Editorial

For those of you who play on a Monday, note that your membership of Droitwich Working Mens Club needs to be renewed, if you haven't already done so. Please contact our treasurer, David Thomas for details.

For those of you who are online, we have set up a Facebook page. Search for “Worcestershire Bridge” and it should be available, visit our website, or click on this link if viewing the pdf version of this newsletter.

Hopefully this will become a useful place with photos of events, details of forthcoming events, a place to find partners and indeed, anything else you think of.

As mentioned in the adjacent column, the successful Malvern congress means that the county can again help the local clubs. Hopefully this will be able to be continued in future years.

To receive this newsletter straight to your inbox send a blank email to: wcba-newsletter-subscribe@yahoogroups.com
or download from www.worcestershirebridge.co.uk
Our thanks are due to this issue’s contributors. All contributions are welcome for future issues:
wcbanews@btinternet.com
41 Burma Close, Evesham, WR11 1GZ.

Forthcoming Events

January
17th Grand Prix Teams  Droitwich
24th National Pairs Heat  Droitwich

February
7th Grand Prix Teams  Droitwich
20th Club Championship Pairs  Astley & D.
28th Championship Pairs Qualifier  Droitwich

March
5th Deadline for submissions to WCBA news
13th Championship Pairs Final  TBC
14th Grand Prix Teams  Droitwich

EBU Club Affiliation Fees

By David Thomas (treasurer)

The WCBA committee is pleased to confirm that following the financial success of the Malvern Congress the county will be standing by its promise and paying EBU club affiliation fees of £30 per club for the coming financial year. Any club receiving a request for payment from the EBU should ignore this as the county will settle the total bill with one cheque.

The county will also be happy to pay the first year affiliation fee of any non affiliated club now wishing to join the EBU and their P2P scheme.

Midland Counties Congress

At the recent Midland Counties Congress, John Turner received a lifetime award for all the help that he has put into the congress over many decades.

Regarding the all important bridge competitions, the top 3 in each of the numerous events are detailed over the page:
Mixed teams:
1st Robin Ogg & Dodo Georgevic, Carolyn Fisher & Jane Hall +89
2nd John Sansom & Pam Pearce, John Amor & Susan Sharp +44
3rd Peter Donovan & Marilyn Jones, Adam Wood & Alan Best +35

Allen Cup (Ladies Pairs)
1st Sue Evans & Stephanie Forward 61.11%
2nd Carolyn Fisher & Jane Hall 55.56%
3rd Jean & Jessie Newton 53.97%

Hudson Cup (Mens Pairs)
1st Dennis Loynes & Nick Forward 66.67%
2nd Peter Oldbury & Brent Wormald 60.29%
3rd Roland Gronau & David Wing 53.13%

Peter Millar Trophy (Mixed Pairs)
1st Steve & Val Kennewell 69.51%
2nd John Sansom & Pam Pearce 66.67%
3rd Hilary Brain & Chris Stevens 63.26%
4th Dick & Jane Rutter Flitch winners 58.71%

Consolation Pairs
1st Chris R Smith & John Councer 60.22%
2nd Bill & Liz Wattleworth 57.69%
3rd Brian Senior & Manny Marks 57.19%

Cooke Porter Cup (B Pairs)
1st Pauline Serby & Eleanor Rice 67.04%
2nd David Clarke & Celia Day 57.75%
3rd Jim Bainbridge & Graham Lightfoot 55.51%

Foster Cup (A Pairs)
1st Sue & Nick Woodcock 65.22%
2nd Dan Crofts & Andrew Thompson 61.33%
3rd Keith Shuttleworth & Brian Nicholls 54.75%

Swiss Teams
1st Malcolm Green & Mike Lewis, Stan & Andrea Powell 110
2nd Judi Stevenson & Jane Stirton, Jenny Matthews & Celia Day 107
3rd Val Cooper & Norman Massey, Bob Foster & Kevin New 106

