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After an exciting day's play, France's Philippe Cronier \& Sylvie Willard go into today with a miniscule advantage over Poland's Piotr Butryn \& Natalia Sakowska. They are closely followed by the holders, Germany's Sabine Auken \& Roy Welland who are trying to add to the Open title they took in Ostend.

These three pairs are followed by Norway's Jonny Hansen \& Gunn Tove Vist, Sweden's Cecilia Rimstedt \& Johan Upmark and a Celtic pair, Scotland's Sam Punch and Wales's Tim Rees.
With five sessions to go to decide the winners, it's all to play for.


MIXED PAIRS FINAL
10.00-11.30: Round 6
11.45-13.15: Round 7
14.30-16.00: Round 8
16.15-17.45: Round 9
18.00-19.30: Round 10

## TODAY'S SCHEDULE

## OPEN PAIRS EBL

10.00-11.30: Round 6
11.45-13.15: Round 7
14.30-16.00: Round 8
16.15-17.45: Round 9
18.00-19.30: Round 10

纹

## NO FAVOURS GIVEN

by Micke Melander

One of the pairs who have been in the top ten since the qualifying started in the Mixed Pairs are Agneta Oppenstam - Håkan Nilsson from Sweden. Here is one reason why they are doing so well.

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

- K 5
$\checkmark 9753$
$\diamond$ J 52
\& J 642

| ^ Q 1062 |  |  | a | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \diamond & \text { Q } 82 \\ \diamond & 1073 \\ \& & \text { A } 109 \end{array}$ |  | N | $\bigcirc$ | A J 106 |
|  |  | W E | $\diamond$ | A Q 964 |
|  |  | S | of | K Q 5 |
|  | ค A98743 |  |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ | K 4 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ | K 8 |  |  |
|  |  | 873 |  |  |


| West | North | EastSouth <br> OppenstamHayman P. <br> Nilsson | Kalita |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  |  | 2 * |  |
| Pass | Pass | Dble All Pass |  |

24 10-13, 6-card suit.

Nilsson led the ace of clubs. When partner encouraged he continued with the ten of clubs, which went to East's queen. Oppenstam now played back the jack of spades, which declarer won in dummy with the king. He called for a heart, East rose with the ace to return the jack of hearts, making life easy for West, who could see how the defense should be played.

Declarer won with the king and tried a low spade from hand, West won with the ten to exit with a club to East king who returned another heart. Declarer ruffed and played another spade, Nilsson won with the queen and exited with his last trump not giving any favours to declarer who had to lead away from the king of diamonds in hand going three off.

800 was all the MPs for a clear top when noone who chose to defend against Two Spades managed to do it without helping declarer with one or the other of the red suits thus only setting the contract with two tricks.

## CAPTION CONTEST

## by The Bulletin \& the Press Room staffs

We asked the daily bulletin's readers for captions for this photograph and published the contributions in the last two issues.


Here are the latest captions received:
Bear with me.
Anonymous
You call that a hand? I call that dinner.
Michael Yuen
Reaching out a local
Anonymous

Smells... Like grand slam hand.
Zbigniew Sagan, Poland

## After counting the votes of the Norwegian jury, the unanimous winner of the contest is Michael Yuen.

CLICK HERE FOR THE NEW CAPTION CONTEST

| Go to PAGE: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
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by Barry Rigal

As Jefferson Airplane famously remarked "When logic and proportion have fallen sloppy dead go ask Alice, I think she'll know."

Logic seemed to go out of the window here when you look at declaring the spade game. Would you rather protect your club tenace or have it exposed on lead?

Board 5. Dealer North. NS Vul.
A K 108
$\bigcirc$ K J
$\diamond$ K J 1093
\& A J 2
Q J 9
$\diamond$ AQ 109642
$\diamond$ A 54
$\& \quad 3$

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { か } & 2 \\ \diamond & 875 \\ \diamond & \text { Q } 872 \\ \& & \text { K Q } 1065\end{array}$
A AQ76543
$\odot 3$
$\diamond 6$
\&) 9874

In one room Dave Caprera opened the North hand a staid and respectable strong no-trump, Anne Brenner transferred to spades at the fourlevel, and East led a top club, West having stayed resolutely silent throughout.
How would you play the hand? Isn't it logical to
duck, planning to set up a red suit for club discards - assuming that for example the heart queen and club five were the other way round? Caprera did duck, and East gave his partner the ruff, letting West cash out for down one.
Things took a more exciting turn when Kitty Cooper and Alex Kolesnik were N/S.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Kolesnik |  | Cooper |
|  | 10** | 20 | 2 |
| 30 | 34 | 40 | 4 |
| 50 | Dble | Pass | 5 |

After the strong club everyone kept bidding till the music stopped in 5 . Cooper won the club lead from West, of course, and crossed to a top spade to lead a diamond up. She had no choice but to win the king, ruff a diamond then lead a heart up. When West won her ace and played back a heart declarer pitched a club. She ruffed another diamond, drew two rounds of trump, ruffed out the remaining diamond honour, and had a trump entry to take seven spades, two diamonds, a club and a heart for a comfortable +650 .
And if that pair of results surprises you too, you can follow Jefferson Airplane in another of their songs, saddle up your frog, and get out of here.


Monkey business
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## I'M IN LOVE WITH VIENNA

## by Mark Horton

After the final session of the Mixed Pairs semifinal this deal was the talk of Tromsø:


On this deal 9 pairs in the A section bid all the way to 7 NT - and they all went one down.
That was good news for the single pair who could only reach $6 \bigcirc$ as they collected $18.49 \%$ of the matchpoints.
The remaining 29 tables played in 6NT and 15 declarers recorded +1020 .

Regardless of who was declarer, no defender led a heart, so how should declarer play?

The flashy line is to win the club lead with the king and lay down the ace of hearts at trick two, which gives you a good shot at getting your name into the Bulletin (Kitty Cooper won the prize draw amongst

Suppose this is the position:


Now you have to make a decision.
Do you play a spade to the queen, a spade to the king, cash the club queen and then take the heart finesse, or cross to the ace of hearts and return to hand with a spade to cash the queen of clubs pitching the jack of hearts, or just cash the $\%$ Q immediately, throwing the jack of hearts.
As it happens if you elect to play off the clubs before taking any diamonds you will know that North started with six clubs, two diamonds and a spade and if you conclude that information makes it more likely if anyone has four spades it is likely to be South, then it is certainly tempting to reject the heart finesse and rely on the Vienna Coup/criss cross ending.
I have a lot of sympathy for the 15 souls who took the heart finesse. the declarers who did that) but as she told me later it is perhaps a little premature (but if you're in love with Vienna what's a girl supposed to do?).
After winning the king of clubs it is safe to cash five rounds of diamonds pitching three hearts and a club from dummy, then take one top spade and a club to reach a five card ending.


| Go to PAGE: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
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I can hear you asking what would I have done had I been confronted with the problem? To which I can only reply by referring the honourable reader to the title of this article.

However, this is not necessarily the best way to approach this problem, as Barry Rigal now reveals.
I believe in Darwin's theory of evolution and that the strongest survive. Its application to bridge is that when faced with a problem where I have to choose between a defender finding a play I would not personally have found, I'll play him NOT to have made such a clever play.
If he can do something I would not do, he deserves to beat me anyway - hence the survival of the fittest continues to hold good.

Let's see how this works if you as West have reached 7 NT on our featured deal. In a way it is highly irritating to me that clubs are 6-2 here, because I don't think you should play off the club honours early and find that out. This is too unlikely to be relevant. Instead let's win the club lead in dummy and run five diamonds pitching hearts from dummy, and then cash $\boldsymbol{\Phi A K}$.

| A 2 | A Q 9 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 2 | $\checkmark$ A J |
| $\diamond-$ | $\diamond$ |
| \& $A Q$ | -4 4 |

At this point in the deal, three separate things may have happened.

1) No spade honour (J/10) may have appeared from either defender,
2) the J/10 may have appeared from North, or
3) the J/10 may have appeared from South.

My strategy at this point would be to assume that if we have seen either the jack or ten from one defender, that defender does NOT have J10xx - in other words either the suit is breaking or his partner has the guard. We shall come back to this later.

In case number one, we cash the spade queen and rely on the heart finesse. This loses when both the spade and heart menace are together and the Vienna Coup would have worked...but in abstract the two critical holdings are slightly more likely to be split than together.
In case number two, we cash the heart ace and play for the Vienna Coup. The only time we go down is if North dropped the $\mathrm{S} \mathrm{J} / 10$ from J 10 xx - a true Grosvenor coup since the contract had no legitimate play. You will have the choice of congratulating North with murder in your heart, or simply murdering them; it is your call.
In case number three, I suggest cashing the $\checkmark A$ and running winners, finessing in spades at the end. You lose when South had $\mathbf{\$} 10 \mathrm{x}(\mathrm{x})$ and the heart finesse was working.

