

Cambs & Hunts Bridge

Number 50, October 2008

Cambs & Hunts in the news

Each issue of the EBU's *Club Focus* runs a limerick competition, featuring a different county association. The latest issue was the turn of Cambs & Hunts and here are some of the best entries:

There was a bridge player from Ely
Whose manners were all touchy-feely
Each card that he chose
He stroked, kissed and squoze
Till his partner was quite jealous, really.
Sandra Nicholson, Oxford

There was a young player from Eye
Who thought it the right thing to try
As a line of attack
a finesse of the Jack
then proudly declared 'Dummy's high'
Margaret Eddleston, Hitchin

And the winning entry:

There was an old man from Bar Hill
Who played bridge with both flair and
with skill
His partners he chided
Scorned, mocked and derided
Tis wondrous they play with him still!
Peggy Millidge, Carlisle

To join in the fun, the current
competition is for the Channel Islands.
Entries: clubfocus@ebu.co.uk by 15 Oct

Stop Press

Catherine Curtis & Paul Fegarty win Great Northern Swiss Pairs.

Philip Wraight receives Dimmie Fleming award from EBU.

In this issue...

Jonathan Mestel debates what constitutes a fair deal, and whether to trust opponents. Chris Jagger tells tales from his teams' victory in the Hubert Philips mixed pivot knockout teams competition, and recounts an interesting hand from the Brighton Swiss Pairs.

We also have the results of "The Blame Game", so see how you have scored against the panel. And don't miss the usual round-up of results from club and county events, plus 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 January.

Please send in news, letters and
hands no later than 15th December.
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

WHOSE SIDE ARE THEY ON, ANYWAY?

by Jonathan Mestel

These two hands display a theme – when opponents unnecessarily reveal their distribution do you suspect them of devious intent or do you just use the information and assume they weren't thinking?

Dealer South, Love all, IMPs			
♠ 8		♠ K9742	
♥ 8		♥ J7	
♦ AJ3		♦ K1094	
♣ AKQJ10652		♣ 93	

N	E	S	W
P	P	1♠	5♣
		P	

North cashes ♥A and leads a spade to the 10. South leads ♥K. We ruff, and lead four rounds of trumps on which South discards three hearts, North a spade and a heart. Further trumps elicit nothing useful.

Oppo have given us a crystal picture: South was ♠AQJ10x ♥KQxxx ♦?? ♣x and North ♠xx ♥AJxxx ♦???? ♣xx. South doesn't need ♦Q for his opening bid. Other things being equal, it looks best to finesse through North, superficially a 2:1 shot.

But South did not have to throw all his hearts. Was he at pains to tell us about his doubleton diamond and heart values to increase his chance of making a doubleton queen? On the other hand, many people discard "useless" cards without thinking ... so what do you do?

Does it niggle when you misguess? On this occasion oppo were not very strong.

Do you wonder how you would have played had RHO been a good player? Not so long later, comes the chance to find out:

Dealer South, Love all, IMPs			
♠ 53		♠ 4	
♥ J84		♥ AKQ	
♦ 762		♦ AJ4	
♣ AKQ52		♣ J109863	

N	E	S	W
		2♠	P
4♠	X	P	5♣
P	P	P	

South opens 2♠ at love all, which should be 5 precisely, 6 card suits going through a multi. Your 5♣ bid is far from automatic; that will certainly be partner's view if you go down when he puts down 6 card support.

A low spade is led to the ace and a heart returned. You draw two trumps and eliminate spades, with North throwing a heart and a spade. You cash the hearts, and North discards! So you now know that North was 5-3-5-0 and South 5-4-2-2.

There are two ways of playing once the majors are eliminated. ♦A and another works when South has a doubleton including at least one of the king or queen which is 11 of 21 possible doubletons. A diamond to the jack works when South has two small, which is 10 possibilities. Close enough to allow other considerations to dominate.