Championship Teams B Final
1st *David Jones & Peter Donovan, Martin Jones & Mike Northwood +86
2nd John Thacker & Mike Ralph, Peter Watts & Ben Britton +66
3rd Brian Senior & Manny Marks, Nevena Senior & Sandra Penfold +35

Championship Teams A Final
1st Chris King & Steve Tomlinson, Cathy & Andy Smith +86
2nd Leslie Reece & Adrian Knight, Adam Wood & Alan Best +53
3rd John Sansom & Richard Jephcott, Nick Forward & Steve Allerston +4

Bidding panel
By Nick Forward

Hand 1
Pairs – love all.
♣ 3 S W N E
♥ Q, 8 - - 1♥ Pass
♦ K, 9, 4 2♣ Pass 2♦ Pass
♠ K, Q, J, 10, 7, 5, 3 ?

Hand 2
Pairs – all vul
♠ A, 10, 9, 3 S W N E
♥ 7 1♦ 1♠ 2♥ Pass
♦ K, J, 6, 4 ?
♣ A, 8, 7, 6

Hand 3
Pairs – E/W vul
♠ K, 8 S W N E
♥ A, K, 8, 6 - - 1♥ 1♠
♦ 5, 4 Dble 2♣ Pass Pass
♣ 8, 7, 6, 5, 3 ?

Hand 4
Teams – E/W vul
♠ A, K, Q, 10, 7, 6, 4, 2 S W N E
♥ - - Pass 1♦ Pass
♦ J, 10 2♣ Pass 3♦ Pass
♣ A, K, 8 ?

Hand 5
Pairs – love all
♠ A, 10, 8, 2 S W N E
♥ 5, 3, 2 - - - 2♥*
♦ Q ?
♣ A, K, 10, 5, 3 * weak

How would you bid the hands above? The panel's thoughts are on pages 4-7.

Welsh Results

At the Porthcawl Congress, Pam Pearce and Sue Sharp won the Friday pairs and came sixth in the Saturday evening pairs.
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Mixed Pairs

For the fourth year in a row, this was won by John Sansom and Pam Pearce. When will they let anyone else get their hands on the trophy? The top half:

1st John Sansom & Pam Pearce 65.10%
2nd= Stewart Fishburne & Joyce Skelton 57.81%
2nd= Ian & Georgina Lineker 57.81%
4th Sue Evans & Dennis Loynes 54.69%
5th David Halford & Monica Parker 53.65%
6th Paul Hammond & Sue Lane 52.08%

Bill Dalman Trophy

This is Worcestershire's mixed pivot teams competition. As a result of the pivot, there are often irregular partnerships playing. One result of that is misunderstandings and the director is often kept busy. This was certainly the result this year. When the dust eventually settled, the top half were as follows:

1st Robert Chilimonczyk & Jane Rutter, Mike Vetch & Dick Rutter +51
2nd David Thomas & Tony Gervis, Linda Gervis & Paul Tapster +40
3rd John Sansom & Stewart Fishburne, Paul Hammond & Joyce Skelton +31
4th Jean & Jessie Newton, John Turner & Susan Sharp +24
5th Dennis Loynes & Marian Wilcox, Sue Evans & Sue Lane +16

County Teams

The first team trounced Staffordshire 20-0 in November (their first win of the season), but then succumbed to a 4-16 loss against Derbyshire in December. This puts them in 7th place in the table.

The second team likewise won 20-0 against Staffordshire, and was beaten by Derbyshire (2-18 in their case). They are mid-table in 5th place overall.

The thirds could only draw 10-10 with Staffordshire, but had a 20-0 win against Derbyshire. Like the second team they are now fifth.

NICKO

Any EBU affiliated club can enter one or more teams of four in the National Inter Club Knock Out or NICKO for short. Early rounds are regionalised to avoid too much travelling. There is a plate competition for any teams knocked out in the first round.

