# BOTH PRE-TOURNAMENT FAVOURITES MAKE IT TO THE FINAL! 

Yesterday it was semifinal day. One Italian team would certainly make it to the final, as the two teams were playing head-to-head. Right from the start, Parioli seemed to have slightly the better of the exchanges. They led by 14 after the first quarter and by 16 at halftime. Then, the tide seemed to turn as Allegra took over the lead early in the third segment. They were not to enjoy this position very long, as a few boards later Parioli came along again to lead by four at the end of the quarter. It looked as if it was everybody's match with only 12 boards to play, but four boards later, it suddenly was all over. Parioli had managed to score 41 IMPs from these first four boards, and although Allegra did well to respond by scoring 21 from the next four, time was running in favour of the holders, who could even afford to lose a further 10 IMPs on the final board.

The score in this match: 106-86 to Parioli.
In the other semifinal match, things were less spectacular. Modalfa took an early lead of 17 IMPs after the first quarter, but for the next 24 boards it was all Computerland. They won $46-2$ in the second quarter and added 22-6 in the third to lead by 82-39 with 12 boards to go. The Dutch won the final segment 29-17, but this did not change the outcome of the match: 9968 was the size of the Polish victory.

Last night, we saw the first 12 boards of the final. As expected, the match is still very close, but the holders have taken a small early advantage, leading by 8 with 36 more to go.

Today's VuGraph Matches 9.30

Tennis Club Parioli Angelini v
Computerland AZS PWR Wroclaw


Tennis Club Parioli Angelini v Computerland AZS PWR Wroclaw

## Programme \& Schedule of play

Sunday 10th October

- 9.30 Final 2nd session (12 boards) Play-Off Ist session (12 boards)
- II.30 Coffee Break - Buffet
- 11.50 Final 3rd session (12 boards) Play-Off 2nd session (I2 boards)
Coffee Break - Buffet
- 13.40 Coffe 4 th session (12 boards)

Play-Off 3rd session (I2 boards)

- 20.00 Prize Giving \& Victory Banquet
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## Results

| Semifinals A | Session 1 | Session 2 | Session 3 | Session 4 | Tot |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tennis Club Parioli Angelini | 32 | 16 | 13 | 45 | 106 |
| Bridge Club Allegra | 18 | 14 | 23 | 31 | 86 |
| Computerland AZS PWR Wroclaw | 14 | 46 | 22 | 17 | 99 |
| Bridge Club Modalfa | 31 | 2 | 6 | 29 | 68 |
| Semifinals B | Session 1 | Session 2 | Session 3 |  | Tot |
| France Société Générale | 32 | 8 | 45 |  | 85 |
| One Eyed Jacks | 24 | 32 | 9 |  | 65 |
| Bridge Club Tofas | 29 | 45 | 14 |  | 88 |
| Bridge Klub Herkules | 34 | 5 | 18 |  | 57 |
|  | Semifinals C | 31 | 31 | 21 |  |
| Bridge House Barcelona | 18 | 23 | 30 |  | 73 |
| Karlsruher Bridge Sport Club | 26 | 18 | 19 |  | 63 |
| Zenith Moscow | 19 | 24 | 14 |  | 57 |
| All England Bridge Club |  |  |  |  |  |


| Final | Session 1 | Session 2 | Session 3 | Session 4 | Tot |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tennis Club Parioli Angelini | 16 | - | - | - | 16 |
| Computerland AZS PWR Wroclaw | 8 | - | - | - | 8 |

Federation Monegasque du Bridge (F.M.B.)

Principauté de Monaco

## Societé des Bains de Mer - Compagnie monegasque de banque IMTERMATMONAL TEAM TOURMAMEMT

/2-/3 - /4 november 2004
Sporting d'Hiver Friday 12 nov.: Entry from 18.00 to 20.00 - Play start at 21.00

## Round Robin round 5

In section A of the Round Robins, the leaders Allegra had to play Herkules in the last round. The Italians had scored 85 V.P. from 4 matches and were 14 V . P. ahead of Modalfa, whereas Herkules were in $3^{\text {rd }}$ position with 61 V.P., 10 behind the Dutch who had recovered remarkably well from their heavy defeat against Allegra in the morning match. So only a big win would do the Swedes any good, even more so as the Dutch looked favourites to beat Denmark in their last match and thus secure qualification without any help from their friends.

Herkules had the good start they needed when the Italians overbid badly on the first board:

Board I. Dealer North, None Vul.
A A 43
ค10532
$\diamond 10$
AKJ 84
© KJ87
$\bigcirc$
$\diamond$ A 9
206532


Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lanzarotti | Nyström | Buratti | Bertheau |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 18 |
| 19 | 23 | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 28 | All Pass |  |

The Swedish relay system coped effectively with all the traps of this hand. The final contract of $2 \checkmark$ was safe, even against the 5-I trump break. Herkules +140 .

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sylvan | D'Avossa | Sundelin | Ferraro |
|  | 1\% | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 2 |
| Dble | Redble | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 31 | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | 5 | All Pass |  |

On misfit hands, bidding carefully often produces better results than overstretching. This certainly was one of those cases: $5 \triangleleft$ had no chance and quickly went down two. Herkules another +100 and the first 6 IMPs of the many they would need.

A larger amount of those much-needed IMPs
came in for them a few boards later:

Board 4. Dealer West, All Vul.

$\bigcirc$
$\checkmark$ AK Q 854
-932

| ¢K653 N |  | ¢ A 1074 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ¢1063 |
| $\diamond$ J 76 | $W_{\text {S }}$ E |  |
| $\%$ Q |  | 9K10765 |
|  | ¢ 98 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q J 97 |  |
|  | $\diamond 102$ |  |
|  | - AJ 32 |  |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lanzarotti | Nyström | Buratti | Bertheau |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Without any clue from the auction ( $2 \checkmark$ had been a relay and $3 \bigcirc$ showed shortness in the suit and a maximum hand), Lanzarotti led a heart to the ten and declarer's queen. Bertheau now played back the 89 . When this held, he could even afford the diamond safety-play, ducking in dummy when his $\diamond 10$ was covered with the jack. West switched to the Q which was allowed to hold, and next played a spade to partner's ace. Buratti's spade return settled the issue for nine tricks, Herkules +600 .

