



2010 DAILY BULLETIN

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIPS



Editor: Stephen Lester
Issue 6

Email us at: editor@abf.com.au
Thursday, July 22, 2010

FUJI XEROX TEAMS SESSION 1 OPERATION SUCCESSFUL, BUT . . .

South deals, EW vulnerable

♠ A 5 2
♥ A 10 7
♦ A Q 6 3
♣ K 9 8

♠ 9 7
♥ K Q J 8 6
♦ J 9 8 5
♣ Q J

♠ Q J 10 4 3
♥ 9 5
♦ 7
♣ A 10 7 6 2

♠ K 8 6
♥ 4 3 2
♦ K 10 4 2
♣ 5 4 3

| | | | |
|----------|-----------------------------|------|-------------------------|
| WEST | NORTH <i>V Brockwell</i> | EAST | SOUTH <i>R Hills</i> |
| Pass | 1♦ | 1♠ | INT |
| 2♥ | 2NT | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass | | | |

Against this optimistic contract ♥K was led and ducked, and ♥Q continuation was taken with the ace. Now ♦AQ were cashed, East carelessly discarding a spade, so declarer cashed two spade winners, then threw East in with a third round of spades.



Val and Richard

After cashing one more spade, East was endplayed in clubs, and West was strip squeezed after East cashed ♣A and exited with a club to dummy's king. West had to bare ♥J to keep the diamond guard. West was then thrown in via dummy's ♥10 to lead away from ♦J. Throwing in both opponents for eight tricks and -50 was a flat board since teammates scored +50 against a less ambitious INT contract.

TOMORROW'S TIMETABLE

10:00am

Snug Butchery Swiss Pairs C06 (1 of 2)
ANC Interstate Teams Finals

1:30pm

ANC Interstate Teams Finals

2:00pm

Snug Butchery Swiss Pairs C06 (2 of 2)

7:00pm

Victory Dinner
Hobart Yacht Club, Hobart, Tasmania

MATCH OF THE DAY

Round 11 saw Noeline Law – Annabel Booth face David Hoffman – Richard Brightling in the Open Room—ACT v. WA Seniors.

Both tables started luckily by bidding the spade slam on Board 1, which needs the trump suit to break 2-2—lucky considering the barrage heart bidding from the opponents.

The action in the Open Room:

Board 1, North deals, nil vulnerable

♠ 8 7 5 2
♥ —
♦ A K Q 7
♣ A K Q 9 5

♠ K 5
♥ 10 6 5 2
♦ J 8 5 2
♣ J 10 2

♠ Q J
♥ A K J 8 4 3
♦ 10 9 4 3
♣ 7

♠ A 10 9 4 3
♥ Q 9 7
♦ 6
♣ 8 6 4 3

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| WEST <i>Brightling</i> | NORTH <i>Law</i> | EAST <i>Hoffman</i> | SOUTH <i>Booth</i> |
| 3♥ | 1♣ | 1♥ | 1♠ |
| Pass | 4♥ | 5♥ | 5♠ |
| | 6♠ | All Pass | |

TBA



I'm not sure that I would have bid 5♠ over Hoffman's 5♥ bid (OK, I wouldn't have). I certainly *would* have bid 6♠ now on North's cards, as what can South have for her 5♠ bid but GREAT spades? Trumps 2-2, what's the problem?

The 8-11 2♠ bid worked well for the ACT pair on the next board:

Board 2, East deals, NS vulnerable

| | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|
| | ♠ J 10 8 | | |
| | ♥ A 10 2 | | |
| | ♦ A J 8 7 2 | | |
| | ♣ 5 3 | | |
| ♠ A 4 3 | | ♠ K Q 9 7 2 | |
| ♥ J 7 6 4 | | ♥ Q 9 5 | |
| ♦ 10 6 3 | | ♦ 5 | |
| ♣ A J 2 | | ♣ Q 8 6 4 | |
| | ♠ 6 5 | | |
| | ♥ K 8 3 | | |
| | ♦ K Q 9 4 | | |
| | ♣ K 10 9 7 | | |
| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| <i>Brightling</i> | <i>Law</i> | <i>Hoffman</i> | <i>Booth</i> |
| | | 2♠ | All Pass |

1. 8-11 HCP, 5+ spades

With no wasted values in diamonds, and ♥10 where you would like it to be, it was impossible to put a dent in 3♣, let alone 2♠, so 4 IMPs to ACT when the board was passed in at the other table.

