

Delhi Bridge Association Newsletter

Editor: T.C. Pant

Vol.1 Issue 8 – January 2004

President: M.D. Dalmia

Hon. Secretary: R.K. Gupta

Regt. Office: 18, Institutional Area, Lodhi Estate, New Delhi

Railways “B” takes the Ruia Trophy in the 45th Winter Bridge Nationals

In the just concluded 45th Winter Bridge Nationals held at Aurangabad from Jan 3 – 13, 2004, Indian Railways again showed their supremacy, when both the Railways team – Railway ‘A’ & Railway ‘B’ reached the Ruia Trophy Finals for the Team of Four event. Finally it was Railway ‘B’ - the Stronger of the Railway teams, who took the coveted Ruia trophy.

Congratulations to all the team members of both the Railways team for their high-class performance.

However it is quite painful that after repeatedly proving their superiority in the National events, the team unluckily is not able to play any tournaments outside India to gain more experience. None of the Railway players get the chance to be part of any Sponsored team that has the resources to go and play tournaments outside India, as they are supposed to represent Railways in National tournaments. Hence, it is high time, either the Indian Railways or the BFI should take care of this talented team to give them exposure of International tournaments.

The first time live broadcast of the Team of Four (Semi finals onwards) and Final of the Holkar Pairs on BBO, created history and Aurangabad will be long remembered just for this. It was really great to see the live Vugraph of the event with some wonderful commentary by Dr. Prakash Paranjape and from top players chipping from outside world. It was also a pleasant surprise to have people like Eric Kokish & Fred Gitelman giving their wonderful comments. All in all the credit for this show goes to Mr. Manoj Nair, who really worked very hard to execute this Herculean task along with his team. Congratulations to Mr. Nair, his team and Mr. Sandeep Thakral (the operator at the site) for a commendable job. The organizers of the tournament also deserve a pat on the back for executing the idea for the first time. We hope BFI will take special interest in arranging the live Vugraph of the Nationals events in the future.

Suddenly we find lot of Bridge Tournaments coming our way and there is a renewed interest in the game. Besides the Winter Nationals, January also saw the PHD-GPI tournament at New Delhi. The scene moves to Kolkata for Shree Cement tournament at the end of January and then in February, we have the Cavendish at Ahmedabad, followed by prize money tournament at Pune and the Lohia tournament at Kanpur. February will end with the Ubhayakar trophy. So friends, lots & lots of Bridge and do enjoy it. However, a small warning to the organizers. They should time the tournaments properly by keeping substantial gap in between tournaments. It will keep the interest of players for a tournament alive and will also help them plan their time for different tournaments. They can also get their energy back after completing one tournament and we will not see stale bridge from tired players.

- From the Editor

TRANSFER RESPONSES OVER STANDARD 1C (Part 2)

In the previous Bulletin, we discussed how opener responds to responder's initial responses to 1C opening playing transfer responses. We continue with the bids responder uses to further explore the hand.

Re-bids by responder after Initial Response to 1C Opening

When opener transfers to the major shown by responder at one level, most of the time opener will have balanced hand of 12-14 HCP but some times can have more HCP with awkward hands. If responder has scrapped us a response on a weak hand, he can pass the transfer but he should do it rarely. Re-bids by responder beyond 1NT can be as per your system however we would recommend XYZ convention (or two way check back presented in this bulletin earlier) in which 2C is puppet to 2D where as 2D is game force.

Whenever Opener shows 18-19 balanced hand with 1NT re-bid over 1C-1D/H or 2NT re-bid over 1C-1S, we recommend retransfers. Certainly Opener should become declarer as far as possible. The use of transfer continuations allows responder to control the auction and stop in a part score when necessary.

<p>1C – 1D (showing 4+ hearts) – 1H – ? 1S – Natural one round Force or like 4th Suit F 1N/2H – to play 2C – Puppet to 2D, to play or Invitational hands Over 2D, responder re-bids Pass – to play 2H – Invitational with 5 Hearts 2S – Invitational with 5 Hearts + 4 Spades 2N – Invitational with 4 Hearts 3C/D – Invitational with 4H & 5+ cards C/D 3H – Invitational with 6 Hearts 3S/4D – Splinters in support of Clubs 2D – GF, Opener to shows 3 card support 2S – 5+H and 4+S, GF 2N – Puppet to 3C (to play or 4-4-4-1 GF hands) 3C/D – 5+H and 5+C/D, GF 3H – Good suit, GF 3S/4C/4D – Self splinters, Good heart suit</p>	<p>1C – 1D (H) / 1H (S) – 1N (18-19 Balanced) – ? 2C – Transfer to Diamond (4M + 4D) 2D – Transfer to Heart (shows 5H if bid major otherwise 5S + 4H) 2H – Transfer to Spade (shows 5S if bid major otherwise 4S + 4H) 2S – Transfer to Club (4M + 4C) 2N – Invitational with 4 Cards in the Major 3C/D – 5+M and 5C/D, GF 3H(OM) – 5+S and 5+H, GF 3S(OM)/4C/D/4H(OM) – Self Splinters</p> <p>1C – 1S – 2NT (18-19 Balanced) – ? 3C = Transfer to Diamond (5+D). After opener accepts transfer, suit bids are all short suits 3D = Transfer to Heart (5D+ 4H) 3H = Transfer to Spade (5D+ 4S) 3S = Transfer to Club (5D+ 4C), Slamish</p>
<p>1C – 1H (showing 4+ spades) – 1S – ? 1N, 2C/D, 2N, 3C same as over 1C-1D-1H 2H – to play, shows weak hand 5S-4H 2S – Constructive, to play 3D/H – 5+S and 5D/H, GF 3S – Good suit, GF 4C/D/H – Self splinters, Good spade suit</p>	<p>1C – 1D(H) / 1H (S) – 2NT (6+C w/wo 3H) – ? 3C – Sign off, opener with stronger hand bids 3D – Single suiter in Clubs, forcing 3M – Clubs + 3 cards in major, forcing 4M – 5C + 4M 3D – Game Force asks opener to describe 3M – 6+C with 3 cards in the major 3OM – Single suiter in Clubs 3N – Single suiter in Clubs, to play 4C – 5C + 4M, shortness in other major 4D – 5C + 4M, shortness in D 4M – 5C + 4M 3M – Sign off 3OM – Stopper, denies 5 cards in the major suit 4D/4OM – Splinter in support of Clubs</p>
<p>1C – 1S (Transfer to 1NT or 4+D) – 1N – ? 2C – Puppet to 2D, to play or Invitational hands Over 2D, responder re-bids 2H/S – Invitational with stopper in bid suit 2N – Invitational with 5D + 4C 3C – Invitational with 4D + 5C 3D – Invitational with Long Diamonds 2D – Game Force, further bidding natural 2H/S – Natural GF, 5+D and 4M 3C/D – Natural, Invitational 3H/3S/4C – Self splinters, Good Diamond suit</p>	<p>The above structure is also applicable after 1D Opening (1D-1M-2N) with long Diamond suit.</p>

