# State Teams Metropolitan Final 2016 <br> Of games and saves and penalties, of slams and singleton kings * by RAKESH KUMAR 



Rakesh Kumar describes himself as an enthusiastic nonexpert who makes enough errors to have plenty of material for bridge columns.

This year, the NSWBA ran the State Teams Metropolitan Final as a Congress, with teams that had qualified via their clubs plus direct-entry teams each competing for a spot in the State Final. The event was a 6 -round Swiss of 9-board matches using the decimalised VP scale. When the smoke cleared, GREEN (Murray Green, Helen Horwitz, Elizabeth Adams, Tony Nunn) had finished a massive 10 VPs clear of the second placed ABEL team (Julian Abel, Rakesh Kumar, Steven Bock, Kevin Davies) with GREWCOCK (Les Grewcock, Peter Jeffery, Bob Sebesfi, Richard Douglas) close behind.

Most of the day was really about not doing silly things, but there were also quite a few interesting hands. Two tested the proposition that "the 5-level belongs to the opponents". On this first board, with distributional hands it was clearly untrue: while East-West routinely headed in the direction of a $4 \boldsymbol{V}$ contract, NorthSouth just as routinely bid on to 4 . When they were allowed to play there, this turned out to be a cheap save, because not only is $4^{\top}$ cold, so is $5 \boldsymbol{}$.

Board 12
Dealer W I Vul N-S


However, only one pair successfully played in $5 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$. Two pairs decided to give partner an option and thus went on to make 5 (doubled on both occasions) without any real difficulty. Elsewhere, 5 East-West pairs were allowed to play in $4 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$, while about half the field was in $4 \boldsymbol{\text { b }}$ by North-South, going down.

This next board had the potential to be quite eventful. If West opens a mere $3 \boldsymbol{V}$ in first seat, it's no problem for South to double and for North to bid 44. Things get a bit more complicated, however, if West decides to go for broke with a $4 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$ opening. Now when South doubles and North bids $4 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$, East is very likely to raise to $5 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$.

Board 20
Dealer W I Vul All
\& AT94
$\checkmark$ KT

- QJ82
-983
- Q2
- AJ876542
- 63
\& 7

- 85
- Q93
- 75

AQT652
© KJ763
$\downarrow$

- AKT94
\& KJ4

| $W$ | $N$ | $E$ | $S$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3 H$ | $P$ | $P$ | $X$ |
| $P$ | $4 S$ |  |  |

Things get a bit more complicated if west decides to open 4 H

|  | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ | 4 | NT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 1 | 5 | - | 5 | 5 |
| S | 1 | 5 | - | 5 | 5 |
| E | - | - | 2 | - | - |
| W | - | - | 2 | - | - |

When that happened at our table, North continued to 54, which was also the final contract at another 4 tables. While this makes, it turns out that doubling $5 \checkmark$ for penalties is actually worth a fair bit more! Only a couple of pairs collected the +800 on offer.

The exciting last round included two glacially cold slams, but these "sure things" weren't always bid. Thus on board 19,7 bid to 64,13 did not, but everyone made 12 tricks. On board 26, again most didn't manage to bid slam, although 7 pairs reached $6 \mathbf{~ a n d}$ one even got to $7 \boldsymbol{s}$ and made it! How would you handle the bidding on these hands?


| $W$ | $N$ | $E$ | $S$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $P$ | $1 S$ |
| $P$ | $2 D$ | $P$ | $2 H$ |
| $P$ | $3 C!$ | $P$ | $3 S$ |
| $P$ | $4 N T$ | $P$ | $5 C$ |
| $P$ | $5 D$ | $P$ | $5 H$ |
| $P$ | $6 S$ |  |  |


|  | 2 | * | $\checkmark$ | $\pm$ | NT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | 3 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 5 |
| S | 3 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 5 |
| E | - | - | - | - | - |
| W | - | - | - | - | - |

One possible auction is $1 \mathbf{~ - ~} 2-3-3$ (fourth suit forcing) 3 (now showing 6-4)-4NT (RKCB). If North can discover that South has one keycard, the queen of spades and two outside kings then bidding 6 is easy and $7 \mathbf{~ i s}$ certainly worth thinking about.

The other 3 boards were might-have-been slam hands, all of which included a singleton $\geqslant \mathrm{K}$. On board 23, the singleton king was onside, so $6 \boldsymbol{\square}$ was cold, but only 2 reached the slam and both went down. On board 24 , once more 6 was makeable, but this time the singleton king was offside and had to be dropped: 3 bid the slam but only one made it. And then on board 27, a contract of was makeable, but again this depended on dropping the offside singleton $\geqslant \mathrm{K}$ and again only 1 out of 3 was successful. Here's the board, which was usually played in 3NT, as was the case at both tables in our match.


| W | N | E | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | P |
| 1D | P | 1H | P |
| 2NT | P | 3NT |  |

A contract of 6D was make-
able, depends on dropping the
singleton King of Hearts

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| N | - | - | - | - |
| S | - | - | - |  |
| E | - | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| W | - | 6 | 4 | 4 |

It can be a cruel game!

## Remarks.

* The subtitle is a play on the third and fourth lines of this stanza from the famous Lewis Carroll poem -
"The time has come," the Walrus said, "To talk of many things:
Of shoes--and ships--and sealing-wax--
Of cabbages--and kings--
And why the sea is boiling hot--
And whether pigs have wings."

