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At the start of the second day of the Round Robin, only the overnight leaders from the Netherlands were pretty certain to qualify. 't Onstein quickly put their qualification beyond reasonable doubt when the won their 7th and 8th match as well. Only then, they started losing by small margins but when the German Reiter did not take full advantage of this but rather lost their final match as well, the Dutch were still first past the post.
Lower down the table, Monaco had finally started a rally. They lost their first match of the day against Villa Fabbriche but three consecutive good wins brought them to within striking distance of the 4th placed team, GS Allegra - who happened to be their opponents in the last match of the day. As the V.P. difference was just under 12, a win by more than 19 IMPs would see Monaco catch up GS Allegra and thus qualify after all. When the smoke had cleared, Monaco had won by 30, mainly due to two big swings on boards 17 and 19. They just failed to catch up the Germans and the Norwegians (Heimdal), whose defeats at the hands of Skalman and Radkov respectively were just small enough for them to stay in 2nd and 3rd place.
It would be 't Onstein v, Heimdal and Bamberger Reiter v. Monaco for today's semifinals.

## CLOSING CEREMONY

The Prize-Giving \& Closing Ceremony will take place on Saturday 12th November in the Istanbul room at 21:00. A cocktail will be served at the end of the Ceremony
abmenunc
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## SEMIFINALS GROUP A - ( $\left.\mathbf{1 s T}^{\text {st }} \mathbf{4}^{\mathrm{tH}}\right)$
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## ROUND ROBIN, ROUND 6

## by Jos Jacobs

## BAMBERGER R.

## vs HEIMDAL

At the start of Thursday's last round of play, Norway's Heimdal were in $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ place, about 6 V.P. ahead of their nearest rivals LT Ilanka from Poland and about 7.5 V.P. ahead of their $6^{\text {th }}$ round opponents, Germany's Bamberger Reiter. The Norwegians had been doing well in their most recent matches of the day whereas the Germans had scored some good wins but some rather heavy defeats as well and thus had to make good some ground.
Taking into account that four teams will proceed to the top semifinal group, it should be clear that just a few V.P. over average after 11 rounds might well be enough to finish in the top four, even more so if ' $t$ Onstein and GS Allegra would continue to do well.
So both teams had everything to play for. Right on the first board, the fight got underway.

Board: 21. Dlr: North/NS
A Q 9762
©K874
$\diamond 10$
\& 764
A A K J 5
© Q J 63
$\diamond$ Q 4
\& 952

↔ 4
$\diamond$ A5
$\diamond$ AK 987653
\& J 3

A 1083
$\bigcirc 1092$
$\diamond$ J 2
\& A K Q 108

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Groetheim | Jagniewski <br> Tondel | Gawel |  |
| 1ヵ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| All Pass | Pass | Pass | Dble |

On this auction, South's double could only suggest a running suit or a solid suit with a side entry so North had to find partner's suit. This proved not too difficult so when he led a club, the contract was quickly one down. +100 to the Bamberger Reiter.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Häusler | Berg | Gromöller | Austberg |

In the other room, EW produced the same auction but when nobody doubled, North led a spade which gave declarer his $12^{\text {th }}$ trick. Another +490 and the first 11 IMPs to the Bamberger Reiter.
Heimdal hit back strongly on the very next board:
Board: 22. Dlr: East/EW

- Q 83
© K J 107
$\diamond$ K Q 52
\& K 6
A AK
คA6 2
$\diamond$ J873
\& Q J 52


A97654

- Q 8
$\diamond 964$
4843
- J 102
© 9543
$\diamond$ A 10
\& A 1097

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Groetheim | Jagniewski | Tondel <br> Towel | Gawel <br> Pass |
| 1NT |  | Pass | $2 \Omega$ |

On this normal enough auction, there was no way for NS to find out that, together, they were having a sound double of $2 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$. When North led an unlucky heart, dummy's queen scored a trick and declarer went on to escape for just down two when he played a club to the queen and king and the defenders did not find their ruff in that suit. Bamberger Reiter +200.

At the other table, we saw an 8-12 NT in operation:

| West <br> Häusler | North <br> Berg | East <br> Gromöller | South <br> Austberg |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | Redbl |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass | Pass |
|  |  |  |  |


| GO To PAGE: | $\mathbf{1}$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | RESULTS |  |

When North passed the mandatory redouble, East had to rescue himself but the big difference was that on this auction, NS knew that together, they indeed had a double.
The defence was merciless. $\diamond A, \diamond 10$ to jack and queen, low diamond ruffed and a heart through. North won the king when declarer ducked and next found the fine shift to the $\% \mathrm{~K}$, not so difficult any more in view of dummy. When it held, he continued the suit to get his ruff and could then play his last top diamond. South overruffed declarer's $\boldsymbol{\$} 7$ and returned another club on which North scored his $\boldsymbol{Q}$ en passant. The defenders had thus managed to win the first nine tricks for a score of +1100 to Heimdal and 14 IMPs.

