

## SABF Senior and Mixed Trials Bulletin Number 7

The trials for the Seniors have now finished after 2 tiring days of play. There were six segments played and the Grant team got off to a strong start winning all three segments played on Day 1. Although the Kalogeropoulos played better on Day 2 winning two of the three segments, they were always trailing and the Grant team were victorious amassing 290 points for their total score to the Kalogeropoulos team with 158. Congratulations James Grant, Larry Chemaly, Diniar Minwalla, Brian Pincus, Nicky Bateman and Val Bloom.

The Mixed Teams Trials have 3 more days of play left. The Round Robin has now been completed and sadly the Narunsky team narrowly missed qualifying for the Semi Finals. The scores at the end of the Round Robin were interesting with at the top, the Rosslee team with 69.70 were just ahead of the Kaprey team with 67.39. There was then a considerable drop to the Shapiro team in 3rd position with 42.31 and the Van Vught team tucked in just behind in 4th with 40.87. It was so close at the bottom and the Narunsky team ended with 39.73. Disappointing for them - just a touch over 1 point separating the two teams. It will be interesting to watch how the Semi Finals pan out.

Submitted by Deirdre Ingersent

### ♠♥♣♦ SABF Mixed Teams Trials 2025 ♠♥♣♦

#### Round Robin (16 board matches) 16-17 March

Team #:	Name	Total VPs	Pen	Pos.	Match 1				Match 2				Match 3				Match 4				RR2 Match 5				
					vs.	IMPs	IMP diff	VPs	vs.	IMPs	IMP diff	VPs	vs.	IMPs	IMP diff	VPs	vs.	IMPs	IMP diff	VPs	vs.	IMPs	IMP diff	VPs	
3	Rosslee	69.70		1	1	40	<u>25</u>	15.92	4	44	<u>25</u>	15.92	2	24	<u>-10</u>	7.20	5	46	<u>45</u>	18.66					12.00
2	Kaprey	67.39		2	4	46	<u>34</u>	17.31	5	25	<u>6</u>	11.76	3	34	<u>10</u>	12.80				12.00	1	22	<u>13</u>	13.52	
4	Shapiro	42.31		3	3	12	<u>-34</u>	2.69	3	19	<u>-25</u>	4.08				12.00	1	25	<u>-9</u>	7.45	5	51	<u>26</u>	16.09	
5	Van Vught	40.87		4				12.00	2	19	<u>-6</u>	8.24	1	38	<u>22</u>	15.38	3	1	<u>-45</u>	1.34	4	25	<u>-26</u>	3.91	
1	Narunsky	39.73		5	2	15	<u>-25</u>	4.08				12.00	5	16	<u>-22</u>	4.62	4	34	<u>9</u>	12.55	2	9	<u>-13</u>	6.48	

The qualifying round robin in the Mixed Teams trials proved to be very exciting when the teams lying third to fifth were separated by less than 3VP's. Well done to the Rosslee, Kaprey, Shapiro and van Vught teams

who will continue to play a 56-board semifinal on 18 March. The match will be broadcast on BBO VuGraph from 10h00. Rosslee will play Shapiro and have a 12.6 VP carryover from the round robin. Kaprey will play van Vught and have a 3.1 VP carryover.

♠♥♣♦ SABF Senior Teams Trials 2025 ♠♥♣♦										
Final (16 board segments) 16-17 March										
Team #:	Name	Total IMPs	Penalties	Pos.	Seg 1	Seg 2	Seg 3	Seg 4	Seg 5	Seg 6
					IMPs	IMPs	IMPs	IMPs	IMPs	IMPs
1	Grant	290		1	<a href="#">61</a>	<a href="#">42</a>	<a href="#">51</a>	<a href="#">41</a>	<a href="#">62</a>	<a href="#">33</a>
2	Kalogeropoulos	158		2	<a href="#">21</a>	<a href="#">17</a>	<a href="#">11</a>	<a href="#">59</a>	<a href="#">5</a>	<a href="#">45</a>

After 96 boards the Grant team, James Grant, Larry Chemaly, Brian Pincus, Diniar Minwalla, Val Bloom and Nicola Bateman, was victorious by a convincing margin. Well done! Bad luck for the Kalegoropolous team who can take comfort in that they won the 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> segments of the final.