North this time is a strong player. Why did he throw a heart, giving you a complete count? Does he have ♠Kxxxx ♥xxx ♦KQxxx ♣— and

realises that if you think his partner might hold three diamonds you will certainly finesse the jack, but you might go wrong if you know about the diamond doubleton? Just how good are

these good players really? On the other hand, might he not have led a diamond holding KQ?

So what do you do this time...?

The Blame Game: the Results

Here are the results from the Blame Game of the last newsletter – your chance to assign the blame without upsetting partner!

1. A fairly hopeless slam – where did they go wrong?

♠ A8		♠ J52									
♥ Q1098		♥ AK52									
♦ 5		♦ AJ942									
♣ J109864		♣ A									
	<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		
	N										
W		E									
	S										

W	E
P	1♦
1♥	4♣
4♠	4NT
5♦	6♥

Many lay the blame squarely at West's feet.

Henry Lockwood: 90:10 (ie West 90%, East 10%) “*West has a bare minimum. He has no extra trumps and no extra values. Surely 4♥.*”

But some think things are more even:

Julian Wightwick: 60:40 “*Both players are badly culpable – we can forgive the 4♣ stretch. However, 4NT is a bad overbid. Still, the worst bid is West's 4♠. East is unlikely to have 5 card support, so West can predict that it will be hard to set up the clubs.*”

And some go even further:

Paul Barden: 29:71 “*4♣ is an overbid: 3♥ is correct. East has got a six-loser hand in which ♣A is not good*

value...having overbid already, driving to slam is grotesque. What is the point of asking for key cards? Why should slam be worse if West has control bid the ♠K, presumably with compensating values elsewhere? Or was East just practising?”

One could almost believe that Paul's partner was East! But I go along with Paul's thinking here, and if we treat this fairly analytically, then 4♣ was a minor overbid, 4♠ was a great overbid (I would not sign off on the hand, but would merely make a ‘last train’ bid of 4♦ showing some interest, but not wanting to go past 4♥), but the worst bid of all was 4NT, which effectively drove the slam, which was both an ineffective bid and also the actual bid that got them too high. Since West did make a clear overbid and got them to the five level, he must take his part of the blame.

Editor's choice West 40: East 60.

Panel answer West 58: East 42.
(Range West 10-100%)

2. An even worse grand slam – who gets the finger of blame?

♠ Q		♠ A942									
♥ K1062		♥ AQ53									
♦ Q1086		♦ A52									
♣ AQJ10		♣ K2									
	<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		
	N										
W		E									
	S										

W	E
1♦	1♥
2♥	4NT
5♥	5NT
7♥	

This time a somewhat agricultural approach of 4NT (for most of us, the 2♥ raise could well have been only three card support), followed by 5NT asking for kings. It is worth mentioning that it is generally considered quite acceptable not to give the answer and simply to leap to the grand slam, if you have reason to believe it should be making.

Victor Milman: 70:30 *“Blackwood approach is not scientific, but there is a finite chance East could have done the right thing after hearing about kings. He was about to make the last guess, but West stole his opportunity.”*

He should partner **Julian Wightwick:** 70:30 *“5NT was too much. For example, ♠xx ♥KJxx ♦KQJxx ♣Ax would be a reasonable 7 punt by West, and offers no play...but West’s 7♥ bid was ridiculous...with no side kings, and no five card diamond suit.”*

That puts West in his place – will nobody stand up for him?! That said, they are not absolving East from the blame, since 5NT was too much.

Some go further, with **Catherine Jagger** and **Andrew Robson** being a potential partnership, both voting 30:70. **Andrew** observed that *“West didn’t really have his 7♥ bid”*, and **Catherine** that it was ‘nuts’, but both were far more upset by East’s overbid.

And I would throw my lot in with them in the marks – although I would be kinder to West. Although I don’t agree with 7♥, the truth is that East really owes his partner an extra trump, and if he’d had ♠Axx ♥AQxxx ♦Axx ♣Kx, then no doubt many would have

congratulated him on his fine judgement as an easy 13 tricks rolled in. His partner has made a foolish overbid, and assuming they tend to keep the bidding simple as it appears, then West has been left guessing a bit what to do – he took an action that could well have been right, so that to me cannot be so ridiculous.