On the next board, the Norwegians at the other table were looking for a big penalty as well:


| West <br> Groetheim | North <br> Jagniewski | East <br> Tondel | South <br> Gawel <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $3 \diamond$ | Dble | Pass | $3 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

West led a spade to dummy's ace and declarer gave up a diamond. West overtook partner's king and returned a trump to East's nine and declarer's king. From here, declarer could continue on almost doubledummy lines. He led a club to dummy's king which was taken by East's ace and the Q Q came back to dummy's ace. Declarer next cashed the clubs, East ruffing the $13^{\text {th }}$ club low and declarer overruffing. A diamond ruff and a spade exit then gave declarer eight tricks. Heimdal a disappointing +200 only.

| West <br> Häusler | North <br> Berg | East <br> Gromöller | South <br> Austberg <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $3 \diamond$ | Dble | 3NT | All Pass |

At the other table, Gromöller took a more practical view. No experiments but a sound and simple 3NT. Ten tricks on a heart lead, Bamberger Reiter +630 and 10 IMPs back to them to lead 21-14 after just 3 boards.

Board 24 was flat and on \#25 the Bamberger Reiter scored another 6 IMPs on a partscore going down at both tables.

Board 26 was more interesting as declarer was squeezed at one table:


In the Open Room, the Polish Club and North's 14 response replacing the "natural" 1 NT made it difficult for EW to assess the situation. A club contract would have been fine for them but how to get there? West was too strong to simply pass $2 \circlearrowleft$ but $2 \uparrow$ was not quite the place to be. Two down, Bamberger Reiter $+200$

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Häusler | Berg | Gromöller | Austberg |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass | 1NT |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

At the other table, South did not open and had to pay the price for losing the initiative. His balancing 1 NT was perfectly OK but he ran into a rather cruel adverse distribution.
Had the defence led a club, declarer's life would have become even more unpleasant but West cannot possibly be blamed for leading a low spade from his five-card suit. Declarer won his jack and played off the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, felling the king. Good news and bad news. He continued a spade but West went up with his king and returned a low club. Dummy's ten won and another spade went to West's ace. When West exited with the $\% \mathrm{~A}$ and another, the lead again was in dummy but, more important, declarer's hand was dead as the $\triangle$ AQ were behind his 9 KJ . Declarer could do little else
than play a low heart to his jack but West won and led his last club to partner's eight, squeezing declarer in the process. He had to discard from his established spade, the $\checkmark \mathrm{Kx}$ and the $\diamond 10 \mathrm{x}$. When he threw a diamond, East could exit with the $\diamond \mathrm{J}$ to put declarer in dummy again. Back in dummy, declarer then erred by exiting in diamonds rather than hearts, thus going one down rather than one up. West would have won his $\checkmark$ A but declarer would have had the last two tricks. This looks like a clear case of tiredness after a long day's play but that's the way it is...Bamberger Reiter another +200 and a surprise 9 more IMPs.
Two boards later, the Norwegians went two down in 1 NT at both tables - one of those cases in which the right to deal the first blow gives your side a decisive advantage.

## Board: 28. Dlr: West/NS

|  | © 8732 <br> A 1053 <br> K 72 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A K 1054 | N | ¢ 987 |
| $\checkmark$ Q 109 |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 54$ |
| $\diamond$ Q 982 | $W^{\text {L }}$ | $\diamond$ K J 4 |
| \& Q 9 | S | \& A 1086 |
|  | 9 Q J 62 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A J 6 |  |
|  | $\diamond 76$ |  |
|  | \& J 543 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Groetheim | Jagniewski | Tondel | Gawel |
| 1NT | All Pass |  |  |

North led a heart to the jack and queen and declarer next went after the diamonds, North ducking the first two rounds of the suit. When declarer continued diamonds, North cashed his two tricks and continued a heart, South winning the ace and clearing the suit. A low club from dummy then went to declarer's queen and North's king. North immediately returned a club to dummy's ace. A spade came next but South played the jack and North took declarer's king with his ace and cashed his $13^{\text {th }}$ heart. The last two tricks then went to South's $\boldsymbol{Q}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ J. Down two, Bamberger Reiter +100 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Häusler | Berg | Gromöller Austberg |  |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $1 N T$ | All Pass |  |

At the other table, the Norwegians also were in 1 NT and East led the 9 to dummy's queen. Declarer next
ducked a heart to West's nine and his spade return went to declarer's ace. When declarer continued the $\varsigma A$ and another, East could win the king and lead a spade through for partner to make two tricks in the suit.
West then correctly shifted to the $\diamond 9$, covered by ten and jack. East's return of the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ went to declarer's ace but the established $13^{\text {th }}$ heart was declarer's last trick as East still had a diamond left to reach his partner. Another case of down two and +200 to Bamberger Reiter, good for another 7 IMPs to them.
On the next board, tiredness probably played its part again but this time to Norwegian advantage.

Board: 29. Dlr: North/All
A K J 83
© Q 10732
$\diamond 7$
\& J 75
A Q 107
©A984
$\diamond \mathrm{Q}$
\& A Q 843

4. 942
© K J 5
勺J543
© K 92
A A 65
$\bigcirc 6$
$\diamond$ AK 109862
\& 106

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Groetheim | Jagniewski | Tondel | Gawel |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Dble | $1 \checkmark$ | 1NT | $2 \diamond$ |
| $3 \boldsymbol{6}$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

As you can see, 3NT in EW is off six top tricks but when South led three rounds of diamonds, declarer could run home with the help of a successful heart finesse. Heimdal +600 .


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Häusler | Berg | Gromöller Austberg |  |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Dble | $1 \diamond$ | 1NT | $2 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

No adventures or experiments at the other table but a quiet partscore for another +90 and 12 IMPs back to Heimdal.
When both teams sadly missed the cold slam on the last board of the day, the final result of the match became:

BAMBERGER REITER vs HEIMDAL
47-26 or 16.18-3.82 V.P.


