cash the top spades for eleven tricks, but unsure of the club position and not unreasonably finding it impossible to believe that West would hand him the contract on a plate he cashed the ace of spades and then finessed to go two down, - 100 .

Closed Room

| West <br> Forge | North <br> Maas | East <br> Ventos | South <br> Vriend |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $2 \boldsymbol{*}^{*}$ |
| Pass | $2 \mathrm{NT}^{*}$ | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

When North discovered his partner's second suit was diamonds he stood not upon the order of his going but went at once to the excellent game. West made the unfortunate lead of a club and declarer was under no pressure at all.
Absent a black suit lead declarer is by no means certain to make Five Diamonds. Indeed, even with all the hands on view the winning lines on a red suit lead are not easy to see (a strip squeeze on West after a heart lead is one - the other after a diamond lead and two rounds of trumps I leave you to work out). +400 gave Vriend II IMPs and they led 22-I 2 at the half.

## It's your bulletin

When you are playing in a bridge tournament that lasts for a couple of weeks you can easily loose touch with what is going on in the rest of the world. Of course it is possible to get a newspaper (albeit a day late) and the Internet is perhaps the greatest innovation of modern times after the computer.
If you switch on the TV in your hotel room you are almost certain to find a news channel that is running 24 hours a day in a language you can understand.
But, my question is what exactly do you want to know while you are away from home? For example, are you a sports fan? (I can tell you that Roger Federer won his opening match at Wimbledon.) Perhaps you are worried about the economy? (Hopes that the Greek debt crisis could be resolved coupled with some strong company statements had the top share indices posting big gains by the close of play yesterday.) Perhaps you are interested in current affairs? (The BBC listed Russia crash may be pilot error, UK man held over website hacks, Deadly bombings hit central Iraq and Ice mission produces first map, amongst their top stories.)
Or, do you think that these things recede into the background while you are playing and that what you want to see in the Bulletin is what is going on in the tournament?
In 2006 I was in Turin for the Chess Olympiad. Remarkably the Daily Bulletin always contained only one game each day (annotated by a leading grandmaster). Can you imagine if we presented a Bulletin with only one deal?
So, gentle reader, if you can find a few moments from your crowded day, come and tell us what you would like to see in these pages. As Winston Churchill famously said, 'Give us the tools and we will finish the job.'


The Championships are honoured by the presence of the President of the World Bridge Federation, Gianarrigo Rona who arrived in Poznan yesterday.

## A study in scarlet (or 'blood all over the carpet')

by Barry Rigal

A couple of deals from the second half of the Mixed Teams round of 32 , grabbed my attention: here is your first chance to win or lose a match. This was from Ca -landra-Pony with Agustin Madala declarer.

Board I6. Dealer West. E/WVul.

- Q 2

คA943
$\diamond$ K 98764
\& 4
-KJ9853
Q 65
$\diamond$ Q 3

- 176

- 6

QQJ 87
$\diamond{ }^{\bullet} 52$
\& K 10983

- A 1074
© K 102
$\triangleleft A 10$
- A Q 52

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 乌$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 N T$ |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Pass | $6 \diamond$ |

All Pass


Agustin Madala, Italy

After an auction replete with overbids/misunderstandings (Rimstedt meant 4NT as quantitative, Madala read it as keycard) Madala arrived in a gruesome 6$\rangle$ contract, only to be rescued by East's unfortunate lead of the $\triangle \mathbf{Q}$ - and yes we've all led worse and had better results.

Madala in essence played simply for the hearts and clubs to behave perfectly by drawing trumps, and was defeated despite the fortunate lies of the minors. Even though the contract can be defeated, can you see how he could have left himself with a much better chance to succeed?

The answer is to win the heart in hand and finesse the club then play three rounds of diamonds (purists will note that at double-dummy West must unblock the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$ under the $\diamond A$ - but our margin is not large enough to publish the details of why that should be). This is the ending:


If (as you or I might do) West has discarded an encouraging spade, then it might require superhuman discretion for East to avoid exiting in that suit. If she does, declarer wins both black aces (pitching a spade), ruffs a spade to hand then settles in to run the trumps. In the four-card ending East will want to keep two clubs and three hearts and the laws require her to let something go. If she pitches a club declarer finesses in hearts to ruff out the clubs and dummy is good. If a heart, declarer finesses in hearts and cashes the QK and his hand is good.

Once the defender has seen the danger, he must break up the position by playing a second heart. That leaves dummy short of one critical entry for the ruffing-squeeze to work.

## 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.

Deal 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
$\triangle 9$
$\checkmark$ K Q 9
$\diamond$ AJIO 873
eJ 74

- K Q 62

ค 1082
$\diamond \mathrm{K}$ Q 6
\& 1096


- A 874

ค J 6
$\diamond 92$
\& A Q 853

The field in general managed to avoid the uninspiring game of 3NT (5 $\diamond$ and 5\% are little better) but Alfredo Versace played $3 N T$ as North on the lead of the unbid suit, a heart. He put up the jack, which held of course, and played a low diamond. When West split his honours, how should he have continued?

At the table, Versace in essence played for a defensive error by winning and continuing the attack on diamonds. West won and shifted to a heart, and East ducked to retain the defensive communications. That allowed Versace to cash out nine tricks without needing a finesse. Of course the defenders could have done better; but should Versace have played for his legitimate chances in diamonds by ducking the first one?


Alfredo Versace, Italy

And finally, hadWest ducked the first diamond, cutting declarer's communications, declarer could have shifted his attention to clubs at trick three. The extremely favourable lie in that suit would have led to nine tricks without needing anything further.

In one of the other close matches Badger-Connector, the young Polish team Connector picked up a game swing by leading a spade against North's 3NT to defeat it by two tricks, while making overtricks in the same contract on a heart lead.

With four deals to go Connector still led Badger by a small margin, as did Balti over Lavazza. Deal 25 had the potential to swing this (and indeed many other) matches.

Deal 25. Dealer North.. E/WVul.
, A Q 8
$\bigcirc 10$
$\diamond$ J 10964
\& 853


Of the 32 tables in play seven bravely bid all the way to game, while three pairs went minus in a grand slam. Additionally, for Team Pony against Calabra, Nehmert went down in $7 \diamond$ and this virtually levelled that match. But you can imagine her irritation at playing the grand slam from East on a club lead. Admittedly, a spade lead might have sunk the Grand Slam out of hand while a red-suit lead lets it through trivially, but after the club lead, taking out the only entry to the strong hand, E/W must have felt extremely aggravated to run into the 4-I trump break which was what was required to prevent her from bringing home 13 tricks!). Two went down in 64, leaving 20 tables to reach contracts of more or less technical merit. Ten played $6 『$, and even on the troublesome club lead - found only by Hugh McGann - 12 tricks were taken by Patrick Sussel, while all the other tables collected 1460 .

Three other tables played $6 \%$ while another played $6 \% x$, all of them making in comfort. Six tables played 6NT, (Smederevac-Wernle and Vecchiato-Engel achieving the coup of making West declarer) and where this contract was not doubled it made in comfort. Grahame Osborne and Andreas Babsch both found the double of 6NT from the East seat, and cashed out when their partners led a spade; Alex Dubinin also played 6NT doubled...but he received a club lead and scored up 1880.

The lead for Badger against Connector lasted just one deal.

- J 64
- K 10
$\checkmark 8643$
\& KJ 97
Deal 26. Dealer East.Both Vul.

|  | - K 5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 93 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 9752$ |  |
|  | - A 1032 |  |
| - J 64 | N | - Q 32 |
| 8 K 10 |  | $\bigcirc$ A 4 |
| $\diamond 8643$ | W E | $\diamond$ AKJ 10 |
| -KJ97 | S | * Q 654 |
|  | - A 10987 |  |
|  | ¢J87652 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q |  |
|  | -8 |  |

Nine of the 32 tables were allowed to play in 3NT from the East seat and handled the board carefully by cashing one top diamond (getting the good news) and then negotiating clubs to best effect. Seven tables went down in 3NT - a couple of tables having been doubled there, and taking an early diamond finesse to lose 1100 in the process. For Connector Sakowska-Butryn racked up 600 at one table while Serek-Kazmucha as N/S bid to $4 \odot$ - undoubled! - and scored 620; impressive indeed and 15 IMPs to give them back a 62-57 lead with one board to go. In Calandra-Pony, Calandra went down in 3NT but made a heart partscore in the other room, so that with one deal to go the lead for Pony was down to I IMP.

Meanwhile, Lavazza had appeared to have no chance to recover from 5 IMPs down with two deals to go, on what appeared to be two quiet games...but the commentators had not allowed for Romanowska's gallant attempt to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. Holding:

- Q 743

○J8543
$\diamond 4$
A J 10
In fourth chair she heard the auction proceed with nobody vulnerable: Pass - Pass - $1 \diamond$. She overcalled $I\rangle$ and it went double on her left, pass from partner $2 \triangleleft$ on her right, so she doubled to call for a non-heart lead. Since 18 was going for 1100 or 1400 , and $28 x x$ was going to make 1240 or 1440 you might argue with her choices of action. All was well however when Cuzzi-Versace declined to take the money on either occasion and simply collected 430 in 3NT. Just for the record Cuzzi held a maximum pass with a 4-5-2-2 pattern and five semi-solid hearts. Balti led by 5 IMPs with one board to go.A dull 3NT you might think - but not so...

Deal 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- Q 4

PA96
$\diamond A K 754$

* AJ 8

4 196

- 1 8

勺J 932
\& K 952

The three matches we are following all played in 3NT Osborne for team Badger declaring it from North on a low heart lead (after South had shown her spades but not her hearts) and collected 630. In the other room South had described her hand more precisely so Leslie led a club to the queen, king and ace. Now instead of relying solely on the diamonds, declarer does best to go after hearts; but what is the best line in hearts, in abstract? Suitplay (devised by Jeroen Warmerdam) tells us that low to the ten is fractionally better than low to the nine - something to do with which 4-2 breaks onside you can negotiate. When declarer played the objectively best line (clearly best because of the entry position to dummy) the cards did not co-operate and the defenders set up clubs. The bad diamond break doomed the game. That meant I2 IMPs and a 69-62 win for Badger.

