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Anna Zareba and Arkadiusz Majcher from Poland won yesterday's Mixed Pairs qualification by a considerable margin of just under $4 \%$ over their nearest rivals, Sanna Clementsson and Mikael Rimstedt from Sweden. In $3^{\text {rd }}$ place we find another Polish pair: Kacper Kopka and Zofia Bałdysz. So Polish pairs took two of the three top spots and in fact 3 of the 4 top spots, as the the only pair from Finland (Millaeri-Koivu) finished the day as $5^{\text {th }}$.
More important for the future of European bridge, and therefore good to see, however, is the fact that the 24 young qualifiers are representing I3 nationalities in all.We shall see what the situation is when it really matters, i.e. at the prize-giving, this evening.

## MIXED PAIRS PRIZE-GIVING AND OPENING CEREMONY

The Mixed Pairs Prize-giving and Opening Ceremony
will be held in the Theater on the first floor of the venue, starting at 20:00 on Thursday July I2th.
Cocktails will follow the ceremony.

The first session of any mixed event very much resembles a lottery, certainly for journalists. They say that pairs tournaments, especially mixed events, are sort of a lottery for many players anyway but in my opinion, this is only partly true. When the number of boards is substantial enough, you will always see the better pairs finishing higher up in the final rankings. In a junior event, this should be basically the same but a side issue is that not very much is known in advance about how well the participating partnerships are established. It is a matter of experience that an established partnership has an advantage over most occasional partnerships in a pairs event, because the latter are more liable to misunderstandings and holes in their agreements. The first eight boards of the tournament brought quite a number of good examples of what I wrote above, I feel.

Session I, board I
N/None

|  | - 843 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 86 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 52 |  |
|  | - A 1043 |  |
| - KJ 105 | N | - A Q 9 |
| $\bigcirc 1043$ | $W^{\text {N }}$ E | $\bigcirc$ A 9752 |
| $\diamond 973$ | W E | $\checkmark$ AK |
| -K97 | S | ¢KJ6 |
|  | ¢ 762 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{KJ}$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 10864 |  |
|  | +852 |  |

Only a total diamond abstention by the defenders will give away the overtrick for a precious +430 to E/W: 96\% instead of only $41 \%$.

Session I, board 2
E/N-S


On the next board, I saw a typical pairs' auction.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lember | Grguric | Torv | Stefanec |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | 19 |
| Dble | 24 | $3 \diamond$ | 34 |
| Dble | All pass |  |  |

On a diamond lead and a heart shift the defenders duly get their ruff for +200 , the kiss of death. It changed an average score into an $84 \%$ quote.

Can you make game on board 3?


Session I, board 3
S/E-W

| ¢ A 8742 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ KQJ 8 |  |  |
| $\diamond$ A 6 |  |  |
| * 105 |  |  |
| Q K | N | ¢ J 10965 |
| $\bigcirc 653$ |  | $\bigcirc$ A 7 |
| $\diamond$ Q 93 | W E | $\checkmark 87542$ |
| 2 A Q 9762 | S | 98 |
| - Q 3 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 10942$ |  |  |
| $\diamond$ KJ 10 |  |  |
| 2 QJ4 3 |  |  |

In a heart contract, N/S have four losers: two clubs, a spade and the ace of trumps. It does not help you that the $\Phi \mathrm{K}$ is singleton: the defenders can simply swap their spade trick for a spade ruff at any time. Say they lead three rounds of clubs. Declarer ruffs, eliminates the diamonds with a ruff and plays trumps. Now all East has to do is duck the ace of trumps and play a spade when he gets in with his $\vee A$ at the second round of the suit. Declarer is then locked in the North hand with only spades left so he will be obliged to offer West a spade ruff after all. Making 9 tricks in $3 \triangleleft$ was worth $61 \%$.
"Yes we can:" do not open the bidding with the East cards. Once East opens, E/W are bound for a minus score. In spite of this, -50 was still worth $36 \%$.

Session I, board 4
The next board proved difficult to handle.
W/All


This time, N/S were in some trouble as they had no clear agreement as to the meaning of 2NT. North thought it was showing the red suits but this was not the case. When the defence lost a club trick, the contract was made after all. A plus score for N/S looked good enough on this deal and so it proved: $=140$ was worth $79 \%$ and + IIO scored $75 \%$.SI bd 5

Can you find a way to stay out of game as E/W?


## DANISHWARMUP <br> Branko Spiljak

Wednesday IIth of July will be remembered by generations as a day when Croatia (or England) secured a berth in the World Cup finals. It's gonna be equally remembered (by the chosen few) as a day when $14^{\text {th }}$ European Youth Pairs Championships started in Opatija.

