

This only applies if defenders WON one or two tricks AFTER the revoke.

Tricks won before the revoke do not count.

A revoke cannot be established on trick 12 – the card can be changed without penalty.

If as declarer you feel that the revoke has damaged you – for example the card that should have been played at the revoke stops you getting to dummy and winning several tricks the director will adjust the score.

SAYING – HAVING NONE

As dummy when declarer does not follow suit you can say ‘having none partner’.

One defender can also say this to another defender.

This should stop all revokes - in all cases call your friendly director.



19th Worcestershire CBA Knock-out Rubber Bridge Competition

Nick Forward, Worcestershire CBA Chairman, handing a cheque for £687 to Tricia Cavell, fund-raising manger of St. Richard's Hospice of Worcester. Players, making donations in order to enter the competition, raised the money



Hospice fundraising manager Tricia Cavell receives the cheque from Nick Forward.

Winners Rostrum (2008 – 2009)

Winners of the Pease Trophy

Paul Hooker and Mike Holmes (Droitwich & Dorridge)

Finalists

Neil Humphries and Maureen Hannah (Worcester)

Semi-Finalists

John and Moira Wright (Solihull)
Brian and Carol Varley (Stourbridge)

Quarter-Finalists

Jessie Newton and John Turner (Worcester)
Sylvia Briggs and Chad Chadwick (Cookley & Wolverley)

Paul Slater and Martin Gill (Redditch)
Sandra Cruickshank and Ann Ball (Redditch)

Fourth Round

Ann and Simon Marriott (Upper Sapey)

John and James Dow (Redditch)

Elsie Allen and Renate Thorne (Bromsgrove)

Anita and Terry Acton (Bewdley)

Hugh and Jay Popplewell (Worcester)

Angela Adams and Mollie Haines (Barnt Green & Blackwell)

Tony Watt and Chris Orme (Stourport & Bewdley)

Wendy Packwood and Maggie Perris (Clent & Sutton Coldfield)

Past Winners

John and James Dow (Redditch) 2007-2008

Bob Whittington and Chris Orme (Kidderminster & Clows Top) 2006-2007

Antony Watt and Carol Timmis (Stourport & Kinver) 2005-2006

Claude Noble and Wendy Packwood (Belbroughton & Clent) 2004-2005

Bob Whittington and Chris Orme (Kidderminster & Clows Top) 2003-2004

David Grant and Jean Newton (Worcester) 2002-2003

David Grant and Jean Newton (Worcester) 2001-2002

Keith Collins and Monica Osborne (Bromsgrove) 2000-2001

Denis and Mary Anne Reay (Malvern) 1999-2000

Glen Thorney and Paul Hooker (Bromsgrove) 1998-1999

Alan Jenkins and Ron Jones (Brierley Hill & Bilston) 1997-1998

Jessie Newton and John Turner (Worcester) 1996-1997

Keith Collins and Joy Burn (Bromsgrove) 1995-1996

Arthur and Marjorie Hillman (Droitwich) 1994-1995

David Grant and Jean Newton (Worcester) 1993-1994

Sue Lane and Stuart McPhee (Malvern & Worcester) 1992-1993

Richard Jephcott and John Sansom (Bromsgrove & Droitwich) 1991-1992

Barbara and Glyn Harrison (Droitwich) 1990-1991

Sponsored by The Limited Edition



Bridge or Poker?

You may recall that in the last issue there was a report about rubber bridge and how it can resemble poker at times. The same can apply to duplicate bridge. Take the recent Worcestershire Championship pairs for instance. The numbers were such that just over half would qualify for the final. 48% or so should be enough to make it through.

After a bad evening, we were hovering around 45% with one round to play. So, we needed a top to pull ourselves into contention. Two middles wouldn't be enough, so we needed to do something. At which point I picked up this motley collection at love all: ♠ Q,9, 5 ♥ J, 9, 8, 7, 3, 2 ♦ 4 ♣ K, 8, 3.

I heard 1♣ on my left and 1♠ on my right. Time to put a spanner in the works with 3♥. This is followed by 4♠ then an aggressive¹ 5♥ from partner, forcing 5♠, which was the final contract. As the field were in 4♠, and there are only 9 or 10 tricks there this proved to be the top we needed.

