

Cambs & Hunts Bridge

Number 64, May 2013

Cambs & Hunts news

We are sad to report the death of Mike Tedham – his long-standing bridge partner Brian Copping pays tribute in this issue.

In county events: Colin Payne from Huntingdon BC won the County Individual; Rod & Sue Oakford won the County Pairs; Andrew Hawthorn & Andrew Fenn won the Novice Pairs; Tapan Pal & Abdelsalaam Abdelmoneim won the Swiss Pairs; and Chris & Cath Jagger, Paul Barden, Julian Wightwick & Jonathan Mestel won the County Knockout Teams. The final of the County Plate is Collier vs King.

At the new East Anglian Bridge Weekend in March, the Swiss Pairs was won by Derek and Celia Oram, ahead of C&H pair Ian Aldridge & Eric Campbell, and the Swiss Teams was won by Giles and Gabriel Ip, Paul Darby and Steve Dannell, ahead of C&H team Jonathan Mestel, Jon Cooke, Paul Fegarty and Catherine Curtis.

Your County Needs You!

Volunteers are needed for the county organisation team. Whatever your skills, there is a role that could suit you, for example:

- Help to organise a county competition
- Find news for updates to the website
- Attend EBU meetings as our county representative

Without your help, our events can't run, so please let the editors or any committee member know if you can help.

In this issue...

Simon Barb regales us with another tale from his Little Stock of Horrors; Peter Burrows recalls a once-popular, Cambridge-invented bidding method: the Double Transfer, and Cath Jagger reports on an unusual auction at the Spring Fours. And there is the usual round-up of results from competitions, and news from the clubs.

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
postmaster@cambsbridge.org.uk

The next newsletter will be published in October. Please send in news, letters and hands no later than 15th September. All contributions welcome!

Editors: **Chris & Catherine Jagger**
14 St Barnabas Court, St Barnabas Rd
Cambridge, CB1 2BZ

Tel: 01223 321910

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

Little Stock of Horrors (2) by Simon Barb

In February's *English Bridge* David Burn described the characteristic of a Bridge disaster. To qualify for a horror story, however, it usually challenges even Deep Finesse to understand how on earth one arrived at the result that occurred at the table. Additionally, the protagonists in great horror stories are usually good players – or at least, players who should know better.

Take this hand for example from a recent mixed pairs competition:

You pick up as dealer at favourable:

♠J852 ♥K10 ♦KQ10854 ♣Q

Now with some (many) partners, you might choose to open this hand 1♦, but with five of your eleven points in your short suits including a singleton queen, you decide on this occasion to pass. The next hand, a very experienced player, opens 3NT, described by his partner as a showing a solid seven card minor with nothing higher than a queen outside, and this is passed out. You are naturally a little mystified as to porosity of the 'solid minor', and this is heightened as dummy tracks with:

♠AK7643 ♥Q742 ♦A3 ♣J

Partner's lead was the ♥6. Declarer plays low from dummy. How do you plan the defence?

Partner, who is from a South East Asian country, renowned for its spicy food, seems to have led away from the ♥A, so we have to decide whether to play a low heart on the first trick. But before we come to that, what do you think declarer has for his 3NT bid?

After some pause, you decide that you do not fancy playing the ♥10 at trick one and seeing declarer win with the ♥J and cash out seven club tricks and dummy's three winners in double quick time, when you had three

potential defensive tricks in the shape of two hearts and a diamond. So you rise with ♥K and declarer follows with the ♥5. Your plan is to lead a diamond, of course, but which one? There seems to be nothing to gain by leading a low one, and it might be a disaster if declarer had ♦J, so you get off lead with ♦K. Declarer will now presumably cash out his ten top tricks. Are you with me so far?

However that is not the end of the hand, for declarer wins in dummy and plays three rounds of clubs, your partner winning the third round with the ♣10.

It is quite hard to describe to a non-bridge player the feeling of nausea which is now welling up inside your stomach. Why did you not win the first heart trick and just return partner's suit? However all is not lost. Partner can play a diamond to your queen and then you can get off lead by leading back your second heart belatedly. Partner will win and play another heart to lock declarer in dummy with no way back to his hand to cash the clubs. And that is what happened.

