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Team White House - Koos Vrieze (President NBB), Meike Wortel, Jacco Hop, Christina Lund Madsen, Ton Bakkeren
In a final where most of the significant action took place in the first session it was the transnational White House team that assumes the mantle of European Mixed Teams Champions. Ton Bakkeren and Meike Wortel were winning their second titles (and their third medals) in the Open Championships.
Sylvie Willard's bronze medal was her eighth medal in the Open Championships, a new record. Philippe Cronier's bronze makes him the first man to have secured five medals (the same number that his wife has!).


## TODAY'S SCHEDULE

## MIXED PAIRS SEMIFINALS A \& B

10.00-11.30: Round 1
11.45-13.15: Round 2
14.30-16.00: Round 3
16.15-17.45: Round 4
18.00-19.30: Round 5


Yesterday's bulletin created a new world record of 42 pages, eclipsing the previous best of 36 . (2vi


Team AJ Diamonds - Anna Sarniak, Andrzej Jaszczak, Cathy Baldysz,
Przemyslaw Janiszewsky, Ewa Harasimowicz, Jakub Wojcieszek


Teams Zimmermann \& Full House - Philippe Cronier, Joanna Zochowska, Pierre Zimmermann, Catherine D'Ovidio, Sylvie Willard, Cecilia RImstedt, Johan Upmark, Karen McCallum, Franck Multon, Cenk Tuncok


## INFERENCE OR HYPOTHESIS

by Mark Horton

Inference: a conclusion reached on the basis of evidence and reasoning.

Hypothesis: a supposition or proposed explanation made on the basis of limited evidence as a starting point for further investigation.

Dealer East. N/S Vul.


| West | North <br> Banaszkiewicz | South <br> Brede |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $3 \Omega^{*}$ |  |  |  |
| Pass | Pass | $4 \Omega$ | 5 |

## $3 \bigcirc$ Weak jump overcall

On this deal from the first session of the Mixed Pairs South adopted what appeared to be a somewhat speculative approach during the bidding.
When West came in with $3 \circlearrowleft$ and East (a passed hand) raised to game he decided that his partner

must have values in the minors and with nine tricks in his own hand he issued a slam invitation.
Although South was limited to the extent that he had not started with a Polish $1 \%$ North decided that her aces justified a raise to $6 \mathbf{1}$.

West led the king of hearts and declarer won with dummy's ace, discarding the eight of clubs from hand, ruffed a heart and continued with seven rounds of spades. It was easy enough for East to pitch two hearts and two diamonds, but what to part with on the next round? When East fatally opted for a club declarer crossed to the ace of diamonds and played two rounds of clubs, taking the last two tricks with a spade and the five of clubs.

So, was South's jump to 51 based on an inference, or was it an hypothesis?

## EBL SOCIAL ACCOUNTS


/europeanbridge


EBL

@europeanbridge
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## A BRACE OF GRAND SLAMS

## by Barry Rigal

Board 29 from the BAM produced an excellent technical problem for the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ declarers.

Board 29 Dealer North. Both Vul.
↔ J 875
$\odot 1086$
$\diamond 1053$
\& 963


This board was played in 7NT at only seven of the 53 tables. Making $7 \circlearrowleft$ would have won you the board at more tables than it would have lost you the board. Play 7NT from West. It seems to me that a spade lead is most awkward (because it prevents you discarding a spade from West on the hearts).

Essentially the only winning line is to win the spade, cash one club if you like, then four (and only four) hearts, overtaking the third. This is the ending you will reach, with South obliged to pitch diamonds - the menace he holds over East, not spades, which would produce a "simple" double squeeze.

|  | 4. J 87 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ - |  |
|  | $\diamond 1053$ |  |
|  | \& 9 |  |
| 4 6 |  | A A 43 |
| $\bigcirc$ - |  | $\checkmark 7$ |
| $\diamond$ A 98 | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond$ K 6 |
| \& K Q 7 |  | \& 10 |
|  | A Q 9 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ - |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q J |  |
|  | \& J 85 |  |

Beware: Cashing the last heart squeezes dummy! Instead you must take the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and K
first; when you do this and lead the fifth heart, South must discard a spade or the clubs run. Now you bite the bullet and pitch dummy's seven of clubs (never easy to do, since partner will sneer if the opponents had double-bluffed you and set it up as a winner already). When you run the clubs, North will be squeezed in diamonds and spades.

My second deal comes from the quarter-finals, and I have covered it briefly there.

You play 7a from the long trumps, and North (drat him!) leads a heart. That removes your late entry to the diamonds, after ruffing a club in dummy and two diamonds in hand.
So you have a choice of lines:
Win $\triangle A, \uparrow A$ ruff a diamond low, play $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$, AA and claim if they split. If they don't split, guess whether to play diamonds from the top, or to ruff a diamond, draw the last trump, run the diamonds, and take a club finesse.
Line two is to play ace, king of diamonds and ruff a diamond high. Then a top trump and a trump to dummy. You claim if either spades or diamonds have split, and ruff a diamond to hand and cross back to a spade for the club finesse if they don't.
It looks to me like line one forces you to a guess when spades are 3-1. Line two goes down when the hand with long spades has short diamonds, and when trumps are 4-0.

How do the percentages compare? In line one you lose out $50 \%$ of the time that you could
make it, if you ruff the third diamond. If you play diamonds from the top I think it's about the same. Call that $25 \%$ of the time.
If you play two diamonds and ruff high you lose out to 4-0 spades (unless RHO has two or fewer diamonds and four spades) - call that $8 \%$ of the time. Of the remaining $92 \%$ of the time you go down when spades are 3-1 and the player with the length has two diamonds - about a quarter of the time spades are $3-1$ so let's call that $13 \%$ of the balance. I make that a combined $20 \%$ of the time.
As my mathematics is notoriously flaky, I invite readers to put me right. Have at it!


Christina Lund Madsen has received a birthday honours award from the Prince Consort of Denmark. The award, which is in the form of a scholarship, is presented to young personalities who have supported the development of the quality of life quality in society and raised Denmark's recognition culturally, commercially or within science.
In presenting the award, HRH mentioned her bridge results and her efforts to communicate and broaden bridge interest in Denmark and also her resolve to become a world champion and her wish
to work with and for bridge.
He mentioned how she started by attending a junior camp in Poland in 2001 in an attack of intellectual boredom ever since spending many long nights at the bridge table. The Prince looked at her over his glasses and said 'Only playing bridge...?'
The other recipients this year were a young art historian who has already written several books, a young scientist and a young male actor who has received several acting prizes, including a silver bear in Berlin.

Go to page: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 |

## Mixed Teams Quarter Finals

On Monday the Round of 16 and the QF's were played. Finally Zimmermann, White House, A J Diamonds and Full House qualified to play the Semifinals. In the QF's, two hands from the Zimmermann-Casino Floor match made me remember that Small is Beautiful.
Small Is Beautiful: A Study of Economics As If People Mattered is a collection of essays by British economist E. F. Schumacher. The phrase "Small Is Beautiful" came from a phrase by his teacher Leopold Kohr. It is often used to champion small, appropriate technologies that are believed to empower people more, in contrast with phrases such as "big or elaborated is better".
How does this relate to bridge you might ask? Let's see some hands to understand the analogy:

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { s } & 10986 \\
\diamond & 96 \\
\diamond & 1082 \\
\& & 10864
\end{array}
$$



| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zimmermann | Charlsen | ZochowskaLarsson |  |
|  |  |  | 18 |
| Dble | Pass | 14 | 28 |
| 49 | All Pass |  |  |

After Larsson's $1 \bigcirc$ opening bid, Zimmermann started with a double; his partner with only a queen and a king, didn't want to say 1 NT , and she didn't want to show either of her two four cards suits that looked more like three cards suits, so she simply said 19 . Larsson continued to compete with her six card suit, and Zimmermann closed proceedings by bidding game.

The declarer onlylost the first three tricks: $\diamond \mathrm{A}, \diamond \mathrm{K}$ and $\&$ A to score +420 .

At the other table the auction started in the same way but East chose to show her club suit. Hoftaniska thought his 2 would have to be enough to show his strong hand but it was not, and they only played a spade part score, which cost them 10 IMPs.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Hoftaniska | Cronier | K.BertheauD'Ovidio |  |
|  |  | $1 \circlearrowleft$ |  |
| Dble | Pass | $2 \%$ | $2 \circlearrowleft$ |
| 2 $\$$ | All Pass |  |  |

Board 4. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ↔ } 754 \\
& \diamond 9842 \\
& \diamond-\bar{l} \\
& \text { \& } \mathrm{Q} 10873
\end{aligned}
$$



After her partner's 1NT opening bid, Zochowska evaluated that her balanced hand would not produce slam. Right she was, +460 .
At the other table E/W reached $6 \diamond$, one down and 13 IMPs for Zimmermann.


Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.

- Q J 2

○ A 875
$\diamond 54$
\& Q 543

| ค 8765 |  | N | A K 94 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ¢ 8765 |  |  | $\checkmark$ | 42 |
| $\diamond$ Q 109 |  | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond$ | A 8 |
| \& 108 |  |  |  | AK 762 |
|  | 9 | 103 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ | K J 6 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ | K J 7 |  |  |
|  | \& | J 9 |  |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bakkeren | Piscitelli | L.Mad | Manno |
|  | Pass | 14\%* | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $1 \checkmark$ | 14 | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | 3 | AllPass |
| 1\% Strong |  |  |  |

Declarer had only 9 tricks but an error allowed her to make 10.


