Four random deals to supplement David Bird's hands for VBlue, year 2. SA Version. Updated summer 2016.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | $P$ | $1 N T$ | $P$ |
| $3 N T$ | $P$ | $P$ | $P$ |


| Y2 VBlue \#5 Four General Hands SA | Contract: 3N |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: 03/07/2016 | By: East |
| Dealer: North | Board \#: 1 |
| Play this hand online! | Vulnerable: None |

Lead: $\vee 5$
Bidding.
East-West bid 1NT - 3NT and we have nothing to say on the South cards.

Play.
So... we are on lead against a confidently bid 3NT. What's the choice?

Well, this isn't really meant to be testing - when holding a five-card suit that's our usual port of call. So a Heart it is, and in many ways that is the important point of this deal. Lead a Heart and 3NT will fail. However, we must take a diversion here.

Which Heart we lead from such a holding is a matter of style and partnership agreement. Get two bridge players together and they can discuss this sensibly, arraign three or more and they will argue - forever and a day.

Many will always lead the "fourth-highest-of-the-longest-and-strongest" and would lead the $\vee 3$. Others would lead "top of nothing" (also known as "top of trash") and would place the v6 upon the green baize. The modern trend, though, which is gaining acceptance around the world, is to lead the "second highest from poor suits". In this case, that would be the $\geqslant 5$.

So, from a simple holding of 45432 there are three logical choices, according to partnership agreements. (In fact, there are even some players who would lead the $\vee 2$ - so make that four logical choices).

Why does it matter? In this hand, frankly, it doesn't matter at all. Not one jot. However, defenders have to try and send messages to each other to explain what they are doing. To distil this into simple terms isn't easy, but we'll try.

The lead of a low card (normally the fourthhighest) says "I have something here, this is a suit worth pursuing, please lead it back if we get the chance". The lead of the second highest card (F'rinstance the $\uparrow 7$ from $\uparrow 9753$ ) says "I have nothing in this suit. Lead it back only if you want to. If we can see a better line of defense, follow it".

Why not lead the "top of trash"? Well, experience (and some have even subjected this to large amounts of computer analysis) has shown that leading the $\uparrow 9$ from a holding of $\uparrow 9$ 753 can cost us a trick by wrecking the suit. Better to keep our powder dry in these cases. Thus, we keep the top card and lead the second highest. The mnemonic here, by the way, is to lead a Low card if we Like the suit and a High card if we Hate it.

So VuBridge will follow the modern style. We lead the top of sequences (when a suit is headed by a Ten or higher), the fourth-highest card from suits headed by honors and the second highest card from a suit headed by a Nine or lower.

Phew! Anyway, if we return to the deal in question you may recall that 3NT went off. How? By plugging away at the feeble-looking Heart suit at every available opportunity using the three Aces as entries to the long suit. At any stage it matters not which Heart we lead as long as we lead one.

Partner has nothing and is probably having a doze. Accordingly, we don't actually have to signal in Hearts to tell him anything. All he needs to know is the score, and that can wait until the end of the hand.
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| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | $1 N T$ | $P$ |
| $3 N T$ | $P$ | $P$ | $P$ |


| Y2 VBlue \#5 Four General Hands SA | Contract: 3N |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: 03/07/2016 | By: East |
| Dealer: East | Board \#: 2 |
| Play this hand online! | Vulnerable: N / S |

Lead: \& 5

## Bidding.

Once again, the opponents have a rapid sequence of 1NT - 3NT.

Play.
As in Hand 1 we are on lead against a confidently bid game, this time with utter garbage. What should we lead? On Hand 1 we made the point that when we hold a five-card suit that's our usual port of call. However, can that be right on this deal?

Previously (Hand 1) we had three cards of entry that allowed us to keep plugging away at Hearts and eventually establish two long cards in the suit. Here, though, what are our prospects? Sure, partner might have entries (he has to have some if 3NT is to be defeated!) and he can plug away with Heart leads but - and this is the crux of the matter - how on earth are we ever to gain the lead to cash the long Hearts when they are set up?

If we think this through we should realize that playing our long suit is pointless. Getting our Heart suit set up will do we no good at all as we can never gain the lead to cash it. So, then, how can we (never forget this is a partnership game!) garner in five defensive tricks?

The only way of establishing five tricks is if we locate partner's strength and lead his five-card suit. This way we (or rather, our partner) can keep plugging away in his suit and get that set up. So what is partner's suit? Well, it isn't Hearts, that's for sure! There is a three-way choice between Spades, Diamonds and Clubs. We have to guess which suit partner has and lead it. What to choose....? That is the question.

The straw in the wind is that the opponents are likely to look for a major-suit fit if they have got one. So dummy may well have a five-card minor but is unlikely to have a five-card major (or he would have bid it). Also, West (on our left) did not employ Stayman so is favorite not to have four Spades. A thin argument, maybe, but it is enough to sway us into leading a Spade rather than a Club or a Diamond.

In fact, on these hands many experienced players follow the guiding light of "when in doubt, lead a major". Leading a Heart, remember, is pointless (partner simply can't have those) so we choose a Spade. This strategy, by the way, is known as "playing for partner's hand".

After that we are (as is utterly predictable given the used tram-tickets that we were dealt) just a spectator to the battle between declarer and partner. However, the Spade lead gives our side the edge - partner can gather in three Spade tricks and two Aces before declarer can establish his ninth trick. On any other lead East has a cakewalk to his contract.

