

Cambs & Hunts Bridge

Number 54, January 2010

Cambs & Hunts news

Cambs & Hunts pairs Rod & Sue Oakford and Nadia Stelmashenko & Victor Milman claimed first and second places in the Championship Pairs at the Felixstowe Congress. Victor & Nadia clinched another second the next day in the Teams.

Mary Waters passed away in October at the age of 96. She had been a regular player for many years at Cambridge and Cottenham.

Forthcoming events

C&H TEAMS OF 8

for the Garden Cities Tournament

Sunday 7th March, Peterborough

Entries to Trevor King: more info on page 10

Jubilee Swiss Pairs

Sunday 25th April, Trumpington

Entries to Penny Riley: more info will be published soon on the county website

The postponed ECL vs Beds has been rearranged provisionally for 28th February.

In this issue...

Chris Jagger recounts unusual tales from the Hubert Philips and gives a round-up of the Tolle qualifier, where Cambs & Hunts were drawn in the Group of Death. Aunt Agony is pleased to hear from her nephew again, after a long silence – maybe his last letter got lost during the postal strikes? Also we have an article on a version of Drury from Chris, the usual round-up of results from club and county events, and an update to the **County Calendar** at the end of this issue.

Visit the county's website at

www.cambsbridge.org.uk

- information on bridge clubs
- this and previous newsletters
- details of competitions and results

Please send items for the website to **David Allen** on david@djallen.org.uk

The next newsletter will be published in May.

Please send in news, letters and hands no later than 15th April. All contributions welcome!

Editors: **Chris & Catherine Jagger**

2 Wycliffe Road, Cambridge, CB1 3JD Tel: 01223 526586

Email: chjagger@deloitte.co.uk or catherine@circaworld.com

Three expensive hands and a concession

by Chris Jagger

You hold: ♠Ax ♥KQJxx ♦xxx ♣xxx

Partner opens 5♣, RHO bids 5♠, you pass and LHO raises to 6♠.

Surprised by all this bidding given your somewhat ordinary but not insignificant hand, you double in the pass out seat and lead ♥K. Dummy reveals ♠10xxxx ♥Axxxxxx ♦– ♣A. Partner shows out on the heart lead, but cannot ruff, and a doubled slam is conceded. Not good news in the first set of a Hubert Philips match!

Another slam one down in the second set ... and then this hand comes along:

♠ KJ	<table border="1"> <tr><td></td><td>N</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>W</td><td></td><td>E</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>S</td><td></td></tr> </table>		N		W		E		S		♠ Axxxx
		N									
W			E								
		S									
♥ Kx	♥ xx										
♦ AQxxx	♦ Jxxx										
♣ AQxx	♣ Kx										

W	N	E	S
1♦	P	1♠	P
3♣	P	3♦	P
3NT	P	4♦	P
4♥	P	4♠	P
5♣	P	5♦	P
6♦	P	P	P

Seems a reasonable sequence to a not very good contract. Not clear who is wrong – rebidding 2NT to show the balanced nature of the hand will work better in order to keep out of the slam – but may lead to 3NT, which looks like being no better than 6♦!

Another slam one down. The third slam swing away in 20 boards – in a Hubert Phillips match this could be enough for a concession – and it was – by the other team!

So what had been happening on the other boards?

You hold: ♠KJxxxx ♥xx ♦Jxx ♣xx

W	N	E	S
P	P	P	1♦
1♠	X	P	3♦
P	3NT		

Would you have stuck the overcall in? If you do, your partner gets off to the right lead against 3NT – taking the contract three off instead of conceding two overtricks, and netting you a handy 960 swing.

Next up:

		♠ K10x									
		♥ x									
		♦ xxxx									
		♣ KQ109x									
♠ AQ8xxx	<table border="1"> <tr><td></td><td>N</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>W</td><td></td><td>E</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>S</td><td></td></tr> </table>		N		W		E		S		♠ J9x
		N									
W			E								
		S									
♥ x	♥ KJxx										
♦ Kx	♦ AJ109										
♣ AJxx	♣ xx										
		♠ x									
		♥ AQ109xxx									
		♦ Qxx									
		♣ xx									

Sitting West, you overcall 4♥ with 4♠. A heart is led to the ten, and ♥9 returned. How do you play? I tried the queen of spades, overruffed with the king. ♣K came back which I won, and drew trumps in two rounds before leading a club off dummy. RHO followed, but only had a doubleton. If he won the trick we would have to lead a red suit away from one of his honours, giving me a trick. Instead LHO won the trick, and then he had to lead away from ♣Q or give up a trick in diamonds, so the contract made. The key is for LHO to duck the spade – declarer is likely to go down after this: so often if declarer ruffs with an honour it is wrong to overruff.

