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The five-year supremacy of Turin's GS Allegra team in this competition has come to an end. Last night, they were beaten at the post by Monaco who then went on to beat Germany's Bamberger Reiter by 32 IMPs in the semis and Norway's Heimdal by 77 IMPs in what already at the halfway point had become a formality as Monaco were 34 IMPs up at that point.

Our sincere congratulations thus go to Tor Helness, Geir Helgemo, Krzysztof Martens, Franck Multon, Pierre Zimmermann and Dominik Filipowicz.
In the other semifinal, Heimdal had secured its place in the final by beating Dutch clear Round Robin winners and therefore the bookmakers' favourites by 10 IMPs, having enjoyed a bigger lead earlier in the match after making good their initial deficit.
In the other finals, GS Allegra regained some of its reputation by winning the B final against France's Riehm team by 13 IMPs, thus ending in 5 th place.
The C final was won by Skalman from Sweden who beat local heroes JT3 by IMPS over their 32 boards.
The play-off for the bronze was won by Germany's Bamberger Reiter, who beat their Dutch rivals from 't Onstein by 7 IMPs, mainly due to board 22 described on page 21 in this Bulletin.
See you next year in Riga!


1st - MONACO
Franck Multon, Geir Helgemo, Dominik Filipowicz, Pierre Zimmermann, Krzysztof Martens, Tor Helness


2nd-HEIMDAL
Glenn Grøtheim, Allan Livgård, Per Erik Austberg, Peter Tøndel, Terje Aa, Jan Tore Berg


3rd-BAMBERGER REITER
Jörg Fritsche, Michael Gromöller, Helmut Häusler, Wojtek Gawel, Rafal Jagniewski, Martin Rehder

## CLOSING SPEECH

- $4 * \otimes^{2}$

H\&**

by Yves Aubry, EBL President



Mr Milan Bandić - Mayor of Zagreb<br>Mr Jurica Carić -<br>President of the Croatian Bridge Federation

Dear Friends,
Before starting officially this ceremony, I have the pleasure to award Gold medals to Marina Pilipović and Nikica Šver, winners of the Women's Pairs competition from the World Bridge Games in Wrocław.

The 15th edition of the European Bridge Champions' Cup is nearly ending and this EBL competition is now one of the major events of the international calendar with the participation of all top European players. I want to thank the city of Zagreb for its great support.

All my congratulations to the Croatian Bridge Federation, its President Jurica Carić, and all the organising committee led by Tvrtko Perković for the great job they have done to organise this 15th Champions' Cup in Zagreb.

I will ask Tvrtko Perković, On-Site Organiser, to come to the stage to receive a plaque from EBL.
I will ask Jurica Carić, President of the Croatian Bridge Federation, to come to the stage to receive a plaque from EBL.
I will ask Milan Bandić, Mayor of Zagreb, to come to the stage to receive a plaque from EBL.
I would like to thank all the staff members who have contributed to the perfect organisation of this competition.
Thank you to the organising committee
Davor Blaženčić - Jurica Carić - Josef Harsanyi - Tvrtko Perković - Fotis Skoularikis
Thank you to the On-site Organisers
Davor Blaženčić - Tvrtko Perković
Thank you to the TDs, IT System \& Scoring
Dušan Krautsak - Slawek Latala - Gianluca Barrese - Fotis Skoularikis
Thank you to the Daily Bulletin
Francesca Canali - Jos Jacobs - Iva Mrkić
Thank you to the Duplication \& caddies
Vanja Grahek - Tomislav Šašek - Matko Ferenca - Tori Vidović
Thank you to the Key-Board operators
Andrija Domitrović - Matea Grgurić - Marko Kučan - Marshall Lewis - Jurica Maričić- Tomislav Mergl -
Ante Mijić- Zoran Šimec - Kristijan Štefanec
Thank you also to all my colleagues of the EBL Executive Committee and the work done during the 2 days meetings.
But I would above all thank you the players, thanks to you this competition became an EBL major competition. You have given through those three days, a nice image of the bridge, a high level of play, a sport spirit and friendships.

I am confident that the 15th Champions Cup will be for all of you, players, officers, journalists and guests a great moment in the bridge.

Still one thanks to you all and have a safe return tomorrow to home.

## ROUND ROBIN, ROUND 11

## by Jos Jacobs

## ALLEGRA $\quad$ vs MONACO

Before the last round of the qualifications got underway, the top four at that moment all seemed to be in a comfortable position. The Dutch were already through and both the Bamberger Reiter and the Norwegians from Heimdal were looking pretty certain qualifiers. GS Allegra, in $4^{\text {th }}$ place, was only a few V.P. behind the $3^{\text {rd }}$ placed team and 11.49 V.P. ahead of the $5^{\text {th }}$ placed team, Monaco. So for them as well, prospects were not bad at all but there was a snag: GS Allegra and Monaco had to play each other in the last round, so Monaco needed just a 19-IMP victory or better to get past GS Allegra. An interesting match thus might well develop: an early Allegra lead might settle things prematurely but an early Monaco lead might well give us all a dramatic finish.
As it happened, neither of these two possible scenarios materialised. The match started very quietly though it could be seen that Monaco were eager to fight for every IMP. Take for example the second board:

| Board: 12. Dlr: West/NS <br> A 82 <br> $\checkmark$ Q 10 <br> $\diamond$ AK 1054 <br> \& A J 43 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AK 5 <br> © K 98 <br> $\diamond$ Q J 76 <br> \& K 865 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { か A J } 109763 \\ & \text { ® A } \\ & \diamond 932 \\ & \text { \& Q } 9 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ง Q } 4 \\ & \diamond \text { J } 765432 \\ & \diamond 8 \end{aligned}$$\text { \& } 1072$ |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Helgemo | Bilde | Helness | Duboin |
| 16 | $1 \diamond$ | 10 | Pass |
| 1NT | Pass | 40 | All Pass |

In the Open Room, 4↔ was down very quickly. South led his singleton, North cashed two top diamonds and South ruffed the $3^{\text {rd }}$ round of the suit. The $\%$ A then settled the issue. GS Allegra +50 .
In the other room, Zimmermann increased the stakes.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bianchedi | Multon | Madala | Zimmermann |
| $1 \mathbf{1}$ | 1 NT | $4 \uparrow$ | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Here too, South (Zimmermann) led his singleton but Multon, after winning his king, found the interesting return of a trump, which took away an entry to dummy. Madala then took about 20 minutes to think of a way to make his contract but in the end, he had no option but to accept defeat as the entry had gone to unblock the $\checkmark A$ and make a profitable discard on the QK.
So Monaco scored +100 and the first 2 IMPs to their credit.

