## World Bridge Productions

# Covendish <br> Invitational 

## Welcome to the $31^{\text {st }}$ Annual Cavendish Invitational

World Bridge Productions welcomes you to the 2005 Cavendish Pairs, John Roberts Teams and World Bridge Productions Pairs. This year Bridge Base will once again provide live Internet Vugraph coverage of the Teams and Pairs (surf to bridgebase.com). The onsite auctions will once again feature the lovely George Jacobs, the soft-spoken Chris Compton, and whoever else we can coerce into making a fool of themselves.

This year's five-session Cavendish Invitational Pairs features a star-studded field forty-four star field (see page 3) while the threesession John Roberts Teams, in its prize-only format, anticipates eighteen entrants (see page 2). The three-session WBP Pairs sports its own field of stars (see
page 3). Page 2 includes a complete schedule for this year's tournament.


As usual international field includes many of the world's top players. It's good to see so many of our friends and familiar faces once again. In the spirit of friendship and good bridge we welcome you to the 2005 Cavendish Invitational. We wish everyone a fun time and a successful experience. We're back at the Rio so enjoy the hotel, the casino, Las Vegas and good bridge to all!

- Robert Blanchard, Bob Hamman, Bill Rosenbaum and Roy Welland


## Gamblers Non-Anonymous

Those players intending to gamble at the Rio during their stay are implored to register at the Total Awards desk, located in the casino area. It will be in your own best interest and that of the WBP if you do so.

## Conditions of Contest: Expansions and Clarifications

In general, it is our intent to allow methods with which other contestants are expected to be familiar. It is also our intent to allow reasonable artificiality in auctions where the bidding side has guaranteed sufficient (high-card) values to invite game. Along with the current "prize-pool only" team format there will be no minimum play requirement for individuals; however, teams should make certain that all team members are listed on the entry before play commences. If you have any questions about your own or your opponents' methods, the person to see is Barry Rigal.

| Schedule |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Day/Date | Time | Activity | Location |
| Wednesday, May 4 | 11:30 AM | Opening Brunch Banquet | Penn-Teller Theater Lobby |
|  | 1:00 PM | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ Session, Teams | Pavilion 1 \& 5 |
|  | 7:30 PM | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Session, Teams | Pavilion 1 \& 5 |
| Thursday, May 5 | 12:00 PM | $3^{\text {rd }}$ (final) Session, Teams | Pavilion 1 \& 5 |
|  | 6:15 PM | Cocktail Party | Pavilion 2 |
|  | 7:00 PM | Pairs Auction | Pavilion 2 \& 4 |
| Friday, May 6 | 12:30 PM | $1^{\text {st }}$ Session, Pairs | Pavilion 1 \& 5 |
|  | 7:30 PM | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Session, Pairs | Pavilion 1 \& 5 |
| Saturday, May 7 | 10:30 AM | WBP Brunch | Penn-Teller Theater Lobby |
|  | 11:00 AM | WBP Auction | Penn-Teller Theater Lobby |
|  | 12:30 PM | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ Session, Pairs | Pavilion 1 \& 5 |
|  | 12:30 PM | $1^{\text {st }}$ Session, WBP Pairs | Pavilion 8 |
|  | 7:30 PM | $4^{\text {th }}$ Session, Pairs | Pavilion 1 \& 5 |
|  | 7:30 PM | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Session, WBP Pairs | Pavilion 8 |
| Sunday, May 8 |  | $5^{\text {th }}$ Session, Pairs | Pavilion 1 \& 5 |
|  | 10:30* PM | $3^{\text {rd }}$ Session, WBP Pairs | Pavilion 8 |
|  | 2:30 PM | Closing Party | Pavilion 3 \& 4 (or outside) |
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## Entrants for the John Roberts Teams 2005

(Unofficial, based on information available at press time. Updates will be published as they become available.)

[^1]
## Entrants for the WBP Pairs 2005

(Unofficial, based on information available at press time. Updates will be published as they become available.)

| Pair \# |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| 1 | Jerry Weinstein - Sue Weinstein |
| 2 | Kerry Sanborn - Steve Sanborn |
| 3 | Marc Jacobus - Lou Ann O'Rourke |
| 4 | Lynn Baker - Kay Schulle |
| 5 | Allan Falk - Peter Friedland |
| 6 | Jim Mahafey - Barnett Shenkin |
| 7 | Barry Schaffer - Colby Vernay |
| 8 | Dan Jacob - Brian Maksemetz |
| 9 | Chris Compton - Gaylor Kassle |
| 10 | Sheila Ekeblad - Michael Seamon |
| 11 | Kent Mignocchi - Beverly Perry |
| 12 | Espen Erichsen - David Stern |
| 13 | Bob Morris - Eddie Wold |
| 14 | Leanord Ernst - Mike Shuman |

Pair \#
1 Jerry Weinstein - Sue Weinstein
2 Kerry Sanborn - Steve Sanborn
Marc Jacobus - Lou Ann O'Rourke

5 Allan Falk - Peter Friedland
6 Jim Mahafey - Barnett Shenkin
7 Barry Schaffer - Colby Vernay
8 Dan Jacob - Brian Maksemetz
9 Chris Compton - Gaylor Kassle
11 Kent Mignocchi - Beverly Perry
12 Espen Erichsen - David Stern
13 Bob Morris - Eddie Wold
14 Leanord Ernst - Mike Shuman

15 David Birman - Danielle Birman
16 Mike Cappelletti, Jr. - Doug Levene
17 Jim Murphy -
20 Wafik Abdou - Connie Goldberg
21 Fared Assemi - Ed Wojewoda
22 Haig Tchamitch -
23 Mark Bartusek - Marshall Miles
24 Roger Lord - Jacqueline Sincoff
25 Simon Kanter - Murry Melton
26 Bill Doroshow - Nate Ward
27 Hemant Lall - Justin Lall
28 Leo Bell - John Jones
29 Rob Crawford - Joe Kivel
30 Marinesa Letezia - Carlyn Steiner

## Entrants for the Cavendish Pairs 2005

(Unofficial, based on information available at press time. Updates will be published as they become available.)

## Pair \#

Eric Greco - Geoff Hampson
Fulvio Fantoni - Claudio Nunes
Bart Bramley - Sidney Lazard
Walid El Ahmady - Tarek Sadek
Fred Gitleman - Brad Moss
6 Norberto Bocchi - Giogerio Duboin
7 Bjorn Fallenius - Roy Welland
8 *
9 Gene Freed - Chris Larsen
10 Ross Grabel - Jon Wittes
11 *
12 Drew Casen - Jim Krekorian
13 Piotr Bizon - Michael Kwiecien
14 Linda Lewis - Paul Lewis
15 Bob Hamman - Zia Mahmood
16 Czary Balicki - Adam Zmudzinski
17 David Berkowitz - Billy Pollack
18 Krystoff Lasocki - Eric Wieleman
19 Steve Garner - Howard Weinstein
20 Alex Dubinin - Andrei Gromov
21 Neil Chambers - John Schermer
22 Alejandro Bianchedi - Hector Camberos
23 George Jacobs - Ralph Katz
24 *

Pair \#
25 Bobby Levin - Steve Weinstein
26 Andrea Buratti - Massimo Lanzarotti
27 Gary Cohler - Chris Willenken
28 Michael Cornell - Michael Rosenberg
29 Perry Johnson - Jeff Meckstroth
30 Franck Moulton - J C Quantin
31 Curtis Cheek - Joe Grue
32 Gunnar Hallberg - Charles Wigoder
33 Fred Stewart - Kit Woolsey
34 Billy Cohen - Ron Smith
35 Russ Ekeblad - Ron Rubin
36 Pablo Lambardi - Juan Ventin
37 Barry Goren - Gavin Wolpert
38 Seymon Deutsch - Paul Soloway
39 Christal Henner-Welland - Mike Kamil
40 Pierre Saporta - Pierre Zimmermann
41 *
42 Dennis Dawson - Eric Rodwell
43 Gilad Altschuler - David Birman
44 Amos Kaminski - Shaya Levit
45 Michael Moss - Antonio Sementa
46 Garey Hayden - Mark Lair
47 Peter Fredin - Magnus Lindkvist
48 Sam Lev - Jacek Pszczola
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# Last Year's Cavendish 

(Adapted from articles by Barry Rigal)

The Teams:

| Bd: 3 | ¢ AK8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: South | $\bigcirc$ J92 |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\diamond$ K8743 |  |
|  | \& A3 |  |
| ¢ 96 |  | ¢ QJ10742 |
| $\bigcirc$ AQ10 |  | - K863 |
| $\diamond$ AQ |  | $\diamond 65$ |
| Q Q87642 |  | K |
|  | ¢ 53 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 754$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J1092 |  |
|  | ¢ J1095 |  |

This deal caused a lot of problems around the room, but in at least one match there were no problems whatsoever. 44 is a reasonable spot, but only if West gets to be declarer. In the match we were watching, Brachman-Passell stopped in 24 making +140 and gaining 8 IMPs when their teammates defended 3NT down two.

