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## Director's Call Laurie Kelso

Oops - I didn't mean to do that!
Bridge is very much a game of mistakes, and the winners are usually those who commit the fewest number of errors. Consequently, the laws are not very sympathetic towards a player who mis-bids, mis-analyses, miscounts, misevaluates or misplays one or more of the hands. They are however somewhat more forgiving in situations that involve non-cognitive (i.e., mechanical) errors.
"If a player discovers that he has not made the call he intended to make, he may, until his partner makes a call, substitute the call he intended for the unintended call." (Law 25A1)
'Unintended' is defined in the laws as "involuntary; not under control of the will; not the intention of the player at the moment of his action".

The accidental removal of the wrong bidding card from a bidding box is an example of an unintended action. The use of the wrong denomination on the written bidding pad is another example of a possible unintended call.

In applying this law, the Director must be satisfied that the player never had it in his mind to select the action he took. Opening $1 \checkmark$ with only one heart and five spades clearly suggests some sort of inexplicable mental aberration and the Director would normally allow the correction to 1 A . By contrast a player who opens $1 \%$ with a 4-card suit before changing it to 1 NT has probably just remembered that he is playing a different notrump range, hence the first call would not be considered unintentional, no matter how quick the correction. The acid test is always the player's incontrovertible intention, not the speed of the change.

The opportunity to correct an unintended call only expires when the player's partner subsequently calls. A bid may be treated as unintentional under this law even if the player's attention is first drawn to it by the action of his partner in alerting the bid or by an opponent's request for an explanation of the bid. Once again, the clear intention of the player is the guideline the Director uses. Cue bidding $2 \uparrow$ over $1 \uparrow$ with a minimum hand and a 6 -card club suit clearly suggests it is appropriate to allow a change. By contrast, bidding $2 v$ in response to 1 NT with a heart suit when playing transfers, does not qualify.

Sometimes the original bid looks ridiculous in the context of the player's hand, but that doesn't necessarily imply that it was unintended. Many strange calls are the result of a player not seeing their partner's or an opponent's previous call. Sometimes the problem is due to the legibility of partner's handwriting. In most of these cases the original call was actually intended, it is just that it was based upon a false premise.

Sometimes a player will momentarily forget the true nature of their partner's last call. A simple example is when a player passes a splinter bid or a blackwood response instead of signing off in the agreed trump suit. None of these passes qualify as 'unintended', because the player's thought processes told him to pass at the very instance that he did. The usual scenario is that the player, having first decided not to bid on to game or slam, simply forgets that the partnership is not yet in the correct denomination.

The most common correctable situations using bidding boxes are those where the mis-pulled call is adjacent to the intended call (i.e., 2NT or $2 \boldsymbol{v}$ instead of 2 A , or the removal of a 'Double' card instead of a 'Pass' card). The Director will however be much more reluctant to allow a change (on purely mechanical grounds) if the prospective alternative call comes from a distinctly different part of the
bidding box (such as the attempted replacement of a 3\% bid with a Pass).

Unintended actions can also feature in the play of the hand:
"Declarer may correct an unintended designation of a card from dummy until he next plays a card from either his own hand or from dummy. A change of designation may be allowed after a slip of the tongue, but not after a loss of concentration or a reconsideration of action." [Law 45C4(b)]

Note that this law uses the term 'designation'. This means it usually only applies when declarer verbally indicates the card he wishes to play, and it also only relates to the cards that declarer nominates from the dummy. A legal card played in the normal manner by a defender or one from declarer's own hand cannot be changed, irrespective of whether it was intended or not.

Typically, the law covers situations where a declarer, in leading from dummy, accidentally says "small heart" instead of "small club". Conversely it is not applicable to a declarer who, having reconsidered the situation, now wants to change from a "small spade" to the "King of hearts". Intent remains the key issue, so a slip of the tongue is correctable, while a change of mind is not.

The rulings in all these situations require a certain degree of judgment and hence it is always the Director and not the players who determine if an action qualifies as 'unintended'.

