

The Cavendish Invitational

*Cavendish Calcutta hits 1.2 Million...
Details in Saturday's Bulletin*

Editor: Donna Compton

Articles Editor: Barry Rigal

O'Rourke Wins 2008 John Roberts Teams

The team captained by **Lou Ann O'Rourke** (Marc Jacobus, Geoff Hampson, Eric Rodwell, Bobby Levin and Steve Weinstein) had an exciting final session of the 2008 John Roberts Teams. Sitting in 7th place as the day began, O'Rourke won all three matches and finished in first place with 182 VPs just ahead of the **Cornell Teodorescu** team (Paul Chemla, Ionut Coldea and Michel Level) who finished with 176 VPs. In third place with 168 VPs was the **Gilad Altschuler** team (David Birman, Sam Lev and Jacek Pszczola). The Roy Welland team (Jeff Meckstroth, Sjoert Brink and Bas Drijver) finished in fourth place while the **David Berkowitz** team (Billy Pollack, Jan Jansma-Russ Ekeblad, Sheila Ekeblad and Michael Seamon) finished fifth rounding out the top five money winners. The **Jim Mahaffey** team (Peter Weichsel, Fredrik Nystrom, Peter Bertheau, Zhong Fu and Jie Zhao) won the third session overall which paid \$10,000.



**Geoff Hampson, Steve Weinstein, Lou Ann O'Rourke,
Marc Jacobus, Eric Rodwell, Bobby Levin**

2008 JOHN ROBERTS TEAMS AWARDS

1 ST	\$52,010
2 ND	\$37,150
3 RD	\$26,748
4 TH	\$19,318
5 TH	\$13,374

Best Third Session not in
the overalls \$10,000



Bobby Levin & Steve Weinstein

2007 Pairs Awards

		Auction	Player
1	Bobby Levin - Steve Weinstein	\$274,400	\$28,420
2	Drew Casen - Mike Passell	176,400	18,270
3	Bruce Rogoff - Louk Verhees	117,600	12,180
4	Curtis Cheek - Joe Grue	88,200	9,134
5	Geir Helgemo - Tor Helness	78,400	8,120
6	John Kranyak - Gavin Wolpert	68,600	7,104
7	Robert Blanchard - Sam Lev	58,800	6,090
8	Michael Elinescu - Entschow Wladow	49,000	5,076
9	Eric Greco - Geoff Hampson	39,200	4,060
10	Peter Fredin - Michael Moss	29,400	3,046

Previous Cavendish Invitational Pairs Winners

2007	Steve Weinstein - Bobby Levin
2006	Ton Bakkeren – Huub Bertens
2005	Andrea Buratti – Massimo Lanzarotti
2004	Sam Lev – Jacek Pszczola
2003	Fred Gitelman – Brad Moss
2002	Bobby Levin – Steve Weinstein
2001	Michal Kwiecien – Jacek Pszczola
2000	Marty Fleisher – Eric Rodwell
1999	Bobby Levin – Steve Weinstein
1998	Bob Hamman – Nick Nickell
1997	Michael Seamon – Harry Tudor
1996	Fred Stewart – Steve Weinstein
1995	Paul Soloway – Harry Tudor
1994	Neil Silverman – Kit Woolsey
1993	Fred Stewart – Steve Weinstein
1992	Amos Kaminski – Sam Lev
1991	Johan Bennet – Anders Wirgren
1990	Piotr Gawrys – Elyakim Shoufel
1989	Marty Bergen – Larry Cohen
1988	Bjorn Fallenius – Magnus Lindkvist
1987	Drew Casen – Jim Krekorian
1986	Matt Granovetter – Michael Rosenberg
1985	Irving Litvack – Joseph Silver
1984	Marty Bergen – Larry Cohen
1983	Robert Lipsitz – Neil Silverman
1982	Ed Manfield – Kit Woolsey
1981	James Cayne – Fred Hamilton
1980	Lou Bluhm – Thomas Sanders
1979	Roger Bates – Daniel Mordecai
1978	Roy Fox – Paul Swanson
1977	Alan Sontag – Peter Weichsel
1976	Alan Sontag – Peter Weichsel
1975	James Jacoby – Gerald Westheimer