The 10/11 event has started and the results for the Worcestershire teams are as follows: Worcester A defeated a team from Sutton Coldfield, and have a bye in round 2.

Worcester B lost to a Moseley team in round one. Meanwhile the Droitwich Spa team conceded against a Cheltenham side. These two sides will played each other in the first round of the plate competition, with Worcester winning.

Evesham lost to a team from Hereford in the main event. In the first round of the plate, they defeated a team from Sutton Coldfield.

Promotions

Firstly, an apology for missing a promotion out earlier in the year. Mrs M S Parker was promoted to Premier National Master in June.

Congratulations to the following on their recent master point promotions:

Premier National Master: Mr P W Edwards.
** Premier Regional Master: Mr R C Rutter.
Regional Master: Mr B Sayers.
***** Premier Master: Mr D Holman.
** Master: Miss M Gibbs.
* Master: Mrs J Jackson, Mrs J Little.
District Master: Mr M H Gill.
Area Master: Mr A Blundell, Mr A Pugh, Mr T Pugh, Mrs B Southwell, Mr B Tyrell.
Club Master: Ms R Hazledine, Mr M Pharoah, Mrs P Pharoah.
Local Master: Mr K Busby, Mr D Horrobin, Mr M Joyce, Ms S Lazenbury, Mr B Limmer, Dr M Oakley, Mrs A Rogers, Mr B Yates.
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Thoughts on last time
By David King

Mike Willoughby wrote a thoughtful article on regularly occurring problems. For “expert” regular partnerships they need to resolve the situations in some detail. Sitting down with a stranger, however, one needs simple rules of thumb. For example, when responding to an overcall, one style I have found reasonably effective is to say that a Minor response to a Major is running, with a singleton at most in the major. Nevertheless, the bidder must take responsibility for any disaster.

Whereas, a Major response to a Minor is constructive with hidden Minor support, say 3+ cards, seeking a better scoring contract, not necessarily game. The unassuming cue-bid simply asks whether overcaller's bid was worth a proper opening bid, and although initially implying a fit, does not guarantee it. This latter bid can be the best way forward when game is a possibility. A side effect of this simplicity is that all direct raises of overcalls are strictly limit bids and may be pre-emptive.

PS I was flattered by the plug for the Roseman Club. If any one is interested I have a book about the style. It developed from the 2006 revision of the EBU Orange Book, being a simple artificial system playable at level 3. It may appeal to those who already play 5-card Majors and a strong No Trump, although to describe the Roseman Club in such terms would be misleading.

Tollemache

The Tollemache is the inter-county teams of eight competition. Despite one of our team turning up at the wrong venue, Worcestershire managed a respectable mid-table finish in qualifying. The final qualifying table looked like this:

1st Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire 98
2nd Surrey 86
3rd London 83
4th Worcestershire 76
Richard Jephcott, John Sansom, Nick Forward, Steve Allerston, John Yuill, Stewart Fishburne, Mike Theelke, Grahame Weir
5th Berkshire & Buckinghamshire 70
6th Northamptonshire 54.5
7th Bedfordshire 50
8th Nottinghamshire 42
possible contracts at this stage could be 5/6♣ or (3)4/5/(6)♦ or 4♥ or an unlikely 3NT.

Jimmy: 2♣; FSF – I want to be in game; either 3NT or 5♣ or partner could have 6 hearts.