But Balicki and Cornell, as the two Wests in the first meeting between Deutsch and Wigoder, showed how to do it. Both of them evaluated their 14 counts as strong notrumps (adding on points for the ruffing values no doubt) and not only did they reach 4s, but they got there the right way up. Now even on a non-diamond lead they could dispose of their diamond on the club winner, and come to ten tricks in comfort for a flat board at +620 .

What is the smallest ever chance you've seen for a contract? We'd say that if you need your LHO to hold six specific cards to set up a pseudo-squeeze you are in a truly uncomfortable spot.

| Bd: 25 | - 64 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | $\bigcirc$ KJ873 |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\diamond$ Q10754 |  |
|  | \& A |  |
| $\xrightarrow{4} 9$ |  | ¢ 107 |
| $\bigcirc$ AQ1054 |  | $\bigcirc 62$ |
| $\diamond$ K6 |  | $\diamond$ J9832 |
| * KJ106 |  | \% 8754 |
|  | ¢ AKQJ853 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 9$ |  |
|  | $\diamond A$ |  |
|  | 2 Q932 |  |

Two declarers we know of (Seymon Deutsch and Claudio Nunes)-there may have been more, but for some reason none of them came forward to tell us of their impeccable bidding sequences, and none of the defenders stepped out
to recapitulate their inspired defense-came home in 6s. On a trump lead you try a heart up, but LHO wins the ace and plays another trump. Now you peel off the trumps to reach the following position:

|  | ¢ --- |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ KJ8 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q10 |  |
|  | * A |  |
| ¢ --- |  | ¢ --- |
| $\bigcirc$ Q10 |  | $\bigcirc 6$ |
| $\diamond$ K6 |  | $\diamond$ J9 |
| \& KJ |  | * 875 |
|  | ¢ 3 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A |  |
|  | * Q932 |  |

On the last trump West has to give up one trick and must avoid conceding two. He cannot release a heart nor can he let go of a club-that sneaky $\$ 9$ comes into its own-but a diamond gives up only one trick. Declarer can take the $\diamond A$ and go to the $\& A$ to cash the $\diamond Q$ but loses trick thirteen to the VQ . As it turned out, both defenders let go of clubs prematurely and the declarers brought in the club suit for no losers.

| Bd: 27 | ¢ AKJ8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: South | $\bigcirc 86$ |  |
| Vul: None | $\diamond$ AQ107 |  |
|  | * A109 |  |
| ¢ 972 |  | ¢ Q106 |
| Q QJ5 |  | $\bigcirc 7432$ |
| $\diamond 983$ |  | $\diamond 54$ |
| -8763 |  | * QJ42 |
|  | $\pm 543$ |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AK109 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ KJ62 |  |
|  | * K5 |  |

After the excesses of Board 25, one of the same Wests from our previous exhibit found himself in the hot seat defending $7 \diamond$. With twelve tricks easy, but the spade finesse losing, it is not so easy to see how to bring home a thirteenth trick. Paul Soloway, North, declared $7 \diamond$ on a heart lead. He rose with the ace, ruffed out the hearts, then drew three rounds of trumps to lead the $\vee 10$ in the following ending:

|  | ¢ AKJ8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$--- |  |
|  | + A109 |  |
| - 972 |  | ¢ Q106 |
| $\bigcirc$--- |  | - --- |
| $\diamond$--- |  | $\diamond$--- |
| - 8763 |  | 2. QJ42 |
|  | - 543 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 10$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K |  |
|  | - K5 |  |

On the 810 West discarded a spade, trying to look like a man with a club guard. Soloway, who has not accumulated the most masterpoints in ACBL history by misreading these positions, pitched a spade from hand, cashed the AK and went to the K to take the last trump, discarding his J and giving East a Hobson's choice: lose the $₫ \mathrm{Q}$ or his club guard.

| Bd: 7 | A K10976 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: South | $\bigcirc$ AJ54 |  |
| Vul: Both | $\diamond$ A87 |  |
|  | +3 |  |
| - 8 |  | - J543 |
| $\bigcirc$ K972 |  | $\bigcirc 863$ |
| $\diamond$ KQ4 |  | $\diamond$ J32 |
| \& AQ965 |  | - J107 |
|  | - AQ2 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q10 |  |
|  | $\diamond 10965$ |  |
|  | - K842 |  |

On our next deal Hallberg, South, declared 3NT after West opened 2enatural and limited, promising six or a five-card suit with a four-card major. Wigoder overcalled $2 \boldsymbol{a}$ and Hallberg tried a delicate 3NT. West, Adam Zmudzinski, led the $\diamond Q$, ducked all around as East encouraged, then shifted to a low club to Cezary Balicki's ten and Hallberg's king. Now Hallberg led the $\triangle Q$, covered by the king and ace, and paused for reflection when East played the $\vee 6$, suggesting an odd number. The spot-cards suggested that West had only five clubs-thus a four-card major, and the diamond lead suggested he had some length there-hence he was a heavy favorite to have only a singleton spade. So Hallberg passed the $\$ 10$ from dummy, and when it held he unblocked the majors and crossed to the $\diamond A$ to take ten tricks.


| Bd: 11 | ¢ 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: South | $\bigcirc$ A987 |  |
| Vul: None | $\diamond$ J1042 |  |
|  | * Q1052 |  |
| - AQ8763 |  | KJ104 |
| $\bigcirc 6$ |  | $\bigcirc 4$ |
| $\diamond$ AK873 |  | $\diamond 965$ |
| - 8 |  | * KJ973 |
|  | - 95 |  |
|  | ® KQJ10532 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q |  |
|  | + A64 |  |

Board 11 was an exercise in the art of the possible for declarer. At most tables the contract was 5 by West after $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$ bid on to 5 O . Let's look at some of the unsuccessful declarers. First, Hamman had heard his RHO open $4 \checkmark$ so after the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ lead followed by a diamond shift the percentage line looked to be to lead a club to the king; one down.

When Gromov and Petrunin were defending against Howard Weinstein, the PA fetched a suit-preference deuce from partner, so a club to the ace followed by a diamond shift left declarer with no chance to make.

At quite a few tables (including the one we watched) the defense shifted to a diamond at trick two. Now declarer had a chance to make, but passed up his opportunity by misguessing the clubs.

Cezary Balicki reached 5 from the East hand on the
 lead and the $\diamond Q$ shift, so he won in dummy, drew trumps, and passed the to South. In with the South had the unenviable choice of giving declarer a ruff and a discard or of leading a club into declarer's tenace, allowing him to establish three club discards for dummy's diamond losers.

Our next exhibit might well be titled "The Lady Vanishes." The point of the defense was for the defenders not to allow any of their queens to put in a premature appearance.

| Bd: 13 | \& J |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | $\bigcirc$ KQ73 |  |
| Vul: Both | $\diamond$ KQ8743 |  |
|  | + 97 |  |
| - Q107632 |  | ¢ AK854 |
| $\bigcirc$ J6 |  | $\bigcirc$ A1054 |
| $\diamond$ AJ |  | $\diamond$--- |
| * 363 |  | * AK52 |
|  | ¢ 9 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 982$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 109652$ |  |
|  | - Q1084 |  |

Gene Freed, West, against the eventual winners, declared
 psych by Jedrychowski did not materially affect the auction; in fact, it might even have helped the opponents.) On the Rusinow $\diamond Q$ lead a reasonable line might be to ruff, draw trumps ending in hand, cash the $\diamond$ A pitching a heart and then lead the $\odot J$, intending to lead hearts toward dummy again if necessary-and if that doesn't work, fall back on the clubs or a squeeze. Freed preferred to play ace, king and another club reasonably enough, but when that suit did not split he had to lose a heart at the end for down one. At the other table Wigoder was not tested in slam by the ©K lead.

In fact the OK was led at most tables, but where a diamond was led the play was fascinating. Hamman stripped off diamonds and drew trumps, then led a heart to the ten playing for a squeeze if necessary, since if South produced a heart honor he expected North to have both the PK and the $Q$. That line brought home twelve tricks easily enough.

When Smith and Cohen defended 64 declarer ruffed the diamond lead and crossed to hand in trumps to lead the $\vee \mathrm{J}$, covered with the king and ace. Next he came back to hand with a spade and led a heart up. Smith ducked smoothly, so declarer decided to play his RHO for $\begin{array}{r}\text { Qxx; down one! }\end{array}$

Peter Fredin played the slam on a top diamond lead and went after clubs. His line of play was to ruff the diamond lead, draw trumps, and lead a low club from dummy. When South contributed the queen, the deal was over. But if South had ducked smoothly Fredin was planning to duck as well, playing North for the doubleton or a three-three break.

| Bd: 21 | - AJ96 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | $\bigcirc$ Q5 |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\diamond$ J875 |  |
|  | +982 |  |
| A KQ10752 |  | - 4 |
| ¢ --- |  | $\bigcirc$ AK10642 |
| $\diamond$ Q1064 |  | $\diamond$ K3 |
| - AK10 |  | * Q753 |
|  | - 83 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J9873 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A92 |  |
|  | + J64 |  |

Most of the field played 3NT from the West seat on a low diamond lead to the nine and ten. Declarer generally played the K to North's ace. If the defense now shifted to a club declarer got to test both spades and clubs, but even on a diamond continuation declarer could take the third diamond and duck a spade, allowing him to test each of the black suits, and when clubs behaved he had nine tricks.