Or not quite, for this was the full deal:

EW Vul	♠ 109		
Dealer S	♥ AJ963		
	♦ 76		
	♣ 10764		
♠ Q		N	♠ AK7643
♥ 85		W	♥ Q742
♦ J92		E	♦ A3
♣ AK98532		S	♣ J
	♠ J852		
	♥ K10		
	♦ KQ10854		
	♣ Q		

After partner had won the ♥A, declarer claimed nine tricks: dummy could take care of a heart continuation and the rest

of declarer's hand was high with the ♠Q as an entry for the long clubs!

Interesting to note that even after the defence's suboptimal start, the contract could still have been defeated if North, when in with the ♣10, had cashed her ♥A and exited with a spade, rather than a second diamond. It almost needed our precise sequence of defensive missteps to allow the contract to make.

Morals of the story:

1. When you have an 11 count and a perfectly rebiddable six-card suit, don't over-intellectualise: just open it.
2. For the sake of partnership harmony, if for no other reason, return partner's suit when defending no trumps and you win the first trick.

3. When defending a gambling 3NT, lead an ace if you have one. If you don't, lead a king (even unsupported). This allows you to look at dummy and judge the best continuation. In this case, it is not clear cut, but North might have led a diamond through dummy, or even cut communications with a spade, either of which would take the contract at least two off.

4. Some gambling 3NTs are more gambling than others. A bottom at pairs is only a bottom, but some hands leave you scarred for life. Thank you, Rod.

For more hands and analysis from Simon, read his Bridge blog at <http://sevennotrumps.blogspot.co.uk>

The Cambridge School: The Double Transfer

by Peter Burrows

Ed: When Simon Barb returned to Cambridge, he asked Peter why they were not playing double transfers, a method that had been popular when he left. This prompted Peter to dig out an old article that he wrote in the 1970s for Eric Kokish's Canadian bridge journal on this now forgotten method:

Over the past ten years or so, many of England's best young players have emerged from Cambridge University, and much original theoretical work on bidding has been done there. Eric Kokish has been pressing me to write an article on some of the local methods for *Melange de Bridge* and I have been fobbing him off with various excuses. However, he knows that this year I am spending Easter on a sunny sandy beach in Gozo, and I fear that if nothing emerges therefrom he will be tempted to stop speaking to me. So, here are some notes on one of the

earliest of the home-grown products, the concept of the Double Transfer.

One of the ideas behind the simple transfer in response to 1NT is to expand the range of constructive bidding. Suppose after the sequence 1NT-2♦-2♥, 2♠ was a further transfer. Would that not extend the range even further? Obviously it would, and once it was worked out that other sequences can be adapted to handle the loss of natural meaning, the locals rapidly latched on to the idea of the double transfer, and here is how it works:

After 1NT-2♦-2♥, responder's continuations other than 2♠ are basically natural and fairly normal.

- (1) 2NT = natural game-try, normally with 5-3-3-2 distribution.
- (2) 3m = GF, showing at least 4 cards in the bid suit and 5+♥.

- (3) 3♥ = GF, showing 6+ and little interest in any other strain.
- (4) 3♠ = precisely 5♥ and 5♠, GF but no slam interest. (By contrast, 1NT-2♥-2♠-3♥ shows 5/5 and game-try values. As to responder's action with 5/5 and a slam-try, you'll just have to wait until the end of the article ... no peeking!)
- (5) 3NT = natural, usually 5-3-3-2.
- (6) 4m = 6 cards in the bid suit and 5♥ GF. (Note this delicate refinement: can you distinguish between 6/5 and 5/6 in this position? [Do you care?])

After 1NT-2♦-2♥-2♠-2NT (2♠ being a second transfer, remember, or, more accurately in the modern vocabulary, a "puppet"), responder continues thus:

- (1) 3m = 5♥ and 4 in the bid suit, invitational.
- (2) 3♥ (screwball) = 4♠/5♥, similarly invitational.
- (3) 3♠ = 4♠/5♥ GF.
- (4) 3NT = 5♠/6♥ GF.
- (5) 4m = 6♥ and 5 in the bid suit GF.

Thus not only can we show the difference between 6/5 and 5/6 in hearts and a minor (perhaps not very important), but we can also introduce a second suit on game-try hands, which is much more valuable, enabling opener to judge his hand much more easily. Most transfer methods where they introduce a second suit can describe either game-try or game-forcing values, but not both.

That is all very well, but already I can hear the question, "What if responder has spades?".

