## 12. Last Match

## By Ron Klinger

Teams in the Columbus Alt on-line tournament in place of the Vanderbilt Knock-Out Teams:

| Blass | Josef Blass, Sjoert Brink, Bas Drijver, Jacek Kalita, Michael Nowosadski, Jacek Pszczola (Pepsi) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Spector | Vincent Demuy, John Hurd, John Kranyak, Warren Spector, Gavin Wolpert, Joel Woolbridge |
| Moss | Ishmael Del'Monte, Roger Lee, Eldad Ginossar, David Grainger, Brad Moss, Sylvia Moss |
| Upmark | Peter Bertheau, Per Ola Cullin, Simon Hult, Marion Michielsen, Fredrik Nyström, Mikael Rimstedt, <br> Ola Rimstedt, Johan Upmark |
| Tulin | David Bakhshi, Alon Birman, Dror Padon, Ricco van Prooijen, Stan Tulin, Louk Verhees <br> Meltzer <br> Lavazza |
| Billy Cohen, Nikolay Demirev, Rose Meltzer, Ron Smith <br> Dennis Bilde, Norberto Bocchi, Philippe Cronier, Giorgio Duboin, Agustin Madala, <br> Street | Antonio Sementa <br> Thomas Bessis, Nic L'écuyer, Cédric Lorenzini, Hugh McGann, Tom Hanlon, Paul Street |
| Standings after Round 6, with one round to go: |  |


| Team | Victory Points |
| :--- | :---: |
| Lavazza | 87.34 |
| Upmark | 76.05 |
| Blass | 73.15 |
| Tulin | 70.19 |
| Moss | 60.10 |
| Street | 57.40 |
| Spector | 46.08 |
| Meltzer | 9.69 |

As it happened the last round pitted LAVAZZA vs UPMARK, placed first and second with one round to go, and BLASS vs TULIN, running third and fourth.

## LAVAZZA vs UPMARK

LAVAZZA North-South:
Bd. 1. West dealer : Nil vulnerable


After West passed, LAVAZZA (N-S) had a relay auction which started 1NT : 2\& $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ (no major) : 2^ (game-force relay: tell me more). South found North had five clubs, 0 or 3 key cards and the Q and bid $7 \boldsymbol{e}$, which was unbeatable, $N-S+1440$. There were holdings for North where the grand slam would have failed. Such as a 3-3-2-5 pattern. At the other table:

UPMARK North-South:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\varsigma}^{(1)}$ | $2 N T$ | Pass | $4 \mathrm{NT}^{(2)}$ |
| Pass | $6 \boldsymbol{6}$ | All Pass |  |

(1) Weak, 5 or 6 hearts
(2) Quantitative

North made all the tricks, +940, but -11 Imps.
Like LAVAZZA, BLASS North-South also began 1NT : 2\&, 2 (no major) : 2^ (game-force relay: tell me more) and bid to $7 \boldsymbol{( 1 4 4 0}$ ). At the other table TULIN North-South bid 1NT : 2*, $2 \downarrow$ (no major) : 4NT (quantitative), 6NT, all pass, +1020 but -9 Imps.

In the other matches, the contracts were $6+940$ vs $6 N T+1020,+2$ Imps, and $3 N T+520$ vs $640,+9$ Imps.
Bd. 14: South dealer : Nil vulnerable

|  | North <br> - A92 <br> - KJ76 <br> - 9 <br> * AK983 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West |  | East |
| - J106 |  | - 87543 |
| - A9432 |  | $\checkmark$ Q |
| - 32 |  | - AKJ10 |
| - 654 |  | - 1072 |
|  | South |  |
|  | - KQ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 1085$ |  |
|  | - Q87654 |  |
|  | * QJ |  |

At each of the four tables where the four leading teams were playing, the contract was 3NT by South. In each case, one declarer succeeded and the other went one down.

LAVAZZA South was in 3NT after North opened 1* and East overcalled 1\&, no other East-West bidding. West led the $\$$ : nine - king - five. East switched to the $\$ 7$. South won with the king and ran the $\uparrow 10$ to the $\vee Q$. East continued with the $\uparrow$, taken by the $\uparrow$. South unblocked the $\& \mathrm{~J}$ and played a heart. With the $\star$ A marked with East from the auction, South had nine tricks, +400 .

At the other table, UPMARK South was in 3NT after North opened 1* and East overcalled 1^ ('Suit quality? We don’t care about suit quality!’). South bid 2\&, showing diamonds, and West bid 2^. North doubled, South bid 2NT and North 3NT, all pass. Given the choices, I’d prefer to overcall $1 \star$ than $1 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$, second choice, Pass.

West led the $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$. South won and ran the $\vee 10$ to the $\vee$. East switched to the $\uparrow 10$ : queen! - two - nine. Double dummy, South can now make nine tricks via $Q$ and the overtaking in dummy. South makes three spades, five clubs and the $\downarrow$.

This requires the 10 to come down doubleton or tripleton. South was not prepared to rely on that. South cashed $\boldsymbol{J}$,
 East-West +50 and 10 Imps to LAVAZZA.

## BLASS vs TULIN

For BLASS, Nowosadski (S) - Kalita (N) also began Pass : Pass : 1 : 1 $\boldsymbol{4}$ (diamonds) : 2 and South ended in 3NT. West led $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$, South won and ran the $\vee 10$ to the $\vee$. East switched to the $\downarrow$ J: queen! - three - nine. South cashed
 dummy. With no hearts left, East had to give the lead to dummy and South had nine tricks, +400 .

|  | North <br> - A92 <br> - KJ76 <br> - 9 <br> - AK983 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West |  | East |
| - J106 |  | - 87543 |
| $\checkmark$ A9432 |  | $\checkmark$ Q |
| - 32 |  | - AKJ10 |
| -654 |  | * 1072 |
|  | South |  |
|  | - KQ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 1085$ |  |
|  | - Q87654 |  |
|  | * QJ |  |

TULIN North-South. With East-West passing throughout, the bidding went Pass: 1* : (4+ diamonds), 2*:2ヶ : 2NT, 3NT, all pass. West led the $\downarrow 2$ : six - queen - five. East switched first to the $\downarrow \mathrm{J}$ : four - three - nine and next to the $\uparrow$ : king - six - two. South cashed the $\boldsymbol{\sim}$, followed by the $\vee 10$. West grabbed the $\uparrow$ A and returned the $\downarrow 2$. East took the $\downarrow$ A, $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ for one down, -50 and 10 Imps to BLASS.

In the other matches the results were $2 \star+110$ vs $2 \star+110$, no swing, and $2 \star+90$ vs $3 N T-50$, for a $4-$ Imp swing.
Round 7 results:

Lavazza 14.92 (+24) beat Upmark 4.08
Blass 13.72 (+17) beat Tulin 6.28
Spector 11.23 (+5) beat Moss 8.77
Meltzer 11.23 (+5) beat Street 8.77
Final standings:

| Team | Victory Points |
| :--- | :---: |
| Lavazza | 102.26 |
| Blass | 86.87 |
| Upmark | 81.13 |
| Tulin | 76.47 |
| Moss | 68.87 |
| Street | 68.63 |
| Spector | 57.31 |
| Meltzer | 18.46 |

When pard mentions the Grosvenor Coup,
Bridge purists get into a stew.
"That refers to a gambit,
It's not a coup, dammit,
And it's ethically dubious, too."
(ACBL Bulletin, March 2020)
In fact, there is nothing ethically wrong with the Grosvenor Gambit.