♠ Axx	<table border="1"> <tr><td>N</td></tr> <tr><td>W E</td></tr> <tr><td>S</td></tr> </table>	N	W E	S	♠ Jxx
N					
W E					
S					
♥ Jx	♥ AQxxx				
♦ KQ10x	♦ A				
♣ Q10xx	♣ AKxx				

W	N	E	S
1NT	P	2♦	P
2♥	2♠	3♣	P
3♠	P	4♦	P
5♣	P	P	P

Not entirely happy with this sequence, though a good contract reached. The first question was about 3♣ – was it forcing – I think it should be,

particularly as we play 2NT as Lebensohl here. Then 3♦ looks more natural than 3♠, showing the nature of the hand as well as giving more space. Over 3♠, 4♦ was a practical attempt to show a good hand, and opener thought that enough had been done. Oppo bid one step further, but slam couldn't be made, so a slam swing came back our way.

Finally the easiest hand of the day. You pick up an 18 count and partner opens 2NT ... it didn't take too long to produce 7NT – but that was one of this match's rare flat boards!

Semi-Drury by a passed hand

by Chris Jagger

Have you ever wondered what to bid with a balance 9-11 count when you pass and partner opens 1♠. Perhaps you have a 3433 distribution. Normally in Acol you would bid 2♣, but the problem is that as a passed hand partner may pass with a minimum, safe in the knowledge that game will not be missed. For example, ♠Kxx ♥Qxxx ♦Axx ♣Jxx opposite ♠AQxxx ♥xx ♦Kxx ♣Kxx might be bid uncontested P-1♠-2♣-P. It is rarely right to play in a 3-3 fit, and this would be no exception! But equally responder might hold ♠xx ♥Axx ♦xxx ♣AQxxx, when it would be best for opener to pass 2♣.

Alternatively, the hands might be ♠KJx ♥Qxxx ♦xx ♣AJxx opposite ♠AQxxx ♥xx ♦AQx ♣xxx, when the auction would proceed P-1♠-2♣-2♠-3♠, probably going one or two down. You would far prefer to play in 2♠, but passing 2♠ might miss game.

There is a solution to all these problems, and it involves using 2♣ as a two-way bid, either showing clubs, or showing a three-card spade raise. This solution is not perfect, but offers significant improvements. The 2♦ response to 1♠ is natural and denies three card spade support. It works like this:

P-1♠-2♣-2♠ = limited to about 13 points, denies four-card club support.

P-1♠-2♣-2♦ = 14+ with diamonds, less than 14 with four clubs, or 14 without either (this could also be a 13 count with six spades).

P-1♠-2♣-anything else = as to a non-passed hand.

The only additional thing to think about is how to continue after the 2♦ response – it is refreshingly simple:

2♥ = Denies spade support (and thus shows clubs) – either a weaker hand that would prefer to play in 2♠ than 2NT, or any 11 count without three spades. Over this, opener can bid 3♣ to play with a weak hand, 2♠ or 2NT offering a contract with a 14 count, and anything else is natural and game forcing, except for 3♥, which is simply showing a good hand without a heart stop.

2♠ = Shows three spades, and up to about 10 points. With 11, jump to 3♠.

2NT = To play, with a maximum of 10 points. This also shows clubs, so opener can convert to 3♣ should he have a weak hand with clubs. Other continuations are natural and game forcing.

You can play a similar thing over the 1♥ opener. It doesn't work quite as well, but still gives many advantages. The main difference is that

P-1♥-2♣-2♦-2♠ is now an eleven count without three hearts – weaker hands without three hearts must simply choose between 2♥ and 2NT. Otherwise it works in a similar way.

Let's give a few examples:

Opener ♠AQxxx ♥xxx ♦Qxx ♣Kx
opposite:

1. ♠Kxx ♥Axxx ♦Kxxx ♣xx
2. ♠Kx ♥xxx ♦Kxx ♣AJxxx
3. ♠xx ♥QJ10x ♦Kxx ♣QJ9x
4. ♠Kx ♥Jxx ♦Kxx ♣QJxxx

All these would begin with the sequence: P-1♠-2♣-2♠. On the third hand you could choose to correct this to 2NT, while the other hands would all happily pass 2♠.