After 1NT-2♥-2♠, there is no room for a double transfer/puppet. The schedule of responder's rebids remains the same as for hearts, and if he has one of the hand types that would have used the

double transfer, then he has to start off with Stayman instead. (Actually we use 2♣ to ask for 5-card majors, followed by our own variety of "Puppet Stayman" but the principle is the same.) After 1NT-2♠-2♦, responder bids:

- (1) 3♣/3♦/3♥ = 5♠ and 4 cards in the bid suit, game-try values.
- (2) 3♠ = 5+♠/4♥ GF.
- (3) 3NT = 6+♠/5♥ GF. (Make sure your partner's memory is up to it before you embark on this convention! More seriously, perhaps you are wondering why, in this position and the analogous one after 1NT-2♦-2♥-2♠, we play 3♠ and 3NT in this offbeat way rather than the other way around? The answer is that where responder is 5/4 in the majors he may well be planning to proceed with the description of his hand. Thus he does not want to bid 3NT for fear that opener may take a masterful view and pass. However, if you consider that that is a lesser risk than one of you forgetting the system in the heat of battle and passing this 3NT bid, then by all means invert these two sequences!)
- (4) 4m = 6+♠ and 5 in the bid suit, GF.

Sometimes opener will inconsiderately bid 2M after 1N-2♣, in which case these pretty sequences have to be dropped. However, one is never worse off than one would be playing simple Stayman and transfers. Anyone still interested in our lunatic methods at this stage of the article can readily verify that for himself. However, I will just remark in passing that one of the attractions of using 2♣ to ask for 5-card majors is precisely that it reduces the possibility of such inconvenient developments.

There remains the problem of minor-suit hands of course. Since we play 3m after

1N-2♣-2♦ to show a secondary suit with primary spades, we have to find a way of dealing with predominantly minor-suited hands. If they are single-suited, the technique is to bid 2NT after 1N-2♣-2♦. (All those who thought this would be a natural game-try are a long way from being Cambridge players – the use of "Puppet Stayman" is itself a game-try, so the 2NT rebid is redundant. More importantly, you might like to note that if opener rebids a major over 2♣, we don't retain the treatment. Once again, however, you will find that if he does so you are never worse off under our methods than with the standard approach.)

After 1NT-2♣-2♦-2NT, opener assumes that he faces a minor-suit game-try and bids:

- (1) 3♣ if he would reject a try in clubs.
- (2) 3♦ if he would reject in diamonds but accept in clubs.
- (3) 3♥ or 3♠ if he would accept either try but is weak in the bid suit.
- (4) 3NT if he would accept either try and is happy about the majors.

Further developments in those sequences are fairly obvious and natural. One small kink is that where opener has bid 3♣, 3♦, or 3NT, responder's bid of a major suit may be reserved as a slam-try (♥ for ♣, ♠ for ♦) on a non-solid suit, thus allowing 4m to show a solid suit, assumed to be 6 cards long in the first instance. After 1NT-2♣-2♦-2NT-3M, that inference is not available, however, since it may be necessary to stop below game, and bids of 4m must be reserved for that purpose. Thus bids in hearts and spades must be general slam tries in clubs and diamonds respectively.

Another possible hand-type for responder is a 4-card major with a longer minor. If he does not wish to show the minor he can proceed via

Puppet Stayman (and if he lacks game-values he will have to do so or pass 1NT), as we have not yet found a way to incorporate such hands that are only worth a game-try into the structure explicitly. If he has game-values and wishes to describe his shape, however, he responds 3m to 1NT, natural and game-forcing with four hearts on the side. Or if his suit is spades he commences with 2♠. This can be:

- (1) An invitational raise lacking a major suit, or
- (2) GF with 4♠ and a longer minor.

After 1NT-2♣, opener assumes that he faces a raise to 2NT and rebid 2NT with a minimum, or 3♣ (artificial) with a maximum. If he rebids 2NT, responder may continue with:

- (1) Pass if appropriate.
- (2) 3m = natural GF, also showing 4♠.
- (3) 3♥ = 2-3-4-4 and a slam-try.
- (4) 3♠ = 3-2-4-4 and a slam-try.
- (5) 3NT = to play (with higher ambitions if opener had rebid 3♣).
- (6) 4♣ = 3-3-3-4 and a slam-try.
- (7) 4♦ = 3-3-4-3 and a slam-try.

