

Worcestershire Bridge News

January & February 2012

Editorial

Below this Editorial you will see an announcement from David Thomas, Chairman of the County Bridge Association, about Droitwich Working Men's Club. As you see, an unfortunate situation has arisen. This really raises the question of what part Bridge and Bridge Clubs play in the community.

Of course, we all enjoy playing – although we all have our moments when the game turns on us! And, apparently, it's been scientifically proven that mental stimulation and playing intellectual games improves both our mental and physical well-being. So, it's good for us and that's a good start!

Of course, there are clear social benefits as well. Many of us have made friends and have developed support networks through playing bridge. While this is also the case with the majority of pastimes, there are not many activities that bring people together as much as a good post-mortem in the car on the way home from a match (hopefully a successful one!). These relationships often provide support in the event of illness or need, and so relieve the burden on the community at large.

Warren Buffett, the extremely successful American Investor, is quoted as saying, in comparing bridge to business, "The approach and strategies are very similar in that you gather all the information you can and then keep adding to that base of information as things develop. You do whatever the probabilities indicated based on the knowledge that you have at that time, but you are always willing to modify your behaviour or your approach as you get new information. In bridge, you behave in a way that gets the best from your partner. And in business, you behave in the way that gets the best from your managers and your employees."

It is quite clear from the quote above that playing bridge encourages skills that are beneficial in other parts of life. Many schools continue to encourage students to learn to play and, as far as is possible, we should all try to support their efforts.

However, is there a downside? Again, from Warren Buffett, "I spend twelve hours a week - a little over 10% of my waking hours - playing the game. Now I am trying to figure out how to get by on less sleep in order to fit in a few more hands". So, as I always say to Wendy, my wife, "There are benefits to my health and to the community in playing AND, if Warren Buffett thinks it's good for him then it's obviously good for me."



Eve Randsley

We are saddened to hear that Eve passed away recently, She was a member of both Bredon and Eckington Clubs before moving away from the area.



Droitwich WMC

The Droitwich WMC has suspended all bridge activities following alleged irregularities concerned with licensing regulations. Attempts by both Droitwich BC and the WCBA have failed to get this reversed while investigations are ongoing. As a result of this both bridge sections have temporarily moved to Droitwich rugby club with no return expected before at least the 13th February. Please watch the WCBA and Droitwich BC websites for further information.



To receive this newsletter straight to your inbox send a blank email to:

wcba-newsletter-subscribe@yahoogroups.com
or download from www.worcestershirebridge.co.uk
Our thanks are due to this issue's contributors.
All contributions are welcome for future issues:
✉ mike.willoughby@btinternet.com





News & Forthcoming Events

County Events

Please check the County Website for a range of events, but don't forget the following: -

- | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| January 23 rd | National Pairs Heat |
| February 19 th | Club Championship Pairs |
| February 27 th | Championship Pairs Qualifier |



Club Events

Don't forget that our clubs have some excellent events. On a later page you can find announcements about events at Malvern Hills and Worcester Bridge Clubs. Be sure to take advantage of them if you can!



Promotions

Well done to the following:-

- 4 Star Regional Master**
Mr B Stewart
- 3 Star Regional Master**
Mr C R Moore
- Regional Master**
Mr D Philpott
- 3 Star Premier Master**
Mr D A McClelland
- 2 Star Tournament Master**
Mr R Carman
- 1 Star Tournament Master**
Mrs G Young
- 2 Star Master**
Mr M S Rees
- 1 Star Master**
Mr A N Darlaston
- Advanced Master**
Mrs D S Roberts
- Master**
Mrs M C Thomas
- County Master**
Mr Frank Balchandani
- Mrs M Mason
- Mr J E Taylor
- District Master**
Mrs S Johnson

- Mrs Doris Newman
- Mr B Yates
- Area Master**
- Mrs Ann Drake
- Ms Rita Hazledine
- Mr Jeff Jones
- Mr Pat Sparrow
- Club Master**
- Mr Chris Flood
- Mrs Sally Flood
- Dr D Jones
- Mrs Je Scaife
- Mr J R Spence
- Mrs Geraldine Thompson
- Mr David Wakefield
- Mr Peter Williams
- Local Master**
- Mr Robin Barker
- Mrs Jenny Barrett
- Mr Mike Barrett
- Mr M Dunn
- Mrs Dorothy Hemming
- Mr John Meyrick
- Duncan Mitchell
- Gill Mitchell
- Mr David Pugh
- Mr Alan Ward
- Mr Michael Joyce
- Mr Tony Oliver
- Mr Clive Watson