Against Ron Smith and Billy Cohen the defense went differently. On the $\boldsymbol{4} \mathrm{K}$ play at trick two Smith ducked as Cohen contributed the eight. Declarer now played the $₫ \mathrm{Q}$ to try to pin the nine or the jack in South, and North won the
ace and returned a diamond to let Cohen take his ace and play a third diamond. Now the tempo in the spade suit was different: declarer had to commit himself either to spades or to clubs, and he guessed wrong by playing a third spade (the right play in abstract since the hand with the long spades might not have had the diamond to cash). That led to a swift down one when Smith cashed two spades and a diamond; 10 imps to Deutsch, who needed just a bit more from their final match to take first place. However, had the following deal worked out differently, they would have retained the lead they held as the last round started.

| Bd: 22 | - K8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | $\bigcirc 98$ |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\diamond 1032$ |  |
|  | \& KJ9753 |  |
| - AJ |  | - Q642 |
| $\bigcirc 10654$ |  | $\bigcirc$ KQ3 |
| $\diamond$ AKQ75 |  | $\diamond 9$ |
| - 104 |  | - AQ862 |
|  | - 109753 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AJ72 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J864 |  |
|  | *--- |  |

Charles Wigoder as East did very well to make 3NT here. On a spade lead from Alain Levy to the jack and king and a spade back to the ace he advanced the 10 , covered with the jack and king. South pitched the $\vee 7$ so Wigoder led the $\nabla K$, ducked, and the $\vee Q$, won by South to shift to the $\diamond J$ to cut declarer's communications. Wigoder cashed the $\diamond$ AKQ (pitching his low spade and heart), then led the 4 from dummy and ducked North's nine. North, Herve Mouiel, had only clubs left and had to lead into the ace-eight for declarer's ninth trick.

Gene Freed, South, also defended 3NT by leading a spade. Declarer, Bob Hamman, won the spade continuation and led a heart to the king and ace. Freed shifted to a diamond so declarer cashed his three top diamonds, pitching a spade and a heart. Now he led a club to the queen, cashed the $\triangle Q$ and $\stackrel{\leftrightarrow Q}{ }$ and exited with a low club in this ending:

|  | 4 --- |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$--- |  |
|  | $\diamond$--- |  |
|  | \& KJ97 |  |
| A --- |  | ¢ --- |
| $\bigcirc 106$ |  | $\bigcirc$--- |
| $\diamond 7$ |  | $\diamond$--- |
| - 10 |  | - A862 |
|  | - 109 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J |  |
|  | \& --- |  |

If Larsen, North, takes the trick he has to play a top club back. Hamman can duck this trick and now the defense must concede the ninth trick. But Larsen ducked the $\$ 10$ and
dummy had to give Freed the last three tricks.
$1^{\text {st }}$ Charles Wigoder, Gunnar Hallberg, Michael Cornell, Richard Jedrychowski (UK and New Zealand)
$2^{\text {nd }}$ Seymon Deutsch, Paul Soloway, Billy Cohen, Ron Smith, Adam Zmudzinski, Cezary Balicki (US/Poland)
186 (\$50.5K)
180 (\$37.8K)
$3^{\text {rd }}$ Hansa Narasimhan, Billy Miller, Roger Bates, Fredrik Nystrom, Peter Bertheau (US/Sweden)
156 (\$25.2K)
$4^{\text {th }}$ Pierre Zimmermann, Pierre Saporta, Alain Levy, Herve Mouiel, Frank Multon, Jean-Christophe Quantin (France)


Winners, 2004 John Roberts Teams: Gunnar Hallberg, Michael Cornell, Charles Wigoder and Richard Jedrychoski

## The Pairs:

On our first deal from the first session 4 4 looks completely safe. Not so against the devious Mike Passell, who found the defense to hold declarer to nine tricks...

| Bd: 2 | ¢ J53 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | จ A1096 |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\diamond$ K109 |  |
|  | * Q52 |  |
| - 76 |  | ¢ KQ10 |
| $\bigcirc$ QJ7 |  | $\bigcirc 832$ |
| $\diamond$ AJ865 |  | $\diamond$ Q732 |
| \& 974 |  | \& J106 |
|  | - 49842 |  |
|  | - K54 |  |
|  | $\diamond 4$ |  |
|  | * AK83 |  |

Passell's opening lead was the $\odot J$, playing standard leads. Not surprisingly declarer put up the $\vee A$ and led a low trump from dummy. Returning the deceptive favor Garey Hayden inserted the $\lfloor\mathbf{Q}$. Alas, unconscious of his impending doom declarer won and played a second trump. Hayden won cheaply and switched back to hearts, establishing the defense's fourth winner.

| Bd: 7 | ¢ AQ4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: South | $\bigcirc 4$ |  |
| Vul: Both | $\diamond$ KJ752 |  |
|  | \& QJ86 |  |
| 4 J 87532 |  | ¢ 6 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q10 |  | $\bigcirc$ KJ76532 |
| $\diamond$ A9 |  | $\diamond 63$ |
| - 532 |  | * A109 |
|  | ¢ K109 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A98 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q1084 |  |
|  | \& K74 |  |

At the table we were watching, Bobby Levin, North, raised his partner Steve Weinstein's $1 \diamond$ opening to $2 \diamond$, inverted. Peter Fredin came in with $3 \checkmark$, passed back to Levin who bid $3 \boldsymbol{L}$ (a double would have asked for a stopper). When Weinstein bid 3NT (perhaps rather optimistically hoping Fredin had no side entry?) Levin hoped to buy a double heart stopper opposite and passed. Down 400 on the VQ lead.

Against Birman-Altschuler, Buratti-Lanzarotti bid 1NT-(P)-38 [both minors, short hearts]-(Dbl); 5»-AP. This was a huge pick-up for them. At almost every other table N/S opened $1 \diamond$ but could not get to $5 \diamond$. Back to the drawing board, everyone.

On our next deal Peter Fredin was able to take advantage of the fact that one of his opponents was not fully awake.

| Bd: 9 | 4 J7532 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | $\bigcirc 943$ |  |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\diamond 4$ |  |  |
|  | K KJ52 |  |  |
| Q Q96 | ¢ --- |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ AQJ107 | $\bigcirc$ K85 |  |  |
| $\diamond$ A65 | $\diamond$ KJ9832 |  |  |
| - 87 | \& A1043 |  |  |
|  | $\triangle$ AK1084 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 62$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q107 |  |  |
|  | \& Q96 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lindqvist |  | Fredin |  |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | 14 |
| $2 \diamond(\nabla)$ | 4\% | 48 | 49 |
| $5 \diamond$ | Pass | $6 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 60 | All Pass |  |  |

The jump to $4 \%$ showed clubs and a fit for spades, and a club lead sets the slam out of hand. But one can hardly blame South too much for leading what was in front of his face. Fredin, playing the slam from the short-trumps side, ruffed the $\Delta K$ lead and advanced the $\diamond 8$, running it when South 'neglected' to cover. That was an easy route to thirteen tricks. Of course if South covers the $\diamond 8$ with the $\diamond 10$ declarer wins the $\diamond A$ to play another diamond. North must not ruff in prematurely, and then, when the defense wins the third diamond and shifts to a club, declarer no longer has any entry to his hand after drawing trumps. Note that if the $\diamond 7$ and $\diamond 4$ were switched declarer might succeed by leading the $\diamond 2$ from hand and running it. (South would have to play the $\diamond 10$ from $\diamond$ Q104 to beat the hand-far from obvious.) Making slam here was worth 337 IMPs to Fredin; had he gone down his opponents would have gained 218 IMPs. If that was grand larceny, the next deal was a more subtle variation on the same theme.

This next board represented a double game swing around the room.


| Bd: 12 | ¢ --- |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: West | $\bigcirc$ KQJ9873 |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\diamond$ Q |  |
|  | \& J 9765 |  |
| - A1084 |  | ¢ 976532 |
| $\bigcirc 104$ |  | $\bigcirc$ A65 |
| $\diamond$ AKJ107 |  | $\diamond 932$ |
| \% KQ |  | +4 |
|  | ¢ KQJ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 2$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 8654$ |  |
|  | \% A10832 |  |

Where Lev as West opened 1NT Buratti bid 30 and Lanzarotti trustingly raised to game. Pszczola doubled but there was no defense to escape: -790 .

