

## From the President



Richard Ward

AVE you ever stopped to think about all that goes on behind the scenes to ensure that your favourite game continues to function successfully? In Australia we have about 330 playing clubs and the vast majority are volunteer-run with management committees, directors, teachers, board dealers, match makers and kitchen helpers. In many clubs, people are needed to set up the playing room and break it down at the end. This totals well over 3.000 volunteers.

At a national and state/territory level there is a small number of generous souls who give their time freely, or thereabouts, to the administration of the game. There is no kudos attached to these roles, no honour and glory - just hard work, the occasional criticism and the satisfaction of overseeing a job well done. We need to do all that is necessary to ensure that our game does more than simply

survive. We need it to flourish. For that to happen, succession planning for administrators must be under way at all levels. It is time to encourage the next generation to step up into these roles.

Speaking of which, bridge in Queensland looks to be headed for a 'perfect storm' in 2025 with:

- the future of the Gold Coast International Congress in its current stellar, internationalrecognised form is under a cloud, mainly because of venue issues; and
- Queensland is hosting the Australian National Championships in July of that year.

The good news about the ANC is that we have an enthusiastic convenor on board and, after an extensive search, we have a first class venue in Brisbane both in terms of space and suitability and at a reasonable price. Thanks to all those across Queensland who offered suggestions regarding venues. More about that once contracts are signed and the time comes for promotion and appeals for assistance from clubs and their players.

The 2024 ANC will be held in Orange, New South Wales. This ANC was initially scheduled for 2021, but was shifted twice to accommodate the pandemic cancellations and

the needs of other Associations. Expect details soon about travel and accommodation options for this one. The Perth Australian National Championship resulted in:

OPEN Andy Braithwaite, Kim Morrison, Pele Rankin, Alison Dawson, Pamela and Jim Evans, Terry O'Dempsey [NPC].1 SA 2 ACT 6 QLD

WOMEN Carmel Martin, Abby Wanigaratne, Sue O'Brien, Margaret Maha Hoenig. Millar, Janeen Solomon, Toni Bardon [NPC]. 1 SA 2 VIC 5 QLD

SENIORS Kerry Wood, Charlie Howard, Ian Afflick, Paul Collins, Ralph Parker, Larry Moses, John Luck [NPC]. 1 SA 2 NSW 3 QLD

YOUTH Kate Macdonald, Alex Wu, Lauren Morgan, Sebastian Landon Macmillan, Paddy Taylor, Zac Ross, Michael Gearing [NPC]. 1 VIC 2 SA 3 QLD

# **River City Gold Mixed Pairs**



'HE River City Gold Mixed Pairs was held on the weekend of May 27-28 at the Toowong Bridge Club. It attracted a large field of 86 pairs including some very strong interstate players. Watson Zhou and Eileen Li prevailed and are the new Queensland Mixed Pairs Champions. Richard Fox and Christine Newbery won the B division (11th overall). It was great to see my fellow BBC members Elaine Jonsberg and John Lahey winning the C section and being 10th overall. They were 5th

From the President River City Gold Mixed Pairs **Barrier Reef Congress** 25 Years Ago **Queensland Butler Pairs** Things I Have Seen **IBPA** Column Service **Director's Corner** 

s	by Richard Ward by Peter Evans by Richard Wallis by Kim Ellaway and Bill Hunt	 7 
	by Matthew MacManus by Tim Bourke by Chris Snook	3  5  8

Contents

Results

going into the final round and at table 1 against Watson and Eileen.

The event was ably directed (as always) by Jan Peach, who had to step in at very short notice. The hospitality and organisation of the Toowong Club and its volunteers was superb - lunches were provided both days, everything seemed to move efficiently, and parking problems caused by the joint use of the carpark with the adjoining soccer club were kept to a minimum by a group of diligent volunteers.

In the first round, this was a frustrating hand (for me) in that it exposed deficiencies in our bidding system:



<sup>1</sup> Invite or better checkback

Ρ

 $2H^2$ 

<sup>2</sup> Four hearts 12-13, doesn't deny three spades

6NT? All pass

After partner's (Alison Dawson's) bid of 2♥, I found myself without a forcing bid to check the spade situation (2♠ and 3♠ would have been invitational and 5 card and 6+ respectively, and 3NT might be passed out). 4♦ would logically have been Minorwood on clubs in our system but I didn't want to tempt fate that partner might think it was a splinter for hearts. Given these problems, the fact I didn't know what was going on in the third round of spades and that partner was a minimum, I decided 6NT was the best practical bid in pairs.

Unfortunately, Minorwood would have detected the ♣KQ, ♦A and ♥K and 13 top tricks, assuming the clubs break. Curiously, 6NT was still worth 57%, but 7NT was worth 96% and would have won us the round. I wouldn't have had trouble with this hand in teams - I would have just bid Minorwood over the 2C and found the grand. In pairs, given the singleton ♥A, I was worried 6♠ or 7♠ might be the preferrable and higher scoring contract, and wandered down the rabbit hole before I realised the problems.



<sup>1</sup> When vulnerable, I prefer 2 level jumps to be an opening hand with six so settled for 1 to on this hand particularly given the poor suit quality).

<sup>2</sup> Invite + raise of diamonds

I think my opponents did well to rightly avoid 3NT on this hand given it's pairs. My ♠6 lead was taken by the ♠J and the ♦J finessed to my bare ♦K. The North declarer now had eight potential tricks (four diamonds, the ♠AKJ and the ♠A), so I had to get the switch right. I could see eight of declarer's points on the play (♠K, ♦AJ) but didn't know where the other 4-6 were lurking. Partner had to have four or more hearts on the bidding, so that was the obvious (and fortunate) switch and we took the contract down with six hearts and the ♦K.



C Grade winners: Joyanne Gissing and Greg Lee

Here's a nice little pseudo squeeze:



I was in 3NT from the North hand on a club lead. I had nine tricks on top so was just playing for overtricks. I led •10 from dummy (which West fortunately didn't cover) losing to the •Q. A club came back and the •A dropped the •K giving me 10 tricks. I ducked a heart to West who returned a heart leaving this position:

	A86	
	—	
	J5	
	KJ	
Q974		J102
975		Q
—		98
_		7
	K3	
	K6	
	7	
	83	

On the run of the  $\bigstar KJ$  and the  $\blacklozenge J$ , East let go a spade. Now West couldn't guard both spades and hearts and let go 2 spades allowing me to make a third round of spades for trick 11. Given East can see her  $\blacklozenge Q$  will fall under the  $\blacklozenge K$ , she should have thrown it away and kept the third spade to guard the suit.



Winners: Eileen Li and Watson Zhou



It's horribly tempting, isn't it? Even though you know you shouldn't bid 2C:

1. You're non-vul against vul,

2. 2C over 1D takes away room for finding majors,

3. It's pairs, so a bad score will be confined to the board, and

4. It points out a good lead to partner.

I succumbed to temptation (as did a large part of the field), was duly doubled and deadly accurate defence took me -800. David Beauchamp suggests an excellent metric for judging 2 level overcalls - if it's a weak 12-14 1NT hand, don't do it.