Editor’s choice West 30: East 70.

Panel vote West 58: East 42. (Range West 30-95%, though half the panel voted for 30!)

3. Finally a defensive problem. We start again with East’s supporters.

Love all	♠ 108
Dealer W	♥ 87
Teams	♦ AK10985 ♣ KQ5
♠ A942	♠ J653
♥ AK432	♥ QJ105
♦ QJ	♦ 6432
♣ J10	♣ 2
	♠ KQ7
	♥ 96
	♦ 7
	♣ A987643

N	E	S	W
			1♥
2♦	3♥	4♣	P
5♣			

Victor Milman: 60:40 *“West did not cash his ace, so partner assumed he did not have it. From East’s point of view the only chance of beating the contract are ♣A with West (defence immaterial), or diamond void. The latter is unlikely. South should have seven clubs to go with three diamonds...which leaves partner with 5-5 majors. Not possible. The ♥4 is the highest heart – thus not asking for a diamond. All in all, East can figure out that the spade switch is requested, but*

West should not put him in this position, especially playing IMPs."

This is a pretty good analysis of the hand, and **Henry Lockwood** agrees with the blame, adding *"This is teams; why not take the tricks and be satisfied with defeating the contract."*

However **Paul Barden and Jonathan Mestel** both ponder the worth of the two imp gain or loss by taking the extra trick – matches can be won and lost by 2 imps, and I've seen weak teams lose 30 imps in a match by carelessly losing undertricks or overtricks.

Andrew Robson: 0:100 *"The diamond return was absurd. West was paying East the compliment of getting the game down two when East had ♠QJ – a 'free shot' he may not take next time. (Sorry to be harsh East!)"*

There speaks an expert. But would he take that view playing with one of his paying clients – I usually don't – I reckon they are paying for me to make their lives easy, and the chance of the second undertrick is not so great.

Julian Wightwick: 20:80 *"West should cash the ♠A at trick 2. South almost certainly has the ♠K on the bidding, so this saves the overtrick when partner has 5 hearts. East blundered by switching to a diamond, so he gets most of the blame."*

A good point, and it could even lead to defeating the contract when partner has five hearts and the ♠K. Though with this holding he probably should be playing the ♥Q. In fact, I think playing the queen should actually suggest only four here, as that is probably most helpful for getting the defence right – though how many would share this view I am not sure.

So it seems that we are all agreed on the analysis, and it is just the attribution of blame that needs to be considered. It clearly depends a bit on the ability of

partner, but even expert partners do miss pips here and there. Against that, East has to miss a couple of pips, and if he is suggesting partner to make an underlead, then he should make sure he pays attention so you know what to do when partner obeys him! In addition, the spade lead does look obvious. The fact that West perhaps should have cashed the spade to save the overtrick is not so relevant – he got away with that one – always happy for partners to take a winning view! That said, he should take into account his partner's abilities – and clearly he didn't on this occasion.

Overall our panel were pretty much against East on this one, though I know that the result of a vote elsewhere on this hand was in fact on East's side – a lot of it does depend on who your partner is.

Editor's choice West 10: East 90.

Panel vote West 24: East 76.
(Range West 0-60%)

So how did our panellists fare? The Editor's choice winner was Paul Barden, closely followed by Andrew Robson. The panellist's winner was Julian Wightwick, not closely followed by anyone, but Victor Milman just sneaked into second place.

The monkey picks 50% each time, and tends to do well with the panel (since scores average around 50% on contentious problems), coming in second on this occasion, so I will award overall victory to Paul, who wins honour, and a free lunch next time I host a Gold Cup match. Thank you very much to all those who entered, and feel free to submit your problem hands in future.