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sylvan | D'Avossa | Sundelin | Ferraro |
| Pass | I $\diamond$ | Pass | I |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \triangleq$ |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Here, North had become the declarer and Sundelin made the good lead of the $\$ 7$ rather than a club. Three rounds of spades put dummy on lead with the Q. D’Avossa next cashed the diamonds, but when they did not break the contract was doomed. He continued with a heart to the nine, but Sylvan could take the king and simply cash two more winners for down one. Herkules +100 and 12 more IMPs.

The next board might have been another Swedish gain, it seems:

Board 5. Dealer North, NS Vul.

|  | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | QQ 1043 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 1076 |  |
|  | Q 1086 |  |
| ¢ K 1097$\vee 7$ |  | ¢ 832 |
|  | $W^{N} E$ | $\bigcirc$ AKJ985 |
| $\diamond 932$ | $W_{S}{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $\diamond$ - |
| \%KJ932 |  | \& 754 |
|  | \& A J 54 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 62$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ KQJ854 |  |
|  | \% |  |


| Closed Room: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lanzarotti | Nyström | Buratti | Bertheau |
|  | Pass | 18 | $2 \varnothing$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | 3 | 4 |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

West led a heart to the jack and East continued the suit. A third heart was ruffed by South with the jack, and from here there are II tricks on a complete crossruff. Bertheau however put his money on the spade finesse after seeing the trump break, which would have worked had he taken the ruffing finesse. His line of taking the finesse through East could easily have been successful as well, as the bidding seemed to mark East with quite a number of the missing high cards, in spite of West's double. Not this time, however: 200 to Allegra.

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sylvan | D'Avossa | Sundelin | Ferraro |
|  | Pass | 18 | 3\% |
| Dble | $4 \diamond$ | $4 \bigcirc$ | 5\% |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | Redble |
| Pass | 5 | 620 | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

This should have been a profitable save as $5 \diamond$ can be made, as we saw. It cost the Swedes another 300, which amounted to II IMPs to Allegra.

The next board was a push, but both sides would at one table consider it a good board for themselves, I assume:

Board 6. Dealer East, EW Vul.


Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lanzarotti | Nyström | Buratti | Bertheau |
| 10 |  | Pass | Pass |
| Pass | 18 | Dble | INT |
| $3 \varnothing$ | $3 \dot{0}$ | Dble | Pass |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | $4 \dot{2}$ |
|  | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

Buratti led his e , but it did not help. Bertheau could not lose more than two spades and a trump. Herkules +510 .

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sylvan | D'Avossa | Sundelin | Ferraro |
| INT | Pass | $2 \dot{2}$ | Pass |
| 2 $\varnothing$ | Pass | $4 \varnothing$ | Dble |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass | Pass |

A perfectly straightforward auction to a perfectly straightforward contract. Alas, either opponent could make his presence felt and that was 500 to Allegra. No swing.

Board II. Dealer South, None Vul.


Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lanzarotti | Nyström | Buratti | Bertheau |
|  |  |  | INT |
| Pass | 4\% | Dble | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| 4NT | Pass | 5\% | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

5\% is the right spot for a save. The save itself is right as $4 \checkmark$ will be made with South as declarer: East cannot lead his singleton diamond. So par was reached with one down, +100 to Herkules.

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sylvan | D'Avossa | Sundelin | Ferraro 10 |
| $1 \diamond$ | 14 | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 38 | 39 | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| 49 | Dble | All Pass |  |

This is not the best spot, though it's one level lower than $5 \%$. On repeated heart leads declarer will get short in trumps before the clubs are established. When Ferraro returned a low club rather than a heart after winning his first top trump, he had given away a vital tempo and in fact an overtrick too! Herkules another (surprise) +690 and 13 more IMPs to lead by 24 now.

At this point in the match, rumours were that Denmark were leading Modalfa by a margin, big enough to see the Swedes through to the semis if they held on to their current lead. Tension was growing all round...

But half the lead went off on the next board by an ill-timed double:

Board I2. Dealer West, NS Vul.


## Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lanzarotti | Nyström | Buratti | Bertheau |
| I $\varnothing$ | 14 | 3 |  |
| All Pass |  |  | $4 \uparrow$ |

Straightforward bidding by both sides here. With nothing to guide him, who can blame declarer for going down after a club lead? Allegra +200.

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sylvan | D'Avossa | Sundelin | Ferraro |
| I $\varnothing$ | I公 | $4 \triangleright$ | $4 \Phi$ |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Well, on a good day 44 might go down a lot, but the chances are that partner is void of the suit, in which case the double might be the road map declarer needs. It certainly was this time, as D'Avossa very quickly finessed twice against West's $\quad$ do land his contract. Allegra +790 and 14 IMPs back.

On the very next board, careless partscore declarer play gave Herkules 7 more IMPs and then, a few boards later, the Swedes outbid their opponents at both tables:

Board 16. Dealer West, EW Vul.

- 43
$\bigcirc 953$
$\diamond A K 10983$
* A 2


Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lanzarotti | Nyström | Buratti | Bertheau |
| Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | $2 』$ |
| Pass | 30 | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

$2 \checkmark$ was relay again and 30 showed a feature in sort of a minimum hand. Very well bid by the Swedes to an excellent contract with nine top tricks.

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sylvan | D'Avossa | Sundelin | Ferraro |
| 1s | $2 \diamond$ | 2NT | $3 \boldsymbol{3}$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

Johan Sylvan's light opening bid and PO's constructive raise made it very difficult for the Italians to find their NT game. Guido Ferraro did his best with 34, but when D'Avossa could not move the game was lost and Sweden had scored another 7 IMPs to lead by 24 again.