COMPETITIONS UPDATE

Midland Counties Congress

As ever, there were strong fields in both the Pairs and Teams Championships. Full results can be found on the WCBA website. Notable Worcestershire successes included: -

Ladies Pairs Winners: Sue Evans and Stephanie Forward. Runners Up: Jean and Jessie Newton

Littleford Healey Cup Winners: John Sansom, Richard Jephcott, Nick Forward, Steve Allerston

Swiss Teams Runners Up: Dennis Loynes, Sue Evans, Val and Steve Kennewell

Hudson Cup Runners Up: Dennis Loynes and Nick Forward



Midland Counties Congress Ladies Pairs Winners:
Sue Evans and Stephanie Forward with David Thomas, Chairman WCBA



Midland Counties Congress Littleford Healey Cup Winners: John Sansom, Richard Jephcott, Nick Forward, Steve Allerston



Healey Cup

The Inter-Club Swiss Teams for the Healey Cup was held on 27th November. Wyeside Bridge Club, from Herefordshire, represented by Steve Booth, Chris Thomas, John Griffiths and George Barrett carried off the trophy



County Mixed Pairs

The Mixed Pairs was won by Ken Carpenter and Marian Wilcox on a split tie from Nick and Steph Forward.



Blackpool Year End Congress

Worcestershire were well represented at the Year End Congress. Successful performances came from Sue

Lane and Paul Tapster, finishing third in the Mixed Pairs and from John Sansom, Pam Pearce, Jimmy Ledger and Maureen Hannah who were fourth in the Swiss Teams event.



AROUND THE CLUBS

Malvern Hills B C

www.bridgewebs.com/malvern hills

26th Jan Simultaneous Pairs for Charity £5 members/£6 guests; no host but contact Mike Lane on 01684-56334 if you need a partner.
7.00pm for 7.15 start

18th Feb Planning the Play & Planning the Defence (Strategy or Tactics?) with a side topic of Slam Bidding. Tuition and play with an accredited WCBA instructor.
Held at Hanley Swan Village Hall.
£7 to include parking, tea and coffee – bring your own lunch.
To book a place phone Michael Lane on 01684-564334.



Worcester B C

www.bridgewebs.com/worcester

Diary Date - Saturday March 10th
Teaching Seminar “Opening Leads & Defence”
Seminar Leader - Mike Theelke
All Worcestershire Players
Welcome

To Register for this event, please contact Jane Rutter tel 01905 339 389 email jmjrutter@hotmail.com or by post to Jane Rutter, Bonscale House, 212A Henwick Road Worcester WR2 5PF.

Please include your name, address, telephone no (and email address if possible).



Evesham B C

www.eveshambridgeclub.org.uk

Congratulations to the winners of the Steve Sawyer Teams Tournament Jean Cotterill, David Jones, Veronica Enticknap and Ronnie Moore.



Victoria and Ronnie, this time playing with Mark Stretch and David Sheerin, were the highest placed Worcestershire Team – third overall - in the Healey Cup.



Pershore BC

www.pershorebridge.co.uk

Final Prizewinners for 2011 were: -

Most Improved Pair: Ruth & Jim Aitkenhead

wcba-newsletter-subscribe@yahoo.com

Most Improved Player: Ruth Simpson
Slammer of the Year: Alan Boyes
Most Masterpoints: Martin Rees



LESSONS TO LEARN!

Bidding Panel

Moderated by Nick Forward

(Thanks once again to Nick for an interesting and challenging (Grrr....) set of hands. Test your skill on these before turning to the Panel's views later in the newsletter – Ed)

Hand 1

Teams	Dealer N		Love All	
♠ K65	<u>W</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>S</u>
♥ 4				
♦ 762		1♦	P	2♣
♣ AQJ985	P	2♦	P	?

Hand 2

Teams	Dealer W		Game All	
♠ K	<u>W</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>S</u>
♥ AKT				
♦ J986	P	1NT	2♠	?
♣ 87653				

* 12-14 **Exactly 5 Spades, may have a 4 card minor

Hand 3

Pairs	Dealer N		E/W Vul	
♠ AJ75	<u>W</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>S</u>
♥ T53				
♦ T7		1♦	P	1♠
♣ AKJ8	P	2♦	P	?

Hand 4

Teams	Dealer N		Love All	
♠ KQJ965	<u>W</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>S</u>
♥ J				
♦ A5432		1♦	P	1♠
♣ 4	2♥	3♣	P	?