2008 WorldBridge Productions Pairs

- Lynn Baker – Karen McCallum
- Jim Mahaffey – Peter Weichsel
- Fred Hamilton - Wafik Abdou
- Gene Freed – Bill Wickham
- Marc Jacobus – Lou Ann O'Rourke
- Stig Farholt – Jacob Ron
- Kerry Sanborn-Steve Sanborn
- Bob Hollman – Bruce Ferguson
- Left Blank
- Wojtek Kurkowski-Roger Lord
- Michael McNamara – Sylwia McNamara
- Mike Cappelletti Jr – John Morris
- Bob Morris
- Jeff Fang – David Yang
- Leo Bell – John Jones
- Sheila Ekeblad – Michael Seamon
- Connie Goldberg - Billy Eisenberg
- Patty Cayne - Charles Weed
- Lisa Berkowitz - Marvin Demeroff
- Sadik Arf - Koray Selcuk
- Joel Wooldridge - Tom Carmichael
- Marshall Miles - Steve Goldstein
- Jeff Hand - Gail Greenberg
- Phil Gordon - Jason Feldman

Entries subject to change. New entries accepted until
Saturday morning at 9:30am

#	2008 JOHN ROBERTS TEAMS FINAL STANDINGS & AWARDS	Rank	Prizes	TOTAL
9	Lou Ann O'Rourke – Marc Jacobus – Geoff Hampson – Eric Rodwell – Bobby Levin – Steve Weinstein	1		182
19	Cornell Teodorescu - Paul Chemla - Ionut Coldea - Michel Lebe	2		176
8	Gilad Altshuler – David Birman – Sam Lev – Jacek Pszczola	3		168
1	Roy Welland – Jeff Meckstroth – Sjoert Brink- Bas Drijver	4		167
18	Berkowitz-Pollack – Jan Jansma – Russ Ekeblad - Sheila Ekeblad - Michael Seamon	5		161
5	Jan-Peter Svendsen – Geir Helgemo – Tor Helness – Erik Saelensminde - Erik Austberg - John Egil-Furness			160
13	Eddie Wold – Mike Passell – Bart Bramley - Kevin Bathurst			144
4	Jim Mahaffey – Peter Weichsel – Fredrik Nystrom – Peter Bertheau – Zhong Fu – Jie Zhao	Best 3rd		143
17	Vitas Vainikonis – Richard Jedrychowski – Wojtek Olanski – Apolinary Kowalski			133
11	James Cayne - Alfredo Versace - George Mittelman - Melih Ozdil			132
10	Stig Farholt – Jacob Ron – Knut Blakset – Mathias Bruun - Bjorn Fallenius – Peter Fredin			129
15	Pierre Zimmermann – Frank Multon – Alain Levy – Herve Mouiel - Michel Bessis - Thomas Bessis			123
14	Connie Goldberg – Wafik Abdou – Billy Eisenberg – Chris Larson			122
2	Drew Casen – Jim Krekorian – Gaylor Kasle – John Diamond – Neil Chambers - John Schermer			121
16	Cristal Henner-Welland – Michael Rosenberg - Galvin Wolpert - Joe Grue - Steve Garner			119
6	Romain Zaleski – Albert Faigenbaum – Marc Bompis – Jean-Christophe Quantin			117
7	Bruce Rogoff – Louke Verhees – Zia Mahmood – Charles Wigoder			108
12	Seymon Deutsch – Jaggy Shivdasani – Billy Cohen – Ron Smith – Gary Cohler – Grant Baze			102
3	Juan Carlos Ventin – Pablo Lambardi – Chris Compton – Bob Hamman			89
20	Amos Kaminski - Veronel Lungu - Shaya Levit - Daniel Savin			72