So, you can call at that range or a little lower if it's an unbalanced hand with an excellent long suit, but with a flattish hand you need more points with a good suit.



4th: Matthew Thomson and Cathryn Herden



I think the North hand is an opening hand. It's clearly too good for a weak 2 with the void, the tens and sharp points working well together. My 5♥ was a little incautious given the placement of the ♠K and the possibility the ♥A wouldn't cash given the known big heart fit, but fortunately EW never found the diamond fit and an attempt at 6♦ from East needs some good guessing to make.

Unfortunately, I elected to play the  $\checkmark$ A given the 11 card fit and the fact East was the big hand. Losing the ▲A,  $\checkmark$ K and two clubs for -500 which at least was better than 4▲ making.



<sup>1</sup> 5+ suit, 2/1 game force <sup>2</sup> 6+ suit

I think this is a reasonable slam given North has opened and South

has 19 HCPs with a good 6-card suit. If diamonds are 3-2 or spades 3-3 or the jack of either suit falls under the top honours then the slam rolls home. Alas, nothing worked and only Deep Finesse knows to take the anti-percentage finesse of the +10.



<sup>1</sup> 2/1 game force

<sup>2</sup> Nobody seems to bother with points at this vulnerability any more

A silly 54 bid from me. Two diamond losers plus a heart loser are unavoidable. It would have been better to try the 4-4 diamond fit and hope losers could disappear on the long clubs. 54 still goes down but the defence has to be careful - assuming a spade lead, a diamond to the king and ace and the spade return ruffed, West must hold up the 4Q until North's trumps are exhausted and then take the third round of spades.



2nd: Elizabeth Havas and George Kozakos





Not a great auction at my table. 3<sup>sh</sup> is a forcing overbid where 2NT is about right and North can chance 3NT if their blood is up. Over 3<sup>sh</sup>, North knows South has only one heart at best and the diamonds could be a serious problem in either 4<sup>sh</sup> or 3NT. Better to try 3<sup>sh</sup> 4th suit forcing and play in the lower level 3NT.

Curiously, all those in 3NT made their contract. Most got a diamond lead to the  $\bullet$ K giving the 9th trick. On other leads, the defence mustn't have been able to find the fatal  $\bullet$ J switch from East and allowed clubs to be set up or the  $\bullet$ K to make.

It's fascinating how often the lead of an unsupported ace from a suit bid and raised by the defence leads to declarer making their king. On my anecdotal count on what I've seen, it seems to be coming in at least half the time. It possibly shouldn't be too surprising given declarer usually is the one with the most points at the table.

Here, East's ♠A lead gave me the contract with only two clubs more to be lost. It's difficult to crime East however, as the necessary club lead (to partner's ace and spade through) doesn't look too appetising from KJ10.



B Grade 2nd Christine Newbery and Richard Fox



B Grade winners: Elaine Jonsberg and John Lahey



 $^{1}$  4+/4+ in the majors

This hand looked simple when I opened 1, but the 1NT bid to my left and partner's inevitable major suit call changed the complexion of things. I had grave misgivings about the safety of my  $AK \times But$  after some squirming bid 5 and hoped partner had the A or AQ, or we wouldn't get a spade lead and somehow the spades could be discarded. Partner made 12 after catching the AK onside and just losing the AQ.



3rd: Marianne Bookallil and Stephen Fischer



D Grade winners: Ben Leung and Kate Macdonald



62<sup>nd</sup> International **GOLD COAST** BRIDGE CONGRESS **— 2024** —

# February Sunday 18<sup>th</sup> to Saturday 24<sup>th</sup>

GOLD COAST CONVENTION CENTRE, BROADBEACH

Kim Ellaway · manager@qldbridge.com.au +61 412 064 903 · +61 7 3351 8602 qldbridge.com.au/gcc



6

AUSTRALIA

### Barrier Reef Congress



Richard Wallis

HIS year I had the pleasure of playing with Ben Leung in the Pairs and Teams in Cairns from April 28 to May 1. I have known Ben since he became an important member of the Qld Youth team, but we have never played together before. We managed our first game at the Toowong BC on the night before we flew to Cairns, and the next game was in the Friday morning Walk-ins in Cairns, where we finished first by a small margin. The Open Pairs on Friday afternoon and Saturday morning was a topsy-turvy affair, starting off with our biggest loss, but it improved after that and we were in 9th place for the last match, dropping back to 15th following a modest loss. The Open Pairs was won by top seeds Geoff Chettle and Simon Hinge, with my brother Jim and Bill Nash in 2nd place.

The Teams started on Saturday afternoon with two matches, four more on Sunday and the final two matches on Monday morning before lunch, presentations and the rush to the airport. Ben and I played with Michael Gearing and Lakshmi Sunderasan, who were wonderful team-mates, and we started off well with four wins until the McMahon team (father, mother and two sons) handed us a small loss. Another small loss in match 7 and a modest win in match 8 saw us finish in 6th place, just out of the money. Geoff and Simon, playing with Mike Doecke and Laura Ginnan. popped up again with a win, and our President Richard Ward, playing with Therese Tully, Yolanda Carter and Toni Bardon, finished 3rd.

I think we're all a little masochistic. Otherwise, why would we continue to play bridge?



East opened with a weak 1NT and I was a bit puzzled by Ben's jump to 3NT after I had shown a strong hand by the double.

He knows that we have the majority of the HCPs, but if he can make nine tricks if West has the first lead, how many can we make if he has the first lead?

West led the  $\pm 2$ , which set up three tricks for Ben, and more importantly, as West had the  $\pm A$ , pin-pointed the remaining hcps with the opening bidder, so after giving up the  $\pm A$  and  $\pm A$ , Ben led a heart off the table and played the  $\Psi Q$ , winning nine tricks for +400.

At the other table the final contract was 1NTE, and this went two off for -200, but 5 IMPs to us.

Match 2 was against Jim Wallis's team, and we were playing Watson and Charlie at our table.



I made my normal response of 3. to Ben's 1. opening bid, forgetting that Ben prefers this to be less than 6 HCPs.

Watson led the  $\pm J$  and the defence did not find their heart ruff, so that was 10 tricks for +130.

At the other table Jim responded 1NT and accepted the invitation to game, to which there is no defence, so -400 meant 7 IMPs away.

It did not come up again, but if it had, I would have remembered that a 3<sup>sh</sup> response to a 1<sup>sh</sup> opening was less than 6 HCPs!



Sponsor – Charles Page with winners Pete Hollands, Simon Hinge, Mike Doecke, Geoff Chettle, Laura Ginnan and the two Holland children



When Ben opened 1♥ I took a view and responded 1NT on a minimal hand.

However, when he rebid what he presumed was a forcing 3C, I revised my thinking and to Ben's amazement I passed!