This gave us 48,43%, but unfortunately the cut off was 48.86%. It does make you think however about similar scenarios in the future. You don't necessarily know how well opponents are doing at the end of an event like this. Are they safely qualified (and will be playing down the middle)? Are they in need of a good round (and will be taking some risks)? Perhaps it is worth asking next time round.



Championship Pairs

The 2009 Worcestershire Championship pairs was held on 21 March at Evesham bridge club. When the dust settled, the final scores were:

1 st	Sue Lane & Paul Hammond	60.32%
2 nd	Sue Evans & Dennis Loynes	59.84%
3 rd	Arthur Williams & Joyce Skelton	57.78 %
4 th	John Sansom & Ross Garratt	57.30%
5 th	Steve Allerston & Nick Forward	55.08%
6 th	David Thomas & Jimmy Ledger	54.13%
7 th	Mike Theelke & Grahame Weir	51.43%
8 th	Ian Thompson & Simon Harrison	50.16%



1 Or suicidal depending on what happens next



Bewdley Bridge Club

Bewdley Bridge Club's annual competition for The Walton Cup was contested this year on 4th & 11th March (combined scores) and the first 3 places were taken by:

1. Liliane Wright & Nigel Oldnall 57.79%
2. Carol & Andrew Gilmour 57.78%
3. Eileen Oakley & Harry Henfrey 57.22%

The Club Shield is awarded each year to the partnership with the highest average score, based normally on their 25 best scores, over the 12 months ending 31st March. The winners this year, with an average score of 58.08%, were Carol & Andrew Gilmour, who just pipped Myra Hunter & Anne Freeston (who had 57.89%) and Peter Edwards & Tony Norgrove (who had 57.42%).



Stourport B. C.

In late January Astley Stourport Bridge Club held its 2008 Christmas party.

In 2008 we lost a hard working treasurer Bob Whittington, who is still sorely missed by all members. In memory of their long term partnership Chris Orme has presented the club with the Whittington trophy. The trophy will be awarded to the top pair for the year.

Nigel Oldnall & Denis Facer are seen here receiving the trophy from Helen Whittington.



Bridge Venues

By Anne Glendenning

The recent change of venue by the WCBA after so many years set me thinking. What is it that makes a good venue for bridge players?

I have played bridge in a number of venues over the past few years, from Minneapolis to the Middle East (“...my friend lives in London, do you know him.....?”). The most unusual was playing bridge in a church. I was shocked, and to be honest, a little disturbed to find it was common practice for bridge players to put their coats and bags on the altar. I am happy to note that although the church continues to be a popular venue, the altar is not now used as a parcel shelf! The worst place was a dingy, secondary school classroom which was rarely cleaned and the geography teacher never changed his wall displays for years and years!

Church premises, village halls, community centres, pubs and clubs are popular choices for bridge venues. Why is this?

They usually offer:

- a reasonable rent.
- security of tenure, guaranteeing the same day/evening every week.
- warm, well lit room.
- adequate space for a dozen or more tables.
- secure storage for all the bridge paraphernalia.
- a kitchen so all dummies can make hot drinks and put out the chocolate biscuits.
- if you are lucky, a dishwasher (automatic, not another dummy) to take care of the messy, time consuming, washing up.
- adequate, free parking.
- easy access.

Bromsgrove Bridge Club’s venue offers most of the above. An added bonus for members is the building itself which has a wonderful art-deco façade, an impressive doorway over which is proudly displayed the Royal Seal of Approval, (of the game of Bridge maybe?) The doorway leads into

an elegant reception area.

Bridge is played in the Conference Room, which has large curved windows overlooking magnificently manicured grounds and gardens. A wonderful distraction during the lighter evenings when attention has wandered.....

Does your venue compare to ours?



Ron Allen Cup

The Ron Allen Cup is the Worcestershire inter-club teams of 8 competition. Any club can enter one or more teams, but this year was a two horse race between the two Worcester teams. The tops team eventually came out in front by a single VP.