Two boards later, the final margin was reached when the Italians outbid the Swedes, for a change, at both tables:

Board 18. Dealer East, NS Vul.

|  | - A 1032 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 107$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A 8743 |  |
|  | * 105 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } 754 \\ & \text { § } 8542 \end{aligned}$ |  | 4 KJ 9 |
|  | $W^{N} E$ | ¢Q963 |
|  |  | $\diamond$ J 65 |
| ¢964 |  | - AJ 8 |
|  | ¢ 86 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AK |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 1092 |  |
|  | \& K Q 732 |  |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lanzarotti | Nyström | Buratti | Bertheau |
|  |  | INT | Pass |
| 20 | Pass | $2 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |

A clear success for the weak NT. Game is on for NS as the cards lie, but they did not enter the auction. On the lead of the $\oslash A K$ and a low club continuation, declarer even managed to make his contract for +110 to Allegra.

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sylvan | D'Avossa | Sundelin | Ferraro |
|  |  | 1\% | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 18 | Dble |
| 2NT | 39 | Pass | 4* |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

Once Ferraro could double at the second attempt, D'Avossa could no longer be shut out. $4 \diamond$ is a fair contract as you will probably lose a spade, a club and a trump. On the normal heart lead, the favourable breaks in both minors enable declarer to establish clubs quickly without having to lose a trump trick, so 12 tricks were easily made. Allegra another +170 and 7 IMPs back to trail by 17 now.

One more Imp went Herkules' way on the last board, so the final score of the match became 51-33 to Herkules, a 19-II win in V.P. As the Dutch had recovered a bit to lose by 12-I8 only, the latter had gone through to the semis after all. It would be Computerland AZS (Poland) v. Modalfa (Netherlands) as the two Italian teams had to meet in the other semifinal.


Enjoy the

## 2nd European Open Bridge Ghampionship

in Tenerife from 18 June to 2 July 2005

## Semifinal A

## Gomputerland v B.E. Modalfa

by Peter Ventura

Bridge Club Modalfa from the Netherlands and Computerland AZS Wroclaw from Poland were lucky not to face any of the two strong Italian teams in the semifinal. Computerland had an relatively easy run to the semis while the Dutch were close to lose their ticket to it. But here they were, playing for the right to meet the stronger Italian team in the final.

The first swing came on the very first board.
Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.


Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Olanski | Paulissen | Starkowski | Nab |
|  | Pass | 1\% | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | Dble | 31 |
| $4 \checkmark$ | 4 | Dble | All Pass |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bakkeren | Balicki | Bertens | Zmudzinski |
|  | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2 g}$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 N T$ | Pass |
| $\mathbf{4} \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |

Both Nab and Paulissen made good decisions on this board. First Nab overcalled I $\diamond$, giving N/S a way into the auction, then Paulissen bid instead of a simple $2 \diamond$-bid. With no defensive values Paulissen took the sacrifice although he knew they were playing on 4-4. When the trump suit split nicely Paulissen was only down two for -300.

Bakkeren transferred twice in the Closed Room and Bertens finally listened. The play in $4 \bigcirc$ was dull; +420 and 5 IMPs to the Dutch.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& AK } \\ & \diamond 987 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\diamond$ AKQJ 5 |  |
|  | -j108 |  |
| ¢ Q 7632 |  | -108 |
| ¢J 3 | $w^{N} E$ | $\bigcirc$ A Q 1042 |
| $\checkmark 10$ | $\mathrm{W}_{\text {S }} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond 742$ |
| * A 9743 |  | \% Q 52 |
|  | - J 954 |  |
|  | ¢K 65 |  |
|  | $\diamond 9863$ |  |
|  | - K 6 |  |

Open Room:

| West | North <br> Olanski | East <br> Paulissen | Starkowski <br> Nab |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass <br> Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | $3 N T$ |  |
| All Pass |  |  |  |


| Closed Room: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West North East | South <br> Bakkeren | Balicki | Bertens | | Zmudzinski |
| :--- |
|  |
| Pass |
| Pass |
| Pass |
| Pass |
| All Pass |

All Pass
In the Open Room Starkowski led a small heart. Paulissen played low and let West win the first trick with $\wp \mathrm{J}$. Back came a spade and declarer won the ace then cashed three diamond tricks. Paulissen was in need of two more tricks and he found the right line by playing a heart to the king, leaving East out from the play. ©K held the trick and declarer won two more diamond tricks then established a club trick by letting ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{j}$ run; Modalfa +430 .

Balicki won $\triangle \mathrm{K}$ at trick one, the right line if hearts are split 4-3, but now, as the cards lay, he had to go down; -50 and 10 IMPs to Modalfa Amsterdam.
Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

```
$K
\diamond
\diamond98753
* 108642
```



Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Olanski | Paulissen | Starkowski | Nab |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Dble |
| Rdbl | 20 | 28 | 3\% |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | Pass | 5\% |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |
| Closed Room: |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bertens | Balicki | Bakkeren | Zmudzinski |
|  | Pass | Pass | 23 |
| Dble | 5\% | Dble | All Pass |

The same contract was reached at both tables and it was even more 'obvious' for Olanski to double since his partner had opened the auction.
In the Closed Room the defence cashed their two red tricks; Computerland +550 .

In the Open Room Starkowski led $\diamond A$ then switched to a spade. When you know by the auction that declarer has only one heart it could be a good idea to cash a trick rather than play a spade when $₫ \mathrm{~A}$ lies in dummy. However, declarer won the king, drew trumps, played $\Phi \mathrm{A}$ and ruffed the next spade. Now came $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ and the defence had to surrender; an overtrick gave +650 and that was worth 3 IMPs for Modalfa.