It started as a cloudy morning - perfect for sleeping. Had my double espresso early and set to watch a fine Danish pair, Emil Buus Thomsen - Johanne Kofoed.

Session I, board I
N/None

- 843
- Q 86
$\diamond$ J 52
\& A 1043
- KJ 105
- 1043
$\diamond 973$
\& K 97

- 762
$\bigcirc \mathrm{KJ}$
$\diamond$ Q 10864
2 852

Board I would be a great success for Puppet Stayman fans but most mortals reached a reasonable 3NT from E. Johanne lead a normal diamond and declarer was limited to 9 tricks (heart contract would yield 10 for juicy top) - $59 \%$ for our stars.


Johanne Kofoed - Denmark


Emil Buus Thomsen - Denmark
Next hand is perfect for lesson in strategy.
Session I, board 2
E/N-S
s A 53
) J 972
$\diamond 62$
cK 976


You look at \$KQI0872 8KI04 $\$ J 985 se, vulnerable vs. not and right-hand opponent opens $\ \diamond$. Kofoed decided for "normal" 2s and it didn't end well. The real question here is should one "preempt" or simply overcall with one spade. Hand is "classic" case of jump overcall but:

- shape indicates potential wild distributions
- diamond holding is good when defending diamond contract but useless otherwise
- heart holding is likely to provide decent defense in heart contract
- spades is highest ranking suit so what's the rush
- you'd like to know if pard has support (so leave him room to show it)
- last thing you'd like is opponents bidding 5\% over your 49
- you're vulnerable!

Session I, board 2

| North | East | South | West |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Buus Thomsen | Kopka | Kofoed | Baldysz |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | 2. | Dble |
| 31 | pass | pass | Dble |

All pass
Kopka - Baldysz from Poland were merciless.After cashing two top diamonds East switched to heart and got a ruff, the defence thus taking the first five tricks. Unlucky? Maybe but check points above again. This unfortunate board was worth $16 \%$ but it was only bad board our stars are about to have.

Session I, board 3
Another Polish pair for a second round but this one came bearing gifts.

|  | 4. A 8742 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ KQJ 8 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A 6 |  |
|  | -105 |  |
| ¢ K |  | 4 J 10965 |
| $\bigcirc 653$ | N | $\bigcirc$ A 7 |
| $\diamond$ Q 93 | W E | $\diamond 87542$ |
| \& AQ9762 | S | 9 |
|  | - Q 3 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 10942$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ KJ 10 |  |
|  | - QJ 43 |  |


| North | East | South | West |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Buus Thomsen | Melkonyan | Kofoed | Trendak |
|  |  | pass | 20 |
| 24 | pass | pass | Dble |
| pass | 2NT | All pass |  |

East not passing takeout double is amazing! I mean she has so many good reasons to pass with a smile:

- 2 certain trump tricks
- 5 trumps over declarer
- side ace (they usually score)
- decent lead (singleton in partner suit)
- no game of her own

But she chose to convert a plus score into minus.
North can go only one down in two spades but would need some inspired guesswork. On the other hand, NS are cold for 4NT (check it out yourself).Our heroes did not play their best defence of the session. They took only 7 out of their possible 10 tricks but even 200 was worth $91 \%$. Lesson learned: never kill opponents bearing gifts, you want them to come again.

Session I, board 9
N/E-W

- J 42
- K 62
$\diamond$ KJ 64
- J 84

| ¢ 1083 | N | A 765 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 10975$ |  | $\bigcirc$ AQ 83 |
| $\diamond 832$ | W E | $\diamond$ Q 97 |
| \& K 73 | S | -62 |
|  | - K Q 9 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{J} 4$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A 105 |  |
|  | \& A Q 1095 |  |


| North $\quad$ East | South | West |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Buus Thomsen Sobczak | Kofoed | Suchodolska |  |
| pass | ISe | INT | All pass |

Board 9 was a display of bad defence:
West's lead was 89 , low from the dummy and East inserted the queen. This is inferior play for a couple of reasons but mainly because you don't know how to proceed. Partner could have $3-4$ hearts but also he may have doubleton. Spades may be your source of tricks but so may hearts. When faced with such an awkward choice best policy is to duck and wait for more information. It should be pretty safe here seeing the dummy because losing tempo to clear hearts can't possibly cost anything.

East returned a spade. South entered dummy with the $\diamond$ K and played the (unblocking 9 from hand). West took the king, played back a spade to clear the suit but it was the end of defence. They even let declarer reach dummy with the $3^{\text {rd }}$ spade, enabling him to finesse in diamonds.