At the other table, the E/W pair couldn't stop out of game, and the defense did not fail, so one down and a 6 IMP prize.
All these hands had nothing special, but what they have in common is the simplicity with which they were treated proving once more that simple can be very beautiful or beneficial.

## CAPTION CONTEST

## by The Bulletin \& the Press Room staffs



Press Room Manger Jan Swaan paid a visit to the Tourist Office (he is the one on the right).

Can you come up with a caption for this photograph?

Bring your suggestions to the Bulletin Room or email them to markhorton007@hotmail.com

## Captions received so far:

When you meet a polar bear on land, no hand is safe.

Alf Markussen, Norway

[^0]
## Ever seen Swan

Taming a bear
Without no fear...?
No ? Just look there
Guy Lambeaux, Belgium

Welcome to Fortitude.
Ron Tacchi
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## LILLEBALUBA BS A J DIAMONDS

by Barry Rigal

Mixed Teams, Quarter Finals

Your reporter was preempted in his choice of matches to cover, and picked extremely badly from the remainder. Not because the bridge was bad; it was exciting. But alas, the computers in each room chose this moment to crash, regularly and repeatedly, making sensible viewing hard, sensible commentary even more difficult than nature had intended.

On the first deal, at both tables the EW pairs did well in the face of an opposition preempt not to get carried away with their powerhouse, and play beyond the game-level, since ten tricks were the theoretical limit. AJ Diamonds gained an overtrick to lead 1-0.

The second board proved challenging for the NS pairs.

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

|  | $\begin{array}{ll} \Delta & \text { K Q } 875 \\ \diamond & \text { Q } 82 \\ \diamond & 1073 \\ \& & \text { A Q } \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ A J 109 |  | 4 632 |
| $\bigcirc 1063$ | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ E | $\bigcirc$ KJ 9 |
| $\diamond$ K 964 | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond 852$ |
| \& K 8 |  | \& 10654 |
|  | ¢ 4 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 754 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A Q J |  |
|  | \& J 9732 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Janiszewski | F. Bogen | Harasim. | A-I Bogen |
|  |  | Pass | 1\% |
| Dble | Rdbl | 10 | Pass |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 1NT |

All Pass

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Harding | Baldysz | Stanghelle Jaszczak |  |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \mathbf{0} \mathbf{0}$ |
| Dble | Rdbl | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $1 N T$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

Harding led 10 , won in dummy, and Jaszczak tried $\& A, \&_{\mathrm{Q}}$; not a success today. The defenders cleared spades, got in with $\diamond \mathrm{K}$, cashed out the spades, and still had a heart and club to come. Down two.
In the other room Harasimowicz's $1 \circlearrowleft$ call might have got her to $1 \Omega \mathrm{x}$, where even four tricks seems like something of a challenge. In 3NT on a heart lead declarer won in hand and took a successful spade finesse and an unsuccessful diamond finesse. Back came a diamond and declarer tried a heart to the queen and king, the defenders clearing diamonds. The same two down - and even at double-dummy if declarer plays on clubs first, eight tricks are the limit.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Janiszewski | F. Bogen | Harasim. | A-I Bogen |
|  |  |  | $1 \Omega$ |
| Dble | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| 34 | All Pass |  |  |

Closed Room

| West <br> Harding | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Baldysz | Stanghelle Jaszczak |  |
|  |  |  | 10 |
| 14 | Pass | 24 | Dble |
| 44 | All Pass |  |  |

This was a huge missed opportunity for Lillebaluba. Janiszewski's double and jump in spades should promise five-card support for all you system buffs out there. (A jump cue-bid by contrast shows these values with four trumps). Harasimowicz passed 3ヘ anyway and made ten tricks after a heart lead.
Harding could have taken the money in 3NT easily enough, but opted for 4A. After a heart lead she went up with the king (a strange decision, to me ) and had to use Q to take the heart finesse. After drawing trumps declarer led clubs from hand and the defenders could exit in hearts, and leave declarer with three diamond losers since she no longer had an entry to dummy.
A simple line might be to win the $\odot \mathrm{J}$ and draw two rounds of trumps with the ace and queen, (three rounds of trumps would be fatal since you lose your re-entry to draw the last trump) then lead a diamond up. South wins and returns a heart, but you can win and draw trumps, then clear diamonds. You still have trump control to set up your club winner.


Przemyslaw Janiszewski, team A J Diamonds

It got worse for Lillebaluba on the next deal when a mirror-image pair of hands created a problem for $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$.

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.
4 754
$\bigcirc 9842$
$\diamond-$
\& Q J 10873


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Janiszewski | F. Bogen | Harasim. | A-I Bogen |
| 1NT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{6}$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

You would have a lot of sympathy with any EW pair who could not identify the mirror images and played a small slam, but your sympathy might be a little muted given the exuberance of the auction from the Closed Room. Their sequence has vanished away like the dew in the morn, which will at least allow some blushes to be spared. Essentially a strong club and positive in diamonds eventually saw West ask for aces then bid 5NT, and East accepted the invitation to $7 \diamond$.
In the other room, whether or not you think the West hand is too good for a strong no-trump (the dreaded Kaplan-Rubens evaluator puts it within range) it certainly simplified things for the Poles. A J Diamonds led 21-0, and added 6 further IMPs when their EW pair stopped sensibly low on the next deal in a club partscore, and brought it home while 3NT was running into some hostile breaks (not to mention some unlucky location of high-cards - in the opponents' hands, not their own...).
27-0; if Lillebaluba were going to break their duck, it would be nice to do it with a decent swing - say a slam hand?
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Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.
A 10
『 Q 107643
$\diamond$ J 3
\& K 1087


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Janiszewski | F. Bogen | Harasim. | A-I Bogen |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 4NT* | Pass |
| 5\%** | Pass | 5 $\diamond^{*}$ | Pass |
| 50* | Pass | 7 | All Pass |

The Closed Room played 6 ; unchallenging, but it has the virtue of being cold. Maybe one failing grand a set is sufficient...? Declarer's route to 12 tricks on a heart lead was to finesse in clubs then ruff out the suit.
The grand slam is quite playable, I think. A heart lead is best (else declarer ruffs out diamonds while ruffing a club in dummy, and can draw trumps then use $\smile A$ as the re-entry to dummy.) After the heart lead from North, Janiszewski won and ruffed a diamond to hand, played $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} \mathrm{Q}$ and a spade to dummy, then had to decide whether to draw the last trump before testing diamonds. There is no winning line today, and no doubt table presence plays a part in the decision, but I'd guess Janiszewki played slightly against the odds by ruffing a diamond and relying on the club finesse, as opposed to playing $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ first. No matter - it was 17 IMPs to Lillebaluba either way. This board will be discussed in more detail elsewhere.


Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

$$
\text { \& } 104
$$

© K 543
$\diamond$ QJ9652
\& 6


Janiszewski simplified matters at his table by opening $4 \checkmark$. Frank Bogen led what was readable as a singleton club. Anne-Irene Bogen won and needed to play a second club (either a high or low one would have done). But from her perspective she could imagine that on a different layout it might be necessary to set up a spade before the clubs in dummy were good - it is a little difficult to find such a layout but imagine declarer with a not-implausible eight hearts to the AKJ and three spades to the jack. In this scenario a spade shift is critical. But not today; declarer could discard his club on the diamonds and claim ten painless tricks.
In the other room Stanghelle played $4 \boldsymbol{A}$ after a slower auction. On an initial trump lead from Jaszczak declarer won and played ace and another heart, letting the queen ride. It feels obvious to run the ワJ now doesn't it? North will duck, you discard a minor, and unless clubs are 5-1 you are home. Cometh the hour, cometh the foul distribution. The defenders can score a heart ruff, ace and a club ruff, and another heart promotes the $\boldsymbol{\Phi} \mathrm{K}$ to the setting trick. The Diamonds' lead was back to 37-17.

Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { ↔ } & 97 \\
\diamond & \text { A } \\
\diamond & \text { KQ J } 982 \\
\& & 10753
\end{array}
$$


$\bigcirc 932$
$\diamond$ A 53
\& $A K J$


- K J 43
© J 10764
$\diamond 74$
\& 84
- $A Q 2$
$\checkmark$ KQ 85
$\diamond 106$
\& Q 962

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Janiszewski | F. Bogen | Harasim. | A-I Bogen |
| 1\& | $1 \diamond$ | 1中* | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| "1 Both majors |  |  |  |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Harding | Baldysz | Stanghelle Jaszczak |  |
| 1NT | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT |

Playing transfer responses after intervention let Harasimowicz show both majors. Janiszewski knew to lead spades against 3NT - which might not appear to accomplish much, but worked a treat. He could hold up his $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, and when he took it he could cash $\% \mathrm{~K}$ to make the defence crystal-clear, before playing a second spade. Declarer was toast.
In the other room Harding led a top club against 3NT and you would have thought had an easy defence: shift to hearts, duck the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and play...which suit?
While a spade shift works, and East's diamond cards (high-low count or suit preference?) might have suggested that, EW were apparently unlucky enough to be playing even cards encouraging at trick one. So Harding won his $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and reverted to diamonds rather than play spades, and declarer claimed +630 for 12 IMPs. At set end the score was 50-19 for A J Diamond, well on their way to a spot in the last four.