And now we see the point; when South has © J10xx without the ऽK they may distract you from testing spades then taking the heart finesse, by dropping a spade honour. If YOU would have thought of that, maybe you should ignore the sight of an honour from South. But my experience is that most people only find these plays in the post mortem or at the bar.

One thing we both observed was that no West was confronted by a heart lead. Given that noone would like to go down in a possibly makeable Grand Slam at trick one it looks human to rise with the ace and play for the squeeze. Of course, there are a few defenders around who would give you pause for thought if they led a heart after East had shown the suit - Peter Fredin for example, which leads us neatly to the third and final part of this story.

The Swedish star did indeed find himself on lead against 7NT. He tried a club and declarer, Thierry De Mendez (no doubt reasoning that the heart finesse must be wrong, as Peter hadn't led one) won with dummy's king and cashed the ace of hearts at trick two. He was the only declarer in either semifinal to bring home 7NT.

EBL SOCIAL ACCOUNTS

EBL

@europeanbridge
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## MIXED PAIRS, SEMIIFINAL A

by Jos Jacobs

For Wednesday's fourth session of the Mixed Semis, I chose the Chinese Wang and Gui as my anchor pair. They had done well so far during the day, finding themselves in the runners-up position when the session started (and also when the session ended, it turned out). They did not enjoy the same exotic procession of people from all over the world as we saw in my report about session two, but once again, a New Zealand pair joined pairs from four different European countries: Norway, Sweden, Poland and the UK to produce an interesting menu for them.

Their first round, boards 5 and 6, was against Cecilia Rimstedt and Johan Upmark from Sweden. On the first board, declarer had to forget about the law of restricted choice (missing QJxx of trumps with the doubleton honours bare behind the AK) to bring home a rather optimistic 44. When Gui did not do so, he was one down for $14.5 \%$. On the second board, the Swedes, in return, reached a pretty sporting $4 \boldsymbol{A}$ contract. But this time, the game could not be beaten and this netted them another $75 \%$. For a moment, I started thinking I should have chosen another table, but from the next board onward, things began to improve for the Chinese.

This was board 7:
Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.


| West <br> Lazer | North <br> Gui | East <br> Gumby | South <br> Wang |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ |  | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $1 \Omega$ | Pass | $1 N T$ |
|  | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

Had East found the courage (or the inspiration) to double 3NT, this would have led to a quick one down (though North might have run to 4\%, after which who knows what might have happened?).
On the actual club lead, declarer won dummy's ace and immediately led a spade to her jack. West won his queen and now, the spotlights turned on him. A heart would actually have led to two down, but when he returned a passive club, declarer had her contract for an $88 \%$ score.

On the next board, EW missed a slam but still scored just over average on a classic double squeeze:

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \phi \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \diamond \\ & \text { \& } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 952 \\ & \text { K Q } 765 \\ & \text { Q } 86 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| s KQ |  |  | ¢ J 876 |
|  |  |  | $\checkmark$ AJ943 |
|  |  | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond$ A 7 |
|  | A J 10742 |  | \& $K$ Q |
|  | a | A 1043 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ | 10 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ | J 542 |  |
|  | 8 | 9863 |  |

West
Lazer
$1 \&$

North
Gui
20

> East
> Gumby
> 3NT
South
Wang All Pass

Not a very sophisticated auction but these do not seem very popular in mixed pairs events anyway.
South led her heart 10 to the queen and ace. When declarer next led a spade, South jumped in with the ace to return the suit (she did not have anything better available). With the count rectified, declarer now had the rest of the tricks. North has to keep the high heart and South the high spade so neither defender can keep the diamond guard. Scoring +490 was still worth $53,5 \%$.

Needlessto say, (typicaljournalistic overstatement or aposiopesis?) that there is no squeeze if South ducks the A twice.

| 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 |

For round 3, a Polish pair joined the Chinese.
On the first board, the declarers in the normal $4 \checkmark$ could take the risk of going one down by trying to make an overtrick with an immediate finesse of the $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{Q}}$ holding singleton jack opposite AK10x. This would have worked. Gui did not want to take this risk and settled for ten tricks in safety, scoring just 41\%.

The other board was more interesting:
Board 10. Dealer East. All Vul.
A J 9
$\checkmark$ Q J
$\diamond$ A Q 963
\& $A K 74$


A Q 7642
© K 986
$\diamond$ J 7
\& 98

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Jaszczak | Gui | Baldysz <br> Pass | Wang |
|  |  | Pass |  |
| 1NT | Dble | Rdble | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Dble | Pass | 2 |

All Pass
NS had an old-fashioned penalty double available, so the Chinese reached a quite playable contract of $2 \boldsymbol{A}$. When it made with an overtrick, they could add a $58 \%$ score to their tally.

The redouble was intended as SOS, asking partner to bid $2 \%$ which he duly did.

One wonders what would have happened if 1NT had been passed out. Correct defence should restrict West to five tricks which would have resulted in a score of -200 and very few matchpoints. And had South sat for the double of $2 \boldsymbol{6}$ best defence (according to Deep Finesse) would have yielded 500 .

When next a UK pair came to the Chinese's table, this was the first board.

Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.


| West |
| :--- |
| Brock |

$1 \diamond$
3NT
North
Gui
Pass
Pass
All Pass
East
Myers
106
2NT

## South <br> Wang Pass Pass

South led the 7 . Declarer called for dummy's ace and continued with a diamond to his king. West took her ace and easily found the club switch. Declarer won the ace and, of course, played for his practical chance of leading a diamond to the ten, hoping to bring in the suit without further loss. When North won his $\diamond J$, he had four more clubs to cash for down two and $92 \%$ to NS.


| GO TO PAGE: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |  |
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The next board was another good score for the Chinese:

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.


| West <br> Brock | North <br> Gui | East <br> Myers | South <br> Wang |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \Omega$ |  | Pass | Pass |
| Pass | 24 | $2 \Omega$ | Dble |
|  | $3 \Omega$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |

Had West led her suit, declarer would have been restricted to 10 tricks, even if he dares to take the spade finesse in the end. When she led the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ instead, 11 tricks were possible with the same spade finesse but at the table, declarer even ended up with 12 tricks when East discarded a diamond or two on the immediate run of the clubs and West returned a spade after winning a trick with her $\diamond \mathrm{K}$. This was worth $95.4 \%$ to NS.

For the final round of the session, a local pair came to their table. I am not at all sure whether the qualification "local" makes any sense here in Norway, as pairs from, say, Oslo would have to travel well over $1,500 \mathrm{~km}$ to arrive here.



On the first board, a heart fit got lost:
Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.
今 K 863
$\diamond$ A
$\diamond$ J6
\& AK J 976
$\begin{array}{ll}\wedge & \text { A Q J } 5 \\ \diamond & \text { K } 1053 \\ \diamond & \text { AK } 85 \\ \& & 2\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { ↔ } & \text { 9 } \\ \diamond & \text { Q J } 874 \\ \diamond & \text { Q } 10432 \\ \& & 8\end{array}$

- 1072
$\bigcirc 962$
$\diamond 97$
\& Q 10543

| West <br> Elstad | North <br> Gui | East <br> Larsen | South <br> Wang <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \diamond$ |  |  | $3 \diamond$ |

North cashed two aces and then had to find either a switch or an exit. A passive trump would have been OK but when Gui went for a low spade instead, he soon found out, to his disgust, that he had given away an overtrick. Still, -150 was worth 68.4 \% to NS.

On the last board, the Chinese reached the routine $4 \checkmark$ and with all the finesses working, easily made 12 tricks for another 63.2 \% score. They had scored $59.93 \%$ over the session which was about equal to their average score after 30 boards of $59.8 \%$ and kept them firmly in second place.
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## 40 $083 x$ FUNBRIDGE

## Play bridge wherever and whenever you like!



## Try it for free!

Download the app, sign up and get 100 free deals

# Click here! WWW.FUNBRIDGE.COM 



GOTO Games, SASU (single individual simplified joint stock company) with a capital of $€ 66,803$. Parc d'activités des 4 vents.
59510 HEM - France - RCS (Trade and Companies Register) 509567681 Lille Métropole
The GOTO Games trademark as well as the trademarks of its derived products are registered trademarks.
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## UNUSUAL BIDDING PROBLEM

by Micke Melander

The Open Mixed Team Championships is now over, but we are still getting a lot of hands from those who played in the competition. This hand is not even from the KOs but from the last qualifying round, in which Susanna Gross found herself with a very unusual bidding problem when Fuglestad met Gold.