ECL Dates

12th October v Herts (A)
23rd November v University (H)
1st February v Northants (H)
22nd February v Norfolk (H)

A Fair Deal by Jonathan Mestel

Even at duplicate we sometimes seem to hold poor hands for an entire evening. While in theory the people holding oppo's monsters at other tables ought to score as heavily, they rarely seem to. Even at IMPs, teammates have been known not to do as well as they might, while we impotently gnash our 3-counts.

Wouldn't it be fairer if EVERYONE at the table held the same hand? By the same hand I mean with permuted suits. There would still be slight injustice – I suppose the ♠A is a better card than ♣A, but not by much. And we'd all hold 10 counts all the time, which is surely fair.

Let's take a simple deal: You pick up ♠AKQJ ♥10 ♦9876 ♣5432, so that the whole hand is, say:

	♠ 10											
	♥ AKQJ											
	♦ 5432											
	♣ 9876											
♠ 9876	<table border="1" style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="padding: 2px;">N</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td style="padding: 2px;">W</td><td style="padding: 2px;">E</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td style="padding: 2px;">S</td><td></td></tr> </table>	N			W	E			S		♠ 5432	
N												
W	E											
	S											
♥ 5432		♥ 9876										
♦ 10		♦ AKQJ										
♣ AKQJ		♣ 10										
	♠ AKQJ											
	♥ 10											
	♦ 9876											
	♣ 5432											

So what shall we bid? Well, fairly obviously the defence can cash 8 tricks in any contract whatsoever. So we'd be at least two down if we open. Better pass it out.

This simple example confirms something we know – that the defence often has the advantage if they manage to lead the right suit. Here's a more extreme case:

		♠ 7										
		♥ 8654										
		♦ AKQJ109										
		♣ 32										
♠ 32	<table border="1" style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="padding: 2px;">N</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td style="padding: 2px;">W</td><td style="padding: 2px;">E</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td style="padding: 2px;">S</td><td></td></tr> </table>	N			W	E			S		♠ 8654	
N												
W	E											
	S											
♥ 7		♥ AKQJ109										
♦ 8654		♦ 32										
♣ AKQJ109		♣ 7										
		♠ AKQJ109										
		♥ 32										
		♦ 7										
		♣ 8654										

Suppose South opens 1♠ and plays there. West cashes two clubs, East throwing a diamond and then leads a third club. Dummy ruffs (it doesn't help to discard), East overruffs and plays two hearts. West ruffs the second heart, cashes the fourth club, on which East discards a diamond. At trick 7, East ruffs a diamond, and South is left with six good trumps.

So if NS declare spades or diamonds they make 6 tricks. Whereas if EW declare spades or diamonds, NS make 12 tricks. Having the lead is worth 6 extra tricks in a suit contract. In NT is worth 11 tricks!

So is it always the advantage to be on lead? Consider this example

N/S Vul												
Dealer S		♠ —										
		♥ A8765432										
		♦ KJ										
		♣ Q109										
♠ A8765432	<table border="1" style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="padding: 2px;">N</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td style="padding: 2px;">W</td><td style="padding: 2px;">E</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td style="padding: 2px;">S</td><td></td></tr> </table>	N			W	E			S		♠ Q109	
N												
W	E											
	S											
♥ KJ		♥ —										
♦ Q109		♦ A8765432										
♣ —		♣ KJ										
		♠ KJ										
		♥ Q109										
		♦ —										
		♣ A8765432										

At last, a 10 count which is worth opening! We can make 5♣, ruffing two spades in dummy, conceding a trump and a heart. Unfortunately by symmetry West can make 5♠. But what happens if South tries 3NT?

The key to this hand is that all four suits are blocked. If West leads a spade to the queen and king the defence can't run the suit. Indeed, on a spade lead we seize the opportunity to jettison one of dummy's blocking clubs. We then duck a club. We make one spade, one heart and seven clubs, making 3NT. Nor does it help West to lead a diamond. We throw one of our hearts on ♦J and prepare to duck a heart.

What about a heart lead? That's even worse. We cash three hearts and duck a club establishing an entry to dummy, making eight hearts and two clubs.