The detailed match results can be accessed on the SABF website, [www.sabf.co.za](http://www.sabf.co.za). Click on the imp differences to see a blow-by-blow account of all the matches.

## Forcing Pass Auctions

<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center; width: 40px; margin: 0 auto;"> <span style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold;">7</span>  <span style="font-size: 0.8em;">D</span> </div>	<b>N</b> larryc777 ♠ 1042 ♥ Q82 ♦ KJ72 ♣ Q63	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #f08080;"> <th style="width: 15%;">W</th> <th style="width: 15%;">N</th> <th style="width: 15%;">E</th> <th style="width: 15%;">S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>P</td> <td>2♥</td> <td>2♠</td> <td>1♥</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3♠</td> <td>4♥</td> <td>4♠</td> <td>3♦</td> </tr> <tr> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> <td></td> <td>P</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				W	N	E	S	P	2♥	2♠	1♥	3♠	4♥	4♠	3♦	P	P		P
	W	N	E	S																	
P	2♥	2♠	1♥																		
3♠	4♥	4♠	3♦																		
P	P		P																		
<b>W</b> Jackay5330 ♠ K85 ♥ J106 ♦ A953 ♣ 754	<b>E</b> andrewsmit ♠ AQJ763 ♥ 97 ♦ 108 ♣ K92	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; border-right: 1px solid black;">4♠ E</td> <td style="width: 50%;">NS: 0 EW: 0</td> </tr> </table>				4♠ E	NS: 0 EW: 0														
4♠ E	NS: 0 EW: 0																				
<b>S</b> goldbar ♠ 9 ♥ AK543 ♦ Q64 ♣ AJ108																					

This was the only table (4 Mixed and 2 senior) where N/S's agreements regarding forcing passes were put to the test. 4♠ goes down 3 but if opponents neglect to double, instead of collecting +800 (a 4-imp gain against +650 for 4♥ making 11 tricks) they will collect only +300 and lose 8imps. Well, is South's pass of 4♠ forcing? Another valid question is does South want his pass to be forcing? From South's point of view, 4♠ could easily be making on distributional hands where the A,K♥ are not taking tricks. From North's point of view, if partner has a 2 suiter (which 3♦ trial bid suggests), again there may be few defensive tricks against 4♠. What is the solution?

I believe that in competitive auctions it is important not to bid suits like ♦ QXX. This is misleading for partner. In general, it is a good idea to play 2NT as a forcing game try with no particularly long side suit. Partner responds to the this try by either signing off with a minimum, bidding game with a maximum or bidding a suit where he has values. This would make it easier for North to double 4♠ when it comes round to him as he knows partner has general values and opponents are unlikely to have a double fit.



<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> <span style="font-size: 24pt; font-weight: bold;">3</span>  <span style="font-size: 10pt;">D</span> </div>	<b>N</b> larryc777 ♠ J876 ♥ 62 ♦ A854 ♣ 543	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">W</th> <th style="width: 15%;">N</th> <th style="width: 15%;">E</th> <th style="width: 15%;">S</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1♠</td> <td>P</td> <td style="background-color: yellow;">3♥</td> <td>P</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6NT</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> </tr> </table>	W	N	E	S	1♠	P	3♥	P	6NT	P	P	P
	W	N	E	S										
	1♠	P	3♥	P										
6NT	P	P	P											
<b>W</b> Jackay5330 ♠ K10542 ♥ Q ♦ KJ3 ♣ AKQ9	<b>E</b> andrewsmit ♠ Q93 ♥ AKJ10873 ♦ 9 ♣ 72													
<b>S</b> goldbar ♠ A ♥ 954 ♦ Q10762 ♣ J1086	6NT W      NS: 0 EW: 0													

This hand was interesting in the Senior's Match. After an uninformative auction to 6NT, Larry Chemaly, North, led the A♦. This lead proved to be fatal when he reasonably, on the bidding, did not find the spade switch for the setting trick. He switched to a heart and on the run of the hearts this interesting position arose.