Those who routinely double with a shortage would have done well on the next board:

Board 3, South deals, EW vulnerable

| | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| | ♠ Q 9 5 3 | | |
| | ♥ K 10 7 4 3 2 | | |
| | ♦ J | | |
| | ♣ 10 6 | | |
| ♠ K J 8 4 2 | | ♠ — | |
| ♥ A Q 9 | | ♥ J 6 | |
| ♦ A 10 9 8 | | ♦ K Q 6 4 2 | |
| ♣ 3 | | ♣ Q 9 7 5 4 2 | |
| | ♠ A 10 7 6 | | |
| | ♥ 8 5 | | |
| | ♦ 7 5 3 | | |
| | ♣ A K J 8 | | |
| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| <i>Brightling</i> | <i>Law</i> | <i>Hoffman</i> | <i>Booth</i> |
| | | | 1♣ |
| 1♠ | All Pass | | |

Brightling, made five tricks for two down in 1♠ (*Deep Finesse* says NS can make eight tricks in spades, so declarer played OK). The defence was pretty, ♣10 lead ducked and a second club ruffed, tapping declarer. Brightling led a diamond to

dummy and tried ♥J, losing to the king. A heart came back. Brightling won, and tried to cash another heart. South ruffed, and played a club, and now it was a ping pong match, with declarer scoring one diamond, one heart, and three spade tricks in the wash. In the endgame, South drew declarer's last trump and ♠10 was high at trick 13. NS played 2♥ making eight tricks in the Closed Room, so 3 IMPs to WA.

I was surprised at South's action on the next swing board:

Board 6, East deals, EW vulnerable

| | | | |
|-------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| | ♠ Q J 3 | | |
| | ♥ 10 7 | | |
| | ♦ 8 6 5 | | |
| | ♣ Q 9 6 5 4 | | |
| ♠ 7 | | ♠ 10 9 6 5 4 | |
| ♥ K Q J 9 8 5 | | ♥ 6 4 2 | |
| ♦ K Q 9 | | ♦ A 10 4 3 2 | |
| ♣ K 8 7 | | ♣ — | |
| | ♠ A K 8 2 | | |
| | ♥ A 3 | | |
| | ♦ J 7 | | |
| | ♣ A J 10 3 2 | | |
| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| <i>Brightling</i> | <i>Law</i> | <i>Hoffman</i> | <i>Booth</i> |
| | | Pass | 1♣ |
| 1♥ | 2♣ | Dbl | 3♣ |
| 3♥ | Pass | 4♥ | Dbl |
| All Pass | | | |

Partner has mapped out a great save in 5♣ – the 2♣ bid was alerted as weak with five clubs, so the choice of a penalty double was not what I expected, especially since Brightling had announced



an extra trump and a good hand. On ♠Q lead, Brightling played safely for 10 tricks, discarding a spade from dummy and claiming as soon as both opponents followed in trumps. 4 IMPs to the ACT when declarer made 11 undoubled tricks in the Closed Room.

Had Booth decided to bid 5♣, the result would likely have been -300 from 5♣ doubled.

Board 7, South deals, all vulnerable

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|
| ♠ A | | | |
| ♥ 9 6 5 4 2 | | | |
| ♦ K J 7 | | | |
| ♣ K 9 7 3 | | | |
| ♠ K J 9 8 6 4 2 | | ♠ Q 7 5 | |
| ♥ 8 7 | | ♥ A K Q J 3 | |
| ♦ 9 6 | | ♦ 8 | |
| ♣ 10 6 | | ♣ A Q 8 5 | |
| ♠ 10 3 | | | |
| ♥ 10 | | | |
| ♦ A Q 10 5 4 3 2 | | | |
| ♣ J 4 2 | | | |
| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| <i>Brightling</i> | <i>Law</i> | <i>Hoffman</i> | <i>Booth</i> |
| Pass | Pass | Dbl | Pass |
| 4♣ | 5♦ | Dbl | All Pass |

More surprise greeted me when I saw that the board above was a loss for WA.