Board 3. Dealer South. EW Vul.
A AJ 93
© J 5
$\diamond$ J 87
\& K Q 65

| ¢ 872 |  |  |  | 1065 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A 974 |  | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ E |  | KQ1086 |
| $\diamond 10943$ |  | ${ }^{\text {W }}$ S | $\diamond$ | Q 652 |
| \& 104 |  |  | \& | 8 |
|  | 9 | K Q 4 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ | 32 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | A J 97 |  |  |

Closed Room:

| West <br> Helgemo | North <br> Gold | East <br> LangelandGross <br>  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \&$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $1 N T$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Susanna Gross was $100 \%$ sure that she had opened the bidding with One Club. But when the tray came back from the other side of the table it was a fact that she had passed with her 17 HCP hand in first seat!

Gross then realised that according to their system she didn't have any forcing bid to make any longer, and then whispered to Helgemo on her side of the screen:

- I have a serious bidding problem, and even you can never guess what it is!

After quite some time she bid One Diamond, which she believed would be the bid that partner was least likely to pass out. When partner replied 1 NT she jumped to game and nobody understood what was going on at the table.

Langeland had no problem leading the king of hearts, nor in continuing the suit when Helgemo encouraged his partner, for a quick one down.

At the other table Brekka - Fuglestad bid their way to the excellent Four Spades contract, on their 4-3 fit. That was eleven tricks and as many IMPs. But it was still not enough for them since that particular eleven was the only IMPs they scored in the match. Gold won 32 on the other nine boards for a 16.18-3.82 win against the Norwegian team.

Imagine if Gross, instead of bidding One Diamond, would had jumped to Six Clubs and East had not got such an obvious heart lead... Even the Rueful Rabbit would have had to applaud!


| 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 |

## USE THESE SPOTS

by Barry Rigal

Barry Myers found a very nice play to bring home his slam here. Let's look at it first as a single-dummy problem before seeing the whole story.

Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.

| A K J |  | 4 | A Q 92 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A |  | $\checkmark$ | 73 |
| $\diamond$ A |  | $\diamond$ | J |
| \& - |  | 0 | A Q J 863 |
| West | North | East | South |
| Brock |  | Myers |  |
|  | 29 | 3\% | 30 |
| 3NT | 4® | 44 | Pass |
| 64 | All Pass |  |  |

The $2 \circlearrowleft$ opening call showed hearts and a minor, the $4 \triangle$ call presumably showing some combination of an optimistic temperament, extra shape, or a mis-reading of the vulnerability. $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ can in fact come considerably closer than NS to making $4 \bigcirc$ after a trump lead.
But now is not the moment to worry about that. How do you play 6 after a diamond lead?
Myers correctly identified the lead as a singleton but nonetheless finessed at trick one.
Back came a diamond at trick two. Myers ruffed high as South pitched a club, sneaked the $\% \mathrm{~J}$ past

South, pitching a heart, then cashed $\& A$ to pitch a second heart. He advanced the $\$ 9$ and South ducked, so he crossed to $\triangle \mathrm{A}$ to ruff another diamond high, finessed the $\$ 8$ and claimed the rest after drawing trumps.
Had South covered the 9 Myers would have ruffed high and finessed the 6 on the next round of the suit to bring home his slam. At the critical moment North was known to be 1-5-$5-2$ so there would have been no guesswork involved.
The full hand:


The critical defensive error was South's in not covering the $\% \mathrm{~J}$, which leaves declarer far too much work to do.

## DUPLIMATE

The Duplimates used to duplicate the championship boards in Tromso are sold out but you can pre-order a Duplimate to be used at the World Championships later on this year on the same terms, i.e. EUR
1999. Contact Jannerstens at the bridge stall in the bridge plaza, or drop a line to per@jannersten.com.


| 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 |

## WINNER TAKES ALL

by Mark Horton

Anxious to make sure we would secure a photograph of the winners of the Board a Match teams I made a rare excursion into the playing room just in time to catch the last board of the event.
By a strange twist of fate one of the tables featured two of the teams in contention, Sanborn and Grazier. Sanborn had been leading the event for a long time, but a 1-3 defeat in their penultimate match had dropped them to fourth, while their opponents were lying second.
Sanborn won the first board, and it transpired that when the last deal hit the table a win for either team would see them enter the winners circle.

Dealer West. All Vul.
A 9
$\checkmark 1052$
$\diamond$ A 98432
\& 865

| A K | N | ¢ A J 10653 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 864$ | W E | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$ |
| $\diamond$ K 10 | S | $\diamond$ Q 765 |
| \& KQJ9732 |  | \& A 10 |
| 4 | Q 8742 |  |
| $\checkmark$ | AQJ 973 |  |
| $\diamond$ | J |  |
| \& 6 | 4 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D. Berkowitz | Naveh | L.Berkowitz | Mermelstein |
| 20* | Pass | 29** | $3 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | Pass | 40* | Pass |
| 4NT* | Pass | $5 \square^{*}$ | Pass |
| 6\% | All Pass |  |  |

2 Forcing for at least one round
40 Good hand

When Lisa bid $4 \checkmark$ David did not intend 4NT to be read as asking for key cards, but when his wife bid $5 \checkmark$ he had no alternative to $6 \%$.
A heart to the ace was followed by the jack of diamonds. North won with the ace and returned a diamond for South to ruff, -200.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grazier | S.Sanborn | Horvitz | K.Sanborn |
| $1 \boldsymbol{\&}$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{\&}$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

South led the ace of hearts and continued the suit, forcing declarer to ruff. A spade to the king was followed by a heart ruff, the ace of spades and a diamond. North won and returned a club and declarer won and played a diamond. South ruffed, cashed the queen of spades and played a heart, claiming the rest when declarer ruffed with his last trump. That was four down, -400 , a win and the tournament.

If East had raised to $5 \%$ or West had corrected 44 to $5 \%$, then his team would have been the one smiling on the front page of the Daily Bulletin.
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Yesterday the White House team won the European Mixed Teams Championship, in a close ending against the AJ Diamonds team, only 9 IMPs difference. It was not the first time that the two teams faced each other, as they met in the Round 9 of the Round Robin. In this encounter White House also defeated the runner-up by 10 IMPs this time in a 10 board's match. These are the two boards that helped the Champion to win their first encounter.
The first board produced the first swing of the match.
RR, Round 9. Board 21. Dealer North. N/S Vul - AK 32
$\checkmark 9654$
$\diamond$ K Q 102
\& $Q$

| A 97 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\diamond$ | J 1072 |
| $\diamond$ | 743 |
| \& | J 752 |

$\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{E}$

| $\bullet$ | $Q$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\diamond$ | $A K$ |
| $\diamond$ | $J 85$ |

A J 108654
$\checkmark$ Q 83
$\diamond$ A 96
\& 8

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wojcieszek | Hop | Sarniak | Wortel |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Dble | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | $3 \uparrow$ | $3 \circlearrowleft$ |
| $4 \%$ | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

Sarniak won the club lead with her $\% \mathrm{~K}$, played the $\bigcirc \mathrm{A}$ and $\backsim \mathrm{K}$ and continued with a small diamond. Declarer won, drew trumps and claimed, +620 . At the other table West wasn't so pleasant:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| L.Madsen | Baldysz | Bakkeren Jaszczak |  |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Dble | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | $4 \uparrow$ | $4 \uparrow$ |
| $5 \&$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |

The declarer lost the first 4 tricks: one spade and three diamonds, but claimed the rest -300 . That was 8 IMPs for team White House.

The difference increased in the following board.


RR, Round 9. Board 22. Dealer East, E/W Vul

| A | 762 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | 652 |
| $\diamond$ | Q 85 |
| \& | 7654 |



| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| L.Madsen | Baldysz | Bakkeren Jaszczak <br> Ba |  |
|  |  | $1 \&$ | $1 \diamond$ |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Dble | Pass | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

At the other table the drama unfolded differently:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wojcieszek | Hop | Sarniak | Wortel |
|  |  | 1NT | Pass |
| $2 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | 29 | Pass |
| 4NT* | Pass | $50^{*}$ | Pass |
| 60 | All Pass |  |  |

Sarniak chose to open her hand with 1NT, her partner started with a heart transfer, and then committed the cardinal sin of asking for keycards with two immediate diamond losers (or was it intended as quantitative - in which case West might have passed - and gone in minus there as well! Editor).

The defenders were not mistaken and punished declarer, making the first two tricks for one down, 13 IMPs for White House.
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## MIXED PAIRS FINAL SESSION 1

by Jos Jacobs

The first ten boards of the final clearly belonged to Sylvie Willard and Philippe Cronier from France, who scored 71.4 \% to lead the field by a $10 \%$ margin. Below, I can show you where some of these matchpoints came from, as well as how some of the other contestants won or lost theirs.

Not surprisingly, given that percentage, the good results for the French started with the first board:

Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\Delta & \text { K } 108 \\
\diamond & \text { J } 742 \\
\diamond & 865 \\
\text { \& } & \text { A } 74
\end{array}
$$



| West | North | East | South <br> Cronier |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | H.Bohnsack | Willard | S.Bohnsack |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $1 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | $2 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{\beta}$ | All Pass |  |  |

Not all Easts balanced when 20 came round to them, so the French had already done well by reaching their club partscore, as 20 is a make. They would do even better by making $3 \%$ as well.

