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Two of the world's strongest pairs fighting it out to reach the final, in Monaco vs. Allegra.

The semifinals produced two results certainly not expected by everyone, as both the Italian teams beat their internationally orientated opponents. Allegra laid a strong foundation for their win in the first segment, increased their lead slightly in the second and in the final session, after some anxious moments brought home the beacon in great comfort with a beautifully played slam by Bocchi to finish it off.

The other semifinal was not so consistent. Russia won the first segment 26-15 but lost the second segment 49-16 to trail by 22 with 16 boards to play. So a tense final set looked in prospect but it quickly looked all over when Angelini added another 24 to their lead on the first six
boards. However, the Russians launched an offensive and when Angelini went down in a slam on the penultimate board, another double-figure swing would have seen them through. But the last board was flat so Angelini made it after all to our all-Italian final.


| RESUMS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SEMIFINALS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | clo | I | Tot | 2 | Tot | 3 | Total |
| Bridge Club Real | 0 | 26 | 26 | 16 | 42 | 39 | 81 |
| Angelini Bridge Team | 0 | 15 | 15 | 49 | 64 | 30 | 94 |
| Monaco FM | 0 | 29 | 29 | 23 | 52 | 41 | 93 |
| G.S.Allegra | 0 | 55 | 55 | 29 | 84 | 60 | 144 |
| Israel Blue | 0 | 60 | 60 | 10 | 70 | 30 | 100 |
| Het Witte Huis | 0 | 35 | 35 | 39 | 74 | 22 | 96 |
| Radkov Bridge Club | 0 | 27 | 27 | 25 | 52 | 57 | 109 |
| BK Lavec - Smile | 0 | 42 | 42 | 24 | 66 | 28 | 94 |
| Hinden -English Premier League |  | 26 | 26 | 22 | 48 | 41 | 89 |
| Consus Kalisz | 0 | 51 | 51 | 21 | 72 | 18 | 90 |
| Israel White | 0 | 30 | 30 | 40 | 70 | 56 | 126 |
| Burghausen I | 0 | 28 | 28 | 18 | 46 | 32 | 78 |



A tense moment in the Bridge Cub Real vs. Angelini match

## Het Witte Huis v. Bridge Club Real

When this match started on Friday early afternoon, the two teams were leading the field in Group B. BC Real, the Russians with a Dutch guest pair, were 7 V.P. ahead of Het Witte Huis, the real Dutch team, who themselves were a further 7 V.P. ahead of Israel White. So the winner of this match could be pretty sure of proceeding into the semifinals whereas the loser would still be in with a good chance to qualify as well, certainly if a close result would be the outcome.
The Russians had decided to play their Dutch guest pair in the Closed Room, so at that table, we would have an allDutch encounter without any language problems. The match started with fireworks into all directions:

Board: 21. Dlr: North/NS

- K 2

ค97
$\triangleleft$ A 109

* AKQ 1084


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KRASNOSSEL | L PAULISSEN | GLADYSH | JANSMA |
|  | 12 | 21 | 38 |
| 34 | 3NT | $4{ }^{1}$ | Dы |
| Pass | 5\% | Pass | 5 |
| All pass |  |  |  |

3\% was invitational in diamonds.
For once, the Dutch NS were in the right contract but they were not allowed to stay there. Rather than taking a small plus, they went on to the alternative game, only to find out that the five-level was too high for them. Real Russia +100 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VERHEES JR | DRIJVER | VAN PROOIJEN BRINK |  |
|  | 1s | Is | Dbl |
| 2. | 3NT | All pass |  |

No spade save here so the Dutch guest-NS at this table were allowed to make a trick with the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ and 12 more tricks in the minors for +720 to Russia and a huge 13 IMPs
to open their account
The real Dutch got their revenge right on the next board, due to a curious defensive error:

Board: 22. DIr: East/EW

- 10
$\bigcirc 53$
$\diamond 1073$
\& Q J 87654


Open Room

| West $\quad$ North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| KRASNOSSEL PAULISSEN | GLADYSH | JANSMA |
|  | 18 | 49 |

## All pass

Nobody doubled so the Dutch loss was a mere -I00 against the cold vulnerable EW game. There are 10 tricks double dummy but declarer, after losing three tricks in the red suits first, crossed to dummy's $\$ \mathrm{Q}$ for a losing spade finesse -and a defensive club ruff to rub it in.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VERHEES JR | DRIJVER | VAN PROOIJEN BRINK |  |
|  |  | $2 \diamond$ | 49 |
| 5 | Pass | Pass | Dbl |
| All pass |  |  |  |