West led the  $\bigstar 2$  and Ben was not psychic enough to rise with the  $\bigstar 10$ in dummy, but instead played three trumps and led the  $\checkmark A$  and  $\checkmark J$ , won by West who still could not bring himself to lead away from the  $\bigstar K$ , instead leading a diamond, so one of Ben's spades went away and he came to 11 tricks for +150.

At the other table the bidding was more spirited and eventually stopped in 4 ×X, which was off on top after

spade leads, so that was +200 and a lucky 8 IMPs.

This was a 50/50 proposition!



West passed initially, but doubled Ben's 2. response to show the red suits, and when I raised clubs, Ben bid the obvious 3NT.

What should West lead at trick 1? Looking at all of the hands the 4 is obvious but West had no help and chose the 5. Ben was in charge now and won the J at trick 2 and led back a heart, eventually making four clubs, three hearts and two other aces.

I did not get the lead at the other table, but it must have been a diamond ( $\diamond$ K?) as 3NT went one off for +50 and 10 IMPs to us.



This was a disaster as the bidding was something that we had not discussed during our brief time together.

West's 2 was not alerted, and I play system on in that situation, so my 2 was a transfer to spades (not alerted by Ben).

Ben asked about the 2+ bid and East said that she was not sure, but thought that it was both majors!

After puzzling over the bidding Ben concluded that maybe I did have four hearts and passed, to which East led the  $\forall K$ .

After the pass East called the director and complained that my body-language was awful!

Nothing I could do in such an awful contract and one off was the result, to go with –680 at the other table for 13 IMPs away.



2nd Teams: Michael Sykes, Fred Whitaker, Jenny Middleton and Barry Jones – the last two from NZ



1st Novice Pairs: Harry Graepel and Sandrine Taillardat





West led the ♣10, and East cashed the three aces and led back a club for West to ruff. West returned the ♣5 which was won on the table by Ben to take the winning heart finesse.

Ben then conceded a diamond for one off and –200, but East insisted that the contract was three off!

East then said that her 3♣ was actually 5♣! The Director was called again and agreed that it could have been 5♣, but East's double had accepted my 3♥ bid, so 3♥X was the final contract, and East said that we were lucky!.

At the other table the contract was initially  $5 \pm X$  going two off, but after an appeal over a slow pass by South and a double by North, it was changed to just  $5 \pm$  for -100 and 7 IMPs away instead of 11.



Best Zonal Pair: Dee Jierasak and Bjorg Risla



In this match we were up against the McMahon family, this time against mum and dad.

The bidding was straightforward keeping my heart suit under wraps, but Susan made a great lead for the defence of the ♠9 and I was not up to the task at hand.

Since the A is obviously in Ken's hand, I rose with the A and led to the  $\forall$ 10, preparing to ruff a heart in dummy.

However Ken had the 3rd spade and the heart ruff was lost. If I had ducked the ♠9 and won the next spade on the table I could have then played a heart to the ♥10 and Susan is out of trumps. At the other table the boys made 10 tricks for –620 and we suffered our first loss.



Ben had no clues as to what to lead after East open 4♥ in 4th seat but did not make the mistake of leading an ace to look at dummy, instead choosing the great lead of the ◆9.

Declarer has no chance now as I have an obvious club switch after winning the  $\mathbf{A}$ K, and we take four tricks for what appeared to be a flat board.

Never assume anything in this mystical game of bridge, as it must have been an ace lead at the other table as 4**V**E made 10 tricks for +420 and 10 IMPs, almost all of our winning margin.



Open Teams 3rd: Richard Ward, Yolanda Carter, Therese Tully and Toni Bardon



After Ben supported my spades I pushed the boat out for a vulnerable game and East was not prepared to take the chance that I was right. Ben's penalty double closed out the auction and Ben led the  $\pm 10$ .

As it turned out the ◆Q would have been more effective, but declarer covered the ◆Q after Ben won the ♥A and we were able to cash our five tricks for +800.

On and initial lead of the  $\mathbf{Q}$ , if declarer ducks, when I win the  $\mathbf{A}$  at trick 2 a heart back puts Ben in to give me a diamond ruff.

It looks like with the red suits behaving that 4♠ will make but if East leads the ♥4 she gets in with the ♠K and puts West in with the ♠K to give her a ruff, and the  $\clubsuit A$  is the setting trick.

At the other table NS did not push it and Michael played quietly in just 4C, going only one off for -100 and 12 IMPs to us.





This looked spectacular from a defender's point of view.

I led the 4 and Ben won the A and Q and followed up with the K, and the Q when this held the trick!

Declarer won the A and led the  $\forall K$ which I won to cash my diamond tricks and exited with a spade, so Ben was able to cash his A for three off and +300.

This looked good when we were writing it down, but just another flat board, as the same contract achieved the same result at the other table!



WNESP2CP2DP2HP2NT!P3NTAll pass

This board in the final match was a good result for Michael and Lakshmi as they finished up in 4♠ and made 10 tricks despite the awful break.

At our table West could not bring himself to bid 2♠ after his partner showed the heart suit and probably thought that it would show a 5-card suit anyway.

Holding an unbalanced hand it should have been automatic for East to rebid 3, but instead he chose 3NT.

I decided not to lead a diamond, and picked a good time to lead 4th highest ♣7, won on the table for declarer to set up the 5th heart and I was in again with the ♥9.

Ben had asked for a spade switch and I duly obliged as West obviously had the ♣A and I did not want to put him in to take the diamond finesse. The contract went one off for 12 IMPs to us, which was almost our winning score.



Restricted Teams 2nd: Barbara Howard, Lyn Dempster, Dave Mathieson and Andrea Mathieson



Rest Pairs 3rd: Di Gardside and Donna Fitch



Best Zonal Open Team: Tony Lusk, Andrew Hooper, Pippa Hooper, and Alexander Long



Restricted Teams winners: Sameer Pandya, John Rivers, Peter Lyons and Daria Williams



Richard Ward, QBA President, and Allison Stralow, ABF President



Best Zonal Restricted: Jane Gryg and Melissa Pressley

### 25 Years Ago

11



1998 Barrier Reef Congress

THE QBA representative team consisted of Kim Ellaway (QBA Manager) / Ray Ellaway and Bill Hunt / Mike Pemberton. These two won the right to play by being the best performed Queensland pair in the Gold Coast Congress Pairs.

Bill and Mike went up on Friday to compete in the two session pairs. Jim Wallis and Ishmael Del'Monte had to have an 85% round in the second session to stand a chance of getting into the prize winners and that's exactly what they did - they won the event!

Ray and I left on the Saturday and upon arrival at the Brisbane Airport all the television cameras were there. I thought to myself, 'Wow! Mackay Bridge Club does have some contacts, but alas, the Broncos football team was disembarking the plane next to the one we were embarking and they were not interested in what I had to say.

The hospitality from the Mackay Bridge Club was outstanding as usual and everyone who attended promised to be back in three years time.

The Lester team averaged 23.4 VPs per match - an impressive win.

Our team was seeded 2. However, it wasn't our weekend and we ended up in the middle somewhere after being down the bottom earlier on.

Bill now describes some of the team's brilliancies but these were limited.