North led a diamond to South's queen and South led a spade through, North winning his king. As the heart suit is frozen for the defence, declarer's main problem was the trump suit. North continued the $৩ \mathrm{~J}$ which was covered all round and Cronier's next move was a club to dummy's king; a very nice guess - perhaps because it appeared South had a singleton club but had not competed to $3 \circlearrowleft$ ? When the queen appeared, he had his nine tricks for an $86 \%$ score.

On the other board of the round, Sylvie Willard was among few declarers who managed to make a quite normal 3NT:

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cronier | H.Bohnsack | Willard | S.Bohnsack |
|  |  | 1』 | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

South found the best lead of a club (the 7) but it did not help the defence. Willard immediately put up dummy's ace as, from the lead, the clubs looked to be 4-4. Her next move was a spade to the king followed by a losing diamond finesse. The defenders then cashed their clubs but with South on lead on the last club, she could do no better than exit with a diamond. Willard carefully cashed only two more tricks in the suit, throwing two hearts and then continued with the A to cater for a possible doubleton queen. Had the queen not appeared, she would have played off the last diamond and taken the heart finesse. But as it was, she could discard the $\checkmark \mathrm{Q}$ on the last diamond and take her last two required tricks with the $\mathbf{J}$ and $\bigcirc \mathrm{A}$. Well done for another $86 \%$ score.
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On the next board, only a few pairs reached a slam and if they did, they chose a minor suit rather than the cold 6NT by South. The Gromovs came near:

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.



- 1094
© 87
$\diamond 96$
\&) 653

ค K 75
$\checkmark$ A 2
$\diamond$ AKQ 8542
\& 8

West
Voldoire

North
Gromov

| $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Dble | Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\phi} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ | Pass |
| Pass | $4 N T$ | Pass |

## South

 Gromova $1 \%$3NT
$4 \diamond$
$6 \diamond$ All Pass

When the clubs broke 3-3, declarer made all the tricks on a heart lead. We will not show you the sequence by which a pair ended up in $6 \%$ - they have used up their ration of luck for the day by doing so, I feel...


Board 5 was a possible grand slam described in full elsewhere in this issue. Cronier-Willard were on the receiving end of a declarer who went down in it for a complete zero.

Two boards later, the French were not to be distracted by the hallucinatory visions their counterparts at quite a number of other tables in play were suffering from:

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

| $\begin{array}{ll} \phi & \text { Q } 1062 \\ \diamond & \text { Q } 82 \\ \diamond & 1073 \\ \text { \& } & \text { A } 109 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} \Delta & \text { K 5 } \\ \diamond & 9753 \\ \diamond & \text { J 5 } 2 \\ \text { \& } & \text { J } 642 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { S J J } \\ \diamond & \text { A J } 106 \\ \diamond & \text { A Q } 964 \\ \text { \& } & \text { K Q } 5 \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{S}}^{\mathrm{N}}$ |  |  |
|  | A A 9874 <br> $\checkmark$ K 4 <br> $\diamond$ K 8 <br> \& 873 |  |  |
| West | North <br> Morawski | East <br> Willard | South |
| Cronier |  |  | Kedzierska Pass |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | 14 |
| 1NT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

This looks a perfectly normal auction. On the lead of the $\boldsymbol{\$} \mathrm{K}$ and another, South won the ace and returned the suit. Cronier won the ten, and when North covered his next move, the $\diamond 10$ from hand, with his jack, ten tricks were easy. Not that it mattered much, as there is communication for two diamond finesses. Ducking the second round of spades would not help South much as he (she) will then be caught in an endplay. +630 was worth another $86 \%$ to the French.

On the board, a popular contract was $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ doubled, which went two off for only 500 . One EW pair even managed to defend 19 doubled and collected a meagre 200.

At yet another table, some over-optimistic Poles were looking at the NS cards. They bid as follows:

| West Gross |  |  | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Sarniak | Gold | Sielicki |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass |  |  | $3 ¢$ | Pass | 30 |
| Pass |  |  | Pass | Dble | All Pass |
| 7 | 8 | 9 | 1011 | 1213 |  |
| 21 | 22 | 23 | $24 \quad 25$ | $26 \quad 27$ |  |

...but David Gold had the last word and everybody was happy (or maybe not? We shall see). West led a heart to partner's ace and a heart came back to declarer's king. South exited with a club. West's nine held the trick and declarer ruffed her $\circlearrowleft Q$ continuation. Another club went to East's queen and the $\bigcirc \mathrm{J}$ was ruffed by declarer's seven and overruffed by West's ten. West continued the $\diamond 10$ which ran to declarer's king and Sielicki exited with a diamond to East's nine. Unsure of the position, East now tried to cash another diamond first, but declarer ruffed, led a spade to dummy's king (felling the jack) and exited in clubs to endplay West and escape for two down, thus turning a clear bottom into a decent score.

In the last round of the session, the French played the Gromov couple from Russia. This was the first board:

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- AQ 9
© 875
$\diamond$ J 9532
of 106

| A J 74 |  | A K 52 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A 1064 | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ | $\bigcirc$ K 93 |
| $\diamond$ A 1084 | ${ }^{\text {w }}$ | $\diamond 76$ |
| \& Q 7 |  | \& K J 432 |
|  | - 10863 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q J 2 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K Q |  |
|  | \& A985 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cronier | Gromov | Willard | Gromova |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | $2 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

With $2 \diamond$ already going down, Cronier really stuck his neck out as there should be a defence to beat 20 as well, though the slightest defensive error might let the contract through. Cronier got the desired effect when Gromov tried 24, a much worse contract than $2 \diamond$, or 1 NT for that matter, would have been.

The defence to $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ was immaculate. West led a trump to dummy's queen and East's king and a heart came back to declarer's queen and West's ace. Another trump now lured South into the idea that the J was also with East, so she went up with the ace and tried a diamond to her king and West's ace. Cronier cashed the $\mathbf{T} \mathrm{J}$ and led a heart. Willard won her king and returned the suit to declarer's jack. Gromova exited with a low club but West jumped in with the queen to play the 13th heart. South ruffed this with her last trump and led another low club to the ten and East's king. When East, perforce, returned a club, South went up with the ace so East's $\% \mathrm{~J}$ became the third undertrick. +150 was worth $98 \%$ to the French.

On the last board of the set, the Gromovs got some revenge when they bid and made an apparently routine 4 for a $66 \%$ score.


[^0]destination ideal for holidays and events. MADEIRA BRIDGE ASSOCIATION, the VIDAMAR RESORTS MADEIRA and INTERTOURS TRAVEL AGENCY are organizing the 18th MADEIRA INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE OPEN.


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
reception and has air-conditioning and 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.
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## TOPS AND BOTTOMS

by Micke Melander

When your opponents bid their way to a grand slam and it is revealed when dummy appears on the table that they have had a bidding misunderstanding to get there, it certainly doesn't feel good when the contract also has a play!

To make things even worse, you managed to make an opening lead straight into declarer's tenace, whereupon declarer followed it up by guessing how to play the key suit of the hand for the needed tricks to make his contract. Now you aren't just feeling bad, you are in pain.

Board 5. Dealer North. NS Vul.

- AK 862
$\checkmark$ A 10
$\diamond K J$
\& K Q 109


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| V.Prooijen | Stienen | Wilson | SchippersB. |
|  | 14\%* | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | 14** | Pass | $2 \diamond *$ |
| Pass | 24** | Pass | $30^{*}$ |
| Pass | 4NT* | Pass | 5 ${ }^{*}$ |
| Pass | $5 \mathrm{C}^{*}$ | Pass | 60* |
| Pass | 7NT | All Pass |  |

1\% Weak-NT or Precision
14 Still two-way but always 4+
$2 \diamond$ Transfer to hearts
24 $16+$ and $5+$
30 6-card suit
4NT RKCB for hearts
$5 \diamond$ 0-3 aces
$5 \bigcirc$ To play if zero aces (very unlikely...)
65 Three aces and the queen of hearts
7NT I can see 13 possible tricks...
This is what happened when Stienen - Schippers Bosklopper played board five in the Mixed Pair


Rene Stienen \& Elly Schippers Bosklopper
final. Stienen sitting North was pretty sure that they 'probably' had thirteen quick tricks coming from two spades, six hearts, two diamonds and three clubs.

East was actually endplayed on the opening lead and had no card to lead that wouldn't help declarer. A diamond was eventually led and Stienen won in hand and played the ace of hearts, followed by the ten, when the queen dropped it was all over.

The Dutch pair received all 50 MPs for a clear top and their opponents could do nothing about it except register a bottom. At the 26 tables in play, 23 reached the excellent 6NT and scored all thirteen tricks, one pair managed to stop in 4NT and the last bid their way to Seven Hearts!