Hand 5

Teams		Dealer E		N/S Vul	
♠ KQJ8743		<u>W</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>S</u>
♥ AQ					
♦ K974				P	1♠
♣ 7		4♥	5♣	P	?

♠ ♥ ♦ ♣ ♠ ♥ ♦ ♣ ♠ ♥ ♦ ♣ ♠ ♥ ♦ ♣ ♠ ♥ ♦ ♣ ♠ ♥ ♦ ♣

The Director Rules - 4

By Mike Theelke

You might have seen an annoying car insurance commercial that shows pedestrians on a crowded street, barging into each, gesticulating and shouting, before claiming that you wouldn't behave that way on the street but that some drivers do on the road. Regular readers will sense an oncoming analogy, so let's get it out of the way.

Suppose a couple are considering joining a tennis club and are invited to a friendly game of doubles as an introduction. They arrive late, arguing about a previous game, and ignore their opponents' greeting. When they win a rally they explain to each other and to the opponents how their clever shot won the point. When one of the opponents plays a poor shot, they explain to them how they could have done better. When they lose a point, a heated discussion breaks out about whose fault it was.

Do they get invited back?

Obviously not; but while the majority of bridge players are friendly and courteous, most regular players will recognise the equivalent situations at the bridge table, and the players that behave this way do get invited back – or at least, not prevented from returning. So how can it be that we tolerate standards of behaviour at the bridge table that we wouldn't in other social settings? Maybe it's partly because we are conscious that attendances are gradually falling at many clubs and don't want to add to the problem by forbidding people to play; maybe partly because the priority of many directors is to get through the evening smoothly rather than tackling problems of behaviour head on and disrupting the session; maybe partly because players feel that nothing can be done.

Let's look at the latter point. The Laws of bridge already provided for the director to take action if a player's conduct might interfere with another player's enjoyment of the game, and the EBU have tried to strengthen that by issuing additional guidelines about behaviour – so the framework exists for directors to deal with any problems. Sometimes a situation becomes so apparent that the director can intervene without being called, but more often, if you feel your opponents are behaving in an inappropriate way, you should call the director yourself, exactly as you would if there were a revoke or an insufficient bid. It's important to do this, because while no club wants to take action against a player who forgets to say "Good evening" once in a while because they're still thinking about how they just went off in three no trumps, if there is a pattern of poor behaviour by a player over a period of time, most clubs would want to deal with it; and they can't if nobody ever reports any problems.

Probably the most common problem is arguments between partners. Whilst every partnership has discussions about bidding misunderstandings or defensive disasters, it's the way in which this takes place that's important. If the discussion is sufficiently acrimonious and prolonged, it's likely that the "interfere with another player's enjoyment" test is relevant, because it can be embarrassing and uncomfortable to be trapped at a table with two players more interested in having a heated argument about the last board than playing the next one. You don't have to put up with it - that's the point at which to involve the director.

Apart from that, your opponents have the right to expect normal courtesy when you're at the table. Greet them, don't ignore them. Don't gloat if you get a good result. If they make a mistake, don't tell them what you think they ought to have done – if they value your opinion, they might ask. But above all, try and stay calm. Sometimes things do go wrong and the director will need to sort it out. Remember that if the opposition feel there's a problem they are perfectly entitled to call the director, and it won't help if you get annoyed because you think they have no case – if there's no issue, the director will tell them that. There is no problem so straightforward that you can't make it worse by losing your temper. Speaking as a director I can certainly confirm that if there's an argument going on at a table and it's unclear who is responsible for causing it, suspicion

But if the heart finesse works then Declarer can throw a loser on the Ace of hearts. Which loser should be thrown? A diamond discard will lead to 2 diamonds being lost and we still have the club position to try and make an overtrick. Perhaps it is better to ditch a club on the Ace of hearts as a 3-3 club break (more likely than finding the QJ of clubs favourably situated) will allow Declarer to also discard a diamond on the 4th club and hence make 11 tricks.

Hand 3

♠ 8762
♥ 654
♦ 2
♣ A10643

♠ K3
♥ AQJ103
♦ K6
♣ KJ52

At pairs, the bidding goes:

West	North	East	South
			1♥
1♠	Pass	Pass	2♥*
3D	3♥	4D	4♥

All Pass

- Perhaps 2C would be better?

The lead is the Queen of clubs.

Suggested Solution:

The Queen of clubs looks to be an obvious singleton so Declarer must NOT let East win the lead. Declarer needs to take trump finesses and so wins the opening lead in the dummy with the Ace and takes a winning heart finesse.