On the next board, it was the other Monegasque pair who threw the axe:

Board: 13. Dlr: North/All
A Q 953
$\odot 4$
$\diamond$ Q 875
\& 9764
4 108
© J 1085
$\diamond$ A J 64
$\% A K Q$


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Bilde | Helness | Duboin |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 N T$ |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | 20 |
| Dble | Redbl | Pass | 2NT |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

West led a top club and continued the $\backsim \mathrm{J}$ which was allowed to hold. The next heart went to declarer's ace and a club came back. West won and led a low diamond to the nine and declarer's king. Duboin then cashed his $\smile \mathrm{K}$ and exited in hearts, Helgemo winning again. His two aces then put the contract one down: +200 to Monaco.
7
8

In the other room, the contract was a modest 1 NT when South opened his 15-17 hand and nobody doubled, but the play was different..

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bianchedi | Multon | Madala | Zimmermann |
|  | Pass | Pass | 1NT |

Top club and $\triangle \mathrm{J}$ but here, East overtook the $\backsim \mathrm{J}$ with his queen and declarer won the ace. He exited in clubs but West won and led a low heart to partner's $\triangle 9$ which declarer allowed to win the trick. This enabled East to push the $\diamond 10$ through. Declarer put up his king but West won and returned a low diamond to partner's nine. A low heart then was allowed to run to West's $\triangle 8$ and the last top club thus put this contract one down. GS Allegra a fine +100 but 3 more IMPs to Monaco.

Board 17 was a matter of luck (or inspiration).
Board: 17. Dlr: North/None
A A 5
©943
$\diamond$ A 7
\& A K Q 1095
\$ 104
© AK 872
$\diamond$ J 1096
\& 8




When Bilde opened 1\&, Helgemo got the opportunity to show his modest values in the red suits but with the 3NT contract placed in the South hand already, West's heart lead was automatic and resulted in a quick one down. Monaco +50 .
In the other room, Multon opened a well-timed offshape 2 NT and he thus became declarer in the normal enough 3NT.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bianchedi | Multon | Madala | Zimmermann |
|  | $2 N T$ | Pass |  |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

When East led a "routine" spade rather than an aggressive $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$ (would you have found this killing lead??), declarer had 11 tricks. Monaco +460 and 11 IMPs to them.

At this point, the score in the match had become 23-4 to Monaco. This 19-IMP difference meant that Monaco would qualify by the smallest of margins: 0,01 V.P.!

However, they settled the issue more clearly two boards later.

Board: 19. Dlr: South/EW |  |  |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | \& Q 9 |
|  | $\diamond$ A Q J 9765 |
|  | \& A 87 |

ヘK106432
© 74
$\diamond$ K 104
\& Q 4


985
คA1086532
$\diamond$--
\&) 953
A A Q J
$\checkmark$ K J
$\diamond 832$
of K J 1062

| West <br> Helgemo | North <br> Bilde | East <br> Helness | South <br> Duboin <br> $1 N T$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $5 \%$ | Pass | $6 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

2NT showed diamonds and after a few cuebids, the ambitious slam was reached. $6 \diamond$ would have been the slightly superior slam but knowing about partner's $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$ and wanting to protect his major suit holdings, Duboin opted for the NT slam.
With the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ right and the $\& \mathrm{Q}$ doubleton, 6 NT is cold on a double-dummy basis but on a heart lead to the ace and a spade back, Duboin now had no option but to win his ace and to try to bring in both minor suits without loss. When a low diamond to the jack held, the first hurdle had been taken but when he next cashed the $\% \mathrm{~A}$ and led a club to the jack and queen, he had to accept two down. Monaco +100 .


| West <br> Bianchedi | North <br> Multon | East <br> Madala | South <br> Zimmemann |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1ヵ | $2 \diamond$ |  | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | $2 \diamond$ | $3 N T$ |
|  |  | Pass | $5 \diamond$ |

So all Monaco had to do (without knowing it, of course), was to go plus on this board at the other table. The y duly did so, as you can see from the auction, and the $11-\mathrm{IMP}$ gain here meant Monaco had won the match $34-4$, more than enough to qualify at the expense of the holders.


## SEMIFINALS A, ROUND 1

BAMBERGER R. vs MONACO
TONSTEIN

For the two semifinals A, I shall once again adopt the idea of presenting a combined report about both the matches., even more so because more often than not, the interesting boards would produce swings everywhere.
This basic idea already paid off on the second board of the set, a wonderful misfit:

## Board: 2. Dlr: East/NS

A A Q J 107
$\checkmark 2$
$\diamond 3$
\& K Q 10965
AK98632
© K 109
$\diamond 7$
\& 732


A 5

- Q 86
$\diamond$ KJ 9864
of $\mathrm{A} J 8$
A 4
© AJ7543
$\diamond$ A Q 1052
\& 4

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Jagniewski | Helness | Gawel |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \Omega$ |
| $2 \circlearrowleft$ | $3 ¢$ | Pass | $3 \circlearrowleft$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