"The PigPen Coup by Brian Senior"

"Swiss Feelings"


Horton's Corner - "Sabine in Action"


Test your play with Dennis Bilde

> More videos are coming soon!
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## LILLEBALUBA VS A J DIAMONDS

by Ram Soffer

## Mixed Teams Quarter Final

Five out of the eight squads which had reached this stage were transnational, but in this match the all-Norwegian Lillebaluba faced the all-Polish AJ Diamonds - a team which included three members, past and present, of the Polish Women team.
The first half went according to form, with AJ Diamonds taking a comfortable lead of 50:19. Were there any realistic hopes for the underdogs? After going through the deals, my inevitable conclusion was that Lillebaluba could have gotten all those IMPs back by playing very well and making use of all their opportunities.
The first such opportunity arrived early:


| West <br> Sarniak | North <br> Stanghelle | East South <br> WojcieszekHarding |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $1 \diamond$ |
| 10 | 14 | 20 | Pass |
| Pass | 440 | All Pas |  |

With eight sure tricks facing an opening, I believe Helge Stanghelle could have produced a more creative effort than signing off in 4^. Slam is definitely not a favourite with the $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$ cards, but the lucky situation in clubs allows 64 to make - just the kind of start you need when 31 IMPs down with 14 to go.
At the Closed Room Baldysz-Jaszcsak stopped in 4\$ as well, making one more trick to extend their team's lead by 1 IMP.


Board 18. Dealer East. N/S Vul.


One would expect $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ to bid a game at IMPs, but South's $3 \bigcirc$ bid didn't give them bidding space to invite game, and West's 3 bid was poorely competitive. The play in a spade partscore was not very exciting, with Haakon Bogen making nine tricks.

| West | North | East | South <br> Sarniak |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Stanghelle | WojcieszekHarding |  |

At the other table West's 3 bid was invitational, and the game was bid. However, the play is greatly complicated by the 4-1 trump break.
Gerd-Marit Harding led the $\triangle$ Q, taken in dummy and followed by the $\diamond 10$.
The only winning defence (against any line of play) is for North to go up with $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ and continue diamonds. South plays a 3rd round of diamonds, forcing declarer to ruff early in dummy, after which there is no way to come to 10 tricks. Nobody defended like this in the six BBO tables where 4A was played. Even those who went up with the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ switched to hearts or clubs.
In our case, South won the $\diamond A$ and continued another round of hearts, ruffed in East's hand.

Jakub Wojcieszek continued diamonds, and North won perforce with her $\diamond \mathrm{K}$. She continued clubs, which declarer had to duck to South's \&K.
Now Harding continued hearts, giving declarer an easy time since after ruffing he is able to draw four rounds of trumps and claim. What would have happened if he continued diamonds, forcing dummy to ruff? Unaware of the actual trump break, declarer would probably attempt to draw trumps in three rounds and fail.
However after South's weak overcall of $2 \Omega$, once he fails to lead a club and is shown to have four diamonds during the play, Wojcieszek could work out his 1-6-4-2 distribution and play accordingly: ruff a 3rd diamond in dummy, ruff a heart (North discards, since if he tries to ruff with the $\$ 8$, declarer can draw trumps after all), return to dummy with a high trump, finesse clubs, cash A and cross-ruff.
Still, it would have been quite an effort to find all this, so one may conclude that Lillebaluba missed a chance to gain 5 IMPs instead of losing 7.

Another chance went begging on the next board:
Board 19. Dealer South. E/W Vul.


South's $2 \diamond$ opening (probably Flannery) silenced West, and N/S bought the contract in $3 \Omega$. East led 4 to ensure down one, but it was not a great result for $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ who were cold for $5 \diamond$.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A.I. Bogen | Baldysz | H. Bogen Jaszcsak |  |
| Pass | $2 \circlearrowleft$ | All Pass | $1 \circlearrowleft$ |

Here South opened a normal 1厅 (Passing was also an option which was exercised in several tables), and a $2 \diamond$ overcall by West also looks normal, after which E/W will probably play in a diamond contract for +150 or +600 .
To be honest, I can't see a completely logical way to reach a game with these E/W cards, but on the other hand, the need to win a lot of IMPs urgently since your team started the session 31 down constitutes a very good reason to overbid a little.
Anyway, letting the opponents play $2 \Omega$ when both sides have a nine-card fit doesn't win you matches. Jaszcsak scored +140 .

On Board 20 the Bogens did take their chance. Unfortunately for them, their good result was duplicated in the other room after a totally different auction.

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.
A KQ 83
$\checkmark$ KJ742
$\diamond$ Q J 4
of 8


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A.I. Bogen | Baldysz | H. Bogen | Jaszcsak |
| 5\% | Pass | 6\% | All Pass |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sarniak | Stanghelle | Wojcieszek | Harding |
| 1\% | 1NT | Dble | 34 |
| 4\% | Pass | 49 | Dble |
| Pass | Pass | Rdbl | Pass |
| 5\% | Pass | 64 | All Pass |

No rules exist in bridge for bidding hands with solid 9 -card suits. The players have to improvise and Haakon Bogen deserves some credit for trusting his partner to follow "the rule of 500" and possess 9 tricks for her five-level preempt.
Anna Sarniak decided to go by the slow route, opening $1 \%$. Her voluntary $4 \%$ bid showed a good one-suited hand, though it didn't indicate 9 cards
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by any means. Once again Wojcieszek deserves the credit for working this out and reaching the proper level. The play was trivial, both teams scoring +1370 for a push.

On the next board a risky action by Jaszcsak met with a cruel punishment.

Board 21. Dealer North. N/S Vul.


Maybe South should have given it another thought at this vulnerability, since a 4 preempt often leaves the opponents no choice but to double for penalty.
The sight of a trump void in dummy was unpleasant, but at least there was a fit for his secondary suit - diamonds. With diamonds breaking 2-2, it seems at first that declarer loses only one trick in each suit for -200, a fairly good sacrifice against the opponent's cold game of $4 \checkmark$.
However, appearances are misleading here. After the $\checkmark A$ lead, followed by hearts (or clubs) at every opportunity, declarer loses trump control and can't enjoy any diamond tricks except the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$. There was no way to overcome this problem, and Jaszcsak had to concede down four and -1100.
At the other table Sarniak/Wojcieszek missed their heart game ( $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}+170$ ). In a way, it was good news for AJ Diamonds that both their pairs had their bad board in the same deal. It cost the team 14 IMPs, but there was still a cushion of 21 IMPs with seven to go.
The last real opportunity to make it close came in Board 22. Once again the Bogens allowed their opponents to play in a making partscore when it was possible to bid and make a vulnerable game.

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.


West A.I. Bogen<br>North<br>Baldysz<br>East South<br>H. Bogen Jaszcsak<br>Pass 1NT<br>All Pass

Jaszcsak's off-shape 1NT was a success. West's cards deserved an overcall, but not all pairs have the machinery to show a hand with 5 clubs and 4 spades over 1NT.
Anyway, E/W can easily make 11 tricks in a club contract. In addition, they can make a partscore in both majors. It was a pretty feeble effort to sell out to 1 NT and then let it make by a club lead.
At the other table Harding opened a normal $1 \diamond$, Sarniak didn't overcall and N/S reached $3 \diamond$. They lost the obvious five tricks and AJ Diamonds gained 4 IMPs - a welcome relief after the disaster of the previous board.
In the final deal of significance, Anna Sarniak found a nice switch at trick two to defeat a vulnerable game which was not bid at the other table.


Andrzej Jaszczak, team A J Diamonds

Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.

- K J 10
$\checkmark$ K J 9
$\diamond$ K 92
\& J 972
A A652
$\bigcirc 732$
$\diamond A$ Q
\& K K 43


A Q 73
$\bigcirc 1086$
$\diamond 107543$
of Q 5

- 984
$\checkmark$ AQ 54
$\diamond$ J 86
\& A 106
West
Sarniak
Dble

North East South
Stanghelle WojcieszekHarding Pass $1 \diamond$ 3NT All Pass

After being over-cautious for most of the session, Lillebaluba at last started to bid aggressively, hoping to create big swings by bidding thin games. At the other table South didn't open, and North declared 1NT.
Wojcieszek led $\diamond 7$ - second best from his long suit in order to indicate lack of honours. Sarniak didn't fall into the trap of the "automatic play" -

winning $\diamond A$ followed by $\diamond Q$. It was not difficult to deduce from the bidding that East had a very weak hand. Therefore West should try to develop his own suit rather than partner's suit. The obvious candidate was spades, and when the 2 was led at trick 2, East produced the Q . Declarer had no time to develop clubs, since $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ had already developed three spade tricks in addition to the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and $\& \mathrm{~K}$.
N/S -100, and 6 more IMPs for AJ Diamonds. Their final margin of victory was 77:45.



ZIMMERMANN VS CASINO FLOOR
by Ron Tacchi

## Mixed Teams Quarter Final

This quarter-final saw Zimmermann facing Casino Floor - a Nordic team where the gentlemen hail from Norway and the ladies from Sweden. Both teams had reasonably comfortable wins in the Round of Sixteen. One question to be asked is would the Zimmermann team be fresher as a result of playing six-handed, or might the Casino Floor team be feeling the pressure of playing all the boards as a team of four.

Board 1.
BBO had communication problems during the first board: fortunately it was a straightforward $4 \triangle$ contract which both teams bid and made easily.