2008 Cavendish Invitational Auction

1	Casen - Passell	\$25,000	Lewis
2	Bertheau - Nystrom	\$30,000	Zimmerman
3	Cohen - Smith	\$20,000	Welland
4	Zhong - Zhao	\$36,000	Lewis
5	Hampson - Rodwell	\$50,000	Mahaffey
6	Cohler - Lev	\$29,000	Wigoder
7	Fleisher - Martel	\$24,000	Zimmerman
8	Bessis - Bessis	\$23,000	Multon
9	Bramley - Kranyak	\$16,000	Welland
10	Fallenius - Fredin	\$42,000	Farholt
11	Bathurst - Lall	\$18,000	Welland
12	Multon - Zimmermann	\$12,500	Pair
13	Henner-Welland - Rosenberg	\$13,000	Wildavsky
14	Austberg - Furunes	\$13,000	Hauge
15	Meckstroth - Welland	\$35,000	Zaleski
16	Stewart - Woolsey	\$12,500	Pair
17	Mahmood - Wigoder	\$12,500	Pair
18	Lewis - Lewis	\$12,500	Pair
19	Coldea - Teodorescu	\$12,500	Pair
20	Chemla - Lebel	\$32,000	Zaleski
21	Berkowitz - Pollack	\$16,000	Rogoff
22	Rogoff - Verhees	\$18,000	Wigoder
23	Jacobs - Katz	\$12,500	Pair
24	Blakset - Bruun	\$17,000	Farholt
25	Levin - Weinstein	\$65,000	Zaleski
26	Doub - Wildavsky	\$13,000	Zaleski
27	Saelensminde - Svendsen	\$27,000	Hauge
28	Elinescu - Wladlow	\$14,000	Wigoder
29	Morgan - Polowan	\$13,000	Wildavsky
30	Compton - Hamman	\$27,000	Diamond
31	Cayne - Versace	\$20,000	Mahmood
32	Blanchard - Blanchard	\$12,500	Pair
33	Lambardi - Ventin	\$12,500	Pair
34	Kowalski - Vainikonis	\$12,500	Pair
35	Gitelman - Moss	\$40,000	Zimmerman
36	Levy - Mouiel	\$20,000	Farholt
37	Brogeland - Shugart	\$12,500	Pair
38	Buchalter - Zur Campanille	\$12,500	Pair
39	Faigenbaum - Zaleski	\$12,500	Pair
40	Brink - Drijver	\$35,000	Zaleski
41	Mittelman - Ozdil	\$16,000	Goren
42	Deutsch - Shivdasani	\$12,500	Pair
43	Pszczola - Zaremba	\$26,000	Zimmerman
44	Ekeblad - Jansma	\$19,000	Goldberg
45	Bompis - Quantin	\$27,000	Zaleski
46			
47	Kaminski - Levit	\$12,500	Pair
48	Jedrychowski - Olanski	\$12,500	Pair
49	Diamond - Krekorian	\$12,500	Pair
50	Helgemo - Helness	\$74,000	Hauge
51	Lungu - Savin	\$12,500	Pair
52			
53	Altschuler-Birman	\$12,500	Pair
54	Chambers - Schermer	\$17,000	Welland
55	Grue - Wolpert	\$28,000	Zimmerman
56	EIAhmady - Sadek	\$37,000	Wigoder

2008 John Roberts Teams Session II, Round 3

The last round of the second session saw Altschuler with a big lead over 2nd placed Welland. At the end of the match – A 29-1 win for Welland, the positions had been reversed. Almost all of the swings came in the auction: Both partnerships for Welland had their bidding boots on and by and large they picked their moments well.

Bd: 19 Dlr: S Vul: E-W

North

S. 2
H. Q 10 7 6
D. J 7 2
C. K J 6 5 2

West

S. —
H. K 8 5 4 3 2
D. A 5 4 3
C. 8 4 3

East

S. K Q J 10 9 7 5 4
H. J
D. K 10 8
C. 10

South

S. A 8 6 3
H. A 9
D. Q 9 6
C. A Q 9 7

Would you balance with 4S or 3S when a strong notrump is passed around to you? Drijver bid 4S, Pszczola bid 3S. I think it is pretty much a blind guess, but it was 10 imps to Welland.

Bd: 21 Dlr: N Vul: N-S

North

S. K 9 8
H. K 10 8 7 6
D. A 4 2
C. A 6

West

S. Q 7 4
H. Q J 9
D. Q J 3
C. 9 8 4 2

East

S. J 10 5 3 2
H. A 4
D. 9
C. K J 10 7 3

South

S. A 6
H. 5 3 2
D. K 10 8 7 6 5
C. Q 5

Berman opened the North hand 1H and was eventually allowed to make +170 in hearts. Meckstroth opened a 14-17 1NT and after a DONT 2C overcall, Welland bid 3NT. Pszczola led a club (there is certainly a case for a spade lead since partner might have doubled the club lead) and that was the ninth winner.