Strange – all four players can make 3NT. So no, it's not always an advantage to be on lead.

But I'm not convinced it would be a more interesting game. Sometimes

Fair is Foul and Foul is Fair...

[*Note:* The 3NT hand was composed by John Beasley (1988). Various rotationally symmetric hands have been analysed by Thomas Andrew and are on his website.]



by Chris Jagger

An interesting hand came up in the Brighton Swiss Pairs:

N/S Vul	♠ QJ42				
Dealer E	♥ KQ97				
	♦ 2				
	♣ 8632				
♠ K76	<table border="1"> <tr><td>N</td></tr> <tr><td>W E</td></tr> <tr><td>S</td></tr> </table>	N	W E	S	♠ 53
N					
W E					
S					
♥ 10853	♥ J4				
♦ 9873	♦ KJ104				
♣ 105	♣ AKQ97				
	♠ A1098				
	♥ A62				
	♦ AQ65				
	♣ J4				

N	E	S	W
	1NT	X	P
P	2♣	X	P
3♣	P	3♠	P
4♠	P	P	P

On a club lead declarer played queen, then ace. He continued with the ♣9, ruffed by declarer with the ♠9, with West throwing the ♦9 to discourage that suit. After some comments as to whether declarer could revoke by playing the ♥9, declarer planned the play. The contract is a near certainty.

Declarer crossed to the ♥K and runs the ♠Q. West won (better is to duck), and returned a trump. Declarer drew the remaining trump, and cashed the ♥A, noting the fall of the jack.

Should declarer now finesse the ♥9?

In isolation the answer is yes – the principle of restricted choice indicates that the jack is more likely to be played from Jx than from J10x (when half the time the defender may have actually followed with the ten). Against this, how likely West is to open 1NT with doubletons in both majors. But in fact all these considerations are irrelevant. You should simply win with the queen and play the last spade from dummy.

In the ending dummy has a club, diamond and heart, and declarer ♦AQx. East has to keep his club so comes down to ♦KJ. West has to keep the ♥10, so comes down to two small diamonds. Now declarer simply takes the diamond finesse and the third diamond miraculously becomes good. A finessing double squeeze, and not a bad score – some people were going two off in this contract!

Honours in the Hubert

by Chris Jagger

One of the interesting features of the Hubert Phillips competition, the national mixed teams knock out, is that it is aggregate scoring with honours counting. The final is over sixty boards, and was something of a local derby, with Jagger, Jagger, Wightwick, Mestel and Pagan lined up against former Cambridge side, Hinden, Allerton, Cooke and Osborne.

The first set saw Jagger edge into a narrow lead, one of the key boards being ♠AJxx ♥AKQJx ♦AK ♣Ax opposite ♠Kx ♥xx ♦Qxxx ♣Kxxxx. 26 points opposite an 8 count. That should be an easy slam.

But no – in one room the auction was 2♣-2♦-2♥-2♠-3♠-3NT-P. There are perhaps several ways this could be bid – technically many would say this was a good auction up to the 3NT bid. 2♦ was a waiting bid, and 2♥ was either natural or 25+ balanced. 2♠ was another waiting bid, and 3♠ was natural showing 4-5 in the majors. The 3NT bid was under pressure, and should probably have jumped to 4NT to show this hand, but perhaps he was worried about this being Blackwood.

The other hand might have helped by rebidding 2NT to show his 25+ points – with nine solid tricks there is no need to play in hearts unless you are bidding a slam, and it would at least have made things easier for partner.

Even easier would simply be to have some way to show the values in the weaker hand straight away. Many people frown on showing points, maintaining it isn't necessary, and pushes the auction up too high, but it is amazing how helpful it can be.

We bid 2♣-2♠-3♥-3NT-6NT. 2♠ was artificial showing at least 8 points with

a balanced or semibalanced hand, and the rest was natural. Should we have played the hand in 6♥ so that we could claim 100 points 'Honours' for having four of the top five hearts? No, in 6NT we got 150 for having the four aces. Though both sides were in no trumps, so the honours cancelled each other out!