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.

| - Q 98 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 10732$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond 107$ |  |  |  |
| Q ${ }^{\text {Q }} 75$ |  |  |  |
| ¢ 752 |  |  | ¢ AK 103 |
| QA 3 | $w^{N}$ | E | $\bigcirc$ K Q 5 |
| $\checkmark$ KJ9542 | S |  | $\checkmark$ Q 86 |
| * 3 |  |  | - 462 |
|  | ¢ 64 |  |  |
|  | PJ964 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A 3 |  |  |
|  | ¢K10984 |  |  |

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Olanski | Paulissen | Starkowski | Nab |
|  |  | 18 | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| $3 \checkmark$ | Pass | 49 | All Pass |
| Closed Room: |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bakkeren | Balicki | Bertens | Zmudzinski |
|  |  | 19 | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| $3 \checkmark$ | Pass | 38 | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | 49 | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | 5 | Pass |
| $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

Starkowski opened with one Polish-style club.

On Easts strong club-bid West showed canapé in spades and diamonds. Perhaps Olanski should have corrected to $5 \diamond$ but it seems as if they were not that close to the six-level.
$6 \diamond$ is a better contract than 6 since you can handle a 4-I split in spades as one spade will go on a high heart. The Dutch pair Bakkeren/Bertens found the slam after a natural bidding sequence where is could be short and West showed longer diamonds by definition.

After the first segment the Modalfa were in leading positing by 31 IMPs to 14 . But in the next session of 12 boards, things started to happen for Computerland.

The Polish team won 10 IMPs on board 15 in a tricky 3NT, when Golebiowski/Kwiecinski got a little help from the defence whereas Balicki/Zmudzinski defended nicely. Then came a bunch of part score swings for Computerland and they left Modalfa behind more and more.

Here came another II IMPs for Computerland.
Board I9. Dealer South. E/W Vul.
$\pm 102$
$\bigcirc 2$
$\diamond$ QJ 9
\& A Q 109742


Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Golebiowski | Paulissen | Kwiecinski | Nab |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 3\% | 49 | All Pass |
| Closed Room: |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bakkeren | Balicki | Bertens | Zmudzinski |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 29 | 32 | Dble |
| Pass | 4\% | All Pass |  |

I am not an expert on the Dutch system and as it seems 3s in the Closed Room was a bid something in between a pre-empt and a normal overcall. I can understand Bakkeren for not compete with 4s if he suspected his partner to have weak cards. Balicki bid $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ and was left to play there. The defence had four obvious tricks one down.

Kwiecinski got a club lead to the ace and Paulissen tried the best he could do by playing a heart. Kwiecinski could afford to lose one heart trick but not two, so he correctly jumped up with the ace to play $s A$
and another trump. A diamond loser could later on be pitched on $\odot Q$ - just made and that was +620 and another II IMPs to Computerland.

Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.

|  | - Q 953 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ®743 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 92 |  |
|  | * AJ2 |  |
| -10642 |  | 4 |
| QQ 1095 | N | ¢AK 862 |
| $\checkmark$ Q 63 | W E | $\diamond 104$ |
| Q ${ }^{2}$ | S | 297643 |
|  | ¢ AK 87 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AJ 875 |  |
|  | 2K108 |  |

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Golebiowski | Paulissen | Kwiecinski | Nab |
|  |  |  | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | IS | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bakkeren | Balicki | Bertens | Zmudzinski |
|  |  |  | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 14 | INT | 38 |
| Pass | 49 | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 4 | Pass | 49 |

As a double dummy problem you can make 6 $\diamond$ or 6s but in practice it is harder to succeed. Balicki/ Zmudzinski were on their way to slam after Zmudzinski's $3 \bigcirc$ splinter, but they stopped in 4s after a very long hesitation. Bertens 'sandwich-bid' INT, showing the other two suits, could help the declarer to find the right track, i. e. declarer can let the $\diamond$ J run towards the hand. Despite that information Balicki made an ordinary finesse. No show for the vugraph audience at all! Balicki made an overtrick which was not found at the other table, so Computerland gained another IMP.

In fact Modalfa only scored 2 IMPs in the second segment compared to Computerland's 45 ! That gives us a score of 59-33 halfway through this semi. The rest was an afternoon walk for Computerland...

## Round Robin Session 5

## Jugande a varios pan̆os

## by Pedro Rubiés

.En la 5a. Sesión clasificatoria, la mayor parte de jugadores en sur se encontraron jugando 3ST con las siguientes manos y terminaron con I down:

```
& QJ2
Q
\DeltaKQ 854
*984
```

- 98
©AQJ 97
$\diamond 102$
- AJ 32

Tras salir $W$ del 34 , el J de N y el Ad de Este, vuelta del 4s para el K de $W$ y más para la $Q$ de N. ¿Cómo juega usted la mano?

Supongamos que la carta de salida de $W$ y la de vuelta de E le convencen, como parece, que el estaba 4-4 (no es habitual que la defensa engañe tanto en la salida como en la vuelta en la cuenta del palo). Si esto es así, ¿entonces cómo seguimos?