Bd: 26 Dlr: E Vul: Both

North

S. Q 7 6 5 4 3
H. 8 5
D. A
C. A 6 3 2

West

S. K J 10 9 2
H. Q 10 6 2
D. Q 9
C. K 4

East

S. —
H. K J 9 4
D. J 10 6 3
C. J 10 9 7 5

South

S. A 8
H. A 7 3
D. K 8 7 5 4 2
C. Q 8

Welland's attempt to steal from his opponents was far less successful. In one room Altschuler opened 1D and when the 1S overcall came back to him, he re-opened with a double (conversations round the water-cooler produced violent disagreement on whether-and with what-to balance). He hit the jackpot when his partner could pass, but Drijver ran by redoubling and now 2H is impossible to beat. In fact, Altschuler declared 3D down 100 – no tragedy but +200 from 1S would have been rather easier.

But in the other room, Welland treated the South cards as a strong no-trump, Lev did not overcall, and ended up defending 4Sx down 500 for 9 imps to Altschuler.



**2008 John Roberts Teams
Session III, Round 1**

Bd: 6 Dlr: E Vul: E-W

Consider this deal as a declarer play problem.

A Tale of Two Slams (or Turnabout is Fair Play)

We saw Altschuler trying for revenge against Welland and getting it (but it is fair to say that is seemed to be more of a case of the Welland team shooting itself in the foot).

Bd: 1 Dlr: N Vul: None

North		East	
S. K 3		S. 9 4 2	
H. K Q J 6 4		H. 8 2	
D. K Q 10 7		D. 8 3	
C. Q 5		C. A J 10 9 4 2	
West		South	
S. J 8 6		S. A Q 10 7 5	
H. 7 5 3		H. A 10 9	
D. A J 5 4		D. 9 6 2	
C. 8 6 3		C. K 7	

North	South
1H	1S
2D	3C
3NT	4H
5H	??*

What does this auction ask for? Normally it is trumps or 4th suit control. Welland maybe should have known he could not be facing a hand with good diamonds and club Qxx. Since that hand would cuebid instead of bidding 5H; I suppose it could have been K/KQxxx/AQxx/Qxx – no, that would be a 4NT bid over 3C. When he raised to 6H, Altschuler had 11 imps.

Smoking is not allowed in the hotel.
Smoking is allowed in the casino area and outside.
No Electronic Devices
in the Play Area.

West	East
1N	1S
2S	2D
4S	3S
	All Pass
West	East
S. A K Q J 8	S. 5 3
H. ———	H. K J 9 6 3
D. A J 8 6 4	D. K 7
C. 9 7 4	C. Q 10 8 5

You bid to 4S and are happy to receive the lead of the HA. You ruff and are relieved to draw trumps in three rounds, pitching a heart from dummy. It looks right to pass the C9 now and RHO wins the king to play a diamond.

Your safest route to ten tricks is to win the diamond in hand with the DA and preserve dummy's entry. The next club loses to LHO's ace, and he knocks out the DK. You cash the HK, ruff a heart and take the club finesse to make 5 spades, 1 heart, 2 diamonds, and 2 clubs. Nicely played...yes, but time for the full deal.

North		East	
S. 9 6 2		S. 5 3	
H. A Q 8 4 2		H. K J 9 6 3	
D. 10 3		D. K 7	
C. A 6 2		C. Q 10 8 5	
West		South	
S. A K Q J 8		S. 10 7 4	
H. ———		H. 10 7 5	
D. A J 8 6 4		D. Q 9 5 2	
C. 9 7 4		C. K J 3	

Note what happens if the defenders take the CJ. In a sort of Morton's Fork position, they can either cash their clubs to set up two discards for your diamonds or exit with a diamond to let declarer rely on the diamond finesse after pitching a club on the HK.

2008 John Roberts Teams Session III, Round 2

You want to know which defender could find the play of the CK from the K J x? That was Zia, trying to establish some psychological one-upmanship against his partner-to-be, Bob Hamman.

Bd: 13 Dlr: N Vul: Both

Bd: 8 Dlr: W Vul: Neither

	North	
	S. 3 2	
	H. 10 8 2	
	D. Q J 10 6 5 2	
	C. J 10	
West		East
S. Q J 8 7 5		S. A K 6 4
H. A 6 4		H. 9 7
D. K 9 8		D. A 4 3
C. Q 8		C. A K 9 7
	South	
	S. 10 9	
	H. K Q J 5 3	
	D. 7	
	C. 6 5 4 3 2	

Lev-Pepsi missed slam – 1S-2N-4S-All Pass – with Pepsi’s final pass seeming to be amazingly pessimistic. Not to worry, Drijver-Brink had a Blackwood auction where responder asked for the trump Q, and got a 6D response showing the SQ and the DK. Now does 6H ask for the HK or CA? One member of the partnership meant it as a heart-ask.