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zimmermann Charlsen |  | ZochowskaLarsson |  |
|  |  | Pass | 1\%** |
| Pass | 10 | Pass | 2\% |
| Pass | $2 \diamond *$ | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | All Pas |  |
| $2 \diamond$ | GF |  |  |
| $3 \diamond$ | Asking for | stop |  |

Here there was a system failure. When asked about the $3 \diamond$ bid Larsson said she did not know what $3 \diamond$ meant and treated it as natural and passed. This was not a resounding success. The contract had no chance, especially as Zochowska, having understood what had happened, led a trump, and North finished two light -200.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hoftaniska | Cronier | Bertheau <br> d'Ovidio |  |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \&$ |
| Dble | 1ヵ | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Cronier and d'Ovidio had a perfectly reasonable auction to reach the standard contract of 3NT. With hearts not behaving and the diamond king offside there was no play for the contract and it finished one off -100 . So a let it off for the Casino Floor team, only three IMPs out.


Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Zimmermann Charlsen |  |  |  | ZochowskaLarsson

With his twenty-count and a heart stopper Zimmermann doubled the opening One Heart bid, no doubt intending to bid some number of no-trumps at his next turn. Zochowska decided with her meagre collection to keep the bidding as low as possible and responded One Spade. She must have been a trifle apprehensive when partner raised her to game and then relieved at the sight of dummy and relieved a second time when the defence started with three rounds of diamonds and no ruff ensued. She claimed when trumps proved not to be $5-0,+620$.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hoftaniska | Cronier | Bertheau | d'Ovidio |
|  |  |  | $1 \Omega$ |
| Dble | Pass | $2 \&$ | 29 |
| $2 \$$ | All Pass |  |  |

The first three bids were the same as the Open Room but here Bertheau bid one of her four-card suits. Over the $2 \circlearrowleft$ interference Hoftaniska just bid $2 \boldsymbol{4}$, which was passed out. Might not West have tried 2NT? It is easy when you can see all four hands, but had East's points been in the North hand then it would not have been a success. (More to the point East could have raised to 34. Editor) Declarer made +2 trivially. Ten IMPs out.

| Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ 754 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 9842$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ - |  |  |  |
| \& Q J 10873 |  |  |  |
| ¢ KQ2 $\sim_{\text {N A J } 3}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| \& A 2 |  | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Q 10986$\bigcirc$ Q J 6 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond 1095$ |  |  |  |
| \& K 96 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Zimmermann | Charlsen | Zochous | wskaLarsson |
| 1NT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

East did not appear to consider the possibility of slam and raised partner to the no-trump game. Declarer cashed his eleven top tricks, +660 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hoftaniska | Cronier | Bertheau | d'Ovidio |
| 1NT | Pass | 24** | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 34** | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 40* | Pass | 44** | Pass |
| 4NT* | Pass | 54* | Pass |
| 5NT* | Pass | $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |

At this table East took a rosier view of her hand. After a Stayman enquiry and continuation had unearthed the diamond fit, the pair reached the
diamond slam. The play record has disappeared into the ether but with the horrendous duplication of distribution and the wasted spade honours declarer had no practical chance of success barring a defensive error, which was not forthcoming. If the jack of spades was moved to the heart suit then the contract is $100 \%$. Another thirteen IMPs out, and a deficit of 26 IMPs after four boards.


Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

```
A 10
\vee Q 107643
J 3
& K1087
```



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zimmermann | Charlsen | Zochowska | Larsson |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | $2 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 40* | Pass | 4NT** | Pass |
| 5 ${ }^{*}$ | Pass | $5 \mathrm{C}^{*}$ | Pass |
| 60** | Pass | 74 | All Pass |

$2 \diamond \quad$ Quasi-game-forcing
4NT Keycard Blackwoo
$5 \diamond 1$ keycard
$5 \checkmark$ Queen?
64 Yes, but no other king
7^ All I needed to know
There appeared to be a long pause before Zimmermann's $4 \checkmark$ bid; there was talk on BBO that they expected a club cue-bid. The usual Blackwood exchange followed and Zochowska seemed to hesitate a while before bidding the grand slam. When North led a club, it simplified declarer's play of the hand and he was up to the task. North queried West's Four Heart bid which was explained as a cue-bid and that he had made that particular bid as he then hoped (correctly it would seem) to get a club lead. The director was summoned, but no adjustment was made.
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Closed Room

| West <br> Hoftaniska | North <br> Cronier | East <br> Bertheau | South <br> d'Ovidio |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1ヵ |  |  | Pass |

A similar, though briefer, auction to the grand slam, and again a club lead simplified declarer's task. It is perhaps worth noting that a heart lead definitely makes things a lot more difficult for declarer and in practice he will almost always go down. But in the end it was just another dull push.

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.
A AJ 6
$\checkmark 6$
$\diamond$ K J 73
\& A 10954


Open Room

| West | North | East | South <br> ZimmermannCharlsen |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | ZochowskaLarsson |  |  |

The opening club bid was one of several options - a weak no-trump, clubs and I believe some strong hands. When the inevitable 3NT was reached, Zimmermann doubled for a heart lead, which was forthcoming. A low heart from dummy enabled him to win with the nine. Zimmermann shifted to a diamond, taken in dummy. Declarer essayed a spade to his jack, which lost to East's king. Declarer is now booked for two off unless the defence finds a way to discard a club, and not take their top tricks. You
are doubtless ahead of me here. East now returned a diamond and West discarded a club. From -300 to +550 in one card.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hoftaniska | Cronier | Bertheau | d'Ovidio |
|  | $1 \%$ | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | $3 \%$ |
| Dble | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | 34 | All Pass |

After team Zimmermann subsided in 3\%, West came back into the auction with a double. Bertheau showed her diamonds and Hoftaniska showed a major two-suiter with his $3 \circlearrowleft$ bid and Bertheau now converted to spades. D'Ovidio started with a trump to partner's jack and declarer's king. Declarer led a diamond, d'Ovidio hopped up with her queen, and continued the trump leads to Cronier's ace and he exited with his last trump. Bertheau led a small heart from hand toward dummy and when d'Ovidio failed to split her honours inserted the nine. Thus she escaped for one off rather than two. Ten much needed IMPs to Casino Floor.

Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- 97
$\checkmark$ A
$\diamond$ KQJ982
\& 10753

| ¢ 10865 |  | ¢ K J 43 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 932$ | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\bigcirc$ J 10764 |
| $\diamond$ A 53 | ${ }^{\mathbf{S}}$ L | $\diamond 74$ |
| \& AK K |  | \& 84 |
|  | - A Q 2 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ KQ 85 |  |
|  | $\diamond 106$ |  |
|  | \& Q 962 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zimmermann Charlsen | ZochowskaLarsson |  |  |

Zimmermann opened proceedings with a weak no-trump and Zochowska found the spade fit after a Stayman enquiry. Neither North or South found a way into the auction and the contract followed its predestined path to a one-trick defeat.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hoftaniska | Cronier | Bertheau | d'Ovidio |
| 1थ | $1 \diamond$ | Dble* | Rdbl |
| 1ヵ | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Here there was no reticence on the part of North and South and they ended in a slightly pushy 3NT. Well one of the hands was balanced and they had the balance of points. We have another contract which should fail in theory was allowed to succeed thanks to the defence. West led the king of clubs, not unsurprisingly, and even more unsurprisingly he continued with a heart to remove dummy's entry. Declarer played two rounds of diamonds, the second of which was taken by West. He had to find the spade switch to beat the contract: if not declarer would have time to force an entry to dummy with a club and be able to cash all those lovely diamonds. I am not privy to East's available signals on the heart lead but I would have thought she would have discouraged. But after a shift another moribund contract came back to life. This is one of the reasons 3NT is bid so often, as it can be an extremely difficult contract against which to defend. Another eleven IMPs to Zimmermann.
At the end Zimmermann had won the first session 45-15. Casino Floor would need an extremely good second fourteen-board session to come back and win this quarter-final.

It appears that on Board 9 from the first session that the BBO record was not quite correct. The play of the hand was surreal, but made a lot more sense if the contract was Four Clubs, and it appears that North took himself out of 3NTx into $4 \diamond$, but The


BBO operator somehow missed it. Also an IMP seems to have disappeared from the Zimmermann score. This leaves the situation as Zimmermann leading Casino Floor 44-7. An even greater task than first thought. Would Casino Floor be up to the considerable task? The first board showed that they were going were going to push all the way.

Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

|  | $\begin{array}{ll} \wedge & \text { AK Q J } \\ \diamond & 6 \\ \diamond & \text { A } 83 \\ \& & 82 \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { s } \\ & \diamond \text { AK } 973 \\ & \diamond 765 \\ & \& 6543 \end{aligned}$ |  | ¢ 982 |
|  | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ E | $\bigcirc$ J 852 |
|  | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond$ K Q 2 |
|  |  | * Q 107 |
|  | A 54 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 104 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 1094 |  |
|  | \& AK J 9 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cronier | Charlsen | d'Ovidio | Larsson |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 20** | Pass | $2 \diamond *$ |
| 29 | 24 | $4 \checkmark$ | Dble |
| Pass | 49 | Pass | 6 |

North opened his hand with a $2 \%$ bid, which I believe to be a strong two in an undetermined suit.Certainly has eight playing tricks. With East and West interfering in hearts South inferred (hoped?) that partner had a singleton and if his spades were solid there would be a play for the slam. There was a play, it was that East held the ten and queen of clubs. Today was their lucky day, since on a diamond lead declarer pitches his hearts and the jack of clubs and gives up a diamond. On a heart lead declarer uses the minor suit for five tricks. So it is a 'good' slam according to Hamman.