After 1NT-2♣-3♣, the basic concept is the same, but 3♥ is now needed to show 4♠ and 5♣, and so, if 2-3-4-4 and slam-minded, responder must bid 4♥.

3NT now merely shows that responder had a game-try in the first instance.

Finally, I must redeem my promise to tell you how to handle 5/5 in the majors and a slam-try (or better). You respond 4♣ to 1NT (4♦ becoming Gerber if you must keep it), and opener rebids 4♦ if unimpressed, or 4♥ or 4♠ on a hand with slam interest, setting the suit and forcing for one round.

If it starts 1NT-4♣-4♦, responder must bid 4♥, over which opener passes or bids 4♠.

Well, there you have it, the concept of double transfers in a nutshell. I think it is quite impressive, and I hope you will like it too. I can say that in a detached sense, since I personally had very little to do with the basic idea. Most important, I hope to have put myself back into Eric's good books, and if he asks me I may even try to let you into some more Cambridge secrets in the next *Melange de Bridge*. Meanwhile, I must admit that I have never produced a bridge article in less conducive surroundings: if you detect any errors

of analysis, please put them down to a surfeit of cheap Maltese wine. The last word should go, I think, to my wife. We first met double transfers from the other side of the table when we were new to Cambridge. My wife is not a great believer in artificiality, and after opponents had bid 1NT-2♦-2♥-2♠-2NT, all alerted and duly explained, she looked distinctly unimpressed when responder now emerged with 3♣. Smiling sweetly at opener she said, "And that, I take it, asks you to bid 3♦!"

Tribute to Michael Tedham

by Brian Copping

Mike Tedham was my principal partner for 30 years until he moved to Australia in 2012. I was shocked by the news of his death on 18 January 2013. He was a member of many C&H clubs: Dry Drayton [which he represented in inter-club competitions] the Thursday Club [where he served as Tournament Director and Chairman], Cambridge [captaining an SCL team] Cottenham and Saffron Walden, and also taught bridge for many years. He always focused on playing "with the odds", and another key principle was not to double unless you had top trump tricks against a suit contract, or an entry and a long-suit to run against no trumps. He was widely known as a polite, helpful and ethical player, always willing to offer advice or an explanation and much asked after once he had moved to Australia.

Mike enjoyed playing further afield at Brighton, the London Year End Congress and County special events. A particular highlight was winning the County 'restricted' pairs with him in 1983. The Northfields were frequent team mates until Bernard's health deteriorated. Mike had reached the

rank of Premier National Master before he left for Australia, where he was looking forward to climbing the ranks all over again.

Mike ran an industrial brush company, and supplemented his income as a taxi driver. This service was well used by Cambridge Bridge players. Rosanne Mattick, who played with Mike at the Thursday Club for many years, became his landlord when he moved his factory to her 'shed'.

Mike's happy and thoughtful disposition added to the pleasure of playing with him. His encouragement was kind – "Would it have been better to do this?" – and was rationed to a real need. No criticism was implied. It was a joy to play with him as partner, but we also shared a mildly competitive rivalry when opponents.

Unlike his statistical approach to bridge, Mike steadfastly refused to accept that smoking had high risks and very nasty consequences that limited life span, in his case to his early sixties.

His smiling face is missed at the table, and my thoughts are with his partner Gloria.

Have you ever had this auction? by Catherine Jagger

Playing in the Spring Foursomes, the auction started:

N (Ian)	E	S (Chris)	W
2♣ ^A	3♣	P	4♣
P	P	5♣ ^A	P

Unusual but not unbelievable. It then continued:

5♦	P	5NT ^A	P
6♣ ^A	P	6♦	P
6♥	P	6♠	All Pass

I bet you'd be surprised if oppo bid like that – and even more surprised to find they had some idea of what was going on!

2♣ was the normal Acol strong bid, and 5♣ was getting partner to pick a suit. When 5♦ came back to Chris he had another go with 5NT 'pick-a-slam please partner' in case partner didn't have a diamond suit. Ian with his 3334 shape didn't know what to suggest, so passed the buck with 6♣. Chris bid 6♦ to confirm he had four, but as Ian had only three he suggested hearts instead. If he'd held four hearts he'd have suggested hearts a round earlier – so Chris was confident now that spades was the right place to play. Finally they alighted in the best contract – by introducing their suits at the six level!

