



54

# Winter National Bridge Championship

16<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2012 at Geetanjali Stadium

## DAILY BULLETIN

Organising Secretary : Arijit Guha

Bulletin # 6 Saturday 22nd December 2012

Editor : SAILA RANJAN DAS  
Assistant : BHOLANATH DAS

### FORMIDABLES WIN RUIA GOLD IN 54TH WINTER BRIDGE NATIONAL

In the 54<sup>th</sup> Winter National Bridge National Bridge Championship, Formidables regained its supremacy in Indian Bridge field by regaining the most coveted Ruia Gold Trophy after conceding it to Railways in the last Nationals. Formidables beat Ashok Ruia's Indian Blues team by 33 IMPs.



In the first session of fourteen boards, Formidables lagged behind by five IMPs. But in the second session Formidables earned 52 IMPs as against 22 IMPs for Indian Blues which ultimately sealed the fate of Indian Blues. In the next session Formidables consolidated its position by adding further 11 IMPs to their account. In the final session Indian Blues could manage a slender margin of four IMPs. But it was not enough final standings being 171 IMPs for Formidables as against 138 IMPs for Indian Blues.

Holkar Pairs elimination rounds have been completed today and the Final will be played tomorrow i.e. the final day of the Nationals.

## 54th Winter National Prizes

	Ruia Gold	Ruia Silver	Holkar	IMP Pairs
1st	120000	42000	24000	16000
2nd	50000	21000	12000	8000
3rd	15000	9000	8000	5000
4th	15000	6000	6000	4000
5th	7500	4500	5000	3000
6th	7500	4500	4000	3000
7th	7500	4500	3000	2000
8th	7500	4500	3000	2000

## RUIA GOLD FINAL RESULTS

TEAM	IMPs				Total IMPs
<b>FORMIDABLES</b> Kiran Nadar, B. Satyanarayana, R. Tewari, H. B. Prabhakar, K. R. Venkataraman, Sunit Choksi <b>Vs</b> <b>INDIA BLUES BOMBAY</b> V.M Lal, J.M Shah, Himani Kandelwal, Subhas Gupta, Rajiv Kandelwal, Swarnendu	37	52	46	36	171
	42	22	34	40	138

### Never Mind

The doctor was checking up on three elderly bridge players who had head injuries from a car accident.

Serene inquired "Doctor, Will I still be able to play bridge?"

The Doctor asked "How many high card points in a deck of cards?"

"60!" the lady replied.

Worried, the doctor turned to Wayne "How about you? How many high card points in a deck of cards?"

"Uh, Wednesday!" he shouted.

Even more concerned, the doctor motioned to the other lady. "Well, what do you say, madam? How many high card points in a deck of cards?"

"Forty!" Sheryl replied.

"Excellent!" the doctor exclaimed. "How did you get that?"

"Oh, it's pretty simple," she explained. "You just subtract the 60 from Wednesday!"

### Never Mind - A new twist

Sheryl subtracted 60 from Wednesday to get 40. The numerical equivalent of Wednesday is  $23+5+4+14+5+4+1+25=100$ . So there!

### Misunderstandings

A cleaning woman was applying for a new position. When asked why she left her last employment, she replied, "Yes, sir, they paid good wages, but it was the most ridiculously undignified place I ever worked. They played a game called Bridge.

Last night a lot of folks were there. As I was about to bring in the refreshments, I heard a man say, "Lay down and let's see what you've got." Another man said, "I've got strength, but no length."

Another man says to the lady, "Take your hand off my trick!"

I pretty near dropped dead just then, when the lady answered, "You jumped me twice when you didn't have the strength for one raise."

Another lady was talking about protecting her honor and two other ladies were talking and one said, "Now it's time for me to play with your husband and you can play with mine."

Well I just got my hat and coat and as I was leaving, I hope to die if one of them didn't say, "Well, I guess we'll go home now. This is the last rubber."

## SHUBHAM FOR BRIDGE



As I sit down in the East West direction immediately my attention goes to my RHO. A sweet nice boy in his teens. He bids 3N after my partner opens 2S. I lead spade and my RHO ducks once. As my partner switches to another suit he makes nine tricks! He is Shubham Acharya, a student of Class IX in Carmel Junior College, Jamshedpur. "I used to see my father playing Bridge. I could not make any head or tail out of it" said Shubham. When his father told him that it was an intellectual game and if he liked he could learn it Shubham immediately lapped up the idea. He started playing of Bridge from 2011. Prior to the Winter National he participated in State Championship and came 4th in the team event. Contrary to the common belief his bridge pursuit has not affected his studies "Play Bridge but if you don't do well in your studies, you shall be out of this house", "my father has already told me" said Shubham. Shubham partnering with his father has qualified for the third eliminations in Holkar Pairs. In the boys & girls of your age lies the future of Bridge. Good Luck Shubham!