By contrast, after a $1 \diamond$ opening and $3 \diamond$ overcall there was less temptation to bid $4 \checkmark$, and $E / W$ could get together in $4 \Phi$. This was generally doubled and it appears that the defense needs to cash the \& to save the overtrick. Not so. On a heart lead would you not sympathize with a declarer who took an immediate diamond finesse? Well, maybe their partners would only offer a limited amount of sympathy that East had turned +690 into -300.

| Bd: 15 | Q Q74 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: South | $\bigcirc 72$ |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\diamond$ KQ9 |  |
|  | * AKQ75 |  |
| 4 J 82 |  | ¢ 63 |
| $\checkmark$ A3 |  | $\bigcirc$ QJ4 |
| $\diamond 10854$ |  | $\diamond$ AJ32 |
| ¢ 9832 |  | \% J1064 |
|  | ¢ AK1095 |  |
|  | - K109865 |  |
|  | $\diamond 76$ |  |
|  | 9 --- |  |

Miller and Wold defended 4s accurately here to give declarer a losing option. After a diamond lead to the king and ace, Miller shifted to the $\nabla Q$. The defense cashed two hearts and then led a third heart, ruffed with the $\Phi 8$ and overruffed with the queen. Now declarer needed to find the jack of trumps to make his game; perhaps he might have played four rounds of clubs to try to get a count there, but maybe this runs the risk of that suit splitting horribly. Anyway, declarer settled for simplicity by leading to the $\Delta \mathrm{K}$, then crossing back to the $\diamond Q$ to finesse in spades, perhaps motivated by the idea that the line of defense chosen had suggested that East was looking for a trump promotion. Of course the fact that East is longer in hearts than West does make that the fractionally anti-percentage play, but the odds are only altered very slightly by this. Making game would have been worth 85 IMPs, going down meant the defense
picked up 216 IMPs.

| Bd: 16 | ¢ KQ872 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: West | $\bigcirc 986$ |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\diamond 104$ |  |
|  | - 532 |  |
| - 963 |  | ¢ 105 |
| $\bigcirc$ AQ107532 |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{KJ}$ |
| $\diamond 5$ |  | $\diamond$ AKQ73 |
| - 97 |  | * K1086 |
|  | ¢ AJ4 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 4$ |  |
|  | $\diamond J 9862$ |  |
|  | \% AQJ4 |  |

At many tables E/W bought the hand in $4 \nabla$ on the auction $2 \checkmark-4 \checkmark$ (or $3 \checkmark-4 \odot$ ), down a trick. But at many other tables South boldly doubled $4 \bigcirc$, and now E/W had to take their chances to beat 4s doubled. A popular defense was to lead a top diamond and shift to a trump. At quite a few tables declarer won in dummy and led a diamond, and West ruffed in to play a trump. Alas for him, this defense resulted in declarer scoring five spade tricks, a heart ruff, three club tricks and having a minor-suit squeeze against East for a tenth trick. If West simply discards on the second diamond East wins to play a second trump, and West can win the first heart to play a third trump. Now declarer will probably struggle to escape for down one.

Brian Glubok and Jim Robison reached a delicate contract here, and Brian threaded his way home against a defense that had gone right till the very end.

| Bd: 17 | ¢ A832 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | $\bigcirc$ A53 |  |  |
| Vul: None | $\diamond 965$ |  |  |
|  | - A92 |  |  |
| ¢ --- | ¢ QJ97 |  |  |
| ® QJ10982 | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 4$ |  |  |
| $\diamond 108$ | $\diamond$ AJ7432 |  |  |
| \& QJ876 |  |  | * K |
|  | ¢ K10654 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 76$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ KQ |  |  |
|  | \& 10543 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Glubok |  | Robison |  |
|  | 1NT(1) | $2 \diamond(2)$ | Pass |
| 28 | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | 40 | Dbl |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| (1) 12-14 HCP |  |  |  |
| (2) ASPRO: spades and a minor |  |  |  |

North led a trump and Glubok won in hand to lead a low club up. North cashed his $A$ and $\nabla A$, then shifted to a diamond. South deceptively won his king and played the $\Phi \mathrm{K}$, but Glubok ruffed, drew the last trump, and was at the crossroads. North needed the three aces for his opening bid. That meant that the location of the $\diamond Q$ was unclear; would South have doubled $4 \triangle$ without it? Glubok decided not. He played a diamond to the ace and claimed his +590 . Note that South had the opportunity to be a hero by returning his $\diamond Q$ intro dummy's tenace, killing the discards since North still had a trump left. This produced a gain of 214 IMPs for Glubok instead of a loss of 135 IMPs.

On our next deal Alexander Petrunin of Russia reached a touch-and-go slam, and managed to find his way to twelve tricks by a very thoughtful line.

| Bd: 18 | A K4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | $\bigcirc$ AQ10632 |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\diamond 5$ |  |
|  | * Q874 |  |
| - A109 |  | ^ Q8652 |
| - K9875 |  | ¢ --- |
| $\diamond$ A8 |  | $\diamond$ KQJ32 |
| A63 |  | \& KJ9 |
|  | A J73 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J4 |  |
|  | $\diamond 109764$ |  |
|  | +1052 |  |

Petrunin as East reached 6aster North intervened in his opponents' game-forcing auction to show hearts. Petrunin ruffed the $\vee \mathrm{J}$ lead and played a spade to the nine and king. Back came a spade to the ten. Petrunin ruffed a heart, crossed to the $\diamond A$, and ruffed a heart with the $\Delta Q$ (South should have underruffed, though it does not matter on the actual layout). Now declarer had generated an extra trump trick by his dummy reversal and appeared to have twelve top tricks. Never one to take things at face value, Petrunin tested the diamonds (prepared to cross to the \&A and draw trumps if they had split) and found that the five-one split had reduced twelve tricks to eleven. Undaunted, he cashed the $\diamond K Q J$, crossed to the \&A, drew the last trump pitching his diamond from hand, and had an automatic double squeeze. In the two-card ending his LHO was known to have a diamond left and his RHO had the VA, so the $\%$ was sure to drop the queen, whoever held that card. Making slam here was worth 266 IMPs, while going down would have cost 241 IMPs.


| Bd: 23 | ¢ QJ8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: South | $\bigcirc 965$ |  |
| Vul: Both | $\diamond$ Q2 |  |
|  | * QJ1052 |  |
| - 1093 |  | - 7 |
| $\bigcirc$ A1032 |  | ¢ KQ7 |
| $\checkmark 654$ |  | $\diamond$ J10983 |
| - 743 |  | \& AK96 |
|  | - AK6542 |  |
|  | - J84 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AK7 |  |
|  | - 8 |  |

Some major-suit games with four top losers seem destined to succeed. For example, where Gromov-Petrunin were E/W they bid 1-(P)-2a-(Dbl); 4@. What would you lead as West? One could make a reasonable case for just about anything; certainly the low trump lead had plenty of logic. But declarer won the $\$ 8$ and could now pitch a heart loser on the top diamonds, then arrange a ruffing finesse in clubs if needed, with the additional possibility of ruffing his heart loser in dummy. At this table the defenders cashed two heart tricks and gave up.

However, at this point in the deal other defenders were not yet out of the game entirely. For example, Steve Garner as East in this position won the first club with a deceptive A and imaginatively returned a low club. Declarer ruffed in hand and ducked a heart. Howard Weinstein won his V 10 and played a second spade, and now when trumps did not split declarer had to decide whether to ruff out West's now bare K or take the ruffing finesse. He got it wrong.

At least two declarers we know of spurned the gift they had been afforded on a trump lead, but in a completely different way. They won the trump lead in dummy and cashed the diamonds to pitch a heart, then led a heart from hand. West took this with the $\vee 10$ to lead a second trump, then won the QA to play a third trump-curtains for declarer.

Claudio Nunes and Fulvio Fantoni were able to survive West's initial diamond lead in a different way. Their declarer won the $\diamond Q$ and cashed two more rounds of the suit to pitch a heart, then led a heart up. Claudio won the $\vee 10$ and led a low trump, giving declarer a guess as to which trump to play from dummy. He elected to play the jack, and could not recover. When declarer led dummy's last heart Nunes overtook his partner's queen and led a second spade. Declarer won in hand, ruffed his heart in dummy, and led the Q. Fantoni won and played a fourth diamond, promoting Nunes' 10 into the setting trick. Nicely done. Making game would have picked up 191 IMPs; going down would have cost 134 IMPs.