With the above structure, it is possible to cover many hands, which are other wise difficult to bid. However keep in mind to alert your opponents when you play the transfer responses.

(Contributed by Sudhir Aggarwal)

Local Bridge News & Results

Delhi Bridge Association Tuesday Pairs Event - Results

06/01/2004

NS 1: Sudhir Aggarwal – Amod Rele	61.46%
NS 2 : Ravi Sawhney – S. Sunderarajan	58.33%
EW1 : T.C. Pant – Sunil Bhatia	63.19%
EW2 : Mrs. Asha Sehgal – Mrs. Suni Chung	57.29%

13/01/2004

NS 1 : S.Majumder – A.K. Jha	61.11%
NS 2 : Prof. S.C. Gupta – Mrs. Mani Gupta	55.86%
EW 1 : D.K. Tewari – Joyjit Sen Sharma	63.28%
EW 2 : Ganpat Rai – Deepak Arora	63.24%

20/01/2004

NS 1 : Kamesh Rao – V.N. Puri	61.97%
NS 2 : Alok Khemka – Vineet Chandra	60.26%
EW 1 : Santosh Kumar – Ashok Srivastava	57.52%
EW 2 : A. Chandra – Mrs. Urmil Aggarwal	57.04%

27/01/2004

NS 1 : T.K. Bhattacharya – A.K. Sinha	63.89%
NS 2 : T.C. Pant – Sunil Bhatia	60.42%
EW 1 : A. Chandra – Mrs. Urmil Aggarwal	59.72%
EW 2 : Yogesh Tewari – Arun Jain	54.86%

IMPORTANT NOTICE

The trials for selecting the pair to represent Delhi State in the **ALL INDIA RAMA JAIN Tournament** will be held at DBA on **28th Feb 2003**.

The All India Rama Jain Tournament will be played at Delhi Bridge Association Building, New Delhi on 13-14th Mar 2004.

VASANT VIHAR CLUB Tournament

Vasant Vihar Club will organize their Annual Bridge Tournament on **21st Mar 2004** at Vasant Vihar Club. The Mixed Pairs event will be played in the morning and the Open Pairs event will be played in the afternoon.

You may please contact Dr. (Mrs.) Nikita Kamal or Mr. Amarjeet Wadhawan for further details.

DBA – Hindustan Times Saturday Team Event – Results

03/01/2004

1. **MUTTS** – (V.N. Puri, Amarjit Wadhawan, D.K. Mutreja, V.K. Mutreja, Joyjit Sen Sarma)
2. **SONCHEL**– (Mukesh Shivdasani, Sudhir Aggarwal, Amod Rele, A.K. Ghosh, Ravi Sawhney)

10/01/2004

1. **MUTTS** – (V.N. Puri, D.K. Tewari, D.K. Mutreja, Joy Sen Sarma)
2. **SONCHEL** – (Mukesh Shivdasani, Sudhir Aggarwal, M.S. Sharma, S. Dharni)

17/01/2004

1. **Subodh's Team** – (Subodh Jain, Rajesh Jain, R.C. Consul, A.K. Narang, J.B. Sengupta)
2. **SONCHEL** – (Mukesh Shivdasani, Sudhir Aggarwal, T.C. Pant, Sunil Bhatia, Subhash Gupta)

31/01/2004

1. **Delhi Blues** – (Sudhir Aggarwal, T.C. Pant, Sunil Bhatia, Amod Rele)
2. **Naples** – (Rajesh Jain, S. Dharni, O.K. Mohan Dass, J.B. Sengupta)

All India Ladies Bridge Assoc. Results

02/01/2004 (12 Pairs)

1. Ganpat Rai – Deepak Arora
2. Mrs. Shashi Jain – Mrs. Urmil Aggarwal
3. C.P. Mittal – S.K. Agarwal

16/01/2004 (16 Pairs)

1. C.P. Mittal – S.K. Agarwal
2. Alok Khemka – Sunny Pasricha
3. K.B. Sikand – Maj. B.H. Iyer

- Reported by Mrs. Shashi Jain

AKAI 45th Winter Nationals Bridge Championships

Maharashtra Bridge Association and Aurangabad Contract Bridge League jointly organized the **45th Winter Nationals Bridge Championships** under the aegis of Bridge Federation of India at **Hotel Auragabad Ashok, Aurangabad from Jan 3 – 13, 2004**. AKAI and Indian Airlines jointly sponsored the event.

