



Date : 13-April-24

Day : 2

Results of the day

Swiss League

After 8 rounds of the Swiss League, **Dhampur Sugar Mills** (Ashok Goel, Vinay Desai, Sunit Chokshi, Swarnendu Banerjee, Raju Tolani and Ajay Khare), emerged winners with 127.61 VPs. In second place were **Rana** (Rana Roy, Sujit Kumar Bhattacharjee, A K Sinha, Bijan Kumar Bandhopadhyay, Shambhu Ghosh and Biswajit Poddar) who had 120.78 VPs.

Such was the dominance of the two that Formidables, the third placed team had only 106.88 VPs.

United Bengal, the team that finished 16th, scored 90.45 VPs, a bit lower than our projected cut off of 92 VPs.

Several highly rated teams like Hemant Jalan, Trambak Rubber and Monica Jajoo failed to make the cut.

The complete result can be seen [here](#)

Pre-Quarter Finals

The top 16 teams played the pre-quarter finals over three sessions of 10 boards each. The upset of the round was RIK'S (Subrata Adhikari, Subir Das, Prabir Das, Bapi Das, Somik Mitra, Biplab Dawn) victory over the fancied Dhampur Sugar Mills.

The complete result is shown below

Shree Cement Pre-Quarter Finals								
Table	Team Name	C/O	Session 1	Session 2	Session 3	Penalties	Total	Difference
1	DSM	7.50	11.0	28.0	24.0		70.5	-11.50
	RIKS	-	24.0	19.0	42.0	-3.0	82.0	
2	Rana	7.50	23.0	45.0	39.0		114.5	83.50
	United Bengal	-	16.0	3.0	12.0		31.0	
3	Formidables	-	28.0	29.0	32.0		89.0	56.00
	Hugli	-	17.0	5.0	11.0		33.0	
4	Indian Chain	-	27.0	19.0	27.0		73.0	31.00
	West Calcutta Bridge Unit	-	25.0	9.0	8.0		42.0	
5	Bangur Cement	-	35.0	27.0	15.0		77.0	33.00
	Mind Crusader	-	17.0	8.0	19.0		44.0	
6	Shree Cement	-	52.0	13.0	29.0		94.0	46.00
	DRSSMC	-	12.0	15.0	24.0	-3.0	48.0	
7	Pradeep	-	33.0	25.0	31.0		89.0	19.00
	Setu	-	12.0	23.0	35.0		70.0	
8	Arun Jain	-	41.0	3.0	34.0		78.0	37.00
	TVS Mobiity	-	2.0	30.0	12.0	-3.0	41.0	

The quarter final line up is 1 vs 8 and so on.

The first session of the quarter finals was also played today. The standings are as shown below

Shree Cement Quarter Finals								
Table	Team Name	C/O	Session 1	Session 2	Session 3	Penalties	Total	Difference
1	RIK'S	-	13.0				13.0	-25.00
	Arun Jain	-	38.0				38.0	
2	Rana	7.50	19.0				26.5	-5.50
	Pradeep	-	32.0				32.0	
3	Formidables	-	27.0				27.0	21.67
	Shree Cement	0.33	5.0				5.3	
4	Indian Chain	-	5.0				5.0	-33.33
	Bangur Cement	4.33	34.0				38.3	

Board A Match

The Board a Match was won comfortably by **Cogito** (Andrey Purushottam, Swapan Some, Raghunath Tripathi and Ayan Chatterjee). In second place were **Adventurers** (Sumit Sah, Swapan Sardar, Sisir Kr. Banerjee and Prasant Bera)

Match of the Day



The match we opted to cover was played on Table 8 during the final round of the Swiss League. The match was played between DRSSMC and Carpadian.



We chose to cover this match so as to introduce the bridge playing public to different people. Also, adding interest to the match was the fact that the result would certainly mean that the loser would be knocked out of the knock outs, so to speak.