Best contract it might be, but the play was the next challenge:

NS Vul	♠ AKx			
Dealer N	♥ AQx			
	♦ AKx			
	♣ KJ9x			
	<table border="1" style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="padding: 2px;">N</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding: 2px;">W E</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding: 2px;">S</td></tr> </table>	N	W E	S
N				
W E				
S				
	♠ QJ10xx			
	♥ Kxxx			
	♦ 109xx			
	♣ —			

The ♣8 was led, fourth or second. The nine forced out the queen which Chris ruffed. He crossed to the ♦A, noting the fall of the queen, and then played the ♣K, covered by the ace and ruffed. A heart to the ace was followed by another ruff of a small club.

Chris now had a sure 12 tricks if the spades broke. He had ruffed three clubs in hand, so now drew trumps ending in dummy, having completed his 'dummy reversal' (ruffing in the long trump hand until there are more trumps in dummy).

The only problem was that the spades were found to be 4-1, with East having four. The contract was still good. A heart off dummy to the king found that East had a 4216 shape so it was then safe to finesse the diamond, East just making a trump trick.

NS Vul	♠ AKx				
Dealer N	♥ AQx				
	♦ AKx				
	♣ KJ9x				
♠ x	<table border="1" style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="padding: 2px;">N</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding: 2px;">W E</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding: 2px;">S</td></tr> </table>	N	W E	S	♠ xxxx
N					
W E					
S					
♥ 10xxx		♥ Jx			
♦ Jxxxx		♦ Q			
♣ 108x		♣ AQxxxx			
		♠ QJ10xx			
		♥ Kxxx			
		♦ 109xx			
		♣ —			

Note that East can stop the dummy reversal by not covering the ♣K, but declarer still makes by not ruffing any more clubs but drawing trumps instead.

Jon Cooke suggested an alternative line: play the ♣9 and duck the ♣Q! You can later take the ruffing finesse in clubs and draw trumps, playing for the red suit squeeze (the count having been rectified by ducking the club), though this requires West to have at least four cards in each red suit.

Results round-up

National competitions

Paul Fegarty, Catherine Curtis, Julian Wightwick & Jonathan Mestel lost in the semi-finals of the Hubert Phillips.

Cambridge University A lost to Imperial College A in the semi-finals of the Portland Bowl.

In the Ranked Pairs, John Leibeschutz with Peter Foster won the Life Master Pairs. John Haslegrave with David Williams won the Regional Masters, Dominic Clark and Tanawan Watts were 3rd, and Henry Lockwood and Matt Johnson were 5th.

Nadia Stelmashenko and Victor Milman finished 9th in the Easter Congress Swiss Pairs. Nadia and Victor also reached the national final of the National Pairs, finishing 25th, ahead of Julian Wightwick and John Liebeschutz in 37th.

The last two remaining Cambs & Hunts teams in the NICKO played each other in Round 5 (last 32), with Cambridge A (capt. Chris Jagger) beating Thursday A (capt. Joanne Caldwell). In the NICKO Plate, Cambridge E (capt. Peter Bhagat) play Thursday B (capt. Brian Copping) in Round 4 (last 16).

In the Monday event of the British Winter Pairs, David Richer and David Waldman finished 19th, just ahead of Jane Woodhouse and Colin Campbell in 25th (playing at Balsham). In the Thursday event, Brian Copping and Mike Clydesdale finished 13th (playing at the Thursday Club)

In the EBU Club Stratified Pairs Monday, Bob Vajda and Ram Bhagat finished 12th and Karen Blacklock and John George finished 21st (playing at Peterborough).

Eastern Counties League

In the last two matches of the 2012/2013 season, the county scored 0-20, 3-17 and 0-20 against Herts and 6-14, 9-11 and 18-2 against Essex.

Final Standings for 2012/13 season:

A division

1. Herts with 107 VPs
2. Beds with 84 VPs
7. Cambs & Hunts with 44 VPs

B division

1. Herts with 108 VPs
2. Northants with 79 VPs
6. Cambs & Hunts with 54 VPs

C division

1. Herts with 90 VPs
2. Northants with 83 VPs
- 3= Cambs & Hunts with 64 VPs

In the first match of the 2013/14 season, the county scored 0-20, 12-8 and 9-11 against Northants.