The double squeeze would have given declarer a glow for the boards to come. This way he just took a finesse which anyone can do.



West has an absolute minimum for their opening bid and should pass East's response (a passed hand). North's double was for take out; South either missed this or was prepared to defend. Who knows, but after the smoke had cleared we were +500. In the other room our team-mates defended 2♠ for -140; +360 to the goodies. There is a message here; if you open a poor 12 count opposite a passed hand do not bid again. South's action may have been dangerous but who can argue with success.



GOLD POINT

EVENT

3NT All pass

MACKAY CONTRACT

**BRIDGE CLUB** 

PRESENTS

**28th BARRIER REEF** 

CONGRESS 2024

3 - 6 MAY 2024

VENUE: 500 PAVILION, THE SHOWGROUNDS MILTON STREET, MACKAY QUEENSLAND

Chief Director: Jan Peach | Senior Director: Peter Busch

Tournament Organiser: Diane Morgan 0427 574 328 | 07 4951 2147

Email: brc2024mky@gmail.com

The bidding has shown West to have a balanced weak hand - not three spades - not four diamonds and at least one heart stopper. You have no good lead. A small heart may present declarer with their 9th trick; a club picks up partner's honour and leading from your +Q is out. That leaves a MUD spade. Declarer, runs this to their queen but South wins the king and returns the **V** to pin dummy's ten and hopefully smother or swamp the ♥Q in the process as partner is now known to have five hearts, yet did not lead one. There are other ways of beating this contract but this is pretty. The message is, 'when defending, think 52 cards'.



The bidding is good although South might have made life a bit more difficult but for the vulnerability. West knows that East has a heart stopper, not three spades, four+ clubs and the •A so all should be plain sailing. But do play the hand carefully. After drawing trumps, the ruffing finesse in spades lands the big one.

You may well ask by how much we won the tournament. We didn't win, as the other 127 boards were not as good.

## Queensland Butler Pairs

THIRTY-TWO pairs entered the 2023 Queensland Butler Pairs at the Northern Suburbs Bridge Club

with most of our top ranked pairs from South-East Queensland taking part. Director Alan Gibson directed the 12 7-board matches over two challenging days. Jill Magee and Terry Strong were languishing in the middle of the field at the half-way mark but came home in fine style with four big wins on the Sunday to stay ahead of other fast finishers Patrick Bugler and Tim Runting who are also the Queensland Men's Champions. Top Women's pair was last year's Qld team members Michelle Radke and Kathy Males ahead of this year's Qld Women's Trials winners Abby Wanigaratne and Carmel Martin.

Would you get to slam on these North-South cards? Half the field did so, but only the winners, Magee-Strong, reached the grand slam. This is how they did it.



The real test of a bridge player isn't in keeping out of trouble, but in escaping once he's in it.

### Things I Have Seen



Matthew McManus Part 2

HIS time around, on the same theme as last time, a few more absurdities that I have observed at the table while directing. On each of the following hands, the player in the spotlight did something wrong, which resulted in an outcome which seems way disproportionate to the error he had made. However, on each occasion, the correct application of the relevant laws meant the end result was quite bizarre. The sort of things which, when other tables see the score on the travelling score sheet, result in me being called and being told to go and fix it because that result is "clearly impossible".

Careful with those red aces



Declarer seems to have three losers in spades, two in hearts and one in each of the minors. Two down,

+500 seems like it will be a very good score for EW, but it didn't turn out that way....

Rather than trying to find partner's strength outside trumps – if he had any – West found the best lead of the  $\pm 6$ . On winning dummy's  $\pm K$ , declarer tried to sneak through a

trick, by leading up to his singleton king of diamonds. This shouldn't have worked, but West "won" with the ♥A and then banged down the ace of clubs. Yes, West had been careless in sorting his cards and had mixed up his red aces. This particular error is probably not that uncommon but the effect on this hand was guite devastating. Playing the ♥A on the diamond constituted a revoke and then leading to the next trick established it. This meant that West could not correct his revoke which in turn meant that the A was a lead out of turn, as South had now won trick two with the  $\mathbf{A}$ 

Declarer chose not to accept the lead out of turn, so the A became a penalty card. The ace of trumps was played and West had to discard the A. So by the time the hand was finished, declarer had lost no tricks in diamonds and no tricks in clubs. The defence still had to make three trumps and the **V**AQ, but not enough to defeat 2.X. To add insult to injury, still to come was the penalty for the established revoke - one more trick to NS. for a final score of NS +870. Quite a difference from the -500 declarer would have been expecting at the start of the hand.

#### Sublime Revoking

The second hand features a simple three-card ending. In a contract of  $5 \div$  by South, West is on lead to Trick 11 in the following position:



West leads the ♥10. Dummy's ace is ruffed by East with the ♣10, and declarer over-ruffs with the king. South next finesses clubs, losing to East's now singleton queen, and dummy's ace of trumps is there to win the last trick. When declarer's ♥6 turns up at trick 13, the revoke is discovered and the director is called. After an established revoke, the penalty when the offending player wins the revoke trick (here, Trick 11) is one trick plus an additional trick if his side wins any tricks after the revoke. That means that two tricks were transferred from NS to EW. Declarer, clutching the ace, king and jack of trumps in his hands with three tricks to go, had contrived with this rather "strong" holding to make a total of zero tricks!

#### **Counting Points**

West is the dealer and the auction goes:

West North East South 1NT

A bid out of turn. The director is called. West has the option of accepting 1NT, but chooses not to.

1NT is therefore cancelled, the call goes back to West and North must pass for the reminder of the auction. (It is one of the curiosities of the laws that in many of the circumstances where you do something wrong, it is your partner who is punished.) West decided to pass. North passed because he had to. East also passed, so it was back to South again. NS were playing a weak no trump and South had really "stretched" to open 1NT with

▲ Q84
♥ J742
♦ KJ8
♣ KJ10

and had then done it when it wasn't his turn to call! He now had to make the big decision for his side.

Of course, he was vulnerable and the opponents weren't. He also knew that his right hand opponent was more than capable of a little legal deceit. That is, East could be holding quite a strong hand, but had passed expecting that South would have to guess at the final contract (since North had to pass), and that he might overdo it and go for a big penalty. After quite a lot of thought, South eventually decided that discretion was the better part of valour and took the lowest road of all - he passed the hand in.

Unfortunately for his side, East had not been laying a trap for him. In fact, this deal contained probably the biggest hand I have ever seen - 27 points. You may have guessed that it was held by North, who cruelly had been forced to pass because of his partner's bid out of turn. The travelling score sheet which looked like:

7NT N 2220
7NT S 2220
6NT N 1470
7NT N 2220
Passed in
7NT N 2220
7NT S 2220

"raised" more than a few eyebrows.