## Coming Congresses

## Ballarat Congress

Saturday $10^{\text {th }}$ Sep - Swiss Pairs 10 am
Sunday $11^{\text {th }}$ Sep - Swiss Teams 10 am
Venue: 1001 Eyre Street Ballarat 3350
Contact: Bruce Morley
Email: bruce.morley@bigpond.com

## Warrnambool Congress

Saturday $8^{\text {th }}$ Oct - Swiss Pairs 10 am
Sunday $9^{\text {th }}$ Oct - Swiss Teams 10 am
Venue: Wannon Function Centre, Warrnambool Greyhound Racing Track
331 Koroit Street, Warrnambool
Contact: Jan Cooke, 0438724609
Email: cookej49@hotmail.com

## Congress Results

## Traralgon Swiss Pairs

1. Steve and Mary Colling
2. Helen Porter and Elizabeth Thomson
3. Fred Sundermann and Roshni Chand

## Traralgon Swiss Teams

1. Arendina Drury, Richard Moss, Jack Kuiper, Deborah Anglim
2. George Campbell, Sandor Varga, Judy Banks, Anna Kearon
3. Alison Farthing, Jean MacLeod, Ken Tierney, Egbert Tzoe

## State Results

## Metropolitan GNOT Final

1. Kim Frazer, Chen Ding, Kitty Muntz, Leigh Gold, Jamie Ebery, Ming Zhang
2. Thilak Ranasinghe, Gordon McRobert, George Lovrecz, Leo Saoud
3. Ian Muir, Raji Muir, Trevor Haley, John Robertson

## Victorian Open Pairs Championship

1. Stephen Sharp, Danny Sharp
2. Robert Fruewirth, Bill Jacobs
3. Eva Samuel, Pete Hollands

## Victorian Open Pairs Plate

1. Len Meyer, Phyllis Moritz
2. Andrew Macready-Bryan, Di Smart
3. Belinda Lindsay, Margaret Klassen

## What Happened here?

TP sent me this hand from the VBA Online Teams. One declarer made 12 tricks but the other 11 declarers playing in a spade contract made fewer tricks. Why?


Say you get a club lead, win in dummy and misguess the heart, West must return a nontrump and you can cash your outside winners and cross-ruff the rest of the tricks. If East hops up with the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and returns a trump, you can cash your $\nabla K$, and other winners and then cross-ruff your way home. Why did so many fail to make 12 tricks?

## Editorial <br> Dee Harley

I have loved watching the World Bridge Series matches on BBO. It is on late at night, since Wroclaw is 8 hours behind Melbourne. One thing that causes wonderment in my mind is what these guys think about when they have gigantic pauses; (you can sit for minutes waiting a card to be played)

You get some idea of the thoughts a top player might have if you read Kit Wolsey's excellent series on Bridgewinners.com as he explains in great detail what is going through his mind as he steps you all the way through a hand.

If you do not have the patience to wait for cards to be played you can have your cake and eat it by watching Pete Hollands' You Tube videos on the World Series. He chooses a match at each stage and then he picks out a
hand and goes through the bidding and play at both tables. There are no long pauses watching it this way, and you get great viewing as well. - Thanks Pete! View Pete's videos here: https://tinyurl.com/2cndkndu

Of course you can always go directly to the results, or read the daily bulletins to keep up to date - here:
https://tinyurl.com/3kzawwu9
I am delighted to be able to provide a new feature in the bulletin - Director's call, a series of articles by Laurie. Educational as well as interesting. Despite the fact that he is in Poland, Laurie managed to send me the article for this month's issue.
We also have new contributors Stephen Sharp and Greg Quittner. All contributions are welcome.

Contact me at dee harley@hotmail.com

## Master Point Promotions

| Silver Life |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lanny Chan | Moonee Valley |
| Dot Peacock | Geelong |
| Life | Traralgon |
| Rob Graham | Waverley |
| Tim Legge | Frankston |
| Mary Colling | Frankston |
| Steve Colling |  |
| National | Moonee Valley |
| Philip Young |  |
| Bronze State | Waverley |
| Vicki Lee | Sunbury |
| Wendy Judge | Ballarat |
| State | Geelong |
| Geoff Dwyer | Geelong |
| Alan Blackburn | Traralgon |
| Wendy Dennis |  |
| Deb Reynolds | RACV |
| Bronze Regional |  |
| Colin Morrison | Ocean Grove |
| Regional |  |
| Ros Thornton |  |

## Something New Stephen Sharp

Congrats to Stephen and Danny Sharp popular winners of the Victorian Open Pairs. Stephen sent me this report of hand 5 on the final night:

| Dlr: North | - 42 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N/S | $\checkmark$ K1098543 |  |
|  | - 10843 |  |
|  | \%- |  |
| ^ QJ8 | N | ^ AK963 |
| - AQ6 |  | $\checkmark 7$ |
| - AK2 |  | - 76 |
| $\therefore 10854$ | S | * AKJ63 |
|  | ค 1075 |  |
|  | - J2 |  |
|  | - QJ95 |  |
|  | * Q972 |  |
| Contract 6NTxx | Lead: $\mathbf{8}^{\text {d }}$ |  |