Con el $\diamond 3-2$, tenemos 9 bazas de cara. Con el $\diamond$ 4-I, hay que blanquear un $\diamond$ por falta de entrada en el muerto, pero entonces sólo contamos con 8 bazas. Por otra parte, si sale el impás al $K \vee, 5$ bazas en $\diamond$ son suficientes. Si no, tras cobrar E-O sus 3 bazas en $\uparrow$,
todavía se gana el contrato con la caída del $\diamond$ o una posición favorable del corazón. Este era el caso, pues la mano completa era:


Tras ganar la tercera baza en el muerto con la Q @, el declarante debe jugar el $5 \bigcirc$ para la $\mathrm{Q} \vee$. Si Oeste gana con el $\mathrm{K}\ulcorner$ el resto del palo es firme y se gana el contrato con 4 bazas en $\diamond, 3$ en $\diamond$, I en y I en T. Si Oeste cede la $\mathrm{Q} \triangleright$, blanqueamos un $\diamond$ para cubrirnos contra el palo 4-I y ganamos el contrato con 5 bazas en $\diamond, 2$ en $\diamond 1$ en $\begin{gathered}\text { y una en } T \text {. }\end{gathered}$

Un interesante carteo en el que el declarante debe apurar todas sus posibilidades para cumplir el contrato.

| BT4 Pernminc atkers seminitals |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank | Score Name | Team | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1 | I,59 Lorenzo LAURIA - Alfredo VERSACE | TC Parioli | 1,49 | 1,08 | 1,13 | 3,58 |
| 2 | I,3I Andrea BURATTI - Massimo LANZAROTTI | BC Allegra | 0,32 | 0,87 | 2,04 | 2 |
| 3 | I,02 Cezary BALICKI - Adam ZMUDZINSKI | Computerland | -1,21 | I,98 |  | 2,31 |
| 4 | 0,93 Franck MULTON - Jean-Christophe QUANTIN | Soc Générale | 0,92 |  | 0,94 |  |
| 5 | 0,91 Yalcin ATABEY - Suleyman KOLATA | BC Tofas | -0,3 | 2,76 | 0,28 |  |
| 6 | 0,83 Juan PONT | Bridge House |  | 0,33 | 1,33 |  |
| 7 | 0,78 Sabine AUKEN - Daniela von ARNIM | Karlsruher | 0,73 | -0,57 | 2,17 |  |
| 8 | 0,72 Mariusz KWIECINSKI - Stainislaw GOLEBIOWSKI | Computerland |  | 2,02 | 0,8 |  |
| 9 | 0,67 Antonio SEMENTA - Francesco ANGELINI | TC Parioli |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 0,55 David BAKHSHI - Andrew ROBSON | All England BC | 0,54 | 0,81 | 0,31 |  |
| 11 | 0,34 Michael ROSENBLUM - Larissa PANINA | Zenith Moscow | 0,98 |  | -0,31 |  |
| 12 | 0,31 Javier GRAUPERA | Bridge House | -0,73 | 0,33 | 1,33 |  |
| 13 | 0,17 Bart NAB - Gert Jan PAULISSEN | BC Modalfa | 0,23 | -2,02 | -0,8 | 3,28 |
| 14 | 0,13 Juan Carlos VENTIN - Carlos FERNANDEZ | Bridge House | 1,98 | 0,57 | -2,17 |  |
|  | 0,13 Peter BERTHEAU - Fredrik NYSTROM | BK Herkules | 0,3 | -0,69 | 0,77 |  |
| 16 | 0,06 Vladimir REKUNOV - Jouri KHOKHLOV | Zenith Moscow | -0,54 | 0,12 | 0,59 |  |
| 17 | 0,03 Jan NICOLAJSEN - Thorvald AAGAARD | One Eyed Jacks | 0,43 | 0,64 | -0,97 |  |
| 18 | -0,04 Klaus ADAMSEN - Dennis KOCH-PALMUND | One Eyed Jacks | -0,92 | 1,74 | -0,94 |  |
| 19 | -0,16 Salvador ASSAEL - Nafiz ZORLU | BC Tofas | -0,39 | 0,69 | -0,77 |  |
| 20 | -0,36 Tom TOWNSEND - David GOLD | All England BC |  | -0,12 | -0,59 |  |
| 21 | -0,4 Lionel SEBBANE - Laurent THUILLEZ | Soc Générale | -0,43 | -1,74 | 0,97 |  |
| 22 | -0,64 Jerome ROMBAUT - Jean-Jacques PALAU | Soc Générale |  | -0,64 |  |  |
| 23 | -0,73 Jose CREUHERAS | Bridge House | -0,73 |  |  |  |
| 24 | -0,81 Evgueni SOLNTSEV - Arseni SHUR | Zenith Moscow |  | -0,81 |  |  |
| 25 | -0,84 Huub BERTENS - Ton BAKKEREN | BC Modalfa | 1,21 | -1,98 | -0,28 | -2,3 I |
| 26 | -0,88 Johan SYLVAN - Per-Olof SUNDELIN | BK Herkules | 0,39 | -2,76 | -0,28 |  |
| 27 | -0,97 Wlodzimierz STARKOWSKI - Wojtek OLANSKI | Computerland | -0,23 |  | 0,28 | -3,28 |
| 28 | -0,98 Jason HACKETT - Justin HACKETT | All England BC | -0,98 |  |  |  |
| 29 | - I, 16 Tomasz GOTARD | Karlsruher | -1,98 | -0,33 |  |  |
| 30 | -1,21 Josef PIEKAREK | Karlsruher | -1,98 | -0,33 | -1,33 |  |
| 31 | -I,3I Fulvio FANTONI - Claudio NUNES | TC Parioli | -0,32 | -0,87 | -2,04 | -2 |
| 32 | -1,33 Entscho WLADOW | Karlsruher |  |  | -1,33 |  |
| 33 | -1,82 Norberto BOCCHI - Giorgio DUBOIN | BC Allegra | -1,49 | -1,08 | -1,13 | -3,58 |

## Semifinal A

T.E. Parioli Angelini v BE Allegra
by Jos Jacobs

On Saturday morning, the decisive stage of this European Champions' Cup got underway when they kicked off in both the semifinals. In one match, Modalfa (Netherlands) were playing Computerland AZS (Poland), and in the other match, an all-Italian setting, Allegra Torino were playing Parioli Angelini Roma. Here are the highlights of the Italian match.