When Helgemo showed his spades in transfer mode and North passed, Gawel could do little better than rebid his longer suit. A double would have been a great success but on this hand, it seems rather far-fetched.
Down one on the obvious but helpful diamond lead, Monaco +50.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Häusler | Multon | Fritsche | Martens |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \circlearrowleft$ |
| $1 ヵ$ | $2 \hookleftarrow$ | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | $3 \%$ | All Pass |  |

Over just 1ヵ, Multon had the chance to show one of his suits, actually the far better one, and when he took out partner's $2 \triangle$ rebid into $3 \boldsymbol{\%}$, the pair had
reached a very good contract for a deserved overtrick, +130 and 6 IMPs to Monaco.
In the other match, the misfit also caused havoc:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Groetheim | Drijver | Tondel <br>  <br>  <br> Dble | Nab |
| 1NT | $2 \diamond$ | $1 \Omega$ |  |
| 2 | All Pass |  | $2 \circlearrowleft$ |

Over West's double, North showed his clubs in transfer mode but when West bid $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ at his next turn, everybody was happy (?). Down three, 't Onstein +150 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Livgaard | Muller | $A a$ |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \diamond$ |
| $2 \diamond$ | $3 \&$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

After the nebulous $1 \diamond$ by East, South took the chance to show both his suits, so the typical misfit contract of 3NT was reached, West having transferred to his spades in the meantime. The hopeless affair went two down for another +100 and 6 IMPs to the Dutch.


Back to Monaco and the Reiter again for an intere－ sting partscore swing：


All Pass

When Häusler did not open the bidding，Multon did． When Martens responded $1 \boldsymbol{A}$ ，the modern replace－ ment for the natural 1 NT ，the balancing Germans found their heart fit but reaching 2 had become too much for the Monegasques．
When the defence failed to attack the black suits on time，the contract even rolled home for another +110 and thus 6 IMPS to the Reiter．

## －ヘロ・ノ

Board 6 seemed to be an easy enough 3NT for NS but not all four SF pairs passed this test：


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Jagniewski | Helness <br> Gawel |  |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{6}$ |
| 1ヵ | $2 \diamond$ | Dble | $3 \boldsymbol{6}$ |
| 3ゅ | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

$2 \diamond$ was natural and ORF．No problem on any lead
$2 \diamond$ was natural and ORF．No problem on any lead
with the hearts well－placed．On a spade lead，Bamber－ ger Reiter +400 ．

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Häusler | Multon | Fritsche | Martens <br>  <br> $1 ヵ$ |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{6}$ |  |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \circlearrowleft$ |
|  | All Pass |  |  |

Multon did not know about partner＇s $6^{\text {th }}$ club so he simply rebid his own suit．There it rested，Monaco +130 but 7 IMPs to the Reiter．

No swing in the other match，both teams duly rea－ ching 3NT．．．

A well diagnosed matchpoint－style balancing action by NS．In relatively short K．O．matches，the partscores can play an important role．A nice +140 to the Reiter when the NS hands fitted reasonably well together．

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Häusler | Multon | Fritsche | Martens |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\&}$ | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\$}$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\&}$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | $2 \circlearrowleft$ | All Pass |


6

There was a swing in the other match on the next board, and it was a big one:


All Pass
When Nab opened $3 \diamond$ as dealer, everybody was stuck. It was not the best NS contract, however. Down three, Heimdal +300 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Livgaard | Muller | Aa <br> Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | $2 \uparrow$ | $4 \checkmark$ | All Pass |

When South at the other table passed as dealer, a much less aggressive approach, West could open $2 \diamond$, the classic three-suiter with short diamonds. East had an automatic $4 \bigcirc$ bid but when West's hearts proved a little weak and the adverse distribution a little unfriendly, Muller, trying to get some tricks from everywhere, went no less than three down for another +300 and 12 IMPs to Heimdal. The problem was that Muller took a free diamond finesse that lost and then had his $\diamond$ A ruffed by North...
On the next board, both declarers in $4 \bigcirc$ found the successful endplay.

Board: 8. Dlr: West/None
A 10972
$\checkmark$ J 94
$\diamond$ A 2
\& 9532


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Jagniewski | Helness | Gawel |
| $1 \Omega$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Dble |
| $3 \Omega$ | All Pass |  |  |

In the Monaco match, Helgemo played in 30 when Helness saw no good reason to raise.
Ten tricks, Monaco +170
The Germans were in $4 \triangle$ when East found a rebid over 39 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Häusler | Multon | Fritsche | Martens |
| $1 \varnothing$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $3 \varnothing$ | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $4 \varnothing$ | All Pass |  |  |

The lead of the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and another did not make life more difficult for declarer. He won South's nine with the ten and played off three rounds of trumps. North won the jack and returned a club but declarer could ruff and now played off all his trumps on which South had to give the show away by eventually throwing his $\% \mathrm{~A}$ or undergo the squeeze by holding on to his A but blanking his $\boldsymbol{\wedge} \mathrm{K}$ instead. He chose the latter, of course, but declarer made no mistake. He cashed the A, felling the king, and finished with an overtrick. Bamberger Reiter +450 and 7 IMPs to them.

In the other match, Groetheim also was in $4 \checkmark$.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Groetheim | Drijver | Tondel | Nab |
| $1 \varnothing$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Dble |
| $4 \varnothing$ | All Pass |  |  |

Though he got the best lead of a club, he found the endplay as well and emerged with just ten tricks, Heimdal +420 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Livgaard | Muller | $A a$ |
| 106 | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | 1 NT |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

South showed minors with his 1NT against West's strong Club. When East showed his suit over partner's strong rebid, there it suddenly rested. One down, Heimdal another +50 and 10 IMPs to take the lead.