**Counting Cards** 



The  $\mathbf{A}Q$  was led and declarer won in hand with the ace, drew trumps in two rounds, cashed the  $\mathbf{A}K$ , then played the king and queen of hearts and ruffed a heart, and then king and queen of diamonds and ruffed a diamond. At this point, declarer called for the director. He had only one card left, while dummy and both defenders still had three cards to go. I asked if he had counted his cards at the start and he assured me that he did and he definitely held thirteen of them. Although I was a bit sceptical (the



We all know TBIB through the ABF Travel Insurance policies they provide, but it is also interesting to learn of the many other ways TBIB can assist. These include:

Club Insurance

•

- Home & Contents insurance
  - Investment Property Insurance

player was not particularly well known for following correct procedure), I checked to see whether any of his cards were stuck together in case two cards had been played at once on an earlier trick. This wasn't the case. The laws require that the director "institute a search for the missing cards". Usually when this occurs, one of two things has happened: the player has dropped the card(s) on the floor, or the cards are still on the previous table, usually under North's system card.

But in this case, neither of those searches solved the problem. It turned out that it was far simpler than that - there were still two cards in the North pocket in the board - so much for counting his cards and counting to thirteen! When the player's cards eventually turn up, the laws require that the hand be completed and the relevant laws are applied as if the cards had been in the player's hand throughout. At the time I was called, dummy just had three trumps left, so there was no more to the play. The missing cards were a heart and diamond. So, I needed to check to see if North may have revoked. So, I asked the questions: did you ruff a heart? "Yes" - two trick penalty for that. Did you ruff a diamond? "Yes" - two trick penalty for that as well. Final result: 44 by North, one down, EW+50.

Those of you have been following closely will have noticed which cards were missing from the hand diagram above - the ace of hearts and the ace of diamonds. So, while this declarer was going down in game, most of the other pairs in the room were bidding and making either a small slam or a grand slam. Sometimes, there is justice in the world.

- Motor Vehicle Insurance
- Commercial Building and Business Insurance

As a broker, TBIB works for you the client, not the insurance companies.

If you haven't yet spoken to them, contact either Steve Weil or Josh Dejun at TBIB on **07 3252 5254** and see how they might assist you.

### IBPA Column Service



North began with a transfer to  $2\Psi$ , promising at least five cards in that suit. South super-accepted the transfer by jumping to  $3\Psi$ , promising four hearts and a maximum. After four cue bids, North placed the contract.

West led the ten of trumps. Declarer saw that twelve tricks would be guaranteed if East held the king of clubs. Declarer realised that if the club finesse lost, he would still succeed when clubs broke 3-3, thereby providing a discard for one of dummy's diamonds. If West began with the king of clubs and that suit failed to break 3-3, declarer would have to rely on the diamond finesse.

However, declarer found a way to guard against a singleton or doubleton king of clubs with West, by preparing for an elimination. After drawing trumps in two rounds, declarer cashed the ace of clubs then he continued with the queen, ace and king of spades. Next came a club towards his  $\Q-J-8$ . If the queen of clubs wins, declarer can return to dummy with a trump to lead a further round of clubs, still making the slam whenever East holds the club king.

On the above layout, West won the second round of clubs with his now bare king, and was endplayed. He had to lead into declarer's diamond tenace, or play a spade conceding a ruff and discard. Either way, declarer had twelve tricks.



This deal arose in a team game. Both South players declared 3NT and received the king of diamonds as the opening lead, with East signalling that he held an odd number of diamonds. Both declarers played low from hand at trick one, and had to win the continuation of the queen of diamonds with their now bare ace.

At the first table, the declarer was more noted for his impatience than his deep thought. He reasoned that West seemed to have at least nine cards in the red suits, and was less likely to have three clubs. At trick three, he led a low club to the king. When East discarded a low spade at this point, declarer had to settle for a three-trick set.

At the other table, the declarer was a careful player. He also placed at least nine red cards on his left but. unlike his counterpart, he saw that there was no rush to tackle clubs. The only suit about which he could safely gather additional information was the spade suit. So, instead of tackling clubs immediately, declarer cashed the ace, king and queen of spades. After West discarded two low hearts on the spades, declarer concluded that the only relevant shapes that West could hold were either 1-5-4-3, or some extreme shape with a club void, such as a 1=6=6=0 shape.

As the latter might have seen more bidding from West, declarer cashed his ace of clubs at trick six. When West followed with a low club, declarer knew that the contract was now safe. Once East discarded a low spade on the ace of clubs, declarer claimed nine tricks on the proven club finesse.





West led the king of hearts, asking for count in the suit. When this held he continued with the ace and queen of hearts, as East discarded a high club pip. Before ruffing the third heart, declarer paused to form a plan. As he had a combined ten trumps and the ace-queen-nine of diamonds in hand, declarer's mind turned towards exploring the possibility of executing an elimination with an endplay to follow.

So, after ruffing the third heart, declarer led his club to the ace and ruffed dummy's eight of clubs high. Then he crossed back to dummy with a low trump to dummy's eight, noting that both opponents followed. Next he ruffed the jack of clubs high, then led a low trump to dummy's ten. As both round suits had been eliminated, declarer led a diamond from table with the intention of covering East's card.

In practice, East played the ten of diamonds and declarer the queen. West took this with the king and found himself endplayed: either he had to lead a diamond into declarer's ace-nine tenace over East's jack-small, or lead a heart, which declarer would ruff in dummy while discarding the nine of diamonds from hand. No matter which option West chose, declarer had ten tricks.

At the end of the session, East asked whether a trump shift at trick two would have avoided the endplay. "No," West replied. "Declarer eliminates the clubs then leads the jack of hearts. I take this with the queen and can then do no better than lead the ace of hearts. Declarer just discards his nine of diamonds at that point and claims nine tricks."

West continued, "I can't do better by taking two hearts and then shifting to a trump. Declarer just draws a second trump in dummy then leads a diamond, covering any card you play. As you had both the jack and ten of diamonds, declarer will surely make two diamond tricks by playing you for them."





This was another deal from a team game where both teams reached 4♥ by South on similar auctions. At both tables, West cashed the ace and king of diamonds then shifted to the five of clubs, which was taken by dummy's ace.

At the first table the declarer continued with the ace, king and jack of trumps. After taking the last with his queen, West exited with a spade. After winning this with the queen, declarer called for a low club which he ruffed in hand with the eight of trumps. Alas for declarer, West overruffed this with his nine to set the contract by one trick.

The second declarer looked at the play more deeply. He saw that any

We cater for all budgets, but we have only one standard of service: the K.M.Smith Standard.



For you... we think of everything Phone 3252 2031 or visit kmsmith.com.au play would do if trumps were 3-2 or when they were 1-4. The only difficulty he could see on a 4-1 trump division was when West began with both the queen and nine of the suit. As a result, he formed a plan that would avoid the outcome the first declarer had suffered.

After a good deal of thought, declarer came up with the winning solution. First he cashed dummy's ace of spades. Next he played the ace, king and jack of trump. The clever part of this move was that he threw dummy's king and queen of spades instead of discarding clubs, thereby turning his jack and ten of spades into winners. After taking his queen of trumps, West had no winning move. On any continuation, declarer would win in hand and have the rest of the tricks for his contract.