The other interpreted it as a club ask. 7S down one – and 11 imps away instead of 11 in. (The technical solution when asked for the SQ is to cuebid your king if you have one, or the one you don’t have with two.) The partnership was playing this way which makes the 6H ask aggressive). Altschuler won by 14 imps to regain the lead and drop Welland to 2nd place, with two matches to go.

	North	
	S. A 10 3	
	H. K Q 4	
	D. Q 5	
	C. J 10 9 6 5	
West		East
S. J 4		S. K Q 7 2
H. A 8		H. 10 9 6 5 2
D. A 10 6 4 3		D. 9 8 7
C. K 8 4 2		C. A
	South	
	S. 9 8 6 5	
	H. J 7 3	
	D. K J 2	
	C. Q 7 3	

Coldea – Teodorescu were on the same wavelength in the auction here.

	Helness	Coldea	Helgemo
Teodorescu	North	East	South
West	1C	X	1N
X	Pass	2H	All Pass

The double of 1NT was penalty and Teodorescu expected to be facing a weak hand 4-5 in the majors. But maybe it would still have been sensible to retreat to 3D? In 2H on a club lead to the CA, Coldea played a spade to the SJ and SA. Back came a club and declarer ruffed and played the SK, SQ and ruffed a spade with the H8, overruffed. The club return was won in dummy and Coldea cashed the HA, and DA, to reach this ending:

Appeals Announcement

Appeals of tournament directors’ rulings (in all events) will not be handled in the same fashion as in previous years. Any director’s ruling will be reconsidered (at the request of either side) by filing a timely request for reconsideration with the Director in Charge. Said request for reconsideration shall be in writing and must set forth in sufficient detail the reason(s) why the filling party believes that the ruling was incorrect.

Upon receipt of a request for reconsideration the tournament directing staff, along with whomever else the staff wishes to consult, will reconsider the ruling and render a decision. The directors may request a hearing when there are facts in dispute, but are not required to do so.

	North	
	—	
	K 4	
	Q	
	Q	
West		East
—		—
—		10 9 6
10 6 4		9
8		—
	South	
	—	
	J 7	
	K J	
	—	

Coldea ruffed a club with the H6 and when Helgemo could overruff with the H7, the defenders had the last four tricks for down one.

In this ending, exiting with a diamond (and subsequently ruffing the club with the H9) ensures one trick and the contract for declarer.

Bd: 14 Dlr: S Vul: None

	North	
	S. K 8 3	
	H. K 8 5 3	
	D. A	
	C. J 10 9 8 2	
West		East
S. 10 9 6 4		S. Q J 7 5 2
H. —		H. J 6 2
D. K J 7 6 5		D. 10 4 3
C. A 6 5 4		C. K Q
	South	
	S. A	
	H. A Q 10 9 7 4	
	D. Q 9 8 2	
	C. 7 3	

It is sometimes hard to tell what a good result looks like. Drijver-Brink were allowed to play 4Sx here for +590. (1H-X-2N-3S-4D-4S-X-All Pass) while Welland-Meckstroth collected +450 for a 14 imp gain.

But that +450, the result Helness-Helgemo managed (2S-3H-4S-5H-All Pass) did not look so good when it came to scoring up in their match. Chemla opened the South cards 1H, bid Blackwood (!) over a 4C response that showed a

singleton diamond, and then bid 6H. On the spade lead, he won the ace, crossed to the DA to take his discard, and exited with a club. Furunes won the CQ and returned a spade, and declarer ruffed in hand. Now he ruffed three diamonds in dummy, the third with the HK, and at trick 11 was able to lead a club and ruff low in safety. Had South returned a diamond at trick five, the timing for the cross-ruff is altered. Declarer has one more trump in hand and will have to read the ending to avoid losing a trump to the HJ x x.