The next board produced one disaster in each match:

## Board: 9. Dlr: North/EW

A Q 9765
$\bigcirc 852$
$\diamond 108$
\& Q 42

A 2
©K763
$\diamond$ K Q J 3
\& A 1086


AA10843
$\bigcirc$ J
$\diamond 76542$
\& K 7
^ K J
© A Q 1094
$\diamond$ A 9
\& J 953

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Jagniewski | Helness | Gawel |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \Omega$ |
| Pass | 1NT | $2 \uparrow$ | Dble |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{6}$ |
| Pass | $3 \Omega$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

North's 1 NT was natural and not forcing.
Helness' daring overcall (vul. against not) did its job once South thought he was too strong to pass.
The defence was quite efficient, as so often from this pair. Spade to the ace, spade ruff, top diamond which held trick and another diamond to declarer's ace. When declarer next did not play a trump but rather a club to the queen and East's king, Helness could return the suit
for his partner to score two tricks in it followed by an overruff of dummy with East's bare $๑ \mathrm{~J}$. The $৩ \mathrm{~K}$ then put the contract down four: Monaco +800 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Häusler | Multon | Fritsche | Martens |
|  | Pass | Pass | 10 |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\infty}$ |
| Pass | $2 \Phi$ | All Pass |  |

When Martens' $2 \boldsymbol{*}$ Gazzilli produced a negative response, the auction came to rest in $2 \Omega$. This went down two alright but as it was not doubled, the loss of 100 points still was worth a 12-IMP swing to Monaco.
In the other match, Heimdal also had the chance to double the opponents in $3 \bigcirc$ :

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Groetheim | Drijver | Tondel <br> Nab |  |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | $2 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Dble |
| Pass | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |

When Tondel bid $4 \diamond$ over $3 \diamond$, NS were out of danger. Heimdal +130 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Livgaard | Muller | $A a$ |
|  | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | $2 \wedge$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

In the other room, North tried a light Multi and soon had to pay for it. Down three, +500 and 9 IMPs to 't Onstein.


The next board produced a small partscore swing to Heimdal when the Dutch went down at both tables but one board later, the Dutch regained the lead:

Board: 11. Dlr: South/None
© Q
© A J 52
$\diamond$ J 762
\& A 763
AA10853
© Q 984
$\diamond 85$
\& 54


- K J 2
© K 63
$\diamond$ K 9
\& K Q J 92

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Groetheim | Drijver | Tondel | Nab <br> $1 \& 6$ <br> 14 |
| Dble | $4 \uparrow$ | Dble |  |

All Pass

Well, $5 \%$ is on for NS but on this distribution, down four was inevitable. 't Onstein +800 .

| West <br> De Wijs | North <br> Livgaard | East <br> Muller | South <br> Aa |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | 1 NT |

With the solid double stopper in spades, 3NT is ice-
cold but it is easy to understand that North did not believe in this, looking at his singleton spade. So the Norwegians reached $5 \%$, the second-best spot, still good for +400 but also good for a loss of 9 IMPs.

## Board: 12. Dlr: West/NS

A 105
$\checkmark$ A 3
$\diamond$ KJ 9852
\& Q 63
か J 7632
๑ 1076
$\diamond$ A 106
\& J 2


A Q
© K Q 4
$\diamond$ Q 3
\& A K 109754
AAK 984
○J9852
$\diamond 74$
88

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Groetheim | Drijuer | Tondel | Nab |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | $3 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | All Pass |

On the next board, East overcalled the probable weak two in diamonds and played there for one down when he did not make the unlikely play of finessing the ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{Q}$ through the pre-emptive bidder. 't Onstein +50 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Livgaard | Muller | $A a$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | $3 \uparrow$ | $3 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

This contract also went down two for another +200 and 6 IMPs more to 't Onstein.


| Gо то PAGE: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 11 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 13 | 14 |  | 15 |  | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | RESULTS |  |

Three boards from the end, there was a slam, but how to get there when the opponents open 1 NT ?

| Board. 1453 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 87653$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond 87$ |  |  |  |
| \& K 2 |  |  |  |
| \$ 8764$\times 4$ | N | ^K Q 1092 |  |
|  |  | $\bigcirc$ J 9 |  |
| $\diamond 109653$ | 3 W E | $\diamond$ A Q |  |
| \&976 | S | \& Q J 5 |  |
|  | A A |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 102 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K J 42 |  |  |
|  | \& A 1083 |  |  |
| West <br> Helgemo | North | East | South |
|  | Jagniewski | Helness | Gawel |
|  |  | 1NT | Pass |
| $2 \%$ | Pass | 24 | Dble |
| Pass | $4 \checkmark$ | All Pass |  |

The NS pair for the Bamberger Reiter did not find the solution and thus scored +480 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Häusler | Multon | Fritsche | Martens |
|  |  | $1 \uparrow$ | Dble |
| $2 \uparrow$ | $4 \checkmark$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | Redbl |
| Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | Pass | $6 \Phi$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West's double of 4d dissuaded a spade lead.
When East opened 19 at the other table, South could take immediate action. South could then show a
strong hand with first-round control in spades. When North was polite enough to next show his $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} \mathrm{K}$, Martens knew enough and bid the excellent (in view of the opening bid) heart slam for a well-deserved +980 and 11 IMPs to Monaco.

In the other match:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Groetheim | Drijver | Tondel <br> To | Nab <br> Dble |
| 3ゅ | $4 \varrho$ | $4 \uparrow$ | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Once again the Norwegians were in sacrifice mode and once again, the outcome was doubtful. Yes, NS were good for +980 but what would you prefer? A possible -980 or a certain -800?
Down four, 't Onstein +800 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| De Wijs | Livgaard | Muller | Aa |
|  |  | 14 | Dble |
| 34 | 45 | Pass | 4a |
| Pass | 5\% | Pass | 50 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Had Terje Aa shown the same courage as Martens did in the other match, he too would have scored $980 \ldots$..As it was, Heimdal lost 8 IMPs on the board.
At halftime, the scores read:

## BAMBERGER R. vs MONACO

25-37
'T ONSTEIN vs HIEIMDAL
48-36

## SEMIIFINALS A，ROUND 2

| BAMBERGER $r . ~ v s ~ M O N A C O ~$ <br> TONSTEIN |
| :--- | :--- |
| HEIMDAL |

Monaco started the second segment with a 12－IMP lead but they lost it on the third board of the set：：


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Helgemo | Jagniewski | Helness | Gawel |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 19 | Dble | 30 | 4a |

Gawel made the play of this hand look extremely easy．He won the МK opening lead and led a dia－ mond to the king and ace．Taking the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ as a true card，his next moves were spade to the ace and a spa－ de to dummy＇s ten．Curtains．He only lost two clubs in the end．Reiter +650 ．

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Häusler | Multon | Fritsche | Zimmermann |
| $1 \circlearrowleft$ |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | $2 \Omega$ | $3 \uparrow$ |
|  | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

In the replay，the first two tricks were the same but after winning dummy＇s $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ ，declarer proceeded with the $\boldsymbol{K}$ and a spade to the ace．Rather than turning his attention to clubs，declarer went on to cash the $\diamond Q$ and cross－ruff diamonds and hearts before le－ ading a club．This enabled West to rise with the of A and remove all the trumps by drawing the master trump followed by the $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$ on which declarer could di－
scard his $13^{\text {th }}$ club．There was no way left for declarer to escape the loss of one more club trick．One down， another +100 and 13 IMPs to the Reiter．
On the next board，the problem for EW was to find the best denomination：

Board：20．Dlr：West／All
－ 987
$\bigcirc$－－
$\diamond$ AKQ 875
\＆Q 632
－AK J 1052
๑A 72
$\diamond 92$
\＆K 10


A Q 43
© K Q 1084
$\diamond$ J 3
\＆A J 5
A 6
๑J9653
$\diamond 1064$
\＆ 9874

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Jagniewski | Helness | Gawel |
| $1 ヵ$ | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

Nothing wrong with the final contract except when the trumps are 5－0．One down，Reiter +100 ．

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Häusler | Multon | Fritsche | Zimmermann |
| $1 ヵ$ | $2 \diamond$ | $3 \diamond$ | $5 \diamond$ |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

When the defence played trumps on every occa－ sion，declarer could only ruff one spade and thus went down three．This would not have been too costly had his team－mates been in 4 4 ．As it was，this Monaco -800 brought the Reiter a further 14 IMPs and sud－ denly a 15－IMP lead．
In the other match，there were no sacrifices but just a difference in choice of games：

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Austberg | Van ProoijenBerg | Verhees |  |
| $1 ヵ$ | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

Nothing special，Heimdal +650

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Livgaard | Muller | $A a$ |
| $1 \uparrow$ | $3 \odot$ | $3 \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ |
| $4 \diamond$ | $5 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | $5 \circlearrowleft$ | All Pass |

$3 \%$ showed either hearts or minors and $3 \diamond$ showed hearts.
Please note that the Norwegian interference made it virtually impossible for EW even to mention spades. EW next got the chance to defend $5 \diamond$ but when they bid on, a big plus changed into a disappointing (and unexpected) minus. Two down, +200 and 13 IMPs to Heimdal who thus regained the lead, never to lose it again.
Three boards later, the ambiguity of the Polish style $1 \diamond$ opening bid had its effects:

Board: 23. Dlr: South/All
© K 107
$\bigcirc$--
$\diamond A K 10853$
\& Q 952


- 852

○K10752
$\diamond 2$
\& A K 63

| West <br> Helgemo | North <br> Jagniewski | East <br> Helness | South <br> Gawel <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass $1 \diamond$ $1 N T$ | Dble |  |  |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

As long as $1 \diamond$ does not necessarily show a long suit, 1 NT seems a sound alternative to a straightforward $1 \Omega$ overcall. When South doubled, West had nowhere to go and so thought East.
South led the $\triangle 5$ and dummy's $\triangle 6$ won the trick. A spade went to declarer's queen and a low heart was taken by South with the king. The defence next cashed four club tricks, South winning the last one and exiting in spades to North's ten and declarer's ace.
With the heart communication blocked, declarer could not make more than five tricks from this point. Two down, +500 to the Reiter.
In the other room, Fritsche overcalled just $1 \Omega$.


| West <br> Häusler | North <br> Multon | East <br> Fritsche | South <br> Zimmemann |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \diamond$ | Pass Pass |

Multon, looking at his heart void and minimum opening, was anticipating an unwanted penalty pass by partner and therefore made the wise decision to pass. One down, +100 to Monaco but 9 IMPs to the Reiter.

In the other match, Verhees found a light opening bid:

| West <br> Austberg | North <br> Van Prooijen | East <br> Berg | South <br> Verhees |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | $1 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | $1 ヵ$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

North's 1ه response was already GF and $3 \diamond$ over the $2 \diamond$ further relay showed 3-5-1-4.
On the combined sub-minimal hands, 3NT had no chance when East led a heart to dummy's ten and West's jack. Down two, Heimdal +200 .
At the other table, a well-timed pre-empt by North did the job:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Livgaard | Muller | Aa <br> Pass |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | $3 \diamond$ | All Pass |

Nobody doubled but -300 was not a good score for the Dutch anyway. Heimdal another 11 IMPs.


| Board: 24. | Dlr: West/ <br> A 109 <br> $\checkmark$ AK 53 <br> $\diamond$ K J 52 <br> \& K Q 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A Q 763 | N | A K J 85 |
| $\bigcirc$ J 1096 |  | $\bigcirc 2$ |
| $\diamond$ A 10983 | W | $\diamond$ Q 7 |
| \& -- | S | \& 1098743 |
|  | A A 42 |  |
|  | - Q 874 |  |
|  | $\diamond 64$ |  |
|  | \& A J 52 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Jagniewski | Helness | Gawel |
| Pass | $1 N T$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{6}$ |
| Pass | $2 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | $4 \varrho$ |