## ROUND ROBIN，ROUND 7

## by Jos Jacobs

| SKALMAN | $v s$ HEIMDAL |
| :--- | :--- |
| LT ILANKA | $v s$ ALLEGRA |

Matches between Scandinavian teams Closed Room traditionally are well－fought，mainly because the va－ rious Nordic rivalries are playing an important part．
This time，it might just be the exception to the rule as Norway＇s Heimdal had enjoyed a quite reasona－ ble first day whereas the Swedes（Skalman）had found themselves back very much down the table－it thus would not come as a surprise if the Norwegians would win this encounter in some comfort．

The first signs of the direction this match would take were shown on board 3 ：

| Board：3．D | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dlr: South/EW } \\ & \text { \& Q } 954 \\ & \diamond 109 \\ & \diamond 1086 \\ & \& \text { A } 1054 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A A J 108 | N | A K 32 |
| ऽK6 |  | $\checkmark$ QJ 8542 |
| $\diamond$ AKJ 954 | 4 W E | $\diamond 72$ |
| \＆\％ 7 | S | \＆J 8 |
|  | 4 76 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 73 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 3 |  |
|  | \＆K Q 9632 |  |


| West <br> Groetheim | North <br> Gullberg | East <br> Tondel | South <br> Bergdahl <br> $1 \propto$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \circlearrowleft$ | Dble | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | $3 \propto$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | $4 \propto$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

North＇s $1 \circlearrowleft$ showed spades．
Whether North bids hearts or spades，getting the he－ arts well into the picture proved a difficult task for East anyway．Another problem was the nature of West＇s double of 4\％．If this would certainly show heart tole－ rance，East might have retreated to $4 \bigcirc$ after all．
Declarer lost the obvious five tricks and thus went two down，Heimdal +300 ．
At the other table，West＇s Raptor－style overcall pre－
maturely silenced everyone．

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Petersson | Livgard | Ahlesved | Aa |
|  |  |  | $1 \boldsymbol{*}$ |

2 showed four spades and a longer minor．
Clubs were led and continued，declarer throwing a diamond on the second round to avoid losing control． He could then win the diamond return，run the $\circlearrowleft$ K successfully，cash the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ felling the queen，play off two top trumps and run good diamonds throu－ gh North．Just made，Skalman +110 but 5 IMPs to Heimdal．

In the LT Ilanka v．GS Allegra match，as well as in the＇t Onstein v．Mossop match，we saw the same more substantial swing：

| West <br> Bianchedi | North <br> Tuszynski | East <br> Madala | South <br> Sakowicz <br> $2 \boldsymbol{\kappa}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2 \diamond$ |  |  | Pass |
| Dble | $3 \boldsymbol{~ P a s s ~}$ | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |

After the Polish 2\％opening bid（Precision style）， Bianchedi had a choice of actions available．Once he elected to double at his second turn，the pair landed safely in $4 \checkmark$ ．One overtrick，GS Allegra +650 ．

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Krupowicz | Bocchi | MiechowiczBrenner |  |
|  |  |  | 14\％ |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 10 | $2 \%$ |
| 24 | 3\％ | Pass | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | 4\％ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |

Basically the same problem as in the Scandinavian match above：what does the double of $4 \%$ imply？
The difference，however：if you don＇t sit it，shouldn＇t you go to $4 \diamond$ rather than $4 \diamond$ ？
One overtrick at this table as well but only +150 to LT Ilanka and thus 11 IMPs to GS Allegra．

4ゝかっ

In the 't Onstein v. Mossop match, this was the only hand on which the Brits registered a substantial swing:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P Hackett | Drijuer | Price | Nab |
|  |  |  | $1 \%$ |
| $1 \diamond$ | 18 | Dble | 20 |
| $3 \%$ | Dble | 30 | Pass |
| 40 | All Pass |  |  |

North's $1 \bigcirc$ showed spades but after Paul Hackett's flexible 3\% bid, $4 \bigcirc$ was reached easily.
Well done, Mossop +620.

| West <br> De Wijs | North <br> Hydes | East <br> Muller | South <br> Mossop |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \diamond$ |  |  | $1 \uparrow$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | All Pass | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |

Interesting to see that if North bids his spades, he removes or definitely diminishes the chance of East getting into the hearts. Three overtricks, 't Onstein +170 but 10 IMPs to Mossop.
Needless to say, one might think after 't Onstein's impressive performance on Thursday, the Dutch went on to win this match $40-11$ or $17.68-2.32$ V.P. despite this early setback...

Back again to the Scandinavian encounter.

## Board: 4. Dlr: West/All <br> A 106 <br> $\bigcirc 3$ <br> $\diamond$ A Q 973 <br> \& J 5 4 32

Q Q 8543

- 10874
$\diamond$ K 2
of A 8


A A J 72
○K5
$\diamond 10$
\& K Q 10976
AK 9
© A Q J 962
ゝJ8654
\&

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Groetheim | Gullberg | Tondel | Bergdahl |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \mathbf{6}$ | $1 \varnothing$ |
| Dble | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | All Pass |  |  |

When Bergdahl did not have the courage to show his second suit over 3 , the Norwegians peacefully
went two down in their contract. Skalman +200 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Petersson | Livgard | Ahlesved | Aa |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \diamond$ |
| Dble | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | $3 \diamond$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | $5 \diamond$ | $5 \diamond$ | $6 \diamond$ |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Nebulous $1 \diamond$ (Strong Club style). Once West showed spades with his double, EW found a number of heart bids to agree spades and show interest in game. In between, South had the chance to show his second suit. After partner's jump to $5 \diamond$, South did not even want to let the opponents play at the five-level - and quite rightly so, as he eventually emerged with an overtrick and +1740 on the lead of the $\% \mathrm{~A}$.