Mr. Rajendra Darda, State Minister for Home (Urban) inaugurated the tournament and Mr. Rajkumar Dhoot, Member of Parliament presided over the function. Mr. Darda regaled the large crowd with a speech full of humour and wit. The tournament started immediately after the inauguration.

The Team of Four Event - Ruia Gold Cup

157 Teams participated in the Team of Four event for the Ruia Gold Cup. The teams were divided in 2 groups and played 16 rounds of Swiss League of 10 boards each after which the top 12 teams from each group qualified for the next stage i.e. Pre-Quarter final league.

On day one of the event six rounds of the round robin league were played. Jai Kali Sarkar Memorial Team from Asansol, comprising of Ranjit Das, B. Mukerjee, S.K. Mitra, K.K.Mondal and Alok Dutta led the group "A", with a staggering tally of 134 VPs. Formidables which represented India in the World Championships this year were third, with 119 VPs, while the glamorous Agsar Paints were languishing at the 15th position with 106 VP's. In the clash of titans, these two pre-tournament favourites, met each other in the third round and Formidables overcame Agsar Paints 20-10. In Group "B", Sunil Machhar's Team represented by Sunil Machhar, Jitu Solani, Kamal Mukherjee, Ashok Goel, Raju Tolani and S.A. Dhakras led with an impressive score of 129 VP's. C.V. Rao were second with 123 VPs. Indian Railways 'A', were lying 5th with 115 VPs.

However, the day one started with a tragedy when Mr Arvind P. Londhe (popularly known as 'Kaka') of Nagpur collapsed on the table in the first round itself. A team of doctors present at the venue tried to revive him but could not save him.

On the second day 3 rounds of pre-determined draw and 4 rounds of actual draw were played and Formidables with 265 VPs in group "A" and Tolani Shipping with 257 VPs in group "B" were leading their respective groups.

The 3rd day was the all-important day for all the teams fighting for the pre-quarter final berths, and at the end of the final round (the 16th round) of round robin the pre-quarter finalists were:

Qualifiers for Pre-Quarter Finals:

SEC A

1. Formidables	318 (-1 Penalty)
2. Alok Daga	296
3. Kamal Kabra	289
4. Indian Rly "C"	279
5. Jaykali Sarkar Memorial	273
6. India Blues	271
7. Agsar Paints	271
8. Gujrat Bridge Association	271
9. Mohota, Nagpur	269
10. NRB's IV	267
11. SPSBA, Kanpur	267
12. Pankaj Kapadia	266

SEC B

1. Tolani Shipping	312
2. Indian Rly "B"	302
3. Indian Rly "A"	301
4. Sunil Machhar	298
5. NALCO	277
6. Pankaj Mehta	275
7. Dr. D.K. Rao	268
8. Trambak Rubber	267
9. ACLA, Asansol	267
10. MBPT	265
11. JP Goenka	265
12. Khandelwal Industries	264

From the top teams, MONOTONA & CV Rao could not reach the pre-quarter finals and went out of contention for the T-4 title.

SUPER LEAGUE

The 24 pre-quarter finalists played a super league of 8 rounds for finalizing the quarter finalists.

J P Goenka's team (J. P. Goenka, D. Majumdar, S. P. Ghosh, Tapan Kumar Roy, Jagdish Biswas and Kamal Roy) might have just qualified for the Round of 24, but then stormed through with an 81.5 per cent score leaving the rest of the field far behind. Pankaj Mehta (Pankaj Mehta, Puneet Gangal, A. K. Narang, R. C. Consul, Sanjiv Singh and Pradip Singh were second) with Haribabu Bajoria's Trambak Rubber team third.

Formidables, the topper of the league stage had 2 major setbacks. In the first round of super league, they lost 25-4 to Tolani Shipping and in the second round they lost again by 25-1 to J.P. Goenka's. However, they were back in tracks with a 25-5 win in the 3rd round against ACLA, Asansol and just qualified for the quarters with 133 VP along with Agsar Paints, who won their last match 17 -13 to squeak in with the same score, at the expense of India Blues who with 132 VPs missed the quarter final berth narrowly.

After 8 rounds of Super league the top 8 teams qualifying for the quarter finals turned out to be:

1. J.P.Goenka 163
2. Pankaj Mehta 143
3. Trambak Rubber 142
4. Railways'B' 140
5. Alok Daga's IV 139
6. Railways 'A' 135
7. Agsar Paints 133
8. Formidable 133

Quarter Finals

The first four teams having option to choose their opponents were bit perplexed, as the teams with positions 5 to 8 teams were much more stronger teams than the teams at positions 1 to 4.

Finally the Quarter Final line up turned out to be:

JP Goenka	Vs.	Alok Daga
Indian Railways A	Vs.	Pankaj Mehta
Trambak Rubber	Vs.	Agsar Paints
Indian Railways B	Vs.	Formidables

In the 4*12 boards Quarter Finals, JP Goenka beat Alok Daga by 149-74 (22-8,19-24,48-22,60-20) i.e. 75 IMPs. Indian Railways A beat Pankaj Mehta by 168-83 (21-11,61-22,38-18,48-32) i.e. by 85 IMPs. In the 3rd QF match, Trambak Rubber beat Agsar Paints by 37 IMPs. Trambak Rubber was leading by 30 IMPs after 2 sessions. Agsar recovered 24 IMPs in the third set but had a disastrous final session to lose the match by 37 IMPs. The final score line in favour of Trambak Rubber was 141-104 (31-22, 37-16, 17-41, 56-25). The 4th quarterfinal between Indian Railway B and Formidables was the toughest of all. Formidables got off to a good start gaining 6 IMPs in the first set, only to lose 10 in the second, gained two in the third to come within striking distance, but, unfortunately for Formidables, they lost a further two in the fourth and final set of to lose the match by 4 IMPs. The scores were 73-69 (24-30, 25-14,15-17, 10-8). Railways were imposed 1 IMP procedural penalty in the second set.