In Pony-Calandra both rooms played 3NT - and both Easts led hearts, allowing declarer time to establish hearts, then diamonds, and come to ten tricks. Where Madala was declarer he held himself to nine tricks in an attempt to make II (a good view in a sense since he lost an IMP here, and the match by two IMPs - had he brought home the second overtrick, it would have taken the match to extra time).

Versace for team Lavazza collected 630 as well; but Sarkanas for team Balti played 3NT on the lead of the club seven. He had opened an artificial is and had rebid to show 18-19 without three spades; when he ducked the second highest lead Bocchi as West put up the king (a play that suggests he was playing his partner for AJ87(x) or 2Al087(x) - but that was highly unlikely if he had only a doubleton spade. In any event, from that point on declarer was only playing for overtricks and emerged with 630 and a win by 5 IMPs.



Appeals Committee:
Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium), PO Sundelin (Sweden), Jan van Cleeff (the Netherlands)

Grattan Endicott sat in on the meeting in his capacity of secretary of the WBF Laws Committee

Mixed Pairs Qualifying Round 2
Board II. Dealer North. None Vul.
, 542
$\checkmark$ AK 102
$\diamond$ Q 43
\% 842

| $\bigcirc 10$ | N |  | ¢ AKQ 983 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| จQJ 653 |  |  | $\bigcirc 4$ |
| $\diamond$ K 652 | W |  | $\diamond$ J |
| \% $A K Q$ |  |  | 997653 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| 18 | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| 2 - | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | 49 | All Pass |

Contract: Four Spades, played by East
Lead:

| Play: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| 2 A | 22 | 23 | 21 |
| $2 K$ | 204 | $\diamond j$ | 210 |
| $2 Q$ | 28 | $\diamond 4$ | $\$ 6$ |
| $\diamond 5$ | $\ldots$ |  | $\diamond A$ |

Result: 12 tricks

## The Facts:

East revoked twice, on the 2 K and 2 Q . After the $\diamond 5$, North called the Director.

## The Director:

Ordered play to continue, saw that 12 tricks were made, and applied a one-trick penalty.

## Ruling:

II tricks, NS -450

## Relevant Laws:

Law 64.A.2, 64.B.2, 64C

## North/South appealed.

Present: All players except South

## The Players:

North believed that if play is stopped after the Q is played, equity dictates that 10 tricks be awarded.

West stated that North had waited 15 seconds after the $\diamond 5$, before calling the Director.

## The Committee:

Read the relevant laws:
Law 64A. Rectification following a Revoke
When a revoke is established:
(...)
and the trick on which the revoke occurred was not won by the offending player then, if the offending side won that or any subsequent trick, after play ends one trick is transferred to the nonoffending side.

Law 64B. No Rectification
There is no rectification as in A following an established revoke: (...)
2. if it is a subsequent revoke in the same suit by the same player. Law 64C may apply.
(...)

Law 64C. Director Responsible for Equity
When, after any established revoke, including those not subject to rectification, the Director deems that the non-offending side is insufficiently compensated by this Law for the damage caused, he shall assign an adjusted score.

The Committee also read an extract of the minutes of the WBF Laws Committee meeting of IOth October 2008:

Law 64C - If there are two revokes on the same board the equity in the case of the second revoke is determined by reference to the position after the first revoke.

It was clear that there had been two revokes, both estab-
lished, and that the penalty after applying Laws 64A and 64B amounted to I trick, subtracted from the 12 tricks that had been made at the table.

There are several possible interpretations of Law 64C:
I) The normal result of the board is II tricks. This is equitable.
2) After the second trick (but before the Q is played), the normal result is 12 tricks, to which one penalty trick is applied, so equity is II tricks.
3) After the Q is played, to which East should follow suit, the normal result is II tricks (losing the ruff and a heart trick), with one penalty trick, so equity is 10 tricks.

A few further considerations were made:
I) The first revoke is only established after the 2 Q is played, so it does not really make sense to consider a position before this. However, the WBFLC minute only applies to the equity position, not the establishment or any other matter.
2) The second revoke is established when the $\diamond 5$ is played. North would have made certain of receiving the score of 10 tricks by calling attention to the revoke (which he is allowed to do) before this card is played.
3) The revoke penalties are soft in certain places (a second revoke by the same player in the same suit is not penalised), and have turned softer in certain other places since 2007 (fewer cases are penalised with two penalty tricks) and the aim of the laws is to rectify, not punish.
4) The question was put whether II was indeed the equity position at the start of the board. Declarer might run the 10 .

In the end, the Committee found that this situation so closely resembled the one described in Law 64B2, that II tricks was deemed the equitable result as per Law 64C.

## The Committee's decision: <br> Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Returned

## Appeals Committee



As in all recent tournaments, all appeals are written up and will be published on the EBL website (follow links to departments - appeals). Some appeals of particular intrest may be published in the Daily Bulletin.

## Championship Diary



Before you read the next piece you should be aware of the fact that one of the problems with advancing years is that your memory can play tricks on you. I tend to write things down just to be on the safe side. However, when I saw I had made a note consisting of the letters ITP it took me some time to work out to what they related.

In the Mixed Teams round of 32, the team called Pony won the first half of its match byI IMP.They repeated this feat in the second half to win the match by 2 IMPs. When they won the first half of their round of 16 match by yes, you guessed it, just I IMP they considered changing their name to One Trick Pony.

We were considering the current physical capabilities of the Bulletin team when Tacchi mentioned that he is the world record holder of the 2 meter dash - to the bar!
(I asked if it should be for the 2 meter dash and Herman said of, threatening to appeal if I changed it.).

When considering what to put in the diary, a vital consideration is that it fills an exact amount of space, making life easy for our layout Editor. I was considering using a picture in today's but when I mentioned that it would make it exactly one column Tacchi insisted that I leave it out.

The new IMSA (International Mind Sports Association) website is now activated! You can visit it right now and be informed on all their latest news and events! The IMSA is a non-profit association that gathers together the federations of Chess, Bridge, Go and Draughts.
The address is: www.imsaworld.com

## Mixed Teams Round of I 6, second half <br> by Jos Jacobs

For this second half report, I chose three matches in which the leading team at halftime had a difficult time in holding on to their lead in the second half. These matches are: Harding v. Balti, Wild Griffins v. Pony and Khandelwal v. Vriend.
Balti led Harding by 20 IMPs at halftime. Six of them disappeared on the first board when Balti overbid to a no-play spade game, and then came this:

Board I6. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

- J632
© A Q 32
$\diamond 84$
\& 943

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { AK } 987 \\ & \text { \& K J } \\ & \diamond 3 \\ & \text { K K Q } 85 \end{aligned}$ | N |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | E | 9864 |
|  |  |  | Q J 7 |
|  | S |  | \& 106 |
|  | - Q 54 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 75$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 109652 |  |  |
|  | ¢ J 2 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Rubins | McGann | Romanovska | Brown |
| 14 | Pass | INT | Pass |
| 32 | Pass | 38 | Pass |
| $4{ }^{\circ}$ | Pass | 68 | All Pass |

When clubs are trumps, Blackwood quite often is of little use and so it proved here as well. Had the $4 \checkmark$-bid been showing the ace, as it probably should, this might have been a different story. In real life, it was the umpteenth case of a slam missing two aces. Harding +200.

| West <br> Hanlon | North <br> Sarkanas | East <br> Harding | South <br> Jankunaite |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathbf{1 Q}$ | Pass | INT | Pass |
| $3 \mathbf{3 0}$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

No accidents at the other table. Nine tricks, Harding +600 and I3 IMPs more to come to within I IMP of their opponents.
In the Khandelwal-Vriend match, we also had a swing but in different fashion.

| West <br> Bakkeren | North | East | South <br> Wernle |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathbf{A r n o l d s}$ | Pass | INT | Pass |
| $2 \mathbf{2 9}$ | Pass | $\mathbf{2} \Omega$ | Pass |
| $4 \Omega$ | All Pass |  |  |

$4 \checkmark$ may well look like a rather ugly contract to you, dear reader, but due to the good spot cards it was completely playable.Vriend +620 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R Khandelwal | Maas | H Khandelwal | Vriend |
| $1 \mathbf{~ P a s s}$ | Pass | INT | Pass |
| $2 \mathbf{2 0}$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Dbl |
| $3 \mathbf{A l l}$ Pass |  |  |  |

Maybe, the double of $2 \diamond$ scared East so much that she elected to pass $3 \%$. Maybe, West might have produced some more noise as well. Anyway, a vulnerable game missed, +I30 to Khandelwal but IO IMPs to Vriend.

The mostly Irish team, Harding, even took the lead on the very next board:

Board I7. Dealer North. None Vul.
-K 852
$\bigcirc 965$
$\diamond$ K 10

- KJ 104
© 3
© J 42
$\diamond$ AQJ954
- A 82

- A Q J 7

คA873
$\diamond 632$

- 75
- 10964
$\triangleright$ K Q 10
$\diamond 87$
\& Q 963

| West <br> Rubins | North <br> McGann | East <br> Romanovska | South <br> Brown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

Opposite a passed hand, West could hardly imagine a game might be on for his side.Apart from that, his side was non vulnerable so it would not be expensive anyway. He thus settled for a quiet partscore and scored +130 for his team.

| West <br> Hanlon | North <br> Sarkanas | East <br> Harding | South <br> Jankunaite |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | INT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

When East did open a weak NT, West took a direct shot
at game. With the $\forall K$ onside, there are nine top tricks, if it's offside there are several extra chances, even more so if the defence does not lead clubs. South led a spade so nine tricks were easy. Harding +400 and 7 IMPs to them to lead by 6. In the space of three boards, they had scored 26 IMPs...