Well done to the winning team: Sue Lane, Ray Foulds, Sue Evans, Marian Wilcox, David King, Rosie Cannon, Dick & Jane Rutter. They will now represent the county in the regional finals, and if they progress, the national finals.

The full results:

1 st	Worcester Tops	121
2 nd	Worester Copper	120
3 rd	Bewdley	102
4 th	Stourbridge	99
5 th	Evesham	84
6 th	Bromsgrove	83
7 th	Malvern	81
8 th	Droitwich	78
9 th	Spadesbourne	74
10 th	Malvern Hills	58



outside losers and assumes South has wasted heart values!! After much deliberation I think the odds favour making a try - 6♣ must be safe! So now West can try and be helpful just for a change – bid 5♠ cue bid with at least 2 clubs.

I also don't like the 3NT bid much but, to be honest, I am not sure what bid is better. I agree though that 4♣ from North is sufficient as the partnership is committed to game.

Grahame: 5♦. Torn between 5♦ & 6♣ - I am certain there is a slam as 3♥ is hows a big hand and probably control in hearts, so A, K of Spades is huge so I must bid again - I bid 5♦ and hope partner will do the right thing.

Graham has realized that North could be two suited, as does Mike although he still chooses to play in clubs rather than the presumed diamond fit.

Mike: 6♣. The question I'm asking is why has partner bid 5♣ rather than a simple forcing 4♣? He doesn't seem to be interested in controls and it looks like he has no heart losers but is also not interested in spades. The logical conclusion is that he has something like ♠ x, ♥ void, ♦ A, K, x, x, x, ♣ A, J, T, x, x, x, x and doesn't trust me not to pass 4♣!!³ I'll bid on as he can't expect so little in hearts and so much elsewhere. I'd be worth 5♠ to try for the grand (I can't have a spade suit) rather than settle for 6♣ if I had a minor suit King rather than in Spades where it may be waste paper.

Two panelists decided that game was the limit of the hand, which incidentally was the same bid that was made when this hand was played.

Sue: Pass. If partner had a very shapely 2 suited hand, he could have bid 4♥.

Jimmy: Pass. I have shown my hand with my 3NT bid and only have 1 Ace. If partner is interested in a slam, he would have bid 4♣.

North's hand was ♠ x, ♥ void, ♦ A, J, T, x, x, x, ♣ A, K, J, T, x, x. It seems to me that North may have bid 4♦ rather than 5♣ and made the 6♦ contract much easier to find.

³ You hit the nail on the head there. In my defence I was playing with an irregular partner and didn't wish to miss game.

Hand 2

♠ 9, 5, 4

♥ A, 9

♦ A, K, 9, 8

♣ 10, 9, 8, 2

Pairs – Love All

South West North East

- 1♣ Dble Pass

?

Votes: 4 for 2♣; 1 for 2NT; 1 for 2♦.

Marks: 2♣ = 5; 2NT/2♦ = 4.

A seemingly innocuous hand which some of the panellists dismissed as straight forward. Strange, then, that we get three different answers. I think it's tougher than it looks because the values make it too good for an underbid but not good enough to guarantee game.

Stewart: 2♦. 8-11 points, no 4 card major, no primary club stop, natural and non-forcing. Easy game! If partner probes further with either 3♣ or 3♦ I will offer 3NT. Am I too strong to bid just 2♦? Definitely not at pairs, where going off in a risky 3NT will score badly. This would be a harder problem at teams.

Grahame: 2NT. Well 2♦ may be right but it may show more shape? So I will plump for an old fashioned 2NT showing shape and points and denying the majors. Hopefully 120 or 150 will beat 110 or 130.

Does show the shape and values but I hope you're not off the first half a dozen clubs! The majority chose the ubiquitous cue bid, but have they agreed whether it is forcing to game or just suit agreement?

Sue: 2♣. It shows strength without length, and denies a major suit. I call it a fishing bid!

Yes, but how much strength?