In the Open Room, Somnath Mitra and Dilip Dutta Gupta were playing NS for DRSSMC versus Satyabrata Lahiri and Kingshuk Bhattacharjee for Carpadian. In the closed room, Ramkrisha Majumder and Moloy Mondal played NS for Carpedian versus and Apurba Bhattacharjee and Soumendra Chakraborty

Fireworks happened on the second deal of the round when NS bid and made 6♠ in the open room. In the closed room the auction had a life of its own

West	North	East	South	Board 12										
Pass	1♠	Pass	2♠	N-S Vul	♠AK 10 9 7 5 2									
Dbl	4♦ ¹	4♥	4♠	IMPs	♥10									
5♥	5♠	All pass			♦J									
					♣AK J 2									
					<table border="1" style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td></td><td style="background-color: red; color: white; padding: 2px;">N</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td style="background-color: green; color: white; padding: 2px;">W</td><td></td><td style="background-color: green; color: white; padding: 2px;">E</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td style="background-color: red; color: white; padding: 2px;">S</td><td></td></tr> </table>		N		W		E		S	
	N													
W		E												
	S													
				♠—	♠J 4 3									
				♥K Q 9 2	♥A J 7 6 5									
				♦K Q 6 4 3	♦10 8 7									
				♣9 8 6 3	♣7 5									
					♠Q 8 6									
					♥8 4 3									
					♦A 9 5 2									
					♣Q 10 4									
				5♠ North										

1. Splinter

North thought a lot before bidding 5♠. Experts can give their opinion about how to reach 6 after this auction. But DRSSMC ended up with 13 Imps on this board.

The only other significant score exchange happened on board 15 which was as below

Board 15	♠ 10 6		
N-S Vul	♥ A 7		
IMPs	♦ A J 10 6 3 2		
	♣ 9 5 3		
♠ Q		♠ A 7 5 4	
♥ 10 8 6 4 3		♥ Q 5	
♦ K 7 5		♦ 9 8	
♣ K Q J 2		♣ A 10 8 7 4	
	♠ K J 9 8 3 2		
	♥ K J 9 2		
	♦ Q 4		
	♣ 6		


It is ironic that while the deal record shows 5♠ by NS, neither table believed that they had a game. In the open room, North-South played in 2♠ making just 8 tricks!

In the closed room, the bidding was about to lapse in 3♦! However, East West came to North Souths rescue and stretched to 4♣, which NS gratefully

doubled and took 2 down for +300 and 5 Imps.

DRSSMC eventually won the match by 15 imp to 10 and qualified in 12th place.

Review

West 2 ♠ Dbl ¹ All pass	North 3 ♥ Pass	East 1 ♠ Pass 4 ♠	South Pass 4 ♥ Dbl	Board 26 Both Vul ♠ 8 7 6 ♥ 10 2 ♦ A J 9 7 6 4 ♣ K 6	♠ 5 4 ♥ K Q J 8 5 3 ♦ 10 ♣ A J 7 4 <div style="text-align: center;">  </div> ♠ K Q J 10 9 3 ♥ 7 6 4 ♦ K Q 5 ♣ 8 ♠ A 2 ♥ A 9 ♦ 8 3 2 ♣ Q 10 9 5 3 2
1. After Pause				4 ♠× East	

This incident took place in the match between Dhampur Sugar Mills and RIK'S. In the closed room DSM was sitting North South. After the board was played, 4 ♠ went 1 down. DSM called the director and claimed that 4 ♠ was bid since the double came after a pause.


The table director, in accordance with the laws conducted 2 polls, one as though there was no break in tempo by East and another, with the break in tempo being informed to the pollees.

Since all pollees opted to bid 4 ♠, the director ruled that table result stands.

Subsequently, a review petition was filed by DSM requesting for a repoll by a panel of experts and the ruling was reviewed by Kamal Mukherjee.

The reviewer wrote **“Table result stands as the process of poll was conducted properly. Deposit to be forfeited”**.

Directorial Ruling

<p>Board 18 N-S Vul IMPs</p>	<p>♠ K J 10 8 ♥ K 6 ♦ Q 9 7 6 2 ♣ K 7</p>	
<p>♠ 9 4 ♥ Q J 7 2 ♦ J 4 ♣ A Q 9 5 3</p>		<p>♠ 3 ♥ 10 8 5 4 ♦ 5 3 ♣ J 10 8 6 4 2</p>
	<p>♠ A Q 7 6 5 2 ♥ A 9 3 ♦ A K 10 8 ♣ —</p>	
<p>7 ♠ South</p>		

In yesterday's bulletin, we had enquired if anybody would have reached the grand slam on the above board. Unbeknownst to us, some extraordinary results had taken place on the same deal, which created a lot of angst in a WhatsApp group yesterday.