## Holkar Pairs Qualification

Rank	MPs	Pairs Name
1	446.85	RAVI GOENKA - SUHAS VAIDYA
2	443.81	M G DALAI - R C NAYAK
3	431.08	SAMIR BASAK - SUKAMAL DAS
4	426.15	PRABIR KR PAL - A BHATTACHARYA
5	422.7	S K BANDHOPADHYA - A K KUNDU
6	422.33	S ROY - J N ROY
7	417.93	A B CHAKRABORTY - A ROY
8	417.47	SANDIP THAKRAL - KAUSTABH BENDRE
9	413.92	R KISHNAN - RAGHVNDRA RAJKUM
10	412.71	S N GHOSH - BISWAJIT PODDAR
11	412.39	S MUKHERJEE - A CHAKRABORTY
12	402.16	MRINAL MUKHERJEE - ALOK DAGA
13	400.2	M BOSE - N P KABIRAJ
14	399.55	P S MUKHERJEE - P BARDHAN
15	396.44	K BHATTACHARYA - A SADHU
16	393.41	B BOSE - C S MAJUMDAR
17	392.57	S SARKAR - P AGARWAL
18	390.87	A DUTTA - S MAJUMDAR
19	390.82	BIMAL SICKA - TAPAN ROY
20	390.01	BALCHANDRA OGALE - S SANKHOLIA
21	384.95	BADAL DAS - SUMIT BHOWMIK
22	384.81	SUBIR MAJUMDAR - SANDIP DATTA
23	384.38	AMAL KUNDU - M K SAHA
24	382.07	A MALHOTRA - H K JALAN
25	381	B SAHA - P KUSHARI
26	378.51	SUDHIR KR GANGUL - P K MUKHERJEE
27	375.65	SOURENDRAC DUTT - A MUKHERJEE
28	375.37	HASIBUL HASAN - SAMIR PAL
29	374.31	MANAS MUKHERJEE - RANA ROY

## MESSAGE FROM SECRETARY BFI



*Dear Friends*

*I congratulate all the participants for making the 54th edition of Winter National a grand success. As you all perhaps know that little bit of uncertainty arose due to non availability of our favorite venue at Netaji Indoor Stadium. However I am thankful to you all for accepting and adjusting well with the new venue. I am thankful to the KMDA authorities to allow us to utilise Geetanjali Stadium. I am thankful to all the Directors whose relentless efforts ensured smooth conduct of the tourney. Sanjib, Sudip, Dimpi, Amit, Suddha, Soumik have very nicely arranged BBO viewing and my thanks to them.*

*My sincere gratitude goes to Mr N Nagappan for being here as Chairman of Appeals Committee.*

*It has been brought to my notice that the food supplied during the tourney has not been liked by some participants. But contrary views also have been expressed by a good number of participants. I would like to say that we have tried to provide foods and other amenities to the best of our ability under the existing circumstances.*

*The most important of all I am very grateful to the Press & media in particular for giving such a wide coverage to the tournament.*

*Wishing you all a very Happy New Year well in advance!*

*Arijit Guha*

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS



M. B. V. Subrahmanyam  
*Chief Tournament Director*



Pranab Bhattacharya (Ranju)  
*Joint Chief Tournament Director*

### TOURNAMENT DIRECTORS



Gora Roy Chowdhury



Kashinath Das



Tapas Mukerjee



Aparajita Iyer



P. Narasinga Rao



B. G. Daxindas



V K Sharma



Avinash Chitale



Sanjoy Chakraborty

If a company without its Board of Directors is unthinkable, a Bridge tourney that too when it is Winter National, is unimaginable without the Directors. Organisers can claim appreciation for success for a well run tournament only when the Directors have successfully conducted the tourney. They are like the conductors of an orchestra. Unfortunately they rarely get bouquets and often get brickbats. We Bridge players should pause for a minute and try to appreciate the yeoman's service being rendered by them. Please give them their due. Yesterday I heard a gentleman calling thrice "Director" "Director" "Director" Thrice I added "Please" "Please" "Please"! Please reduce my work and call the Director, "Director Please".