The declarer in Seven Hearts got a spade led. Declarer won with the ace of spades in dummy and crossed to the ace of clubs in hand to lead a low heart to dummy's ten, for one down! That was a well-deserved 50 MP swing to Phillippe Cronier and Sylvie Willard when Cronier didn't lead the "obvious" small trump against the grand slam with three small in hand!
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## MIXED PAIRS FINAL

by David Bird

There were 52 pairs contesting this final: 46 from semi-final A and 6 from the repechage semifinal B. There was interesting play here:

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.



Willard won the $\$ 7$ lead with dummy's ace. She reached her hand with the K and ran the $\diamond J$ to North's $\diamond \mathrm{K}$. The best defence now is to take three club tricks, ending in the North hand. A heart switch would then prevent declarer from combining her chances in the major suits.
When North played the $\% \mathrm{~K}$ and $\% 4$, South won with the 10 (rather than the 0 Q ). She cashed the $\mathscr{\&}$ and had to exit safely with a diamond. Willard cashed only two more diamonds, to avoid squeezing the dummy, and played the A . The Q fell and she had her +400 , $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{S}$ scoring only $7 / 43$.
On Board 7 many South players were doubled in a spade part-score and had to restrict the penalty to less than the value of a cold 3NT by the opponents.

Board 7. Dealer South. E/W Vul.


From West's point of view, it was possible that E-W could not make a game. It was therefore clearcut to pass the double for penalties. In fact, East was quite strong and +600 was available in 3NT. The defenders' target was therefore +800 .
West began well with the $\% \mathrm{~A}$. East won the continuation with the $\& \mathrm{Q}$ and switched to the J , won with the king. When a heart was led, East rose with the ace, cashed her last club winner and exited with the $\checkmark \mathrm{J}$ to declarer's king. The winning play for only 500 down now is a double endplay on West, aiming to score the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$. You lead a middle trump to West's 10 , forcing the $\checkmark$ Q exit. After ruffing this, you play ace and another trump, forcing West to win and lead a diamond.
Hayman seemed to have read the position correctly when she exited with the $\bigcirc 7$ to West's $\$ 10$. She ruffed the $\triangle$ Q return but sadly continued with the $\checkmark 8$, allowing West to win and exit safely in trumps. That converted the penalty from 500 to 800 and $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{S}$ scored $0 / 50$ instead of $36 / 14$.
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This board was well bid:
Board 10. Dealer East. Both Vul.
A K 10432

- Q 942
$\diamond$ Q 8
\& J 7

| 4 A 95 |  | A J 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ AJ 7 | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ E | $\bigcirc 10853$ |
| $\diamond$ J 42 | ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | $\diamond 10763$ |
| \& K 852 |  | ¢ 1043 |
|  | A Q 86 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 6 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AK 95 |  |
|  | \& A Q 96 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hayman | Sielicki | Kalita | Sarniak |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \mathbf{0} 0$ |
| Dble | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | 39 | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Sielicki located a spade fit and then gave partner an option, suggesting 5-4-2-2 shape with her 3NT bid. In 4\$ with two likely trump losers, even +620 may require some work. West, whose take-out double had been adventurous, led the 2 against 3NT. Sarniak won East's 10 with the queen and continued brightly with a spade to the king. (The take-out double had suggested playing West for a doubleton A.) A second spade went to the jack, queen and ace, West exiting safely with a spade. At one stage declarer had a chance to collect a remarkable +660 . She settled for +630 , surely a good matchpoint score, and collected 45/5.

| Board 14. Dealer East. Neither Vul. <br> - 97 <br> $\checkmark$ K 53 <br> $\diamond \mathrm{J} 4$ <br> \& A Q 8762 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{lll} \Delta & \text { A Q } 104 \\ \diamond & \text { Q J } 7 \\ \diamond & \text { Q } 53 \\ \& & 943 \end{array}$ |  | a | J 65 |
|  | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ | $\checkmark$ | A 109842 |
|  | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | $\diamond$ |  |
|  |  | 9 | J 5 |
|  | A K 83 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 6$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AK 10 | 982 |  |
|  | of K 10 |  |  |
| West Welland | North <br> Morawski | East | South |
|  |  | Auken | Kedzierska |
|  |  | 20 | $3 \diamond$ |
| 30 | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Sabine Auken led the $\Omega 9$ to declarer's king. Six club tricks and two diamonds were scored for +400 (N/S scoring 31/19).
'Remarkable hand,' observed Oscar the Owl, the club's senior kibitzer. 'Both sides can make 3NT.' As you see, on a spade lead the defenders can score the first nine tricks. It may seem that a double-dummy lead of the N would give them ten tricks. After a start of $\boldsymbol{J} / \uparrow \mathrm{K} / \uparrow \mathrm{A}$, followed by the $\$ \mathrm{Q}$ and a heart switch, East's $\mathbf{6}$ blocks the suit.
The kibitzers, and apparently the players, were mystified by the bidding on my final mixed pairs deal.

Board 19. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

- Q 7
$\checkmark$ A 72
$\diamond$ KJ4
\& K 9765
A 964
$\checkmark$ J 64
$\diamond$ Q 763
\& Q J 3


A A J 2
$\checkmark 98$
$\diamond$ A 1082
\& A 1042
A K 10853
$\checkmark$ KQ1053
$\diamond 95$
\& 8

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gromov | RKhandelual | Gromova | KKhondelual |
|  |  |  | $20^{*}$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | Rdbl |
| Pass | Pass | 2NT | All Pass |

If you are expecting me to explain South's $2 \checkmark$ and the subsequent redouble, you are looking at the wrong guy. East's 2NT was presumably intended as Unusual but read as natural (and why not?)
South led the $\checkmark \mathrm{K}$, followed by the $\checkmark 10$ to the $\checkmark$ A. North switched to the $\mathbb{Q}$, won with the $\boldsymbol{A}$. After a club to the queen and king, followed by a spade continuation, declarer finished five down vulnerable and $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{S}$ collected 48/2. Kibitzers queried why North had not doubled 2NT but to collect 500 off an escape to $3 \diamond$ you would have to defend carefully.
If the editor will grant me space (He will. Editor) I would like to mention just one more bidding deal from the Mixed Teams semi-final between Whitehouse and Zimmerman. I had to omit it from the original article because my record was incomplete.
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Are you happy with Meike Wortel's 2 overcall, vulnerable against non-vulnerable? It is absolutely splendid. Heaven spare me from players who say 'I like a little bit more when vulnerable'. A negative double located the heart fit and +420 was made.
Now see what happened in the Closed Room.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Bakkeren | ZimmermannL.Madsen | Zochowska |  |
| $1 \diamond$ | $2 \uparrow$ | Dble | $3 \uparrow$ |
| $4 』$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $5 \circlearrowleft$ | All Pass |  |  |

Ton Bakkeren won the spade lead and took a losing finesse of the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$. He won the club switch in dummy, crossed to the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and ruffed a diamond with the $\triangle 8$, all following. How should he play the trump suit? North had started with six spades, three diamonds, and probably two clubs since he might have led a singleton club. This left South with three trumps to North's two, making him a 3 -to-2 favourite to hold the $\bigcirc \mathrm{J}$. (If declarer thought that South must hold the $\triangle \mathrm{A}$ after the weak 2A overcall, the position of the 9 J would be a $50 \%$ guess). Bakkeren played with the odds, finessing the $\bigcirc 10$. That was one down and 11 IMPs were lost. Do you blame East or West for getting too high?
I am entirely happy with West's $4 \checkmark$ bid. I am equally admiring of East's 4 slam try, since she could place partner with a singleton spade. As I see it, the swing was caused entirely by Joanna Zochowska's excellent raise to 34, which took away bidding space. It's a lesson for bridge players everywhere!


Bring your suggestions to the Bulletin Room or email them to markhorton007@hotmail.com
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## INDIAN TEAM SELECTION TRIAL

by John Carruthers

With unlimited space at our disposal we thought you might like to read this short report from the event that determined the team that will represent the hosts India in the Bermuda Bowl in Chennai.

If you're anything like me, you much prefer to watch team matches on BBO rather than pairs games. Watching a team match feels like reading a good book, whereas watching a pairs game feels like watching bad televison.

So, while the Mixed Pairs was going on in Tromsø, I took the opportunity to watch some of the Indian Bermuda Bowl Team Selection Trials from the Bengal Rowing Club in Kolkata, held from June 28 to July 1.