In the match between the Wild Griffins and Pony, the latter had a half-time lead of I IMP. They had added 5 more on the first board of the set and lost one overtrick on the next. The Wild Griffins took over the lead on this one, however:

| West <br> Yuen | North S Orlov | East <br> Pony | South <br> T Dikhnova |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | 31 | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

This looks like a bidding uncertainty to me. If 3s shows a stopper, then why should West refrain from bidding 3NT? If it denies a stopper, the spade singleton looks extremely useful. So the Pony team missed a reasonable game and had to be content with +130 only.


Fiona Brown, England

The Polish style Club made life easy for EW from the moment East found an opening bid.
Ten tricks on a spade lead, Wild Griffins +430 and 7 more IMPs. They led by 2.

The next board proved tricky for some of the players involved, both in bidding and play:

Board I8. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
\& K 10643
๑K 95
$\diamond$ Q J
\& 1092

```
- AJ 82
Q Q 10632
\(\diamond\) K 98
\& 4
```



```
- Q 97
- A 84
\(\checkmark A 104\)
\& AJ 85
4 5
\(\vee 17\)
\(\triangleleft 76532\)
\& K Q 763
```

| West <br> Rubins | North <br> McGann | East <br> Romanovska | South <br> Brown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | INT | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $\mathbf{2} \boxtimes$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $\mathbf{4} \oslash$ | All Pass |

The transfer had made East the declarer, so South led her spade and got an immediate ruff when dummy ducked. After this, declarer made the rest of the play look ridiculously easy. South exited with a discard to North's Jack and East's ace, cashed the $\vee$ A noting the fall of the jack and proceeded to unblock the $\Phi \mathrm{Q}$, intending to throw her diamond loser on the spades and ruffing the last diamond before reverting to trumps. This good plan was made irrelevant, as the $\diamond Q$ made her welcome appearance when she crossed to the $\diamond$ K. Ten tricks, Balti +420 .

| West <br> Hanlon | North <br> Sarkanas | East <br> Harding | South <br> Jankunaite |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | I $\&$ | Pass |
| 18 | Pass | INT | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2 e}$ | All Pass |  |  |

In the Closed Room, the Norwegian-Irish combination had a terrible misunderstanding about the relay (?) meaning of $2 \boldsymbol{\mu}$. $1 \diamond$ had shown hearts but the unwanted final contract went two off, +100 to the Balti who thus regained the lead by 5 IMPs.

In the Khandelwal-Vriend match, it turned out that making $4 \checkmark$ is not that easy on a different defence:

| West | North <br> Wernle | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | INT | Pass |
| $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | $2 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | 38 | Pass |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |  |

Again with East the declarer, South led the \$K. Declarer won the ace and played two rounds of trumps, North winning the king and...simply returning the 9 for the jack, queen and a ruff in dummy. The last trump was drawn and now declarer had to take a view in spades. Low to the queen and if this loses to the king, playing the suit from the top is probably a good enough plan. But as you can see, once you started by playing low to the queen, you have two losers in the suit. When North got the lead in spades the first time, he made the same cunning return of the $\diamond$ J. Declarer could hardly avoid falling into this trap, in view of the information available at this point about the NS hands, so she won the ace and finessed the queen on the way back. She thus lost a diamond, two spades and a trump for down one, +50 to Khandelwal.

| West <br> R Khandelwal | North | Maas | East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H Khandelwal | South |  |  |
| Vriend |  |  |  |

When South led a low club, declarer had no further problems after winning the jack and playing 8 A and another. Khandelwal +430 and IO IMPs back to trail by 7 .

A few boards later, the Harding team stole 3NT at one table:

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

- 965

QQ9743
$\diamond$ K 96
\& 62

- 743
$\triangle$ AK 5
$\diamond 1032$
\& AK 104


Q QJ 1082
$\bigcirc 2$
$\diamond$ A Q 85
\& 93

| West <br> Rubins | North <br> McGann | East <br> Romanovska | South <br> Brown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Dbl | Redbl | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | All Pass |  |  |

With the hearts $5-1$ and the queen behind the $\triangle \mathrm{AK}$, no game was on, so the Balti team had quite correctly stayed out of it after discovering that the diamond stopper was missing. Well done, just made, Balti +130 .

| West <br> Hanlon | North <br> Sarkanas | East <br> Harding | South <br> Jankunaite |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INT | Pass | $2 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |

When South did not overcall after the weak NT and Stayman, North could never find the killing diamond lead. Ten tricks, Harding +630 and II IMPs more to them.

In the Khandelwal-Vriend match, Jovanka Smederevac had a second arrow on her bow:

| West <br> Bakkeren | North <br> Wernle | East <br> Arnolds | South <br> Smederevac |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $19 \mathbf{e}$ | Pass | 18 | 19 |
| Dbl | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

One Club was $2+$ and the double showed three hearts. South led from her second suit, the $\langle\mathbf{Q}$ in fact, and the defenders cashed the first five tricks. Khandelwal +100 .

In the Closed Room, Bep Vriend stuck to her most solid suit:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R Khandelwal | Maas | H Khandelwal | Vriend |
| $1 \&$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | 12 |
| Dbl | Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |



Marianne Harding, Norway

I $\diamond$ showed hearts and the double, again, was support. South led the Q Q and declarer quickly claimed ten tricks. Khandelwal +630 and 12 IMPs back to them, to take over the lead by 4 .

They handed back those IMPs on the next board, however:
Board 21. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

- 976

คA 73
$\diamond A J 9$
\& AJ 92


After the weak NT and the natural double, the Dutch had no trouble in reaching game. South doubled only to find out there was no winning defence any more when North led a trump. Vriend +590 .


Well, 24 by East clearly did not send over the message to West. Khandelwal +I70 for a loss of 9 IMPs. They were 5 down again...

In the Wild Griffins-Pony match, they showed us how to beat 4s:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yuen | S Orlov | Pony | T Dikhnova |
|  | INT | $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{s}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\Phi}$ | All Pass |

After the weak NT and the Landy overcall, EW reached 4s quite easily and North led a trump. Curtains. Pony +420 .

In the Closed Room, EW also reached 4s but Thomas Gotard, looking at three aces, made the more enterprising lead of the A . This proved very effective as it enabled him to continue the good work by shifting to a diamond. Now, there was no longer a parking place for declarer's second
losing diamond so the contract had to go one off. Pony a well-deserved +50 and IO IMPs back to regain the lead by 8 .

The Wild Griffins levelled the match again when South for the Pony team found an unlucky lead against a thin slam, not bid in the Open Room:

Board 24. Dealer West. None Vul.
$\pm 96$
『K 95
$\diamond$ Q 96
\& U J 1076
¢ 82
$\vee$ J 642
$\diamond$ AJ 532

- A 8

. A Q 105
$\checkmark$ A Q 103
$\diamond$ K 1074
93
\& KJ743
$\bigcirc 87$
$\diamond 8$
\& K 9542

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yuen | S Orlov | Pony | $T$ Dikhnova |
| Pass | Pass | $I \diamond$ | $2 \boldsymbol{Q}$ |
| Dbl | Pass | $4 \triangleright$ | All Pass |

Twelve tricks on a diamond lead, Pony +480 .

| West <br> Khven | North <br> Gotard | East <br> Gulevich | South <br> Eggeling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \boxtimes$ | Pass |
| $2 \boxtimes$ | Pass | 42 | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 N T$ | Pass |
| $5 \diamond$ | Pass | $6 \vee$ | All Pass |

Cuebids at the four-level and RKC saw EW reach a very thin slam against which South led her singleton diamond, thus picking up the suit for EW.When hearts were 3-2 with the king onside, losing the spade finesse did not matter any more. Wild Griffins +980 and II IMPs back. A close finish was indeed in sight, in which the Griffins just had the edge and thus made it into the last eight.

The penultimate board of the set settled the issues in both the other matches. To slam or not to slam, that was the question.

In fact, played by East the slam is not all that bad as South cannot profitably lead a pointed suit. The only thing declarer has to do, is to draw trumps finessing the king successfully and then guess how to play which of the pointed suits. If he guesses the king that is actually held by North, he is home immediately but the presence of the $\diamond 10$ offers an extra chance of (mis)guessing diamonds. Running the $\diamond 10$ is a winning move, as is presenting the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$ from East.

Let's see what actually happened in our two remaining matches.

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.
4 9652

$\diamond 1862$

* J 10987
© A 7
คAJIO632
$\diamond A 10$
K K 65


Q Q 84

- Q 754
$\diamond$ Q 93
* A Q 4
- KJ 103

○K 98
$\checkmark$ K 754
32

| West <br> Rubins | North McGann | East <br> Romanovska | South <br> Brown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 190 | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| 28 | Pass | 38 | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 3NT | Pass |
| 4\% | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |

For the Baltis, nothing very much happened, as you can see. Eleven tricks when declarer refrained from the heart finesse but played safe instead, after receiving a diamond lead to queen, king and ace. When the trumps broke 3-0, tricks were in some jeopardy again but all was well when the $\diamond 9$ survived the third round of the suit. Balti +450 .

| West <br> Hanlon | North Sarkanas | East <br> Harding | South Jankunaite |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 18 | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 4\% | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $6 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |  |

3\% showed a good raise, so West went straight to slam after hearing about the one keycard only.
North had an automatic club lead, so declarer won, drew trumps and played $\diamond \mathrm{A}, \diamond 10$ running it when North played low. Harding +980 and II IMPs to them to go into the lead by 9 with one to play. They added another 5 IMPs on that last board to win comfortably in the end by 14.