Semi Finals

In the 4*14 boards first semi final Railways 'B' comfortably beat J.P. Goenka by 65 IMPs. The second Semi final turned out to be a tough affair and finally Railway 'A' defeated Trambak Rubber by 2 IMPs.

Finals

In the 4*16 boards finals Indian Railways 'B' defeated Indian Railway 'A' by 31 IMPs to take the Ruia Trophy. Congratulations to both the Railway teams for the superb show.

The winning Indian Railway 'B' team was represented by Pritish Kushari, Sumit Mukherjee, Manas Mukherjee, Rana Roy & Amarnath Banerjee. The runner-up were represented by Ashim Mukherjee, S. Roy, D. Majumdar & P.Roy.

Pairs Event – Holkar Trophy

After a grueling 3 elimination rounds, Rajesh Dalal – Anil Padhye took the top honors in the Final of Pair event to win the Holkar Trophy. The final ranking was:

- 1st **Rajesh Dalal & Anil Padhya**
- Jt 2nd **Ratanlal Kejriwal & Prakash Kejriwal**
- Jt 2nd **Usha Kabra & Gopinath Manna**
- 4th **Subrato Saha & Sukumal Das**
- 5th **J.Biswas & Tapan Roy**
- 6th **Vivek Bhand & Subir Roy**

B-A-M

After 2 elimination rounds, Formidables (Mrs. Kiran Nadar, B. Satyanarayana, Sunit Chokshi, K.R. Venkatraman, Subhash Gupta & R. Krishnan) won the finals of the Board-a-match event. The final ranking was:

- 1st **Formidables**
- 2nd **CV.Rao's Team**
- 3rd **Pankaj Kapadia**
- 4th **Alok Daga**
- 5th **Indian Railways**
- 6th **Trambak Rubber.**

Categorised Pairs

The final ranking in the Categorised Pairs was:

1. P. K. Banerjee - K. K. Roy 955.36
2. S. Roy - S. P. Roy 955.00
3. S. Sarkar - S. Majumdar 931.67
4. Sudhir Chakraborty - S. Pal 925.95

Heartiest Congratulations to All the Winners

- Reported by Editor

(Courtesy: Information from Mr. B. Satyanarayana, Mr. Manoj Nair & Bulletins of the Tournament)

PHD-GPI Bridge Tournament

The 2nd PHD-GPI Bridge Tournament sponsored by Godfrey Phillips India Limited was held at PHD House, New Delhi from 22nd to 25th January 2004.

Team of Four Event:

The tournament started with the Team of Four event, in which 36 Teams participated. A large number of teams were expected due to attractive prizes, however it seems the Bridge players were a bit tired after the grueling Winter Nationals and hence not too many teams could make it to this tournament. Agsar Paints, Well Knit, Tolani Shipping & MONOTONA were some of the good teams missing from the tournament

DSM Team (Ashok Goel, Kamal Mukherjee, Subir Majumdar, Sukomal Das, Sankar Acharya) with 200 VPs and **AZURE** (Maj. S. Hooda, N.K. Gupta, Ravi Batra, Krishna Kumar, P. Sridhar & J.M. Shah) with 190 VPs, topped the Round-Robin stage (10 rounds of 10 boards each) to finalize the quarter-finalists. The quarter finalists were:

1. DSM	-	200 VPs
2. AZURE	-	190 VPs
3. Formidables	-	188 VPs
4. Lawrence Club	-	184 VPs
5. C.V. Rao	-	177 VPs
6. MAYA-MIRA	-	168 VPs
7. Pankaj Mehta	-	167 VPs
8. Bhansali's IV	-	166 VPs

Bhansali's IV & the Victors's team both finished the round-robin with 166 VPs, Bhansali's team winning the tie-break by 26007 to 25083 and taking the last position.

The Quarterfinal line up was:

1. DSM	Vs.	Bhansali's IV
2. AZURE	Vs.	Pankaj Mehta
3. Formidables	Vs.	MAYA-MIRA
4. Lawrence Club	Vs.	C.V. Rao

In the 2*10 boards Quarter Finals, **Bhansali's IV** beat DSM **53-44** (5-26, 48-18); **Pankaj Mehta** beat AZURE **70-55** (34-40, 36-15); **Formidables** beat MAYA-MIRA (Vijay Goel, Kingshuk Bhattacharya, Tapas Mukherjee, K. Nandy, C.S. Majumdar & S. Basak) by **43-35** (37-2, 6-33) and **C.V. Rao** beat Lawrence Club (A.N. Banerjee, Gobind Singha, Ashim Mukherjee, Snehashis Roy, Atanu Ganguly & Pavan Agarwal) by **52-38** (36-21, 16-17). The Semi final line up was:

Bhansali's IV	Vs.	C.V. Rao
FORMIDABLES	Vs.	Pankaj Mehta

Both the Semi-finals (3*10 boards) turned out to be very tight matches. In the first match **C.V. Rao** beat Bhansali's IV (R.K. Bhansali, Vinod Sharma, R. Prasad, G.N. Manna, Tapan Roy & Iandish Biswas) by **57-50** (27-2, 14-9, 16-39)

and in the second semi-final **Formidables** beat **Pankaj Mehta** (Pankaj Mehta, Puneet Gangal, R.C. Consul, Pradeep Singh & S.K. Bandhopadhyaya) by **75-63** (25-29 – with a 2 IMP penalty to Pankaj Mehta team for late coming, 23-22, 27-14).