Opener ♠AQxxx ♥Kxx ♦Qxx ♣Kx
opposite the same four responder hands:

1. P-1♠-2♣-2♦-2♠-P
2. P-1♠-2♣-2♦-2♥-2NT-3NT (I know this turns out to be a terrible contract, but you do have a combined 25 count!)
3. P-1♠-2♣-2♦-2NT-P (note you may well choose to respond 1NT on this hand instead)
4. P-1♠-2♣-2♦-2♥-2♠-P

Opener ♠AQxxx ♥xx ♦Qx ♣Kxxx
opposite the same four responder hands:

1. P-1♠-2♣-2♦-2♠-P
2. P-1♠-2♣-2♦-2♥-3♣-P
3. P-1♠-2♣-2♦-2NT-3♣-P
4. P-1♠-2♣-2♦-2♥-3♣-P

Opener ♠AQxxx ♥xx ♦AQJx ♣Kx
opposite the same four responder hands:

1. P-1♠-2♣-2♦-2♠-4♠
2. P-1♠-2♣-2♦-2♥-3♥-3♠-4♠ (The 3♥ bid showed that 2♦ was natural, and has 15+ points)
3. P-1♠-2♣-2♦-2NT-3NT
4. P-1♠-2♣-2♦-2♥-3♥-3♠-4♠

ECL Dates

31st January v Norfolk (A)
28th February v Beds (H)

A mental unblock

Dear Auntie,

As you enjoined, I have refrained from writing to you again until I played a hand “half way decently”. I hope this meets your standards.

Playing pairs, I was West below at favourable vulnerability as North dealt:

NS Vul, Dealer N			
♠ Q63	N	♠ 742	
♥ KJ1092	W E	♥ 6543	
♦ A7	S	♦ Q52	
♣ Q73		♣ A104	

N	E	S	W
1♦	P	P	1♥
1NT	2♥	P	P
P (reluctantly)			

North led ♠A and South played the nine. Perhaps they had a signalling misunderstanding for North now continued with ♠A and a 3rd round. Winning with the ♠Q, I led ♥K from hand. North won with the ace and continued with ♥Q and a 3rd heart.

On these two trumps, I was careful to retain ♥2, recalling your summary of my play a few years back that “a blockhead block-ed the suit”. Meanwhile South discarded the ♠J and a middle diamond.

A similar hand came to mind, where you commented that “even a one-eyed wombat could have read the lie, but alas, not my nephew.” It seemed that South was unlikely to hold five clubs given his discards, and given North’s reticence before her final pass, she would likely hold the missing kings, maybe ♠AKx ♥AQx ♦Kxxx ♣Kxx and South ♠Jxxx ♥x ♦xxxx ♣xxxx with the minor Jacks unknown. So the position was now:

NS Vul		♠ —	
Dealer W		♥ —	
		♦ K?xx	
		♣ K?x	
♠ —	N	♠ —	
♥ 92	W E	♥ 6	
♦ A7	S	♦ Q52	
♣ Q73		♣ A104	
		♠ —	
		♥ —	
		♦ ?xx	
		♣ ?xxx	

I could afford to lose one more trick, but even with the trump entry to table I couldn’t see how to organise a suitable endplay, whoever held ♣J. But then I had a mental unblock! All I had to do was play off my last two trumps, throwing a club from table. With five cards remaining, I could endplay North in whichever suit she came down to Kx! So I cashed my trumps, North threw two diamonds with a resigned air, and I threw her in with ace and another diamond.

I hope you are pleased with,

Your affectionate nephew

Dear Nephew,

Well, well! Wonders will never cease – you don’t seem to have played a card wrong. Perhaps there is something in what one of the editors said: “Maybe you criticise him too much. He’s not that bad, really. Well, not always.”

But you may, inevitably, have missed a few points. You comment that North had a resigned air, obviously aware of the impending endplay. I would hazard a guess that South had thrown another diamond, so that North had nothing to try for. But suppose South keeps three diamonds and two clubs, while North

keeps two diamonds and three clubs. You now cash ♦A. How would you continue if North unblocks ♦K under your ace?

You can still make if you locate ♣J. If South holds ♣J, you should then play three rounds of diamonds, endplaying South to lead away from his Jack. But this fails if North has ♣KJ. And if North holds ♣KJ, you must lead a club, intending to finesse the 10. When North inserts the Jack, you win, cash ♦Q and exit with ♣10. North's last card is a club to your queen. But this line obviously fails if South holds ♣J. So who should you play for ♣J?

