1/4/2005 **Club News Sheet – No. 126**

| Mon 28/3/05 | 1st Bob/Dave | 68% | 2 nd Chuck/Paul | 55% |
|-------------|------------------------|-----|---|-----|
| Wed 30/3/05 | $1^{st} = Tomas/Bjorn$ | 59% | $1^{st} = Bob/Thorlief$ | 59% |
| Fri 1/4/05 | 1st Tomas/Philip | 70% | 2 nd Richard(USA)/Richaed(IRL) | 61% |

Bidding Quiz

Standard American is assumed unless otherwise stated.

Hand A

With Hand A LHO opens 1♦ and RHO bids 1NT, what do you do?

- **▲** A104
- **♥** AJ32
- ♦ K94
- ♣ Q109

So that explains it

Board 1 from Friday 25th

| North | South | Remember this board from last week? Two tables | | |
|---------------|--------------|---|--|--|
| | | reached a silly 3NT and I said I could not understand | | |
| ▲ AJ32 | ♦ Q5 | how. Apparently one North opened this hand with 2NT. | | |
| ♥ Q83 | ♥ J62 | Now there is a variation of Benjamin twos that allows a | | |
| ◆ AQ6 | ◆ 752 | 2-level opening on a balanced 19-20 (and, indeed, our | | |
| ♣ AQ7 | ♣ J10984 | Australian visitors Gerard/Derek played something | | |
| | | similar) but I simply don't like it. Playing Standard | | |

American the way to bid a balanced 18-19 points is to open a suit and then jump in NT. A 2NT opener should be 20-21 and this flat hand is nowhere near a 2NT (or equivalent) opener. As I said last week, this hand is worth 18 at most and I would not argue if you downgraded to open a 15-17 1NT. South's raise to 3NT opposite what he believed to be 20-21 was perfectly OK of course but the contract was hopeless.

Have a good look before you complain

Board from Friday 25th

| Hand E | Hand F | And remember these two hands E & F from last week's quiz? |
|----------------|-----------------|---|
| | | One pair complained when the holder transferred after partner |
| ▲ K6 | ▲ K6 | had opened 1NT and then had a long pause before eventually |
| ♥ KJ543 | ♥ KJ1093 | passing partner's 2♥ response. The main protagonist later |
| ♦ 43 | ◆ 107 | agreed with me that bidding 2NT (or having a think) with |
| \$ 5432 | 4 10872 | hand F was quite reasonable. |

Don't go bananas just because you're non-vul.

Board 19 from Monday 28th

| Dealer: | ♦ 97 | | | | | |
|-------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| South | v 1072 | | West | North | East | South |
| E-W vul | ♦ J3 | | - | - | - | pass |
| | ♣ AQ9765 | | 1 (1) | 3♣ (2) pass | 3♠ (3) pass | 4 4 (4) pass (5) |
| ♠ AKQJ10 | 62 N | ♦ 843 | | | | |
| ♥ Q9 | \mathbf{W} E | ▼ A83 | | | | |
| ◆ K752 | S | ♦ Q984 | | | | |
| . - | | ♣ KJ3 | | | | |
| | 4 5 | | | | | |
| | ♥ KJ654 | | | | | |
| | ◆ A106 | | | | | |
| | 4 10842 | | | | | |

This was the auction (supervised by me) at the beginner's table: -

- (1) A nice hand, but 1 ♠ is sufficient playing Standard American. Playing Benjamin twos it's close to a 2 ♣ opener and playing Namyats then 4 ♦ (a good 4 ♠) is OK. The hand is too good for a traditional 4 ♠ which should be weaker with 8 ♠ 's.
- (2) A weak jump overcall. It would be nice to have a 7 card suit at the 3 level but at this vulnerability I think it's just about OK. But this really is up to partnership style; if I were partnering Chuck then I would pass and if I was partnering Bob then it's a clear 3. bid.
- (3) Now even this mild pre-emptive action has made life awkward for East; 3♠ is probably a slight overbid but there really is no other sensible choice.
- (4) South asked me here; I did not look at his hand as I was East, but suggested that with 3 &'s he should bid 4 and with 4 decent &'s then 5 was OK. He chose 4 which I think is probably best with no & honour.
- (5) And he asked if he should bid again here; I said definitely not. When one raises partner's pre-empt, do so to the limit at the first opportunity. So 5♣ would be acceptable at (4) but not now. I explained that the previous pre-emptive action had already probably caused sufficient disruption so that nobody really knew what was going on; maybe 4♠ goes down, maybe E-W have missed a slam. Bidding again here would simply give E-W another bite at the cherry and may be costly if it's doubled.

And what happened? 5♣ doubled would have been costly. The comfortable 4♠ was bid at 3 of the six tables and scored 620 or 650. One N-S pair decided upon a not too unreasonable 5♣ but this went for 800. But this turned out to be an average score as two N-S pairs went bananas! 6♣ doubled down 5 for 1100 away, and 5♥ doubled down 6 for 1400 away.

The bottom lines.

- Don't go bananas?
- If your partnership did, then re-read the advice that I gave the beginners above.

Pass 1NT with a flat hand

Board 18 from Monday 28th

| Dealer: | ▲ A104 | | Table A | | | |
|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------|----------|------|-------|
| East | ♥ AJ32 | | West | North(A) | East | South |
| N-S vul | ♦ K94 | | - | - | 1 ♦ | pass |
| | ♣ Q109 | | 1NT | dbl (1) | pass | 2♠ |
| | | | pass | pass (2) | pass | |
| ▲ J98 | N | ♦ Q76 | | | | |
| ♥ Q105 | W E | ♥ K64 | Table B | | | |
| ♦ 832 | S | ◆ AJ765 | West | North | East | South |
| ♣ AJ75 | | ♣ K8 | - | - | 1 ♦ | pass |
| | ♠ K532 | | 1NT | pass (1) | pass | pass |
| | y 987 | | | | | |
| | ◆ Q10 | | | | | |
| | 4 6432 | | | | | |

Table A: (1) What did you bid with this North hand A in this week's quiz? A double (take-out of ◆'s) is a very poor bid with this flat hand, especially vulnerable.

(2) And North has landed partner in a miserable 4-3 fit.

Table B: (1) This North chose the 'obvious' pass.

And what happened? 1NT was passed out at 3 tables and made exactly 3 times. Other contracts were $2 \checkmark$, $2 \spadesuit$ and $3 \spadesuit$ by N-S and these all went down (vulnerable) for poor scores.

The bottom lines: -

- Don't double the opponent's 1NT with a mediocre and/or flat hand.
- You need a very good hand to double in this position (opposite a passed partner when opener may be strong).

Bidding Quiz Answer

Hand A: Pass. A double would be take-out of ♦ 's but with this flat hand it is a very poor bid. And double is also very dangerous here: partner has passed and LHO (opener) is unlimited with a balanced partner, if opener has anything more than a minimum opener you will find a redouble very uncomfortable.