With two boards to play, Khandelwal were leading by 4 but their lead did not survive this board either:

| West | North | East | South Smederevac |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bakkeren | Wernle | Arnolds | Smederevac |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 18 | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3\% | Pass | 3NT | Pass |
| 4\% | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |

When Arnolds could not produce a cuebid over 4\%, Bakkeren could hardly make any further move.Vriend +450 when Bakkeren played trumps from the top but later
guessed correctly in diamonds.

| West <br> R Khandelwal | North <br> Maas | East <br> H Khandelwal | South <br> Vriend |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| I $\vee$ | Pass | $3 \triangleleft$ | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 68 | All Pass |  |  |

When the Khandelwals reached slam, the outcome of the match was in the captain's hands. He too got a club lead but then fell from grace by going up with the trump ace when South did not cover dummy's queen. To add insult to injury, South then ruffed the third round of clubs and cashed the $9 K$ as the setting trick before exiting in diamonds. This brought declarer an extra trick but there still was no way to get rid of the spade loser: down two, 100 and II IMPs to Vriend who thus regained the lead by 7. This also proved to be their winning margin when the last board was a push.

## Poznan Pointers

Poznan is a city with a history that goes back more than a thousand years. It was here that the first Polish rulers settled. Today Poznan is a capital of the Wielkopolska region, a city with the population of nearly 600,000 inhabitants to which can be added a student population of over 130,000. Monuments of art and architecture, representing a wide variety of styles illustrate rich history of the city. Each part of Poznan prides itself on its unique character. If you have time to explore the best and the least expensive way is to use the Poznan City Card.
This is the best and least expensive way to get to the city and the adjacent areas. You can gain free or discounted admission to over sixty tourist attractions, free access to the public transportation system and an opportunity to save time and money.
The Poznan City Card comes in three versions: one, two and three-day.

## Holders of the Poznan City Card are entitled, among other things, to:

- free use of public transportation
- free admission to most of Poznan's museums
- discounted admission to sports and recreational facilities
- discounted admission to the Conservatory and the Zoo
- discounts at hotels and restaurants

The Poznan City Card comes in three versions:

- one day - costs 30 PLN
- two day - costs 40 PLN
- three day - costs 45 PLN


## Mixed Teams quarter finals, first half

by Jos Jacobs

As the report about the Mahaffey- Harding quarterfinal will appear in tomorrow's Bulletin, I can, in a way, restrict myself to having a look at what happened in the other three matches. It turned out that, on a few boards, there were all sorts of things going on at the various tables involved. Here is a survey.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.


First blood in the Wild Griffins v. Zimmermann match went to the Griffins, due to a defensive mistake:

| West <br> Zimmermann | North <br> Orlov | East <br> Cronier | South <br> Dikhnova |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass |
| I $\rangle$ | Pass | 12 | Dbl |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | $3 Q$ | All Pass |

I $\vee$ by West showed spades, of course. EW wisely stopped in 34 which made with an overtrick for +170 to Zimmermann when dummy's queen held after South led a low diamond.

| West <br> Khven | North <br> Multon | East <br> Gulevich | South <br> Willard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | INT | Pass |
| $2 \otimes$ | Pass | $3 \mathbf{4}$ | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | All Pass |

Strong Club and transfer, East showing her maximum plus fit. South led a club to the queen and ace and suddenly, the play had become interesting. North won the second round of spades and shifted not to a diamond but to a heart. Declarer played the king and South took her ace and returned the suit. Dummy's 8 J won and a club was led. North went up with his king and finally led a diamond, but rather than letting this run to dummy's queen, declarer went up with
the ace and cashed the erj.When the ten appeared, the 8 was the winner on which the last losing diamond went away. Just made, +620 and 10 IMPs to the Wild Griffins.
In the Green Eyes v.Vriend match, Carla Arnolds had different ideas:

| West <br> Bakkeren | North <br> R. Mihai | East <br> Arnolds | South <br> G. Mihai |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $2 \oslash$ |
| Pass | 2NT | Dbl | $3 \triangleleft$ |
| Pass | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

When $3 \triangleleft$ was passed round to her, she bid where she wanted to play: 3NT.A diamond was led to the ten and her ace and she first drove out the \$A. North returned a diamond to South's king and South cleared the suit. When in with the 8 A , she duly played her 4th diamond but the defence never had the chance to establish any tricks in clubs before declarer had nine tricks. A club lead does not help either, as long as East is declarer and puts up the jack if North returns a low club at any time. Vriend +600 .
The Closed Room played in 3s by West which was just made on a diamond lead from North. Green Eyes +140 but 10 IMPs to Vriend.
Our third featured match is between Badger and Russia. Here, both tables were in 4 but with mixed results:

| West <br> Dubinin | North <br> Allerton | East <br> Ponomareva | South <br> Leslie |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | INT | Pass |
| $2 \boxtimes$ | Pass | 39 | Pass |
| $4 \Phi$ | All Pass |  |  |

Strong Club, transfer, maximum fit, diamond lead from South to dummy's queen and curtains. Russia +620 . Bridge really can be as easy as that.

| West Osborne | North Gromov | East <br> Hinden | South Gromova |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 28 |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | Pass | Dbl | Pass |
| 3s | Pass | 49 | All Pass |

$2 \boxtimes$ was a two-suiter and 2NT enquired about the minor. When $3 \triangleleft$ ran to East, she doubled and thus West became declarer in 44. North led a heart which South ducked, then won the $\Phi \mathrm{A}$ at first attempt to continue hearts, get his ruff and return a diamond. Down two. As I just said: bridge can be as easy as that. Very well defended, Russia +200 and 13 IMPs to them.
Careful bidding proved quite ineffective on board 8:

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.
Ⓚ 10742

- J 5
$\diamond 11062$
- 87

| ¢ A J 8 | N 96 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A 7 | W E |  | $\bigcirc$ K Q 8 |
| $\diamond 543$ |  |  |  |
| \& K 10643 | S |  | J 952 |
|  | 4 Q 53 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 1096432$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AK 97 |  |  |
| \% - |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Dubinin | Allerton | Ponomareva | Leslie |
| 19 | Pass | 2\% | Pass |
| 3\% | Pass | 38 | Pass |
| 39 | Pass | 49 | Pass |
| 5\% | All Pass |  |  |

EW correctly managed to discover the lack of a diamond stopper and thus ended up in $5 \%$, only to find out that diamonds were 4-4. There is no justice in this game...one down, +50 to Badger.

| West <br> Osborne | North <br> Gromov | East <br> Hinden | South <br> Gromova |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \vee$ | Pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{3 2}$ | Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |

After the inverted raise and the minimum rebid, East took a reasonable enough shot at the most likely game to succeed. Right she was: Badger +400 as the defence could (and did) only take their four diamond tricks.
More IMPs for Badger on the next board:
Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

|  | - Q J 987 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 42 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AK 64 |  |  |
|  | 2- |  |  |
| $\pm 43$ | $N$ AK65 |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ AK 107 | W E $\quad \odot$ |  | $\checkmark 5$ |
| $\diamond$ Q 7 | W $\quad \diamond 8$ |  |  |
| \% Q J 1085 | S |  | 2K976432 |
|  | -102 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 9863$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J109532 |  |  |
|  | \& A |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Dubinin | Allerton | Ponomareva | Leslie |
|  | 19 | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $2 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | $3 \%$ | Pass | $3 \bigcirc$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

When East never showed her 4-7-I-I distribution, NS got a free run to whatever contract they liked. On the actual layout, making anything was out of the question for them. Even with diamonds as trumps, seven tricks should be the maximum, whereas EW can make game in clubs. So going down just one in 3 looked like a bargain for NS.

| West <br> Osborne | North <br> Gromov | East <br> Hinden | South <br> Gromova |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \boldsymbol{1 4}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| $4 \Omega$ | Pass | $4 \infty$ | Pass |
| $5 \boldsymbol{2 N}$ | All Pass |  | Pass |

And so it proved when EW had little trouble in reaching game at the other table, once East simply overcalled 2\% after North's Is. Badger +600 and II IMPs more to them.
On the next board, the Wild Griffins registered a game swing when Zimmermann, defending against 3NT, led the A rather than a diamond:

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.
\& KJIO 72
$\checkmark$ AK 9
$\diamond 1087$
2 K 6

- A86
$\bigcirc 10542$
$\diamond$ A 9632
- 3


Both tables were in 3NT by South.When Khven, West for the Wild Griffins, led a diamond, this meant a quick two down but the SA lead gave away the contract immediately due to the block in diamonds. 13 IMPs to the Wild Griffins who led 29-4 at this stage.
The last three boards of the set were more swingy.
On the first of them, Zimmermann got his revenge when he brought home a shaky slam by going for about his only winning line, a dummy reversal on a 4-3 fit:

Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- J8764
$\checkmark 1065$
$\triangleleft 753$
\& 42


A 532
$\bigcirc$ K J 8
$\diamond A 98$
\& K 87
© K Q 9
-Q 72
$\triangleleft$ Q 104
\& Q 1065

| West | North Orlov | East <br> Cronier | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I $\diamond$ | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| 2\% | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 49 | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | 5 | Pass |
| $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

As the eventual contract was made, it is unfair to even try and find out at which point the EW bidding went wrong. We should rather give all praise to declarer who, just two boards after a clear mistake, showed his skills by handling this contract superbly. He won the spade lead and immediately ruffed a spade. Next came a heart to the jack and queen. South returned another spade, ruffed in hand again. Now a club to the king and a diamond to the jack. The $\Delta \mathrm{K}$ was cashed and dummy was reached with the $\nabla K$. The $\triangleleft A$ drew all the outstanding trumps, a club to the jack held and on the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, the remaining hearts appeared. The slam-going trick was thus taken by the $\vee 9$ as declarer had shed the 4th club, and not the 4th heart, on the $\diamond A$. Zimmermann a huge +920 and a strong candidate for the best played hand of the tournament (or the year...). The only objection might be that unlikely contracts are excluded from competition.
Obviously, they came nowhere near matching this result in the Closed Room:

| West <br> Khven | North <br> Multon | East <br> Gulevich | South <br> Willard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I $\diamond$ | Pass | IQ | Pass |
| INT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

North led a club and declarer managed to make no less than 12 tricks, which was quite an achievement in itself but did not at all do the Russian case any good. IO IMPs to Zimmermann.
In the Green Eyes v.Vriend match, Carla Arnolds actually managed to make all 13 tricks in her 3NT when South led away from her $\triangleleft$ Q. Not that it mattered very much as a wheel came off in the Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Marina | Maas | Stegaroiu | Vriend |
| I $\diamond$ | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| 230 | Pass | $2 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