EW bid accurately to 4♣, and North took the good save, only one down when South could play the club suit for two losers.

I am not sure of the bidding in the Closed Room, but the five-level was (again) punished, presumably after North led a low diamond against 5♣, South switching to the singleton heart and North delivering a heart ruff. +300 in total to ACT, 7 IMPs.

Board 8, West deals, nil vulnerable

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

Hoffman played Board 8 in 2♥, when at the other table the contract was 3♥. Nine tricks appear easy,

and my friend *Deep Finesse* agrees, but declarer was nevertheless one down at the other table, for 7 IMPs to ACT. Perhaps declarer lost control after a diamond lead and continuation, and lost the timing to establish the spade suit.

Hoffman took only a perfunctory sniff at slam on the next swing deal:

Board 12, West deals, NS vulnerable

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|
| ♠ Q J 8 7 6 4 3 | | | |
| ♥ J 6 | | | |
| ♦ 10 4 | | | |
| ♣ 8 6 | | | |
| ♠ 2 | | ♠ K | |
| ♥ A 10 7 4 | | ♥ K Q 8 3 | |
| ♦ K Q J 2 | | ♦ A 9 8 6 | |
| ♣ A Q 7 4 | | ♣ J 10 9 3 | |
| ♠ A 10 9 5 | | | |
| ♥ 9 5 2 | | | |
| ♦ 7 5 2 | | | |
| ♣ K 5 2 | | | |
| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| <i>Brightling</i> | <i>Law</i> | <i>Hoffman</i> | <i>Booth</i> |
| 1♦ | Pass | 1♥ | Pass |
| 2♠ | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3♣ | Pass | 4♥ | All Pass |

When Brightling showed five ace-king controls with his 3♣ bid, Hoffman decided slam was out of the picture with one ace and one king missing.

Slam was available in three denominations EW, thanks to the position of ♣K. The WA EW bid to 6♣, so 10 IMPs to WA. I can comment at this stage that 1-4-4-4 hands seem to have been prevalent, at least when I have been watching. I am yet to find a common ground about which suit people open—I have seen 1♠, 1♦ and 1♥ in about equal measure!

What can I say about the defence on the next deal which resulted in just a 1 IMP swing?

Board 13, North deals, all vulnerable

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

The contract was the same in both rooms: 3NT

after North checked on a major fit, in the Open Room. Brightling led $\heartsuit 4$, and declarer played $\heartsuit 9$ from dummy when a low heart would have sufficed. No matter—West can duck a heart, allowing declarer one entry to dummy even if a low heart is played at trick one. Declarer played a heart towards dummy on winning $\heartsuit A$; Brightling went up with $\heartsuit Q$ and exited $\heartsuit 8$ to dummy's jack as Hoffman discarded an odds and evens $\diamond 4$. Declarer played a club off board, inserting $\clubsuit 8$. Brightling, in with $\clubsuit 10$, did not cash his winning heart to see what partner might play—he exited after some thought with $\spadesuit J$, covered with the queen, king and ace, and when clubs behaved, declarer had a magnificent nine tricks.