In the Mossop v. 't Onstein match, Bart Nab did not show any inhibitions whatsoever:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P Hackett | Drijver | Price | Nab |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | $1 \diamond$ |
| $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | $5 \diamond(!)$ |

All Pass

Just one overtrick:: 't Onstein +620
In the other room, Precision took away some bidding space:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Hydes | Muller | Mossop |
| Pass | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | $2 \Phi$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

One down but diamonds lost forever...Mossop +100 but a loss of 11 IMPs for them.
In the LT Ilanka v. GS Allegra match, South opted for a practical approach that backfired:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bianchedi | Tuszynski | Madala | Sakowicz |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \%$ | $4 \varnothing$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

South's bold jump silenced everyone but the contract proved too difficult when declarer, after ruffing the \& A lead, refrained from taking the diamond finesse but played a diamond to the ace - his only chance to quickly get to dummy in some safety. When the hearts did not behave, he lost control and thus could not establish his spade trick in time. One down, GS Allegra +100 .


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Krupowicz | Bocchi | Miechowicz Brenner |  |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Dble | $5 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

At the other table, Brenner showed his two-suiter and thus, Bocchi was quickly in $5 \diamond$. One doubled overtrick for +950 and 14 more IMPs to GS Allegra.

Strange things happened on board 7:


West's overcall ran into a strong variation of the Polish Club. The contract would have gone down by sheer lack of winners but West's evasive action would not have improved the EW position. When North spoke again, all EW problems were over. Though there are 12 tricks available (double dummy, of course), North contented himself with nine and scored +140 for LT Ilanka.

| West | North <br> Krupowicz <br> Bocchi | East <br> MiechowiczBrenner |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | $1 \Omega$ |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{6}$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{6}$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Once South opened $1 \checkmark$, EW were out of trouble. $2 \kappa$ was either natural or any strong hand and $2 \diamond$ showed $8+$. 2NT then showed 16-19 and 3NT over the relay confirmed 2-5-3-3.

West found the fine deceptive lead of the $\% \mathrm{Q}$ which was allowed to hold. The doJ came next and when this, too, held the trick, West shifted to a low diamond. East played the $\diamond 10$, of course, and declarer won the jack.
At this point, declarer was completely in the dark about the layout of the hand - don't forget there had not been any oppositional bidding. He therefore went for a late endplay: he cashed four rounds of spades, overtaking his queen with dummy's king in the process, and then played $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and another expecting (or hoping) to put West on lead for a forced heart return.
When it was East who won the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ for a heart return, the contract was one down. LT Ilanka +100 , a fully deserved 6 IMPs only for a wonderful defence.

In the Scandinavian match, they had different ideas:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Groetheim | Gullberg | Tondel | Bergdahl $24$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 30 | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | 4\% | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Pass | 54 |
| Pass | 64 | All Pass |  |

Bergdahl treated his hand as a strong 2NT so the Swedes pressed on to the slam level. They would need a double-dummy line of play, however, to bring it home.
West led a diamond to the ten and jack. Declarer's next move was to run the $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$ successfully, dummy throwing a club. When declarer proceeded to ruff a low heart in dummy, followed by a trump to his ace and the $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$, he could no longer make the contract. One down, Heimdal +100 .
Had he cashed the $\triangle \mathrm{A}$ and ruffed a heart, followed by a diamond to his nine, the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and a club up, he would have made his contract. After reaching dummy, he can ruff the $13^{\text {th }}$ diamond high and in the end, his club loser will be taken by both West's $\uparrow \mathrm{J}$ and East's fifth trump.
In the replay, the Norwegian NS reached 3NT and easily made it on a less inspired defence than we saw above for a gain of 12 IMPs.

The final scores:

## SKALMAN vs HEIMDAL

0-37 or 1.16-18.84 V.P.

## LT ILANKA vs GS ALLEGRA

10-29 or 4.25-15.75 V.P.

| BAMBERGER R. | ONSTEIN |
| :---: | :---: |
| HEIMIDAL | LT ILANKA |

In round 8 , the match between 't Onstein and their eternal rivals (and possibly their "Angstgegner" as well) from Germany was scheduled. The two teams were at the top of the table when the match started, though a $24-$ V.P. gap separated them. If the Germans would manage to inflict a first defeat on the Dutch, they would make a giant step forward towards finishing in the top four.

Everything went according to the German plans on the first board:


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| De Wijs | Jagniewski | Muller | Gawel |
|  |  |  | $1 \%$ |
| 20 | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| Pass | 24 | Pass | 3\% |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

$1 \%$ was Polish, of course and the proper contract was duly reached. East led the $\triangle \mathrm{K}$ which declarer immediately won with his as he still held a second stopper in the suit. His next moves were a diamond to the king which held the trick and two rounds of clubs ending in his hand. At this point, Jagniewski had to choose between another diamond and guessing right or the simple chance of a spade to the king, hoping to find East with the ace. When he opted for the latter, he was home. Bamberger Reiter a fine +400 .

| West <br> Häusler | North <br> Drijver | East <br> Fritsche | South <br> Nab |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2 \varnothing$ |  |  | 106 |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | Dble |
|  | 3 | All Pass |  |

In the replay, Fritsche tried to make life difficult for his opponents by raising to $3 \triangle$.