Board 3. Dealer South, EW Vul.

|  | $\triangle \mathrm{AK}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 987$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AK Q J 5 |  |
|  | \& 108 |  |
| ¢ Q 7632 |  | -108 |
| ¢J3 | $W^{N} E$ | $\bigcirc$ AQ 1042 |
| $\diamond 10$ | $W_{S}{ }^{\text {E }}$ | $\diamond 742$ |
| \& 9743 |  | ¢ Q 52 |
|  | ¢ J 954 |  |
|  | ¢K 65 |  |
|  | $\diamond 9863$ |  |
|  | ¢ K 6 |  |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lanzarotti | Fantoni | Buratti | Nunes |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | INT | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Once Fantoni treated his hand as an 18-20 NT, his side was committed to game. Buratti led a low heart which was ducked in dummy. Lanzarotti won the jack and returned the suit, Buratti clearing the suit. The only thing left to do for declarer was to guess the clubs, a rather easy task as defeat would be inevitable if Buratti held the s. Parioli +400 .

Open Room:

| West <br> Versace | North <br> Bocchi | East <br> Lauria | South <br> Duboin <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | INT | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{3}$ | $\mathbf{3} \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

The NT range made the difference here. When Duboin could not make a further move, game was lost. Not that it was a very good game to be in, but if it can be made, you want to be in it. Allegra +130 and the first 7 IMPs to Parioli.

There were more to come on the next board:

Board 4. Dealer West, All Vul.


Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lanzarotti | Fantoni | Buratti | Nunes |
| Pass | Pass | I $\diamond$ | Pass |
| IS | Pass | INT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

As Buratti had to open $\mid \diamond$ to prepare for a strong NT rebid, Nunes had no reason NOT to lead a low diamond to his partner's king. Even though declarer ducked the return of the $\diamond \mathrm{J}$, the contract could not be made as it was South who held the A . Parioli +100 .

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Versace | Bocchi | Lauria | Duboin |
| Pass | 2 | Dble | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

When Bocchi elected to open a weak two, Duboin had no reason NOT to lead partner's suit. Lauria won and quickly played two rounds of spades. When Duboin ducked his ace twice, Lauria ran home for another +600 and 12 more IMPs to Parioli.

Keeping your balance against a weak NT is not always easy, as was shown a few boards later:

Board 7. Dealer South, All Vul.

- 12
$\bigcirc 43$
$\diamond$ Q 832
2Q9854


Closed Room:

| West | North | East <br> Lanzarotti | Fantoni |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | Buratti | South |
| :--- |
| Nunes |
| INT |

In view of South's opening bid, game looks a better proposition than at first glance, but I do not blame Buratti-Lanzarotti for not bidding it. With everything well-placed for declarer, ten tricks were easy enough however, so Allegra scored +170 here.

| Open Room: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Versace | Bocchi | Lauria | Duboin |
|  |  |  | $1 \diamond$ |
| INT | Pass | 20 | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | 49 | All Pass |

Once Versace could overcall INT, he would end up in game if partner would have a fit in either major. On a heart lead, Duboin won the ace and returned the six, which Versace ran to dummy's eight. When trumps broke 3-2, he had registered another fine +620 for 10 more IMPs. Parioli led 29-I at this point.

Two boards later, we finally saw the first substantial swing to Allegra:

Board 9. Dealer North, EW Vul.

$$
\Delta K
$$

$\odot 3$
$\diamond$ Q 98753
2 108642


Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lanzarotti | Fantoni | Buratti | Nunes |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Dble |
| Redble | $2 \stackrel{2}{2}$ | Pass | 38 |
| Dble | Pass | $3 \curvearrowright$ | Pass |
| $4 \curvearrowright$ | All Pass |  |  |

On repeated club leads, declarer had to lose control when the trumps turned out to be $4-\mathrm{I}$. Parioli +200 for down two.
Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Versace | Bocchi | Lauria | Duboin |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Dble |
| Redble | $2 \dot{2}$ | Pass | $3 \triangleq$ |
| Dble | Pass | $3 \searrow$ | Pass |
| $4 \varnothing$ | $5 \&$ | Dble | All Pass |

With combined singletons in both red suits as clear losers, the only thing Bocchi had to do was to establish his diamonds after drawing trumps. Thus, eleven tricks were easy and Allegra had scored +550 for a gain of 8 IMPs.

On the last board of the quarter, we saw aggression from all angles:

Board I2. Dealer West, NS Vul.


Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lanzarotti | Fantoni | Buratti | Nunes |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $1 乌$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

1s is a very light overcall, even more so if red $v$. green. When Fantoni did not take evasive action, Buratti had sort of an automatic double, which Lanzarotti was happy to sit. The defence was excellent. $\diamond \boldsymbol{J}$ to the king and ace and a low heart back. West won the $\triangle A$ and returned the suit to the jack and queen. What can declarer do? Another heart was ruffed by West who exited with a spade to partner's ace. A fourth heart was ruffed by West with the jack, and now he made the good move of exiting with $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ and another, locking declarer in his hand to lead clubs away from his KJx to East. This meant down two, Allegra a much-needed and well-deserved +500 .

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Versace | Bocchi | Lauria | Duboin |
| Pass | Pass | I $\diamond$ | Is |
| Pass | INT | All Pass |  |

When you play light overcalls like these, it might be an idea to make life more difficult for your opponents by responding something. That's exactly what Bocchi did here. As nobody was strong enough to take any further action (West's spade spots don't look that promising, don't they?) he escaped undoubled. On a diamond lead and continuation after west came in with his $\nabla \mathrm{A}$, the contract duly went two down here as well, but 7 IMPs had gone Allegra's way.

The score after the first quarter: 32-I8 to Parioli.

For the second quarter, the same players would play again in the same positions they had during the $1^{\text {st }}$ segment. The boards, however, were far less exciting than what we saw earlier in the day, with the possible exception of board 13. We lost this board, however, as it was redealt at the table after one of the players took his cards out of the wrong pocket.