Bidding:

| W | N | E | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| $34^{1}$ | Pass | $4 \%^{2}$ | Pass |
| $4{ }^{2}$ | Pass | 5\% ${ }^{3}$ | Pass |
| $5 \downarrow^{3}$ | Pass | $5{ }^{3}$ | Pass |
| $5 \mathrm{NT}^{4}$ | Pass | $6{ }^{5}$ | Pass |
| $6 V^{5}$ | Dbl ${ }^{6}$ | $6 \boldsymbol{a}^{7}$ | Pass |
| $6 \mathrm{NT}{ }^{8}$ | Pass | Pass | Dbl |
| Rdbl | All Pass |  |  |

1 Game force
2 Cue (1st round)
3 Cue (2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ round)
$4 \wedge \mathrm{Q}$ and interest in Grand Slam
5 Cue (3 $3^{\text {rd }}$ round)
6 Lead directing
7 Small slam feels enough partner!
8 Danny wants to play the hand because heart lead comes into him as declarer from his side(technical analysis) and because Danny just wants to play the hand (entertainment analysis)...admittedly also superior outcome at match points if either analysis is correct)
12 tricks achieved only losing the Q of clubs. First time in over 40 years of play that we have managed a slam contract doubled and redoubled...who knows what next week will bring!!!

## Something Different Greg Quittiner

Greg Quittner sent me the following guide to slam bidding: This deal occurred at the Waverley Bridge Club


Bidding:

| W | $N$ | $E$ | $S$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2 \%$ | Pass | 2 |
| Dbl | $2 \downarrow$ | 3 | $3 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $4 N T$ | Pass | $5 \%$ |

Pass 6v All Pass
POINTS TO REMEMBER:
With only 4 losers North should open 2 \& despite missing $\vee \mathrm{KJ}$.

South's 2 is a waiting bid asking North to describe his hand

West's double is lead directing.
With a weak hand South would have bid $4 \vee$ over East's 3 . For this reason, North introduces Key Card Blackwood.

5\% shows one key card. North works out that South must have the $\vee K$ as West must have the $\star$ A for his lead directing double.

IMPORTANT : In a game-forcing situation a bid below game is stronger than the jump to game.

| Play Problem \# 32 Solution |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IMPs |  |  |
| Dlr: West | A 873 |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\checkmark$ AK |  |
|  | - 108754 |  |
|  | * A52 |  |
| $\wedge$ Q | N | A? |
| $\bullet$ ? | W E | $\checkmark$ ? |
| - ? |  | - ? |
| \% ? | , | \& ? |
|  |  | ค A 9 |
|  | $\checkmark \mathrm{J} 42$ |  |
|  | - AQ93 |  |
|  | \% K87 |  |
| Contract 3NT | Lead: $\uparrow$ Q |  |
| Bidding: |  |  |
| W | $N \quad E$ | S |
| $2 \mathrm{~A}^{1}$ | Pass Pass | Dbl |
| Pass | $3 \downarrow^{2} \quad$ Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |
| 1 Weak (6 card | suit) |  |
| 2 Values (Lebe | nsohl) |  |

East plays the $\uparrow K$ on the first round and when you duck, he continues with the $\uparrow 2$ What is the best chance to take 9 tricks?

East has no more spades. At all costs you must keep West off lead since he would have all those Spades to cash.

If you can pick up the diamond suit for 4 tricks, then you will be home. My first thought was to cash the $\star$, and then lead towards the $Q$. This will work fine if West has a singleton $\uparrow K$, but if West holds Jxx and East has the singleton $\begin{aligned} & K \\ & \text { you have just blown it! }\end{aligned}$

The revised plan is to cross to a dummy with a heart and lead a small diamond. If East plays the K you must play low from hand, but if East plays any other diamond, you play the - A, cross back to dummy with a club and lead a diamond towards your Queen. This combines your best chances to make the contract. If West started with a guarded $\diamond K$ or $\downarrow$ J, then you will not make your contract.

## Play Problem \#33

IMPs

| Dlr: West | ^ KQ43 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N/S | - 763 |  |
|  | - K432 |  |
|  | \% KQ |  |
| A 62 | N | A 75 |
| $\checkmark$ AKJ? |  | $\checkmark$ 954? |
| - ? |  | - ? |
| \% ? | S | \& ? |
|  | ^ AJ1098 |  |
|  | $\bullet$ Q2 |  |
|  | - AJ9 |  |
|  | \& 543 |  |

Contract 4ヵ Lead: $\vee \mathrm{A}$

Bidding:

| $W$ | $N$ | $E$ | $S$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 N T^{1}$ | Pass | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |

All Pass
15-17
East plays the $\vee \mathrm{A}, \vee \mathrm{K}$, and then the $\vee \mathrm{J}$ which you ruff. You draw two rounds of trumps (they break 2-2) and now you are left with the problem of how to make 10 tricks.