#### ROCKHAMPTON

The Rockhampton Bridge Club celebrated its 53rd birthday with a Yeppoon/Rockhampton challenge match, a smorgasbord lunch, and the presentation of certificates and prizes to the clubs' winners of the local masterpoint divisions for 2022. The most Masterpoints awarded to a club member was won by Don Cameron. Yeppoon (with the help of some Rocky defectors) won the bragging rights for another year after a narrow victory.

Volunteer week saw the Wednesday night supervised play group present a fruit and chocolate box to Don Cameron thanking him for his commitment to their education as newbies, and ongoing training and mentoring as they transition to novice and intermediate levels. His monthly tutorials for all club members are well supported and the new "gadgets" and tips on bidding, play, and defense strategies have been embraced by the attendees.

Club president Lee Chenoweth was also acknowledged presented with flowers and chocolates from members for her dedication to the role and the many hours she commits to supporting and overseeing the day to day running of the club.

ANC



Margaret Millar, Carmel Martin, Sue O'Brien, Maha Hoenig, Toni Bardon, Abby Wanigaratne, and Janeen Solomon



John Luck, Toni Bardon, Terry O'Dempsey, Maha Hoenig, Michael Gearing, Ian Afflick and Paul Collins

Queenslanders in the Interstate Pairs. Women's: 1st Toni Bardon - Alison Dawson, 2nd Carmel Martin - Abby Wanigaratne. Seniors': 2nd Ian Afflick - Paul Collins. Youth: 1st Lauren Morgan - Paddy Taylor.



Ken Cupples, Peter Lawton, Philip Smith, Michelle Rau, Cameron Ronnfeldt, Mark Schalch, Adele Rogers, Lee Chenoweth (President), Matt Rau, Alan Rogers, Don Cameron and Anne Owens

### **Directors'** Corner



#### Telling people they must pass!

Chris Snook

Those involved in teaching beginners in clubs all around the state can be proud of their efforts - the graduates of their beginner lessons are now taking their first steps into supervised, restricted, or open sessions.

As these tyros venture out, they will often encounter a player who rules the roost, eg tells them exactly what they "can" and "cannot" do at the table. I'm sure much of this is good general advice about correct procedure and has already been taught parallel to their bridge lessons. Gentle reinforcement is usually appreciated but continual commentary could be viewed as harassment, and we must be cognisant of Law 74.

Unfortunately, on occasion, will come comment(s) that makes Directors cringe!

1. Something happens at the table (such as there is an unmistakable hesitation by the tyro's partner) and then the tyro is told "you have to pass"; or

2. Just as bad is people trying to console the tyro (who hasn't done anything wrong and is now upset) by telling them not to listen to these comments because they can "bid what they like".

Neither is quite right.

Example 1. There is no law that gives a player the right to tell an opponent that they have to bid or pass. Indeed, there isn't anything that gives the Director the right to tell someone they have to bid or pass. There are, however, specific Laws that the Director may quote that tells a player that they must bid something or pass. The simplest of these is Law 31.A.1 Bid out of rotation: "When the offender has called at his RHO's turn to call, then (1) if that opponent passes, offender must repeat the call out of rotation and when that call is legal there is no rectification". So, if our tyro at South bids 1 ◆ but East is dealer, then West can accept this call if they wish; but in this case they don't. Now the 1 ◆ is cancelled, and the first call goes back to East – who in this case passes. There is now no choice for anyone – Law 31.A.1 tells the tyro that they must repeat their 1 ◆ call and play continues without further rectification.

Example 2. In a new auction our non-vulnerable tyro at South holds:

٨	862
¥	KQ108653
٠	K10
+	7

East opens 1♠, our tyro makes a preemptive overcall of 3♥ and West bids 3♠. North has a longish think and then passes. East bids 4♠ and now the tyro has a little think. Immediately comes the comment from East, "your partner hesitated and now you have to pass". This silences most Souths, but it is not founded in Law.

At this stage, South is the only player who can see their hand and they can bid accordingly. No-one can tell them what to do, but they do need to understand their obligations by Law 16B, and the consequences of their action. It is a difficult concept for most players and certainly difficult for beginners, so the Director should take extra care to explain their ruling.

This example now presents several scenarios.

Scenario 1: South passes as they were told to do, East plays in 4♠ and makes nine tricks. West is not happy because South might have bid 5♥ and would have gone down.

Scenario 2: South passes as they were told to do, and East makes 10 tricks in spades. Many other tables played in 5.

Scenario 3: South bids 5♥ and makes and now East is not happy.

Scenario 4: South bids 5♥, West bds 5♠ and goes down, and EW are not happy.

For now, we will assume that South has bid 5♥ and later East has called the Director to the table.

Firstly, the Director will establish the facts. Was there a variation in

tempo (a hesitation)? Law 73.D.1 tells us that "It is desirable, though not always required, for players maintain steady tempo and to unvarying manner. However, players should be particularly careful when variations may work to the benefit of their side". This law tells North it is desirable for them to maintain steady tempo and that they should carefully avoid variations when these may work to the benefit of their side. 'Should' in the Laws means failure to do so is an infraction jeopardising the infractor's rights but not often penalised. The fact that there was a break in tempo (hesitation) is usually agreed to by those at the table and it is not an infraction. If there is not agreement, then by Law 85, the Director shall base his view on the balance of probabilities. So in our example there was a break in tempo. Law 16B Extraneous information

from partner says, "Any extraneous information from partner that might suggest a call or play is unauthorised. This includes remarks, questions, replies to questions, unexpected alerts or failures to alert, unmistaken hesitation, unwonted speed, special emphasis, tone, gesture, movement or mannerism".

Director will need to know the partnership agreements of the NS pair. What extra information does a hesitation before passing suggest in this case? Passing suggests not having sufficient values or shape to bid further, and a hesitation before passing probably suggests there was a possibility of North taking some other action. The other action is not likely to be a penalty double, and might rarely be showing their own suit, but is most likely raising in hearts.

Now the attention turns to South. Law 16B.1(a) continues, "A player may not choose a call or play that is demonstrably suggested over another by unauthorised information if the other call or play is a logical alternative". Law 16B.1(b) continues, "A logical alternative is an action that a significant proportion of the class of players in question, using the methods of the partnership, would seriously consider, and some might select". Sometimes determining the logical alternatives is easy and sometimes we need to actually survey/poll players of a similar class to find out what they would consider.

In our example, South appears to have two logical alternatives: to pass as per their system, or to bid on because they cannot contemplate defending 4. They might well argue that they would always call in this case, but that is not relevant. Does the unauthorised information demonstrably suggest that one alternative is likely to be more profitable than the other(s)? The unauthorised information suggests values and so suggests bidding might be more profitable than passing, so Law 16B.1(a) says that South may not choose this alternative. Thus, Law 16B.1(a) tells South that they must pass.