But how do we get back to dummy to take another finesse? As it looks as though West must hold both Aces on the basis of the bidding, Declarer should play the king of Diamonds at trick 3. West will win but cannot put his partner on lead.

Declarer can now enter dummy by ruffing a diamond and taking another heart finesse. If West follows to this trick then no trump tricks are lost and the contract makes with the loss of 1 diamond and 1 or 2 spades.



Bidding Panel

Moderated by Nick Forward

We have the same five panellists as last time so no preamble – straight on with the hands:-

Hand 1

Teams	Dealer N		Love All	
♠ K65	<u>W</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>S</u>
♥ 4				
♦ 762		1♦	P	2♣
♣AQJ985	P	2♦	P	?

Votes: 2 for 2♠; 2 for 3♦; 1 for 3♣.

Marks: 2♠ = 5; 3♦ = 4; 3♣/4♣ = 3; 4♦ = 2.

This proved to be an interesting hand evaluation problem. How good is the South hand in light of the bidding?

Mike: 2♠; Better in my view than 3♣ or 3♦ because it enables us to subside in either of those or bid to a minor suit game or a right-sided 3NT. It also leaves open the possibility of a 3-4 spade fit: he may even raise me to 4♠

Jimmy: 2♠; I am interested in game and want to know if partner has a heart stop for 3NT- if not 5♦ has a good chance.

I decided to give the maximum score to 2♠ because it recognized the game possibilities with the hand rather than the more conservative option...

John: 3♦; This is a hand that should be safe to 3♦ and gives options for a contract of 3/4/5♦ or 5♣ or the possibility of 3NT with running clubs and a Heart stop.

Surely however partner will often pass 3♦ and with a heart stop but no spade stop will be reticent to bid 3NT

Sue: 3♦; Nothing here to get excited about. BUT.... If partner bids 3♥ next, I'll bid 3NT.

Stewart has decided to opt for a more subtle constructive bid which he acknowledges may or may not work.

Stewart: 3♣; It's teams so despite partner's minimum, I'm worth another bid, if only to stop them bidding 2♥ if I pass. Partner could have 4 spades on this auction (my 2♣ bid took away his room), so I can't bid 2♠ in case he raises. So my

choice is between 3♣ and 3♦, neither of which are forcing, just invitational. I think the best chance of game will be 3NT and partner will not appreciate that Kx of clubs is worth 6 tricks unless I repeat the clubs, so 3♣ is my choice. I'm prepared for the stern look when partner proves to have a singleton and finds I've got 3 card support for diamonds.

As indicated above I have favoured those who took a rosier view of the hand; and you will appreciate why when you learn that partner had ♠Ax ♥xxxx ♦AKQxx ♣xx and yes the club finesse worked and diamonds broke so actually 6♦ was makeable. As I said an interesting hand evaluation problem.

Hand 2

Teams		Dealer W		Game All	
♠ K		<u>W</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>S</u>
♥ AKT					
♦ J986		P	1NT	2♠	?
♣ 87653					

* 12-14 **Exactly 5 Spades, may have a 4 card minor

Votes: 2 for 2NT; 1 for Dble; 1 for pass; 1 for 3NT.
 Marks: 2NT = 5; Dble = 4; Pass = 3; 3NT = 2; 3♣ = 1.

I held this hand in a Silver Plate match and personally think it is tough with no perfect solution. This is borne out by the varying bids made by the panel. Only one bid got two votes;

Mike: 2NT; Whether or not I'm playing Lebensohl (I'm a simple soul!). This is natural, unless I am playing Lebensohl, in which case I'll probably be bidding 3NT on the next round which, depending on our methods, will either show or deny a spade stop plus the values (almost) for game. If partner takes it as natural, he should take a view as to whether to bid on and, if he does, whether to bid a suit depending on his spade holding. We may even end up in 4♥ on a 4-3 fit. These hands are difficult, whether or not you have methods in place, but I'm vulnerable playing teams so I'll push for game somewhere.

Sue: 2NT; Lebensohl, asking partner to bid 3♣, then 3♠, asking partner to bid 3NT with a half stop.

Jimmy: 3NT; I can't bid 2NT as this is Lebensohl. In teams I want to be in game.

All of the above are happy to push to game with an eleven count opposite a weak no trump with a five card suit that is likely to be difficult to establish – a bit rich for me!