A good example of how things were going is board 16:

Board I6. Dealer West, EW Vul.

|  | - 7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 98$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 9873 |  |
|  | - A Q 62 |  |
| - A 932 |  | ¢ 1086 |
| $\checkmark$ A 32 | $w^{N}$ | ¢QJ 64 |
| $\checkmark$ A 42 | $W^{\text {S }}$ E | $\diamond$ J 6 |
| \& K 53 |  | -10974 |
|  | QKQJ 54 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 1075$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 105 |  |
|  | \% 18 |  |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lanzarotti | Fantoni | Buratti | Nunes |
| $1 \dot{2}$ | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 14 |
| Pass | INT | Pass | $2 \searrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

As Lanzarotti could not open INT, Fantoni had room to introduce his suit at a very low level. As EW really have nowhere to go, they had to sell out to 2 $\diamond$ which was made in comfort even though Fantoni misguessed the $\diamond$ J. Parioli +90 .

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Versace | Bocchi | Lauria | Duboin |
| INT | Pass | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | All Pass |  |

At the other table, Bocchi could not bid $2 \triangleleft$ naturally. When Duboin showed a major one-suiter, Bocchi made a disciplined correction to 24, thus leaving the proper contract again.

Had he found the $\diamond \mathrm{J}$ in the play all would still have been well in 24 too, but when he did not, he had to go one down, losing two hearts, two diamonds and two spades. Parioli +100 and 5 IMPs.

The only substantial bridge swing of the set occurred a few boards later and it went the other way:

Board 19. Dealer South, EW Vul.

$$
102
$$

$\bigcirc 2$
$\diamond$ QJ 9
\& A Q 109742


Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lanzarotti | Fantoni | Buratti | Nunes <br> Pass |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{e q}$ | $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ | All Pass |

As Fantoni-Nunes play very light preempts in $3^{\text {rd }}$ seat, Nunes was not sure what to do when Buratti put him under pressure with a direct jump to 4s. Well done, Allegra +620 . Club lead to the ace and heart switch, but Buratti went up the ace and drew trumps.

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Versace | Bocchi | Lauria | Duboin |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 3\% | 31 | 49 |
| Dble | Pass | 49 | Pass |
| Pass | 5\% | Dble | All Pass |

When Lauria overcalled a more cautious 3s Duboin could show his willingness to save, accepted by Bocchi two rounds later. This meant +300 only for Parioli, so Allegra had picked up 8 IMPs.

At the end of the set, halfway through the match, the score stood at 48-32 to Parioli. Still wide open.

For the third quarter too, the same players would retain the same positions. On the first board after the resumption, Allegra struck a first small blow, though they were a trifle lucky too:

Board I. Dealer North, None Vul.


Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lanzarotti | Fantoni | Buratti | Nunes |
|  | Pass | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $2 \dot{2}$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 2NT | All Pass |  |

For systemic reasons, Fantoni could not open in $I^{\text {st }}$ seat. As a consequence, Nunes had a more or less automatic pass when Fantoni invited game later on. With the missing cards all lying friendly, nine tricks were never in danger. Parioli +150 .

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Versace | Bocchi | Lauria | Duboin |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 38 | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Once Bocchi opened in ${ }^{\text {st }}$ position, his side was pretty sure to reach game. And so it proved. Versace led a low heart from his holding of AKJx, but it did not matter any more. Allegra +400 and 6 IMPs to close the gap to 10 IMPs only.

A few boards later, Parioli reached a very good minor suit game, only to find out that this could not be made whereas the inferior 3NT was easy:

Board 5. Dealer North, NS Vul.

|  | ¢1065 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AK 83 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 84 |  |
|  | - $\mathrm{AK}^{\text {¢ }}$ |  |
| ¢ AJ 72 | N | ¢K843 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 75 | $W^{N}$ | ¢J1064 |
| $\checkmark 75$ | S | $\checkmark$ J 1096 |
| * 10532 |  | -8 |
|  | - Q 9 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 92$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AK 3 |  |
|  | \& Q J 7 |  |

## Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lanzarotti | Fantoni | Buratti | Nunes |
|  | $1 \%$ | Pass | 2\% |
| Pass | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 34 | Pass | 4\% |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 50 |

Had the trumps been 3-2 there would also have been squeeze chances against a defender holding 4-4 in the reds. As it was, spades were 4-4 but diamonds and trumps did not behave, so Fantoni had to go one down.
+100 to Allegra. Please note how well NS discovered that they were lacking a spade stopper.

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Versace | Bocchi | Lauria | Duboin |
|  | INT | Pass | 3NT |

All Pass
Not very scientific this time, but very disciplined anyway. The final contract depends on the spades 4-4 or avoiding the lead in that suit. When the first condition was met with, Allegra had an easy road to another +600 and 12 IMPs. For the first time in the match, they were in the lead, be it by 3 IMPs only.

On board 10, Allegra picked up a double partscore swing of 6 IMPs to increase their lead to 8 , but then Parioli came back strongly:

Board II. Dealer South, None Vul.


Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lanzarotti | Fantoni | Buratti | Nunes |
|  |  |  | 1\% |
| 14 | 2\% | 38 | Pass |
| $4 \checkmark$ | 4NT | 5 | 6\% |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Well, $7 \diamond$ is well and truly magnificent, but out of reach if the suit is never mentioned. With clubs as trumps, I2 tricks are the maximum. Parioli +920 .

Open Room:

| West <br> Versace | North <br> Bocchi | East <br> Lauria | South <br> Duboin <br> 18 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | 20 | $4 \varnothing$ | Dble |
| Pass | 59 | Pass | 5 |
| 58 | Dble | Pass | $6\rangle$ |
| Pass | Pass | 68 | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

It would have been out of this world, holding this North hand, to imagine that $7 \diamond$ was on, so Bocchi duly
respected partner's double. As the spades lay well for Lauria, he managed to lose only three tricks for a score of -300 or 12 IMPs to Parioli. They had gone back into the lead by 6I-57 IMPs now and there it rested on the last board of the third quarter.