There are two indications of the correct line. Firstly, you are right that South's failure to throw a club suggests four of them, and very likely Jxxx. But more relevantly, consider the opening bid. With a balanced 20 or 21 count, wouldn't North have opened 2NT? So

you should play South for ♣J. There was indeed no defence at that stage.

Could the defence have done better earlier? North had an unpleasant collection to lead from, and at trick 3 South should give a suit preference signal in the minors. With Jxxx x Jxxx J9xx he would probably signal for a club, by following with his lowest spade. This might have enabled North to find a switch to ♣K when in with a trump, which would defeat your contract. But this would be tough defence in an unfamiliar partnership, given the tempting alternative of exiting passively and hoping you misplayed the hand.

But I am indeed delighted that my gentle encouragement over the years is bearing belated fruit.

Your unaffected aunt

The Group of Death

If Brazil, Portugal and Ivory Coast seemed like a tough draw, you should have witnessed the draw for the Tolle qualifier, where five of the six most successful counties were drawn in the same group – along with Cambs & Hunts there was London, Surrey, Middlesex and Manchester – the other four teams never really looked like they were going to be in the running, although Hants and Avon were among them, and they have both appeared in the final in recent years. Representing Cambs & Hunts in what turned out to be a somewhat undistinguished performance: Paul Barden/Jonathan Mestel, Catherine Curtis/Paul Fegarty, Julian Wightwick/Rod Oakford, Giles Woodruff/Chris Jagger.

The first afternoon saw some critical slams:

♠ AKQx	<table border="1"> <tr><td></td><td>N</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>W</td><td></td><td>E</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>S</td><td></td></tr> </table>		N		W		E		S		♠ xx
		N									
W			E								
		S									
♥ Axxx	♥ Kx										
♦ J	♦ Axxx										
♣ KQJx		♣ A10xxx									

W	N	E	S
1♣	P	2♣ ^A	P
3♦ ^A	P	3♥	P
3♠	P	4♦	P
?			

2♣ was an inverted raise, showing values to raise to the three level, or a stronger hand. 3♦ was a splinter. The strong hand at some tables made a mistake over 4♦, getting out RKCB.

The problem is that you will find out about the aces, but there will still be a lot you don't know. If partner has ♠xxx ♥Kxx ♦Axx ♣Axxx, then even 6♣ may be a struggle, while if he has ♠xxxx ♥Kx ♦Axx Axxx then 7♣ isn't so bad. Giles bid 4♥ instead, and now the weaker hand, knowing about his four diamonds, and shortness in both majors, was able to take control and bid the grand slam.

The very next board: 1♣-1♠-3♠. Giles had ♠QJxxx ♥Ax ♦Q ♣Qxxxx, and made a slam try – enabling us to reach another good slam reached when I held ♠A10xx ♥xx ♦AKx ♣AK10x. He may not have played since the previous Tolle, but it didn't seem to be a problem!

Next an interesting hand in many ways:

NS Vul Dealer N	♠ xx ♥ AQ10xx ♦ xxx ♣ A10x	<table border="1" style="margin: auto;"> <tr><td>N</td></tr> <tr><td>W E</td></tr> <tr><td>S</td></tr> </table>	N	W E	S	♠ Kxxxx ♥ J ♦ Jxx ♣ Jxxx
N						
W E						
S						
♠ Axx ♥ Kxx ♦ A109x ♣ xxx	♠ QJx ♥ 9xxx ♦ KQx ♣ KQx					

W	N	E	S
	P	P	1NT
P	2♦	P	2♥
P	3NT	P	P
P			

An unusual sequence – but I have some sympathy, since the cards are very key ones. Somewhat surprised to be raised to game by a passed hand, I opted to play in NT – thinking nine tricks were more likely than ten. +600 didn't seem like a bad score.

However some pairs were faced with a defensive problem. South declared 4♥ at some tables on a spade lead to the jack and ace. I don't know the auction here, but there must be a good case for switching to ♦10 now – you need to set up a second diamond before it goes away on ♠Q. Instead the defense put a spade back and it was too late to beat 4♥.