ECL Dates

9th June v Norfolk (A)
 7th July v Bedfordshire (H)
 22nd September v Suffolk (A)
 10th November v Herts (H)
 12th January v Essex (H)
 16th February v University (A)

Garden Cities Qualifier

- | | | |
|---|-----------------|----|
| 1 | Cambridge | 88 |
| 2 | Peterborough A | 63 |
| 3 | Peterborough B | 60 |
| 4 | Cambridge Univ. | 47 |
| 5 | Huntingdon | 27 |
| 6 | Peterborough C | 15 |

The Cambridge Club was represented by Julian Wightwick, Victor Milman, Jonathan Mestel, Jon Cooke, Rod Oakford, Mike Seaver, Paul Fegarty and Catherine Curtis.

East Anglian Bridge Weekend

Cambs & Hunts, Suffolk and Norfolk ran their first joint Green Point weekend in March.

Swiss Pairs:

- 1 Derek Oram & Celia Oram
- 2 Ian Aldridge & Eric Campbell
- 3 Chris Jepson & Catherine Curtis
- 4 Gabriel Ip & Giles Ip
- 5 Peter Oake & Alan Green
- 6= Roger Amey & Gerard Faulkner
- 6= Alison Lloyd & Susan Mealing
- 8= Matthew May & Niel Pimblett
- 8= Nadia Stelmashenko & Mike Seaver
- 10 Jane Aylett & Peter Ison

Swiss Teams:

- 1 Giles Ip, Gabriel Ip, Paul Darby & Steve Dannell
- 2 Jonathan Mestel, Jon Cooke, Paul Fegarty & Catherine Curtis
- 3= Maureen Kimbley, Bogdan Drobny, Gerard Faulkner & Roger Amey
- 3= Peter Gemmell, Paula Leslie, Ingar Hansen & Christopher Chambers
- 5 Jeff Orton, Rick Hanley, Eric Newman & Graham Beeton
- 6 Michael Keogh, Stephen O'Kell, Doreen Simpson & Alan Coker
- 7= Graham Foster, Raymond Clarke, David Clark & Albert Kitchin
- 7= Robbie Roberson, Iris Green, Neil Tracey & Laura Tracey
- 9 Graham Grist, Mike Walsh, Charles Melvin & Tom Melvin
- 10 Brian Davies, Val Mollison, Bernie Hunt & Paul Mollison

County Knockout

Preliminary round:

LUI beat POLLARD
MAY w/o PATTEN
ANDERSON beat COPPING
STEVENSON beat BRASS

Round 1:

JAGGER beat KING
JACKSON beat LUI
MAY beat JONES
LARLHAM beat COLLIER
SEAVAR beat ANDERSON
RILEY beat NG
STEVENSON beat CURTIS
JACOBSBERG beat BOYD

Quarter-finals:

JAGGER beat JACKSON
LARLHAM beat MAY
SEAVAR beat RILEY
STEVENSON beat JACOBSBERG

Semi-finals:

JAGGER beat LARLHAM
SEAVAR beat STEVENSON

Final:

JAGGER beat SEAVAR

County Plate

Preliminary round:

BRASS beat JONES
KING w/o NG
COPPING beat LUI
COLLIER beat BOYD

Quarter-finals:

ANDERSON beat BRASS
KING beat JACKSON
COPPING beat PATTEN
COLLIER beat POLLARD

Semi-finals:

KING beat ANDERSON
COLLIER beat COPPING

County Pairs

Congratulations to Rod & Sue Oakford on winning the Cambs & Hunts Pairs.

- 1 Rod & Sue Oakford
- 2 Brian Copping & Michael Clydesdale
- 3 Julian Wightwick & John Liebeschuetz
- 4 Joanne Caldwell & Kevin Smith
- 5 Stephen Goodwin & Malcolm Anderson
- 6 Mary Knights & Rona Stewart
- 7= Mike Seaver & Simon Barb Margaret & Roger Chaplin
- 9 Roger Salmon & Fred Allen
- 10 John Pearce & Chris Dickman

County Swiss Pairs

Colin Sills reports: The 2013 County Swiss Pairs was held at Trumpington Village Hall on 28 April. The event was oversubscribed, with the maximum 32 pairs competing. There were six 8-board matches, with tea provided at the half-way interval.

A big thank you to Penny & Ken Riley, for their considerable effort in running such a successful and enjoyable event. If you would like to volunteer to help organise the 2014 event, please contact a member of the Cambs & Hunts committee.