Seven teams entered the Trials. Most of the top names in Indian bridge were in attendance. The teams were:
Arun Jain: Arun Jain, Raju Tolani, S Sundarram, P Sridhar, Swarnendu Banerjee, JM Shah
Bangur Cement: Debasish Ray, NRK Moorthy, SK Iyengar, Sukamal Das, Chandrashekhar Majumder, Manas Mukherjee
Cv Rao: A Bhattacharya, Pranab Bardhan, PS Mukherjee, SN De Sarkar, Avijit Chakraborty, Satyabrata Mukherjee
Hemant Jalan: Hemant Jalan, Ashish Malhotra, Sandeep Thakral, Kaustubh Bendre, Kaustabh Nandi, Sandip Datta
Indian Railways: Subir KR Majumder, Rana

Ray, Amarnath Banerjee, Sumit Mukherjee, Debabrata Majumder (aka Laltu), Gopinath Manna
Shree Cement: Pritish Kushari, Ravi Goenka, Vinay Desai, Arun Bapat, Bhabesh Saha, Ajay Bagaria

Those six teams played a double round robin to qualify three teams for 60-board semifinal knockout play. The seventh team in the Trials had a bye to the semifinals, having qualified that far by winning the Ruia Gold Cup, the premier Indian team event, at the Winter Nationals late last year. They were:
Formidables: Kiran Nadar, B Satyanarayana, B Prabhakar, Rajeshwar Tewari, Sunit Choksi, Keyzad Anklesaria
The semifinal winners played a 90-board final.
Results of the Round Robin were:
1 Indian Railways 128.33
2 Cv Rao 109.74
3 Bangur Cement 106.91
4 Arun Jain 96.75
5 Hemant Jalan 93.36
6 Shree Cement 64.91
Semifinal results were:
Bangur Cement 116 Formidables 107
Indian Railways 192 Cv Rao 152
The final:
Indian Railways 194 Bangur Cement156

## PLAY BRIDGE TONIGHT!

## FIRST SOCIAL EVENING TOURNAMENT

## AT HOTEL THE EDGE

START 21:30
15 BOARDS // 150 NOK PER PAIR
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## Final 5 of 6

There were three Majumders and two Mukherjees playing in the final match: Chandrashekhar (CS) Majumder for BANGUR CEMENT; and Subir KR Majumder and Debabrata Majumder for INDIAN RAILWAYS; Manas Mukherjee for BANGUR CEMENT; and Sumit Mukherjee for INDIAN RAILWAYS. We shall refer to them by their first names or initials: CS, Subir, Debabrata, Manas and Sumit, respectively, for simplicity and clarity (we hope).

Further confusing matters (confusing me, really, and I know most of the players!), there was a Ray (Debasish) and a Roy (Rana) playing in this match and there were two more Mukherjees and another Banerjee on other teams not reaching the semifinals.

We like the Delhi Bridge Association custom of laying out the table lineups at the beginning of a report (and now you know why they do it!). Here are the lineups for Set 5 of 6 .

Closed Room
North: Gopinath Manna (Railways)
West: Sukamal Das (Cement)
East: Cs Majumder (Cement)
South: Subir Majumder (Railways)
Open Room
North: Manas Mukherjee (Cement)
West: Sumit Mukherjee (Railways)
East: Debabrata Majumder (Railways)
South: Debasish Ray (Cement)
With the score BANGUR CEMENT 139 INDIAN RAILWAYS 109...

Board 1. Dealer North. Neither Vul.


$42^{\text {nd }}$ Bermuda Bowl| $\mathbf{2 0}^{\text {th }}$ Venice Cup $\mid 8^{\text {th }} d^{\prime}$ Orsi Trophy $\mid 10^{\text {th }}$ Transnational Open Teams

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Das | Manna | CS | Subir |
|  | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \odot$ |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |

All Pass

Das led the nine of diamonds. Declarer, Subir, won with dummy's ace, drew trumps and finessed the queen of spades. CS took his ace of clubs and king of diamonds and exited with another club. Declarer had to lose a spade for -50 .

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Sumit | Manas | DebabrataRay |  |
|  | $1 \Delta$ | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | $4 \Omega$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The Open Room duplicated the auction, but not the play. Sumit also led his diamond nine. Ray won with dummy's ace, drew trumps and led a spade to the ace, gathering the jack from East. Declarer led dummy's eight of diamonds, won by East's king. East led out the ace and another club, ruffed by declarer, who cashed the queen of diamonds for a pitch of dummy's third club. Having stripped the minor suits in both hands, declarer led a spade to the nine, forcing East's king. Even if East had had started with the jack-ten doubleton, or if declarer had misguessed by playing the queen of spades, East would have been endplayed. Plus 420 and 10 IMPs to CEMENT.

Declarer played well, but could have improved his line by leading a club before the ace of spades, to ensure being able to eliminate the suit. As it was, if East could have refrained from playing clubs early, he'd have had a club exit if declarer had misguessed spades. However, that was probably academic, since he guessed them anyway.
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Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.
A J 8
$\checkmark 10976$
$\diamond$ AJ 3
\& K J 97


Open Room

| West <br> Sumit | North <br> Manas | East <br> DebabrataRay |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | Pass |

Sumit/Debabrata conducted a sensible auction to a sensible spot. Ray led his trump and Manas won with the ace to shift to the jack of spades. Declarer won with his ace, took the club ace, and cross-ruffed three clubs and two hearts, cashing the heart ace along the way. When he left dummy with a heart, North had the ten left and South the king. Declarer discarded a spade and was ensured of making the king-ten of diamonds at the end. That was a sensible $\ldots+130$ for RAILWAYS.

## Closed Room

| West <br> Das | North <br> Manna | East <br> CS | South <br> Subir <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Dble |
| 2 N* $^{*}$ | $3 \%$ | 3NT | All Pass |

## * Fit-showing

Events at the other table were less ordinary. Das/CS conducted a very optimistic auction to an atrocious spot.

Subir led the king of spades. Manna dumped the jack on that and declarer ducked. A second spade went to declarer's seven. CS led a diamond to the queen and North's ace. North shifted to a curious jack of clubs; declarer put in the queen and led the king and another diamond to North's jack. North got out with the seven of clubs, won by declarer's ten. When declarer cashed his diamonds and the ace of clubs, his seventh trick, the defence was in
a pickle. Declarer could lead the last club (South had had to discard his fourth club on the diamonds) and whoever won it would be endplayed: South into the ace-ten of spades or North into the acequeen of hearts. That was a brilliant +600 and 10 IMPs to CEMENT.


Open Room

| West | North | East $\quad$ South |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sumit | Manas | DebabrataRay <br>  <br> Pass |  |
| $1 \Omega$ | $5 \diamond$ |  |  |
| Pass | Dble All Pass |  |  |

Whatever you may think of the bidding, the result certainly looked good to North/South. They were one off in five diamonds doubled, -100 , with the opponents on a successful finesse for either of two slams. They failed to reckon with Subir.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South <br> Das |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Manna | CS | Subir |
|  |  | $1 \circlearrowleft$ | $2 \diamond$ |
| Dble | $3 \diamond$ | $4 \checkmark$ | $5 \diamond$ |
| $6 \circlearrowleft$ | All Pass |  |  |

The final contract was just acceptable, being slightly worse than on a finesse. However, it met Bob Hamman's criterion for a good slam: "A good slam is one that makes". Subir led the ace of spades and shifted to... the eight of clubs! From declarer's point of view, this was unlikely to be away from the king, since South could not possibly know the location of the jack. Declarer might have had no play for his slam other than to duck the club. Be that as it may, declarer rose with dummy's ace and is today a sadder but wiser man.
That was 5 IMPs to RAILWAYS when it might have been 16 to CEMENT.
After this set, BANGUR CEMENT led 146-137.
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## Final 6 of 6

CEMENT's lead did not outlast the first board of the last set.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CS | Debabrata | Das | Sumit |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \wedge$ |
| Pass | $1 N T$ | Pass | 3NT |

All Pass

Das led the five of hearts, which ran around to declarer's nine. Three rounds of diamonds put West in, as East discarded the three and seven of spades. West thus shifted to the ten of clubs, jack, queen, three. Declarer ducked the king of clubs as well, and East shifted to the six of spades. With a diamond and two clubs in the bag, East hoped that West had one spade trick to go with the heart to come. Plus he knew that declarer had no entry to the dummy. Why? Declarer had squandered the two of diamonds on the first round of the suit. West had given remainder count in clubs, so East also knew that declarer had no more clubs.

Thus, two clubs, one diamond, one heart and one spade would ensure declarer's defeat provided West had either the ace or the kingqueen of spades third. Not too much to ask. In theory, it mattered not, since declarer could have forced East to lead into the ace-queen of spades later anyway, even with no dummy entry. The defence later scored the king of hearts, but that was nine tricks for declarer, +400 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Roy | Manas | Banerjee | Ray |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Dble | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $1 N T$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The lead and early play were similar. However, when in with the jack of diamonds (East having discarded the two and eight of hearts), Roy shifted to the five of clubs rather than the ten. Declarer ducked twice and, here, Banerjee continued with a third club to dummy's ace. Declarer had a blind spot (discarding the queen of spades and running the jack of hearts would have ensured the contract) and discarded a heart on the ace of clubs. He then ran his two diamond tricks to reduce everyone to four cards.