Verhees took the wrong decision, on paper that is, when he bid on over 4@. We should not argue with success, however, as this is how it continued. South led his top spades, North contributing the 88 in the second round of the suit. Rather than settle the issue by cashing a top club as well, South apparently read this as a suggestion of an eventual possible trump trick (or whatever) so he continued another spade. Declarer ruffed high in dummy and simply ran home. Het Witte Huis +850 and all I 3 IMPs back to tie the match at I3 all after two boards. Would they keep up this scoring rate?
No they wouldn't, as the next two boards were a push and a near-push.
Then came a flurry of good boards for the Real Russians.

Board: 25. Dlr: North/EW

- 10432
$\bigcirc 53$
$\diamond 974$
AKK 6

| $\stackrel{1}{1}$ | N | , KQ 985 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QQJ10987 |  | $\bigcirc$ A 4 |
| $\checkmark$ A 65 | W E | $\checkmark$ KJ 10 |
| \& 10542 | S | \& 187 |
|  | - AJ 76 |  |
|  | PK62 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 832 |  |
|  | * Q 9 |  |

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| KRASNOSSEL PAULISSEN | GLADYSH | JANSMA |  |
|  | Pass | I组 | Pass |
| INT | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 20 | All pass |  |  |

Forcing INT and disciplined bidding led to the proper contract. Russia +140 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VERHEES JR | DRIJVER | VAN PROOIJEN BRINK |  |
|  | Pass | INT | Pass |
| 40 | Pass | 49 | All pass |

4\% was a non-invitational shot at game. HadVan Prooijen held the right cards, he would have made the contract easily enough but this time, he had no chance, even less so when Brink led the eq. Down two, another +200 to Real and 8 IMPs to Russia. Then:

Board: 26. Dlr: East/All

- KQJ965
$\bigcirc K$
$\diamond$ KJ 8
- 54
- 8432

Р 1854
$\diamond 63$

* KJ 3

- A 10
© A 10
$\diamond$ A 107
\& Q 98762
$\perp 7$
QQ97632
$\diamond$ Q 9542
- 10


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| KRASNOSSEL PAULISSEN | GLADYSH | JANSMA |  |
|  |  | INT | Pass |
| 20 | 2 | $3 \%$ | Pass |
| Pass | 3 | All pass |  |

Well done by the Russians as 3 is a make and 3 is not. On the lead of or the switch to the $\boldsymbol{4} \mathrm{A}$, followed by a low club, declarer has to lose five tricks. Needless to say that the Russian defence was impeccable. Russia +100 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VERHEES JR | DRIJVER | VAN PROOIJEN BRINK |  |
|  |  | INT | $2 \oslash$ |
| Pass | 24 | All pass |  |

When EW made no further move, it had to rest in 24. Declarer was presented with an overtrick which was worth an extra IMP, six instead of five more to Russia.
On the next board, the Real Russians gained another 4 IMPs on a partscore hand but then, the tide turned:

Board: 28. Dlr:West/NS

- KQJ9854

ค984
$\diamond{ }^{\circ} 2$

- 3

A A 106
$\bigcirc 1$
$\diamond 9874$
AJ1065
 32
K Q 6532
$\diamond$ AQ6 5
\& K

- 7

8 A 107
$\diamond$ K 103
\& Q 98742

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| KRASNOSSEL PAULISSEN | GLADYSH | JANSMA |  |
| I $\diamond$ | $3 \triangleq$ | Dbl | Pass |
| 3NT | All pass |  |  |

As the hearts are 3-3 and the spades are known to be 7I, making 3 NT or $4 \checkmark$ should not be too difficult as it happens to be South who holds both the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and the threecard diamonds. This means that North should never get the lead again to cash winning spades against either contract. At the table, life is not so simple, as we shall see.
North led a top spade and continued the suit, declarer winning the second round. He next ran the $\vee \mathrm{J}$ and, when that held, played a diamond to the queen and king. South exited in clubs, declarer winning dummy's king perforce and cashing two top hearts next. When the suit broke 3-3, declarer had to make up his mind about the minors. If South were to hold all remaining diamonds, he could be endplayed for sure at this point in the suit, being forced to either return a diamond into declarer's double tenace or a club to dummy, presenting declarer with his 9th trick both ways. So, after a long consideration, declarer exited with a low diamond, which led to North being on lead with only winners left...A spectacular down five , +250 to the real Dutch.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VERHEES JR | DRIJVER | VAN PROOIJEN BRINK |  |
| Pass | 39 | $4 \bigcirc$ | All pass |