Bd: 16 Dlr: E Vul: E-W

	North	
	S. K J 6	
	H. J 9 6	
	D. J 9 8 4	
	C. A Q 7	
West		East
S. A 10 9 5 2		S. 8
H. Q 4		H. A K 10 8 2
D. 6 2		D. A K Q 10 7 5
C. 10 4 3 2		C. 5
	South	
	S. Q 7 4 3	
	H. 7 5 3	
	D. 3	
	C. K J 9 8 6	

These days the “loose-Clubbers” (we are talking system not morals here) seem to be growing in number. One of the disadvantages comes when you lose the club suit – one of the benefits comes...on deals like this.

If you reach slam (6H or 6D) after a 1D opening, the play in the diamond suit becomes transparent. But Sheila Ekeblad reached 6D after Birman opened 1C – partnership style on 4-3-3-3 hands. Now after two rounds of clubs, ruffed, declarer had no reason not to play trumps from the top. And that was a swift one down and 12 imps in for Altschuler instead of 12 away.

BUFFETT CUP CHALLENGE MATCH

September 15-18, 2008

Louisville, Kentucky

www.buffettcup.com

Bd: 17 Dlr: N Vul: None

Lebel exited passively with a heart so declarer cashed four rounds of hearts and played the CA, and a club to North.

North		North	
S. K 9 8 5 4		K 9 8	
H. 5 2		—	
D. A 10		A 10	
C. K J 5 4		—	
West	East	West	East
S. A 10 2	S. Q J 7	A 10 2	Q J 7
H. K J 10	H. A Q 7 3	—	—
D. K J 6 5 4	D. 9 3	K J	9 3
C. Q 9	C. A 8 7 2	—	—
South		South	
S. 6 3		6 3	
H. 9 8 6 4		—	
D. Q 8 7 2		Q 8 7	
C. 10 6 3		—	

3NT is considerably easier from the West seat. Austberg declared 3NT from West and was favored with a low club lead. Chemla did not put up the 10 so he won the C9 and advanced the CQ, ducking when the CK appeared.

Lebel exited with a spade. Austberg won and threw him back in with a spade to concede trick 13 to DK. Contract made for an 11 imp pick-up since 3NT went down two in the other room when declared by East on a spade lead.

One Too Many ???

By Sam Leckie, Scotland

In my early years here I found it easy picking the winners of the Cavendish. I used to select a few pairs (3 or 4) and the winner always seemed to come from them. Then there were the two years I accurately named the winner –Levin/Weinstein (2002) and Gitelman/Moss (2003). In fact, it was the following year that the WBP stopped me from announcing my selection until after the auction as they felt it could affect the bidding!

Matters are quite different these days and my recent selections have been well off the mark. The funny thing is when I was successful, I don't remember one player congratulating me, but these past few years many have commented about my lack of success. Last year, one guy hit me hard, "You might have more luck with a pimp, Scotty."

To come all these miles to listen to that, I ask you. I decided to consider the whole situation carefully and work out why this has happened. Then it struck me this has all come about since I stopped attending the European Championships and Bermuda Bowl. These days I know little or nothing about the new regime of players or in other words I have been living in the past.

For instance, in three of these unsuccessful years I fell for the Zia three-card trick. "Surely Zia had to win this

event one day," I said to myself. He seems to win everything playing with anybody, how is it possible for him to play with the Great Bob himself and not win? Yet he managed to do just that – three years in a row!

Last year, I chose Helgemo/Helness (Norway). When I saw their names in the field, I remembered the last time I watched them winning the Sunday Times two years in a row by a huge margin. What I forgot was that this was in 1998 and 1999, so there I was living in the past again!

There was only one thing to do. I spent all day yesterday interviewing all the pairs I knew little about. Don't worry if I didn't speak to you, I probably spoke to your partner. You will find it surprising that despite all this work I'm opting for the same pair as last year. When I told Geir the good news I asked him, "Are you confident and do you like the method of scoring?" He replied, "The scoring is OK, and I'm always confident!" I then admitted that I don't keep track of big tournaments these days, and could he give me something to hang my hat on like any recent successes.

"We have won the last two World Championships. Is that good enough?" He answered.

"That'll do," I replied as I walked away sheepishly. Talk about asking one question too many!

Cavendish Invitational Pairs &WBP Pairs - Conditions of Contest, 2008

1A — Cavendish Pairs

There will be no more than 60 pairs entered. Play will consist of three-board rounds and there will be no more than 45 rounds.

1B — WBP Pairs

Format will be based upon the number of entries. Play will be conducted over three sessions.

For both events, the boards will be played simultaneously, barometer style, but scores will not be posted until the end of each session. Screens will be used in the Cavendish but not in the WBP.