The objective of covering this deal today is to outline the directorial process. People who mock the process (and there were dozens yesterday) need to understand what happens when a ruling is given.

West	North	East	South
		Pass	1 ♣ ¹
Dbf ²	1 NT	2 ♥	2 ♠
Pass	3 ♠	Pass	4 ♠
All pass			

1. Precision
 2. Wrongly alerted as D + H

So, to return to the story. The following auction happened at one table

West's double was alerted as Diamonds and Hearts. As per their convention card, it was supposed to mean clubs and hearts.

North therefore bid 1NT and suggested a slam with a 3 ♠ bid which North declined.

After the deal was over, NS discovered this mistaken explanation and they contended that the wrong explanation prevented them from finding the double fit in diamonds and spades after which a grand slam would certainly have been found.

After asking NS to elaborate, they contended that the auction would have progressed in this sort of fashion

West	North	East	South
		Pass	1 ♣ ¹
Dbl ²	2 ♦	2 ♥	2 ♠
Pass	3 ♠	Pass	5 ♣ ³
Pass	5 ♦ ⁴	Pass	7 ♦
Pass	7 ♠	All pass	

1. Precision
2. Clubs and Hearts
3. Exclusion Key Card Blackwood
4. 1 Key Card

After this, South said he would bid 7 ♦ considering that even if spades broke badly, he would pitch heart losers on the established spades. However, South would convert to 7 ♠ since he had 4 spades.

The Process

The first step taken was to establish that North would indeed bid 2 ♦ with the correct explanation. This was done by taking a poll of Precision players of a similar skill. All players polled confirmed 2 ♦ would indeed be bid.

The next step taken was to verify that North – South indeed played Exclusion Key Card. This was done by verifying their convention cards.

The final step in the ruling was to adjust the score. This was done in consultation with the CTD.

Observations

As an accredited director myself, I have the following observations to add

1. Directors are encouraged to consult rather than reach unilateral decisions.

Indeed this process was followed

2. While adjusting scores, the directors are required to determine, to the extent possible, what would have been the result had the transgression not taken place.

Consultation with the CTD and other senior directors suggested that 7 ♠ is the contract that they would have reached had they had the correct information.

If there is doubt in anybody's mind about where they would have actually bid it at the table, the directors are giving the benefit of the doubt to the damaged party.

3. The process of adjusting scores is to ensure that parity is restored to the disadvantaged side and **not** to punish any side for the transgression

The score of 7 ♠ was not given to punish the offending side. Rather, it was determined that this is the contract that would have been reached.

4. The fact that they chose to timidly not bid 4 ♠ is not germane to the ruling because they had no idea of the double fit given the mistaken explanation.
5. What happened at other tables is not relevant because the ruling has to concern itself with the auction as it happened on **this table only**. You may recall our observation yesterday that not many pairs would have bid the grand slam.

6. This board happened in the second round yesterday. Had the offending party requested for a review of the ruling, it could have been sorted out without all this angst. However, for reasons best known to them, they preferred to bring it up in a WhatsApp group.

The point being made here is that the directors are not exercising **any** discretion when arriving at a ruling. All that they are doing is applying laws. One may not agree with some (or even all of them). However, such as they are, they need to be applied.

Bols Bridge Tips – Courtesy IBPA

Hungarian by birth, GEORGE HAVAS now lives in Brisbane, Australia . A computer scientist and theoretical mathematician by profession, he has represented Australia in four World Championships and two Far East Championships. His best result was to win the Far East Open Pairs in 1971. He has been a bridge columnist of The Australian for more than twenty years. We unfortunately couldn't find a photograph of his. Nevertheless, his tip, is genuinely insightful and even humorously labeled **Falsies**

FALSE-CARDS both by defenders and declarers are well understood and practised in bridge. False-bids ('falsies') are not so well appreciated, but they sure can give you a substantial uplift.