**Card Dealing**  
Chetan Raval  
C Vijaya Kumar  
S R C Sekar



**Bulletin Desk**  
Saila Ranjan Das  
Bholanath Das



**Volunteers with CTD**  
Moloy Mukherjee, Mithu Saha, Kamal Acharya,  
Samir Das, Krishna Gopal Ghosh, Biswajit Sinha,  
Dulal Acharya, Biswa Bhattacharya, Somnath Bose,  
Subhajit Das, Anirban Kar, Rana Adhikary,  
Ashim Paul, Pritam Biswas, Surajit Das, Subrata Das,  
Akash Das, Souvik Saha, Loknath Chakraborty,  
Sumit Roy Choudhury  
**Office Staff**  
Tushar Dhara, Ranajit Chowdhury (Babli)

## Cooperative doubles after 1NT openings ala Phillip Martin - by Jeff Lehman

One of my favorite bridge conventions is cooperative doubles after we open 1NT and the opponents intervene. The convention is explained by Phillip Martin at <http://sites.google.com/site/psmartinsite/Home/bridge-articles/countering-notrump-interference>.

To show the richness of the convention, I am going to present an illustration. Just as the convention is a steal from Phillip Martin's website, the illustrated hand is a steal from BridgeWinners website. There, Kit Woolsey was presenting another of his fascinating "over the shoulder" analyses of a hand he played in the Rosenblum Cup. I have slightly modified the hand presented by Woolsey to make the opening bid of 1NT consistent with the 12-14 range adopted by most of my partnerships, rather than the 10-12 range used by Woolsey and his partner on the hand. If you should use 15-17 as the range for your 1NT opening, feel free to further modify the hand. The actual ranges you use do not matter: if your range for opening 1NT is 3 HCP higher than my range, then your range for responder's cooperative double will be 3 HCP lower than my range. What is important is not the relevant ranges but the distributional inferences that can permit the opening side to compete effectively when their 1NT opening is met with interference.

Before presenting the illustrated hand to describe how the cooperative doubles apply, allow me to first state that a partnership has many choices how to define a double of an overcall of their 1NT opening. Many partnerships use a double as penalty and many other partnerships use a double as takeout. I can't definitively say that their use

of the double is worse than my using the double as cooperative. All I can say is that I prefer the cooperative double use.

The primary purpose of the cooperative double is to penalize the opponents when they have interfered with our 1NT opening and our side has: (1) the balance of power, meaning usually 22-25 HCPs; and (2) sufficient length in the trump suit of the opponents — sort of a Total Tricks concept, but on defense —, meaning six or more combined trumps if the opponents are in a two-level contract or five or more combined trumps if the opponents are in a three-level suit contract. Failing the second of those two conditions, meaning we have the balance of power but insufficient combined length in the trump suit of the opponents, we seek the secondary purpose of the cooperative double, to compete effectively for a partial.

OK. Enough talk; let's show some cards:

Dealer: **North**

**Vul: West**    ♠ AK54  
                  ♥ AT865  
                  ♦ 4  
                  ♣ QJ4

<b>West</b>	<b>East</b>
♠ 98	♠ Q762
♥ Q3	♥ K42
♦ AK73	♦ QT52
♣ KT985	♣ A6

**South**

♠ JT3  
♥ J97  
♦ J986  
♣ 732

*Continued Page 7*

## Cooperative doubles after 1NT openings ala Phillip Martin - by Jeff Lehman

West opens 1NT, showing 12-14. North overcalls 2♣, in the instant case showing the major suits.

East has the prototypical hand for the cooperative double: 10-11 HCP, doubleton in the suit of the overcall, at least three card support for each suit other than the suit of the overcall. One of the interesting aspects of the convention is that the meaning of East's double is not altered by the meaning of North's 2♣ overcall. Whether 2♣ shows the majors (as here), or clubs, or a two-suiter with or without clubs, or a one-suiter not necessarily clubs ... that does not matter. In all of those cases the cooperative double by East shows a doubleton in the suit overcalled. (A few other hand types of East also call for a cooperative double, as discussed in Martin's article, but here I will focus on the prototype shown here and leave the discussion of the other types and the follow ups to those other types to Martin's article.)

What East is hoping will happen is that the strength and distributional information provided by East's cooperative double will enable the partnership to penalize the opponents.

Let's see what might happen next.

Let's first assume that South bids 2♦, asking, per the N-S agreements, for his partner to bid his better major.