2. The events will be conducted in accordance with the latest edition of the Laws of Duplicate Bridge (The Laws). Whenever the use of screens precludes unauthorized information the Tournament Director may waive certain provisions of The Laws.
3. Absolutely no electronic devices capable of sending or receiving signals (other than hearing aids) may be brought into the playing rooms under any circumstances. This applies to kibitzers as well as players.
4. Players are required to be in their places at the announced starting times. A penalty of 50 IMPs will be assessed for each five-minute lateness segment, beginning 10 minutes after the starting time for first offenders, and for each five minutes of tardiness after the announced starting time for repeat offenders.
5. Discussion of boards during a round is prohibited. In each session a player making any remark that, in the judgment of a director might be overheard at another table, will be penalized 50 IMPs for the first offense, 100 IMPs for the second infraction, and 150 IMPs for each offense thereafter. These are automatic and not appealable.
6. Players are free to leave the playing area when they conclude each round, but are prohibited from comparing results in the playing area. Any pair detected doing so will be assessed automatic, non-appealable penalties as in 5 above.
7. For each three-board round, 25 minutes (17 minutes for two-board rounds) are allotted, plus a two-minute grace period. A new round may not be started until the previous round's play has been completed at all tables. Pairs failing to complete play within the allocated time will be given a written warning for a first offense. A second infraction will result in a 50 IMP penalty; subsequent offenses, up to 200 IMPs. The cumulative penalties for slow play will not exceed 300 IMPs in any single session. Penalties for slow play do not carry over to another session and are administered by the Chief Director, in consultation with the Tournament Committee. In the absence of a player's report to a Director regarding an opponent's slow play or the player himself, it shall be deemed that both pairs are equally at fault. Slow play penalties are not appealable.
8. It is strongly recommended that at trick one declarer take about 15 seconds before playing to the opening lead and that the player in third seat take about 10 seconds before playing. Thereafter, significant breaks in tempo before selecting small cards will be strongly discouraged.
9. The Alert Procedure is mandatory. Players shall alert their calls as they are made, and their partner's calls when the bidding tray is moved to their side of the table. It is the Alerter's responsibility to ensure that his screenmate realizes that an alert has been made. A player may ask for an explanation of a bid, **IN WRITING** at the appropriate turn to bid and play, and the answer must also be given **IN WRITING**. All bids or calls which have a conventional meaning (other than Stayman, Blackwood, strong and artificial 2-club openings) are subject to an alert. Each player shall have a convention card completely filled out and, if possible, a hard copy of all system notes available for inspection.
10. No pre-alerts are required for carding agreements, except that leading low from a doubleton must be pre-alerted. Any method of leads against suit or notrump contracts is permitted, but the partnership may play only one structure of honor and low card leads against suit contracts. A different structure of leads may be played in defense of a notrump contract, but only one method is allowed. Normal or upside-down signals and discards for attitude, count or suit preference are permitted, but variable, or encrypted, signals are not.
11. Any irregularity in the Alert procedure may result in score adjustments for Misinformation or Unauthorized Information. Both players are required to know their bidding agreements and to alert and explain their agreements properly and identically. The appropriate laws will be applied if damage to the opponents result therefrom, and even if no damage ensues from an alert infraction, a procedural penalty may be assigned. In general, players should assume that if no alert is made, no alertable call has been made. Therefore, if there is any doubt in a player's mind as to whether or not a call is alertable, the player should alert.
12. The North and South players control the bidding tray. The screenmate is permitted to make a screen huddle to normalize the tempo by removing the bid card from the bidding box, showing it to North or South, but withholding it from being placed in the tray.
13. Players (behind screens) should endeavor to place their bidding cards in the tray without creating sounds which would be heard on the opposite side of the screen.
14. In general, any convention or treatment that is familiar to the average tournament player, or can be explained to the average player within 10 seconds, is allowed. Methods of a destructive nature are not authorized, nor are the following:
 - a. Forcing or strong pass systems;
 - b. Multi 2♦ and similar conventional opening bids;
 - c. Two-suited weak two/three-bid openings which specify only one (or neither) of the suits held; anchor suit must contain at least five cards, except that two of a major showing that suit and a minor is permitted – even if the major is only a four card suit.
 - d. Preemptive bids that do not specify which suit is held;
 - e. Artificial bids or sequences that require a lengthy explanations;
 - f. Canapé style overcalls or opening bids if the first-bid suit may be shorter than four cards;
 - g. Any system, convention or treatment that would require a pre-alert (in ACBL parlance) and written suggested defenses.
 - h. Transfer openings and transfer responses, subject to the following exceptions:
 1. Any transfer response structure to a notrump opening, overcall or rebid is permitted, as are transfer responses showing at least high-card game invitational values.
 2. Transfer responses over a 1♣ opening bid, as long as a 1♠ response promises at least invitational values.
15. Each board will be scored by International Match Points as follows: each pair's score will be compared with every other score achieved by pairs in the same direction. The maximum swing on any single comparison will be 17 IMPs times the number of comparisons. Average-plus and average-minus scores will be calculated according to a pre-determined formula, as will the adjustment for a fouled board.
16. Any Director's ruling (other than penalties under sections 4, 5, 6 and 7) may be appealed to the Appeals Committee designated by the Tournament Committee. If a pair or team wishes to lodge an appeal, it must post US \$50 which will be forfeited if the Appeals Committee deems the appeal to be substantially without merit. Decisions of the Appeals Committee are not subject to further appeal; however see 20 below.
17. The Tournament Committee will decide on the acceptability of substitutes should the need arise.
18. Disciplinary penalties may be imposed by the Tournament Committee for violations of conduct by players or their guests.
19. Kibitzers will be permitted to enter the room only at the beginning of a round or match.
20. Any of the above notwithstanding, the Tournament Committee may take any action it deems necessary in the best interests of the event and its participants.