South led the QQ , standard from her actual KQ9(xx), and continued the king and nine when East held off. Unsure about the position of the remaining spades, declarer first went after the clubs. The jack held but when the suit did not break, she turned her attention to hearts, playing low to the jack and South's queen. South now cashed her master club and exited in hearts on which North pitched a spade and declarer a diamond. She had lost four tricks already and thus had to choose between the diamond finesse
or the pointed suit-squeeze on North for her contract. When she went for the squeeze and thus played $\diamond A K$, she was one down...Vriend +50 and an unexpected II IMPs more to them.
The always ominous-looking board 13 created swings in all our featured matches:

Board I3. Dealer North. All Vul.

|  | ¢ K 10987 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 7$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 8542$ |  |  |
|  | \& AK 10 |  |  |
| Q Q J 4 |  | 4 | 32 |
| $\bigcirc 153$ | W E |  | 942 |
| $\checkmark$ Q 106 |  |  |  |
| ¢ J 732 | 2 |  |  |
|  | ¢ 5 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 1086 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 973 |  |  |
|  | \& Q 965 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Zimmermann | Orlov | Cronier | Dikhnova |
|  | 19 | 28 | Pass |
| Pass | Dbl | All Pass |  |

One can feel sympathy for NS but the points went to EW. Just made, Zimmermann +670 .

| West <br> Khven | North <br> Multon | East <br> Gulevich | South <br> Willard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1 \mathbf{Q}$ | $2 \vee$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dbl | Pass | 2NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Willard did well not to sit the double. 2NT went one off in peace for a loss of 100 but a gain of II IMPs to reduce the deficit to 12 IMPs.
In the Green Eyes-Vriend match, the auction started the same way, of course, but Geta Mihai also did not venture a pass:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bakkeren | R. Mihai | Arnolds | G. Mihai |
|  | 14 | $2 』$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dbl | Pass | $3 \&$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Right she was: down two but only -200 to the Green Eyes rather than -670 or more...
At the other table, Bogdan Marina was in a different position:

| West <br> Marina | North | East <br> Stegaroiu | South <br> Vriend |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| $2 \boxtimes$ | $2 \Phi$ | $4 \Omega$ | All Pass |

When North did not open, he heard his partner open I 8 so his raise to $2 \boxtimes$ was automatic. So was the jump to game by his partner. South did not want to give the show away by doubling this and thus collected three undertricks for another +300 or II mire IMPs to team Vriend. Their lead had gone up to 36 at this stage.

| West <br> Dubinin | North <br> Allerton | East <br> Ponomareva | South <br> Leslie |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{4}$ | $2 \Omega$ | Pass |
|  | Dbl | All Pass |  |

We have already seen this auction before. Ponomareva even managed an overtrick, Russia +870 .

| West <br> Osborne | North <br> Gromov | East <br> Hinden | South <br> Gromova |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1 \mathbf{Q}$ | 28 | All Pass |

Gromov showed some consequent thinking when he decided not to reopen the bidding after the $2 \checkmark$ overcall. Not warned by any double, declarer did not take the precaution of leading a low trump to the jack at any time and thus even went one down, 100 more to Russia for a swing of 14 IMPs and regain the lead by 5 .
On the last board, Zimmermann further tightened the gap:

Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.

- A 103

Q Q 9863
$\diamond$ A 54
\& A K
, Q 82
$\checkmark$ A
$\diamond$ K Q J 76
\& 1972


4 K J 65
) J 54
$\checkmark 10832$
\& 63

| West <br> Zimmermann | North <br> Orlov | East <br> Cronier | South <br> Dikhnova |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| I $\diamond$ | Dbl | Pass | $1 Q$ |
| Pass | INT | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \&$ | Dbl | All Pass |  |

North's double probably was not meant for penalties but when South passed, it was clear NS were not quite on the same wavelength. Still, the contract should gave gone down one as North can lead a low spade at any time, and the defence will collect their three tricks in the suit. When he led the $\$ \mathrm{~A}$ after leading a heart to the ace and winning the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$
at trick two, the contract could no longer be defeated. Zimmermann + 180 .

| West <br> Khven | North <br> Multon | East <br> Gulevich | South <br> Willard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \oslash$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dbl | Redbl | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | $2 \oslash$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

A more quiet contract, just made, Zimmermann another +110 and 7 more IMPs to trail by 5 at halftime.
In the Green Eyes - Vriend match, Radu Mihai did indeed find the best defence:

| West <br> Bakkeren | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mihai | Arnolds | G. Mihai |
| $1 \diamond$ | Dbl | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \&$ | Dbl | $4 \&$ | 19 |
| Pass | Dbl | All Pass | Pass |

48 looks a little overenthusiastic by East, even more so as making $4 \bigcirc$ would have been well beyond the NS reach. North had an obvious double and started off with his two top trumps and when he duly shifted to a low spade, the contract was down three. Green Eyes +500 .

| West <br> Marina | North <br> Maas | East <br> Stegaroiu | South <br> Vriend |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1} \diamond$ | $\mathbf{y}$ | Pass | Pass |
|  | All Pass |  |  |

Suddenly, everybody was happy after Anton Maas overcalled I $\vee$.Vriend +I 70 on friendly defence but still 8 IMPs to Green Eyes, who thus reduced their halftime deficit to 28.


Marina Stefaroiu, Romania

## The Power of the Muiderberg

by Jan van Cleeff

Long ago, way back in the previous century, the Dutch invented the Muiderberg two-bids, showing a five card major with four or longer in a minor and less then opening values. Muiderberg is a small village in the neighbourhood of Amsterdam, where Onno Janssens, the inventor of the convention, used to live. The opening turned out to be a very efficient device, destructive and constructive at the same time. It soon became extremely popular, first in and later outside The Netherlands.
Here in Poznan, after two days of bridge, your reporter detected already two fine examples of the Muiderberg. Langer v. Zimmermann

Board 29. Dealer North. All Vul.



Hans-Herman Gwinner by Elizabeth van Ettinger

After the spade lead thanks to the favourable layout declarer ended up with nine tricks in the thin game.

*5-10 HCP, 5 card hearts, 4+ cards in a minor
East led a club to the jack and king. West continued the suit and declarer had an easy road to eight tricks. He cashed the $\vee A$ and king and continued with high clubs pitching diamonds from dummy. It resulted in a I2-IMP gain on the board in favour of Langer.
One day later,Vriend played Gottlieb in the Swiss A.

| Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ 10 |  |  |  |
| - K 982 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ A 3 |  |  |  |
| \& AJ 10986 |  |  |  |
| - AKQ 75 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ J 5 | W | $\bigcirc$ | 1063 |
| $\diamond 6$ |  |  | 52 |
| \% K Q 752 |  | ¢ |  |
| ¢ 986432 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 74$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ K Q 874 |  |  |  |
| \& - |  |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Anderson | Vriend | Larsson | Maas |
|  |  | 2 ${ }^{*}$ | Pass |
| 2NT* | 3\% | Pass | Pass |
| Dbl | Pass | $3 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| $3 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |  |

$2 \triangleleft$ (Mysterious) Multi, 5 cards allowed
West was not sure about the double and ran away to her second suit., +140 .

Open Room

| West <br> Bertens | North <br> Fredin | East <br> Verbeek | South <br> Michielsen |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \mathbf{2}^{*}$ | 3 Ne $^{*}$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dbl | All Pass |  | Pass |

$2 \vee$ Muiderberg
2. Constructive, natural, nf

When the smoke cleared EW scored +500 and Vriend collected 8 IMPs on the board.

## Misplay this Hand with Me

by Mark Horton

Having been eliminated from the Mixed Teams at the European Open Championships in Poznan I have reluctantly agreed to continue in the lengthy Mixed Pairs. Towards the end of the fourth session we are handily placed when we meet a pair from the Netherlands. Only the opponents are vulnerable and I have the following:

- K Q 42
$\bigcirc \mathrm{KJ}$
$\diamond$ KJ 94
\& 186
The attractive young lady on my left, who appears to favour a minimalist approach when it comes to apparel, opens $2 \boxtimes$ and as we are sharing the screen she informs me that her bid promises hearts and another suit. Not one to be distracted I observe that my partner has doubled and the next player has passed. I have several options, but simply bid 49. My partner is not finished and advances with 50 which I take to be a cue bid in support of spades. I say $5 \diamond$ and partner goes 54. Clearly partner does not have the ace of hearts, so I am confident she will have the ace of diamonds. Attempting to outscore the field I jump to 6NT.

This has been our spirited auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2)* | Dbl | Pass | 49 |
| Pass | 5\%* | Pass | $5 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 54. | Pass | 6NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West leads the ten of clubs and I get the following dummy:


I have eleven tricks on top and this lead appears to have handed me the extra one I am looking for on a plate. With fair confidence I play low from dummy but East produces the queen and switches to the ten of hearts. With a sinking
feeling I cover it with the jack, and West takes the queen and cashes the ace. In due course I claim the rest for a disappointing -300.

The full deal:


## Post mortem

Declarer should have realized that the location of the queen of clubs was irrelevant. Assuming West has the $\vee \mathrm{AQ}$ it is sufficient to win the first clubs and cash five spades, discarding a club from hand. Then declarer plays diamonds. This will be the position when the last diamond is played:


If West discards the queen of hearts declarer simply plays a heart and a club will see dummy's four of clubs promoted to glory.