Closed Room

| West <br> Bertheau | North <br> Multon | East <br> HoftaniskaWillard |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass |  |  |

Multon opened with Four Spades and was left to play there, since South could never envisage a hand where there was a play, albeit a $24 \%$ chance, of slam. Thirteen IMPs to Casino.
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Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.
A A652
$\checkmark$ AJ 3
$\diamond 1087$
\& A 84


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cronier | Charlsen | d'Ovidio | Larsson |
| $1 \%$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $2 \%$ | All Pass |  |  |

D'Ovidio did not bother to invite a game as she knew that her partner at best had three hearts and a maximum of fourteen points and little prospect of a useful fit. Declarer minded his work and made an overtrick.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bertheau | Multon | HoftaniskaWillard |  |
| 1NT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{*}$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

In this room, in need of IMPs, Casino Floor pushed to game. They had reckoned without the killer lead of Multon: the jack of hearts. Now the contract was booked for three light and nine IMPs back to Zimmermann.



Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.
^ K Q 83
$\checkmark$ K J 742
$\diamond$ Q J 4
\& 8


- J 10942
$\checkmark 10$
$\diamond$ K 8732
\& J 2
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cronier | Charlsen | d'Ovidio | Larsson |
| $5 \%$ | All Pass |  |  |

Who, if anyone, was at fault here? You have twelve of the most solid tricks and you are playing at the five-level. I suspect the problem is that West could have made the same bid with a lesser hand. When I was a boy we were told in no uncertain terms that vulnerable pre-empts must be within two tricks; if this dictum was still adhered to, East has no problem in bidding the slam as nine plus three equals twelve. Pre-empting is a two-edged sword.

Closed Room

| West | North | East $\quad$ South |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bertheau | Multon | HoftaniskaWillard |  |
| $5 \%$ | Pass | $6 \%$ | All Pass |

Again in need of points, East had no qualms at setting her sights on a slam; and he was correct. Two successful slam swings in six boards, twelve IMPs to Casino Floor.

Board 21. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\diamond$ A 1042 |  |  |
|  | \& 109642 |  |  |
| A K65 N 9873 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc \text { AK Q J } 5$ | $\mathbf{W}^{\mathbf{N}}$ E $\quad \bigcirc 962$ |  |  |
| $\diamond$ K J |  |  |  |
| \& 753 |  | $\stackrel{4}{4}$ | A Q J 8 |
|  | - AQJ 1042 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 8$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ Q 7653 |  |  |  |
| \& K |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Cronier |  | d'Ovidio | o Larsson |
|  | Charlsen | Pass | 14 |
| 1NT | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 30 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

D'Ovidio made an effort, and Cronier offered her the choice of 3 NT or $4 \checkmark$, she chose the lower level game. Charlesen selected the two of clubs for the opening lead, Cronier, whose name is not Leonard, inserted the jack, losing to the singleton king. Larsson switched to a small diamond and declarer was at the crossroads - get it right and he had a chance for his contract - get it wrong and he would fail by several tricks. After some thought declarer played his king, reasoning that as South had opened the bidding she was more likely to hold the ace. But it was not to be and the contract failed by three -150 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bertheau | Multon | HoftaniskaWillard |  |
| - | Pass | Pass | 14 |
| $2 \varnothing$ | Pass | $3 \odot$ | All Pass |

After South's opening 1^ Bertheau made a simple overcall of $2 \triangle$ and East's pre-emptive raise to three brought the auction to a conclusion. Again North led a small club but this time declarer rose with the ace felling the singleton and now was cold for plus one and would make a second overtrick if she guessed the diamonds correctly. Even plus one was worth another eight IMPs to Casino Floor.


Bertheau had no such hang-ups about entering the fray with her five-card club suit. When her partner introduced his heart suit in a competitive auction she bid the major-suit game. Willard led her queen of diamonds which declarer took in hand with his singleton ace. A small heart to the king and a small one ducked to the ace left Willard on lead again. Now rather than continuing with a diamond, which would have left declarer without resource she tried a small spade and now declarer did not need another chance. He claimed his ten tricks and another ten IMPs. It was now all square at fifty-four apiece.
Over the next five boards Zimmermann gained seven IMPs in dribs and drabs.

Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
A A
$\checkmark$ A 7642
$\diamond$ AJ 9
\& J 863


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cronier | Charlsen | d'Ovidio | Larsson |
| 1ヵ | Dble | Pass | Pass |
| 1NT | Dble | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| Pass | $2 \circlearrowleft$ | All Pass |  |

When Cronier realised he could be playing in $1 A_{x}$ with that miserable spade suit, he essayed 1NT. North was not going to keep quiet and doubled again. D'Ovidio took out into $2 \diamond$ but North was not going to go quietly and bid $2 \circlearrowleft$. This was not a success, as the defence was accurate and resulted in two undertricks, -200.

Closed Room

| West | North | East South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bertheau | Multon | HoftaniskaWillard |
| $1 \uparrow$ | Dble | All Pass |

Bertheau was made of stronger stuff and resolved to stick it out. Again the defence was accurate and Casino Floor were again two light. -300 and eleven IMPs to Zimmermann who ended winning by eighteen IMPs. Nonetheless it was close until the final board, and it was a fine comeback by Casino Floor against the first seeds.
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Website: www.vidamarresorts.com

The VIDAMAR RESORTS MADEIRA has ocean-view rooms and natural daylight in all public areas including the bridge tournament room. This room is situated on the 4th floor the same floor as the reception and has air-conditioning and
access to an outside terrace with sea

TOURS

OR RESERVATIONS PLEASE CONTACT
Mrs. Cristina Sousa or Mrs. Rosana Pereira el.: (+351) 291208906 (direct) or (+351) 291208900 Fax: (+351) 291225020
E-mail: cristina.sousa@intertours.com.pt E-mail: rosana.pereira@intertours.com.pt Website: www.intertours. com.pt access to an outside terrace with sea view. The Resort offers different highlyenjoyable leisure and sport facilities, such as several restaurants and bars, indoor and outdoor swimming pools and the sensational Mar Spa.

The Round of 16 and the quarterfinals. In the quarterfinals the White House team defeated the Breno team that had won the Round Robin.

Board 19 added 11 out of the 30 IMPs that WH won over the set's 14 boards.

Board 19. Dealer South. E/W Vul.
A Q 106
$\checkmark$ AQ 54
$\diamond 1086$
\& 963


| West <br> Bakkeren | North <br> Piscitelli | East <br> L.Madsen Manno <br> Pass |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \diamond$ |  |  | South |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 1NT | $2 \diamond$ |
| $4 \diamond$ | $3 \diamond$ | Dble* | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |

*Action Double

E/W have a game in diamonds, however the White House pair were the only ones to reach game.

When North bid $3 \triangle$ Christina Lund-Madsen thought, that her partner had to have a good hand because he had bid $3 \diamond$ and used what she called an 'Action Double' suggesting she had a maximum for 1NT and good diamond support.
When Bakkeren continued with $4 \diamond$ Christina could envisage a singleton heart in her partner's hand and with no wasted values she raised to game.
Piscitelli led her $\checkmark A$, and when she saw dummy's cards, she switched to a spade. Bakkeren won Manno's $\uparrow \mathrm{J}$ with the $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$ and played the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, claiming when the diamond queen appeared.
At the end of the match, Fernando Lema asked Christina about this hand. This is a video with her answer: https://youtu.be/-1KTMeMtxlo
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## WHITEHOUSE VS ZIMMERMANN

## by David Bird

## Mixed Teams Semi Final

There were many splendid bidding boards in this set. I will be spoilt for choice and I hope you are happy with my selection. I will first shine my torch on this potential spade slam:

Board 3. Dealer South. E-W Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cronier | Wortel | D'Ovidio | Hop |
|  |  |  | 14 |
| Pass | 3NT** | Pass | 44** |
| Pass | $4 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | 40* |
| Pass | 44 | All Pass |  |

At the other table the bidding started 14-40 (splinter). Zochowskia (South) had some good cards but very weak trumps. Even if dummy held four honor-laden trumps, these might be needed for ruffing hearts. She was surely right to bid 44, which ended the auction.


At this table Wortel responded 3NT, showing an undisclosed splinter bid. If the opener has no slam interest, he rebids $4 \uparrow$ and the location of dummy's shortage is unknown to the defence. Hop did enquire and the $4 \diamond$ response showed short hearts. What a great deal for this method! South could now bid $4 \bigcirc$ to show that he was still interested in a slam. With five great trumps and the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, I think North is too good to sign off. A great chance to bid the slam was spurned.