Schedule of Events

Friday, May 9, 2008

10:30am	CIP 1 st Session	Estancia Ballroom	(27 boards)
4:00pm	CIP 2 nd Session	Estancia Ballroom	(27 boards)

Saturday, May 10, 2008

9:00am	Breakfast	LaCascada	
9:30am	Auction, WBP Pairs		
10:30am	CIP 3 rd Session	Estancia Ballroom	(27 Boards)
	WBP Pairs 1 st Session	Grand Ballroom 3-4	
4:00pm	CIP 3 rd Session	Estancia Ballroom	(27 boards)
	WBP Pairs 2 nd Session	Grand Ballroom 3-4	

Sunday, May 11, 2008

10:30am	Final Session CIP	Estancia Ballroom	
	Final Session WBP Pairs	Grand Ballroom 3-4	
3:00pm	Closing Party	Lobby Bar Terraces	

2008 John Roberts Teams Session III, Round 3

Bd: 24 Dlr: W Vul: Neither

With 1st playing 2nd and 3rd playing 4th, a big win for any of the teams would give them excellent chances of the title. Meanwhile, Teodorescu in 5th place was posting a blitz to be the leader in the club house.

North

S. 4
H. 8 5 4
D. A Q 6 3
C. A K J 7 3

West

S. K Q 10 9 8
H. Q 6 3
D. J 9 8 2
C. 2

East

S. 7 6 5 2
H. K 2
D. K 10 7 5 4
C. 6 4

South

S. A J 3
H. A J 10 9 7
D. —
C. Q 10 9 8 5

O'Rourke struck the first blow:

Bd: 20 Dlr: W Vul: Both

North

S. 6 5 4
H. 10 5 2
D. 10 9 6
C. A 10 9 3

West

S. Q 7 2
H. 9 8 7 4 3
D. 3
C. Q J 6 4

East

S. A K 10
H. A Q J 6
D. A K J 5 2
C. 2

South

S. J 9 8 3
H. K
D. Q 8 7 4
C. K 8 7 5

Everyone coped well with this deal if give an unopposed auction; but Birman-Altschuler had real problems.

Hampson	Birman	Rodwell	Altschuler
West	North	East	South
2S	X	3C (diamonds)	X
4D	5C	Pass	7C

You can understand Altschuler's ebullience – partner's wasted values in diamonds were a huge disappointment. Perhaps a 3D cuebid might have been a better way to start to get his two-suiter across.

We've all been in worse slams than 6H. When Lev showed a heart response, Pszczola blasted slam (hoping to have a possible home for a club loser if the heart finesse lost). Unlucky – and 12 imps away.

The 14 imps for O'Rourke were enough to ensure the win from Teodorescu. Altschuler despite being blitzed held on to 3rd when Welland and Berkowitz ended in a draw.