Not knowing about partner's singleton $\bigcirc 10$, and no doubt taking into account the chance of finding four spades opposite, Drijver bid 3a which became the final contract. On the actual layout, declarer could not both ruff hearts and keep control so he had to concede one down. Another +50 and 10 IMPs to the Reiter. They had made the start they wanted and they would stay in the lead until board 17, as we shall see.

In our other match, both tables duly reached in 3NT but with a different outcome.

| West <br> Urbanski | North <br> Berg | East <br> Tuszynski | South <br> Austberg |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2 \varnothing$ |  |  | $1 \boldsymbol{0}$ |

For the Poles, East led the МK. Declarer won the ace and immediately led a diamond to dummy's king and West's ace. When West went on to cash two top hearts, the $\triangle 9$ had become declarer's $9^{\text {th }}$ trick before declarer would have had to guess which winning finesse (diamonds or spades) he had to take. Had West ducked the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, it might have been a different story. Heimdal +400 .

| West | North | East | South <br> Aa |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Krupowicz |  |  |  | Livgard | Zawada |
| :--- |
| $1 \boldsymbol{1} \%$ |
| $1 \circlearrowleft$ |

As West had overcalled just $1 \triangle$, East did not bother to lead partner's suit but tried a low diamond instead. Declarer called for dummy's king which held the trick and from here, he was left to his own devices. Two top clubs ending in hand and another diamond for the moment of truth. When he called for dummy's queen, West won the ace and the contract had gone down. West returned the $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$ rather than his last diamond
but this did not even matter as East was still looking at his A as well. Nicely done, another +50 and 10 IMPs to Heimdal.
In the same match, a different lead led a $4 \boldsymbol{A}$ contract through at one table:

Board: 15. Dlr: South/NS |  |  |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | A A J 108764 |
|  | $\diamond$ J 962 |
|  | $\diamond 4$ |
|  | $\& 5$ |

か952
© Q 753
$\diamond 865$
\& A 74

| N | ¢ K Q 3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| W E | $\checkmark$ A 108 |
| $\mathrm{S}^{\text {S }}$ | $\diamond$ K J 3 |
| S | \& 10962 |

- 

© K 4
$\diamond$ A Q 10972
\& K Q J 83

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Urbanski | Berg | Tuszynski | Austberg $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | 34 | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | 40 | Pass | 44 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

When East made the unlucky lead of the 2 , declarer suddenly had a chance when dummy's king held
bleton or he was expecting the 10 as the lead from 109 xx . With the club loser gone, declarer went on to ruff out the $\%$. Next came two rounds of trumps, East winning his queen and returning a low heart. Declarer was not to be fooled about this so he called for the king in dummy. When this held, declarer could cash a top club, ruff himself back to his hand in clubs and take a diamond finesse to get rid of another heart loser on the diamond ace. This way, his losses were restricted to just two trumps as West had used his third trump at the wrong moment during the play. Heimdal a remarkable +650 ..

| West | North <br> Ka | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Erupowz |  |  |  | Livgard | Zawada |
| :--- |
| Pass |
|  |
| 1ヵ |

At the other table, East found the fine lead of the $\diamond J$, removing a crucial entry to dummy but leaving declarer with at least four losers anyway. When West returned a low diamond after winning the A at trick two, the contract even went down two. Heimdal +200 and 13 IMPs to them.

In the 't Onstein - Bamberger Reiter match, the Dutch scored their first IMPs of the match on this board when they stayed in 3 just making whereas the Germans went down in 4ه.


With the score at 14-6 to the Reiter, this was board 17:

Board: 17. Dlr: North/None |  |  |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | \& A 1084 |
|  | ® A 109 |
|  | $\diamond 6$ |
|  | \& Q J 1085 |

| AKQ652 | N | ヘ J 97 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ©QJ | ${ }_{W}{ }^{\text {N }}$ | $\bigcirc 8763$ |
| $\diamond$ A 854 | W E | $\diamond$ K 72 |
| \& 72 | S | \&963 |
|  | - 3 |  |
|  | © K 542 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q J 1093 |  |
|  | \& AK 4 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| De Wijs | Jagniewski | Muller | Gawel |
|  | $1 \%$ | Pass | $2 \%$ |
| 24 | Pass | Pass | 30 |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

$2 \%$ was GF in diamonds.
Polish Club quickly saw NS end up in 3NT. Had West held the 9 as well, declarer would have had an easy run but when East produced $\uparrow$ j97, declarer had no chance. One down, t Onstein +50 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Häusler | Drijuer | Fritsche | Nab |
|  | 1\% | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| 14 | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| Pass | 20 | 24 | 30 |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | 5\% |

All Pass


BC'T ONSTEIN
$1 \diamond$ showed (in this case) 7-11 with one four-card major.
Five Clubs proved an excellent contract as spades can be ruffed if necessary but, more important, diamonds can be established easily for two losers and three extra tricks to get to the required 11.
't Onstein a fine +400 and 10 IMPs to take the lead: 16-14.
Only one other pair reached 5\%: Bilde-Duboin.