In the T-4 Finals played over 4 sessions of 10 boards each, **FORMIDABLES** (Mrs. Kiran Nadar, B. Satyanarayana, Subhash Gupta, K.R. Venkatraman & Rajeshwar Tewari) beat C.V. Rao's Team (Debashish Roy, Pritish Kushari, Alok Sadhu, Sumit Mukherjee & Badal Das) by 73-53 IMPs (15-31, 33-1, 13-15, 12-6) to win the T-4 Championship.

PAIRS Event:

The Pairs Tournament started with 84 Pairs (excluding the 24 quarter finalist pairs) playing in the 1st elimination round in 3 sections. 6 NS & 6 EW from each section qualified for the 2nd elimination. The 36 qualifiers plus the 12 loosing quarter finalist pairs further played the 2nd elimination round in 2 sections, out of which a total of 18 pairs qualified for the Finals. The qualifiers along with the 6 loosing semi finalist pairs played the 46 Boards Pairs Finals.

The winners of the event were:

1. Manas Mukherjee – Rana Roy	314.41
2. Jagdish Biswas – Tapan Roy	310.54
3. Atanu Ganguly – Ashim Mukherjee	301.33
4. Ravi Gujral – P.C. Gupta	288.02
5. C.S. Majumdar – S. Basak	286.93
6. R.K. Bhansali – Vinod Sharma	285.47
7. N.K. Gupta – Krishna Kumar	280.02
8. Dr. M.A. Quadri – Virendra Singh	276.97
9. J.M. Shah – P. Sridhar	273.65

For Manas & Rana, this was their second consecutive win in the event.

For the first time, we saw the organizers giving prizes not only to quarter finalists but also to positions from 9th to 16th in the T-4 event. This was an excellent boost for the upcoming teams who rarely get the chance to get prizes in major prize money tournaments. Besides this there were special prizes for the best Ladies team, best Ladies Pair & the best Mixed pair. The highlight of the tournament was presence of lot many ladies players.

The best Ladies team prize went to the CHALLENGER team of Delhi Gymkhana, represented by Mrs. Brij Judge, Mrs. Kunti Thakur, Mrs. Urmil Aggarwal, Mrs. Veena Vishwanathan & Mrs. Mohini Bindra. Mrs. Urmil Aggarwal & Mrs. Shashi Jain won the best Ladies Pairs prize & the best mixed pairs prize was won by Dr. (Mrs.) Saroj Mohan & Mr. S.K. Uppal.

Heartiest Congratulations to All the Winners

- Reported by Editor

International Bridge News

IBPA ANNUAL AWARDS 2003

*Adjudication by Barry Rigal
Commentary by Patrick Jourdain*

BIDDING

The Romex Award for Best Auction

*Winners: Bart Bramley & Sidney Lazard (USA),
Blue Ribbon Pairs, Phoenix, December 2002
Author: Bart Bramley (USA)*

It is rare to see an auction with seven natural bids reach the top-scoring contract despite intervention, when three strains and two different levels are under consideration. This was beautifully handled by both players.

The Blues

By Bart Bramley, Chicago

Natural Bidding

Our best bid hand was from the first final session.

Dealer East. All Vul.

♠ -	N	♠ A 10 7 5
♥ A K Q 7 5 4 3	W	♥ 10 6
♦ A 10 5 3	E	♦ Q J
♣ K 7	S	♣ A Q J 10 9

West	North	East	South
<i>Lazard</i>		<i>Bramley</i>	
1♥	1♠	2♣	3♠
4♦	Pass	4♥	Pass
4♠	Pass	6♣	Pass
7♥	Pass	7 NT	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Sidney eschewed opening 2♣ because the opponents were at favorable vulnerability and he had a spade void. When the opponents jammed the auction Sidney still had a big problem at his second turn. His delicate 4♦ bid was a great solution, as it was natural, forcing, and low. That bid may look obvious, but ask around and you'll find out differently. My 4♥ preference was conservative, but I feared bidding more on a

potential misfit. Luckily for us, the 4♥ bid relieved Sidney of any concerns about hearts running. Sidney's next call, the 4♠ cuebid, continued his gradual approach to a complex hand. Having pulled in a notch earlier, I was comfortable driving to slam over 4♠, but I was still not sure of the best trump suit. I chose the descriptive 6♣, simultaneously accepting the slam try, showing a strong suit, and offering 6♣ as a choice of contract. Note that 6♣ could be the winning contract opposite

♠ -- ♥ A Q x x x x ♦ A K 10 x x ♣ x x

or the like. That was good news for Sidney, who knew that the ♣K was huge, so he confidently bid 7♥. Equally confidently, I converted to 7NT based on possession of the ♠A. I knew Sidney held solid hearts, the ♦A ace, and one of the minor-suit kings.

Note that our auction was completely natural except for 4♠, a cuebid of a void, hardly a big contribution to a contract of 7NT. We used no ace-asking bid and cuebid no aces. Every bid but 4♠ showed a suit, and our last several bids were all offers to play. Yet when we reached 7NT we both knew it was cold!

