



Otago Bridge Club

Inc
Established 1936



NOVEMBER 2012 BRIDGE UPDATE

'BACK TO THE FUTURE' Teams event
Monday 5 & 19 November & 3 December **at 7pm.**
Teams to comprise of no more than one member from Open Division, 1 Senior, 2 Inter/Jnr players OR 1 Open, 2 Senior, 1 Int/Jnr players (any substitute must be a member of the same Division as the person absent).
Each pair to use the system that the lower divisional player uses.
Entries on Noticeboard close Friday 2 November



Congratulations to our Intermediate Team who won the Inter-Provincial Teams competition at the Hamilton Congress. Team members: Matt Blakely, Susie Lawless, Robert and Vivienne Cowan, Christine Samson, Lyn Clark, Non-playing Captain - Cameron Benson.

Friday Bridge continues – be seated by 10.25am. Bring Lunch. Visitors welcome.

Saturday Bridge: Open to all grades and to visitors. Date: 10 November

TOURNAMENT NEWS

There were no entries for the Winton Open Pairs or the Timaru Anniversary Pairs from the OBC.

On the 20th and 21st of October the OS Provincial Teams and Pairs were held at the Otago Bridge Club. Lindsay Gunn directed both Tournaments with Liz Nevill in charge of the catering.

In the Teams' final ladder we had Genc team 1st, Miller team 2nd, Skipper team 3rd and Woodhead team 4th.

Plate Teams: 1st Gregory team;
2nd Nicholas team; 3rd Collins team and 4th
Sheehy team.

Thanks to all who supported this event.

Chris Ackerley and Murat Genc won the final ladder for the OS Provincial Pairs with a total score of 58.73%. 2nd were Graeme Stout and Jeff Miller with 57.42%. 3rd were Jane Skipper and John Skipper with 56.04%. 4th were Moss Wylie and Anne Somerville with 55.63%. 5th were Tony Sheehy and Robert Cowan with 55.35% 6th were Tim Schumacher and Lindsey Glover with 54.72%.

These top 6 pairs had a difference of 4.01%. Very little between them.

Thanks again to all who supported this Tournament.

Quick Bridge Laws and Regulations Reference with Jared Fudge

Situation: The auction proceeds thusly:

West	North	East	South
1NT	NB	2D*	2H**

* East's 2D shows long Hearts, a transfer bid, requesting West to bid 2H

** South's 2H bid, by partnership agreement, is a two-suited take-out bid (i.e. doesn't show Hearts)

Does North have to alert South's conventional 2H bid?

Answer: No. Cue bids (bidding an opponent's suit or suits being shown) are self-alerting and do not require an alert during the auction. This is because in most situations where cue bids are made, they are not natural. Thus, the opponents are entitled to inquire at their respective turn to call or play as to the agreement of the opponent's cue bid.

If you don't have an agreement for this sequence with your regular partner, perhaps you might wish to now make one.

What does a Double of the transfer show?

Situation: A Defender revokes during the play, which is revealed a few tricks later (i.e. the revoke is now established). No one seems to notice except for Dummy. When may Dummy legally bring up the matter for an established revoke?

Answer: At the end of the play of the hand (includes after a claim or concession has been made by either side and accepted). Basically, dummy may prevent an irregularity but must not draw attention to it. That means, Dummy may ask Declarer "Having none?" when declarer shows out (at the time, preventing a revoke) but must not inquire about the possibility of a revoke after the fact (drawing attention to it). So, in this situation, Dummy must keep the possible revoke to him/herself until the end of the hand, to prevent them 'coaching' their partner as to the play of the hand. Players are allowed to, and should, ask their partner if they fail to follow suit at the time.

Situation: Mistaken explanation or departure from partnership agreement?

During a competitive auction, a cue-bid is made by East, specifying the Major suits, 5/5 or better. West, in accordance with their actual partnership agreement, explains to the opponents that is what their agreement really is, and competes in Hearts, whilst holding a small doubleton in Spades. East becomes dummy, when this hand comes down, inconsistent with West's explanation: S: J73 H: AKJT8 D: KJT82 C: None. North-South are not happy about it as they can take 9 or 10 tricks in a Spade contract, as they have a 4-4 fit and competing values. Have they received a mistaken explanation of their opponents' agreement or has East simply departed from their agreement?

Answer: The Director ascertains East has in fact departed from their actual agreement, after consulting their system card. In this instance, because although the explanation was true, they are unfortunately not entitled to any redress. A system card makes it clear for everyone (Director and opponents) in these types of situations, which seem to happen relatively frequently. A mistaken explanation in this instance would be if this same hand and explanation were given, but East-West's real agreement is that the two suits are unspecified. Here, North-South may be entitled to redress (i.e. an adjusted score) as the explanation provided is not their agreement.