Mike: 2♣. Options are 2♣ or 2♦. I don't know yet if it's worth game, but I have to tell partner that I have 11 working points in 3 huge cards. 2♦ doesn't get this across and, since 2♣ is forcing to suit agreement and gives more flexibility to the auction, it gets my vote. This may eventually get us to 3NT, but it's also important to realize that the possibilities on this hand range from a fiddly game in a 4-3 spade fit up to a reasonable slam opposite a 13 count such as ♠ A, Q, J, x, ♥ K, x, x, x, ♦ Q, J, T, x, ♣ x.

I think that Mike has hit the nail on the head in that this hand is difficult to evaluate at this stage, we don't know if it's a part score hand, a game hand or – optimistically – a slam hand.



Jimmy: 2♣. Shall wait and see what partner says.

John: 2♣. Forcing and asking for more information. South has a good 11 count with controls but no major. If partner has a club stop 3NT looks safe, if North bids a major the hand can rebid 3♦.

Hand 3	Pairs – N/S vulnerable			
♠ A, 9, 8, 6				
♥ 9	South	West	North	East
♦ A, K, 9, 6, 3	-	-	1♦	1♠
♣ Q, 6, 5	?			

Votes: 2 for 2♠; 1 for Pass; 1 for 2♦; 1 for 3♠; 1 for 3♥.

Marks: 2♠ = 5; 2♦/3♠/3♥ = 4. Pass/3NT=3. 2NT=2.

It would appear that we have the values for game; but which game? The panellists come to a variety of conclusions:-

Grahame: 2♠. A general force needing more info. Will end up in 3NT or 5♦, depending on partner's response.

Mike: 2♠. Agrees diamonds and shows a raise to 3 or more. No problem on this round – it may get difficult on the next!

Not sure that everyone would play that the cue bid would necessarily agree diamonds. Two of our panellist really liked their hand and bid accordingly.

John: 3♠. A super fit in diamonds, good hand and first round control of spades. N.B. Splinter bidders might bid 3♥ but this (in my view) is not as useful to North, and if North has the right hand the heart shortage can be shown later.

Stewart, however, does choose to splinter first.

Stewart: 3♥. I won't stop short of 5♦ and will show the Spade control on the way.

Jimmy takes a high risk option and does not give partner the good news that there they have a fit. I really hope that partner is on the same wavelength and doesn't just pass the hand out:-

Jimmy: Pass. Partner SHOULD double and I will bid 2♠ to show a good hand and we may play in 3NT or 6♦. If partner has an embarrassing opener and bids 2♦ then we will probably play in 5♦.

Sue: 2♦. I play inverted minors, so I shall have time and space to show my spade stop later, if

requested. The 2♦ bid also denies four hearts. The vulnerability is wrong to pass and hope that partner can re-open with a double.

I like this bid and this convention. Basically inverted minors, means that 2♦ is unlimited and forcing and 3♦ is pre-emptive. As a convention it has the benefit of being simple, and on a hand like this shows the fit and retains a lot of bidding space adequately to explore the hand.

Hand 4	Teams – N/S vulnerable			
♠ A, K, Q, 3				
♥ 5	South	West	North	East
♦ Q, 10, 9, 6	-	-	1♥	Pass
♣ K, J, 7, 2	1♠	Pass	3♥	Pass
	?			

Votes: 3 for 3NT; 1 for 4♥; 2 for 4NT.

Marks: 3NT = 5; 4♥ = 4; 4NT/6NT = 3; 6♥ = 2.

This hand cropped up in a league match and caused some discussion between my partner and me. As far as the panel is concerned, the majority view is summarized as follows:-

Mike: 3NT. As Bobby Wolff said, "whenever it looks like 3NT is the right bid, it usually is". A heart contract (maybe even slam) will depend on the solidity of the hearts and I have no way of finding out – it's very unlikely that there's a fit anywhere else since he would normally introduce a decent second suit in preference to the jump rebid. If he's on the weak side, we may have communications problems in 3NT. But it's the hardest contract to defend!

Stewart evokes a comment from the long time partner of Bobby Wolff but, nevertheless, chose a different bid.

Stewart: 4♥. Partner's hand could be useless if played in anything other than Hearts, so I'm not going to try 3NT. And 6♥ seems very unlikely as partner has denied an 8-playing trick hand. There is just too precise a hand required to make the slam good - 6 solid hearts, Ace of clubs and a singleton diamond. Anything less and it's a bad slam, anything more and partner would have bid more strongly. To paraphrase Bob Hamman; "don't play for partner to have exactly the right hand – he never does!"

