

**OXFORDSHIRE V DERBYSHIRE**  
**Derby School of Bridge: 2 July 2006**

A good all-round performance by Oxfordshire, against what looked (at least from what I saw) to be a full-strength Derbyshire:

- A team (+39 imps) 16-4
- B team (+ 30 imps) 15-5
- C team (+ 72 imps) 19-1

The B team in particular required a storming final set after being 25 imps down with 8 boards to play, while the other two teams were ahead throughout. (Derbyshire have now indicated that they do not intend to appeal against a ruling made in the B team match, so these results can be regarded as final.)

In terms of teams of 4, the results were made up as follows:

A team	Tim Pike & Alan Wilson / Robert Procter & Michael Robinson	+25 imps
	Lynne Hayes & Sandra Landy / Marian Day & Nick Percival-Price	+14 imps
B team	Dinah & Andrew Lintott / Geoff Nicholas & Debbie Roberts	+20 imps
	Krys Kaz & Sandra Nicholson / Tim Dickinson & David Southcombe	+10 imps
C team	Sandra & Brian Claridge / Chris Cooper & Nathan Piper	+55 imps
	Malcolm Currie & Jo Murray / Norman Gascoigne & Jean Squires	+17 imps

Thanks to Michael Robinson for cross-imping:

Team	Pair	Cross-imping across			Butler IMP across	
		own team	A&B only	all 3 teams	A&B only	all 3 teams
A	Tim Pike & Alan Wilson	3	9	23	-1	12
	Rob Procter & Mike Robinson	42	34	25	26	17
	Lynne Hayes & Sandra Landy	37	41	53	33	44
	Marian Day & Nick Percival-Price	-3	-10	-16	-17	-31
B	Andrew Lintott & Diana Lintott	18	11	23	-4	9
	Geoff Nicholas & Debbie Roberts	15	25	16	19	5
	Krys Kaz & Sandra Nicholson	10	7	21	0	10
	Tim Dickinson & David Southcombe	13	18	11	16	3
C	Sandra & Brian Claridge	29	n/a	2	n/a	-12
	Chris Cooper & Nathan Piper	58	n/a	73	n/a	72
	Malcolm Currie & Jo Murray	39	n/a	12	n/a	7
	Norman Gascoigne & Jean Squires	10	n/a	25	n/a	14

So well done in general, and particularly to Hayes/Landy in the A team and Cooper/Piper in the C team, with commiserations to those whose scores look negative on this occasion – we all know that cross-imps never tell the full story of who was lucky or unlucky, whether in terms of getting away with mistakes, the oppo doing the right thing against them, or whatever.

I thought there were rather fewer interesting boards than usual, and not many people have supplied me with any details of what happened, so I have only written notes on a few hands below, almost all of which seem to be around the slam zone.

**Board 2:** East (Dealer) ♠A ♥KQ832 ♦AJ1086 ♣103 opposite ♠KQ1097 ♥A9 ♦KQ9 ♣A76. Most played this in a small slam, though one pair in each team only got to game. Two Oxfordshire pairs made it to 7, though – Procter/Robinson required a bit of luck in 7NT, but congratulations to Cooper/Piper in finding the best contract of 7D: 1H 1N (=forcing with 5+ spades); 2D 3C (=game force); 3D 4N; 5H 5N; 6H\* 7D. Chris comments that “6H was the key bid I guess, showing either the

KH or the two black kings but also showing extra values to bid past 6D. 7D seemed obvious afterwards and is superior to 7N”.

**Board 9:** South (Dealer) ♠K7543 ♥KQ52 ♦- ♣AKQJ. What should S rebid after N responds 1NT to an opening bid of 1S? I think the most popular choice was 3H, leading typically to 4H-1. I chose 2C, thinking that partner’s next bid (assuming there was one!) would now give me a much clearer idea of where we were going than a (semi)-forced bid. This could have been rather successful when partner raised to 4C with ♠10 ♥A76 ♦K943 ♣76543. Unfortunately I now forced partner to 6C, which although it has play went 1 off (C 2-2, but SA offside and triply guarded, and H 4-2). Only the Lintotts both bid and made game on this hand (in 3NT!, which is not necessarily the right spot when DAQJx lie over DK and SAJ92 over SK), so getting to 5C rather than 6C would have been worth quite a lot here – one Derbyshire pair found the right spot but proceeded to misplay for only 10 tricks.

**Board 10:** A possible slam hand, with East (dealer) holding ♠QJ10765 ♥KQ3 ♦5 ♣A108 opposite ♠A83 ♥A9652 ♦A72 ♣QJ. It looks as if either 6S or 6H is reasonable, but with both black kings offside it is important for East to play the contract not West since otherwise the hand goes down on a C lead through the ace. In practice this means you want to be in 6S not 6H. Once again, Cooper/Piper were the only Oxfordshire pair to hit the jackpot, while Procter/Robinson were very unlucky to reach 6H and go off. Derbyshire were slightly more adventurous than Oxfordshire, with 3 pairs bidding slam. The Claridges had no chance defending 6S, while Kaz/Nicholson had a chance against 6H but didn’t find the winning lead (understandable, perhaps, when holding KQJxxx in a different suit and xx in the suit that had to be led). Hayes/Landy managed to take 6H an impressive 2 off, though!

**Board 21:** chiefly remarkable for Debbie winning the first trick with a singleton H9 as declarer with Q2 in dummy to help bring home a no-play 5D. The defender who underled AKJ1065 to get a ruff did not quite achieve what he had in mind.

**Board 22:** Rather unlucky for the Claridges, where an opponent raised a 13-15 1NT to 4NT holding ♠KQJ ♥K95 ♦73 ♣AKJ72. Opener went on to 6NT with ♠A1092 ♥AQ74 ♦A10 ♣543. No other table found slam here, but with H 3-3 and the CQ onside 12 tricks were straightforward.

**Board 32:** My partner was disappointed on this one. Like all except one pair on each team we reached 6S with declarer holding ♠AJ1063 ♥K7 ♦Q85 ♣A106 opposite ♠Q8542 ♥AQ5 ♦AK10 ♣QJ. At first sight the contract appears to depend on one or other of the black kings being onside, but Tim found a nice line to make with some distributions even if both were offside. On an initial heart lead he played 3 rounds, discarding a diamond from hand, followed by 3 rounds of diamonds (discarding a club). Only now did he take the trump finesse, knowing that if it lost to a singleton SK then the defender would be endplayed into giving a ruff and discard or leading into the club tenace. Why the disappointment? Well both kings were onside, so it was impossible to go down however the hand was played!

Alan Wilson