Convinced that East had the two major-suit kings remaining, both guarded, declarer played off the ace and queen of spades instead of the ace and queen of hearts-the "Miami Endplay", and West claimed two off. Declarer was aghast. Two off meant 11 IMPs to RAILWAYS.

RAILWAYS had slightly the better of it to lead by 15 with two boards to go. On the penultimate board, Debabrata for RAILWAYS made a winning decision to pull Sumit's three notrump suggestion to four hearts on ©Q9 ゝQ8 $\diamond A Q 1098 \curvearrowright K 653$ after the auction:

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $C S$ | Debabrata | Das | Sumit |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | $2 \uparrow$ | $3 \circlearrowleft$ |
| $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

Sumit had ゅK6 అKJ762 $\diamond 5$ \&AQ842. Sumit lost the ace of spades and two heart tricks when they were 4-2.
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At the other table, East/West never bid, so North/ South were not alerted to the spade danger and bid to three notrump, off one for 12 IMPs to RAILWAYS, cementing their victory. Five clubs looks to be the best game, but no one ever bid the suit naturally.

Just to put a cap on it, RAILWAYS bid the ninetieth and final deal of the match to perfection at both tables.

Board 30. Dealer East. Neither Vul.

> s 1094 $\diamond$ 643 $\diamond$ A J 109 \& 1074


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CS | Debabrata | Das | Sumit |
|  |  | 1\% | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | $2 \%$ | Pass |
| 20 | Pass | 30 | Pass |
| 4\% | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Dble! |
| Pass | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ | All Pass |

It must be said that CS kind of dogged the hand. Five hearts might have engendered five notrump from East and then six notrump would have been very attractive. But let's not take anything away from Sumit's doubleit was a great bid and he hit it for six.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roy | Manas | Banerjee | Ray |
|  |  | 1\% | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 20 | Pass | 30 | Pass |
| 30 | Pass | 3NT | Pass |
| $4 \%$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 6NT | All Pass |  |  |

Banerjee/Roy got to six notrump from the right side and made +990 on a diamond lead to the ace.
INDIAN RAILWAYS were certainly worthy winners.


Marion's Solution


Interview with the English Star David Gold


Horton's Corner - Karen McCallum Lesson


Kisses \& Hugs in the Mixed Final


Being a T.D. - A.Riccardi explains the Procedure
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## MIXED PAIRS - FINAL A

RESULTS AFTER SESSION 5

| 1 | CRONIER P. - WILLARD S. | $1,586.00$ | 58.96 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | BUTRYN P. - SAKOWSKA N. | $1,584.00$ | 58.88 |
| 3 | AUKEN S. - WELLAND R. | $1,521.00$ | 56.54 |
| 4 | HANSEN J. - CIST G. | $1,517.00$ | 56.39 |
| 5 | RIMSTEDT C. - UPMARK J. | $1,468.00$ | 55.57 |
| 6 | PUNCH S. - RES T. | $1,464.00$ | 54.42 |
| 7 | NILSSON H. - OPPENSTAM A. | $1,453.00$ | 54.01 |
| 8 | GROMOV A. - GROMOVA V. | $1,445.00$ | 53.72 |
| 9 | KIZILOK O. - KUTUK B. | $1,444.00$ | 53.68 |
| 10 | WENNING K. - WENNING U. | $1,437.00$ | 53.42 |
| 11 | KHANDELWAL - KHANDELWL | $1,425.00$ | 52.97 |
| 12 | SCHIPPERS-B. E. - STIENEN R. | $1,424.00$ | 52.94 |
| 13 | HELGEMO G. - LANGELAND A. | $1,415.00$ | 52.60 |
| 14 | HELNESS G. - HELNESS T. | $1,414.00$ | 52.57 |
| 15 | CAYNE P. - DE FALCO D. | $1,412.00$ | 52.49 |
| 16 | GOLD D. - GROSS S. | $1,412.00$ | 52.49 |
| 17 | BROCK S. - MYERS B. | $1,404.00$ | 52.19 |
| 18 | HAYMAN PIAFSKY J. - KALITA | $1,404.00$ | 52.19 |
| 19 | MICHIELSEN M. - ROSENTHAL | $1,394.00$ | 51.82 |
| 20 | CAMERON G. - STABELL L. | $1,388.00$ | 51.60 |
| 21 | HESKJE T. - OVESEN J. | $1,384.00$ | 51.45 |
| 22 | SARNIAK A. - SIELICKI T. | $1,383.00$ | 51.41 |
| 23 | SHI B. - TIAN W. | $1,381.00$ | 51.34 |
| 24 | BERKOWITZ D. - WILLENKEN | $1,375.00$ | 51.12 |
| 25 | MANNO A. - PISCITELL F. | $1,364.00$ | 50.71 |
| 26 | BLOOM V. - EBER N. | $1,363.00$ | 50.67 |


| 27 | AVON D. - VOLDOIRE J. | 1,353.00 | 50.30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28 | BALDYSZ C. - JASZCZAK A. | 1,345.00 | 50.00 |
| 29 | KHOLOMEEV V. - RAKHMANI | 1,331.00 | 49.48 |
| 30 | BREKKA G. - FUGLESTAD A. | 1,311.00 | 48.74 |
| 31 | BAKKE C. - GRUDE L. | 1,299.00 | 48.29 |
| 32 | PASKE T. - SEALE C. | 1,298.00 | 48.25 |
| 33 | LEV S. - LEVITINA I. | 1,294.00 | 48.10 |
| 34 | BLAAGESTAD L. - FREDIN | 1,292.00 | 48.03 |
| 35 | GODEJORD O. - MOE H. | 1,292.00 | 48.03 |
| 36 | GUIS. - WANG L. | 1,290.00 | 47.96 |
| 37 | DOMICHI N. - GUPTA S. | 1,281.00 | 47.62 |
| 38 | DE BOTTON J. - MALINOWSKI | 1,273.00 | 47.32 |
| 39 | McCALLUM K. - TUNCOK C. | 1,273.00 | 7.32 |
| 40 | MCALLISTER - ZUR-CAMPANIL | 1,267 | 47.10 |
| 41 | PETTERSEN A. - PETTERSEN | 1,248.00 | 46.39 |
| 42 | BOHNSACK H. - BOHNSACK | 1,243.00 | 46.21 |
| 43 | KEDZIERSKA U. - MORAWSKI | 1,240.00 | 46.10 |
| 44 | VAN PROOIJEN R. - WILSON A. | 1,236.00 | 45.95 |
| 45 | LINDAAS P. - RINGSETH J. | 1,210.00 | 4.98 |
| 46 | BOGEN A. - BOGEN F. | 1,186.00 | 44.09 |
| 47 | OLIVIERI G. - ZALESKI R. | 1,177.00 | 43.75 |
| 48 | MULTON F. - WARD-PLATT K. | 1,176.00 | 43.72 |
| 49 | BILDE D. - CILLEBORG D. | 1,170.00 | 43.49 |
| 50 | ASLA R. - MARKUSSEN S. | 1,165.00 | 43.31 |
| 51 | HETZ C. - PACHTMANR. | 1,154.00 | 42.90 |
| 52 | CORNELL M. - CORNELLV. | 1,125.0 | 41.82 |