On the last board of the match, the Reiter may have considered themselves a trifle unlucky:

Board: 20. Dlr: West/All
AK6532
© Q 83
$\diamond 1053$
$\circ 54$

| - A Q 4 | N | A 98 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 109$ | $W^{\text {N }}$ E | $\bigcirc$ J 74 |
| $\diamond$ Q 862 | $\mathbf{W}^{\text {L }}$ | $\diamond$ AK J 9 |
| \& AK L 3 | S | \& J 1086 |
|  | A J 107 |  |
|  | ๑AK652 |  |
|  | $\diamond 74$ |  |
|  | 4972 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Jagniewski | Muller | Gawel |
| 1NT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

This is the practical approach followed at nearly all tables and resulting in an almost general +630 for EW when North invariably led a spade.
There were two exceptions: Ahlesved-Petersson for Skalman and the auction below:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Häusler | Drijuer | Fritsche | Nab |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \wedge$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \propto$ | Pass |
| $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

2 was an 8-11 diamond raise and 39 showed weakness. Five diamonds was a legitimately good contract as it would depend on a spade finesse rather than the hearts 4-4.

When the spade finesse proved wrong, the Dutch had gained another 12 IMPs to win the match
$28-14$ or $14.54-5.46$ V.P.

## ROUND ROBIN, ROUND 9

## by Jos Jacobs

## T ONSTEIN vs HEIMDAL <br> RADKOV

At the start of this round, there was a 16 V.P. gap between the $4^{\text {th }}$ - and $5^{\text {th }}$ - ranked teams. This would mean that for any of the teams within the top four ('t Onstein, GS Allegra, Heimdal and Bamberger Reiter) it should be sufficient to just avoid any big defeats whereas any wins would be welcomed like before.
On the first board of the 't Onstein-Heimdal match, it very much looked like the old story of this event once again.

## Board: 21. Dlr: North/NS

A A Q 97
© 97
$\diamond$ A Q J 96 \& 83

| か J 86432 | N | A K 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ J 2 | W E | $\bigcirc$ AKQ 83 |
| $\diamond 87$ | W E | $\diamond$ K 542 |
| \& K Q 4 | S | \& J 9 |
|  | A 10 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 10654$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 103$ |  |
|  | \& A 1076 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Groetheim | Drijver | Tondel | Nab |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 1ヵ | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

The Norwegian EW were given a rather free run to game but then, Drijver wanted to have last word. Understandable and correct. Down two, 't Onstein +300 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Verhees | Berg | Van ProoijenAustberg |  |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $2 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 N T$ | All Pass |

East suggested a good hand with his $2 \diamond$ but when West could not produce more than $2 \boldsymbol{\sim}$, East gave it one more try with 2NT on which West had a pretty
obvious pass.
On a diamond lead, the defenders have four diamond tricks and two aces but South led a club which ran to declarer's nine. Van Prooijen now was a tempo ahead, so he simply returned a club. South won the ace and returned the 10 but it was already too late. 't Onstein +150 and 10 IMPs when declarer's $\diamond K$ also scored later in the play.

Board 24 was a matter of keeping quiet. Not all NS pairs succeeded.

## Board: 24. Dlr: West/None

A A 64
© K 3
$\diamond 6$
\& A Q 8632
© Q 82
$\checkmark 109$
$\diamond$ K J 1073
cf J 94


A J 953
๑AQJ876
$\diamond-$
1075
A K 107
○542
$\diamond$ AQ98542
\& --

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Groetheim | Drijver | Tondel | Nab |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\&}$ | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $4 N T$ | Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{\downarrow} \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $5 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | $5 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

When South bid a forcing $4 \diamond$, East's $3 \diamond$ bid had done its job.
South duly bid 5NT on partner's request to do so ( $5 \circlearrowleft$ ) but even this contract proved just one too high: Heimdal +50 .

| West | North | East $\quad$ South |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Verhees | Berg | Van Prooijen Austberg |  |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{4}$ | $3 \Omega$ | Pass |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

South cautiously passed over $3 \circlearrowleft$ - which proved the right thing to do. Ten tricks, Heimdal +430 and 10 IMPs to them.

In the other match, the Bulgarians had the same problem:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gromöller | Tenev | Fritsche | Tiholov |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $5 \%$ | All Pass |  |

Declarer even went two down when he cashed all his trumps, hoping that some sort of endplay would develop. Not that it mattered very much...Bamberger Reiter +100 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nedkou | Jagniewski | Radev | Gawel |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\infty}$ | $3 \varnothing$ | Pass |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 4NT | All Pass |  |

Over partner's strong rebid, Gawel gave it one more try but when partner signed off, he wisely passed. Well done, bid up to the limit for another +430 and 11 IMPs to the Reiter.