If South knew all this and thought through the consequences at the time, then they would have passed, and we would not be having this conversation. Our tyro didn't realise this and bid 5♥ – so now we have a problem. The last part of Law 16B.3 tells us that "The Director shall assign an adjusted score (see Law 12C1) if he considers that an infraction or law has resulted in an advantage for the offender". In our example, the Director would accept the auction up to the point where South bid 5<sup>v</sup>, remove the 5♥ and replace it with a pass and consider how the rest the auction and play would proceed. They would then compare the score that EW got after the infraction with the score that EW would most likely have got if the infraction had not

APRIL

MACKAY PAIRS [Director – Geoff Taylor] 1 Diane & Max Holewa; 2 Noel Bugeia / Tex Sheedy; B Helen Van Den Broek / Patricia Garner; C Annie Lynch / Diane Stokes; **SURFERS PARADISE PAIRS** [Director – Julie Jeffries] UNDER 500 MPs 1 Eugene Pereira / Martin Wu; 2 Barry Williams / Ashok Chotai; 3 Vesna & Voyko Markovic; NOVICE 1 Moyra Galton / Jean Sheather; 2 Deryl McConaghy / Martyn Jacobson; 3 John Rivers / Paul Jenkins. **QLD TEAM TRIALS 2023:** [Director – Alan Gibson] WOMEN'S 1 Carmel Martin – Abby Wanigaratne; 2 Margaret Millar – Sue O'Brien; 3 Maha Hoenig – Janeen Solomon; Reserves: Greer Tucker – Pele Rankin; SENIORS 1 Kerry Wood – Charlie Howard; 2 Paul Collins – Ian Afflick; 3 Larry Moses – Ralph Parker;

occurred. If the EW score is better without the infraction, then that is the score that they are awarded. If the EW score is same or worse without the infraction, then they get the original score.

Reserve our rights!

If East should not be telling South that they should pass does this mean they do nothing?

Law 16B.2 tells us that "When a player considers that an opponent has made such information available and that damage could well result he may announce that he reserves the right to summon the Director later". This is not a weapon to hold the opponents at bay. It is to establish whether the extraneous information occurred. If there is agreement the table plays on, if not, the Director is called immediately.

QBA Regulations Section B has good wording on this: "The preferred procedure is to summon the director at the end of the hand but only if it becomes apparent that an opponent may have acted upon extraneous information made available by his partner. The director need only be called if the non-offenders believe they may have been damaged. Whenever a player believes there is a possibility that an opponent may have acted on unauthorized information from their partner's gesture, comment, hesitation, or the like, he should immediately try to establish the facts about what has occurred. This should be done as pleasantly as possible, stressing that establishing the facts now is to avoid

#### **RESULTS APRIL - JUNE 2023**

Reserves: Paul Hooykaas – Tony Hutton. **BRISBANE BRIDGE CENTRE EASTER CONGRESS** [Director – Chris Snook] PAIRS A 1 Seb Langdon Macmillan / Kim Morrison; 2 John Kelly / Peter Evans; B 1 Jasmine Skeate / Laurie Skeate; 2 Richard Spelman / Lyn Tracey; C 1 Adele Munro / Michael Clibbon; 2 Clive Carter / Michael Corney; TEAMS A 1 Jill Magee / Terry Strong / Pamela & Jim Evans; 2 Peter Evans / Alison Dawson / Maha Hoenig / Janeen Solomon; B 1 Jasmine Skeate / Laurie Skeate / Kate Macdonald / Ben Leung; 2 Lilly Jia / Davis Zhang / Lyn Tracey / Richard Spelman; C 1 Malcolm Corney / Oliver Goodman / Vanessa Brewis Jenny McGowan; 2 Carla Webb / Olivia Jackson / Jennifer Vickers / Jeff Borg. **TOWNSVILLE PAIRS** [Directors – Jan Smith, Leigh Owens] 1 Ched Twyman / Pat Larsen; 2 Betty Hobdell /

#### dispute later should it be necessary to call the director at the end of play. The director should only be called earlier if there is no agreement about what has occurred. If at the end of the hand, the non-offending side believe they have been disadvantaged, the director can then be summoned".

Our example is rather simple, and deliberately so for the newer players and newer Directors. Real-world situations are often more complex but he same basic procedure applies. A poll is essential to determining what logical alternatives need to be considered and the wording of the poll is critical to getting the right outcome.

#### Training

A Director Training Weekend is planned for Saturday-Sunday 14-15 October. Content will suit club directors with some practical directing experience, those moving towards congress accreditation and the more experienced director as a refresher.

There will also be a training session in August to suit interested players and those commencing their Director journey. Venue and dates will be advised via Kim.



Judy Hunt; B 1 Donna Fitch / Di Garside; 2 Devan Mitchell / Kim Holl; NORTHERN SUBURBS PAIRS [Director -Alan Gibson] 1 Kim Morrison / Tony Hutton; 2 Jenny Hay / Ralph Parker 2; B 1 Barry Koster / Barbara Mackay; 2 Tere Wotherspoon / Terry O'Dempsey; C 1 Peter Lyons / Warren Males; 2 Darren Brake / Paul Brake; GYMPIE **CONGRESS** [Director – Steve Murray] PAIRS 1 Brett Middelberg / Ines Dawes; 2 Vesna & Voyko Markovic; B 1 Maureen Wright / Prunella Adams; 2 Jennifer Hollingworth / Carolann Verity; TEAMS 1 Patrick Bugler / Tim Runting / Lyn & Jim Martin; 2 Tim Ridley / David Harris / Rosemary Green / Sam Halvorsen; B 1 Eugene Pereira / Sally Hall / Vesna & Voyko Markovic; 2 Ann McGhee / Glenys Tipler / Mary & Graeme Allan. **CLEVELAND BAY DIGGERS CONGRESS** [Directors - Leigh Owens. Jan Smith] TEAMS 1 Ian Patterson / Betty Hobdell / Phil Rains / Lesleigh Rooney; 2 Bill Redhead / Cathy Crawford / Gladys Tulloch / Barbara Hospers; PAIRS 1 Ched Twyman / Leigh Owens; 2 Betty Hobdell / Ian Paterson; B Judith Threlfall / Bill Redhead; **TOOWONG NOVICE PAIRS** [Director – Julie Jeffries] 1 Peter Fagan / Kerry Barridge; 2 Althea Crowley / Jacqui Dudurovic; B Lou Stanley / Ann Welsh; WARWICK APRIL PAIRS [Director – Chris Snook] 1 Pamela & Jim Evans; 2 Ivy & John Luck; B Vesna & Voyko Markovic; ANZAC DAY TEAMS [Director – Jan Peach] 1 Terry Strong / Jill Magee / Watson Zhou / Charlie Lu; 2 Tim Runting / Patrick Bugler / Alan Gibson / Brian Patterson; B Barbara Kent / Ross Murtagh / Jack Rohde / Lex Ranke; C Louise & Stephen Bennett / Debbie Carroll / Jacinta Lee.