But the defence at the other table was even worse! Declarer played low on the heart lead, and headed East's king with the ace. Declarer played a medium club at trick two. West went up with $\clubsuit 10$, East overtook with $\spadesuit J$ to switch to—another heart! Very unhelpful, especially when $\diamond J$ switch would have made the defence easy. West won the queen and switched to $\spadesuit J$, so now when clubs behaved and $\diamond A$ was forced out, declarer had a super-magnificent 10 tricks, +630 and 1 IMP to ACT. The last board of the match was an exercise in slam play:

Board 20, West deals, all vulnerable

| | | | |
|---|---|--|----------------|
| \spadesuit J 10 2 \heartsuit 6 \diamond 7 2 \clubsuit K Q 9 8 7 5 3 | | | |
| \spadesuit 9 7 \heartsuit A K Q 10 9 7 \diamond A K 6 5 \clubsuit 10 | \spadesuit A Q 8 3 \heartsuit 5 4 3 \diamond J 9 \clubsuit A J 4 2 | \spadesuit K 6 5 4 \heartsuit J 8 2 \diamond Q 10 8 4 3 \clubsuit 6 | |
| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| Brightling | Law | Hoffman | Booth |
| 1 \heartsuit | 3 \clubsuit | Pass | 4 \heartsuit |
| All Pass | | | |

There was little pressure on Brightling, as his brief was to bring in 10 tricks. He won $\clubsuit K$ lead, cashed two diamonds and played a third. North scored $\heartsuit 6$, with dummy unable to beat this card. North switched to $\spadesuit J$. Brightling rose ace, and belatedly drew a round of trumps, noting North's show out.

He claimed 11 tricks, +650, which was a 13 IMP swing when the declarer in the other room was two down in $6\heartsuit$.

Given the preempt in clubs, surely it would be a good idea to win $\clubsuit A$ at trick one and ruff a club. Once we know North has seven clubs, it is highly likely that North has a singleton trump. The simple line of drawing one round of trumps works, but perhaps you can see a better line?

An error-ridden set resulted in a 55—22 IMP win for the storming ACT Seniors.

SNAPSHOT OF THE NT WOMEN

It's been great for the Women's event to have eight teams and no bye, thanks to the inclusion of a relatively inexperienced squad marshalled by playing captain Pam Nunn. Dave Beauchamp suggested I watch one of the team's matches, as he had conducted some seminars with them recently. I thus sat behind Claire Baxter in Match 12, where the NT women were playing NSW in the form of Kim Neale—Linda King, a highly talented and very experienced partnership. Pam and Claire had Kim down on a difficult 3NT, until Claire took her eye off the ball at trick 12:

Board 14, East deals, nil vulnerable

| | | | |
|---|--|---|-----------------------------|
| \spadesuit Q 8 4 2 \heartsuit 6 \diamond J 10 8 6 5 \clubsuit 8 5 2 | | | |
| \spadesuit A \heartsuit K J 10 \diamond A K 9 2 \clubsuit A Q J 10 9 | \spadesuit 10 9 7 \heartsuit A Q 5 4 3 \diamond Q 7 3 \clubsuit K 6 | \spadesuit K J 6 5 3 \heartsuit 9 8 7 2 \diamond 4 \clubsuit 7 4 3 | |
| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| Neale | Nunn | King | Baxter |
| Dbl | Pass | 1 \spadesuit | 1 \heartsuit ¹ |
| 3NT | All Pass | Pass | Pass |

1. I didn't come all this way to pass!

Nunn led $\diamond J$ against 3NT. Neale won $\diamond K$, then played $\clubsuit Q$. Baxter won $\clubsuit K$ and played $\diamond Q$, Neale ducking. She won the next diamond and cashed the club suit, then $\spadesuit A$, before exiting with $\heartsuit J$, as Nunn showed out (she had discarded a spade and a heart to help give partner a picture of the hand).



An ebullient NT Women's Team

Baxter, in the four-card endgame won ♥Q, and cashed ♥A, Neale playing ♥K. With ♥5 and ♠10 left, and looking at ♠K and ♥9 in dummy, she shrugged and played the spade, allowing Neale to discard her losing diamond and claim the last two tricks with ♠K and ♥10.

3NT can and should be made after South opens the bidding. Declarer should duck the diamond, win the diamond continuation, cash ♠A, and the other top diamond before exiting with a heart. South can win her two heart tricks, and exit a heart to West. Now West plays ♣A, ♣Q, playing for South to be endplayed into giving an entry to dummy with a heart or a spade. Declarer loses one diamond, two hearts and a club.