<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> <span style="font-size: 24pt; font-weight: bold;">3</span>  <span style="font-size: 10pt;">D</span> </div>	<b>N</b> larryc777 ♠ J876 ♥ 62 ♦ A854 ♣ 543	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">W</th> <th style="width: 15%;">N</th> <th style="width: 15%;">E</th> <th style="width: 15%;">S</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1♠</td> <td>P</td> <td style="background-color: yellow;">3♥</td> <td>P</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6NT</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> </tr> </table>	W	N	E	S	1♠	P	3♥	P	6NT	P	P	P
	W	N	E	S										
	1♠	P	3♥	P										
6NT	P	P	P											
<b>W</b> Jackay5330 ♠ K10542 ♥ Q ♦ KJ3 ♣ AKQ9	♥ 7	<b>E</b> andrewsmit ♠ Q93 ♥ AKJ10873 ♦ 9 ♣ 72												
<b>S</b> goldbar ♠ A ♥ 954 ♦ Q10762 ♣ J1086	6NT W      NS: 1 EW: 5													

On the **second last heart** South was squeezed in 3 suits with no escape. Usually squeezes only operate when the last top card is played but this was an exception.

<div style="border: 2px solid red; padding: 5px; display: inline-block; background-color: white;">10</div> <span style="color: red; font-weight: bold; font-size: 1.2em;">D</span>	<b>N</b> lexvan ♠ 965 ♥ KJ94 ♦ KJ ♣ Q1054	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: red; color: white;"> <th>W</th> <th>N</th> <th>E</th> <th>S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1♠</td> <td>P</td> <td>1NT</td> <td>P</td> </tr> <tr> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				W	N	E	S			P	P	1♠	P	1NT	P	P	P		
	W	N	E	S																	
		P	P																		
1♠	P	1NT	P																		
P	P																				
<b>W</b> deebee2 ♠ QJ432 ♥ A8 ♦ AQ1083 ♣ 8	♦A	<b>E</b> Fann4 ♠ 8 ♥ 762 ♦ 976 ♣ AKJ972																			
<b>S</b> peta_b ♠ AK107 ♥ Q1053 ♦ 542 ♣ 63		1NT E      NS: 1 EW: 1																			

I can't imagine why West would pass 1NT but it gave her partner Jeff Sapire a chance to exhibit his excellent card play technique.

South led a heart which Jeff ducked and won the second heart. He now made an excellent play of the A♦. He was rewarded when the Jack dropped and he now saw a route to 7 tricks by continuing the diamonds. That was 4 diamond tricks, 1 heart and 2 clubs. QED.

15 D	N moremo	W	N	E	S
	♠ AK643 ♥ K ♦ 83 ♣ Q10942	3♥ P	3♠ P	P P	1♦ 3NT
W chris1756		E banditos			
♠ 1098 ♥ 10965432 ♦ A ♣ K7	♥8	♠ Q72 ♥ Q ♦ KJ9754 ♣ J63			
	S treetops38				
	♠ J5 ♥ AJ87 ♦ Q1062 ♣ A85	3NT S NS: 4 EW: 1			

What looks like a mis-click on the second last board of the round robin tragically meant that the Narunsky team was knocked out. At the point of declarer playing the 8♥, he had 9 tricks – 4 clubs, 3 hearts and 2 spades. Making 3NT would have drawn the match and Narunsky would have qualified easily. Such are the vicissitudes and idiosyncrasies of life and bridge.

D 16	N lexvan	W	N	E	S
	♠ Q543 ♥ ♦ K852 ♣ J8532	1NT P 2♥ P 3♥ P 4♠ P 5♥ D	P P P P D	2♣ P 2♠ P 4♣ P 5♣ P D	P P P P D
W deebee2		E Fann4			
♠ AK7 ♥ AQ752 ♦ 106 ♣ A97		♠ J862 ♥ KJ104 ♦ AQJ97 ♣			
	S peta_b				
	♠ 109 ♥ 9863 ♦ 43 ♣ KQ1064				
		5♥ W		NS: 0 EW: 0	

The key to bidding close slams, especially opposite balanced hands is to show shortage if you can. I feel East erred when he bid 2♠ as a slam try agreeing hearts. Although West was maximum, she could not be 100% sure there that East had a diamond control and therefore stopped short of slam. I think West was partly to blame as when East cue bids clubs twice and she was looking at the Ace, this can only be a void. In which case, where are East's high card points? He must have a diamond control on that basis.