All Pass
Against this normal enough contract, East found the club lead. West ruffed and when declarer played dummy's jack on West's return of the $\diamond 9$, the second ruff and the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ put the contract one down. Monaco +50 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Häusler | Multon | Fritsche | Zimmermann |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{0}$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Dble | $1 \odot$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{6}$ |
| Pass | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | $4 \circlearrowleft$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

South's $1 \diamond$ showed hearts and West's double showed diamonds. On this auction, $4 \bigcirc$ was made easily with an overtrick when East led the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$, solving the problem in that suit.
Monaco another +450 and 11 IMPs to them.
In the other match, NS were talked out of their best fit:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Austberg | Van ProoijenBerg | Verhees |  |
| $2 \diamond$ | Dble | 3ム | Dble |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

West opened $2 \diamond$ showing a weak hand with both majors. I do not think NS can be blamed for not getting to $4 \triangle$ now any more but on the other hand, going down four in $4 \diamond$ does not look very good either, even more so when $3 \boldsymbol{s}$ is probably going down - and certainly so on the mandatory repeated trump leads. Heimdal thus scored +200 here.
And what about a simple 3NT? Anyone?

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Livgaard | Muller | Aa |
| Pass | 1NT | Pass | $2 \wedge$ |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Dble | 3NT | All Pass |  |

There are 8 top tricks because the hearts do not break, so a good diamond guess, or, as happened at this table, the lead of the $\diamond$ Q, would see $3 N T$ contract home. Heimdal another +430 and 12 more IMPs.

Then, Monaco hit back strongly:
Board: 25. Dlr: North/EW
A 864
๑ J 109764
$\diamond$--
\& Q 854

- KQ 92
$\checkmark$ AKQ 82
$\diamond 95$
\& A 7


A A 75
๑ 53
$\diamond$ AK 1042
\& K 93

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Jagniewski <br> Helness | Gawel <br> Pass |  |
|  | $3 \Omega$ | Pass | Pass |

With no solo penalty double of $3 \bigcirc$ available, Helgemo took his second best shot by bidding 3NT.
With the diamonds not behaving, this was a hopeless affair but as nobody had doubled, the costs were a mere -200 on the lead of a low club to the nine and ace..

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Häusler | Multon | Fritsche | Zimmermann |
|  | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | $4 \varnothing$ |
| Dble | Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The auction at the other table was amusing for the neutral observer, one might say. How could Fritsche possibly know he had to pass? Was his void a clear enough indication of what was going on? Should Häusler himself have passed $4 \checkmark$ ?
Anyway, down three and +800 brought Monaco another 12 IMPs to regain the lead by just 3 IMPs.

| бо то раGE: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 15 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 13 | 14 |  | 15 |  | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | RESULTS |  |

In the other match, both Wests were in 3NT and received a club lead, but with different outcomes.

| West | North $\quad$ East | South |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Austberg | Van Prooijen Berg | Verhees |  |
|  | 30 | Pass | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Dummy played the J which held the trick and now, declarer made the interesting move of playing the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ to South's king, North throwing a heart. South returned a club to declarer's now blank ace and declarer went on to drive out the With all EW communication gone, South then could afford to cash the $\% \mathrm{~K}$ and the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ before exiting with his last spade, giving declarer a choice of evils.
Elegantly done, 't Onstein +100 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Livgaard | Muller | Aa |
|  | 39 | Pass | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

At the other table, contract and opening lead were the same but declarer immediately went after the spades. South took his ace and returned a club but declarer could win, cash all his major suit winners and exit in diamonds, forcing South to bring a trick in the suit to dummy in the end. Well played, another +600 and 12 IMPs to 't Onstein to reduce the score to 87-60 to Heimdal.

On the next board, we saw the end of the Bamberger Reiter aspirations...
$\left.\begin{array}{llll}\text { Board: 26. } & \text { Dlr: East/All } \\ & \text { \& K Q } 65\end{array}\right]$

On this diabolical layout, declarer may have escaped for even down only one but after two top diamonds and a club shift, declarer ran into a club overruff when he tried to get back to his hand for another spade to dummy. Down three, Monaco +800 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Häusler | Multon | Fritsche | Zimmermann |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | 1NT | 30\% | Dble |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | 4品 |

Same contract but no double and no trouble at the other table. Two diamonds and a club to the ace. When declarer sued his heart entries to hand for trump plays, he went just two down for -200 but 12 IMPs to Monaco who now lead by 15.
This proved enough, even more so when Monaco added 16 more IMPs on the final two boards. as. The final score: $96-68$ to Monaco.

Board: 30. Dlr: East/None
A 9
$\bigcirc 965$
$\diamond$ AK9632
\& 873
A 654
© K Q J
$\diamond$ J 10874
$\rightarrow$ A 2


AKQ732
© A 8
$\diamond$ Q 5
\& K 654
A A J 108
®107432
$\diamond-$
\& Q J 109

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Austberg | Van ProoijenBerg | Verhees |  |
|  |  | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 4 | All Pass |

$3 \diamond$ was invitational with at least three cards in spades. The final contract was normal but a shade too high. Two down, +100 to 't Onstein.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Livgard | Muller | Aa |
| $2 \triangleleft$ |  | 1ヵ | Pass |
| Dble | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West's $2 \triangle$ was a constructive spade raise and his double of $3 \diamond$ speaks loudly for itself.

1100 points later the score read 87-77 to Heimdal but there it rested when the final boards were flat in this match.