E/All

|  | - A 5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 84$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 7642 |  |
|  | * KJ5 3 |  |
| ¢ Q 109873 | N | ¢ J 4 |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$ |  | $\bigcirc$ A Q J 10762 |
| $\checkmark 83$ | W E | $\diamond$ K9 |
| - 9742 | S | Q 6 |
|  | - K 62 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 953$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AQ 105 |  |
|  | - A 108 |  |

Board 10 brought excellent decision by Buus Thomsen to compete over $2 \checkmark$ partial with 2NT holding
4A5 $\vee 84 \diamond$ J7642 ¢ K KJ53.
This pushed opponents to level 3 for down two and a score of $70 \%$. Sleepy pass would make a difference of about 40\%.

Session I, board I2
W/N-S


Well, it's hard to guess why East pushed on with $3 \diamond$, even harder why West got into "let's compete" mood. Probably because it was such a sleepy morning. Nobody doubled because (repeated for reference) Lesson learned: never kill opponents bearing gifts, you want them to come again.
Anyway, it was down 5 for 250 and clean $79 \%$.

S/N-S

- J 86
$\bigcirc 97$
$\diamond$ Q 8543
- J 72
- 42
$\checkmark$ AKQ 2
$\diamond K 7$
ค A 10843

© K 1093
© J 1083
$\diamond$ AJ 9
$\% K Q$
- A Q 75
$\bigcirc 654$
$\diamond 1062$
9965

Hand I5, only with slam-rated action involved again turned out to be lucky for our stars. Their Italian opponents reached the wrong slam. They ended in6\% from West instead of $6 \triangleright$ from East which is laydown. A spade lead would kill it instantly but the lead was a sneaky eight of diamonds. Defence did well in discarding and declarer played a spade to the king in the end for one down.

It was a nice solid session by the Danish juniors displaying solid bridge without fishing for swings. Their total of $57.57 \%$ was enough for 12 th place in standings.


## MIXED PAIRS, SESSION I <br> Daniel Gulyás

How can you pick whom to watch at the first session of a junior pairs event? We all know these kids are the future, but usually we have no clue where to look before they start playing.
Well, this time I had an easy choice: Mikael Rimstedt does not need any introduction. A current European Junior Champion from last year, but also a constant player on the Swedish Open Team is one of the biggest stars of this tournament. His partner may not be familiar to everyone, but Sanna Clementsson is no slouch either: she was on the U2I team in Samorin, who happened to win their age group, too - so actually, there are TWO champs sitting opposite each other.
Board I was not the the hand to advertise the idea of trying 3NT even if you could have a major fit - Mikael did have a 4333 , but $4 \boxtimes$ would have fared better by a lot, MP-wise, but +400 still gave them $41 \%$ of the points. The diamond lead made sure there was no time for the heart suit.

Board 2, Ida Oeberg forgot their agreement on defence, and that was costly - but could have been the other way round:

Session I, board 2
E/N-S

|  | ¢ A 53 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ¢ J 972 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 62$ |  |  |
|  | $\frac{2976}{N}$ |  |  |
| ¢ 64 |  | ¢ 19 |  |
| $\checkmark$ A Q 65 | W E | $\bigcirc 8$ |  |
| $\diamond 107$ | S | $\checkmark$ A |  |
| \& AJ 1043 |  | 2K |  |
|  | ¢ K Q 10 | 872 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K 104 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 985 |  |  |
|  | ¢ - |  |  |
| North | East | South | West |
| Austad | Clementssen | Oeberg | Rimstedt |
|  | I $\diamond$ | 24 | Dble |
| pass | $3 \diamond$ | pass | pass |
| 34 | pass | pass | Dble |
| All pass |  |  |  |

24 was supposed to be spades+clubs, 55+, but Ida forgot. So when $3 \triangleleft$ came back to her partner, he thought it is best to compete with the major suit. Mikael thought he had enough to double that - he did well earlier to pass $3 \diamond$ anyway.
The diamond ten lead went to the queen, but Sanna thought the heart return is not needed, she could see partner ruffing the club return after the given information. Declarer could have made now, had she drawn trumps, as she could just concede two hearts and ruff one losing diamond, and discard the other on the good heart; it was all well, as a score correction would have been in order probably. She conceded a diamond, and now Sanna knew what to do, the heart ruff defeated the contract one trick, for the magic +200 , and $84 \%$ for our heroes. Interestingly, I I tables were in 3s doubled, and 3 of them made it after the diamond lead, probably the same way Oeberg could have.

On board 3, Kielbasa-Ocylok overbid to $4 \checkmark$, which went down one, the +50 was worth $78 \%$.

On Board 4,Thomasz Kielbasa was the most aggressive, but it paid off:

Session I, board 4
W/All

. K 72
$\checkmark$ K Q 2
$\diamond$ AK 5

- 8742

| North <br> Kielbasa | East <br> Clementsson | South <br> Ocylok | West <br> Rimstedt |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | pass |

It was a brave move to reopen with that 6 count, and a void, but his partner had enough herself to pass this and beat it one trick. This time the magic 200 went their opponents' way, for a $10 \%$ score.