West will double 2♦. Knowing — because of East's cooperative double of 2♣ — both that his partnership has the balance of power, and that East has at least three diamonds, West can make a penalty double of 2♦. If, on the other hand, West had only a doubleton diamond (which means that the combined diamond length of EW could be as few as five), he would pass 2♦.

North runs to 2♥. If East had four hearts, East would double 2♥ for penalty. Combined with the minimum of two hearts

expected of West for his 1NT opening bid, East would know that the EW partnership has at least six combined trumps, enough to penalize a 2♥ contract. However, in this case East was dealt only three hearts, the minimum number he promised when he made his cooperative double on the previous round. Hence, East must pass 2♥ and hope that West has at least three hearts and can make a penalty double.

Alas, when 2♥ is passed around to West, West can see that the opponents have found a successful escape. West has only two hearts and his partner has only three hearts; not enough combined heart length to double the opponents. Given that EW still has the balance of power on the hand, however, West can hardly afford to pass out 2♥. Instead he must compete for the partial.

How might West compete for the partial? Well, if West owned four spades, he would bid 2♠. East has promised at least three spades, maybe more, from East's first round cooperative double of 2♣ and so 2♠ should have play. However, in the instant case, West has only two spades and so a 2♠ call is out of the question. What does West know about East's distribution? He knows that East has a doubleton club (from the initial cooperative double of 2♣ made by East). He also knows that East has exactly three hearts (three or more hearts were promised by the cooperative double, and East has denied as many as four hearts by having failed to make a penalty double of 2♥). Hence, West knows that East has eight cards in the pointed suits. These eight pointed suit cards might be divided 4-4 or 5-3 either direction.

If West's distribution were 2=2=5=4, West could safely bid 3♦ here. He would know that East has at least three diamonds and so the fit for a 3♦ contract should be acceptable.

*Continued Page 8*

## Cooperative doubles after 1NT openings ala Phillip Martin - by Jeff Lehman

However, West's actual distribution is not 2=2=5=4 but is 2=2=4=5. Now a 3♦ call risks landing the partnership in a seven card fit at the three level; that would surely not be acceptable. Accordingly, West's actual call in passout seat is 2NT, a scramble call.

To summarize the auction to date:

West	North	East	South
		Dbl	
		(10-11	
		HCP,	
		doubleton 2♦	
1NT	2♣	club, at	(asks
(12-14)	(showing	least	for
	majors)	three	better
		cards in	major)
		each	
		other	
		suit)	
Dbl (3+ diamonds)	2♥ (better major)	(denying 4+ hearts)	P
2NT			
(scramble)			

Now let's move to East's seat and explore the distributional inferences East has available about West's hand. First, East knows that West has at least three diamonds (because West made a penalty double of South's 2♦ call). Second, East knows that West has exactly two hearts (because West failed to make a penalty double of 2♥). Third, East knows that West has fewer than four spades (because West failed to balance with 2♠ call). Fourth, East knows that West has fewer than five diamonds (because West failed to balance with a 3♦ call). The possible distributions for West are 3=2=3=5 or 3=2=4=4 or the actual 2=2=4=5. To avoid the risk of playing 3♦ on the first of the three

possible distributions, where the partnership has only seven combined diamonds, East will pass West's 2NT call.

And, lo and behold, 2NT is probably the best place for EW. Even if, on a different allocation of the high cards, NS could run the first five heart tricks against 2NT, chances are strong that EW can claim the final eight tricks.

Let's go back to an earlier stage in the auction. Let's assume that instead of bidding 2♦ at his first turn to ask for North's better major, South had passed 2♣X. Of course, West would pass 2♣X, too. But North would rescue his partnership by calling 2♥. East would pass 2♥. As before, the parlay of East's first round cooperative double of 2♣ and his second round pass of 2♥ would show exactly three hearts. As in the actual auction, West would balance with 2NT. And again, East has available to him enough distributional inferences about West's hand to pass 2NT.

Cooperative doubles after the opponents have interfered with our opening 1NT are not bullet-proof. The emphasis by the opening side on showing distribution and overall strength overlooks the location of honor cards. When honor cards of the opening side are concentrated in their short suits and not their long suits the offensive potential of the hand will be overstated. Nonetheless, I have found cooperative doubles to be among the more useful conventions I have adopted. I hope this post, combined with a reading of Martin's article, will help demonstrate why cooperative doubles can be so useful. Martin also explains the use of a cooperative double by the opening 1NT bidder. I like that use, too, although it can backfire more frequently than the use of cooperative doubles by responder.