For the final segment, the four players once again stayed in the same positions. With the match almost level and only 12 boards to play, an early blow might turn the tide to either side. Those who were hoping for action were not to be disappointed, as we saw two swings in a row on the first two boards. This was \#13:

Board I3. Dealer North, All Vul.

```
& }
\veeQ10963
\diamondKJ532
& 10 3
```



```
- AK 3
\(\vee\) J 84
\(\diamond\) A Q 76
-964
- QJ 864
\(\triangle A K 5\)
\(\diamond 4\)
AKQ 8
```

- 10952
$\checkmark 72$
$\diamond 1098$
*) 752


## Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lanzarotti | Fantoni | Buratti | Nunes |
|  | Pass | 18 | Dble |
| I $\searrow$ | $3 \searrow$ | Pass | $4 \searrow$ |

All Pass
After sweeping away Lanzarotti's little psyche, Fantoni-Nunes for Parioli reached the normal contract of $4 \triangle$ and Buratti led the SA on which Lanzarotti played the deuce (count). He switched to a trump, dummy's $\$ 5$ winning the trick. Now, declarer decided to ruff spades in hand, expecting to drop the other honour in two rounds. Spade ruff, trump to the king, spade ruff (yes, right he was!) and trump to the ace. Two more spades and three top clubs brought his tally to ten tricks. Parioli +620 .

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Versace | Bocchi | Lauria | Duboin |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Dble |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | INT | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 28 | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

At the other table, Lauria made the lead of a low club. Left to his own resources, declarer cashed three rounds of the suit, throwing his losing spade, and played a diamond to the king and ace. A trump came back,
dummy's five again winning the trick. Four tricks in the bag and six more in a possible spade-diamond cross-ruff would have meant 10 tricks, but when Bocchi played one more round of trumps he could no longer make the contract. Parioli another +100 and 12 IMPs. They led by 16 now.

And:
Board I4. Dealer East, None Vul.

## - K 85

-KJ9752
$\diamond 3$
\& K Q 9

| $\& 1073$ |
| :--- |
| $\vee$ A 1083 |
| $\diamond$ QJ 2 |
|  |


© A Q 2
$\vee$ Q 4
$\diamond$ AK 10976

* 10

4J964
$\bigcirc 6$
$\diamond 854$

- A8754

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lanzarotti | Fantoni | Buratti | Nunes |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $1 \triangleleft$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | All Pass |

When Buratti did not show any higher ambitions, EW stayed in a quiet partscore, non-vulnerable. Right they were, as there was no game on for them. Allegra +110 .

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Versace | Bocchi | Lauria | Duboin |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| I $\$$ | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |

Lauria did show his ambitions when Versace responded $1 \oslash$. He upgraded the value of his $\vee Q$ and jumped in spades. Versace could do little else than make a sign-off in 2NT. This had the advantage, however, of inducing Bocchi to assume Alfredo had a real club stopper, so he elected to lead a heart against the final contract rather than a top club. Nicely done: Parioli +400 and 7 more IMPs for a stolen game.

On the next board Lauria and Versace bid and made another thin game, non-vulnerable, which BurattiLanzarotti had not bid so the complexion of the match had already changed dramatically: Parioli were in the lead by 85-57. Then came what looked like the final blow:

Board 16. Dealer West, EW Vul.


Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lanzarotti | Fantoni | Buratti | Nunes |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 29 | 24 |
| Pass | Pass | 38 | Pass |
| 4\% | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |

As hearts were never mentioned by NS they did not know they had a good fit in the suit. That's probably why they were not tempted to save against $5 \diamond$, a contract that could not be made due to the duplication in hearts in the EW hands. Parioli +200 .

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Versace | Bocchi | Lauria | Duboin |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \otimes$ | $3 \&$ | 4 |
| $5 \otimes$ | Pass | 5 | 5 |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

Once Bocchi introduced his hearts, NS were likely to compete up to a dangerously high level, as Duboin held the ideal competitive hand with four nice trumps and a side suit of his own. Lauria led a club, Bocchi's ace winning, and a trump was taken by Lauria with the king. Three more rounds of clubs followed, Lauria shedding his two spades and dummy ruffing the fourth club. Next, a spade went to declarer's queen, but Lauria ruffed and led a diamond to Versace's ace. Another spade was ruffed by Lauria and with the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ still to lose Bocchi was down five, 1100 more or 16 IMPs to Parioli. It was all over, as Parioli had scored 4I IMPs in four boards to lead by 45.

On the next four boards, Allegra recouped 21 of those 45 but their time had already run out when the last board came up:

Board 24. Dealer West, None Vul.


Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Versace | Bocchi | Lauria | Duboin |
| $1 \&$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \triangleq$ |
| Pass | INT | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

On the lead of the $\diamond 9$ to the queen and ace, this contract quietly went one down. West won his en at trick two and led his second diamond to partner's king, thereby making life easy for declarer. Parioli +50 .

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lanzarotti | Fantoni | Buratti | Nunes |
| $1 \mathbf{1 s}$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | 18 |
| $2 \otimes$ | Pass | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

As you can see, they had different ideas here about the bidding. It was the more inspired defence that did the job for Allegra, however. Lanzarotti led a heart to declarer's ace and Nunes next played his club. Lanzarotti was quick to rise with the ace. When he continued $\boldsymbol{\Phi} \mathrm{A}$ and another, declarer had to hope for the best in diamonds and thus made the standard play of $\diamond A$ and a small diamond. As diamonds were 4-2 but without an honour in the doubleton, he thus had to go down three for a worthy +500 farewell to Allegra. Ten IMPs had come back.

This profitable double brought the final score to 106-86 to Parioli, a much closer result than seemed possible a few boards ago. Still, it would be the holders, Parioli/Angelini from Rome, against Computerland AZS from Wroclaw, Poland, for the European Champions Cup. Looking back on the Poles' performance yesterday, one would expect that the stage was set for a close and well-fought final.