By falsies I do not mean those outrageous psychic opening bids on virtually no values that cause all kinds of trouble to both sides of the table. Rather I refer to bids aimed at deceiving the defenders, but with little risk to the declaring side.

An ideal falsie will cover your deficiencies and hide your weak holdings while retaining credibility. If you think that you might enjoy misleading your innocent opponents, give falsies a try.

Good situations for using a falsie arise when you have a pretty fair idea of where you want to end up. You do not really need much more co-operation from partner so he cannot be misled in a damaging way. Such opportunities most frequently occur when partner's hand is already limited.

Consider the following deal from the Mixed Championship at the World Pairs Tournament held in Biarritz .

E-W Vul	♠ 9 5 3		
IMPs	♥ AKJ 8 7		
	♦ J 9 4		
	♣ K 8		
		♠ Q 10	
♠ J 4		♥ 9 5 3	
♥ 10 6 4 2		♦ K 10 7 6	
♦ 5 2		♣ A Q 10 2	
♣ J 7 5 4 3			
		♠ AK 8 7 6 2	
		♥ Q	
		♦ A Q 8 3	
6 ♠ South		♣ 9 6	

When Jim and Norma Borin of Australia sat North-South, Jim knew that he was going and he knew from his hand that a club lead was surely the most damaging one.

With a limited partner, it could not cost to try a falsie, showing length in clubs, to discourage a club opening lead.

Therefore the bidding progressed like this

When Norma accepted the game try Jim simply asked for aces. He leapt to the small slam once he knew that his side held three aces.

The falsie worked. West believed that declarer held long clubs so led a diamond and Jim wrapped up all the tricks. This earned North-South 377 /388 matchpoints, a shared top with ten other pairs.

West	North	East	South
	1 ♥ ¹	Pass	1 ♠
Pass	2 ♦ ²	Pass	3 ♣ ³
Pass	4 ♠	Pass	4 NT
Pass	5 ♦ ⁴	Pass	6 ♠
All pass			

Note that, without the Three Club bid by South, West may well lead a club. This gives the defence two quick tricks, a poor score for North-South in Four Spades but a disaster in Six. However, confronted by the falsie, West's view was misguided and he was induced into a poor opening lead for the defence.

As with false-carding by defenders, there is a risk that you could mislead partner with an ill-chosen falsie. However, do contemplate using a falsie in the bidding, especially when partner has shown limited values so that you cannot lead him too far astray, in order to divert your opposition's attention.

It is not always right to make a clean breast of your holdings in the bidding. Add some titillation to your game.

My BOLS bridge tip is:

Consider a Falsie it could give you a top.

Schedule of Events for Teams

Date	Time	Session
Saturday, 13 April, 2024		Swiss Teams Quarter Finals 3 * 10 Boards
	10:00	Quarter Finals R2
	11:30	Quarter Finals R3
		Pre Registered Pairs of Losing Quarter Finalists will join Session 2 of Pairs Elimination
	01:00	Lunch
		Swiss Teams Semi Finals 4 * 10 Boards
	01:45	Semi Finals R1
	03:20	Semi Finals R2
	04:45	Tea Break
	05:00	Semi Finals R3
	06:35	Semi Finals R4
Sunday, 14 April, 2024		Swiss Teams Finals 4 * 12 Boards
	09:30	Finals / Play Offs R1
	11:30	Finals / Play Offs R2
	01:00	Lunch
	02:00	Finals / Play Offs R3
	03:45	Tea Break
	04:00	Finals R4

Schedule of Events for BAM and Pairs

Date	Time	Session
Saturday, 13 April, 2024		Pairs
	10:15	Match Point Pairs Elimination S1
	01:00	Lunch
	02:00	Match Point Pairs Elimination S2
	04:30	Tea Break
	05:00	Match Point Pairs Elimination S3
Sunday, 14 April, 2024		Pairs
	09:30	Match Point Pairs Finals (26 Boards) S1
	10:00	IMP Pairs (22/24 Boards) S1
	01:00	Lunch
	02:00	Match Point Pairs Finals (26 Boards) S2
	02:00	IMP Pairs (22/24 Boards) S2