Board 5 looked normal. Spade lead, trumps, and lose 4 red tricks, but the defensive marking got lost, and the diamond ace and king did not make a trick - but declarer's ten did; since most tables were down in $4 \vee$, this 450 gave them $98 \%$.

Board 6 looked like a normal 3s partscore deal, but Mikael got a friendly defence that allowed him to make 10 tricks that were there - had they shortened dummy, this would not have happened. + 170 when most of the tables score 140 can be very useful at this kind of scoring; almost $77 \%$ this time.

On the next hand, those who led their king from KQx were awarded, and two of this suit could have been cashed. Leading this suit into a 2NT opener could be dangerous, tho, and so Felix Eder did not lead it, and it cost him a trick and some matchpoints; 7I\% was the Swedish award.
The Austrians were held to 9 tricks in a 3NT hand, and that was also above average for Mikael and Sanna, $62 \%$ is always welcome. The Finns, Myllaeri and Koivu (one of the many contenders for high postions themselves, actually) managed to bid and make $6 \diamond$ when the opponents did not try to cash their spade trick, and it went away.

Board 9 did not go well for the Swedes, though:
N/E-W

|  | - J 42 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - K 62 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ KJ 64 |  |  |
|  | - J 84 |  |  |
| -1083 | N | - A 765 |  |
| $\bigcirc 10975$ |  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 83 |  |
| $\diamond 832$ | W | $\diamond$ Q 97 |  |
| - K 73 | S | $\pm 62$ |  |
|  | - K Q 9 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{J} 4$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A 105 |  |  |
|  | - A Q 1095 |  |  |
| North | East | South | West |
| Koivu | Clementsson | Myalleri | Rimstedt |
| pass | 19\% | INT | pass |
| 20 | pass | 2 | pass |
| 2NT | pass | 3NT | All pass |

This stayman sequence did not promise a 4 card major, so the heart suit certainly comes to mind; Mikael led a diamond, and this was pretty much the end of the hand.

Declarer played a spade, and Sanna did not find the killing return: a heart! This may be hard, but after seeing all the honors already in diamonds and spades from declarer, you may trust partner to have a trick in clubs. If he does, he can shoot a heart through to beat the contract. But this may be too IMP thinking. Clementsson ducked the spade, declarer conceded the club king, and since Rimstedt knew his partner needed to have exactly these heart honours for the return to matter, and then he had already allowed to make an impossible contract by not leading the right suit, he tried spades, and that was that. 430 was a great score for the Finns, $91 \%$.

The next board was yet another '200 out' hand. Most pairs were down this much, some played lower, or allowed the opps to make a partscore, so this was only $30 \%$ Sweden's way.

Board II was an interesting lead problem:

Session I, board II
W/N-S

- J
©A862
$\diamond K 964$
- J876

| - Q 832 | N | - K 10754 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc 9$ |
| $\diamond 9732$ | $\mathrm{w}^{\text {S }}$ | $\diamond 10853$ |
| \& K 2 |  | \% 543 |
|  | - A96 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 4$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A Q J 7 |  |
|  | \& KQ 109 |  |


| North | East | South | West |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Okuniewski | Clementsson Grodzka | Rimstedt |  |
| -- | $1 \%$ | $2 \vee$ |  |
| pass | pass | $2 N T$ | pass |
| 3NT | All pass |  |  |

Rimstedt told me that a spade lead stands out when playing IMPs, and I agree; it would have defeated the contract. In MP scoring, sometimes it is safer to lead your nice long suit, not blowing a trick. The winning lead was found by some, so -430 only netted $37 \%$. Okuniewski did not play the next hand optimally, and was down in a 34 that he could have made; the $91 \%$ reward was very welcome after so many bad looking results on the previous boards.

The same is true the other way round: when you bid a normal 3NT, but go down 2 as everyone else, your score will yet again be below average; $39 \%$.
At the last table, both of our Swedes thought they needed to do something.