Another hand of interest was 6♥:

NS Vul Dealer N	♠ AKQx ♥ Jxx ♦ x ♣ Qxxxx	<table border="1" style="margin: auto;"> <tr><td>N</td></tr> <tr><td>W E</td></tr> <tr><td>S</td></tr> </table>	N	W E	S	♠ Kxxxx ♥ Q9x ♦ xx ♣ Kxx
N						
W E						
S						
♠ xx ♥ 10x ♦ KQxxxx ♣ xxx	♠ Jx ♥ AKxxx ♦ AJxx ♣ Ax					

W	N	E	S
	P	P	1NT
P	2♦	P	2♥
P	3NT	P	P
P			

We opened a weak two diamonds, and led ♦K against 6♥. Alerted to the diamond split, declarer ruffed a diamond, crossed to a top heart, and ruffed another diamond, which was overruffed. Now declarer won the spade return, drew trumps and had the rest of the tricks.

One of our declarers had the same problem, but without the weak two in diamonds. Now after ruffing the diamond, he crossed first in spades. He ruffed the next diamond, overruffed, and another spade came back, and declarer could no longer make the contract as he was stranded from the spade winners.

A blindspot that is easy to have: Plan the play in 3NT, on a diamond to the king, and ♥10 switch:

♠ Ax	<table border="1"> <tr><td></td><td>N</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>W</td><td></td><td>E</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>S</td><td></td></tr> </table>		N		W		E		S		♠ J109xx
		N									
W			E								
		S									
♥ AKx	♥ xxx										
♦ J10xx	♦ x										
♣ KQxx		♣ AJ10x									

In fact you need a good spade lie – KQx onside is about the only chance – which duly comes in.

Now how do you play the uncontested auction: 1♦-1♥-1♠-2♣-2♦-2NT

Usually after fourth suit forcing, 2D as above would be nonforcing. After this, bidding a suit, eg 2H or 3D, would be forcing. But what about 2NT? This is not so standard, but in fact it is useful to play this as non-forcing – eg 109x AJ98xx – KQ9x – so a hand that doesn't want to hide its heart potential, but has a good club stop also.

Finally we end with a simple but effect bit of cardplay:

After a diamond opening from LHO, Giles declared 2♥:

♠ Axx	<table border="1"> <tr><td></td><td>N</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>W</td><td></td><td>E</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>S</td><td></td></tr> </table>		N		W		E		S		♠ J98
		N									
W			E								
		S									
♥ A109xxx	♥ QJx										
♦ Q8	♦ K10xxx										
♣ K9		♣ Qx									

He received ♠K lead, which he won, and fearing a diamond ruff, played ace and another heart, won with the king. ♦9 was returned, and Giles smoothly contributed the queen. Sure enough LHO decided his partner had ♦98, and the contract made ten tricks once he failed to cash his ♣A. It is easy to say that LHO should have been able to read it as a singleton – but it is amazing how often people fail to read things if you make life more difficult for them.

A disappointing finish saw us languishing fifth in the group, Middlesex and Manchester qualifying.

Results round-up

National competitions

Rod & Sue Oakford won the Championship Pairs at the Felixstowe Congress. Victor Milman & Nadia Stelmashenko came 2nd. Victor and Nadia also finished 2nd in the Swiss Teams.

Ian McDonald & Joanne Caldwell finished 14th in the 'A' Final of the Championship Pairs at the Seniors Congress.

Richard Lyons & Sandy Cuthbert from North Cambridge were the highest-placed Cambs pair in the David Boston Simultaneous Pairs, finishing 29th, one place ahead of Peter Watson & Bryan Wynne from Ely.

Robert Cronshaw & Michael Du from the Perse School finished 12th in the EBU Schools Simultaneous Pairs, while Damian Bell & Sam Hunt were 21st and Tristan Marris & Niall Davies were 26th.

David Williams & Ian Hill from Huntingdon finished 17th in the Monday event of the Children in Need Simultaneous Pairs

Eastern Counties League

The county scored 16-4, 20-0, 20-0 against the University; and 16-4, 0-20, 0-20 against Northants.