Another interesting hand was one where Cath showed how not to get too high, with a hand I suspect many would climb too high on. Holding ♠Ax ♥AKxx ♦QJ ♣KQJxx she opened this 20 count 1♣ (she might have tried 2NT), getting a diamond overcall on her left, passed back round to her. She bid 1♥, and her partner converted this to 1♠. There the matter rested, making exactly seven tricks, and the limit of the hand.

Even with the 20 points, you must consider what partner can have – he clearly has long spades and not enough to bid over 1♦. Thus there are three quick losers off the spade contract, in addition to whatever spade losers there are. In fact partner had ♠Qxxxxx ♥xx ♦9xxx ♣x.

In the other room they climbed to 3♠. The auction started similarly, but Hinden doubled 1♦. Her partner jumped to 2♠, which she raised – a little ambitiously in my view. It seems hard to imagine that there is going to be a game on.

The second set saw another 1000 points to our side, but no honours. The third set opened with: ♠QJxx ♥AKQJx ♦Q ♣Jxx opposite ♠xxx ♥10xx ♦K8xxx ♣Ax. More honours, and a swing to our side when we stayed in 2♥. Even 3♥ is too high on a club lead.

Now what do you bid over 1♣ with ♠x ♥– ♦AKQJxxx ♣A87xx. 5♦ seemed to hit the mark, which was doubled, and was unbeatable on a club lead. In the other room, after a weak two in hearts, they played transfer responses, and played it the other way up. Cath led a top spade, and switched to a trump. Declarer led ace and another club, her partner following with the Q then jack. She had ♠AKxx ♥Qxx ♦xx ♣K10xx. If her partner had another diamond it would be right to duck and take the contract two off by letting partner play back a trump. She played safe, by overtaking and playing another trump back, being duly rewarded when declarer turned out to have all the remaining trumps. Thus the contract was one off, and a big swing in.

In spite of this, we lost 20 on this set, and as it was the halfway mark, and the only time we were allowed to change which four played, we sent Julian home and carried on with Jonathan – a good swap as only Jonathan would get so much enjoyment out of getting four sets of honours in the first six boards!

The first was a flat diamond partscore, the second a 5♥ contract, the third 4♠ going one down in both rooms at vulnerable, for nil in each room – we may as well have passed the board out! And the last was of more interest.

N/S Vul	♠ Kx		
Dealer S	♥ Kx		
	♦ AKQJxxx		
	♣ xx		
♠ Q109xx		♠ xx	
♥ Jxxx		♥ xx	
♦ x		♦ xxx	
♣ Qxx		♣ AKJxxx	
	♠ AJxx		
	♥ AQxxx		
	♦ xx		
	♣ xx		

N	E	S	W
		1♥	P
3♦	P	3♥	P
3♠	P	3NT	

3♠ was merely a neutral bid asking partner to decide what to do. I might have chosen 4♦, but it seemed likely that partner had a club stop, and I wasn't keen to get too high. Likewise partner was worried about clubs, but also worried that there might be three losers against 5♦. They led a spade and I cashed my 13 tricks, believing I would probably gain 20 points over 5♦, which would only make 11 tricks but had honours to claim.

In the other room our teammates got busy: 1♥-P-2♦-4♣, P-5♣-6♦. This went the obvious one off – in fact 2♦ was game forcing, thus pass was forcing and he could have afforded to pass 5♣ to his partner, and then pull the (presumed) double to show a slam try. Instead he thought they must have a ten card fit, and was sorely disappointed. But at least he could claim his honours – another board where the score would have been the same if they'd simply passed it out!

We had another 2400 points, but with 20 boards to go, I thought opponents were a little too desperate to try and generate swings, and by the end of the fifth set it was worse to they conceded. But not before two more honours had been claimed – a flat 3H-1 for nought each way, and a 5♣ contract – I wasn't expecting honours when I bid 2♠-X-4♠-5♣ on ♠xx ♥Axx ♦Axx ♣Axxxx, but partner put down ♣KQJ10x – and you still get them as dummy (and as a defender if you happen to be in that lucky position!). That was 720, much to Jonathan's relief, who had bid 3♠-X-5♠-X for 800, so only 80 points away. These honours can be a lifesaver!