Session I, board I5

S/N-S

|  | - J 86 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 97$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 8543 |  |
|  | - J 72 |  |
| +42 | N | ¢K 1093 |
| $\bigcirc$ AK Q 2 | W E | ¢J108 3 |
| $\diamond$ K 7 | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{L}}$ | $\diamond$ AJ 9 |
| \& A 10843 | S | \& K Q |
|  | - AQ 75 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 654$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 1062$ |  |
|  | 2965 |  |


| North | East | South | West |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maczka | Clementsson | Szymaszczyk | Rimstedt | All pass

Sanna liked her somewhat ugly looking I4 count so much, that she showed slam interest in hearts with her 21 bid. Mikael did not need more, he had a 5 card side suit, and prime controls, so simply went for the slam, and was rewarded. Most pairs took 12 tricks, but not in slam. The spade lead was impossible to find, and this nice 980 was worth $91 \%$ ! On the last hand of the session, Rimstedt was trying to hide his trump queen mainly, so led his aces. This worked wonders, as Clementsson had a king to go with one of them, and there was a trump trick yet to come. About half the field allowed $4 \bigcirc$ (or 3 NT ) to make, so this was also a very nice $69 \%$ to finish a very well played set.
Despite some errors, the result was a reasonable $57.59 \%$, and I Ith place. Since the top 24 pairs qualify


For session 2 of the Mixed qualifications, I decided to have a look at the 3 rd-placed Italians. Elsewhere, you will find a story about the Czech leaders at lunchtime. The Polish runners-up at lunchtime, who did well in the second session, will certainly catch the Bulletin spotlights today.

On the first board after lunch, the English declarer did not really keep an eye on the ball (this also was very much the issue for both sides in last night's World Cup semifinal...):

Session 2, board 17
S/N-S

- QJ9864
$\bigcirc 4$
$\diamond J 94$
* A Q 8


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percario | Rose | Dal Pozzo | Jones |
|  | 19 | pass | $2 \checkmark$ |
| pass | 2 | pass | 38 |
| pass | 34 | pass | 3NT |
| All pass |  |  |  |

West led a club, won by East's king when dummy played low. East returned a club to dummy and declarer correctly first took the diamond finesse which lost to West's king. West returned A and another, East winning dummy's jack with her king and exiting in hearts. Rather than establishing the hearts and cashing out for one down, declarer first tried the diamonds and when they did not break, took the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and the hoping for her last chance: the (unlikely) drop of the 10 . This way, she went two down which changed $48 \%$ into just $21 \%$ of the mp .

On the next board, we saw a nice play by Giacomo Percario.

Session 2, board I8

- J 84
-A7
$\diamond$ J 974
\& A 765


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percario | Rose | Dal Pozzo | Jones |
|  |  | 18 | pass |
| 14 | pass | 20 | pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | pass | $2 \nabla$ | pass |
| 3NT | All pass |  |  |

Two Clubs was Gazzilli and $2 \diamond$ thus showed at least 8 hcp.

North led a ominous enough looking low diamond to dummy's ace and declarer immediately led a low club, his jack winning. North was then given his diamond trick.. When North after some thinking returned a low heart, declarer was quick to call for dummy's king. When this held, Percario could play another club. North could win his ace and cash the $\vee A$ but then, any return would give declarer at least a chance of making the rest of the tricks. When he elected the id, probably best from his point of view, the grew in stature and the precious overtrick was there. Scoring +400 already would have been worth $65 \%$ but the overtrick made it an $87.5 \%$ score.

After a routine $4 \checkmark$, one down on the layout, board 20 was more interesting.

Session 2, board 20
W/All

|  | \$K 64 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PJ6 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AK Q 52 |  |
|  | 2Q 32 |  |
| - AJ |  | - Q 1073 |
| $8 A \mathrm{~A} 53$$\diamond 6$ | N | ¢K872 |
|  | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ E | $\diamond$ J 1094 |
| $\diamond 6$ <br> AKJ965 | $\mathrm{W}^{\text {S }}$ | 97 |
|  | $\bigcirc 1094$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 873$ |  |
|  | -1084 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Percario | Rose | Dal Pozzo | Jones |
| I\& | INT | pass | pass |
| Dble | All pass |  |  |

An entirely natural auction, poor South having nowhere to go.
East could hardly believe that a club lead (her singleton) would be OK so she led a more natural $\vee$ J.

Declarer could do little else than establish a 4th trick in diamonds, which gave West the chance to produce some very clear discards: two low hearts and the in the end when East was given her $\diamond 10$. The required club return then made it down two and +500 , worth only $44 \%$ to the Italians as E/W can make game in hearts and NT. The remarkable thing is that the club play is not necessary at all. Try the effect of four rounds of hearts at this point (at this table West had already discarded two hearts so this defence was no longer possible). Declarer has to find two discards on the hearts: a spade and... the 5th diamond. Now he can be given his club trick for down three after all and a score of over $90 \%$.

On the next board, Imogen La Chapelle found a fine lead.

Session 2, board 21
N/N-S


- J 1064
-AJ 1097
$\diamond \mathrm{Q}$
\& J 32

After a straightforward transfer auction over INT, Federica Dalpozzo as West had become declarer in the normal 44. North led the 4 and declarer now was facing a classic problem.