Cambs & Hunts League

Few matches have been played yet in the 2009/10 season, except for in Division 2:

#	Division 2	P	W	L	D	VPs	Ave
1	North Cambridge 1	4	3	1	0	57	14.3
2	Crafts Hill	4	3	1	0	49	12.3
3	Thursday 1	4	2	2	0	48	12
4	Peterborough 1	4	2	2	0	30	7.5
5	Peterborough 3	4	0	4	0	16	4
6	Huntingdon 2	0	0	0	0	0	0

County Knockout

In Round 1

LARLHAM beat COPPING
 KING beat JONES
 MAY beat KUEH
 SEAVER beat RILEY

In Round 2

LARLHAM beat ANDERSON
 JACOBSBERG beat FARIA
 JAGGER beat RICHER
 KING beat ANG
 CURTIS beat MAY
 OAKFORD beat POLLARD

SEAVER beat LAWRENCE
 TILLEY beat STEVENSON

Novice Teams Tournament

- 1 Geoff Burbridge & John Frampton,
Sylvia Morton & Sue Fox
- 2 Olive Richley & Susan Lee, Jerry &
Pauline Hathorn
- 3 Chloe Cockrill & Helen Singer,
Sherry O'Donovan & Anne Vidler
- 4 Andrew Roberts & Julia Smith,
Teresa Stow & David McBride
- 5 Graham & Sue Oates, David & Nina
Aistrup
- 6 John Saunders & Jean Murray, Mary
Vickers & Maureen Cahill
- 7 Norma Coggins & Sheila Miers,
Pauline & Peter Bramworth
- 8 Barbara McCormick & Doreen
Farman, Maggie Paget-Wilkes &
Sue Saxton
- 9 Jill Flack & Stella Hill, Lillian
Parker & Doreen Worbey
- 10 Sylvia Williams & Marlene Gillson,
Ann Worthing & Julia Thornton

Around the Clubs**Cambridge**

The club raised £150 in the Children In Need simultaneous pairs, part of a £40,000 cheque that Anna Gudge presented to Terry Wogan live on TV.

The Swiss Pairs for the Wraight Cup was won by Brenda & Philip Jones.

The Handicap Teams was won on a split tie by Dave Harrison, Clive Stops, Fred Peirce & Damian Reid, who just beat Carole Parker, Peter Jackson, Penny & Ken Riley.

Cottenham

David Newman & Kit Orde-Powlett won the Autumn Handicap Pairs for the Alan Ashment Cup.

Kiki Allen, David Allen, Peter Morgan, Mike Seaver won the Club Teams.

North Cambridge

The Club Teams of Four was won by Peter Morgan, Frank Padgett, Joanne Caldwell & Ian McDonald.

The Club Pairs was won by Richard Lyons & Sandy Cuthbert.

The monthly Prize Pairs have been won by Joan Grayer & Angela Newman (October); Bernard Buckley & Wendy Pollard (November); Peter Morgan & Frank Padgett (December); Zona Lacy & Margaret Allen (January).

CAMBS & HUNTS TEAMS OF 8

for qualification to the Garden Cities Tournament

Sunday 7th March 2010, 1pm
Peterborough Bridge Club

Refreshments available, licensed bar
Entry fee £48 per team of 8 (including free tea & coffee)

Contact Trevor King by 1st March to confirm entry: Trevor@AlpineBridge.co.uk
01733 572457. Please make cheques payable to C & H CBA and send to:
Trevor King, Tamar House, 27 Barnes Way, Werrington, Peterborough PE4 6QD

County Calendar 2010

Except for the Novice Pairs and County Individual qualifying round, all competitors must be members of the EBU. For all other events except Garden Cities Trophy, competitors must also be members of the Cambs & Hunts CBA. Full details of events and entry forms are available from clubs, direct from the event organiser, or on the county website www.cambsbridge.org.uk.

Sunday 24th January Trumpington 1pm	County Individual Final All partner all and only a simple system is permitted. (Organiser: Paul Bond, bridge@systems.co.uk)
Sunday 7th February Trumpington 1pm	County Pairs Final The green-pointed final of the County's premier pairs event. The leading three pairs represent the county in the Corwen. (Organiser: Peter Grice pg10003@cam.ac.uk)
Sunday 7th March Peterborough 1pm	Garden Cities Qualifier One Day club teams of eight (clubs may enter more than one team). The winning club represents the County in the Regional Final. (Organiser: Trevor King: Trevor@alpinebridge.co.uk)
Saturday 13th March Trumpington 10am	Novice Pairs Tournament For inexperienced players and players new to tournament bridge. (Organised by Gladys Gittins, gladys.g40@ntlworld.com , and David Carmichael)
Sunday 25th April Trumpington 1pm	Jubilee Swiss Pairs A popular pairs competition in Swiss format with six 8-board matches. (Organised by: Penny Riley, penny.riley@ntlworld.com)

Eastern Counties League dates are published separately, by Chris Larlham, CLar365164@aol.com.