Congratulations to Tapan Pal & Abdel Abdelmoneim on winning the event.

- 1 Tapan Pal & Abdel Abdelmoneim
- 2 Matt May & Niel Pimblett
- 3 Lorraine Waters & Alan Edwards
- 4 Gina Dickson & Paul Wiltshire
- 5 Ross Midgley & Chris Waites
- 6= David Man & Tanawan Watts
- 6= Karen Blacklock & John George
- 8 Fred Allen & Ann Aplin
- 8= Barry Ransley & Gary Kendall
- 10 Alison Lloyd & Verity Joubert

The leading pair at half-time that finished outside the final placings was Gulzar Waljee & Carol Graves. The Ascenders' Prize was won by Barry Ransley & Gary Kendall. The prize for

pairs ranked Master or below was won by Karen Blacklock & John George.

County Individual

Paul Bond reports: The top three were separated by less than 0.7%, but in the end Colin Payne pipped Zona Lacy – our 2010/11 winner – to the finishing line. Colin retains the trophy for Huntingdon (Malcolm Anderson having won it last year).

- 1 Colin Payne (*Huntingdon*)
- 2 Zona Lacy (*Thursday*)
- 3 Ken Firth (*Huntingdon*)
- 4 Paul Russell (*Cambridge*)
- 5 David Samuel (*Dry Drayton*)
- 6 Isobel Lattimore (*Huntingdon*)
- 7 Fred Allen (*Thursday*)
- 8 John George (*Peterborough*)
- 9 Charles King (*Huntingdon*)
- 10 Trissa Orange (*Balsham*)

I'd like to thank all who took part, and thanks behind the scenes to Penny Riley for duplimating the boards and Peter Grice for supplying the movement. If you would like to volunteer to help organise the 2014 event, please contact a member of the Cambs & Hunts committee.

Novice Pairs

Congratulations to Andrew Hawthorn & Andrew Fenn on winning the Novice Pairs.

- 1 Andrew Hawthorn & Andrew Fenn
- 2 Lita Rutherford & Maggie Calder
- 3 Peter Bramworth & Patti Parker
- 4 Carl Houghton & Viera Rudkins
- 5 Terry Otterman & Allison Kaye
- 6 Bettie Sweet & Liz Frampton
- 7 Bill & Sue Sutton
- 8 David & Nina Aistrup
- 9 John Saunders & Shirley Coleclough
- 10 Sandra Nowottny & Mary Vickers

Cambs & Hunts League 2012/13**Division 1**

	Team	C2	E1	N1	P3	H2	H1	P1	Total	Ave
1	Cambridge 2	+	20	9	6	12	13	19	79	13.17
2	Ely 1	0	+	14	15	20	10	19	78	13.00
3	North Cambridge 1	11	6	+	11	7	17	19	71	11.83
4	Peterborough 3	14	5	9	+	7	12	13	60	10.00
5	Huntingdon 2	8	0	13	13	+	17	7	58	9.67
6	Huntingdon 1	7	10	3	8	3	+		31	6.20
7	Peterborough 1	1	1	1	7	13		+	23	4.60

Congratulations to Cambridge 2 on winning Division 1.

Division 2

	Team	U1	T1	H3	C4	N2	T4	C3	Total	Ave
1	University 1	+		17	14	20	19	13	83	16.60
2	Thursday 1		+	18	6	13	20	19	76	15.20
3	Huntingdon 3	3	2	+	18	15	20	20	78	13.00
4	Cambridge 4	6	14	2	+	17		18	57	11.40
5	North Cambridge 2	0	7	5	3	+	6	18	39	6.50
6	Thursday 4	1	0	0		14	+	15	30	6.00
7	Cambridge 3	7	1	0	2	2	5	+	17	2.83

Division 2 hinges on the result of the match between the top two teams...

Division 3

	Team	U2	P4	E2	S1	E3	P5	Total	Ave
1	University 2	+		20			14	34	17.00
2	Peterborough 4		+		4	20	19	43	14.33
3	Ely 2	0		+	20	17	19	56	14.00
4	Saffron Walden 1		16	0	+	12	20	48	12.00
5	Ely 3		0	3	8	+	8	19	4.75
6	Peterborough 5	6	1	1	0	12	+	20	4.00

Division 3 has several matches still to be played.