Two panellists however were not prepared to give up on a slam – and wheeled out an Ace asking bid.

More computery solution

By David King

There may, of course be several similar solutions involving the smaller cards but on the night the honours for the full deal were placed thus:

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

Even then, in 6NT, 6♥ or 6♣ it may not be obvious how to play the Club suit. To make 4 tricks one has to lead low from North. If East plays the 10, the King drops on the next round. If East wins with the King, then a scoop finesse of the Jack on the next round pins the 10 and wraps up the suit. One still has to work out how to make 12 tricks in Diamonds, without losing a Club trick. That pesky computer, how does it do it? Who taught it the necessary "Elopement" technique? One has to take the Diamond finesse [it doesn't matter if West covers or not]. Cash the A♣, if not already done so. Draw two more rounds of trumps, then all the Hearts discarding Clubs from North. Ruff a Club, return to South in the Spade suit taking up to two rounds, by a finesse if necessary. When South leads another Club, North elopes with the long diamond to win the 12th trick. So one makes 2 Spades, 4 Hearts, 5 diamonds, and 1 Club.



Malvern Hills B. C.

<http://www.bridgewebs.com/malvernhills/>

Malvern Hills Bridge Club pair Michael Lane and Bill Everley came 8th in the whole country in the national simultaneous pairs on 12th March 2009 in aid of Action for Medical Research.



Cwmbran

By Stewart Fishburne

In the last newsletter you noted that John Sansom, Pam Pearce, Steve Gore and I had played at Cwmbran in February. Here's a hand that helped us climb the leader board on Sunday

♠ 10, 6, 2	Dealer east
♥ J, 5, 4, 3, 2	N/S vulnerable
♦ K, 8	
♣ 10, 5, 4	
♠ Q, J, 5, 3	♠ A, 8, 4
♥ A, K, 10, 8	♥ Q, 6
♦ 8	♦ A, 10, 9, 7, 5, 3
♣ J, 9, 6, 3	♣ K, 2
♠ K, 9, 7	
♥ 9, 7	
♦ K, Q, J, 2	
♣ A, Q, 7, 4	

Table 1 John and Pam North - South.

North	East	South	West
	1♦	1NT	pass
2♥	All pass		

East lead the A♦ and declarer came to 7 tricks for 100 to East West.

Table 2 Steve and Stewart East - West

North	East	South	West
	1♦	1NT	x
2♦ ¹	pass	2♥	x
All pass			

¹ 2♦ was alerted as a transfer.

Trick 1 ♠Q to ♠A (1 trick to defence).

Trick 2 Spade to South's King.

Trick 3 Declarer exits with a Spade to J (a mistake - he should play a trump) (2 tricks to defence).

Trick 4 Club to K and A.

Trick 5 K♦ to ♦A (3 tricks to defence).

Trick 6 Club to declarer's Queen.

Trick 7 Q♦ ruffed by West (4 tricks to defence).

Trick 8 J♣ cashed by West (5 tricks to defence).

Monday Ladder

The ladder competition is held on Monday nights during the year. Usually there are several divisions of players each week. The top 10 for 08/09 were:

		Played	Score
1 st	David Thomas & Mike Theelke	9	101
2 nd	Steve Allerston & Nick Forward	9	98
3 rd	Sue Page & Simon Harrison	8	94
4 th	John Samson & Richard Jephcott	7	91
5 th	Alan Reid & Suzanne Griffin	10	90
6 th	Jean & Jessie Newton	8	81
7 th	Sue Lane & Arthur Williams	9	78
8 th	Sue Evans & Stephanie Forward	9	71
9 th	Jimmy Ledger & Maureen Hannah	9	69
10 th =	Graham Weir & Joyce Skelton	7	63
10 th =	John Turner & Dennis Loynes	6	63



INTERMEDIATE/ADVANCED BRIDGE TUITION CLASSES

Steve Allerston

I intend to run a set of Intermediate to Advanced Tuition sessions for experienced duplicate bridge players who wish to improve. The course will take place on Friday evenings at the Pembridge, Malvern, commencing on Friday 3rd April at 7.30pm.