Mike: 2♣; 3♣ would be forward going but not forcing. 4♣ would express the hand reasonably well but would not be forcing, so I’ll bid 2♣ on the way to 4♣ so that I create a forcing situation if partner shows any enthusiasm at all and also so that I find out more about the hand. Any hand opposite with three aces and some kind of extras in a red suit opposite should give me play for slam; on the other hand, if he has slow values in the other suits and responds 2NT, 3NT could be the best spot (especially at pairs, I don’t want to play in 5♠). e.g. ♥JQTx, ♠KJxx, ♦Axx, ♣x

Whether 4♣ is forcing or not would seem to be a matter of debate judging by Stewart’s response:

Stewart: 4♣; Even at pairs it must be right to try for a slam, given our one-loser 7 card suit, a singleton and useful cards in both of partners suits. As 3♠ is only constructive and not forcing, 4♣ is natural and forcing. It would be nice to have the arrangement that it sets the suit and is Roman Key Card Blackwood (RKCB) in clubs, and if you have that agreement it will work well here (taking a slight risk on partner having neither the Ace nor King in hearts). If not you will have to rely on cue-bids.

Taking a more pessimistic view:

Sue: 3♠; No choice really. The suit is good enough to bid again, and leaves space for partner’s 3♠ (FSF), 3♦ (5-5 or better) or 3NT rebid. My hand is not quite good enough to bid 3♠.

I think that 3♠ would be fine without the queen of hearts but this hand is a bit too good in my view for a non-forcing, although constructive, bid. Oh, and by the way, there is room to bid 2♣ and yes, there are other choices!!! Finally, on an uncharacteristically pessimistic note:

Grahame: 2♥; good chances to make, while 3♠ may drift off.

I think this is a gross underbid, HOWEVER I am surprised that more of the panel haven’t considered that hearts might be the right strain at pairs. Indeed, partner held ♥A10xx; ♥AJ10xx ♥void; and 4♥ proved very playable.

Hand 2

| ♠ A, 10, 9, 3 |
| ♥ 7 |
| ♦ K, J, 6, 4 |
| ♣ A, 8, 7, 6 |

Pairs – all vul

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1♣</td>
<td>1♠</td>
<td>2♥</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Votes: 3 for 2NT; 3 for 3♠.

Marks: 3♠ = 5; 2NT = 4.

The panel was completely split down the middle on this one with the arguments slightly favouring 3♠. A number of the panel felt that South should have passed as opener to avoid this problem:

John: 3♠; Ugh!!! Why open this hand – my hint for the day – pass a weak three suiter! So… you are faced with bidding 3♠ and hope partner is strong enough to give you a chance of bidding NTs or escape to a “fit” in diamonds to find the right spot – I fear disaster looms with a 3♥ bid from partner!

Sue: 2NT; This hand should not have been opened at this vulnerability, because the rebid is too difficult. If partner’s 2♥ is forcing then 2NT is the only remaining option.

Stewart: 3♠; The auction has started badly for us. The 1♥ overcall has cost us room in which to explore. Obviously my original plan was to rebid 1♠ over partner’s likely 1♥ response. But what to do now? The hand has “misfit” written all over it and such hands play badly, usually. So I must make every effort not to overbid. As 2NT would show 15-16, I have little option but to try 3♠. If partner is good enough to go for game he will no doubt try either 3♥ or 3♣ (FSF). I might just pass 3♥, but have an easy 3NT over 3♠.

Mike: 2NT; No doubt the general style is to treat 2♥ as Forcing for one round, so I have to bid 2NT (ugh!!!).

Grahame: 3♠; Can’t bid 2NT it’s too big a lie even for me!

Actually partner held ♥xx; ♥KJ10xx; ♥xx ♥KQxx so 3♠ proved a very playable spot whereas No Trumps was not at all attractive.

Hand 3

| ♠ K, 8 |
| ♥ A, K, 8, 6 |
| ♦ 5, 4 |
| ♣ 8, 7, 6, 5, 3 |

Pairs – E/W vul

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dble</td>
<td>2♠ Pass Pass</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Votes: 3 for Dble; 2 for 3♣; 1 for pass.

Marks: Dble = 5; 3♣ = 4; pass = 3.