Board 5. Dealer North. N-S Vul.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { A } & \text { A J 3 } \\
\diamond & \text { K } 65 \\
\diamond & 54 \\
\text { \& } & \text { Q J } 1086
\end{array}
$$



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cronier | Wortel | D'Ovidio | Hop |
|  | 104 | $1 \diamond$ | $2 \diamond^{*}$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Hop's $2 \diamond$ was a transfer response, showing at least five hearts. The doubled diamond game was easily made and N-S would have been only one down in a red-v-white $5 \triangle$ sacrifice. Do you think that South should have ventured $5 \bigcirc$ ? That would be quite a gamble. As I see it, North should have bid $3 \circlearrowleft$ at her second turn. Then South would surely find the profitable sacrifice.
This was the bidding in the Closed Room:
West North East South
Bakkeren
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Christina L. Madsen \& Pierre Zimmermann
Here North did raise the hearts. If East had raised to $5 \diamond$, surely South would have bid $5 \checkmark$. When East bid only $4 \diamond$, allowing $4 \diamond$ from South, the tempo of the auction changed. Zochowskia chose to defend (it was a close decision) and the board was flattened.

| Board 6. Deale | er East. E-W <br> A 4 <br> $\checkmark$ AJ 4 <br> $\diamond$ A Q 105 <br> \& A952 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - KQJ 72 |  | 4 A98 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 82 | N | - K 10765 |
| $\diamond$ K 84 | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond$ J 76 |
| \& Q 10 |  | \& 74 |
|  | A 10653 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 93$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 93$ |  |
|  | \& K J 863 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cronier | Wortel | D'Ovidio | Hop |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 14 | Dble | 2a | 3\% |
| Pass | 34 | Dble | 4\% |
| Pass | 5\% | All Pass |  |

How I like Jacco Hop's 3\% bid! The theory of 'free bids' was discredited many decades ago. Even so, many players would not have ventured $3 \%$. The club game was made with an overtrick, on the favourable lie.

| West <br> Bakkeren | North <br> ZimmermannL.Madsen | Easth <br> Zochouskia |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Pass |  |  |

A completely different auction and 6 IMPs changed hands.

Board 7. Dealer South. Both Vul.


Open Room

| West <br> Cronier | North <br> Wortel | East <br> D'Ovidio | South <br> Hop <br> $1 \&$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \Omega^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \&$ |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

North's $1 \circlearrowleft$ promised at least five cards (otherwise she would respond $1 \diamond$ ). What should South bid over $3 \diamond$ ? I like $3 \diamond$, although some pairs would bid that only with a doubleton honour. When Hop chose to bid 34, North had a tricky decision to make. A freak defensive blockage in spades makes 3NT OK, but $4 \bigcirc$ is much better. Wortel did well to bid $4 \checkmark$ and 11 tricks were made. Which game would they choose in the Closed Room, do you think?

| West <br> Bakkeren | North <br> ZimmermannL.Madsen | East | South <br> Zochowskia |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \diamond *$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |

North's $1 \diamond$ showed hearts. Here South followed my advice and bid $3 \checkmark$ instead of $3 \wedge$. Four cue bids followed, precluding any form of RKCB, and the small slam was bid missing the A-K of trumps. Perhaps North could have marked time with $5 \diamond$, expecting partner to bid the slam with the ace or king of trumps.
The first half drew to a close with Whitehouse leading by 24 IMPs to 12 .
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## DRAMATIC SEMIFINAL IN THE MIXED TEAMS

With only a game swing difference at halftime between AJ Diamonds and Full House in one of the semi-finals of the European Open Mixed Teams the stage was set for another drama in Tromsø. The standings were 22-12 to Full House.

The second half kicked off with East holding -A10954 ऽ10 $\diamond 2$ \&AJ8765 and hearing partner open the bidding with 1 NT . RHO overcalled Two Hearts. Harasimowicz decided to ask for aces after she got spade support from herpartner and hit gold when partner didn't have one single wasted value in her hand, holding AQ873 ऽA43 $\diamond$ A106 \&KQ9!

Twelve easy tricks for AJ Diamonds, and 11 IMPs, when Upmark in the Closed Room did not venture higher than Four Spades.

The standings now showed a score of 22-23! And as they say, one accident rarely comes alone...

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rimstedt | Baldysz | Upmark | Jaszczak |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Dble | Rdbl | 4a | $5 \diamond$ |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |
|  | 4 A Q J |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 1084$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 1076$ | 52 |  |
|  | of K 9 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { A } & 9842 \\ \diamond & \text { A J } 93 \\ \diamond & \text { A } \\ \text { \& } & \text { Q } 542 \end{array}$ |  | 4 |  |
|  | ${ }^{\mathrm{N}}$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond 3$ |  |
|  |  | 0 |  |
|  | A |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 4$ |  |  |
|  | \& |  |  |

What to lead? After long thought Cecilia Rimstedt led the ace of diamonds (wisely to make sure she would be in on lead after seeing dummy come down - one might think that the ace of hearts might be a better alternative to get an attitude
from partner and still be sure to get in at least once more - if that was of importance). She got to see the dummy when all other followed low. How now to continue?

Rimstedt after an even longer thought eventually played a club.

Board 16. Dealer West. EW Vul.
A A Q J
© 1084
$\diamond 107652$
of K 9


Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Janiszewski | McCallum | Harasim. | Tuncok |
| Pass | 1NT | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $5 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rimstedt | Baldysz | Upmark | Jaszczak |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Dble | Rdbl | $4 \uparrow$ | $5 \diamond$ |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Jaszczak had no problem making his contract when he could take the ruffing finesse in spades to discard a heart loser. Another 4 IMPs to AJ Diamonds when Janiszewski led a spade in the Open Room and declarer finessed. East could cover, but declarer had the king of clubs as the entry to cash the ace-queen of spades pitching two hearts and claiming his contract.
AJ Diamonds then fought a little bit too
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aggressively at both tables in their competitive auctions and lost two swings of 4 IMPs to the Full House when they went off after some nice defenses. That brought the Full House back to lead in the match by 30-27.

A few boards later the next bomb arrived:


Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Janiszewski | McCallum | Harasim. | Tuncok |
|  | 1 NT | Pass | Pass |
| Dble* | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{q}^{*}$ | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Dble $=$ minor $(5+)+$ major $(4+)$
$2 \boldsymbol{*}=\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{C}$
Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rimstedt | Baldysz <br>  <br> Pass | Upmark | Jaszczak |
| Pass | $1 \Omega$ |  |  |
|  | $2 \Omega$ | All Pass |  |

Let's start the reporting from the Closed Room. Rimstedt led the king of spades, which held when Upmark advanced with the jack (promising the ten) she led back a low spade at trick two won by declarer in hand with the ace. The contract looked quite solid if declarer would play with the odds.

But something remarkable happened - declarer played a club to the queen which held and then called for the king from dummy - all followed low - allowing South to win the king of clubs too!

Being in dummy, declarer now decided it was time to play a trump and called for the king of hearts - all following low again. Jaszczak then
went back to clubs, probably without any idea of who that was playing a ducking game and why... when East didn't cover the seven of clubs declarer discarded her spade and West won with the jack. Now the ace of clubs arrived, trumped by East with the queen! declarer discarded a diamond and finally went two off for 200 to E-W.

In the Open Room the double showed a five card minor and a five card major, Two Clubs was just a relay asking for the minor. When the next pass confirmed that West held clubs and a major. With three clubs in her hand East never saw any reason to look for a better major fit since they already were in a 5-3 fit...

When Tuncok kicked off with the nine of clubs it was just a matter of how many down the contract would go, eventually the answer was down four. 800 meant that Full House got a double swing to their account, in the shape of 14 IMPs.

AJ Diamond immediately came back in the game when Tuncok made a very strange play on the next hand. Perhaps a cow flew by...

Board 22. Dealer East. E-W Vul.


Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Janiszewski | McCallum | Harasim. | Tuncok |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \%$ |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | $4 \checkmark$ | All Pass |  |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rimstedt | Baldysz | Upmark | Jaszczak |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \Omega$ |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $3 \Omega$ |
| Pass | $4 \Omega$ | All Pass |  |
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Jaszczak received a diamond lead to the ace and another diamond from East．Declarer rose with the king and played club to the ace， a club to the king and ruffed a club with the nine of hearts．A spade ruff took declarer back to hand to ruff the fourth club in dummy． With AKQ65 in trumps it was impossible to lose more than a trump and a diamond at this point for 420 ．

What about the flying cow then？Well，Tuncok got the ace of spades led，ruffed by declarer in hand．He then took the same route as the other room by playing a club to the ace and a club back to the king for a third round towards dummy－but declarer ruffed with the jack！

One might think that the reason for this high ruff was to ensure that he would get the chance to ruff his fourth club in dummy by another cross－ ruff manoeuvre．But when declarer next called for the nine of hearts－he had simply removed all his entries to dummy and had no chance of leading a diamond up to the king anymore for his tenth trick．Justice was served when trumps were 4－1， the ace of diamonds onside and the defense didn＇t cooperate by playing the suit either．Down one was 10 IMPs back to AJ Diamond who still was down some IMPs in the game．

Board 23．Dealer South．All Vul．
A K J 5
$\checkmark$ A 9874
$\diamond 6$
\＆ 6432


Open Room：

| West <br> Janiszewski | North <br> McCallum | East <br> Harasim． | South <br> Tuncok |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| 2 $\mathbf{4}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{1}$ | All Pass |

Closed Room：

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rimstedt | Baldysz | Upmark | Jaszczak <br> $2 \Upsilon^{*}$ |
| Pass | $4 \varsigma$ | Dble | All Pass |

Baldysz－Jaszczak then outbid Rimstedt－Upmark on board 23，stealing the contract in Four Hearts． Who can blame Rimstedt for not bidding over her partner＇s take－out double with those cards！Four Hearts went one down，as expected，without any declarer or defensive errors，for once．．．

In the Closed Room N－S were outbid when South could not open the bidding with his hand． In Four Spades it looked like declarer had two spades and a heart loser since the losing diamond could be discarded on the last club given the lucky distribution of the suit．

Tuncock led the jack of diamonds．Declarer rose with the ace in dummy and played a spade to the ten and South＇s queen．The defense could now ruff a diamond，then underlead the ace of hearts by playing a heart to the king to get another diamond ruff for down one．Tuncok actually did find the return of the ten of diamonds！But when McCallum didn＇t ruff，declarer pulled trumps and a little later could claim the contract when things behaved．