In the Closed Room, Van Prooijen was faced with mainly the same problem but all was well for him when he, after winning the spade lead and drawing trumps, exited with an immediate $\triangleleft \mathbf{Q}$ to South's king. He later conceded a trick to South's $\diamond 10$ but this way, he was never in trouble. So +420 more and 12 IMPs to Het Witte Huis who thus reduced their deficit to 25-33.
Please note that playing $\diamond \mathbf{A}, \diamond \mathbf{Q}$, a line adopted at other tables, works equally well.
Then came:
Board: 29. Dlr: North/All

## 4

$\bigcirc 973$
$\diamond$ AJ 9874
\& A 64
© Q J 109
8 KJIO 542
$\diamond 6$
\& 19


A 763
A
$\diamond$ K Q 52
\& Q 1073
4 K 852
ค Q 86
$\diamond 103$
\% K 852

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| KRASNOSSEL PAULISSEN | GLADYSH | JANSMA |  |
|  | Pass | INT | Pass |
| $2 \triangleleft$ | Dbl | Pass | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | All pass |  |  |

This contract fell apart once declarer decided to duck North's opening spade lead. KK , spade ruff and a heart to dummy's blank ace. Declarer tried the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ but North won the ace, cashed the A and continued a club to partner's king to get another spade ruff. With the $\vee Q$ still to come for the defence, that was down four. +400 to the Dutch.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VERHEES JR | DRIJVER | VAN PROOIJEN BRINK |  |
|  | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | $3 N T$ | All pass |

As you can see, the Dutch EW did not solve the problems of this hand either but as 3NT went one down for only I00, their net profit still was +300 or 7 IMPs more to almost level the match.
The Dutch took the lead on the next board when a game contract basically depended on taking the right view in trumps, missing Q Q Xx ..

Two quiet boards to relax a little and then on to the next two double-figure cases:

Board: 33. Dlr: North/None
Q J 43
คA8642
$\diamond$ J 9
963


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| KRASNOSSEL PAULISSEN | GLADYSH | JANSMA |  |
|  | Pass | 18 | Is |
| 39 | All pass |  |  |



Louk Verhees, Het Witte Huis

Against this contract, reached after what looked like an EW bidding misunderstanding, North led the $\diamond J^{\text {which held }}$ the trick and shifted to a spade. Declarer won the ace in dummy and when he next led the ${ }_{2}$, South rose with the ace to lead his heart, obtain a heart ruff and kill dummy in the process. One down as declarer still had a diamond to lose. Het Witte Huis +50.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VERHEES JR | DRIJVER | VAN PROOIJEN BRINK |  |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \&$ |
| 2\& | Dbl | Redbl | $2 \checkmark$ |
| 2NT | Pass | 3NT | All pass |

In the Closed Room, a more normal contract was reached. North led a spade which declarer won with his king. When he first attacked clubs, naturally enough, he happened to hit upon the defenders' ace to be removed first and thus easily made his contract, as North was out of spades when in with his 8 A. +400 to add to the +50 gave Het Witte Huis 10 IMPs.
...which they lost on the next board:
Board: 34. Dlr: East/NS

- A 5
$\bigcirc 10764$
$\diamond$ A Q J 875
$\% 6$

| $\perp Q 9643$ |
| :--- |
| $\vee \mathrm{AJ}$ |
| $\diamond 109$ |
| J 1083 |


| N |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| W | E |
|  |  |

( K 1087

- K 8
$\diamond$ K 643
\& AK 9


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| KRASNOSSEL PAULISSEN | GLADYSH | JANSMA |  |
|  |  | $2 \triangleleft$ | Dbl |
| Pass | $3 \%$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4\rangle$ |
| Dbl | $5 \%$ | Pass | $6\rangle$ |

All pass
After East's major/minor opening bid, 3e by North showed an invitational hand with diamonds. In a sense, NS were unlucky because from the auction at their table, it looked as if East would hold the crucial $\vee \mathbf{A}$ - the card on which the success of the slam depended.
When East led a low heart, the hand was over...Real Russia +100 .
In the Closed Room, we saw an unopposed, neat auction by the Russian Dutchies:

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VERHEES JR | DRIJVER | VAN PROOIJEN BRINK |  |
|  |  | Pass | INT |
| Pass | 2\% | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 3\% |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 34 | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 49 | Pass | 5\% |
| Pass | 5 | All pas |  |

Real Russia +600 and 12 IMPs to close in a little: down 4555 at this point. The issue was settled on the final board: Board: 40. Dlr:WestNone


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| KRASNOSSEL PAULISSEN | GLADYSH | JANSMA |  |
| $1 \otimes$ | $1 ヵ$ | Dbl | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | $2 \&$ | 3NT | All pass |

A sound auction to the best contract. With South holding the $\vee J$, declarer can always prevent North from getting the lead twice in hearts: once to clear the spades and once to enjoy them. One overtrick, Real Russia +430 .
In the Closed Room, we saw an entirely different auction:

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VERHEES JR | DRIJVER | VAN PROOIJEN BRINK |  |
| $2 \diamond$ | $2 \&$ | 3NT Pass |  |
| $4 \nabla$ | All pass |  |  |

West might as well have passed 3 NT but $4 \bigcirc$ certainly had good chances too. North led the ${ }_{2}$, which declarer won in dummy to lead a heart up. When South inserted the nine, declarer ducked this - a plan that did not work according to declarer's ideas as South returned a club for his partner to ruff with the $810 \ldots$ which suddenly put the contract one down as the loss of the two major suit aces was as inevitable as it was at the beginning of the play of this hand.
So Real Russia scored another 10 IMPs to earn themselves a winning draw: 57-56. As a consequence, the Allegra v. Het Witte Huis match, scheduled for the final round, would be crucial for both these teams as the winner of it would most probably be the second qualifier in Group B.

## The Semifinals, Segment I

In this report about the first segment of the semis, I will be concentrating on the Monaco v.Allegra match with an occasional look at what was happening in the Russia v.Angelini match. The reason for this approach is very simple: most of the bids and plays worth reporting occurred in the former match, I feel.
Allegra immediately took the lead on the first board by avoiding a poor spade game and this was board 4:

Board: 4. Dlr:West/All

- A

QQ9763
$\diamond$ A 743

- 873


Both Norths reached the obvious $4 \checkmark$ but the swing occurred when Bocchi led a club and Helness a spade. The club lead defeated the contract out of hand by way of the


Fulvio Fantoni, Monaco FM
ruff whereas the spade lead gave declarer time to discard a club on the QK and then play trumps from dummy, immediately solving the problems in that suit. That was 12 more IMPs to Allegra.
A few boards later, Monaco managed to hit back, due to the intricacies of the Italian bidding system or, if you want, the simplicity of the Norwegian methods:

Board: 8. Dlr:West/None

- K Q 102
$\bigcirc$ Q 3
$\diamond$ J 1043
Q 84
- 865
© K J IO 9
$\diamond K$ Q 5
\& K 73

¢ 43
$\bigcirc 754$
$\diamond A 9872$
- J 92


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MADALA | FANTONI | BOCCHI | NUNES |
| 18 | Pass | $2 \%$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | $3 \odot$ | Pass |
| $4 \odot$ | All pass |  |  |

After the inverted raise, a natural auction made East the declarer in $4 \checkmark$ and South led the $\$ 3$ (low from doubleton). Declarer won North's queen with the ace and immediately played $\varangle \mathbf{A}$ and a low heart to dummy's nine. North won the queen, cashed the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ and gave his partner a spade ruff. The $\diamond A$ then meant one down. As you can see, it was by no means obvious that the lead had been from a doubleton. Monaco +50 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| HELGEMO | SEMENTA | HELNESS | DUBOIN |
| I $\varnothing$ | Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | $4 \varnothing$ | All pass |

Helgemo could open a four-card major. Helness showed a forcing raise and Helgemo's 3NT rebid showed 4-3-3-3. So North was on lead and he chose the \$K. After this lead, it was clear that the number of spade losers would be restricted to just one but also that a spade ruff might be imminent. So declarer simply played off the ऽAK, dropping the queen in the process and thus eventually chalking up an overtrick. Monaco +450 and II IMPs back to nearly level the match.
They took the lead on the next board:

Board: 9. Dlr: North/EW
¢ 964
『K 972
$\diamond A 854$

- A 2

A Q 1053
$\checkmark$ QJIO 6
$\diamond$ Q 7
64

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| HELGEMO | SEMENTA | HELNESS | DUBOIN |
|  | I $\diamond$ | Pass | INT |
| Db | All pass |  |  |

With his good-looking majors, Helgemo had an obvious take-out double which Helness was happy to convert. Helgemo led the $\triangle Q$ and, when this held, immediately shifted to his other red queen, which also won the trick. The next diamond went to declarer's ace and declarer exited with a heart. Helness took his three red winners and continued the $\$ .$. As Helgemo had discarded one small spade, the contract thus went down only three for +500 to Monaco, not enough compensation for the vulnerable 3NT their way.
Well, on the actual layout, 3NT can be made easily on double-dummy lines but at the table, it's a different story, even more so after North's weak INT opening bid.

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MADALA | FANTONI | BOCCHI | NUNES |
|  | INT | Pass | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3NT | All pass |  |  |

2\% showed majors.
Fantoni led the A , on which Nunes contributed the three (a positive signal) and shifted to a low heart. Madala won the ten in hand and now, rather than going after the diamonds first, tried a low club, dummy's ten losing to South's jack. When Nunes returned a heart to dummy's now blank ace, playing on spades would have been the only winning continuation as they are 3-3 with the king onside and also because North is out of clubs.
When Madala, not being clairvoyant, continued a diamond to his queen and a diamond back to Fantoni's ace, the latter could cash his $\vee K$ and lock declarer in his hand with another heart, so the contract eventually went three down as dummy had been squeezed in the process. Monaco +300 and 13 more IMPs to them.
In the Russia v. Angelini match, there also was a big swing on this board. In the Closed Room, West had bid $2 \diamond$ after

I $\diamond$-pass-INT to show his majors. This way, the final contract became $2 \checkmark$ which certainly was not best but...it made in some way. Russia +IIO.
In the other room, the Italians did much better:

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| GIUBILO | DRIVER | CIMA | BRINK |
|  | INT | Pass | Pass |
| 2e | Pass | 3NT | All pass |

Drijver, for Russia, also opened INT (weak) and now, Giubilo could show his majors with $2 \%$ after which Cima concluded the auction with 3NT, this time played by East.. Brink found the good lead of a low club to Drijver's ace but now, a heart shift might have been best. When Drijver returned the 2 , it was difficult for Brink to find the winning defence (if any) so he won the jack, cashed the king and exited with a diamond to partner's ace. This way, declarer was forced to try his luck in spades and when this came off, he had nine tricks. Angelini +600 and 10 IMPs to them.
Two boards later, it was slam time:
Board: II. Dlr: South/None

- K 7532

QQJ964
$\diamond 2$
\& 74

| - A 1098 | N | - Q |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A |  | $\bigcirc 10872$ |
| $\checkmark$ A 1076 |  | $\diamond$ KJ 3 |
| - Q J 108 | S | - AK963 |
|  | - J64 |  |
|  | PK 53 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 9854 |  |
|  | - 52 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MADALA | fantoni | BOCCHI | NUNES |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 1\% | $2 \diamond$ | 3 | 38 |
| 3 | Pass | 4\% | Pass |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 5\% | Pass |
| $5 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 6\% | All pass |

$2 \triangleleft$ showed majors. The contract was made easily for +920 to Allegra. In the Closed Room, Helgemo-Helness were more optimistic:

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| HELGEMO | SEMENTA | HELNESS | DUBoin |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 18 | Pass | 31 | Pass |
| $4{ }^{1}$ | Pass | 5 | Pass |
| 5NT | Pass | $6\rangle$ | Pass |
| 7\% | All pass |  |  |

When Sementa led a trump, even with trumps 2-2 the crossruff is not easy as communications are awkward. Helgemo went one down when he incurred a diamond ruff, trying to finesse his way back to his hand in the suit. So +50 to Allegra and 14 IMPs to regain the lead.
Board 13 was a pretty cold $5 \diamond$ if played by East (or would you go for the triple underlead as South?) and so it proved in the Russia v. Angelini match. In our featured match, they had other ideas, however:

Board: 13. Dlr: North/All
\& 」 107
ค J 2
$\diamond 2$
\& Q 986543


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MADALA | FANTONI | BOCCHI | NUNES |
|  | Pass | I $\diamond$ | 19 |
| 2\% | 24 | Dbl | Redbl |
| 3 - | Pass | Pass | $3 \bigcirc$ |
| Db | 39 | All pass |  |