Stewart: Dble; Who does this hand belong to? Partner has opened first in hand and I have 10 good HCPs, so I’m tempted to believe that it is ours. On the other hand they have the spade suit. But if they can make exactly 8 tricks in a presumed 8-card spade fit, it is virtually always right to remove them from it if, as here, we are non-vulnerable. Even one-off doubled would be cheaper than 110. And if they can’t make 2♠ we will probably be making 110 somewhere, so again leaving them in 2♠ will get us a bad board. The obvious way to do something is to double again. This is a “do something sensible, partner” double. I hope partner passes and we collect 200 or more. If it’s –670, that’s just the price one pays for competing at pairs.

On a similar wavelength:

Mike: Dble; This should be penalty orientated but partner shouldn’t expect me to have too much in the way of trumps so he should be prepared to pass or bid depending on his hand (the vulnerability suggests that he can even afford to bid and go off if necessary). I don’t subscribe to the view that all low level doubles should be takeout. At pairs, trying for the magic +200 is usually worthwhile, especially since +100 is likely to be a poor score.

Less penalty oriented however:

Jimmy: Dble; and play in what partner bids.

Not everyone though feels comfortable with trying for a possible penalty;

Grahame: 3♣; Must compete here; can’t double without diamonds – we might get too high.

John: 3♣; you are not good enough to bid NT as partner is reluctant to bid, and should/will not have 4 Hearts so 3♣ could well win the auction.

One panelist decided that to bid again would court disaster.

Sue: Pass; We do not have a fit. My hand is not strong enough to double or bid 2NT.

Partner’s hand was ♠x; ♥xxx; ♦AKxxxx ♣Axx so the doublers were likely to get lucky if the spade Ace was well placed or if West had 3 diamonds. 3♣ or 3♦ were both reasonable contracts however.

Hand 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>♠, A, K, Q, 10, 7, 6, 4, 2</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♥ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ J, 10</td>
<td>2♠ Pass</td>
<td>3♣ Pass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣ A, K, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Votes: 3 for 3♣; 2 for 4NT; 1 for 4♠.

Marks: 3♣ = 5; 4NT = 4; 4♠ = 3; 3/4♥ = 2.

At last a good hand! – and what is more, partner has opened the bidding. Clearly we are going places but what is the best next step? Firstly the cue bid;

Sue: 4♠; We could be heading for 6♠, 6♦, or 6NT. One thing is for sure – he will not pass 4♠.

I have sympathy with the cue bid but it is not yet clear from partner’s point of view what strain we will be playing in. So how about fixing the suit?

Jimmy: 3♣; Need to convince partner that spades is the suit and want to know whether he has the Ace or King of diamonds.

Stewart: 3♣; It’s already clear that a small slam is going to be a likely make. But what about the grand? And in which suit, diamonds or spades? It’s difficult to find out. I think I’ll just bid 3♠ which sets the suit and requires partner to cue bid.

Even though, as you say, the hand may belong in diamonds!

Mike: 3♣; Tempting to bid 4♠ agreeing diamonds as trumps even though I intend to play in spades. However, I want to find out about partner’s red suits. Over 3NT, if that’s what he bids, I can bid 4♠ to start a cue bidding sequence. If he bids 4♣, I’m reasonably confident that he doesn’t have wasted values in hearts and does have sensible diamonds, so can bid 4♥. I can’t bid 4♠ as this would show a hand without the King of clubs. If anyone even mentions the possibility that 3♠ may be Non Forcing, I suggest they throw away their copy of Acol for Bright Beginners and seek out a copy of Snap for Dummies instead.

Easy Tiger! – it is game forcing given the jump to 2♠ over 1♣. Anyway, if we are going to play in spades why not ignore all this faffing about and just bid good old blackers?

John: 4NT; asking for key cards in diamonds – in a well tuned partnership I prefer to bid 3♥ (cue bid - showing agreement in diamonds) to see what partner
responds with a view to 6♠ or 6♦. NB In my regular partnership 3♦ here would show a good diamond suit plus reasonable hand BUT not liking Spades (at most small singleton in Spades) and possible slam interest. Readers might like to review what it means in their partnership.