Those 9 IMPs took AJ Diamonds back into the lead of the match by 47－44 with only five boards to go．

Board 24．Dealer West．None Vul．
か 108543
$\checkmark$ A 3
$\diamond 1063$
\＆A 95

| か K 76 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| か J 98 |  |
| $\diamond$ | AK 82 |
| \＆K 43 |  |



A A 92
© K 1064
$\diamond J 974$
\＆ 82
A Q J
－Q 752
$\diamond$ Q 5
\＆$\quad$ Q J 1076
Open Room：

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Janiszewski | McCallum | Harasim． | Tuncok |
| 106 | Pass | $1 \varnothing$ | Pass |
| 1NT | All Pass |  |  |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rimstedt | Baldysz | Upmark | Jaszczak |
| $1 \mathbf{1}$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \uparrow$ | $1 N T$ | $2 \boldsymbol{6}$ |
| Pass | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | All Pass |

Upmark made no mistake in Two Diamonds and eventually even managed to make nine tricks for 110 . In the Open Room North led the three of spades, which went to the jack and king. Declarer then put the jack of hearts on the table; North went up with the ace and played another round of spades, setting up the suit when the queen dropped. Declarer still had seven tricks if just the diamonds could be cashed. But when West didn't trust that they would stand up and finessed in hearts, the roof fell in. South won with the queen of hearts and made sure to score three clubs and three more spade tricks for four down!

7 IMPs to Full House who were temporarily back in the lead by 4 IMPs.

Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.
A 7632
$\bigcirc$ K 8
$\diamond$ A Q J 3
\& K K 84


Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Janiszewski | McCallum | Harasim. | Tuncok |
|  |  | Pass | 10 |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | 3^ |
| Pass | 34 | Dble | 3NT |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rimstedt | Baldysz | Upmark | Jaszczak |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \Omega$ |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | 1 NT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

When Upmark didn't Lightner double for a spade lead his partner just led a passive club. With the king of diamonds onside declarer didn't have any problem getting ten tricks for 630.

Things went differently in the Open Room when their artificial bidding sequence gave East the chance to double Three Spades on their way to Four Hearts. Three Rounds of spades were played so if West just didn't overruff when South ruffs in with the seven of hearts the contract would be down when trumps didn't behave. Janiszewski overruffed however and shifted to the five of diamonds. For reasons unknown it looked like Tuncok gave up and jumped up with the ace from dummy. He would still have made his contract if he ran the diamond to the nine in hand and finessed hearts by leading a low to dummy's eight. Now he was bound to go down.

12 fresh IMPs to AJ Diamond. The team scored another 5 IMPs on both the last two boards that remained to be played of the match, and finally won the semi-final by 69-51.


## More for your Bridge

From today the side games starting at 10.00 will feature the revolutionary Bridge+More boards.
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## MIXED PAIRS QUALIFICATION

RESULTS AFTER SESSION 5

BUTRYN P. - SAKOWSKA N. HESKJE T. - OVESEN J. KEDZIERSKA U. - MORAWSKI D. PENFOLD S. - SENIOR B. ARONOV V. - ZOBU A.
CICHOCKI M. - HOCHEKER D. LINDAAS P. - RINGSETH J.
BILDE D. - CILLEBORG D.
WENNING K. - WENNING U.
HELLEMANN A. - SAELENSMINDE E.
BOGEN A. - BOGEN F.
GOWER C. - BATEMAN N.
HINDEN F. - OSBORNE G.
AVON D. - VOLDOIRE J.
MAHAFFEY J. - RADIN J.
GROMOV A. - GROMOVA V.
HOLMOY S. - THOMASSEN K.
BROCK S. - MYERS B.
LEV S. - LEVITINA I.
GODEJORD O. - MOE H.
KHOLOMEEV V. - RAKHMANI D.
HETZ N. - SVENDSEN T.
BREKKA G. - FUGLESTAD A.
BREIVIK K. - HOYLAND S.
CAMERON G. - STABELL L.
GUI S. - WANG L.
HELNESS F. - VOLL C.
DE BOTTON J. - MALINOWSKI A. MICHIELSEN M. - ROSENTHAL A. VAN PROOIJEN R. - WILSON A. BRENNER A. - CAPRERA D. AUNOIEN A. - JOHANSEN H. AUKEN S. - WELLAND R. ASLA R. - MARKUSSEN S. NILSEN K. - STORNES H.
CAYNE P. - DE FALCO D. OLIVIERI G. - ZALESKI R. KIZILOK O. - KUTUK B. SCHIEFLOE A. - STRAND K. MANNO A. - PISCITELLI F. KHANDELWAL H. - KHANDELWAL R. FURUTA K. - NISHIMURA T. PETTERSEN A. - PETTERSEN K. HOMME E. - HOMME M. HEGGE K. - MORTENSEN M. GUMBY P. - LAZER W. BANASZKIEWICZ E. - BREDE L. DOMICHI N. - GUPTA S.

6,399.00
6,276.67
6,182.54
6,126.93
5,979.74
5,928.97
5,928.77
5,928.46
5,904.37
5,904.04
5,867.59
5,867.36
5,858.16
5,838.33
5,828.79
5,813.00
5,782.20
5,779.61
5,744.37
5,709.98
5,706.75
5,695.33
5,686.28
5,684.86
5,678.58
5,672.73
5,665.43
5,655.72
5,653.44
5,651.97
5,644.13
5,628.83
5,626.65
5,612.98
5,604.79
5,604.35
5,594.03
5,592.86
5,580.71
5,578.23
5,576.03
5,557.90
5,555.79
5,548.68
5,542.99
5,542.85
5,536.52
5,527.47
62.13
60.94
60.02
59.48
58.06
57.56
57.56
57.56
57.32
57.32
56.97
56.96
56.88
56.68
56.59
56.44
56.14
56.11
55.77
55.44
55.41
55.29
55.21
55.19
55.13
55.08
55.00
54.91
54.89
54.87
54.80
54.65
54.63
54.49
54.42
54.41
54.31
54.30
54.18
54.16
54.14
53.96
53.94
53.87
53.82
53.81
53.75
53.66

CORNELL M. - CORNELL V.
5,495.54
53.35

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85

OZGUNES A. - UZUM D.
GAVIARD D. - MARRO C.
COOPER K. - KOLESNIK A.
PUNCH S. - REES T.
NILSSON H. - OPPENSTAM A.
BERKOWITZ D. - WILLENKEN C.
DOBROWOLSKI M. - MADUZIA A.
SCHIPPERS-BOSKLOPPERE. - STIENEN R.
SCHNEIDER M. - SMYKALLA G.
BAKKE C. - GRUDE L.
BJERKSET S. - HAUGEN A.
FENESS J. - KOPSTAD K.
LARSEN H. - NILSEN L.
HELGEMO G. - LANGELAND A.
ANFINSEN I. - SOLHEIM E.
MCALLISTER J. - ZUR-CAMPANILE M.
HETZ C. - PACHTMAN R.
PASKE T. - SEALE C.
ELSTAD S. - LARSEN E.
HANSEN J. - VIST G.
BONES T. - BREKKE V.
BLOOM V. - EBER N.
AASELID J. - KARLSEN A.
QUINTANA M. - SIVERTSEN A.
BERGHEIM G. - KJAER E.
ROMANOWSKI J. - ROSSARD M.
GOLD D. - GROSS S.
SHI B. - TIAN W.
LIGGAT D. - McGOWAN E.
HINGE S. - MIRKOVIC A.
HOILAND T. - THORESEN S.
SAYER N. - ZAHARIEV Z.
HELNESS G. - HELNESS T.
SALONEN I. - STRETZ F.
HAUGE R. - MALINOWSKI A.
GRAIZER N. - HORVITZ S.
BLAAGESTAD L. - FREDIN P.
STABELL T. - VOS V.
VERHEES Jr L. - VIDIGAL A.
BAREKET I. - SAADA N.
ALLERTON J. - LESLIE P.
MOLLE L. - TER LAARE M.
NATHAN M. - OLSEN S.
BRIGHTLING R. - MOFFAT L.
BERG B. - KVERNSTROM K.
WANG W. - ZHANG B.
BARONI I. - TOKAY M.
CAYNE J. - MITCHELL J.
FLAATT E. - FLAATT P.
EDLUND L. - LARSSON R.
EIDE L. - ELIASSEN N.
BULL S. - NESSETH B.