Norberto Bocchi, G.S. Allegra

This was not the optimum EW result, though 3s duly went one off on the obvious trump lead. Allegra +100 .
At the other table, an off-shape INT by Helness had a remarkable effect:

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| HELGEMO | SEMENTA | HELNESS | DUBOIN |
|  | Pass | INT | $2 \boldsymbol{2 e}$ |
| 3NT | All pass |  |  |

2s by Duboin showed majors, so Helgemo had a sort of automatic raise to 3NT which Duboin was happy to let go. Allegra +200...and 7 more IMPs to them where they easily might have lost II.
Two boards later, a wise decision by Bocchi kept his opponents out of another cold vulnerable game:

Board: 15. Dlr: South/NS


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MADALA | FANTONI | BOCCHI | NUNES |
|  |  |  | $I \varangle$ |
| Pass | INT | All pass |  |

One overtrick, Monaco +120.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| helgemo | SEMENTA | HELNESS | DUBOIN |
|  |  |  | 18 |
| Pass | INT | 2. | Pass |
| Pass | 3 - | Pass | 31 |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | 5 |
| All pass |  |  |  |

When Helness balanced after the same start of the auction, Sementa got the chance to introduce his real suit, thus striking gold as Duboin even started thinking of a slam. They landed on their feet in game which proved unbeatable as the defence cannot lead two or three rounds of trumps immediately. Allegra +600 and 10 more IMPs to win the segment 55-29. The score in the Russia v. Angelini match after the first 16 boards was 26-I5 to Russia.

## (44. Piatnik

Wiener Spielkartenfabrik
Ferd. Platnik \& Sohne
A-1140 Wien, Hatteldorfer Straße 229-231
Tel.: +43 19144151
Fax: $+4319111445,+431914415114$ / Export
eMail: infoeppiatnik.com -www.piatnik.com
Rechisform: KG
fN 4283z HG Wien
Vienna, September 2012

To all the participants in the eleventh European Bridge Champion's Cup,

We at PIATNIK are thrilled to be part of this prestigious event which takes place in Israel for the first time. A long tradition exists between our company and the Bridge playing community and we feel honoured by the opportunity to provide a commemorative deck of playing cards to mark this event.

We believe that many Bridge players are familiar with our cards but what may not be so well known is that our playing cards were the very first available to players here in Israel back in the 1950's when we established a long lasting cooperation with LION company, a relationship that remains alive to this day. After all this history our involvement with the Red Sea Bridge festival today acts as a source of tremendous pride for all parties involved.

Finally we would like to express our gratitude to the Organising Committee who have made this event possible.

We salute all participants and we wish you a fantastic tournament experience and may the best player win!

Yours faithfully

Dieter Strehl
Managing Director
WIENER SPIELKARTENFABRIK FERDINAND PIATNIK \& SÖHNE


## Russia V. Angelini <br> by Marjo Chorus

I am happy to welcome a guest author, Marjo Chorus from The Netherlands. She is well known in the international bridge Press Rooms as former Editor of the Dutch national Bridge Magazine, the largest bridge magazine in Europe.
The first segment had ended with Angelini scoring I5 IMP and Russia 26 . Not much happened on the first five boards in segment 2. Some IMPs were exchanged, Angelini having the 'most' of it: 5-3.
But then Angelini won a bundle on the next 2 boards:
Board: 22. DIr: East/EW

- A 86
-AK 10965
$\diamond 2$
\& A 5


In the Open Room, Gromov was left to play in $4 \vee$ doubled and went off two. Angelini +300 .
This is what happened in the other room:

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BRINK | CIMA | DRIJVER | GIUBILO |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 14 | Dы | 38 | Pass |
| 3. | 4 | Pass | Pass |
| $4{ }^{1}$ | Dы | All pass |  |

Who should have doubled 49? 4ent one off for another +200 to Angelini: 11 IMPs.
Even more points were scored by Angelini on board 23.
Board: 23. DIr: South/All

|  | - 63 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 94$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 1062 |  |
|  | 2 Q 842 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { AKQJIO } \\ & \& \text { A2 } \end{aligned}$ | N | - A 87542 |
|  |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{J} 7$ |
| $\diamond$ QJ 7 |  | $\checkmark 94$ |
| KJ65 | S | -1093 |
|  | - 9 |  |
|  | PQ 108653 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 853 |  |
|  | \& A 7 |  |