## CO SŁYCHAĆ?

## AGRESJA KONTROLOWANA

We wczorajszej relacji z meczu Connectora umknęło mi jedno rozdanie... W kontrolce było 600 i 620 . Nie zwróciłem uwagi, że na przeciwnych liniach!

|  | Rozdawał E Obie po partii |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - K 5 |  |
|  | - Q 93 |  |
|  | $\diamond 9752$ |  |
|  | - A 1032 |  |
| - J64 | N | - Q 32 |
| 8 K 10 |  | $\bigcirc$ A 4 |
| $\checkmark 8643$ | W E | $\checkmark$ AKJ 10 |
| 9 | S | 2 Q 654 |
|  | - A 10987 |  |
|  | QJ87652 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q |  |
|  | - 8 |  |
| West | North East | South |
|  | Serek | Kazmucha |
|  | IBA | 2' |
| pas | 28 ktr. | 38 |
| pas | $4 \bigcirc$ pas... |  |

## I)oba kolory starsze



Jacek Pszczoła, Poland

Nie zważając na założenia, Danuta Kazmucha licytowała bardzo ostro - doceniając walory układu 6-5, zdecydowała się na wejście, pomimo zaledwie 5 grających punktów. Potem, po wywoławczej kontrze otwierającego, podniosła kiery do trzech - pozostając w zgodzie z prawem lew łącznych, a Cezary Serek, mając niewiele, ale wszystko bezcenne, zalicytował końcówkę. Przeciwnicy z respektem powstrzymali się od kontry. $4 \checkmark$ zostało bez problemu zrealizowane.
Na drugim stole para NS licytowała tylko na wysokości dwóch i kontraktem końcowym stało się 3BA, wygrane przez Natalię Sakowską i Connector zarobił łącznie 15 imp.

## CZYTANIE RĄK

W ćwierćfinałowym meczu Mahaffey - Harding znalazło się rozdanie jak z mojego cyklu „Czytanie rąk" w ,Brydżu"...
Jacek Pszczoła rozgrywał 3BA po następującej licytacji (obie po partii, rozdawał E):

| West <br> Hanlon | North <br> Pszczoła | East <br> Harding | South <br> Seamon-Molson |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | pas | 19 |
| pas | 14 | pas | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| pas | $2 \diamond^{\prime}$ | pas | $3 \%$ |
| pas | $3 B A$ | pas... |  |

I)sztuczny forsing

Marianne Harding zaatakowała $\diamond$ J:

zagraną ze stołu damę $W$ pobił asem i odwrócił szóstką. Z ręki siódemka, król od E. E zagrała teraz czwórkę karo, do której W dołożył dziewiątkę. Po wzięciu na dziesiątkę, Jacek zagrał króla trefl, do którego E dołożyła dójkę, a W trójkę. Kolejny trefl, od E ósemka. Co ze stołu?
Jak wygądają ręce obrońców? Było oczywiste, że E zaatakowała z koloru trzykartowego, licząc na longera karo u partnera. Była to przesłanka, że nie ma ona czterech kierów, a jej ręka to coś w rodzaju 4@333 lub $5 \$ 332$.

Ponieważ można oczekiwać, że W ma $5 \diamond 4$ , dłuższy fragment trefli powinien znajdować się w ręce E. Ponadto, W mając 5 kar, dwa asy i jeszcze damę trefl - 10 PC - mógłby „zmieścić się" w licytacji po otwarciu lę. Idąc tymi tropami, Jacek zaimpasował damę karo, biorąc II lew.

Oto całość rozdania:


Na drugim stole przy grze utrzymała się para WE:

| West <br> Mahaffey | North <br> McGann | East <br> Radin | South <br> Brown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | pas | 10 |
| pas | I $\nabla^{\prime}$ | pas | $2 \boldsymbol{2 s}$ |
| ktr. | rktr. | $2 \diamond$ | pas |
| pas | ktr. | pas... |  |

I)transfer na piki


Hugh McGANN, Ireland

Ten kontrakt po dość nieszczęśliwym wiście damą karo zakończył się wpadką bez jednej i drużyna Mahaffeya zarobiła 10 imp .
O tym, że skuteczne czytanie rąk jest efektywne, ale w dłuższym dystansie, może świadczyć rozdanie z meczu półfinałowego:

| Po licytacji (rozdawał E, NS po partii): |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bakkeren | Pszczoła | Arnolds | Seamon-Molson |
|  |  | pas | $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| I $\&$ | $1 \Phi$ | $2 \Omega$ | ktr. |
| pas | $3 \Phi$ | pas... |  |

E zaatakowała (naturalnie) $\vee 5$ :

- AJIO 983

ค10842
$\diamond 92$
Q


- K 72
-K7
$\diamond 1864$
- AJ 93
na blotkę ze stołu W kładzie dame, po czym gra asa, króla i blotkę karo. Przebijasz starannie ósemką (od E dziesiątka) i co dalej? Jacek zagrał damę trefl - król, as, szóstka (zrzutki odwrotne). Teraz król kier. W bije asem i gra kiera ósemka, walet, przebitka... Pozostał problem rozegrania pików. W wszedł na czwórce, pokazał trzy kara, a trefle zrzucił na nieparzysta - wygląda, że ma układ I-4-3-5... Wejście I z 3433 na pewno nie byłoby w stylu gracza tej klasy. Wobec tego rozgrywający przebił trefla w ręce dziewiątka, i usiłując zapisać się do księgi rekordów mistrzostw (w kategorii ,najniższa lewa atutowa pierwszego okrażenia") zagrał trójkę pik, a po dołożeniu czwórki przez E zaimpasował siódemką. Rozkład faktycznie był taki, jak Jacek sobie wyliczył:

4 AJ 10983

- 10842
$\diamond 92$
- D

- 654

J 95
$\diamond$ Q 1073
\& K 104
. K 72

- K7

勺J 864

- AJ 93
ale niestety, singletonem była dama... Bez jednej i 5 imp dla teamu Vriend, gdyż na drugim stole NS grali tylko 24, realizując kontrakt.


## PIERWSZY WIST

Eliminacje turnieju par wygrali reprezentanci Polski Cathy Bałdysz i Piotr Tuszyński. Nie trzeba nikogo przekonywać, że w turniejach na maksy dobry wist to podstawa sukcesów. Oto dwa problemy wistowe z ostatniej sesji:
I.Po licytacji (rozdawał N, NS po partii):

| West | North <br> Tuszyński | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  | Pas | pas | pas |
| 1818 | pas | 18 | pas |
| 2BA | pas | $3 \triangleleft$ | pas |
| 38 | pas | $3 B A$ | pas... |

I)naturalne albo przygotowawcze

Tuszyński musiał zawistować z ręki: s K 762 ®K $62 \triangleleft 3$ 2 \&A 76 5. Jaki byłby Twój wybór?

Piotrek stwierdził (po wytłumaczeniu, że $3 \bigcirc$ obiecywało czwórkę) - ,jeżeli grają 3BA, pomimo uzgodnienia kierów, to na atak w piki na pewno są przygotowani..." i wyszedł blotką trefl... Popatrzmy na cały rozkład:


Piotr Tuszyński, Poland

- K 762
- K 62
$\diamond 32$
\& 465
- A 104
$\checkmark$ AQ 73
$\diamond A J 75$
\& K 8
- 19

8 J 984
$\diamond$ KQ864

- 19

Q Q 853
$\bigcirc 105$
$\diamond 109$
\& Q 10432

Rozgrywający, po wzięciu na króla, przeszedł do stołu karem i zaimpasował kiera - bez jednej i $99 \%$ liderów. Po ataku w pika byłoby 10 lew i 10\%.
2.Po licytacji (rozdawał E, obie po partii):

| West | North | East | South <br> Bałdysz |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1\% | pas |
| $18^{1}$ | pas | 2BA | pas |
| 3\% | pas | 3, | pas |
| $40^{2}$ | pas | 4BA | pas |
| $5{ }^{3}$ | pas | 64 | pas... |

I) tekas na piki
2) 5-5 piki $z$ treflami
3) I wartość z 5
w co wistujesz z ręką: $8653 \vee 108 \triangleleft \mathrm{~K} 64$ K Q 85 ?

Cathy Bałdysz wyszła w atu. Popatrzmy na całość rozdania:


Rozgrywający wziął w ręce i zagrał as trefl, trefl. Cathy przejęła waleta figurą i ponownie połączyła atu, kładąc kontrakt bez jednej. Ten zapis był warty $91 \%$.

## MIXED PAIRS - QUALIFYING

(final standings after 7 sessions - subject to confirmation)