Ducking the lead and locating the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ later on leads to II tricks, because the only losers will be two trump tricks. When declarer decided to go up with her ace at trick one, she could play the $\$$ and ruff a diamond, followed by the covered all round. South duly returned her last club to get the ruff in the suit but then found herself endplayed. She tried a heart, the fastest way to solve declarer's problems. Making ten tricks was worth $43 \%$ but the overtrick would have made it $73 \%$ to $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$.


Board 23 struck me as a typical example of lack of responsibility.

Session 2, board 23

S/All

|  | ¢ ${ }^{\text {A }} 8$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 1053$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AJ 94 |  |
|  | 974 |  |
| - KJ97 | N | - Q 43 |
| ¢A842 | W E | QJ 9 |
| $\checkmark$ Q 853 | S | $\checkmark$ K 1062 |
| \% 9 |  | \&K 632 |
|  | -10652 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 76 |  |
|  | $\diamond 7$ |  |
|  | 2 A Q J 105 |  |


| West | North <br> Hulanicki | East <br> Dal Pozzo | South <br> Hulanicka <br> Pass |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pass | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | pass | $1 \mathbf{1 4}$ |
| Dble |  |  |  |

Assuming that in Polish Club the free rebid of INT still shows the weak NT hand, possibly improved a little in view of the passed-hand double, South has good reasons to bid on with her fine five-card suit - but in that case, why not a straightforward raise to 3 NT ? We rarely see hands on which 2 NT is exactly the right contract.. With the cards lying well for N/S, the only problem in 3NT is to find the doubleton $\vee \mathrm{J}$.
East led the $\diamond 2$ to the queen and ace and declarer took a successful club finesse. A low heart was led now, West playing low after some considerable thinking. Had declarer put up the king and repeated the club finesse, his eight tricks would have been secure and a ninth still possible but when he inserted the $\vee I O$ instead, East took her $\odot$ J and switched to a spade to put the contract one down as declarer could not get to his heart trick any more. Not that it mattered that much: scoring +120 would have been worth $32 \%$ only and going down one scored II\%. Their session score of just over $55 \%$ was good enough to keep the Italian pair in 3rd place and on track for qualification, of course.

Only the carry-over amount would matter...


Giacomo Percario - Italy

## BRIDGE RASTIGNANO 2018

XI edition 8-9 september

## OPEN TEAMS

Saturday, September $8^{\text {th }} \mathbf{2 . 0 0}$ p.m $1^{\text {st }}$ prize 2.500 euros

## TEAMS SCHEDULE

0.30-1.30 pm: registration and payment entry fees 2.00 pm : qualification -n .4 rounds of swiss 8 board each and following division into section of 20-25 teams
7.00 pm : dinner break
8.30 pm : finals -n .3 rounds of swiss 8 boards each

Prize giving to follow
Full carry over - Bridgmates will be used Live on Bbo

## ENTRY FEES

140 euros per team (max 6 players)
120 euros: teams without $1^{\text {st }}$ category players
60 euros: students and junior teams
Partecipation reserved to member of Figb or foreign bridge federation. Admitted students enrolled at least in their 2nd year
TECHNICAL AND TD STAFF
M. Ortensi - M. Eminenti - S. Valentini - F. Natale V. Boldrini - C. Cenni - N. Fedele - A. Brunetti - S. Peruzzo

ROLL OF HONOUR
2008 (56 T.) : Tamburi- Andreoli - Basile - Facchini 2009 (56 T.) : Treossi - Bianchi - Mieti - Zannoni 2010 (66 T.) : Montanelli - Andreoli - Bonvicini - Golfarelli 2011 (70 T.) : Franchi - Giubilo - Montanari - Versace 2012 (73 T.) : Medugno - Rinaldi - Tanini - Venier 2013 (82 T.) : Luppi - Botti - Giachetti - Pattacini 2014 (96 T.) : Cambiaghi - Franco - Matteucci - Minaldo 2015 (103 T.) : Muller - Bombardieri - Giannessi - Stoppini 2016 (93 T.) : Boldrini - De Leo - Pantusa - Percario 2017 (111 T.) : Fellus - Giubilo - Donati - Porta