Stewart: Pass; This is a horrible hand, all the values
 wcba-newsletter-subscribe@yahoo.com

in short suits. I doubt very much that we can make game, even if partner is maximum. I'll take my chances in defence rather than seeking a fit in one of those horrible minors. Put me down for a pass.

John: Dble; The hand should belong to N/S and, despite an aggressive interpretation of the holding by South, a double describes the hand best i.e. values to at least 2NT with a spade "feature". Partner will bid 2NT with a minimum and no interest in Spades and pass for penalties with trick taking potential plus Spades. If partner bids 2NT - South should bid the lousy but probably safe 3♣.

I also chose to double and we beat the contract by one trick so I do have sympathy with Stewart's pass (however I do hate to be talked out of a hand when I know we have the majority of the points). For the record partner had a 12 count with four spades: ♠Qxxx ♥QJxx ♦Axx ♣Kx

Hand 3

Pairs		Dealer N		E/W Vul	
♠ AJ75		<u>W</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>S</u>
♥ T53					
♦ T7			1♦	P	1♠
♣ AKJ8		P	2♦	P	?

Votes: 4 for 3♣; 1 for 2NT.
 Marks: 3♣ = 5; 2NT = 3; Pass = 2.

There is considerable unity on this hand although the panel is aware that by bidding 3♣ you suggest a 5 card spade suit. However firstly the lone dissenter:-

Sue: 2NT; partner will know from my bid that I do not have four hearts (I would bid 2♥), or 5spades (I would bid 3♣), and will judge his hand accordingly. *However he may think you have a heart stop!!*

Stewart: 3♣; 13 points and partner opens - so it would seem that we ought to be in game. But there may not be a making game. At this juncture all I can do is show where my values lie with 3♣. If partner can't do more than 3♦, I think I'll give in. Is this one of those hands where we both have 3 hearts and they can only cash 4 tricks? It could be, I suppose, but I've no idea of how to find out.

John: 3♣; values to proceed and forcing - describes the hand well and prepares partner for a possible 3NT bid or even find a 4-3 spade fit. The hand has the hallmark of having game values but no play – but that should not prevent trying to find a game.

Jimmy: 3♣; if partner bids 3♦, I shall try again with 3♥.

N.B. 3♥ would be fourth suit forcing asking for a stop in hearts.

Mike: 3♣; Worth a push and this gives the option of a Moysian (i.e. 4/3) spade contract or 3NT from North. A matter of style but mine isn't to just punt 3NT on this sort of hand though I accept that it can be the winning approach.

I was defending this hand but at the table South (a good player) chose to pass as he did not wish to indicate a 5 card spade suit and risk possibly being in a 4/2 fit. In retrospect he regretted not bidding 2♣ first rather than 1♠. In view of this and also Stewart's and John's observations I decided to give Pass some points. In fact they missed a simple 3NT when North showed ♠xxx ♥AQxx ♦AKxxx ♣x. Mind you with 3 spades North may well have supported spades anyway!!

Hand 4

Teams	Dealer N		Love All	
	<u>W</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>S</u>
♠ KQJ965				
♥ J				
♦ A5432		1♦	P	1♠
♣ 4	2♥	3♣	P	?

Votes: 3 for 3♥; 1 for 3♦; 1 for 4♦.

Marks: 3♥ = 5; 4♦ = 4; 3♦ = 3.

This hand clearly has potential, the question is how to develop it:-

Jimmy: 3♥; Showing a good hand. I still fancy a slam in diamonds so let's see what partner says.

John: 3♥; A choice between 3♥ and 4♦ but I much prefer 3♥ as leaving the best options to find the right pairs contract. South's hand is very strong but lacks controls so the alternatives look like being 5/6/7♦ or 4♠ and possibly 6♠. 4♠ is important at pairs if the Diamond slam is not available as it is likely to score better. 3♥ sets up a game forcing sequence and asks partner for "more information". It looks as though North might have a few hearts and is short of spades but you never know. I expect to be able to make an invitation to a slam in Diamonds and cue bids to follow depending on North's next bid.

Sue: 3♥; Tricky. Partner is showing a good hand. With our Diamond fit, I can afford to make a game try in Spades, so 3♥ will find out more. If partner

bids 3NT, then I'll bid 4♦, and we'll get to 5 or 6♦ if his hand is suitable, but if he supports Spades, we'll probably subside in 4♠, since I am worried that successive club leads will weaken my trump holding. If Spades are trumps, they are almost good enough to stand on their own, but Ax in partners hand will be comforting.