Surely, John, at this stage the grand must still be well on the horizon!

Grahame: 4NT; Either with spades or diamonds agreed as the trump suit depending on partnership agreement. Either way, I'm looking for 6/7♠.

Partner opened ♠xx; ♥10xxxx; ♦AKQxxx ♣void, so 7 diamonds and 7 spades were both straightforward.

Hand 5

Pairs – love all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>♠</th>
<th>10, 8, 2</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♡</td>
<td>5, 3, 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2♥*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♣</td>
<td>A, K, 10, 5, 3</td>
<td>* weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Votes: 3 for 3♣; 1 for Pass; 1 for 2♠; 1 for 3♥.

Marks: 3♣ = 5; Pass/2♠ = 4; 3♥/Dble = 3.

On this hand partner had spades and double hit the jackpot, however as the panel make clear, if you double and partner does not have spades and inconveniently bids diamonds you are in trouble after a take-out double. Balanced against this is the fact that this is pairs and pass may also be the losing option. The majority opt for the workmanlike 3♣.

Jimmy: 3♣; If I double what do I do when partner bids 3♦? So I bid 3♣ (might miss a spade fit). Exactly!!

Mike: 3♣; I have to stick with what I did at the table. If I double I’m not strong enough to introduce spades if/when partner bids diamonds and, in any case, the three small hearts make this a poor hand. Therefore, I have to take a pragmatic view rather than try desperately to show the 4 cards in spades at any cost. Despite the fact that 4♠ was technically a better contract, I was happy enough with my pragmatic approach and writing 550 for 5♣ doubled in the plus column. Second choice 2♠, by the way!

Mike’s partner on the night also remembered the hand but would have bid differently:

Stewart: Pass; I remember this hand! Partner bid 3♣. This is definitely a stretch, but is the only possible positive action, as double with a singleton diamond is unacceptable. But would pass be better? I think it probably is. If my LHO is strong he has a penalty double available and if partner has a fair hand with a heart stop and Qx of clubs he will try 3NT and be disappointed to find I have only a 5-card suit. Better to pass for now and let partner protect in 4th seat if suitable. Sorry, Mike!

John has a partnership understanding which makes this hand easier to handle

John: 2♣; but it is a weak takeout promising only a 4 card spade suit.

Sue takes a more aggressive view:

Sue: 3♥; I want to get in on the action, so I will show partner that I have two places to play, and let him chose.

But does he know that one those places are clubs and spades – what happens if he bids 4♦?

Well done to Jimmy and Mike who both scored 24 with an identical set of answers. Stewart scored 23; John 22; Grahame 20 and Sue a few less! Many thanks again to the panel for their time and input.

Closed teams

With one exception, we are now at the semi-final stage, with the draw as follows:

Stewart Fishburne, Paul Hammond, Joyce Skelton, Arthur Williams vs Ian Thompson, John Turner, Mike Willoughby, Simon Harrison

Richard Jephcott, John Sansom, Mike Theelke, Grahame Weir vs David Thomas, Jimmy Ledger, Mel Downing, Alan Boyes, Ross Garratt

Seniors Congress

At the seniors congress, the B final was won by Dodo Georgevic and Arthur Williams.
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League Standings

The Worcestershire leagues are progressing well, and standings are currently as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division 1</th>
<th>Ply</th>
<th>Won</th>
<th>Drw</th>
<th>Lst</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acolices</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge at the ridge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striped tailed apes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split menaces</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grumpy old men</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great expectations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble rot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division 2</th>
<th>Ply</th>
<th>Won</th>
<th>Drw</th>
<th>Lst</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five are even better</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingle duos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banal bridge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Springs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beech babes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The weak twos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division 3</th>
<th>Ply</th>
<th>Won</th>
<th>Drw</th>
<th>Lst</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saints and sinners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plum crazy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magpies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo O'Barry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old peculiaris</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double faults</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division 4</th>
<th>Ply</th>
<th>Won</th>
<th>Drw</th>
<th>Lst</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromsgrove</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanbury chicks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tennis aces</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Fear</th>
<th>Ply</th>
<th>Won</th>
<th>Drw</th>
<th>Lst</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair deal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wordsley whatnots</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bandits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kniver dream team</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stourport slammers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newcomers</th>
<th>Ply</th>
<th>Won</th>
<th>Drw</th>
<th>Lst</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pirton pirates!</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ruffians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The unconventionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hoarse whisperers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Try Duplicate News