At the end of the first session Buratti-Lanzarotti of Italy had the lead over Gromov-Petrunin of Russia.

| Bd: 5 | ¢ AQ8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: North | $\bigcirc$ AK96 |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\diamond$ AQJ43 |  |
|  | * 3 |  |
| - 10532 |  | - J9 |
| $\bigcirc 52$ |  | $\bigcirc$ J1083 |
| $\checkmark$ K65 |  | $\diamond 108$ |
| - 10542 |  | - AKQ76 |
|  | - K764 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q74 |  |
|  | $\diamond 972$ |  |
|  | - 198 |  |

4a in the four-three fit on a club lead is rather more challenging than $5 \diamond$, which is very nearly laydown. Let's see two different approaches to the major-suit game on two rounds of clubs. Paul Chemla ruffed the second club, unblocked the $₫ A Q$, crossed to the $\triangle Q$, cashed the $\$ K$, took the diamond finesse, and played off the two winning hearts. If his LHO had ruffed in, all the defense would have been able to take was one more club trick. When West instead threw a club, Chemla led the fourth heart and pitched his last club as did West. East won his 810 and led a club, ruffed and overruffed, but West had to concede the last two tricks to dummy. George Jacobs duplicated this line, card for card. Jacek Pszczola also played 4s on a club lead and continuation. He ruffed, cashed the A , led a heart to the queen, finessed in diamonds, and then led the $\Delta Q$, overtaking when the jack appeared. Backing his judgment that spades were four-two he repeated the diamond finesse, then cashed out the diamonds discarding his club, and lost only to the two trump winners. Making game was worth 173 IMPs, while going down would have lost 174 IMPs.

| Bd: 7 <br> Dlr: South <br> Vul: Both | - K1098 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K72 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A10854 |  |
|  | * 6 |  |
| - A765 |  | - Q4 |
| © AQ6543 |  | $\bigcirc 8$ |
| $\diamond$ Q |  | $\diamond$ J62 |
| - 83 |  | * AKQ10975 |
|  | \& J32 |  |
|  | © J109 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K973 |  |
|  | + J 42 |  |

Paul and Linda Lewis bid: 1ऽ-24; 2ワ-3e; 34-4ワ. Somehow it feels wrong to put down a seven-card suit to a hundred honors in dummy. North led his singleton club, and Paul won to take the heart finesse. Now the key to the defense is for North to underlead the $\diamond A$-and for South to put up the king. It was not so easy for North to see this; when he played ace and another diamond Lewis could ruff and play ace and another heart, claiming when the suit split.

A remarkable number of pairs played 3NT from the jack-third of diamonds side on the auction: 10-2s; 2ワ-2NT; 3s3NT. On a low diamond lead to the queen and ace and the $\diamond 5$ return a depressingly large number of Souths ducked the $\diamond J$ or took the jack with the king and switched, playing their partner for the $\diamond$ A54. However misguided that might have been, North takes some of the blame for not spotting the "overkill" potential in diamonds and returning the $\diamond 4$ to simulate a four-card suit, to ensure that partner continues diamonds.

What would we do without Deep Finesse? We looked at 3NT by E/W and how the defense can unscramble the overkill in diamonds. Now try 5y East on the spade lead found at the table against Adam Wildavsky. North wins the K at trick one and shifts to a trump. Declarer wins and leads a diamond up, forcing South to win and lead a second trump. Declarer, with six of the last seven tricks but needing them all, wins and runs trumps, reaching the following position:

|  | - 1098 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K72 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A |  |
|  | *--- |  |
| A A76 |  | \& Q |
| $\bigcirc$ AQ65 |  | $\bigcirc 8$ |
| $\diamond$--- |  | $\diamond$ J6 |
| *--- |  | * 975 |
|  | - J3 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J109 |  |
|  | $\diamond 97$ |  |
|  | \& --- |  |

South leads the 9 pitching a heart from dummy, and North begins to feel the pressure. A diamond or a spade gives up a trick immediately, so North must throw a heart. Now East plays another trump throwing another heart from dummy, and any pitch North makes is fatal.

| Bd: 10 | ه K75 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: East | $\bigcirc$ A1085 |  |
| Vul: Both | $\diamond$ QJ10 |  |
|  | * Q62 |  |
| - 962 |  | - A108 |
| © KJ32 |  | $\bigcirc 7$ |
| $\diamond$ K7 |  | $\diamond$ A8642 |
| - 3975 |  | + A1084 |
|  | Q QJ43 |  |
|  | - Q964 |  |
|  | $\diamond 953$ |  |
|  | + K3 |  |

Alain Levy and Herve Mouiel cooperated for one of the most elegant defenses of the event. Against 3* played by East ( $1 \diamond-1 \diamond ; 2 \boldsymbol{*}-3$ ) Alain as South led the 4 (third and fifth) to
the king and ace. Declarer crossed to the $\diamond$ K to pass the $\mathbf{7}$ to Alain's king. Back came a low spade and Herve won his king, then very carefully cashed the $\odot A$ and led a spade to Alain's jack. When Levy led the fourth spade for a ruff-sluff Mouiel could discard a diamond; now it did not matter which hand declarer took his ruff in. He could not draw trumps without losing a diamond trick, and if he tried to ruff a diamond in dummy Mouiel would score the $\&$ via an overruff. This was worth 93 IMPs to the defenders; letting 3* make would have cost 41 IMPs.

| Bd: 11 | - J932 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: South | - Q75 |  |  |
| Vul: None | $\diamond 3$ |  |  |
|  | \& AKJ107 |  |  |
| - Q1087 |  |  |  |
| © KJ64 |  |  | 103 |
| $\diamond$ AK754 |  |  | 086 |
| - --- |  |  | Q9643 |
|  | - A |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 9$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q |  |  |
|  | +8 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Woolsey |  | Stewart |  |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | 24. | Pass | Pass |
| Db | All Pass |  |  |

Stewart-Woolsey managed to get the maximum on this deal. On a diamond lead to the king, Woolsey shifted to the $\$ 7$ (a heart would have been better) and declarer erred by covering with the nine, king, ace. Declarer returned a spade. Woolsey won the queen and continued with a third spade, 4, jack, 3, six. Now a low heart to the king was followed by a heart to the ten. Stewart cashed the P A and exited with a diamond, ruffed by declarer. This was the position:

|  | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$--- |  |
|  | * AKJ10 |  |
| - 8 |  | ¢ --- |
| $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$--- |
| $\diamond 754$ |  | $\diamond 10$ |
| *--- |  | - Q964 |
|  | - --- |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q2 |  |
|  | + 852 |  |

Declarer could do nothing but lead the A, then the 10 . Stewart won his queen and played back a low club, and now
the spade loser would not go away-either the would score or the spade would have to be conceded at the end.

As inflation attacks opening bids, passing a 'marginal' opening can create as great a swing as used to come from opening it. Here, such caution would have been well repaid.

| Bd: 14 | - 104 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | $\bigcirc$ K8 |  |
| Vul: None | $\diamond$ A109543 |  |
|  | * K74 |  |
| ¢ K8653 |  | - QJ972 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q1095 |  | $\bigcirc$ A7 |
| $\diamond$ Q7 |  | $\diamond$ J8 |
| Q Q5 |  | * A1096 |
|  | - A |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J6432 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K62 |  |
|  | - J832 |  |

Everyone knows bridge is a tough game and this deal exemplifies the problems defenders have. You (South) lead a heart against 4@ (1 -4@), nine, king, ace. Back comes a spade and you take your ace. Should you lead a heart to try to give partner a ruff? And if not, what should you do instead?

At most tables the defenders did try for the heart ruff, giving declarer a diamond pitch on the hearts. Even where the defense shifted, it was frequently to a club-still not good enough. Maybe the easiest way to set the hand is to play partner for the $\diamond A$. The $\diamond K$ will get encouragement-end of story, so long as the defense cashes two diamonds and then switches back to spades or hearts.

Stewart-Woolsey defended 4a on a heart lead to the ten, king and ace. Declarer repeated the heart finesse and tried to cash the $\triangle Q$, ruffed with the 10 -a suit-preference attempt-and overruffed. Now when Stewart was in with the \&A he had to cash his side's two diamond tricks. When he instead played a fourth heart, declarer could ruff and exit with a diamond and the defense had to open up clubs, leaving declarer a guess he could not get wrong. (Sure, if the k had been with the opening leader they would have been able to set the hand by force.)