Not so easy if South has kept quiet in the auction. Talking about keeping quiet in the auction, this was the auction at another table in the Women's field:

| | | | |
|------------------------|----------|------------------------|-------|
| WEST <i>Hoffman</i> | NORTH | EAST <i>Weddell</i> | SOUTH |
| 2♣ | Pass | 2♦ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3♥ ¹ | Pass |
| Pass ² | All Pass | | Dbl |

1. Transfer to spades
2. Denies three spades

Mary Weddell decided that 3♥ doubled was as good a place to play as any; after all, partner would surely have three hearts, maybe even four. How right she was! She scored +630 from 3♥ doubled making four, when declarer was -50 at the other table. A coura-



Mary Weddell

geous decision, and one that must have given partner apoplexy!

I kibitzed the Nunn—Baxter table for quite some time before I decided a brilliancy from the NT would have to come from the Closed Room.

Two boards into my move, I had my hand!

Board 9, North deals, EW vulnerable

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

| | | | |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| <i>Boocock</i> | <i>Lowry</i> | <i>McEwan</i> | <i>Folkard</i> |
| | 1♠ | Pass | INT |
| 3♥ ¹ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

1. I didn't come all this way to pass!

Folkard, thinking the 3NT bid was predicated on a heart fit, and not thinking her ♥Q would be of much use to the defence, started with ♠K, won by declarer's ace, as Lowry contributed ♠3. The NT declarer, Denise McEwan played ♦Q. Folkard won ♦K to continue a second spade. Lowry won ♠Q, and now the hand was over, with declarer only needing to force out ♦A to make her contract.

Good luck NT women, hope to see you next year in Melbourne!♦♣



ANC TEAMS OPEN RR2 ROUND 5 - 2010

| Place | Team | Name | Score | IMPs |
|-------|------|------|--------|------|
| 1 | 1 | NSW | 97 | 171 |
| 2 | 2 | ACT | 57.1 | 67 |
| 3 | 4 | WA | 30 | 39 |
| 4 | 7 | SA | -2.9 | -2 |
| 5 | 3 | QLD | -18.7 | -25 |
| 6 | 5 | VIC | -33.3 | -45 |
| 7 | 6 | TAS | -131.7 | -205 |

ANC TEAMS SENIORS RR2 ROUND 5 - 2010

| Place | Team | Name | Score | IMPs |
|-------|------|------|--------|------|
| 1 | 1 | ACT | 119.9 | 137 |
| 2 | 3 | VIC | 96.7 | 117 |
| 3 | 2 | SA | 63.7 | 79 |
| 4 | 4 | TAS | 4 | -14 |
| 5 | 6 | QLD | -48 | -66 |
| 6 | 5 | WA | -61.6 | -46 |
| 8 | 7 | NSW | -175.5 | -207 |

ANC TEAMS WOMEN RR2 ROUND 5 - 2010

| Place | Team | Name | Score | IMPs |
|-------|------|------|--------|------|
| 1 | 1 | QLD | 203.5 | 245 |
| 2 | 3 | ACT | 95 | 95 |
| 3 | 2 | WA | 76.1 | 129 |
| 4 | 5 | NSW | 53.6 | 121 |
| 5 | 6 | TAS | -20.2 | -4 |
| 6 | 4 | SA | -88.9 | -169 |
| 7 | 7 | VIC | -121.1 | -131 |
| 8 | 8 | NT | -199.6 | -286 |

ANC TEAMS YOUTH RR3 ROUND 2 - 2010

| Place | Team | Name | Score | Imps |
|-------|------|------|--------|------|
| 1 | 1 | NSW | 160.5 | 246 |
| 2 | 2 | VIC | 127.5 | -9 |
| 3 | 3 | QLD | 107.5 | 138 |
| 4 | 4 | ACT | -96.6 | -2 |
| 5 | 6 | SA | -131.6 | -182 |
| 6 | 5 | WA | -177.7 | -306 |



The Metz on the Bay

15% Discount on Meals on presentation
of this advertisement.
during the National Bridge Championships
17-29 July 2010
Not valid on Wednesday evenings.