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VERSACE | Gromov | LAURIA | DUBININ |
|  |  |  | 18 |
| Dы | $2 \diamond$ | 31 | $4 \diamond$ |
| 4 | 5 | Pass | 5 |
| Dы | All |  |  |

Lauria put the pressure on with his jump to 3 . Versace was happy to double $5 \bigcirc$ and when Dubinin played 8 Q to the ace and later a small heart to the nine, $5>$ went off three: +800 to Angelini.
In the other room NS were not tempted:

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BRINK | CIMA | DRIJVER | GIUBILO |
|  |  |  | 18 |
| Dы | 28 | 2 | 38 |
| $4{ }^{1}$ | All pass |  |  |

Cima did not mention any diamonds but just raised to 29 . After only 24 from Drijver, Giubilo could tell a minimum hand with $3>$ and Brink's 4is ended the auction. Minus one and a huge 14 imp to Angelini.
And the Italians went on:
Board: 24. Dlr:West/None

- 19732

ค 1086
$\diamond A K Q$
K 9

$$
A 104
$$

$\diamond A Q 7$
$\diamond 10983$
$\& A Q 2$


- K Q 86
-K 95
$\diamond 72$
- 7543
$\pm 5$
J 432
J 654
J 1086


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VERSACE | GROMOV | LAURIA | DUBININ |
| INT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2 s}$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3NT | All pass |

Versace (West) played 3NT. When North got off with a small spade, the 8th trick was there. Versace played a diamond, North another spade and then Versace took an excellent view on the cards: he cashed all his spade- and heart tricks, then a diamond to North who eventually had to play
clubs. Angelini +400.
At the other table, Brink had no chance in 3NT when Cima cashed three diamond tricks, then exited with a heart: Minus two and another II IMPs to Angelini. At this point, the score in the second segment was: Angelini 4I, Russia 2! Overall Angelini 56, Russia 28.
On board 26 Brink as West had to find a lead when Drijver doubled 3NT (South INT-North 3NT):

Board: 26. Dlr: East/All

- K 6

Q Q 84
$\diamond$ K Q 32

- Q 1043

$\diamond$ A 54
2 AJ 52
Brink did not find the spade lead but put down $\vee I O$ that went to declarers king. Declarer crossed to $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ and played 88. What would declarer do if Drijver plays low?

But Drijver, after some thoughts, put up the ace, and now could have made things all right for his side by playing a spade. Instead, he played a club to Brink's king and now the spade shift came too late, as declarer now had a spade trick and three tricks in each of the other suits. +950 to Angelini against 630 in the other room. Another 8 IMPs to the


Alfredo Versace, Angelini Bridge Team

Italians, who had scored 49 IMPs in the segment, with Russia still on only 4. Russia had to strike back, and had to strike firmly.

Board: 29. Dlr: North/All
$\$ 63$
ค AK 93
$\diamond$ J 1073
\& 1093

- 108

ค J 108
$\diamond$ K Q 964

- J 84

| N |
| :---: |
| W E |
| S |
| ¢ 754 |
| $\bigcirc 765$ |
| $\checkmark$ A 82 |
| ¢K 762 |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VERSACE | GROMOV | LAURIA | DUBININ |
|  | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| INT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{s}$ | Pass |
| 44 | All pass |  |  |

In the Open Room, Lauria was in 4s. Dubinin started off with a heart to North's king.. Back came a club, then another heart and a diamond: one down, +100 to Russia.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BRINK | CIMA | DRIJVER | GIUBILO |
|  | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| INT | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3e | Pass | 3NT | Pass |
| 4e | All pass |  |  |

2NT showed good spades (six) and Drijver made a very good shot by suggesting 3NT as the final contract. But Brink elected to bid 49.
How did Drijver fare in his 44? Giubilo chose to lead a spade. Drijver took the ace and immediately led a diamond. Ten tricks made and I2 much needed IMPs back to Russia.

Nothing very much happened on the last three boards so the second segment was won by Angelini: 49-16. Theyhad taken over the lead: 64-42.

I am quite pleased that Marjo accepted my invitation to write down her views on the second segment of the Russia v. Angelini match, which turned out to be so spectacular that a much shorter report on what happened in the second segment of the Monaco v. Allegra semifinal will appear in the last issue of our Bulletins (Ed.),