Doub-Wildavsky also had a chance to beat 4 4 . Adam led the \&A at trick one; now he played a club and declarer guessed right, won Doug's king with the ace, crossed to the Q, returned to hand with a trump, led the 10 ruffing out the jack, returned to hand with the PA and pitched one of dummy's losing diamonds on the good 9 .


| Bd: 20 | - KJ876 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: West | $\bigcirc 3$ |  |
| Vul: Both | $\diamond$ KJ3 |  |
|  | - QJ109 |  |
| - 542 |  | - AQ10 |
| Q QJ4 |  | $\bigcirc$ A10875 |
| $\diamond 954$ |  | $\diamond 86$ |
| - 7542 |  | - 486 |
|  | -93 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K962 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AQ1072 |  |
|  | \& K3 |  |

N/S pairs were going for large numbers around the room, often doubled by East in 3NT, and AI Roth would have been able to say "I told you so." However, Billy Cohen as East was in a position to collect a different sort of large number. Having missed his winning play at the table, we can only applaud him on his subsequent analysis-and masochism in then passing it on to the Bulletin. He declared 28 doubled [14-(2V)-P-(P); Dbl-AP] and won the lead cheaply in hand. The defense was threatening a spade ruff, so if declarer delays drawing trumps $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$ will obtain an easy sixth trick. Try leading a low heart up. Dummy's queen holds. Now what? If you play a spade they get a ruff; if you lead a heart to the ten, that holds, too. The defense doesn't get a ruff but you lose your third spade trick. The winning move is to lead the P 10 at trick two. This gives you your entry to dummy when you need it; the defense now gets only one heart trick. Making $2 \triangle$ doubled would have picked up 214 IMPs , losing 200 swung 195 IMPs away.

| Bd: 22 | - A85 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | ¢ J1098 |  |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\diamond$ KJ109 |  |  |
|  | - 106 |  |  |
| - 763 | QJ942 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q73 | $\bigcirc$ A5 |  |  |
| $\diamond$ Q7 | $\diamond$ A82 |  |  |
| * KJ943 |  | * Q87 |  |
|  | - K10 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K642 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 6543$ |  |  |
|  | - A52 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Doub |  | Wildavsky |  |
|  |  | 14 | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | Pass | Dbl |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Adam Wildavsky defended $3 \diamond$ nicely here. On a spade lead to the jack and king, declarer led a diamond to the jack,
which held, then a club to the ace and a diamond to the queen, king and ace. Adam found the sneaky low heart play as East now, and when declarer ducked, Doug Doub won his queen and returned a heart, letting Adam switch back to clubs to get his heart ruff for down one. This represented a pick up of 52 IMPs instead of a loss of the same number if the contract had made.

At the end of the first day Buratti-Lanzarotti were still in the lead but Rose Meltzer and Peter Weichsel were in second, hotly pursued by Garey Hayden and Mike Passell.

| Bd: 6 | - KJ5432 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | $\bigcirc$--- |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\diamond$ J97 |  |
|  | * J862 |  |
| - AQ7 |  | Q --- |
| $\bigcirc$ Q652 |  | $\bigcirc$ AK1097 |
| $\diamond$ Q852 |  | $\diamond$ K643 |
| - KQ |  | - 9754 |
|  | ¢ 10986 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J843 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A10 |  |
|  | + A103 |  |

Virtually the entire field went down here, one way or another. Some E/W pairs climbed to $6 \vartheta$; South had a pretty fair double of that (Lev-Pszczola collecting +800 ). Even $4 \bigcirc$ by the long hand could not come home when repeated spade leads created a trump trick for the defenders.

At the table where we were ensconced, Brian Glubok declared 4a doubled after Bjorn Fallenius to his left opened 18 and showed short spades. Very reasonably (to our minds) he ran the J , then repeated the finesse. Now he lost two clubs and a ruff for -300 .

Buratti-Lanzarotti were the only E/W we saw who coped with their cards efficiently. Against Grabel-Wittes the auction went:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lanzarotti | Wittes | Buratti | Grabel |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 10(1) | 24 | 30 | 3 |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Wittes expected Grabel to have the hearts locked up so did not save. (Grabel thought he had the hearts under control, too.) Lanzarotti won the opening spade lead with the queen and played a heart to the ace, discovering the position in that suit. He ran the 810 as Wittes pitched two diamonds, then called for a low diamond prepared to guess the suit correctly. Grabel rose with the ace and Lanzarotti now had an easy ten tricks; +630.

| Bd: 7 | Q Q4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: South | $\bigcirc$ J8754 |  |
| Vul: Both | $\diamond$ A4 |  |
|  | - K1042 |  |
| - 1098 |  | ¢ AKJ |
| $\bigcirc 6$ |  | $\checkmark$ AQ1032 |
| $\diamond$ KJ653 |  | $\diamond$ Q97 |
| * J975 |  | + Q6 |
|  | - 76532 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K9 |  |
|  | $\diamond 1082$ |  |
|  | + A83 |  |

Both Goren-Rosenberg and Bocchi-Duboin appeared to be having good sets. Neither pair did their chances any harm here. Rosenberg as East overcalled Balicki's 10 opening with 1 NT and was overjoyed to hear his LHO raise to $2 \triangle$ and his partner produce a negative double. He sat it out, of course, and led the A, then shifted to the $\vee A$ and a second heart. Declarer could arrange to score two clubs, one diamond, and three trumps but that was still -500 .

Bocchi did even better. He opened 18 in fourth seat and over his partner's 1NT response relayed with 2 , then raised his partner's 2NT bid (both minors, less than 8 HCP) to 3NT. On the $\Delta$ lead Duboin drove out the $\diamond A$ when the defense could not hold up for two rounds, and now had nine tricks.

| Bd: 16 | ¢ QJ952 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: West | $\bigcirc$ AKJ75 |  |
| Vul: E/W | $\diamond$ Q3 |  |
|  | +2 |  |
| - A3 |  | - K876 |
| $\bigcirc 106$ |  | $\bigcirc$ Q84 |
| $\diamond$ K5 |  | $\diamond 107642$ |
| * J1097643 |  | $\otimes$ Q |
|  | - 104 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 932$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AJ98 |  |
|  | - AK85 |  |

Chip Martel, North, received a testing defense on a low diamond lead (third and fifth) against $4 \triangle$ (well, not quite as testing as a low spade lead). Now he had to decide which basket to put all his eggs into: the one with the diamond finesse winning or the one with both majors behaving. The
 elected to rise with the $\diamond A$, then cash the VAK (very wisely) and only then take the AK to pitch his diamond. When East discarded, he now had a fairly good idea that his LHO was $4=3=5=1$ or $5=2=5=1$. Since his RHO appeared to have a spade honor Chip led a low spade from dummy to his queen. East might have done better to duck this but declarer would still have had trump control to bring in the spades. Making game brought in 91 IMPs, while down one would have been

156 IMPs away．

| Bd： 19 | ¢ AQ84 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr：South | $\bigcirc$ KJ64 |  |
| Vul：E／W | $\diamond 4$ |  |
|  | ＊K732 |  |
| －－－－ |  | A J10965 |
| $\bigcirc$－－－ |  | $\bigcirc$ AQ52 |
| $\diamond$ AKJ7652 |  | $\diamond$ Q3 |
| ＊AJ9865 |  | ＊Q10 |
|  | －K732 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 109873$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 1098$ |  |
|  | － 4 |  |

Probably every table had its story to tell on this deal．No one did any better with the E／W cards than play 6 or $6 \diamond$ ． However，some did considerably worse．For example，when Barnet Shenkin held the North cards he doubled $1 \diamond$ and heard 1s on his left， $3 \bigcirc$（value－showing）from his partner，4\＆ on his right，so he bid $4 \varnothing$ ．That was doubled on his left and his RHO ran to 5 ，which he（perhaps naively，perhaps craftily）doubled．When his LHO retreated to $5 \diamond$ that ended the auction．

Guido Ferraro as North heard the auction start（1»）－Dbl－ （Rdbl）－3৫；6e．When his opponents settled in $6 \diamond$ he saved in 69 ．The defense was merciless：Buratti led the $\diamond A K$ and when Chemla ruffed and crossed to the $\boldsymbol{\$ K}$ to lead a club up Buratti hopped up with the to play a third diamond to let Lanzarotti discard his and collect +800 ．Still，that was much better than－1370．

Hamman－Zia did even better：as N／S they bid diamonds three times．


That was +200 for them．

| Bd： 22 | － 82 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr：East | $\bigcirc 2$ |  |
| Vul：E／W | $\diamond 10432$ |  |
|  | ＊AKQ876 |  |
| － 653 |  | ¢ AQJ97 |
| $\bigcirc 1095$ |  | © KQJ43 |
| $\diamond$ AK95 |  | $\diamond 6$ |
| － J 94 |  | ＋ 32 |
|  | －K104 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A876 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ QJ87 |  |
|  | ＋105 |  |

The field was getting into a lot of trouble here．3 down two or three undoubled was pretty much average．But only one pair managed to collect a significant penalty that we saw． When Bramley－Compton were N／S the auction went：（1s）－P－ （2ヵ）－34；（3ソ）－P－（4ヘ）－P；（P）－Dbl－AP．The defense cashed two clubs，then shifted to the singleton heart．Compton gave Bramley his ruff and now a third club forced declarer to ruff with the $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$ just to escape for -800 ．

Paul Chemla did well in the bidding on our next exhibit，on a hand where the field was regretting being declarer at pretty much every table．

| Bd： 23 <br> DIr：South <br> Vul：Both | ＾AK7653 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AJ98 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q10 |  |
|  | ＊ 4 |  |
| － 10942 |  | －QJ |
| $\bigcirc 63$ |  | －KQ102 |
| $\diamond$ K75 |  | $\diamond$ A642 |
| － 10972 |  | \＆AK6 |
|  | ¢ 8 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 754$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J983 |  |
|  | －QJ853 |  |

Sitting East Chemla doubled 1s and heard his partner respond 2\＆．When his RHO rebid 2 Paul passed！Maybe there is no such thing as a bad 19－count，but if ever there was，this is it． 24 went quietly down 200 ，while it is hard to see that E／W could have stopped in a sensible spot（2NT is their last making contract）if Paul had bid again．