There was a small point in the play. On the spade lead I pitched a heart from dummy. Sidney, who had been looking nervous, perked up and said, "That's a good sign!" I didn't need the seventh heart for 13 tricks, but if hearts had been 4-0, I could still have made the contract with the diamond finesse and a squeeze if LHO had Jxxx, J98x, K9xx, x, a holding consistent with the bidding. Plus 2220 was worth 42 on a 51 top.

DEFENCE

The ITES Award for Best Defence

*Eric Greco (& Geoff Hampson) (USA) at Nebraska Regional
Authors: Larry Cohen & Alan Truscott*

One can just imagine the thrill for Greco and the anguish of declarer as the deal unwound. So sad to go three off when at one point you can make 12 tricks!! (Yes, if declarer plays the ace of clubs on the second round of the suit, West gets squeezed later) But there was a sound reason for declarer's play. So was dummy sympathetic?

Cornhusker Defence


By Larry Cohen, Boca Raton, FL
and Alan Truscott, New York City

Anyone who spotted Warren E. Buffett of Berkshire Hathaway at the Summer North American Bridge Championships in Long Beach, California, last month might have been excused for thinking that he was the wealthiest person present. However, that would have been wrong, for one of his teammates in the Master Mixed Teams was Bill Gates of Microsoft.

A week later, Buffett, back at his Omaha, Nebraska home, entertained a group led by another financial wizard, Peter Lynch, and played a friendly match. Lynch and his wife, Carolyn, then continued to the 'Nebraska' regional tournament, played just outside the state, across the Missouri River, in Iowa. Their team was uniformly successful, winning three knockout events and the Swiss teams.

In one knockout event, Eric Greco, West for the Lynch team on the diagrammed deal, produced a stellar defense.

Dealer East. All Vul.

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

At the other table, Greco's teammate South opened a 14-16 no trump, and dummy transferred to clubs and then showed spades. South bid three no trumps and received a fourth-best ♦8 lead. Dummy's jack won, and the ♣Q went to West's king. West cashed the high diamonds, and declarer claimed 10 tricks for plus 630.

Contrast this with what happened at Greco's table. South opened 1♦, and again the dummy showed clubs and spades with South arriving in 3NT.

Greco led a high diamond and got the discouraging 2 from partner, Geoff Hampson. Even looking at all four hands, it's difficult to see a way to beat the game, but Eric found it. He played the ♦7 at trick two, won by declarer's 9.

Declarer crossed in spades (East showing an even number) and led the ♣Q for a finesse. Greco ducked in tempo. Declarer, afraid to lay down the ♣A (if East has king-third, he can't be let in for a diamond through), continued with dummy's ♣J, passed around to Greco's now bare king.

Greco continued the good work by shifting to the ♠Q. Not only did this pin the jack, but it also severed declarer from dummy's clubs. The ♣A was now blocking the suit. Declarer countered by ducking the spade! Had Greco woodenly continued spades, declarer could have won in dummy and thrown the ♣A to make the contract. But, having done everything right so far, Greco wasn't going to fall from grace at that point. He accurately shifted to hearts, the final nail in declarer's coffin.

Declarer now had to fail by three tricks, down 300! Declarer, seemingly with nine top tricks, was held to two clubs, two hearts, one spade and one diamond trick. Making the right play in all four suits (at the right time), Greco earned 14 IMPs for his team with his superb defence.

PLAY

The Digital Fountain Award for Best Play

Geir Helgemo (Norway) OKbridge
Author: Geir Olav Tislevoll (Norway)


Classic Helgemo. This is yet another example of his superior ability to see through complex positions to the way home. Geir's ability to project the end-position of the cards at the early point of the deal makes him appear a magician at the table.

A Thing of Beauty

By Geir Olav Tislevoll, Trondheim, Norway

This lovely piece of declarer play took place when Geir Helgemo and Jimmy Cayne were practising on OKbridge. Since it did not occur in a big tournament, there was a danger that it would not come to light. To remedy that, here it is:

Dealer South. None Vul.

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


♠ 3 ♥ A J 10 8 6 ♦ 8 7 6 ♣ A K 6 5			
---	--	--	--

West	North	East	South
	<i>Cayne</i>		<i>Helgemo</i>
			1♥
Pass	1♠	2♦	Pass
Pass	3♦	Pass	3♥
Pass	4♥	All Pass	

East-West were strong opponents and West found the best lead – a trump – which prevented declarer from ruffing a diamond for his 10th trick. Geir took the first trick with the ace over East's queen. If the opponents' spades had been 4-3 there would not have been much to tell. In that case, declarer would have had no problems in establishing the fifth spade.

The play would continue ♠A, ♠K, discarding a diamond. Then a spade is ruffed, and if both opponents follow to that trick, declarer plays three rounds of clubs. The defenders must then play two more rounds of trumps to deny declarer a club ruff, and he ends up in dummy with the nine of hearts. He would then ruff another spade, and can get to the now good, fifth spade with the ♦A.

But, luckily for all but East-West, East showed out on the third spade, discarding the ♣8. Geir ruffed and played the jack of hearts to East's king (East cannot profitably duck). East continued a heart to dummy's 9. On that trick, West had to find a discard, and he could not let a black card go without giving declarer an easy task. So West discarded his ♦K, best defence. This was left:

♠ Q 9 ♥ -- ♦ 10 ♣ Q J 9 3		♠ 10 4 ♥ - ♦ A 2 ♣ 10 7 2	♠ - ♥ - ♦ Q J 9 5 4 3 ♣ 4
------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	------------------------------------

♠ - ♥ 10 ♦ 8 7 ♣ A K 6 5			
-----------------------------------	--	--	--

Now came a strange but beautiful trick: the 2, jack, 7 and 10! If East now switches to a club declarer plays low and West will be end-played, forced to help declarer in spades or clubs. But East continued with a diamond to the ace. On that trick, West had to discard again. He could not give up a club, but since there was no more entry to the North hand he could afford to let a spade go, and so he did. That only delayed the inevitable. Helgemo still had one joker left to play out: he ruffed a spade with his last trump, and that took away West's last spade as well. With four cards left both West and South held only clubs. North had a high spade and his three clubs. A low club toward dummy's 10 gave West no good option. Beautiful, yes?