Results round-up

National competitions

Paul Fegarty & Catherine Curtis won the Great Northern Swiss Pairs.

Cath Jagger retained the National Women's Teams. Nadia Stelmashenko & Sue Oakford finished 5th in the qualifying round, just missing out on qualification for the semi-finals.

At the Spring Bank Holiday Congress, Paul Fegarty & Catherine Curtis won the consolation Swiss Pairs, with Roger Courtney & Robin Cambery finishing 6th. In the teams, David Kendrick, Jonathan Mestel, Ian Pagan & Chris Jagger finished 2nd.

In the Swiss Pairs at the Brighton Congress, Catherine Jagger & Jonathan Mestel finished 12th and Catherine Curtis & Paul Fegarty were 26th. The next weekend in the teams, Chris Jagger & Ian Pagan finished 4th in the A final, Catherine Curtis & Paul Fegarty finished 2nd in the B final (10th overall), with Cath three places behind.

Stephen Goodwin and Jonathan Taylor won the Clare Swiss Teams. Ted Shaw & Lorraine Waters were 4th.

The team of Chris & Cath Jagger, Jonathan Mestel, Julian Wightwick (missing from photo) & Ian Pagan won the Hubert Philips Bowl, defeating Frances Hinden, Jeffrey Allerton, Jon Cooke & Graham Osborne in the final.

Cambridge A (Cath & Chris Jagger, Jonathan Mestel & Julian Wightwick), have reached the final of the NICKO 2007/8. The same team finished 7th in the Pachabo.

In the Garden Cities, Cambridge, in the National Final for the third year running, finished in fourth place. The team for the final was Rod Oakford, Jonathan Mestel, Paul Fegarty, Catherine Curtis, Nadia Stelmashenko, Sue Oakford, David Kendrick & Victor Milman.

Cambs & Hunts League

Final standings for the 2007/8 season:

#	Division 1	P	W	L	D	VPs	Ave
1	Ely 1	8	5	3	0	103	12.9
2	Cambridge 2	8	5	2	1	102	12.8
3	Peterborough 2	8	6	2	0	95	11.9
4	University 1	8	5	3	0	94	11.8
5	Peterborough 1	8	5	2	1	85	10.6
6	Thursday 1	8	3	5	0	74	9.3
7	Saffron Walden 1	8	3	5	0	61	7.6
8	Cambridge 4	8	1	6	1	54	6.8
9	Thursday 2	8	1	6	1	52	6.5

#	Division 2	P	W	L	D	VPs	Ave
1	North Cambs 1	8	6	1	1	118	14.8
2	Huntingdon 2	8	7	1	0	114	14.3
3	Crafts Hill	8	6	2	0	89	11.1
4	Peterborough 3	8	4	4	0	88	11.0
5	Cambridge 3	8	4	3	1	78	9.8
6	University 2	8	3	5	0	73	9.1
7	Huntingdon 1	8	1	7	0	58	7.3
8	Peterborough 4	8	2	6	0	52	6.5
9	Royston 1	8	2	6	0	44	5.5

#	Division 3	P	W	L	D	VPs	Ave
1	Huntingdon 3	6	6	0	0	100	16.7
2	Peterborough 5	6	4	1	1	65	10.8
3	Balsham 2	6	3	3	0	62	10.3
4	North Cambridge 2	6	3	3	0	47	7.8
4	North Cambridge 3	6	2	4	0	47	7.8
6	University 3	5	1	3	1	46	9.2
7	Peterborough 6	5	0	5	0	19	3.8

The final matches in Division 1 resulted in Ely 1 (Catherine Curtis's team) retaining the title.