Special credit goes to Fantoni－Nunes．Nunes doubled a strong club as East（blacks or reds）and Fantoni bid $1 \diamond$ ． When Hampson bid 14 as North，Nunes doubled again，and passed $2 \diamond$ ，going +90 －the only player in either direction to make his contract．

| Bd: 1 | ¢ 10852 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | $\checkmark$ AK104 |  |
| Vul: None | $\diamond$ J106 |  |
|  | * 104 |  |
| ¢ KQ7 |  | ¢ AJ943 |
| $\bigcirc$ J875 |  | $\bigcirc$ Q93 |
| $\diamond$ AK |  | $\diamond$ Q74 |
| \% AQ87 |  | * K2 |
|  | - 6 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 62$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 98532$ |  |
|  | ¢ J9653 |  |

As opening bids decline in expected high-card strength, people rarely adjust their expectations facing them. Perhaps their declarer play is improving by virtue of needing to stretch their limited assets further. Eric Greco is a realist. Since he and Geoff Hampson open lighter even than the rest of the field, he was not convinced of the need to make even one slam try when he picked up a control-rich 19-count and heard his partner open 14. His auction was: 14-2 $;$; 2NT(11-13)-3s; 3NT-4\&; 4ヶ-P. With the heart ruff looming against the suit game it was necessary to stop at 4@ just to go plus.

| Bd: 2 | ¢ K10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | - KQ75 |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\diamond$ KQJ74 |  |
|  | * KJ |  |
| - 93 |  | ¢ QJ87642 |
| $\bigcirc 1096$ |  | $\bigcirc$ AJ8 |
| $\diamond 1063$ |  | $\diamond$ A98 |
| * 109762 |  | \& --- |
|  | ¢ A5 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 432$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 52$ |  |
|  | \% AQ8543 |  |

This next board was equally exciting for North players. Brian Glubok must have been irritated to pick up an 18-count, hear his partner overcall at the two level, and find he could not make game. Hampson led a top spade against 3NT [(14)$2 \boldsymbol{*}-(\mathrm{P})-3 \mathrm{NT}$ ] and Glubok won his king and played the $\& \mathrm{~K}$ to get the bad news, then the $\diamond K$, carefully ducked by Hampson. Now declarer could not come close to nine tricks.

| Bd: 4 | ¢ A10985 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: West | $\bigcirc$ A9732 |  |
| Vul: Both | $\diamond$ Q |  |
|  | - 65 |  |
| - Q742 |  | ¢ J63 |
| $\bigcirc 10$ |  | $\bigcirc$ KQ864 |
| $\diamond$ A752 |  | $\diamond$ KJ1096 |
| A AQ97 |  | \& --- |
|  | 4 K |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{J} 5$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 843$ |  |
|  | \& KJ108432 |  |

3NT is a contract with some potential, while it was also possible for E/W to make a living doubling their opponents in $2 \triangle$ or $3 \%$-though it was not so easy to sit for either double. Playing four-card majors, Hallberg-Wigoder reached 3NT on the unopposed sequence: 1ヵ-2V; 2NT-3®; 3NT. On a club lead declarer won cheaply, led a heart to the queen, then cashed the $\diamond A$, led a diamond to the king, and tried a spade toward his hand for nine tricks.

It was not so easy to make eleven tricks in $5 \diamond$ unless you received a club lead (and even then...). Obviously the spade ruff might beat you, and even without that, tricks are at a premium. Richard Jedrychowski played $5 \diamond$ doubled as West on the $\triangle A$ lead (after North had overcalled $1 \diamond$ with 1s) as South unblocked the $\nabla J$. North misread the position and continued a heart, so Richard put in dummy's eight pitching a spade, then drew three rounds of trumps and cashed the OKQ pitching two more spades to reach this ending:

|  | ¢ A109 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 9$ |  |
|  | $\diamond--$ |  |
|  | \& 65 |  |
| $\triangle$ Q |  | ¢ J63 |
| $\bigcirc$--- |  | $\bigcirc 6$ |
| $\diamond 7$ |  | $\diamond$ J10 |
| A AQ97 |  | \& --- |
|  | ¢ K |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$--- |  |
|  | $\diamond$--- |  |
|  | \% KJ1084 |  |

The $₫ Q$ now left South on play to lead a club to set up two discards from dummy, or forced North to play the ace and set up the $\boldsymbol{J}$. Either way declarer had eleven tricks-a perfect winkle. That brought the New Zealanders 195 IMPs; one down would have represented a loss of 134 IMPs.

| Bd： 13 | ¢ J876 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr：North | $\bigcirc$ K973 |  |
| Vul：Both | $\diamond 843$ |  |
|  | － 95 |  |
| $\pm 4$ |  | ¢ Q105 |
| $\bigcirc$ A862 |  | $\bigcirc$ J |
| $\diamond 10972$ |  | $\diamond$ KJ65 |
| K1032 |  | \＆QJ876 |
|  | ¢ AK932 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q1054 |  |
|  | $\diamond A Q$ |  |
|  | \＆A4 |  |

The normal contract here is $4 \infty$ and one way or another the deal reduces to finding the $\Phi Q$ coming down in two rounds （no such luck）or finding the $\vee J$ ．The typical sequence of plays is to win a diamond lead，cash the sAK，then take the remaining diamond winners to play ace and another club． East should win，cash his $\Phi Q$ ，then exit with a third diamond leaving declarer to ruff and negotiate hearts for himself． Since he intends to play West for the $\nabla \mathrm{J}$ he might as well start by leading the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ ．This only gains over the straight 50 percent chance when East has the bare jack，but those little percentage points add up，don＇t they？

| Bd： 16 | s K6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr：West | $\bigcirc$ KQJ7 |  |
| Vul：E／W | $\diamond$ A653 |  |
|  | \＆J106 |  |
| －9 |  | ¢ 87 |
| $\checkmark$ A9865 |  | $\bigcirc 1032$ |
| $\diamond$ KJ4 |  | $\diamond$ Q82 |
| ＊AK32 |  | Q9874 |
|  | ¢ AQJ105432 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 4$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 1097$ |  |
|  | \＆ 5 |  |

A surprisingly high percentage of the field made 4థ here． Some defenses had the excuse of a transfer auction making North declarer after West＇s 18 opening and a 1NT overcall by North．（Mind you，an anti－lead directing double of the transfer bid might get East off to a decent opening lead．） Fallenius－Welland set 4ゆ doubled after 1ऽ－（P）－1ゅ－（4ゆ）；Dbl－ AP where the 1s bid was a forcing 1NT equivalent．Fallenius led the A and Welland discouraged，suggesting that a shift to diamonds was acceptable．That allowed Fallenius to play a low diamond，and though declarer ducked，the defense could continue the attack on diamonds，and Welland＇s count card made it clear which minor－suit winner was cashing．

Since Altschuler－Birman registered +1080 and there were quite a few 690s here，those who registered -450 did not lose as much as they might have feared．

| Bd： 20 | ¢ QJ53 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr：West | $\bigcirc$ AKQ102 |  |
| Vul：Both | $\diamond$－－－ |  |
|  | \％K432 |  |
| ¢ K86 |  | $\pm$ A92 |
| $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc 653$ |
| $\diamond$ J96543 |  | $\diamond$ AK108 |
| －Q109 |  | －A65 |
|  | ¢ 1074 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 9874$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q72 |  |
|  | ＠J87 |  |

Doug Doub and Adam Wildavsky got to the Goldilocks level here to generate maximum interest． $3 \diamond$ would have been too low， $5 \diamond$ too high，but $4 \diamond$ was just right．The auction was：

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \varnothing$ | Dbl | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Dbl | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |

The defense started with two top hearts．Doub ruffed， crossed to the $\diamond K$ ，then led three rounds of spades．South took the trick with his $\boldsymbol{\$ 1 0 \text { and shifted to a club，letting Doub }}$ win the first club trick cheaply in hand when West ducked his king．Doub responded by crossing to the $\diamond A$ and exiting with the third diamond，endplaying the defenders to lead clubs for a second，fatal，time．

If South had unblocked his $\boldsymbol{\Phi} 10$ ，might West have worked out that if his partner had the $\diamond Q$（likely from declarer＇s decision to abandon trumps）the correct defense was to assume he also had weak clubs headed by the jack？Then the winning move would be to play a fourth spade for the ruff and discard．East would ruff in with the $\diamond Q$ and exit a trump， leaving the defenders with a club trick．The correct defense would have gained 57 IMPs instead of costing 87 IMPs．

With one session to go，the top six pairs were dominated by foreign players，but the only American－born player in there was in the lead．Hamman－Zia led Chemla－Ferraro，followed by Lev－Pszczola，Fantoni－Nunes，Bocchi－Duboin，and El Ahmady－Sadek．

When the last session started，the second placed pair fell back at once．This was the beginning of the end for them．


| Bd: 2 | - AK73 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: East | $\bigcirc 73$ |  |  |
| Vul: N/S | $\diamond$ Q98 |  |  |
|  | \& AK103 |  |  |
| ¢ J108 | - 6542 |  |  |
| - A10865 | $\bigcirc 4$ |  |  |
| $\diamond$ K65 | $\diamond$ A1073 |  |  |
| \% Q4 | \& J865 |  |  |
|  | ¢ Q9 |  |  |
|  | จ KQJ92 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond J 42$ |  |  |
|  | * 972 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 18 | Dbl. | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

You receive the unhelpful lead of the $\mathbf{S}$, which you win in dummy to lead a heart to the king, ducked, and a second top heart. West wins as East pitches a spade and continues with the $\mathbf{~ 1 0}$. You win in hand and lead a club to the ten. East (normally a fast player) takes some time to win the jack and returns a spade, on which West follows with the eight. You try the A from dummy, and are not particularly surprised to see the queen appear from West. Assuming you remember that the $\mathbf{~} 7$ is now high, should you take it now, and if so what should you discard on it from your hand?

