

TAIERI BRIDGE CLUB NEWSLETTER



MAY 2017

News from the Committee:

- Thanks to all those that supported the Hospice Tournament held on Sunday 7th May. A special thanks to Eve for all the organising she did to make this such a successful event. A total of \$1030.00 was raised. 18 full tables were in attendance on the day. Thanks to all members who donated prizes as well as Mosgiel New World and Wal's who donated prizes. Well done to 6 of our own members who made it in the top 3 North South and East West results.
- It will come around quickly but don't forget we have another fun night coming up on Queen's Birthday Monday. Hope to see you there ☺.
- A challenge to you all – if you used to play Wednesday nights and haven't been for a while – all is forgiven – come back and have fun in the great atmosphere. If you haven't tried Wednesday nights at all then take it from someone new to Wednesday nights who was reported to say "It's not as scary as I thought it would be and everyone is so friendly". Try it for yourself. If you currently play this night then how about inviting someone new to come along!!
- Tournaments coming up:
 - May 21st Otago Bridge Club Save the Children Charity Pairs. Start time 1.30 but be there by 1.15. Cost is \$10.00
 - May 27th – Gore Intermediate 5B and Junior 3B Pairs, cost \$20.00. Entries close 22 May.
 - June 3rd and 4th – Otago Southland 10A Teams and Pairs

Opening Lead out of Turn

When a defender makes an opening lead out of turn, the declarer has so many choices to make that it can often be very confusing. Here is an explanation of some of the choices and some tips for making the most advantageous decision in each case.

1. **Declarer can accept the lead and become Dummy.** His/her hand goes down on the table and partner plays. OR

2. **Declarer can accept the lead and remain Declarer.** Dummy goes down on the table and Declarer can look at it before playing a card from his/her hand.

Tip: The decision about whether to accept the opening lead is based on 2 things: (1) Can I win that trick or at least regain control in the second round? And (2) Do I want the weak or the strong hand on the table? Usually you want the strong hand OFF the table so any weaknesses in it remain hidden from the opposition.

If the opening lead is in your weak suit (i.e. you have only losers in it), you would choose not to accept it. In this case, the lead must come from the correct hand and you have 3 further choices.

3. **You can require the lead to be in the same suit as the incorrect lead.** In this case, the incorrect lead is picked up and does not have to be played as long as Defender follows suit.

Tip: This would be a strategic decision if you have a broken suit in your hand that you want the opposition to lead into. Not recommended unless you know what you are doing.

4. **You can forbid a lead in the same suit as the incorrect lead.** (Once again, the incorrect lead is picked up.) Defender cannot lead from the forbidden suit as long as s/he retains the lead.

Tip: This is your best bet if you've got losers in this suit that you hope you will be able to throw away (pitch) on one of your strong suits.

Director's Decision(s)

North S 2 H Q 7 4 D K953 C J8532				Directors don't necessarily have an easy job, and they do not always agree. This situation arose at another club recently and advice was sought — NS are top players, EW fairly good intermediates. Dealer South; EW vulnerable.			
West S AQJ3 H KJ82 D 74 C KQ10		East S 987 H A93 D A106 C A976		2S was alerted and explained as "weak with spades and a minor" 2NT was alerted and explained as "both minors". NS maintained the "wrong explanation" prevented North from bidding 3C (pass or correct) on the first round thereby enabling NS to judge co-operatively (and correctly) whether to sacrifice or not. West said she knew the agreement was "minors" but didn't know how else to bid the hand.			
South S K10654 H 1065 D QJ82 C 4				It was ruled the result should stand because:			
Bidding				[a] EW bidding was not illegal (Law 40A3, I see no evidence East's bidding was based on an undisclosed partnership understanding) and			
S	E	N	W	[b] I don't see how the misinformation would influence North-South's decision whether to sacrifice. There could be a case for adjustment if there WAS a profitable sacrifice that NS were prevented from finding, expecting West to hold both minors.			
2S	2NT	NB	3C				
NB	3H	NB	4H				
NB	NB	5C	X				
NB	NB	5D	X				
All pass, result -4							

Director 1 Clearly the table result should stand if E/W can show a system card that shows the explanation of minors is correct. However without that systemic corroboration I am not so happy because West's self-serving statement that the explanation was correct and she knew that, but didn't know what to do is a little odd. Choosing to bid 2NT if you knew that it showed both minors seems way out there. As I have to assume this is a mis-explanation and as the result may be different if the correct explanation is given an adjusted score is therefore necessary. I go for the simple 60% for N/S and 40% for E/W.

Director 2 I am a little bemused by the statement "I knew the agreement was 'minors' but didn't know how else to bid the hand". Does this now make the bid a psyche? If so, then there are no problems letting the result stand that I can see. I also don't really buy that the "wrong explanation" prevented North from bidding 3C" etc".

One Wish

A bridge duffer was polishing a lamp and... poof! Out popped a genie who said, "I will grant you one wish." The duffer unfolded a map of the world and said, "Let all of these countries live in peace and harmony."

"You've got to be kidding! I'm only a genie." The duffer thought for a while and then suggested, "OK, then make me a winning bridge player."

"Hmm..." the genie pondered. "Let me see that map again."

Happy bridging –be kind to all players while still being competitive!!!!