## Results are subject to confirmation



| $1$ | SANBORN K. - SANBORN S. | 3,371.55 | 59.99 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | TER LAARE M. - MOLLE L. | 3,343.70 | 59.50 |
| 3 | BAREKET I. - SAADA N. | 3,245.48 | 57.75 |
| 4 | UZUM D. - OZGUNES A. | 3,114.20 | 57.71 |
| 5 | DOBROWOLSKI M. - MADUZIA | 3,216.84 | 57.24 |
| 6 | KOWALSKI A. - MISZEWSKA E. | 3,203.85 | 57.01 |
| 7 | HINDEN F. - OSBORNE G. | 3,194.44 | 56.84 |
| 8 | MATUSHKO G. - GULEVICH A. | 3,056.17 | 56.64 |
| 9 | SVENDSEN O. - GILLIS S. | 3,182.80 | 56.63 |
| 10 | NOSACKI M. - SAADA P. | 3,171.08 | 56.42 |
| 11 | BREKKE V. - HELNESS F. | 3,039.79 | 56.33 |
| 12 | STEPHENS R. - ROSSLEE D. | 3,121.84 | 55.55 |
| 13 | GOUVERITH M. - DE MULLER | 3,118.63 | 55.49 |
| 14 | KJONSVIK O. - SPILLUM B. | 3,093.60 | 55.05 |
| 15 | KERN S. - ILLNER A. | 3,089.30 | 54.97 |
| 16 | CLAIR P. - PAGNINI-ARSLAN C. | 3,086.16 | 54.91 |
| 17 | FJAELBERG J. - BIRKELAND B. | 2,834.20 | 54.80 |
| 18 | MITCHELL J. - CAYNE J. | 3,068.19 | 54.59 |
| 19 | HOMME M. - HOMME E. | 2,818.34 | 54.49 |
| 20 | SHAMI A. - CAMP O. | 3,061.52 | 54.48 |
| 21 | NILSEN H. - PETTERSEN V. | 2,813.21 | 54.44 |
| 22 | LESLIE P. - ALLERTON J. | 3,047.01 | 54.22 |
| 23 | KARLSEN S. - JESUS F. Q. M | 3,041.16 | 54.11 |
| 24 | NIKITINA A. - GUSEV V. | 3,038.66 | 54.07 |
| 25 | YALMAN A. - YALMAN G. | 3,036.86 | 54.04 |
| 26 | ZOBU A. - ARONOV V. | 3,021.16 | 53.76 |
| 27 | AYDIN A. - SUZER U. | 3,019.43 | 53.73 |
| 28 | OZTURK E. - CAKICI F. | 3,018.26 | 53.71 |
| 29 | SENIOR B. - PENFOLD S. | 3,004.92 | 53.47 |
| 30 | WANG W. - SHEN (1) Q. | 3,003.55 | 53.44 |
| 31 | BRENNE E. - MOENV. | 2,996.76 | 53.32 |
| 32 | HOLMOY S. - BOGEN H. | 2,750.56 | 53.22 |
| 33 | ANFINSEN I. - SOLHEIM E. | 2,981.82 | 53.06 |
| 34 | GOWER C. - BATEMAN N. | 2,961.50 | 52.70 |
| 35 | HANSSEN B. - KOFOED H. I. | 2,833.30 | 52.51 |
| 36 | GRUDE M. - SIVERTSVIK R. | 2,699.60 | 52.24 |
| 37 | STANGHELLE H. - HARDING | 2,932.54 | 52.18 |
| 38 | GAVIARD D. - MARRO C. | 2,930.04 | 52.14 |
| 39 | DAI J. - ZHANG B. | 2,692.46 | 52.06 |
| 40 | ENGEBRETSEN G. - OWER A. | 2,804.16 | 51.97 |
| 41 | ROREN T. - WENNEVOLD I. | 2,800.99 | 51.91 |
| 42 | TESHOME S. - THROWER J. | 2,790.71 | 51.72 |
| 43 | KOVACHEV V. - MARQUARDT | 2,778.59 | 51.49 |
| 44 | McGOWAN E. - LIGGAT D. | 2,776.86 | 51.46 |
| 45 | HETZ N. - SVENDSEN T. | 2,881.18 | 51.27 |
| 46 | SUNDLAND H. - HAUGSTAD | 2,879.47 | 51.24 |
| 47 | MIYAKUNI A. - MIYAKUNI K. | 2,866.72 | 51.01 |
| 48 | FRENKEL R. - SAWICKI H. | 2,862.44 | 50.93 |
| 49 | ELIASSEN N. - EIDE L. | 2,861.07 | 50.91 |
| 50 | LYBAEK A. - ELLINGSEN K. | 2,850.70 | 50.72 |
| 51 | HOYLAND S. - SJODAL S. | 2,848.14 | 50.68 |
| 52 | SAYER N. - ZAHARIEV Z. | 2,843.66 | 50.60 |
| 53 | ZOCHOWSKA J. - ZIMMERMAN | 2,838.27 | 50.50 |
| 54 | VOS V. - BASA M. | 2,832.47 | 50.40 |
| 55 | ROSENTHAL L. - GREEN L. | 2,824.61 | 50.26 |
| 56 | TISLEVOLL G. - MAYER F. | 2,703.12 | 50.09 |
| 57 | GLAERUM L. - HERMANSEN V. | 2,812.81 | 50.05 |


| 58 | McLEISH P. - McLEISH D. | 2,804.67 49.91 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 59 | BUGGE L. - GUSTAVSEN A. | 2,803.13 49.88 |
| 60 | KARAIVANOV K. - HANSEN L. | 2,688.81 49.83 |
| 61 | CURTIS C. - FEGARTY P. | 2,782.59 49.51 |
| 62 | PICUS S. - HOFFMAN D. | 2,668.73 49.46 |
| 63 | FENESS J. - KOPSTAD K. | 2,767.04 49.24 |
| 64 | CAPLAN E. - FRISBY W. | 2,765.94 49.22 |
| 65 | ELLINGSEN S. - NICOLAISEN S. | 2,760.88 49.13 |
| 66 | JAKOBSEN A. - DANIELSEN A. | 2,645.48 49.03 |
| 67 | BRAGADIR S. - DE MENDEZ T. | 2,752.33 48.97 |
| 68 | EGGELING M. - GOTARD T. | 2,639.70 48.92 |
| 69 | FURUNES J. - STORNES H. | 2,743.89 48.82 |
| 70 | PEREZ N. - PEREZ H. | 2,739.11 48.74 |
| 71 | KVIKSTAD J. - KVIKSTAD Y. | 2,737.49 48.71 |
| 72 | SNEVE S. - HELMERSEN K. | 2,732.74 48.63 |
| 73 | FAGERDAL R. - ANDERSEN W. | 2,731.36 48.60 |
| 74 | ISPORSKI V. - NIKOLOVA M. | 2,728.54 48.55 |
| 75 | THOMASSEN K. - HINGE S. | 2,721.44 48.42 |
| 76 | EDLUND L. - LARSSON R. | 2,714.63 48.30 |
| 77 | HAGEN E. - ANJER M. | 2,703.31 48.10 |
| 78 | LOSSIUS T. - THEODORSEN L. | 2,484.84 48.08 |
| 79 | DAHLV. - BRINCHMANN K. | 2,696.11 47.97 |
| 80 | THEELKE M. - SKELTON J. | 2,578.92 47.79 |
| 81 | OVSTEDAL F. - LARSEN H. | 2,565.51 47.54 |
| 82 | KREUNING H. - OUDA S. | 2,668.00 47.47 |
| 83 | GRAIZER N. - HORVITZ S. | 2,666.23 47.44 |
| 84 | MARK M. - MARK S. | 2,443.80 47.25 |
| 85 | NAVEH N. - MERMELSTEIN G. | 2,652.39 47.20 |
| 86 | SOLVANG B. - KANDAHL E. | 2,651.97 47.19 |
| 87 | BULL S. - NESSETH B. | 2,544.70 47.16 |
| 88 | SOLUM R. - GARVIK O. | 2,641.43 47.00 |
| 89 | PELLE I. - HAVERKATE J. | 2,631.99 46.83 |
| 90 | STRETZ F. - SALONEN I. | 2,607.78 46.40 |
| 91 | RIESE S. - RIESE T. | 2,603.90 46.33 |
| 92 | KVERNSTROM K. - BERG B. | 2,462.35 45.63 |
| 93 | SOOILAND T. - DUBLAND K. | 2,561.09 45.57 |
| 94 | HERLAND J. - LARSSEN I. | 2,552.73 45.42 |
| 95 | SJODAL E. - SJODAL R. | 2,447.05 45.35 |
| 96 | JOYCE E. - FITZGERALD J. | 2,540.98 45.21 |
| 97 | YUEN M. - FENTON A. | 2,538.87 45.18 |
| 98 | KHONICHEVA E. - FEOFANOV | 2,526.54 44.96 |
| 99 | PHELAN L. - MITCHELL L. | 2,520.28 44.84 |
| 100 | LARSEN H. - LARSEN L. | 2,503.52 44.55 |
| 101 | KOLESNIK A. - CAPRERA D. | 2,490.01 44.31 |
| 102 | ERNSTSEN S. - JAKOBSEN K. | 2,488.35 44.28 |
| 103 | SIVERTSEN A. - SOLLIE F. | 2,387.12 44.24 |
| 104 | BANKOGLU E. - BANKOGLU L. | 2,485.43 44.22 |
| 105 | HALFON N. - HALFON T. | 2,267.00 43.87 |
| 106 | LUND H. - VIGANDER K. | 2,455.09 43.68 |
| 107 | CRICHTON R. - CRICHTON P. | 2,450.86 43.61 |
| 108 | PARNIS-ENGLAND M. - DIX M. | 2,434.62 43.32 |
| 109 | GOTARD B. - GOTARD T. | 2,425.90 43.17 |
| 110 | FJAELBERG A. - LERBREKK R. | 2,171.93 41.99 |
| 111 | FRANCESCONI A. - MANZANO | 2,312.68 41.15 |
| 112 | ROBERTSEN G. - ROSLAND S. | 2,276.64 40.51 |
| 113 | MALUISH A. - MILL A. | 2,269.33 40.38 |
| 114 | ROSSARD M. - ROMANOWSKI | 2,167.82 38.57 |


| GO Tо PAGE: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
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[^0]:    Madeira offers a unique opportunity to enjoy a natural environment bathed by a mild climate all year round, with extraordinary landscapes such as tropical gardens, a deep blue Ocean, and the natural hospitality of its people which makes Madeira a high-quality