## FINAL A, ROUND 1

## by Jos Jacobs

## HEIMDAL <br> MONACO

The final of this year's edition of the Champions Cup, after the maybe or maybe not surprising results of the two semifinals, thus would be contested by Norway's Heimdal and Monaco.
The scoreboard started moving immediately on board1 with an overtrick to Monaco and then again on board two with two extra undertricks for Monaco in their inferior partscore. So Heimdal led 5-1 when the double-figure swings entered the scene:

## Board: 3. Dlr: South/EW

© Q J 42
© Q 108
$\diamond$ A 865
\& 52
A A 9873

- A 65
$\diamond$ J 2
\& K 109


A 6
$\bigcirc 732$
$\diamond$ K 10743
\& A Q 74
A K 105
© K J 94
$\diamond$ Q 9
\& J 863

| West <br> Helgemo | North <br> Berg | East <br> Helness | South <br> Austberg <br> $1 N T$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | Redbl |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Dble | $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

The NS escape system after their 8-12 NT opening bids worked well for the Norwegians but as there are no provisions in it to cope with adverse 5-1 trump breaks, they had to concede down two and -300 in 2 after all. Two hearts, three trumps and the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ was all NS could get.

| West <br> Groetheim | North <br> Multon | East <br> Tondel | South <br> Martens |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1NT | Rble | Pass | Pass | Redbl

Martens'1NT opening 1NT was a shade stronger than Austberg's (10-12 as to 8-12) so North had an
obvious pass over the redouble.
Declarer won the low spade lead and played two rounds of hearts before reverting to spades. West won the third round of that suit and shifted to the $\diamond$ J. East won the king and then very much had to regret his mistake of discarding two low clubs rather than diamonds on the spades. Had he held on to both of his clubs, the defence could have taken four quick club tricks now which would have resulted in down one. With the setting tricks gone, declarer could no longer avoid making 7 tricks for the unusual score of +560 . This was good for 13 IMPs to Monaco rather than just 3 , had the contract been defeated.

On the next board, the failure to lead or play trumps cost Heimdal dearly:

| Board: 4. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dlr: West/All } \\ & \text { \& K } 3 \\ & \text { ®A } 97543 \\ & \diamond \text { Q } 7 \\ & \text { \& } 876 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A Q 1095 | N | A AJ87642 |
| $\bigcirc 862$ |  | $\bigcirc$ K Q 10 |
| $\diamond 104$ |  | $\diamond 6$ |
| \& K J 109 | S | \& Q 3 |
|  | A -- |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AKJ 985 | 32 |
|  | \& A 42 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Berg | Helness | Austberg |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \diamond$ | $5 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

$2 \circlearrowleft$ was Multi but Austberg was not interested. When Helness led a trump, half of the good defensive work was already done. The now more obvious second half of the good work came when Helgemo, after being given his club trick, returned another trump to secure the survival of his last good club.
One down, Monaco +100 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Groetheim | Multon | Tondel | Martens |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | $5 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

This result should have been duplicated in the replay, I think, but it was not.
West made the OK lead of the $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$ to king and ace, and even East's return of a heart did not hurt the defence. When declarer next led two rounds of clubs, East winning his queen, playing a trump did matter, however. When East persisted with spades, declarer could ruff, give up a club and ruff his last club with dummy's last remaining trump for his contract. Monaco another +600 and 12 more IMPs.

Two more IMPs to Monaco on \#5 and then a possible slam:

> Board: 6. Dlr: East/EW
> A 8432
> $\checkmark$ J
> $\diamond 1097642$
> \& 105
> © 1062
> $\diamond$ AK 53
> \& 9764

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Berg | Helness | Austberg |
| Dble | 4 | $1 \%$ | $2 \propto$ |
|  |  | $5 \%$ | All Pass |

Possible to bid slam, that is, but rather impossible to make on the J lead, though both BBO and the official scorecard show 12 tricks as the result of this contract. Monaco +600 or +620 .

It did not matter, as we shall see shortly:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Groetheim | Multon | Tondel <br> To | Martens |
|  |  | $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $2 \diamond$ |
| 5 | $3 \uparrow$ | $4 \%$ | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | $6 \boldsymbol{4}$ | All Pass |

$2 \diamond$ showed majors and thus, $2 \triangleleft$ was a club raise. Maybe, Tondel overbid by going to $6 \boldsymbol{6}$, in view of his now useless heart holding. No chance, Monaco another +100 and 12 IMPs, no matter what the exact result at the other table would be. Suddenly, Monaco were leading 40-5.

After two flat boards, Heimdal finally hit back:


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | Berg | Helness <br> Austberg |  |
|  | $1 N T$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{0}$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

When West hit upon the unlucky lead of a low heart, declarer could easily come to ten tricks: two hearts, two heart ruffs, two club ruffs in hand with small trumps, the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and three more trump tricks from his - KQ108 once the $\$ 9$ made an early appearance. Heimdal +420 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Groetheim | Multon | Tondel | Martens |
|  | 1 NT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 30 |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Multon's weak NT and Martens' Smolen-style 3@ led to a simple $4 \boldsymbol{\top}$ in the replay as well. However, when West led a low diamond to the queen, king and ace, the situation had changed considerably.
Declarer returned a diamond to East's jack and a heart came back, West's king winning. When West did not cash his good diamond but returned a heart instead, declarer had some hope when he tried to ruff out the $\% \mathrm{~A}$ but when he ran the $\% \mathrm{~K}$ and threw his last diamond, West won the ace as the $3^{\text {rd }}$ defensive trick with the Atill out. One down, Heimdal another +50 and 10 much needed IMPs back.
Heimdal added 2 IMPs for one less undertrick to their score over the next five boards but on the final board of the segment, Monaco may well have managed to already put the match out of reach for Heimdal:

RESULTS


3\% showed a good heart raise.
East led a club to declarer's ace and next came the $\diamond 5$ on which East contributed the three. Your methods are high-low to show an even number. What should you do as West when declarer inserts dummy's jack?
From partner's $\diamond 3$, his lowest, you may well deduce that declarer has a singleton diamond, in which case it is probably best to win the ace, though we can see (double-dummy) that playing low to this trick beats the contract immediately. Trumps are 4-1 and declarer is sort of stranded in dummy at this point.


problem is, of course, that partner can hold exactly $\diamond$ Q3, in which case ducking your ace is mandatory and also automatic.
However, if you win the ace and return a spade away from your ace, declarer has to believe in his luck. He can draw four rounds of trumps and then (hopefully) enjoy the diamonds. Alternatively, he can play for trumps 3-2 and thus start by ruffing out the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$, just in case this would be necessary.