By Mike Theelke

The first of the new series of Try Duplicate sessions for recent learners and social bridge players took place at Worcester BC in early December, and eight pairs turned up to give it a go, which was as many as we had space for. After some initial nerves everyone enjoyed the evening, and most intend to come along again. The idea is to arrange these sessions in a variety of clubs, and that hopefully in due course a few pairs will feel confident – and welcome – enough to brave the main club duplicate.

Sessions are already booked for Malvern in January, and for Worcester and Malvern Hills in February. Players are asked to contact me before turning up so that I can arrange partners where required and ensure that each evening has at least the minimum six pairs needed to run.

If your club that would be interested in participating, please get in touch to chat about what is involved and book a date. If you are, or if you know, a player interested in trying the sessions, please contact me, either on 01684 897757, or by email at wcbatraining@sky.com

Try Duplicate result – Worcester, Dec 8th

1   Jill Piner and Jonathan Morton  64.58%
2=  Bill and Sue Ellis   57.29%
2=  Paul Lampit and Lorna Fellows  57.29%

(full result on Worcester BC website)

Autumn Congress

At the EBU Autumn Congress, Nick Forward, Steve Allerston, Sue Evans & Dennis Loynes finished fifth in the Burlington Cup.

Healey Cup

The Healey Cup is the the club teams of 4 championship for clubs from Worcestershire and Herefordshire. Eighteen teams took place, with the winners from Worcester triumphing by virtue of winning all their Swiss matches.

The results are overleaf.
This event was held at the RBL premises on Friday 17th December. 24 members had signed up and paid for the dinner and 23 attended despite the cold night and the threatening snow. Regrettably our Myra had been taken ill and was unable to make it but sent husband John to ensure that the Hunters were represented. We had expected several others to attend but, unfortunately, the Stourbridge Christmas Party was held on the same night and those with dual membership of the two clubs could clearly not attend both.

It is worth recording that the Club evenings before and after the Party were cancelled due to the weather and the traditional mince pie and free drink had to be postponed. We are all hoping that the mince pie will not again turn out to be delayed as badly as last year when it eventually became “stollen, simnel cake and a free drink”.

The dinner itself was most enjoyable, cooked and served by the RBL head chef, Sheila, and the staff. To them many thanks are owed for the quality of both the meal and the service.

Given that snow was indeed forecast it was decided that instead of playing a standard 21 board evening in order to give masterpoints we would instead play 15 boards of fun bridge which had the added advantage of establishing winners on the same night (no computerised bridgemates here) so that prizes could be awarded before we all headed home. So, congratulations to Chad, Linda and Eric.

Heading home, as the snowflakes danced in the headlights, we decided to keep our fingers crossed and hope that we didn't clash with Stourbridge in 2011.