5,487.35 53.28
$5,484.15 \quad 53.24$
$5,479.71 \quad 53.20$
$5,475.14 \quad 53.16$
$5,474.63 \quad 53.15$
$5,473.47 \quad 53.14$
5,457.96 52.99
$5,452.55 \quad 52.94$
$5,450.19 \quad 52.91$
$5,437.25 \quad 52.79$
$5,430.30 \quad 52.72$
$5,428.80 \quad 52.71$
5,421.57 52.64
5,412.15 52.55
5,406.61 52.49
5,400.84 52.44
5,393.16 52.36
5,389.56 52.33
5,375.59 $\quad 52.19$
5,367.15 $\quad 52.11$
5,366.60 52.10
5,357.33 52.01
5,347.47 51.92
5,345.20 51.90
5,341.37 51.86
5,341.16 51.86
5,327.24 51.72
5,319.42 51.64
5,318.00 51.63
5,314.79 51.60
5,303.25 51.49
5,302.78 51.48
5,274.29 51.21
$5,273.03 \quad 51.19$
5,268.06 $\quad 51.15$
5,263.57 51.10
$5,261.39 \quad 51.08$
5,242.89 50.90
5,239.48 50.87
5,227.57 $\quad 50.75$
5,218.31 50.66
5,215.87 50.64
$5,213.92 \quad 50.62$
5,211.00 50.59
5,204.19 50.53
5,195.58 50.44
5,192.32 50.41
5,192.05 50.41
5,188.91 50.38
5,183.85 50.33
$5,182.22 \quad 50.31$
5,177.04 50.26
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DIKHNOVA T. - MATUSHKO G.
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155 McLEISH D. - McLEISH P. YALMAN A. - YALMAN G. PEREZ H. - PEREZ N. SANBORN K. - SANBORN S. HALFON N. - HALFON T. JOHNSEN S. - LYSTAD B. KAZMUCHA D. - SEREK C.
MIYAKUNI A. - MIYAKUNI K. JENSSEN I. - RUBACH B. DUBLAND K. - SOOILAND T.
KOWALSKI A. - MISZEWSKA E.
FOSSUM A. - SVINDAHL F.
CURTIS C. - FEGARTY P.
JONES B. - LOURIE O.
MALUISH A. - MILL A.
CAMP O. - SHAMI A.
SKELTON J. - THEELKE M.
CAPLAN E. - FRISBY W.
NOSACKI M. - SAADA P.
ALBERTAZZI M. - PRATESI A.
GOUVERITH M. - DE MULLER S.
BAKKE T. - REMEN S.
BROGELAND B. - BROGELAND T.
GRUDE M. - GRUDE T.
ENGEBRETSEN G. - OWER A.
GUSEV V. - NIKITINA A.
GLAERUM L. - UELAND D.
BOHNSACK H. - BOHNSACK S.
BERTHEAU K. - HOFTANISKA T.
DANIELSEN A. - JAKOBSEN A.
LARSEN G. - NILSEN H.
ELLINGSEN K. - LYBAEK A.
GILLIS S. - HARDING M.
GROVE L. - KARLSEN S.
CRICHTON P. - CRICHTON R.
MERMELSTEIN G. - NAVEH N.
JENSEN A. - VESETH A.
GREEN M. - ROSENTHAL L.
HAYMAN PIAFSKY J. - KALITA J.
GULEVICH A. - VAINIKONIS V.
ELIASSEN E. - SUNDLAND H.
NILSEN S. - NORENG H.
HERLAND J. - LARSSEN I.
KREUNING H. - OUDA S.
ANDERSSEN R. - MOGSTAD A.
KVIKSTAD J. - KVIKSTAD Y.
ANJER M. - HAGEN E.
ROREN T. - WENNEVOLD I.
BUGGE L. - GUSTAVSEN A.
MAYER F. - TISLEVOLL G.
LARSEN H. - OVSTEDAL F.
RYNNING E. - THOREN V.
BESSIS T. - CRONIER B.

5,171.97
50.21

5,169.07
50.19

5,162.17 50.12
$5,156.73 \quad 50.07$
$5,151.54 \quad 50.01$
$5,150.52 \quad 50.01$
$5,146.78 \quad 49.97$
5,136.76 49.87
5,126.38 49.77
5,121.88 49.73
5,106.22 49.57
5,105.80 49.57
$5,089.74 \quad 49.41$
$5,081.36 \quad 49.33$
$5,081.10 \quad 49.33$
$5,080.65 \quad 49.33$
$5,078.87 \quad 49.31$
$5,075.57 \quad 49.28$
5,073.19 49.25
5,070.33 49.23
5,062.87 49.15
$5,059.96 \quad 49.13$
5,057.46 49.10
5,055.36 49.08
$5,052.33 \quad 49.05$
$5,050.70 \quad 49.04$
5,038.62 48.92
$5,036.92 \quad 48.90$
5,034.49 48.88
5,030.34 48.84
5,028.43 48.82
$5,026.51 \quad 48.80$
5,021.37 48.75
$5,019.59 \quad 48.73$
5,016.32 48.70
5,015.10 48.69
5,011.57 48.66
5,001.25 48.56
4,993.24 48.48
$4,992.50 \quad 48.47$
4,984.29 48.39
$4,981.27 \quad 48.36$
$4,980.24 \quad 48.35$
$4,973.73 \quad 48.29$
$4,965.35 \quad 48.21$
$4,942.31 \quad 47.98$
4,934.41 47.91
4,927.48 47.84
4,923.39 47.80
$4,916.34 \quad 47.73$
$4,913.88 \quad 47.71$
$4,913.24 \quad 47.70$
$4,899.72 \quad 47.57$
4,883.34 47.41
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BRENNE E. - MOEN V.
157 HANSEN L. - KARAIVANOV K.

BRINCHMANN K. - DAHL V.
DIX M. - PARNIS-ENGLAND M. HARDING G. - STANGHELLE H.
SOERENSEN L. - STOKKELAND H. BIRKELAND B. - FJAELBERG J. HAVERKATE J. - PELLE I. FRANCESCONI A. - MANZANO A. BOGEN H. - LINDAHL S. FENTON A. - YUEN M. GOTARD B. - GOTARD T.
FEOFANOV M. - KHONICHEVA E. HOFFMAN D. - PICUS S.
FURUNES J. - SIVERTSVIK R.
BANKOGLU E. - BANKOGLU L.
ROSSLEE D. - STEPHENS R.
TESHOME S. - THROWER J.
KOVACHEV V. - MARQUARDT D.
CLAIR P. - PAGNINI-ARSLAN C.
GARVIK O. - SOLUM R.
DARLING M. - HOWARD J.
BRAGADIR S. - DE MENDEZ T.
BARENDREGT R. - LAMO Y.
KJONSVIK O. - SPILLUM B.
DUC L. - MAGNUSSON S.
SOLUM B. - SOLUM S.
MARK M. - MARK S.
ANDERSEN W. - FAGERDAL R.
EGGELING M. - GOTARD T.
SJODAL E. - SJODAL R.
LUND H. - VIGANDER K.
DAI J. - SHEN (1) Q.
FJAELBERG A. - LERBREKK R.
KOKSOY E. - SEMERCI U.
FRENKEL R. - SAWICKI H.
CAKICI F. - OZTURK E.
HAUGSTAD E. - SJODAL S.
ISPORSKI V. - NIKOLOVA M. ILLNER A. - KERN S.
JOHANSEN L. - KLINGEN M.
SKJETNE E. - STOEN T.
WEIMAN M. - WEIMAN M.
LISLAND T. - WELANDER U. AUNE E. - EIDE P.
RIESE S. - RIESE T.
ROBERTSEN G. - ROSLAND S. GOSVIG H. - OPSAL K.
SOLVANG B. - KANDAHL E. REITAN E. - SKRE I.
FABER H. - NICOLAYSEN F.
ELLINGSEN S. - NICOLAISEN S. LARSEN H. - LARSEN L.

| $4,865.51$ | 47.24 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $4,860.72$ | 47.19 |
| $4,860.53$ | 47.19 |
| $4,856.56$ | 47.15 |
| $4,844.97$ | 47.04 |
| $4,837.79$ | 46.97 |
| $4,828.08$ | 46.87 |
| $4,827.94$ | 46.87 |
| $4,785.24$ | 46.46 |
| $4,783.30$ | 46.44 |
| $4,775.13$ | 46.36 |
| $4,762.56$ | 46.24 |
| $4,758.47$ | 46.20 |
| $4,728.65$ | 45.91 |
| $4,727.97$ | 45.90 |
| $4,726.91$ | 45.89 |
| $4,724.78$ | 45.87 |
| $4,719.46$ | 45.82 |
| $4,702.41$ | 45.65 |
| $4,693.70$ | 45.57 |
| $4,681.59$ | 45.45 |
| $4,672.50$ | 45.36 |
| $4,665.40$ | 45.30 |
| $4,663.66$ | 45.28 |
| $4,647.95$ | 45.13 |
| $4,645.25$ | 45.10 |
| $4,619.33$ | 44.85 |
| $4,616.74$ | 44.82 |
| $4,597.61$ | 44.64 |
| $4,566.68$ | 44.34 |
| $4,553.49$ | 44.21 |
| $4,537.69$ | 44.06 |
| $4,537.57$ | 44.05 |
| $4,516.98$ | 43.85 |
| $4,508.49$ | 43.77 |
| $4,495.14$ | 43.64 |
| $4,479.88$ | 43.49 |
| $4,471.70$ | 43.41 |
| $4,452.70$ | 43.23 |
| $4,422.57$ | 42.94 |
| $4,404.36$ | 42.76 |
| $4,381.78$ | 42.54 |
| $4,269.08$ | 41.45 |
| $4,267.85$ | 41.44 |
| $4,254.13$ | 41.30 |
| $4,251.66$ | 41.28 |
| $4,226.62$ | 41.04 |
| $4,152.27$ | 40.31 |
| $4,081.11$ | 39.62 |
| $3,993.68$ | 38.77 |
| $3,950.09$ | 38.35 |
| $3,799.50$ | 36.89 |
| $3,624.81$ | 35.19 |
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## MIXED TEAMS KNOCKOUT



ROUND OF 16
QUARTER FINALS
SEMI FINALS
FINAL


[^0]:    I am a Swaan, please don't bite me - but what will you bite on this hand?
    L.B.