Division 4

	Team	P2	U3	S2	T	F	B	Total	Ave
1	Peterborough 2	+	12	15	17	20		64	16.00
2	University 3	8	+	6		20		34	11.33
3	Saffron Walden 2	5	14	+	3	17		39	9.75
4	Trumpington	3		17	+	2		22	7.33
5	Fulbourn	0	0	3	18	+		21	5.25
6	Balsham						+	0	0.00

Peterborough 2 have won Division 4.

Around the Clubs

Blinco

Anne Beytell & Janice Wilson won the Frank Weatherhead Cup.

Cambridge

The start time on both Tuesday and Wednesday evenings will now be 7.30.

Congratulations to the following members who were successful in passing the Club Tournament Director Course in March. Distinction: Simon Barb, Norman Hutchingson, Fred Peirce, Paul Russell. Pass: Terry Otterman, Allison Kaye, Simon King, and Roger Timmins.

The club has begun holding monthly 'hosted evenings' when anyone can turn up without a partner and be assured of a game. Two have been held so far, and the next is on Wednesday 29 May. The evenings are open to visitors, at no surcharge.

The Teams of Four League for the Collis Plate was won by John Liebeschuetz, Victor Milman, Rod Oakford, Nadia Stelmashenko, Clive Stops & Julian Wightwick..

The Club Individual Championship for the Roy Cradock Bowl was won by Rod Oakford.

The Butler Pairs Championship for the Jacobs Shield was won by Rod Oakford & Mike Seaver.

The Club Pairs Championship was won by Simon Barb & Mike Seaver.

The Swiss Pairs for the Wraight Cup was won by Rod & Sue Oakford.

The Mixed Pairs Championship for the Thomas Kirkby Trophy was won by Joanne Caldwell & Ian McDonald.

The Teams of Four Championship for the Marie Johnson Trophy was won by

Paul Barden, Jon Cooke, David & Liz Kendrick.

The Spring Equinox Handicap Plate was won by Bryan & Peter Last.

Cottenham

The Championship Pairs was won by Lorraine Waters & Alan Edwards.

The Winter Handicap Pairs for the Alan Ashment Cup was won by Verity Joubert & Chris Dickman.

The Tiger Trophy was won by John Pearce.

Ely

The Championship Pairs was won by Barry Lowe & Mike Bradley.

Huntingdon

The Presidents' Rose Bowl was won by Derek Oxbrow while runner-up Peter Somerfield won the Joe Ward Salver.

Charles King won the Slam Trophy,

The Club Teams of Four Championship was won by Malcolm Anderson, Stephen Goodwin, John Lambden & Gina Dickson.

The Stuart Morton Trophy for the Random Teams event was won by Audrey Stenner, Mike Nevertton, Ken Firth & Roger Millington.

The Club Individual Championship for the Alan Nott Trophy was won by Charles King, while runner-up Derek Oxbrow won the McCann Plate.

The March Random Teams was won by Stephen Goodwin, David Dickson, Pauline Baily & Graham Dubock.

North Cambridge

The monthly Prize Pairs have been won by Verity Joubert & Neil Matthews (January), Joanne Caldwell & Ian McDonald (February), Rosanne Mattick & David Larman (March) and Verity Joubert & Fred Allen (April).

The Handicap Teams of Four was won by Joanne Caldwell, Ian McDonald, Cynthia & Nicholas Bull.

The Handicap Pairs was won by Lyn Mason & Robert Wright.

Peterborough

The Committee Cup was won by John Crane & Bob Vajda.

The Peterborough Pairs was won by Mark Tilley & Ufuk Cotuk.

Mark Tilley, Mary Knights, Terry Knights, Ufuk Cotuk & Kieran Tilley won the Teams Championship.

The Handicap Trophy was won jointly by Martin Cooper & Bridget Spencer.

The Pivot Teams was won by Trevor Thrower, Mark Tilley, Tim Durdin, Karl Farquhar & Ufuk Cotuk.

The Club Championship was won by Mark Tilley & Trevor Thrower.

The Gentle Pairs was won by Anne Wilkinson & Jan Wilson.

Thursday

The President's Shield was won by David Carmichael.

The St John Championship was won again by Fred Allen & Roger Salmon, while Norman & Rosalind Hutchinson won the Mackenzie Plate.

Mary Doyle & Norman Hutchinson won the Unusual Partner Pairs.

David Carmichael & Tapan Pal won the Swan Shield.