#### MAY

BARRIER REEF CONGRESS - CAIRNS [Directors Jan Peach, Julie Jeffries, Peter Busch] PAIRS: OPEN 1 Geoff Chettle / Simon Hinge; 2 Bill Nash / Jimmy Wallis; RESTRICTED 1 Sameer Pandya / John Rivers; 2 Barbara Howard / Lyn Dempster; NOVICE 1 Harry Graepel / Sandrine Taillardat; 2 Danny Bowden / Elaine Dickson; TEAMS: OPEN 1 Laura Ginnan / Peter Hollands / Mike Doecke / Geoff Chettle / Simon Hinge; 2 Michael Sykes / Jenny Millington / Barry Jones / Fred Whitaker; RESTRICTED 1 John Rivers / Peter Lyons / Sameer Pandya / Daria Williams; 2 Barbara Howard / Lyn Dempster / Andrea & Dave Mathieson. QUEENSLAND NOVICE PAIRS [Director - Julie Jeffries] 1 Paddy Taylor / Alex Wu; 2 Stuart Stoddart / Sue Calthrop; B George Collings / Phil Kay; C Richard Huysmans / John Reed; HERVEY BAY CONGRESS [Director - Chris Snook] PAIRS 1 Jenny Millington / Barry Jones; 2 Gordon Kellerman / Patricia Mann; B Maurice Williams / Patricia Hamilton; C Duncan Welsh / Sue Mittermair; TEAMS 1 Patricia Mann / Gordon Kellerman / John Morris / Neven Burica; 2 Fred Whitaker / Anna Monks / Jenny Millington / Barry Jones; B Barbara Love / Rob Anderson / Marianne Elmer / Peter Kriksciunas. **SURFERS PARADISE TEAMS** [Director – Alan Gibson] 1 Margaret Pisko / Trish Anagnostou / Edward Hahn / Jeff Conroy; 2 Jill Magee / Terry Strong / Edda & Tom Strong; B Daria Williams / Eugene Pereira / Voyko & Vesna Markovic; C Kevin Ridgway / Helen Jones / Lois & John Rolls. GOONDIWINDI MAY PAIRS [Director -Alan Gibson] 1 Elizabeth Zeller / Alison Dawson; 2 Ivy & John Luck; B Mary Simon / Kevin Hamilton-Reen; C Leonard Schofield / George Sloss; CALOUNDRA CONGRESS [Director - Peter Busch] PAIRS A

Rosemary Crowley / Richard Perry; B Ross Shardlow / Peter Gruythuysen; C Bob Galvin / Ian Pitts; TEAMS A Kathy & Warren Males / Sue Ziegenfuss / Tim Runting; B Eugene Pereira / Sally Hall / Sue & Andrew Sharp; BRISBANE BRIDGE CENTRE PAIRS [Director – Julie Jeffries] A 1 Jill Magee / Terry Strong; 2 Maha Hoenig / Janeen Solomon; B 1 Lyn Tracey / Richard Spelman; 2 Jenny McGowan / Martin Wu.

#### JUNE

RIVER CITY GOLD MIXED PAIRS [Directors - Jan Peach & Steve Murray] 1 Eileen Li / Watson Zhou; 2 Elizabeth Havas / George Kozakos; 3 Marianne Bookallil / Stephen Fischer; B 1 Elaine Jonsberg / John Lahey; 2 Richard Fox / Christine Newbery; C 1 Joyanne Gissing / Greg Lee; 2 Sarah Strickland / Darren Brake; NOVICE 1 Kate Macdonald / Ben Leung; 2 Elizabeth & David Ward. **ARANA CONGRESS** [Director – Julie Jeffries] PAIRS 1 Maha Hoenig / Janeen Solomon; 2 Pele Rankin / Kim Morrison; B Joyanne Gissing / Greg Lee; C Ian Broadley / Ben Ludic; TEAMS 1 Therese Tully / Paul Hooykaas / Pele Rankin / Kim Morrison; 2 Neville Francis / Patrick Bugler / Watson Zhou / Charlie Lu; B 1 Mick Fawcett / Dewi Eastman / Lyn Tracey / Winny Chan; 2 Jennifer Bavage / Susan Kennard / Jane Doyle / Melva Leale. CAIRNS NOVICE PAIRS [Director – Rick Gryg]: 1 Cheryl Parks / Julie Duncan; 2 Deb Morison / Bridget Findley; B 1 Thomas Kik / Yana Kappel; GOLD COAST CONGRESS [Director – Alan Gibson]: PAIRS 1 Ann Liu / Usher Zeng; 2 Rachel Langdon / Kim Morrison; B Barry Koster / Barbara Mackay; C Juliet Rogers / Carolyn Waters; TEAMS A Carmel Martin / Abby Wanigaratne / Pamela & Jim Evans; B Barry Koster / Lyn Tracey / Richard Spelman / Barbara Mackay; C Robyn Kronenberg / Alan Kestenberg / Deb Carroll / John Lemarchand; NOOSA PAIRS [Director Peter Busch]: 1 Ken Dawson / Adrienne Kelly; 2 Fred Whitaker / Duncan Badley; B Eugenie Mooney / Anna Irminger; 2 Dieter Bendt / 1 Stanton / Janeen Solomon; 2 Adrienne Kelly / Ken Dawson; B Carmel Dwan / Tricia Merefield; TEAMS 1 Toni Bardon / James Wallis / Neville Francis / Patrick Bugler; 2 Nikki Riszko / Mattie Baljet / Andrew Struik / Marcel Hoevenaars; B Shanaal & Hema De Zoysa / Denise Hartwig / Chris Snook.

#### MASTERPOINT LEADERS 6 months to 30 JUNE 2023

QUEENSLAND OVERALL James O'Sullivan Trophy SILVER GRAND 1 Kim Morrison; 2 Paul Gosney; GRAND 1 Charlie Lu; 2 Carmel Martin; GOLD LIFE 1 Abby Wanigaratne; 2 Watson Zhou; SILVER LIFE 1 Rachel Langdon; 2 Fay Stanton; BRONZE LIFE 1 Eugene Pereira; 2 Daria Williams; LIFE 1 Shayne Palfreyman; 2 Ming Shu Yang; SILVER NATIONAL 1 Trevor Henderson; BRONZE NATIONAL 1 Sonya Palfreyman; 2 Vesna Markovic: **NATIONAL** 1 Lilly Jia; 2 Martin Wu; **BRONZE STATE** 1 Jenny McGowan; 2 Vanessa Brewis; STATE 1 Ben Leung; 2 John Rivers; BRONZE REGIONAL 1 Bill Gilmore; 2 Diane Beasley; **REGIONAL** 1 Julia Caldwell 2 Jacqui Dudurovic; SILVER LOCAL 1 Kate Macdonald; 2 Davis Zhang; **BRONZE LOCAL** 1 Elizabeth Ward; 2 David Ward; LOCAL 1 Dave Reid; 2 Duncan Welsh; CLUB 1 Sue Mittermair; 2 Melissa Pressley;

**GRADUATE** 1 Keith Caldwell; 2 Wayne Mitchell; **NIL** 1 Shane Hubner; 2 Sheila Waddell.