Send me your solution if you can see one.

## Suit Combination

You(South): A964 Partner(North): K753.
You need 3 tricks:
How do you play? - estimate your chances of success

You have plenty of entries to both hands.
Decide how you would play before peeking at the Solution on P6

## \% KNAVE OF CLUBS A GOOD RALLY!

This deal occurred in a pairs game, which accounts for the declarer trying for ten tricks in hearts rather than eleven in clubs. West, who had been listening to the auction, began with ace, queen and another diamond. Declarer saw that his main chance was trumps breaking 3-3. He then pondered what he could do if trumps were 4-2.

Perhaps, you want to consider before reading on?

After some thought, he saw that he could survive a 4-2 trump break whenever the player with four trumps had both a singleton club and four spades. So, after ruffing the third diamond in dummy while discarding a spade from hand, he cashed the queen of trumps before playing the ace and king of clubs. Now it was East's turn to pause to consider his options. As the cards lay, if he had ruffed the second club then the rest would have been easy for declarer: the best East could have done was to play another diamond, which declarer would have ruffed on the table, then crossed back to hand with a spade to draw trumps and claim.

| Teams |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | ค 53 |  |
| Vul: E/W | - Q62 |  |
|  | - J8 |  |
|  | \% AKQ873 |  |
| $$ | N | ^ 3984 |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ J1084 |
|  |  | - K1042 |
|  | S | $\therefore 9$ |
|  | ^ AK76 |  |
|  | - AK73 |  |
|  | - 96 |  |
|  | * 1062 |  |

Contract: $4 \vee$
Lead: $\star$ A

Bidding:

| $W$ | $N$ | $E$ | $S$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1 \%$ | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $2 \%$ | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $4 \psi$ | All Pass |  |

There would be a similar outcome if East had thrown a diamond on the second club. Declarer would have continued with the ace, king and another trump to put East on lead with only spades left in his hand. Declarer would have won the forced spade return and run the clubs for his contract. After some thought East discarded a low spade, and it was then declarer's turn to reconsider his options. Declarer knew East well: he was not the sort of player who would refuse to ruff the second club with only two or three trumps.

Therefore, declarer decided to play East for four trumps and cashed the ace and king of spades, then ruffed his remaining spade in dummy. When the queen of clubs was played, East could do no better than ruff and play a diamond. As declarer had the ace-king-seven of hearts left, he ruffed this with the seven and took the last two tricks with master trumps for his contract. A tricky hand to play!

## Solution to Suit Combination

You(South): A964 Partner(North): K753.
Needing 3 tricks:
The solution here is to cash the King, if one of the Q, J or 10 appears behind South, you can now play towards the 9, picking up HHxx in the West hand. Very similar to last months problem! I missed it again in the Victorian Open Pairs.

You need the suit to break 3-2, or if 4-1 then East needs a singleton Q or J or 10 .

It works out at 76.3\%
67.8\% for the 3-2 break +
$2.83 \%$ * 3 (for each singleton honour)

## BAIRNSDALE BRIDGE CLUB $18^{\text {th }}$ ANNUAL

| Conditions of Entry |
| :--- |
| System cards compulsory |
| Current ABF alerting procedures |
| are enforced |
| Victorian Government CoVID | Prizes for Dpen, Restricted, Novice, Bairnsdale Bridge Club, ERBA and "most improved pair 8 team" (based on ranking)

## CONGRESS

St. Mary's Parish Centre (enter through McDonald's carpark)

## SATURDAY 15 ${ }^{\text {th }}$

October - PAIRS

## 12 noon start - $\$ 35$ per person SUNDAY $16{ }^{\text {th }}$ October,

 TEAMS10am start (lunch provided) \$45 per person
If you have any dietary restrictions, please contact the Convener

| CONVENER |
| :---: |
| Alison Farthing |
| Phone 0428729519 |
| Email: |
| alisonfarthing45@gmail.com |
| DIRECTOR |
| Martin Willcox |
| ENTRIES |
| $\frac{\text { www.bridgeunlimited.com }}{\text { or contact Convenor }}$Pay at door on arrival |