The evenings will consist of partnership bidding, dummy play and defence and also a slot for discussions on participants' queries and problems that are raised. A few boards will also be provided to play if there are suitable numbers of participants present, with a subsequent analysis.

For this to work I hope those interested are able to come as playing partnerships so that they may obtain most benefit. The tuition is based on an ACOL style of bidding using a weak No Trump.

The cost per evening session will be £5 per person. The room has limited space so the maximum number envisaged will be 10 pairs.

If partnerships are interested then please let me know by replying to me at my

sjallerston@hotmail.com address. I shall employ a first come first accepted methodology.

If you are a member of a WCBA Club, please feel free to pass on this information to club members.

The Pembridge is located at 114 Graham Road, Malvern, WR14 2HX, telephone number 01684 574813.



Non Expert Competition

The results of the non expert competition, based upon results on Monday evenings during the year were:

1 st	Mike Vetch	14	53.38%
2 nd	Linda Gervis	14	51.16%
3 rd	Stephanie Forward	10	48.50%
4 th	Brian Wilkes	18	46.97%
5 th	Ursula Bryant	18	46.55%
6 th	Dieter Baer	17	46.03%



Monday Points

In the annual Monday night masterpoint competition, we have the following final top ten for the year:

1 st	John Samson	1770
2 nd	Mike Theelke	1519
3 rd =	Nick Forward	1316
3 rd =	Steve Allerston	1316
5 th	Graham Weir	1306
6 th	Richard Jephcott	1283
7 th	David Thomas	834
8 th	Sue Page	817
9 th	Simon Harrison	759
10 th	John Turner	680



BridgeTuition Malvern Hills Bridge Club

DEFENDING THE CONTRACT
Tuition by Ian Thompson – sponsored by WCBA

One day tuition and supervised play

Date: Saturday 5th Sept. 2009. Time: 9:30 – 5:00

At Hanley Swan Village Hall, Welland Road

Hanley Swan, Worcestershire. (~ 250 yards south of The Swan pub)

- 9:30 Coffee on arrival
- 10:00 Tuition session – Handouts provided
- 10:45 Play hands based on learning topic
- 1:00 Lunch and coffee
- 2:00 Mini-competition (supervised) using pre-prepared boards
- 4:15 Discussion

COST: £5 TO INCLUDE PARKING, TEA AND COFFEE

(PLEASE BRING A PICNIC LUNCH)

TO BOOK PLACES: Phone Michael Lane on 01684 594379



Avon Cup

Badsey Recreational Club, on Saturday 23rd May, 2.00 p.m. Start.

This is a teams of four competition for clubs along the river Avon. Members enter their names in pairs, the pairings will be matched to make a team so that each team will have 4 players, a maximum of 3 teams per club. There will be an expectation that one person from each team should agree scores with their opposition and remain after play has finished until all scores have been agreed and reconciled. There will be a break for refreshments during the session.

The competition is designed for clubs in eastern Worcestershire to enter, and for players who do not enter other club competitions. For more details, contact Roger Cooke ☎ rogercooke@tiscali.co.uk



Easter Festival of Bridge

The English Bridge Union run two congresses at Easter. One is in London. The other is more northern and historically has been held in Blackpool. This time round, however, it moved to Buxton. Those of you with old memories like me will remember this as the venue for the Bridge Great Britain events fifteen years or so ago. A number of Worcestershire players attended the congress.

The Swiss teams was won by Mike Theelke & Graham Weir with Alex Hogg and David Adelman. Mike and Graham were also seventh in the championship pairs.



Portland Pairs

The Portland pairs is Britain's main mixed pairs competition. This year it was won by Worcestershire's Pam Pearce, playing with Ron Davis, to add to the English Ladies trophy that Pam won earlier this year.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: We are grateful to **Parkinson Wright**, Solicitors of Droitwich, Evesham and Worcester ☎ 01905 726 789 for the production of this **Worcestershire Bridge News**