Worcester B. C.
http://www.bridgewebs.com/worcester/

At Worcester BC, the Teams Championship was won by John Sansom, Richard Jephcott, David Thomas and Nick Forward, with a huge score of 100 IMPs; in 2nd place, a mere 65 IMPs behind them, were Dick Rutter, Mike Vetch, Jane Rutter and Tim Keates.
Grand Prix Teams

After the two heats of the Grand Prix teams competition the top ten in the standings for 10/11 are as follows:

1st  Worcester Grant (Sue Evans, Dennis Loynes, Jean & Jessie Newton, John Turner & Susan Sharp; Subs Richard Jephcott)  39
2nd= Unquote (Paul Hammond, Ken Carpenter, Sue Lane & Marian Wilcox)  35
2nd= Three Retirees and a Worker (Ross Garratt, Mel Downing, Joyce Skelton & Arthur Williams; Subs Nick Forward)  35
4th= Double Faults (James Taylor, Linda Wright, Angela Cowdry, David Horton & Peter Adams)  34
4th= Black Pears (Lyn Jackson, Paul Tapster, Ian & Georgina Lineker; Subs Mike Vetch, Robert Chilimonczyk, David Thomas)  34
6th  Polish Forcing Pass (Mike Vetch, Robert Chilimonczyk, Brett Welch & Clive Finney; Subs Lyn Jackson, Paul Tapster)  29
7th  Spam (Mike Heard, David Philpott, Peter Edwards, Alan Reid & Suzanne Griffin; Subs Jennifer Romer, Dieter Baer, Rob Blakeway)  27
8th= Moore’s Marauders (Veronica Enticknap, Ronnie Moore, Sue & Derrick Munday)  25
8th= Spadesbourne (Ian Argyle, Monica Parker, Will & Sylvia Parsons)  25
10th Norfolk and Chance (Linda & Tony Gervis, Stephanie Forward & Judith Little; Subs Barbara Griffiths & Eric Martin)  23

The top 2 in the slam competition are:

1st  Sue Evans & Dennis Loynes  7
2nd  Richard Jephcott & John Sansom  4

rubber bridge section

Rubber Bridge Rd 3

David Wilkes & Alan Pardoe (Bromsgrove) vs Vic & Vilma McLouglin (Lickey)

Mary Wightman & Diana Larkham (Blackwell) vs Ann & Tony Ball (Redditch)

Ann Ball & Sandra Cruickshank (Redditch) vs John & James Dow (Astwood Bank)

Paul Slater & Martin Gill Webheath vs Jean Towler & Joy Overton (Marlbrook)

Keith Collins & Mike Power (Bromsgrove) vs Chris Kirby & Patrick Eckersley (Rowney Green)

Mollie Haines & Angela Adams (Blackwell) vs Claire Maiden & Gel Clarke (Elmley Lovett)

Honor Craig & David Moody (Droitwich) vs Jennifer Romer & Marian Walters (Kempsey)

David & Malley Terry (Droitwich) vs Laureen & Alan Moyse (Omersley)

Bruce & Rosie Carter (Droitwich) vs Linda Symonds & Anne Parker (Hartlebury)

Trish Mann & Sally Kelly (Worcester) vs Jennifer Romer & Heather Westcott (Kempsey)

John Turner & Jessie Newton (Worcester) vs Martin Hills & Glen Thorney (Worcester)

James Spence & Marjorie Westwood (Severn Stoke) vs Lillie Taylor & Doris Newman (Evesham)

Alan Reid & Mike Vetch (Barbourne) vs Jane Bayliss & Ann Cole (Severn Stoke)

Ron & Chris Bailey (Kinver) vs Allan Knowles & Cliff Gammon (Pedmore)

Rosalind Dace & Rosemary Brice (Hagley) vs Wendy Packwood & Maggie Ferris (Clent)

Anita & Terry Acton (Bewdley) vs Colin Clarke & Betty Humphreys (Stourbridge)

Malvern Bridge Club

The results of the 2010 season are:

Mens Pairs - Geoffrey Herbert & John O’Loghlen
Ladies Pairs - Glynis Coy & Janet Holder
Mixed Pairs - Jane & Dick Rutter
Championship Pairs Averages - Jane & Dick Rutter
Championship Pairs Playoff - Sue Lane & Paul Hammond
Individual Averages - Maurice Curtis
Handicap High Score - Maurice Curtis
Improvers Champion - Glynis Coy
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