No change to the leaders in Divisions 2 or 3 following completion of the final matches; the divisions were won as expected by North Cambs 1 (captained by Ian Aldridge) and Huntingdon 3 (captained by Bill Stevenson).

Eastern Counties League

The county scored 3-17, 14-6 and 15-5 against Bedfordshire; 0-20, 17-3 and 13-7 against Suffolk; and 20-0 and 8-12 against Essex.

County Knockout

In the Final
JAGGER beat KUEH

County Plate

In the Semi-finals
MAY beat KEOGH
HASLEGRAVE beat OAKFORD

In the Final
HASLEGRAVE beat MAY

Around the Clubs

Blinco

The Doric Cup was won John Fairclough & Mervyn Rogers.

Cambridge

The Abdelmoneim Trophy for the summer ladder was won by Rod Oakford & Victor Milman.

The Autumn Equinox Handicap Pairs was won by Victor Milman & Julian Wightwick

Huntingdon

The Alan Knott Individual trophy was won by Jaqui Racey.

Peterborough

Peterborough Bridge Club held its annual charity day on Saturday 14th June and raised a total sum of £729 for the Club 73, a local social club for young people with disabilities.

The event started at 11am with a workshop on doubling by Graham Hedley, followed by a duplicate pairs event won by Bob Vajda & Margaret Dowell.

Following a raffle at tea time, the evening teams event was won by Rona Stewart & Eric Don, playing with Ken & Penny Riley.

Club Chairman Trevor King said that the day was extremely successful, with over 60 players turning up for one or other of the sessions. It will definitely be repeated again next year in its present format.

Thursday

The Fry Trophies were won by Susan Hilken, Ian Davies, Tapan Pal & Ian McDonald.

The June Unusual Partner Pairs was won by Fred Allen & Tanawan Watts.

The Orchard Pairs was won by Bernard Buckley & Brian Robinson.

The September Unusual Partner Pairs was won by Lorraine Waters & Bernard Buckley.

University

Andre Kueh finished the year top of the club's leaderboard.

County Calendar 2008-2009

Except for the Novice Pairs Tournament and County Individual qualifying round, all competitors must be members of the EBU. For all other events except Garden Cities Trophy and Newmarket Open Swiss Teams, 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 12th
October 2008
Closing date for entries to the **County Teams Knockout**. The major green-pointed teams-of-four championship with matches played privately. The winners represent the County in the Pachabo. There is also a Plate event for first round losers, so no excuse for not entering this one! £10 per team. (Organised by Dave Harrison*)
- Sunday 26th
October 2008
Peterborough
1pm
Cambs and Hunts Open Swiss Teams (formerly Newmarket)
The County's prestige teams-of-four competition.
(Organised by Andrew Wilkinson**)
- Sunday 18th
January 2009
Trumpington
1pm
County Individual Final
This is what bridge is all about! All partner all and only a simple system is permitted. Qualifying heats (open to non-EBU members) to be held in clubs by 27 December. Pester your club to hold a heat. Entry £1.50 per person. (Organised by Dave Harrison*)
- Sunday 8th
February 2009
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. Qualifying heats held in clubs by 24 January. Entry fee £2.50 per person. One pair may play without standing to make a full table. (Organised by Dave Harrison*)
- Saturday 14th
March 2009
10am
Novice Pairs Tournament
For inexperienced players and players new to tournament bridge.
(Organised by Gladys Gittins email: gladys.g40@ntlworld.com, and David Carmichael)
- Sunday 19th
April 2009
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)
- Sunday 26th
April 2009
1pm
Jubilee Swiss Pairs
A popular pairs competition in Swiss format with six 8 board matches.
(Organised by Andrew Wilkinson**)

*Dave Harrison

61 Harlestons Rd, Cottenham, Cambs, CB24 8TR

Tel: 01954 250332

Email: djh1@cam.ac.uk

**Andrew Wilkinson

44 Field View, Bar Hill, Cambs, CB23 8SY

Tel: 01954 200350

Email: Andrew@ajwilkinson.com