## Board: 27. Dlr: South/None

A 10
$\bigcirc 6$
$\diamond$ A Q 542
\&A Q 10862
© Q J 4
©AJ985
$\diamond 1093$
\& 43


A AK8763
© Q 432
$\diamond 8$
\& 75
A 952
© K 107
$\diamond$ K J 76
\& K J 9

| West <br> Groetheim | North <br> Drijuer | East <br> Tondel | South <br> Nab <br> $1 N T$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ | Dble | Pass |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| $4 \diamond$ | $5 \diamond$ | $5 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

Over South's weak NT (10-12), North bid 2 which could show, among other things, a strong minor twosuiter. When East doubled this, West got the chance to introduce a fitbid in hearts, which made the sacrifice obvious. When declarer handled the trumps correctly (not so difficult in view of the auction), the Dutch had to be content with one down only, +100 .
West
Verhees
Pass
3ム
All Pass
North
Berg
$2 \diamond$
4NT

| East $\quad$ South |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Van Prooijen | Austberg |
|  | $1 N T$ |
| $2 \wedge$ | Pass |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ |

In the replay, 1 NT was $8-12$ and $2 \diamond$ was GF. East showed his spades but when West did not make a fitbid in hearts, the chance of finding the profitable sacrifice was lost. The contract of $5 \diamond$ was made with an overtrick for another +420 and 8 IMPs to Heimdal who had taken the lead with just three boards to play. Would they succeed in becoming the first team to beat the Dutch?

Yes, they would, as nothing happened in this match on the remaining boards. The final score became 1913 or $12.18-7.82$ V.P. to Heimdal.
Both teams, however, had missed their chance to do extremely well on board 29 , a push at -100 in their match.


Board: 29. Dlr: North/All
AK9853
© A 9
$\diamond 852$
\& A 102

Q 72
-KJ87
$\diamond$ A Q 9
\& 987


- A J 4
© Q 2
$\diamond$ K J 1064
\& K Q J

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gromoeller | Tenev | Fritsche | Tiholov |
|  | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 2 NT | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Of course, 4 $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$ by North was the popular contract. If East finds any red suit lead, the contract can go down on a diamond ruff or the loss of a heart trick be-
fore the diamonds are established. Of course, declarer might guess the spade position after the ruff, as probably happened at many tables - 4^ was made more often than not, even though North was the declarer.
When Fritsche led a heart, Tenev was down one as he had no reason whatsoever to go for the scooping play in trumps. Bamberger Reiter +100 .

Curiously enough, 4 by South is cold as East will never get the lead on any normal play.
The problem this is: how to get there? Easily, as the other Reiter pair showed us.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nedkov | Jagniewski | Radev | Gawel |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \%$ |
| Pass | 10 | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | 4a |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

North passed (!) as dealer and responded a transfer $1 \checkmark$ over partner's Polish Club. The rest was plain sailing. Just made and 12 more IMPs to the Reiter who thus won the match 28-7 or 16.18-3.82 V.P. to consolidate their position.


## ROUND ROBIN, ROUND 5

## by Jos Jacobs

## MONACO <br> vs ONSTEIN

In Round 5, the big match certainly was the one between the leaders 't Onstein and Monaco. To a certain extent, this match could be considered a replay of the recent World Bridge Games final in Wrocław. The tournament situation, however, was not quite the same. In Poland, it was a final but here, it was Monaco who were badly needing some V.P. as they had scored just average over the first four rounds and time was already slightly beginning to run out for them if they wanted to make it into the top four. They certainly would have to avoid a big defeat to keep their chances for tomorrow intact.

First blood in this match, however, went to the Dutch:

| Board: 12. | Dlr: West/NS <br> a K 64 <br> © K Q J 1084 <br> $\diamond 97$ <br> \& 75 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ A Q 973 | N | ¢ 1082 |
| -A53 |  | $\bigcirc 76$ |
| $\diamond$ Q J 3 | W E | $\diamond$ A 1064 |
| \& K 8 | S | \& A Q J 6 |
|  | A J 5 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 92$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 852 |  |
|  | \& 109432 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Multon | Muller | Zimmermann |
| 1\& | $2 \oplus$ | Dble | Pass |
| 2ゅ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | All Pass |

Strong Club in action. 3 showed a non-minimum raise but 3NT showed a minimum. Muller then signed off in $4 \boldsymbol{A}$, the normal contract.
North led a heart which was allowed to hold. He shifted to a diamond which went to South's king and a heart came back, declarer winning the ace. De Wijs' next move was to cash the A. When he continued a club to dummy and a spade up to his $\boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ Q9, his problems were over when the jack appeared. Very well played for a fully deserved +420 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Van Prooijen Helness | Verhees |  |
| 1NT | $2 \diamond$ | Dble | Redbl |
| Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | Pass |
| $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

Over 1 NT, North bid a Multi $2 \diamond$. South's redouble asked North to bid his major and here too, the normal $4 \uparrow$ was reached.
When Helgemo immediately won the $৩ \mathrm{~K}$ lead and returned the suit, he was quickly one down. North took the trick and simply continued the suit, South overruffing dummy's 10 with the jack. Declarer later had to lose the $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} \mathrm{K}$ and $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ as well. Another +50 to 't Onstein and 10 IMPs.

On the next board, Monaco immediately hit back:
Board: 13. Dlr: North/All
A A 43
© 42
$\diamond$ K 854
\& K 763

| AK | N | A 65 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ AK 1097 | W E | - Q 8653 |
| $\diamond$ A Q | W E | $\diamond 62$ |
| \& J 1095 | S | \& A 84 |
|  | ^J109872 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 10973 |  |
|  | \& 2 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Multon | Muller | Zimmermann |
|  | Pass | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Dble | 4^ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Hearts were never mentioned so the Dutch had to be content with one down and +200 only.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Van ProoijenHelness |  | Verhees |
|  | Pass | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ |
| Dble | $4 \uparrow$ | $5 \circlearrowleft$ | All Pass |