JUNIORS

The OKBridge Award for Best Play by a Junior

*Ophir Reshef (Israel) from the ACBL Junior Camp
Author: Andrew Robson*

This was a beautiful false-card and quick thinking by declarer not only to realize the significance of dummy's 9 in the suit, but how East would be tempted into returning the trick conceded, as well as diverting the club switch.

*The False-Card
By Andrew Robson, London*

Ophir Reshef found a great false-card on this deal.

Dealer East. N/S Vul.

♠ A Q
 ♥ 9 7 5 4
 ♦ K Q J 8 7
 ♣ A 6

♠ J 6 4 3 2
 ♥ 6
 ♦ 9 4 2
 ♣ K 10 7 2

♠ 9 7 5
 ♥ A J 10 8
 2
 ♦ A
 ♣ Q J 9 8

♠ K 10 8
 ♥ K Q 3
 ♦ 10 6 5 3
 ♣ 5 4 3



West	North	East	South
		1♥	Pass
1♠	2♦	Pass	3♦
Pass	3♥	Pass	3NT
Pass	Pass	Dble	All Pass

North-South really belong in a part-score – 2NT is their best-scoring spot, but an aggressive auction such as the one shown is quite reasonable. What would you expect the fate of the contract to be? Well, on a spade lead by West declarer drives out the diamond ace, and the defence must play clubs to hold declarer to nine tricks. On a heart lead and club shift, or on a club lead at trick one, declarer cannot make more than eight tricks. Agreed?

Well, consider East's problem if his partner leads a heart to trick one. The obvious solution is to go up with the ace; if no honour appears, shift to clubs and hope for the best. Nice logic, but...

Ophir Reshef was sitting South and on the auction shown above he was treated to a heart lead. Gauging the situation accurately, he called for a low heart from dummy, and when East put up the ace he dropped the queen! East sniffed the air suspiciously for a few minutes then took the bait and returned a low heart, letting Ophir run this to dummy's 9 and collect his 10 tricks for all 15 matchpoints out of 15.

(Courtesy: Daily Bulletins of World Championships at Monte Carlo)

Interesting Deal From PHD-GPI Bridge Tournament

Who is Sacrificing?

The following deal came in the 3rd session of the Team of Four Semi final match between Formidables and Pankaj Mehta teams:

Dir: North, Vul: None

	♠ AKQxxxx ♥ xx ♦ AKJx ♣	
♠ ♥ AKQxxxx ♦ xx ♣ KQTx	N W E S	♠ xx ♥ Jx ♦ Txxx ♣ A8652
	♠ Jxxx ♥ xx ♦ Qxx ♣ Jxxx	

The bidding in the Open room went as follows:

West	North	East	South
Pradeep	Venky	Bandopadhya	Satya
	1S	Pass	3S (1)
4H	4S	5H	Pass
Pass	5S	Dbl	Pass
6H	Dbl	All Pass	

(1) – Pre-emptive

The way the bidding went, it was difficult to judge, whether NS or EW are sacrificing. Venky for Formidables opened the North hand with 1 Spade and was raised to a pre-emptive 3 Spade by partner (Satya). Pradeep Singh of Pankaj Mehta's team came out with 4 Hearts and when Venky bid 4 Spade, it seemed that the bidding is all over. However Bandopadhya as East bid 5 Hearts with Jack doubleton and it seemed that EW are sacrificing against 4 Spades. Venky tried again with 5 Spade and now it seemed that NS are sacrificing against the making 5 Hearts. Finally Pradeep took the best decision, when he took out the 5 Spade doubled bid to 6 Hearts.

As it turned out 5 Spade doubled would have been cold. 6 Hearts went only one down (it could have gone 2 down, if after playing ♦A, North plays a low diamond for a club ruff) for minus 100 against a minimum 450 (for 4 spades making five). As it turned out Pankaj Mehta's team gained good IMPs as the contract in the closed room was 4 Spades doubled, making five.

- Reported by Editor

LAW 75

PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS

➤ **A – SPECIAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS**

Special partnership agreements, whether explicit or implicit, must be fully and freely available to the opponents (see Law 40 – Partnership Understandings). Information conveyed to partner through such agreements must arise from the calls, plays and conditions of the current deal.

➤ **B – VIOLATIONS OF PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS**

A player may violate an announced partnership agreement, so long as his partner is unaware of the violation (but habitual violations within a partnership may create implicit agreements, which must be disclosed). No player has the obligation to disclose to the opponents that he has violated an announced agreement and if the opponents are subsequently damaged, as through drawing a false inference from such violation, they are not entitled to redress.

➤ **C – ANSWERING QUESTIONS ON PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS**

When explaining the significance of partner's call or play in reply to an opponent's inquiry (see Law 20), a player shall disclose all special information conveyed to him through partnership agreement or partnership experience, but he need not disclose inferences drawn from his general knowledge and experience.