|  | Perce | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Cathy BALDYSZ - Piotr TUSZYNSKI | 62.45 |
| 2 | Michael GROMOELLER - Ria KUERSCHNER | 1.73 |
| 3 | Renata DANCEWICZ - Tomasz WINCIOREK | 59.65 |
| 4 | Malgorzata JELENIEWSKA - P. LUTOSTANSKI | 58.44 |
| 5 | Anne GROMOELLER - Andreas KIRMSE | 28 |
| 6 | Ewa KATER - Tom TOWNSEND | 26 |
| 7 | Doris FISCHER - Bernd SAURER | 58.12 |
| 8 | Mihaela BALINT - Claudio NUNES | 58.11 |
| 9 | Andrei ARLOVICH - Sviatlana BADRANKOVA | 7.87 |
| 10 | Karel DE RAEYMAEKER - Anna ON | 43 |
| 11 | Daniela BIRMAN - David BIRMAN | 56.96 |
| 12 | Mircea Sergiu LUPU - Smaranda LUPU | 6.23 |
| 13 | Grazyna BREWIAK - Grzegorz NARKIEWICZ | 56.22 |
| 14 | Petr BAHNIK - Eva BAHNIKOVA | 55.83 |
| 15 | Marta MAJ-RUDNICKA - Jan MOS | 55.83 |
| 16 | Nadia BEKKOUCHE - Johan UPMARK | 55 |
| 17 | Andrzej HYCNAR - Renata WAJDOWICZ | 5.59 |
| 18 | Jan JANSMA - Aida SALDZIEVA | 55.57 |
| 19 | Ewa BANASZKIEWICZ - Frank SVINDAHL | 55.52 |
| 20 | V. CARCASSONNE-LABAERE - Alain LABAER | 55.32 |
| 21 | W. KWIATKOWSKI - Ewa MIELCARZEWICZ | 55 |
| 22 | Catherine CURTIS - Paul FEGARTY | 55.09 |
| 23 | Jana JANKOVA - Milan MACURA | 54.83 |
| 24 | Bojan AMBROZ - Milojka AMBROZ |  |
| 25 | Eric MAUBERQUEZ - Vanessa REESS | 54.71 |
| 26 | Sonata SIMANAITIENE - Albertas TYLA | 54.62 |
| 27 | Monika SAUTAUX - Radoslaw SZCZEPAN | 54.62 |
| 28 | Rafal JUNIK - Jolanta ZIETARA | 54.32 |
| 29 | Claus LUND - Maria Dam MORTENSEN | 54. |
| 30 | Richard RITMEIJER - Magdalena TICHA | 4.00 |
| 31 | Heather DHONDY - Jeremy DHONDY | 53.98 |
| 32 | Susan HUMPHRIES - Nick JACOB | 53.93 |
| 33 | M.WOZNIAK - E. RODZIEWICZ-BIELEWICZ | 53. |
| 34 | Halina KLUKOWSKA - Maciej TERPILOWSKI | 53.71 |
| 35 | Sara CHAPLEAU - Jeff MECKSTRO | 53.68 |
| 36 | Vesa LESKELA - KirsiVIRTANEN | 53.66 |
| 37 | Nathalie FREY - Jerome ROMBAUT | 53.65 |
| 38 | Otakar SVOBODA - Pavla SVOBODO | 53 |
| 39 | Cristina GIAMPIETRO - Yuval YENER | 53.55 |
| 40 | Ewa Agnieszka GRABOWSKA -V.VAINIKONIS | 53 |
| 41 | Joseph MACHOTKA - Nese MERCAN | 53.4 |
| 42 | Stephen PETERKIN - Sam PUNCH | 53.3 |
| 43 | Thomas BESSIS - Veronique BESSIS | 53.04 |
| 44 | R. KOWALEWSKI - Katarzyna TYSZKIEWICZ | 52.97 |
| 45 | Yury KHIUPPENEN - Tatiana TAZENKOVA | 52.96 |
| 46 | Trine BINDERKRANTZ - Thomas VANG-LARSEN | N2.87 |
| 47 | Emine KONDAKCI SEN - Tezcan SEN | 52.86 |
| 48 | Anna KOWALSKA - Marek TYRAN | 52 |
| 49 | Jean Francois ALLIX - Joanna NEVE | 52.80 |
| 50 | Ingrid GROMANN - Rob HELLE | 52.77 |


| 51 | Mehmet Remzi SAKIRLER - Umran SEMERCI | 52.75 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 52 | David A JACKSON - Teresa RIGNEY | .72 |
| 53 | Virginia CHEDIAK - Even MORKEN | I |
| 54 | Bengt-Erik EFRAIMSSON - A. ZACK | 52.64 |
| 55 | Ferda CAKICI - Erdem OZTURK | . 53 |
| 56 | Leszek SZKUDLAREK - Olga ZABULEW | 52.40 |
| 57 | Alicja KUPCZYK - Roman WACHOWIAK | 6 |
| 58 | Linda MOLLE - Marco TER LAARE | 52.32 |
| 59 | Tadeusz KACZANOWSKI - Halina SWIECH | 52.27 |
| 60 | Mireille FAYAD - Gabriel HARFOUCHE | 52.23 |
| 61 | Barbara JAROTA - Jaroslaw ROMANIUK | 52.15 |
| 62 | George BILSKI - Mischa SOLAR | 0 |
| 63 | Tomislav SCEPANOVIC - Nikica SVER | 52.06 |
| 64 | Natali SAADA - Yaniv ZACK | 52.04 |
| 65 | Mats ALLGOWER - Ella OLS | 52.02 |
| 66 | Pernilla ANDREASSON - Kjell HOL | 51.94 |
| 67 | Melih Osman SEN - Inci SUT | 51.90 |
| 68 | Martin LOEFGREN - Elke WEBER | 51 |
| 69 | Lotan FISHER - Gilda WASSERMAN | 51.74 |
| 70 | Cristina GOLIN - Massimo LANZAROTT | 51.7 |
| 71 | Geoff HAMPSON - Lindsay PEARLMAN | 51.65 |
| 72 | Lone MORTENSEN - Jens Otto PEDERSEN | 51.59 |
| 73 | Michael ASKGAARD - Christina Lund MADSEN | 51.54 |
| 74 | Zeynep ALP - Okay GUR | 51.54 |
| 75 | Iwona CZAJKA - Bogdan SZULEJEWSKI | 51 |
| 76 | Olga DLUGOSZ - Jakub WOJCIESZEK | 51.48 |
| 77 | Anita FOLKMANE - Gatis GAIGALS | 51.29 |
| 78 | Per-Arne KARLSSON - Anna ROOS KARLSS |  |
| 79 | Hartmut KONDOCH - Maria WUERMSEER | 51.2 |
| 80 | Francoise VANHOUTTE - P. VANHOU | 51.24 |
| 81 | Ron PACHTMAN - Rozalia RONEN | 51. |
| 82 | M. KWIECINSKA-WILK - Maciej STEFANIU | 51.09 |
| 83 | Petro KARLYKOV - Marina TETYUSHEVA | 51.03 |
| 84 | Todor KOSTADINOV - Cvetanka NALBATSKA | 51.02 |
| 85 | David GOLD - Susanna GROSS | 51.02 |
| 86 | Bogumila JAKUBOWSKA - Piotr KORECKI | 50.95 |
| 87 | Michael SCHNEIDER - Gisela SMYKALL | 50.90 |
| 88 | Ismail KANDEMIR - Sevil NUHOGLU | 50.8 |
| 89 | Stefan GEORGIEV - Svetla NENOVA | 50.88 |
| 90 | Danielle AVON - Jean-Michel VOLDOIRE | 50.83 |
| 91 | Arunas JANKAUSKAS - Jurgita ROTOMSKIENE | 50.7 |
| 92 | Monica AGHEMO - Andrea BURATTI | 50.73 |
| 93 | Nina ANIDJAR - Diego BRENNER | 50.67 |
| 94 | Michal KOPECKY - Jeanette REITZER | 50.6 |
| 95 | Loek FRESEN - Waltraud VOGT | 50. |
| 96 | Severine DISSARD - Gert Jan PAULISSEN | 50.55 |
| 97 | Larysa KUZNIATSOVA - Aleh TIMAKHOVICH | 50.52 |
| 98 | Mehves PISAK - M.Gokhan YILMAZ | 50.52 |
| 99 | Egil HOMME - Marianne HOMME | 50.52 |
| 100 | Krister AHLESVED - Catharina FORSBERG | 50.48 |
| 101 | Dorota TOKAJ-WOJTCZUK - R.WOJTCZUK | 50.43 |

102 Ewa SOBOLEWSKA - Marek SZYMANOWSKI 50.4I
103 Eva CAPLAN - William FRISBY 50.38
104 Cezary KRZEMINSKI - Marta OSTROWSKA 50.36
105 Tine DOBBELS - Rutger VAN MECHELEN 50.3I
106 B. DRINOVEC DRNOVSEK - Marjan ZADEL 50.29
107 Leyla ATALIK - Selcuk ATALIK
50.28

108 Wlodzimierz BUZE - Aneta JARMOCIK 50.22
109 Vasil BATOV - Marina PILIPOVIC 50.21
110 Dariusz MORAWSKI - Irmeli SALONEN 50.15
III Anne-Marie COLOMBARO - Jean-Yves DANIC 50.03
112 Margot ALFHEIM - Magne EIDE 49.99
113 Jens Ove HENNEBERG - Marlene KIRSTAN 49.99
114 Zdenek LASTOVICKA - Vera SCHULZOVA 49.99
115 Jacek KLIMCZAK - Danuta KRUPNIK 49.96
116 Paolo CLAIR - Carla PAGNINI-ARSLAN 49.91
117 Julide YARDIMCI - Hakan PEYRET
49.84
49.79
49.69
49.66

121 Sandra HAVLICEK - Miro TESLA $\quad 49.54$
122 Krzysztof LATOSZEWSKI - Anna MANDECKA 49.48
123 Luca MARIETTI - Laura Cecilia PORRO 49.44
124 Dan BYLUND - Helena STROMBERG 49.43
125 Ilona BOBKO - Dariusz ZEMBRZUSKI 49.27
126 Marek DRUKIER - Uschi HUSTEN 49.25
127 Lukasz BREDE - Malgorzata ROZMAN 49.20
128 Hanna KOWALSKA - Andrzej MAJCHER 49.17
129 Patsy MEEHAN - Marcin RUDZINSKI 49.03
130 Bodil Nyheim OIGARDEN - S. F. SIMONSEN 48.98
I3I Malgorzata SAWICKA - Jurek CZYZOWICZ 48.85
132 Fulvio FANTONI - Iolanda RIOLO 48.77
133 Sylwester MLYNARCZUK - Danuta ZABICKA 48.74
134 David LIGGAT - Elizabeth (Liz) McGOWAN 48.61
135 John PHELAN - Lucy PHELAN 48.56
136 Brigitte AUBONNET - Christophe CARDE 48.47
137 Joan KENNY - Marshall LEWIS 48.33
138 Marta JANECZEK - Aleksander KASPRZAK 48.33
139 Anna BUCZEK - Waldemar SIUDA
140 Claudia LUESSMANN - Ingo LUESSMANN
48.28
48.10
48.08
48.02
48.01
47.88
47.85

145 Hans-Herman GWINNER - Darina LANGER
146 Lena LESZCZYNSKA - Witold TOMASZEK
47.79
47.75

148 Victor ARONOV - Ahu ZOBU 47.73
149 Jane Norgren HANSEN - Lars Sogaard HANSEN 47.66
150 Jacek BALCEROWSKI - Marta BYSTRON 47.64
15I Netsy SAYER - Zahari ZAHARIEV
152 Anna SEGALOV - Zbigniew STACHNIUK
153 Agneta KAREKE - Torbjorn KAREKE
154 Agata KOWAL - Jakub KOWAL
155 Victor MILMAN - Nadia STELMASHENKO 47.34