At the table, upon winning the spade return, declarer followed the latter line and first played another diamond. The queen duly appeared but from this point, declarer could not both remove the outstanding trumps and enjoy the diamonds any more. One down, Monaco +50 .
The same contract and the same lead at the other table.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Groetheim | Multon | Tondel | Martens |
| 10 | $1 \Phi$ | $3 \boldsymbol{6}$ | $4 \Omega$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Here too, declarer won the $\& \mathrm{~A}$ and led the $\diamond 5$, East playing the three (high-low count). The jack was called for and here too, West won his ace prematurely, facing the same problem as above.
A spade came back here, too, but when Multon won the trick with his king, he simply went for his luck. Four rounds of trumps and then a diamond produced the queen and an overtrick.

Monaco another +450 and 11 IMPs to lead 51-17 at halftime. Would the second half be a fight or more of a formality?

## PLAY-OFF FOR 3 ${ }^{\text {RD }}$ PLACE

## T ONSTEIN

vs BAMBERGER R.
By far the most spectacular hand of the whole event occurred in the play-off for 3rd place between the old rivals from Germany and the Netherlands.


| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| De Wijs | Jagniewski | Muller | Gawel |
|  |  | 1\% | 30 |
| 34 | 4® | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

In the Closed Room, the Polish pair playing for the German team launched some aggressive intervention against the Strong Club. In a sense, they were quite right as the Dutch came nowhere near their vulnerable diamond slam but contented themselves with five undertricks and +1100 .
The play was straightforward. Two top spades and a diamond. Declarer ruffed the second diamond and took two losing club finesses. That gave the defence five tricks and there still were three trump tricks to come.
So it would be a 7-IMP gain for the Reiter if their EW pair would manage to get to $6 \diamond$, their proper contract.

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gromöller | Van ProoijenFritsche | Verhees |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $1 \diamond$ | $2 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Dble | $3 \diamond$ | $6 \diamond$ | Pass |  |  |  |
| $7 \diamond$ | Dble | All Pass |  |  |  |  |

After Fritsche's $6 \diamond$ bid, we saw a comedy of errors. First of all, Gromöller fell into the duplication trap. North was quick to double, thus suggesting an ace or a void but eventually, the spotlight turned on poor South who had to find a lead.
When he produces the $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$, declarer had all 13 tricks as his clubs just disappeared on the spades with the help of one ruff.
Bamberger Reiter thus registered the highest score of the tournament: +2330 . This was good for 15 IMPs rather than the expected (or hoped for) 7 but distinctly more than the 16 -IMP loss had the contract duly gone down...
Needless to say that this board contributed heavily to the German win in this play-off.
In the match between Villa Fabbriche and LT Ilanka, the Italians also bid and made $7 \diamond$ but they were not doubled and thus have to remain out of contention for the top score.

At another table, an EW pair was asking too much when they bid 7NT.
There was no squeeze available...

## RESULTS

SEMIFINALS GROUP A - ( $\left.1^{\mathrm{ST}}-4^{\mathrm{TH}}\right)$

| BC'T ONSTEIN | SET 1 | SET 2 | TOT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 48 | 29 | 77 |  |
|  | HET 1 | SET 2 | TOT |
| HEIMDAL | 36 | 51 | $\mathbf{8 7}$ |


| FINAL GROUP A1 - (1 ${ }^{\text {ST }}-2^{\text {ND }}$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $4$ | HEIMIDAL | SET 1 | SET 2 | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOT } \\ 40 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | MONACO | SET 1 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { SET } 2 \\ 66 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { TOT } \\ & 117 \end{aligned}$ |

FINAL GROUP A2 - (3

| $\mathbf{R D}$ | $\left.-\mathbf{4}^{\mathrm{TH}}\right)$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BC'T ONSTEIN | SET 1 | SET 2 | TOT |
|  | 22 | 23 | 56 |
|  | SET 1 | SET 2 | TOT |
| BAMBERGER R. | 22 | 31 | $\mathbf{6 3}$ |

SEMIFINALS GROUP B - $\left(5^{\mathrm{TH}}-8^{\mathrm{TH}}\right)$

| ALLEGRA | SET 1 | SET 2 | TOT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 42 | 28 | 70 |  |
|  | SET 1 | SET 2 | TOT |
| RADKOV | 33 | 27 | 60 |


| FINAL GROUP B1 - $5^{\text {TH }}-6^{\text {TH }}$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) | ALLEGRA | SET 1 <br> 52 | SET 2 | TOT 81 |
| $\square$ | RIEHM | SET 1 | SET 2 39 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { TOT } \\ 68 \end{gathered}$ |
| FINAL GROUP B2 - (7 $\left.{ }^{\text {TH }}-8^{\text {TH }}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | MOSSOP | SET 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { SET 2 } \\ 33 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { TOT } \\ 38 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | RADKOV | SET 1 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SET 2 } \\ 30 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOT } \\ 71 \end{gathered}$ |

SEMIIFINALS GROUP C - (9TT $\left.-12^{\text {TH }}\right)$


| MOSSOP | SET 1 | SET 2 | TOT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 19 | 28 | 47 |
|  | SET 1 | SET 2 | TOT |
| RIE | 37 | 25 | $\mathbf{6 2}$ |

RIEHM
MOSSOP

IILA FABBRICHE

JT3

IL ANKA

SKALMAN

## 1. MONACO

## 2. HEIMDAL

## 3. BAMBERGER REITER

4. BC'T ONSTEIN
5. ALLEGRA
6. RIEHM

## 7. RADKOV

8. MOSSOP
9. SKALMAN

## 10. JT3

## 11. VILLA FABBRICHE

12. ILANKA