| Team prizes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pos | Fin.A | Fin.B | Fin.C | Fin.D | Fin.E | Fin.F | Special prize cumulative ( | $\begin{aligned} & \text { s not } \\ & \text { in } 3 \mathrm{~T} . \text { ) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | 2500 | 340 | 260 | 220 | 200 | 200 | 1 mixed | 160 |
| 2 | 1200 | 220 | 200 | 160 | 160 | 160 | 1 ladies | 160 |
| 3 | 700 | 200 | 160 | 160 | 160 |  | $1 \mathrm{nc} 2 / 3$ cat | 140 |
| 4 | 500 | 160 | 160 |  |  |  | 1 ASDBBR | 160 |
| 5 | 360 | 160 |  |  |  |  | 1 students | 100 |
| 6 | 240 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 Junior | 100 |
| 7 | 200 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 out reg | 140 |
| 8 | 180 |  |  |  |  |  | Last 2rounds | 140 |
| 9 | 160 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 Students | (1) |
| Prizes added with 100 teams |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 Junior | (1) |
| Prizes added with 110 teams |  |  |  |  |  |  | $2 \mathrm{nc} 2 / 3$ cat | (2) |
| Prizes added with 120 teams |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 mixed | (2) |
| (1) Software Bridge Base |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 ladies | (2) |
| (2) Products offered by the sponsor |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 ASDBBR | (2) |

Guaranteed prize fund 13.000 euros


## OPEN PAIRS

Sunday, September $9^{\text {th }}-1.30 \mathrm{pm}$
$1^{\text {st }}$ prize 1.000 euros $1^{\text {st }}$ mixed pair 500 euros
PAIRS SCHEDULE
$0.00-1.00 \mathrm{pm}$ registration and payment entry fees ore $1.30 \mathrm{pm}: 3$ rounds $10-12$ pre-dealt hands Mitchell movement
About 7.15 pm prize giving Bridgmates will be used

## ENTRY FEES

40 euros per pair
30 euros students and junior
Partecipation reserved to member of Figb or foreign bridge federation. Admitted students enrolled at least in their 2nd year

## ROLL OF HONOUR

2014 (120 coppie) : Bassi B.- Ulivagnoli G 2015 (149 coppie) : Buratti M. - Mariani C 2016 (148 coppie) : Venini L. - Pattacini M. 2017 (170 coppie) : Andreoli A. - Coraducci V. VENUE
UNAWAY HOTELS CONGRESS CENTER Via Palazzetti 1/N - S. Lazzaro di Savena (Bologna) UNAWAY HOTEL CONVENTION
(rates "per room"; per day wiht breaktast)
CLASSIC DUS (single use): 56.00 euros CLASSIC DOUBLE: 62.00 euros JUNIOR SUITE: 90.00 euros Direcy booking: tel. +39.0514997411 The manegement reserves the right to make any modification considered necessary for both tounaments

| Pos. | Pair prizes | Special prizes n (min | ot cumulative <br> p.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1000 | 1 mixed/lad | 500 (*) |
| 2 | 500 | 2 mixed/lad | 250 (*) |
| 3 | 330 | 3 mixed/lad | 140 (*) |
| 4 | 220 | $1 \mathrm{nc} 2 / 3 \mathrm{cat}$ | 50 |
| 5 | 160 | 1 out region | 50 |
| 6 | 120 | 1 out prov | 50 |
| 7 | 100 | 1 ASBBR | 50 |
| 8 | 80 | 1 students | 40 |
| 9 | 70 | 1 junior | 40 |
| 10 | 60 | 2 students | (1) |
| 11-15 | 50 | 2 junior | (1) |
| 16-19 | 50 | $2 \mathrm{nc} 2 / 3 \mathrm{cat}$ | (2) |
| 20-23 | 50 | 2 ASBBR | (2) |
| 24-27 | 50 | (*) pairs without more convenient placement |  |
| Prizes with 130 p |  |  |  |
| Prizes with 150 p |  |  |  |
| Prizes | with 170 p |  |  |


(2)

ELETTRIK < 2000 Elettrotecnica
Installazione e manutenzione impianti elettrici, MT-BT e e fotovoltaici Bisceglie (BT) - tel. 080.3346350-e-mail:elettrik2000g@ @libero.it

$5)^{\text {3C Gasa S.r.I. }}$<br>www.3ccasa.it info@3ccasa.it

溇
Via Speranza 48/A - San Lazzaro di Savena - Bo
www.nuovagastecnica.com


Studio di ingegneria
ING. ANDREA DALPOZZO San Lazzaro di Savena (BO
Via Calindri 11
ing.andreadalpozzo@gmail.com


ORGANIZATION AND RESERVATION
Asd Bridge Bologna Rastignano
bridge-rastignano.jimdosite.com info@rastignanobridge.it


## $\hat{s}$

+39.051742329 (office Asd) - +39.3200183214 (A. Dalpozzo)


La Casadel Vini stl
Via Fornace 32 - Isola Dovarese (Cr) Tel. 0375.396102

## Mixed Pairs Ranking

## after 3 Cumulative Sessions

I MAJCHER Arkadiusz ZAREBA Anna POL - POL 64.32

2 RIMSTEDT Mikael CLEMENTSSON Sanna SWE SWE 60.38
3 KOPKA Kacper BALDYSZ Zofia POL - POL 60.08
4 SOBCZAK Mateusz SUCHODOLSKA Monika POL - POL 59.38