➤ **D – CORRECTING ERRORS IN EXPLANATIONS**

1. **Player Recognises His Own Error** – If a player subsequently realises that his own explanation was erroneous or incomplete, he must immediately call the Director (who will apply Law 21 or Law 40C).
2. **Player Recognises His Partner's Error** – A player whose partner has given a mistaken explanation may not correct the error before the final pass, nor may he indicate in any manner that a mistake has been made. He must not take any advantage of the unauthorized information so obtained. The player must call the Director at the earliest legal opportunity which is – after the final pass and before opening lead is made if the player is to be declarer or dummy or after the play ends, if the player is to be a defender, the player must inform the director and the opponents that, in his opinion, his partner's explanation was erroneous.

In both the cases above, the Director can award an adjusted score if he deems that the non-offending side was damaged due to misinformation.

Two examples may clarify responsibilities of the players (and the Director) after a misleading explanation has been given to the opponents. In both examples following, North has opened 1NT and South, who holds a weak hand with long diamonds, has bid 2D, intending to sign off; North explains, however, in answer to West's inquiry, that South's bid is strong and artificial, asking for major suits.

Example 1 — Mistaken Explanation

The actual partnership agreement is that 2D is a natural signoff; the mistake was in North's explanation. This explanation is an infraction of Law, since East-West are entitled to an accurate description of the North-South agreement (when this infraction results in damage to East-West, the Director shall award an adjusted score). If North subsequently becomes aware of his mistake, he must immediately notify the Director. South must do nothing to correct the mistaken explanation while the auction continues; after the final pass, South, if he is to be declarer or dummy, should call the Director and must volunteer a correction of the explanation. If South becomes a defender, he calls the Director and corrects the explanation when play ends.

Example 2 — Mistaken Bid

The partnership agreement is as explained — 2D is strong and artificial; the mistake was in South's bid. Here there is no infraction of Law, since East-West did receive an accurate description of the North-South agreement; they have no claim to an accurate description of the North-South hands.

(Contributed by Sudhir Aggarwal)

BFI ELECTIONS

List of Elected Committee Members

Mr. Y. Kamalakara Rao was re-elected to the post of President of the Bridge Federation of India (BFI) at the Annual General Meeting of the body held on Saturday, January 3, 2004. This is the fourth time that he has been elected to the post. Following is the list of those elected, all unanimously:

President : Y. Kamalakara Rao

Vice-Presidents :

N. S. Hariharan IAS (AP)
M. K. Choudhary(Raj)
Kailashpat Newatia (UP)
Ku. Vijayanand Singh (UP)
Jeroo Mango (Mah)
Geetha Lakhani (President AILBA)
Yatish Chandra IPS (Retd) (MP)
S. S. Parmar IAS (HP)
Viswajeet Khanna IAS (Pun)
Dr. Ramesh Roy IRS (Ori)
Inder Pal Singh (Del)
S. S. Sidhu (Chan)
A. R. D. Sequeira (Mah)
V. C. Kapoor (Guj)
R. P. Bhatnagar (U'chal)

Hon. Secretary : Mukul Chatterji

Hon. Secretary (MP) : Niranjan Ubhayakar

Hon. Jt. Secretaries :

Arijit Guha
B. Rama Mohan Rao
R. V. Subramaniam
Arvind Gupta

Hon. Treasurer : Dipak Poddar

** ANNOUNCEMENTS ** PRIZE MONEY TOURNAMENTS

February 2004

P.Y.C. Hindu Gymkhana, Pune will organize The "GOLDENERA SUPERBOWL BRIDGE CHAMPIONSHIPS – 2004", a Prize money Bridge Tournament at PYC Hindu Gymkhana, Pune from 12th to 15th Feb 2004. The event will have T-4 duplicate & Open Pair events.

February 2004

Kanpur Bridge Association will organize the XVIII "SETH SHRINIWAS LOHIA MEMORIAL BRIDGE CHAMPIONSHIP " under the kind patronage & Presidentship of Shri B.P. Birla from 19th to 22nd Feb 2004. The total prize money is above Rs. One Lac. The event will have T-4 duplicate, Open Pair & BAM events.

May 2004

A Prize Money Tournament will be organized at GARJIA (Corbett Park) from 6th (After Lunch) to 9th (Afternoon) May 2004. The event will have T-4 duplicate & Open Pair events. Details will follow soon.

DELHI BRIDGE SCHEDULE

1. Pair event is played at DBA on every Tuesday evening from 1830 Hrs. onwards.
2. Team event is played at DBA on every Saturday from 1430 Hrs. onwards.
3. The Ladies Bridge Association holds an Open Pairs tournament on every alternate Friday or on Holidays at PHD House.
4. Central Secretariat Club holds an open Pair event on every Monday commencing at 1800 Hrs.

Editorial board

Mr. T.C. Pant, Editor

Mr. S.N. Mathur, Mr. Sudhir Aggarwal

Technical Consultants:

Mr. Subhash Gupta, Mr. B. Satyanarayana

Forthcoming National Events

12-15th Feb – P.Y.C. Hindu Gymkh. Prize Money, Pune
19-22nd Feb – Lohia Memorial, Kanpur
29th Feb – Ubhayakar Open Pairs at Home (All India)
13-14th Mar – All India Rama Jain, New Delhi
07-10th May – Tournament at Garjia (Corbett Park)

Forthcoming International Events

09-15th Feb – 9th NEC Festival, Yokohama, Japan
18-28th Mar – ACBL Spring NABC, Reno, NV
23rd Oct – 6th Nov – World Bridge Olympiad, Istanbul

CONTACT US:

You can send your bridge articles, comments, results & tournament schedules to us on the following e-mails:

tcpant@hotmail.com

sgagarwal@hotmail.com

IMPORTANT: This Newsletter is only for Free Circulation and not for Sale.