It appears that you need to guess who has the $\diamond 10$; not so. The right way to come home from here is to lead the $\uparrow 7$, discarding a diamond from hand, cross to the 9 , and watch what four cards West has come down to. If he has only one heart left you cash your two heart winners and concede the last two tricks. If West has kept two hearts he has only two diamonds left, at least one of which must be the ace or king. So you lead your low diamond up; West will take his honor and exit with the low diamond, but whether East ducks or wins you will take two of the last three tricks.

At the table, after taking the A Chemla cashed the spade discarding a diamond, but then ran the $\diamond 8$ immediately. Zmudzinski won the ace and returned a diamond, letting Balicki win the king and play back a club. Whichever hand declarer took this in, he had to concede a trick at the end. This play cost 238 IMPs. Making game would have meant a pick-up of 72 IMPs.

All the other pairs in the top five were making progress, though none of them were dominating the event. On the following deal Hamman was the beneficiary of a misguided defense.

| Bd: 20 | ¢ J52 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIr: North | $\bigcirc$ J6 |  |
| Vul: Both | $\diamond$ AKQ9763 |  |
|  | * 2 |  |
| - 63 |  | ¢ K874 |
| $\bigcirc$ A9532 |  | \% K10 |
| $\diamond 42$ |  | $\diamond 1085$ |
| K765 |  | - AQ43 |
|  | ¢ AQ109 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q874 |  |
|  | $\diamond J$ |  |
|  | * J1098 |  |

Playing 3NT with five top losers is not normally a recipe for success, but it was rather harder than usual for the defense to identify its five winners.

Try to plan the defense as East after the unopposed auction $1 \diamond-1 \diamond ; 2 \diamond-2 N T ; 3 N T-P$. A low club lead from partner goes to your queen (say) holding the trick. You must plan for the possibility that you have only three club tricks to cash but two tricks in either spades or hearts. If you lead a low club to declarer's jack and partner's king you will have to guess what to do when West returns a club to you. However, this is still probably the right defense, and particularly if you are playing upside down signals. By this point in the deal you will know that declarer started life with the \%J1098 (partner has only four and declarer will not be able to conceal that he has the master club) so your partner's $\$ 6$ will in this instance be suit preference for hearts.

That may sound complex; why is it the right defense? Well, if you play the A at trick two and a club to partner, he will cash the VA, see what looks like a discouraging $\vee 10$ from you, then play you for the $\Delta \mathrm{A}$. If you were playing regular signals you might prefer to go this route, but maybe partner would be worried that you had the bare $\nabla 10$ (not the $\vee \mathrm{Q} 10$, of course, as then you would drop the queen). A surprising number of defenders got this wrong, including Hamman's opponents, giving him 242 IMPs instead of a loss of 86 IMPs. Lev-Pszczola did manage to cash out here, while FantoniNunes stopped in $3 \diamond$, gaining 42IMPs in the process.

Going into the last round the top three pairs were, in order, Lev-Pszczola, Hamman-Zia and Fantoni-Nunes, with first and third places separated by rather more than a game swing in real terms. Two of the last three deals were quiet enough, with each of the pairs doing no more than gaining or losing an IMP. This was the other deal.



Many pairs stopped in a partscore when North made a limit raise of spades and South denied game interest. FantoniNunes climbed to game and Nunes made his contract, gaining 170 IMPs, after East's opening bid helped declarer
make the crucial guess in the club suit. Note that on a diamond lead you must duck the first trick if you intend to play clubs before drawing trumps, as indeed you should. Otherwise East can win his A and underlead in diamonds to get a club ruff. Pszczola and Lev defended 4 4 , losing 170 IMPs when the contract made. The swing here was nearly (but not quite) enough for the Italians to overtake the leaders. But what of Hamman-Zia?

Zia declared 4e after the auction shown, and the normal clue to the position of the a was not available to him-quite the contrary. Instead of the usual 18 opening, Marty Fleisher had chosen to open $2 \nabla$. This was a maximum vulnerable weak two-bid for him, but it was an action that most other players in the field would have considered excessively restrained, and Zia was equally taken in. He won the opening heart lead and had to guess the clubs immediately. With the bidding he had heard, it was very probable that the was on his left. He therefore led a club to the king, and when East produced the ace he had to go down a trick. If he had made 4@, his partnership would have won the Cavendish Pairs. As it was, they had to be content with third place.

| Rank | Score | Pair | Bid | Prize | Player Pool |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 3495 | Sam Lev - Jacek Pszczola | $\$ 35 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 243,308$ | $\$ 26,810$ |
| 2 | 3424 | Fulvio Fantoni - Claudio Nunes | $\$ 36 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 156,412$ | $\$ 17,236$ |
| 3 | 3363 | Bob Hamman - Zia Mahmood | $\$ 32 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 104,274$ | $\$ 11,490$ |
| 4 | 2895 | Norberto Bocchi -Giorgio Duboin | $\$ 53 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 78,206$ | $\$ 8,618$ |
| 5 | 2565 | Paul Chemla - Guido Ferraro | $\$ 17 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 69,516$ | $\$ 7,660$ |
| 6 | 1757 | Eric Greco - Geoff Hampson | $\$ 30 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 60,828$ | $\$ 6,702$ |
| 7 | 1531 | Bjorn Fallenius - Roy Welland | $\$ 27 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 52,138$ | $\$ 5,744$ |
| 8 | 1522 | Brian Glubok - Jim Robison | $\$ 12.5 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 43,448$ | $\$ 4,788$ |
| 9 | 1488 | Andrea Buratti - Massimo Lanzarotti | $\$ 35 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 34,760$ | $\$ 3,830$ |
| 10 | 1389 | Rose Meltzer - Peter Weichsel | $\$ 12.5 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 26,070$ | $\$ 2,872$ |



Winners, 2004 Cavendish Pairs: Sam Lev and Jacek Pszczola


[^0]:    * provisionally

[^1]:    1 Perry Johnson, Eric Greco, Geoff Hampson, Jeff Meckstroth, Eric Rodwell
    2 LouAnn O'Rourke, Norberto Bocchi, Giorgio Duboin, Peter Fredin, Marc Jacobus, Magnus Lindkvist
    3 Jim Mahaffey, Gary Cohler, Garey Hayden, Mark Lair, Barnet Shenkin, Chris Willenkin
    4 Gene Freed, Ross Grabel, Chris Larsen, Jon Wittes
    5 Pierre Zimmermann, Fulvio Fantoni, Franck Multon, Claudio Nunes, Jean-Christophe Quantin, Pierre Saporta
    6 George Jacobs, Steve Garner, Ralph Katz, Mike Passell, Howard Weinstein, Eddie Wold
    7 Juan Ventin, Andrea Buratti, Chris Compton, Gaylor Kasle, Pablo Lambardi, Massimo Lanzarotti
    8 Charles Wigoder, Michael Cornell, Gunnar Hallberg, Michael Rosenberg
    9 Andrei Gromov, Alex Dubinin, Cezary Balicki, Adam Zmudzinski
    10 Roy Welland, Bjorn Fallenius, Bobby Levin, Steve Weinstein
    11 Seymon Deutsch, Billy Cohen, Walid El Ahmady, Tarek Sadek, Ron Smith, Paul Soloway
    12 Russ Ekeblad, Sheila Ekeblad, Fred Gitelman, Brad Moss, Ron Rubin, Michael Seamon
    13 Billy Pollack, David Berkowitz, Sam Lev, Jacek Pszczola
    14 Gilad Altschuler, David Birman, Piotr Bizon, Michal Kwiecien
    15 Paul Lewis, Roger Bates, Linda Lewis, Jim Robison
    16 Rose Meltzer, Bob Hamman, Kyle Larsen, Zia Mahmood, Chip Martel, Lew Stansby
    17 Mike Moss, Drew Casen, Jim Krekorian, Antonio Semanta
    18 Hansa Narasimham, Curtis Cheek, Vincent Demuy, Joe Grue, Joanna Stansby, Gavin Wolpert
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