Helness did not wait for his partner's second double
(or whatever) but went straight to $5 \circlearrowleft$ over $4 \uparrow$. Well judged and made with an overtrick for +680 and 10 IMPs back to Monaco.
Two quiet boards and then a Dutch hattrick of dou-ble-figure swings:

Board: 16. Dlr: West/EW
-AK8754
© Q 82
$\diamond$ K 10
\& Q 2

| ¢ 2 | N | ¢ J 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 6$ |  | © J 1043 |
| $\diamond$ J 765432 | W E | $\diamond$ Q 8 |
| \& 497 | S | \& K J 1065 |
|  | Q 963 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AK975 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A 9 |  |
|  | \& 4 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Multon | Muller | Zimmermann |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \varrho$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $5 \circlearrowleft$ | All Pass |  |

This time too, 3NT was "non-serious" but when South forgot to retreat to 5 over $5 \varrho$, the Monegasques suddenly were in the wrong game contract, having to lose two clubs and a trump as they were not playing on a double-dummy basis. 't Onstein +50 .
As the Dutch did not go beyond 4 , they could add another 11 IMPs to their tally as 4 made with two overtricks when the clubs were not cashed immediately.

Then:
Board: 17. Dlr: North/None

- K 52
© AK 65
$\diamond 872$
\& 632
か 109763
ऽ J 1084
$\diamond$ AK 5
\& $Q$

- Q J 8
$\bigcirc 72$
$\diamond$ J 103
\& K J 874
A A 4
© Q 93
$\diamond$ Q 964
\& A 1095

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Multon | Muller | Zimmemann |
| 1NT | Pass | Pass |  |
| $2 \boldsymbol{6}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Over the 10-12 NT, $2 \triangle$ showed majors so EW reached their spade fit without any trouble.
The defence started off with two rounds of trumps and a diamond back but when South did not play a heart after winning his $\% \mathrm{~A}$, two overtricks were the bonus. 't Onstein +670 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Van ProoijenHelness | Verhees |  |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |  |
| Pass | $1 \Omega$ | Pass | Pass |
| $1 ヵ$ | Dble | $2 \uparrow$ | Dble |
| Pass | $3 \Omega$ | All Pass |  |

The Monegasques were in 2 doubled as well but North wisely ran. $3 \bigcirc$ was not a success but two down undoubled at 50 per undertrick gave the Dutch another 11 IMPs.
$15^{\text {TH }}$ EUROPEAN CHAMPIONS' CUP

|  | ROUND 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | LT ILANKA | ALLEGRA | 10 | 29 | 4.25 | 15.75 |
| 2 | ONSTEIN | MOSSOP | 40 | 11 | 17.68 | 2.32 |
| 3 | RADKOV | RIEHM | 36 | 16 | 15.97 | 4.03 |
| 4 | SKALMAN | HEIMDAL | 0 | 37 | 1.16 | 18.84 |
| 5 | JT3 | BAMBERGER | 9 | 43 | 1.56 | 18.44 |
| 6 | MONACO | VILLA FABBRICHE 16 | 27 | 6.28 | 13.72 |  |


|  | ROUND 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | JT3 | ALLEGRA | 7 | 17 | 6.57 | 13.43 |
| 2 | MONACO | SKALMAN | 35 | 13 | 16.39 | 3.61 |
| 3 | VILLA FABBRICHE | RADKOV | 5 | 15 | 6.57 | 13.43 |
| 4 | BAMBERGER | ONSTEIN | 14 | 28 | 5.46 | 14.54 |
| 5 | HEIMDAL | LT ILANKA | 25 | 11 | 14.54 | 5.46 |
| 6 | RIEHM | MOSSOP | 0 | 51 | 0.00 | 20.00 |

## ROUND 9

| ALLEGRA | MOSSOP | 12 | 10 | 10.77 | 9.23 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LT ILANKA | RIEHM | 7 | 21 | 5.46 | 14.54 |
| ONSTEIN | HEIMDAL | 13 | 19 | 7.82 | 12.18 |
| RADKOV | BAMBERGER | 7 | 28 | 3.82 | 16.18 |
| SKALMAN | VILLA FABBRICHE | 4 | 26 | 3.61 | 16.39 |
| JT3 | MONACO | 9 | 36 | 2.66 | 17.34 |

ROUND 10

| 1 | HEIMDAL |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | RIEHM |
| 3 | MOSSOP |
| 4 | LT ILANKA |
| 5 | ONSTEIN |
| 6 | RADKOV |


| ALLEGRA | 21 | 19 | 10.77 | 9.23 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| BAMBERGER | 7 | 40 | 1.70 | 18.30 |
| VILLA FABBRICHE | 2 | 30 | 2.49 | 17.51 |
| MONACO | 14 | 24 | 6.57 | 13.43 |
| JT3 | 21 | 39 | 4.48 | 15.52 |
| SKALMAN | 13 | 31 | 4.48 | 15.52 |

## ROUND 11

ALLEGRA
VILLA FABBRICHE
BAMBERGER
HEIMDAL
RIEHM
MOSSOP

| MONACO | 4 | 34 | 2.16 | 17.84 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| JT3 | 11 | 8 | 11.14 | 8.86 |
| SKALMAN | 20 | 39 | 4.25 | 15.75 |
| RADKOV | 8 | 22 | 5.46 | 14.54 |
| ONSTEIN | 17 | 12 | 11.85 | 8.15 |
| LT ILANKA | 22 | 8 | 14.54 | 5.46 |