5 MYLLAERI Maria KOIVU Oskari FIN - FIN 59.15
6 BUUS THOMSEN Emil KOFOED Johanne Bilde DEN - DEN 58.33
7 KILJANVeri VISSER Esther NED - NED 58.30
8 YANINSKI Nikolay KOSTOVA Liya BUL - BUL 57.78

9 MARCINOWSKI Piotr CIUNCZYK Hanna POL POL 56.96
10 PERCARIO Giacomo DALPOZZO Federica ITA ITA 56.5I
II LAZAROV Dobromir TENEVA Gergana BUL BUL 56.47
I2 BAKKE Christian SJODAL Sofie Grasholt NOR NOR 55.58
13 BUNE Sophie BUNE Soren DEN - DEN 55.32
14 KIELBASA Tomasz OCYLOK Dominika POL POL 54.72
I5 TIJSSEN Luc KOLEN Sandra NED - NED 54.54
16 THORPE Stephan PIIBOR Johanna AUT - AUT 54.09

17 KOHUTOVA Lucie KLEMS Erik CZE - CZE 53.50
18 GRGURIC Matea STEFANEC Kristijan CRO CRO 53.46
19 IHER Mirjam MAIDE Rasmus EST - EST 53.35
20 KOLEK Lukas STRBOVA Barbora CZE - CZE
52.98

21 BIRCHALL Alex NATT Shahzaad ENG - ENG 52.68

22 SUCHARDA Edward KOKOT Joanna POL - POL 52.31

23 VASAR Martin LAAN Susanna EST - EST 5 I. 38
24 JASINSKI Piotr ZARZYCKA Maria POL - POL
51.30

25 BELLOY Constance NEVEU Loic FRA - FRA
51.08

26 DUFRENE Beryl FRAGOLA Maxence FRA - FRA 50.67

27 BAZYLUK Jakub DASKO Dominika POL - POL 50.26

28 PATREUHA Patryk MYSLIWIEC Alicja POL - POL 50.15

29 MAJEWSKI Konrad KRUPNIK Patrycja POL - POL 49.74

30 AUSTAD Marius Dalemark OEBERG Ida Marie NOR - NOR 48.85
31 HERMANN Sophie EDER Felix AUT - AUT 48.81
32 LEMBER Manglus TORV Helina EST - EST 47.77
33 MACZKA Stanislaw SZYMASZCZYK Joanna POL - POL 47.73

34 KOWAL Kinga CIBOROWSKI Konrad POL - POL 47.66

35 GIUBILO Gabriele DALPOZZO Valentina ITA ITA 47.58
36 SZYMANSKI Marcin DZIUBINSKA EWA POL POL 47.25
37 BACZEK Krystian HERNANDEZ RIZO Mariana POL - POL 46.88
38 GAVRILOVA Elizaveta STRAUME Toms LAT - LAT 46.58

39 BRASS Tommy TUUS Hanna ENG - ENG 46.50
40 ARSENTYEVA Elizaveta STOLYAROV Egor RUS RUS 46.43
41 GOTINK Kevin CHRISTENSEN Malene Holm NED - NED 46.39
42 CAPOBIANCO Sophia LOMBARDI Matteo ITA ITA 45.61
43 LEEMING India ROBSON Ian ENG - ENG 45.57
44 TRENDAK Lukasz MELKONYAN Karolina POL POL 45.16
45 CICHY Krzysztof ZALEWSKA Joanna POL - POL 44.94

46 ROPER William SELWAY Louise ENG - ENG 44.87

47 KRAWCZYK Blazej MROZEK Maja POL - POL 44.49

48 BUKAT Aleks CIBOROWSKA Lucja POL - POL 44.31

49 OKUNIEWSKIWojciech GRODZKA Julia POL POL 44.08
50 GORSKI Michal HULANICKA Sara POL - POL 43.94

51 SELBY Oscar LA CHAPELLE Imogen ENG - ENG 43.64

52 PYTKA Anna SHINDLER Aron POL - POL 43.08
53 JONES Megan ROSE Henry ENG - ENG 42.82
54 HULANICKI Pawel HULANICKA Estera POL-
POL 4I. 74
55 GROCHOWSKI Maksymilian MANKIEWICZ
Agnieszka POL - POL 4I.3I
56 BROGELAND Anders KJENSLI Agnethe Hansen NOR - NOR 41.26
57 PATREUHA Jakub JASKULECKA Alicja POL - POL 41.15

58 DEAN Nicholas COVILL Laura ENG - ENG 38.65