Eschewing the nebulous cue bid is:-

Stewart: 4♦; LHO has taken a bit of room with his 2♥ bid, but partner's 3♣ must still be a better than minimum hand. So I have huge potential for him. We may have a grand slam on and I'd be disappointed if partner doesn't have 2 aces, but that must be possible. The way to find out is Blackwood but first I need to set the suit with 4♦, natural and forcing. Partner will cue-bid a major Ace and then I'll use 'the old Black' (or the new RKCB for preference).

Mike: 3♦; What's the problem? Partner has bid a new suit at the 3 level so we're in a forcing situation. The problems arise if you don't think this is forcing because however you proceed you either run out of space (4♦) or have problems agreeing what the trump suit is (3♥ or 4NT).

Clearly the other panellists were not certain that we are in a game forcing situation and to be honest neither am I. With a 6 count and 4spades and 3 diamonds South would want to make a non-forcing preference bid of 3♦. North actually held ♠A3 ♥Q♦QJ10987♣AK106. The diamond and spade slams depend on the diamond decision – they break 1-1 with the King Offside!

Hand 5

Teams	Dealer E		N/S Vul	
	<u>W</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>S</u>
♠ KQJ8743				
♥ AQ				
♦ K974			P	1♠
♣ 7	4♥	5♣	P	?

Votes: 3 for Pass; 1 for 5♠; 1 for 5♥.

Marks: Pass = 5; 5♠ = 4; 5♥ = 3.

The question on this hand is how do you treat partner's bid of 5♣, is it natural, a cue bid agreeing spades, natural with secondary spade support – Jx or Ax- or slam invitational? Most of the panel think it's natural:-

Stewart: Pass; This is a horrid situation – not much more than a guessing game. What does partner

Well done to Brian Stanley/Joyce Skelton and Lyn Jackson/Paul Tapster, both of whom bid successfully to slam.

This hand proved troublesome, with only two pairs going plus:

	♠ K8763	Dealer West
	♥ A	Game All
	♦ AQT	
	♣ T974	
♠ AJT		♠ 542
♥ K875		♥ QT96
♦ 9843		♦ K65
♣ J2		♣ K63
	♠ Q9	
	♥ J432	
	♦ J72	
	♣ AQ85	

A mundane approach to this hand would be N/S bidding along the lines of 1♠, 2♣, 3♣, P, making, one would have thought, exactly. However, a more imaginative approach was, I believe, adopted at one table, with N/S bidding, 1♠, 2♣, 2♦ (?), 2♠, 3♠ (?). This type of hand is always hard to evaluate – 4 card trump support and good distribution can play extremely well. So North, quite reasonably I suppose, felt that his hand was too good for a simple 3♣ bid and temporised with 2♦.

When his partner, very correctly, gave preference to 2♠, he felt that a further effort was merited. Somewhat ambitiously, he then opted for 3♠. (*perhaps 3♣ would have got across the same message and led to a rather more secure contract? – Ed*)

However, E led ♥2, prompting W to play the K, taken by the A. ♠3 to the Q and A was followed by another heart. All declarer has to do now is discard a club on the losing heart and so set up the J♥ to discard his second club. However, he ruffed and, although he had some further chances, he eventually lost control and went one off,

After this heat, Worcester Grant have just edged Unquote into second place. Look out for the next exciting heat on 13th February!



A Hand to Play

By Mike Willoughby

This one is advanced but well worth working through! Partner opens 1♦ and you're looking at: -

♠A4, ♥AT, ♦T9, ♣AKQT742

You are contemplating how to develop this had as scientifically as possible, when the next hand bids 2D showing the majors. 3♣ is fortunately forcing here and, despite the hand on your left making a further ♠ bid, you wind up in 7♣.

The ♦8 is led and you see: -

♠ Q92	Dealer West
♥ Q5	Game All
♦ AQJ42	
♣ J63	
♠ A4	
♥ AT	
♦ T9	
♣ AKQT742	

After a few minutes (!) cogitation, you elect to play small from dummy and, to your relief, this runs successfully to your ten. Cover up the full hand below and try planning the play single dummy. If you can't work that out, look at the full hand and try it double-dummy. Its fascinating - the winning line of play will be shown in the next issue!

♠ Q92	Dealer West
♥ Q5	Game All
♦ AQJ42	
♣ J63	
♠ KJ7	♠ T8653
♥ 863	♥ KJ9742
♦ K8763	♦ 5
♣ 85	♣ 9
♠ A4	
♥ AT	
♦ T9	
♣ AKQT742	

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