156
157
158
159
160
161
162 Amit CHAUDHURI - Eva ENGSTROM
163 Jolanta JACOSZEK - Przemyslaw MALISZEWSKI
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176

177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200

206
207
208 Rita CHANDRA - Gerardo MALAZDREWICZ
47.34
47.32
47.07
47.00
46.95
46.95
46.86
46.83
46.68
46.65
46.62
46.46
46.44
46.35
46.16
45.99
45.98
45.73
45.70
45.68
45.68
45.4I
45.39
45.35
45.34
45.33
45.21
45.17
45.02
45.00
45.00
44.94
44.75
44.69
44.63
44.50
44.45
44.39
43.86
43.82
43.58
43.52
43.48
43.42
43.05
43.02
42.90
42.65
41.96
41.70
38.93
38.73
37.16

## MIXED PAIRS - SEMI-FINAL A

(standings after 2 sessions - subject to confirmation)

| Rank | Names Per | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| , | A KOWALSKI - E MISZEWSKA | 69.81 |
| 2 | M CANONNE - P SUSSEL | 65.84 |
| 3 | R RITMEIJER - MTICHA | 65.39 |
| 4 | I KHAZANOV - M LEBEDEVA | 62.75 |
| 5 | B EFRAIMSSON - A ZACK EINARSSON | 62.37 |
| 6 | D FISCHER - B SAURER | 62.26 |
| 7 | T BINDERKRANTZ - TVANG-LARSEN | 61.95 |
| 8 | N SAADA - Y ZACK | 61.46 |
| 9 | J DE BOTTON - A MALINOWSKI | 59.98 |
| 10 | A IVANOV - S IVANOVA | 59.41 |
| 11 | T SCEPANOVIC - N SVER | 57.97 |
| 12 | M EGGELING - T GOTARD | 57.37 |
| 13 | T BESSIS -V BESSIS | 57.06 |
| 14 | D LU -Y WANG | 56.75 |
| 15 | A SARNIAK - L SZTYRAK | 56.12 |
| 16 | J F ALLIX - J NEVE | 55.73 |
| 17 | E A GRABOWSKA -VVAINIKONIS | 55.68 |
| 18 | S AUKEN - N BOCCHI | 55.57 |
| 19 | L MOLLE - M TER LAARE | 55.33 |
| 20 | H KLUKOWSKA - M TERPILOWSKI | 55.24 |
| 21 | M BALINT - C NUNES | 55.22 |
| 22 | G HELNESS - T HELNESS | 54.91 |
| 23 | E BANASZKIEWICZ - F SVINDAHL | 54.81 |
| 24 | P ERKKILA - K KOISTINEN | 54.74 |
| 25 | G BUSSE - P BUSSE | 54.55 |
| 26 | E MAUBERQUEZ -V REESS | 54.44 |
| 27 | M S LUPU - S LUPU | 54.09 |
| 28 | S PENFOLD - B SENIOR | 53.99 |
| 29 | S SIMANAITIENE - A TYLA | 53.81 |
| 30 | R HAUGE - A MALINOWSKI | 53.75 |
| 31 | K DUFRAT - M NOWOSADZKI | 53.65 |
| 32 | M SAUTAUX - R SZCZEPANSKI | 53.63 |
| 33 | N SANDQVIST - N SENIOR | 53.55 |
| 34 | M CICHOCKI - D HOCHEKER | 53.50 |
| 35 | $\checkmark$ CARCASSONNE-LABAERE - A LABAERE | E 53.42 |
| 36 | Y KHIUPPENEN - T TAZENKOVA | 53.41 |
| 37 | G HELGEMO - D B POPOVA | 53.17 |
| 38 | G HAMPSON - L PEARLMAN | 53.14 |
| 39 | D BIRMAN - D BIRMAN | 53.13 |
| 40 | J SMEDEREVAC - S WERNLE | 53.04 |
| 41 | M LOEFGREN - EWEBER | 52.93 |
| 42 | C BALDYSZ - PTUSZYNSKI | 52.81 |
| 43 | M ROMANOVSKA - K RUBINS | 52.77 |
| 44 | L FISHER - G WASSERMAN | 52.64 |
| 45 | S SUN - R YAN | 52.48 |
| 46 | L SZKUDLAREK - O ZABULEWICZ | 52.30 |
| 47 | D ANGEBRANDT - B UTNER | 52.24 |
| 48 | B GOTARD - T GOTARD | 52.14 |
| 49 | C GIAMPIETRO - Y YENER | 52.08 |
| 50 | J JANKOVA - M MACURA | 51.98 |
| 51 | P FREDIN - M MICHIELSEN | 51.82 |
| 52 | H DHONDY - J DHONDY | 51.73 |
| 53 | $\checkmark$ CHEDIAK - E MORKEN | 51.72 |
| 54 | A BABSCH - U SCHRECKENBERGER | 51.69 |
| 55 | L GOLDBERG - U GOLDBERG | 51.59 |
| 56 | D KAZMUCHA - C SEREK | 51.47 |
| 57 | K DE RAEYMAEKER - A ONISHUK | 51.41 |
| 58 | O SVOBODA - P SVOBODOVA | 51.01 |
| 59 | P ANDERSSON - A LARSSON | 50.81 |
| 60 | S PETERKIN - S PUNCH | 50.69 |
| 61 | A KOWALSKA - M TYRAN | 50.51 |
| 62 | H KHANDELWAL - R KHANDELWAL | 50.32 |


| 63 | N FREY - J ROMBAUT | 50.30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64 | C GOLIN - M LANZAROTTI | 50.29 |
| 65 | C CURTIS - P FEGARTY | 50.23 |
| 66 | T KACZANOWSKI - H SWIECH | 50.22 |
| 67 | D A JACKSON - T RIGNEY | 50.11 |
| 68 | A HYCNAR - R WAJDOWICZ | 50.02 |
| 69 | B BROGELAND - T A BROGELAND | 50.00 |
| 70 | E KLIDZEJA - D PROKHOROV | 49.69 |
| 71 | B JAROTA - J ROMANIUK | 49.61 |
| 72 | A ELSINEN -T ELSINEN | 48.83 |
| 73 | L MORTENSEN - J O PEDERSEN | 48.81 |
| 74 | J MACHOTKA - N MERCAN | 48.66 |
| 75 | A KUPCZYK - R WACHOWIAK | 48.34 |
| 76 | D FORGE -VVENTOS | 48.34 |
| 77 | R JUNIK - J ZIETARA | 48.30 |
| 78 | R BOEDDEKER - F ZARKESCH | 48.26 |
| 79 | M WOZNIAK - E RODZIEWICZ-BIELEWICZ | 47.98 |
| 80 | N BEKKOUCHE - J UPMARK | 47.91 |
| 81 | C LUND - M D MORTENSEN | 47.61 |
| 82 | J ROMANOWSKI - M ROSSARD | 47.39 |
| 83 | P LEITNER - E PICHLER | 47.10 |
| 84 | JTACZEWSKA - M TACZEWSKI | 46.99 |
| 85 | P B NEHMERT - MYUEN | 46.67 |
| 86 | M JELENIEWSKA - P LUTOSTANSKI | 46.64 |
| 87 | M O SEN - I SUT | 46.25 |
| 88 | F CAKICI - E OZTURK | 46.02 |
| 89 | E KONDAKCI SEN - T SEN | 45.83 |
| 90 | A K FUGLESTAD - E SAELENSMINDE | 45.68 |
| 91 | G CAPPELLER - J CAPPELLER | 45.59 |
| 92 | E KATER - T TOWNSEND | 45.48 |
| 93 | CVECHIATTO - B ENGEL | 45.27 |
| 94 | G BILSKI - M SOLAR | 45.14 |
| 95 | M FAYAD - G HARFOUCHE | 45.10 |
| 96 | W KWIATKOWSKI - E MIELCARZEWICZ | 44.54 |
| 97 | G BREWIAK - G NARKIEWICZ | 44.53 |
| 98 | A MADALA - C RIMSTEDT | 44.45 |
| 99 | P BAHNIK - E BAHNIKOVA | 44.41 |
| 100 | F AYDOGDU - S AKIN | 44.21 |
| 101 | G GOTTLIEB - B KUZSELKA | 44.10 |
| 102 | H BERGER - R HANSEN | 43.99 |
| 103 | M R SAKIRLER - U SEMERCI | 43.74 |
| 104 | S CHAPLEAU - J MECKSTROTH | 43.37 |
| 105 | R KOWALEWSKI - K TYSZKIEWICZ | 43.35 |
| 106 | V LESKELA - K VIRTANEN | 43.32 |
| 107 | M ALLGOWER - E OLSSON | 43.19 |
| 108 | D GAVIARD - B PAYEN | 43.09 |
| 109 | M MAJ-RUDNICKA - J MOSZYNSKI JR | 43.06 |
| 110 | J JANSMA - A SALDZIEVA | 42.97 |
| 111 | S HUMPHRIES - N JACOB | 42.92 |
| 112 | G JANKUNAITE - G SARKANAS | 41.62 |
| 113 | B CALLAGHAN - C DUCKWORTH | 41.56 |
| 114 | S COPE - S STOCKDALE | 41.54 |
| 115 | I GROMANN - R HELLE | 41.28 |
| 116 | W FRUKACZ - G NASTASE | 41.21 |
| 117 | M GROMOELLER - R KUERSCHNER | 40.72 |
| 118 | P BUTRYN - N SAKOWSKA | 40.23 |
| 119 | A ARLOVICH - S BADRANKOVA | 39.99 |
| 120 | R DANCEWICZ - TWINCIOREK | 37.86 |
| 121 | A GROMOELLER - A KIRMSE | 37.72 |
| 122 | P ANDREASSON - K HOLMGREN | 37.34 |
| 123 | B ATALAY - A WITKOWSKI | 35.47 |
| 124 | B AMBROZ - M AMBROZ | 34.45 |

## MIXED PAIRS - SEMI-FINAL B
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