Now, which Spade do we lead from 45 2? Well, following the guidelines outlined in Hand 1 we start off with the $\uparrow 5$ (second highest from a poor suit). On the second round, interestingly, we should follow with the $\downarrow 6$. This sequence of plays from three small cards (lead the middle, follow upwards, and finally play the smallest) revels in the name of MUD (for Middle, Up Down).

Here, the precise sequence of our play in Spades is irrelevant (partner couldn't care less and probably didn't notice) but it is the customary way of telling our co-defender what we are doing. From four low cards we would lead the second highest and then follow with the lowest card. On some days that would be important.

www.vubridge.com
Four random deals to supplement David Bird's hands for VBlue, year 2. SA Version. Updated summer 2016.

| Y2 VBlue \#5 Four General Hands SA | Contract: 4H |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: 03/07/2016 | By: East |
| Dealer: South | Board \#: 3 |
| Play this hand online! | Vulnerable: E W W |

## North

- AQ863
- 752
- Q5
- K76

| West | N | East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - KJT | $0 \cdot 0$ | . 742 |
| - K4 | C | - AQJT98 |
| - AK82 | S | - T4 |
| * QT43 |  | - 49 |
|  | South |  |
|  | - 95 |  |
|  | - 63 |  |
|  | - J9763 |  |
|  | * J852 |  |

Another day, another deal, another poor hand.

Your target on this deal is to make four tricks - and where are they going to come from?

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | $P$ |
| 1NT | $P$ | $4 \vee$ | $P$ |
| $P$ | $P$ |  |  |

Lead: 9
Bidding.
We Pass with a collection of dross and West opens 1NT. With no further ado, East bids $4 \vee$.

Play.
Well, here we are on lead against $4 \vee$ reached rapidly by our opponents. What card do we select from this collection of rat-droppings?

We must think clearly here. Our target is four tricks - and we are not likely to take too many by ourselves. Partner will have to make a major contribution to our cause but it would be unreasonable for him to take all four defensive tricks. Might we make one trick to help the North-South cause?

When we have garbage like this it is often a good idea to lead a shortage - a singleton or a doubleton - in the hope of obtaining a ruff. Here, the $\$ 9$ works like a charm (note that we always lead the higher card from a doubleton) as North can play three rounds of Spades, giving us a ruff on the third round. Provided that we then sit there and don't fall off our chair our side will come to a Club trick in the ending for one down.

Now, a few important points.
Firstly, North can recognize our lead as being from a doubleton. How? Well, what else can it be from? We have led the $\uparrow 9$ and we would lead the second highest from a poor suit. (So, had we chosen to lead a Spade from, say, 97 5 we would not have led the 9 , we would have led the ©7). Partner, therefore, can see immediately that we have a Spade shortage and is able to play three rounds of Spades, secure in the knowledge that we will ruff the third round. As an aside, this is a trap that those partnerships that lead "top of trash" frequently fall into. How can they tell how many of the suit partner has? Don't ask us!

Secondly, players tend to overdo leads from doubletons (and singletons for that matter). It is fine when our hand is hopeless (as this one is) because there is room in our partner's hand for
him to hold key high cards. Here, we'd like North to hold the $\wedge$ K , although the $\uparrow A$ Q works just as well on this layout. Had our hand been better, though, our partner would have had no room for in his hand for these cards so the Spade lead would have proved less effective. It is a truism that the worse our hand is the better a shortage lead is.

Next, look at the Club layout on this hand. When we have taken our third defensive trick by ruffing the Spade return from North, the contract is "booked". We can afford to get off lead and wait for what is rightfully ours - there is no hurry to lead a Club. In fact, the suit is positively poisonous - if we were to lead a Club at trick four declarer could make $4 \vee$ by playing low from dummy. If we were to look carefully we'd see the look of reproach in partner's eyes before they glazed over and he played the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$, killing all hope for our side.

The technical term for this Club layout is that the suit is frozen. Whoever leads it first loses out by doing so. This is a constantly recurring theme in bridge.

Finally, East could have made life easy for his side by using a transfer bid. If he had responded $2 \diamond$ to 1 NT , and then raised $2 \vee$ to $4 \vee$, it is North who would have been on lead. $4 \vee$ by West is undefeatable. This is one of the advantages of transfer bids.


Four random deals to supplement David Bird's hands for VBlue, year 2. SA Version. Updated summer 2016.

| Y2 VBlue \#5 Four General Hands SA | Contract: 4S |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: 03/07/2016 | By: East |
| Dealer: West | Board \#: 4 |
| Play this hand online! | Vulnerable: All |

North

- 52
- T87642
- T5
- K63

| West | N | East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - T9 | $0 \cdot$ | - KQJ874 |
| - AQJ3 | W E | - K |
| - K643 | S | - Q82 |
| - 854 |  | - 472 |
|  | South |  |
|  | - A63 |  |
|  | - 95 |  |
|  | - AJ97 |  |
|  | - QJT9 |  |

Your hands are getting better.
Having beaten three game contracts in a row you need to beat the fourth to maintain a 100\% record.

Yet again it all hangs on the opening lead. Your go, maestro...

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $P$ | $P$ | $1 a$ | $P$ |
| 2. | $P$ | 3 | $P$ |
| 4a | $P$ | $P$ | $P$ |

Lead: $Q$
Bidding.
After two Passes East opens 14. West has just enough (10 points) to respond $2 \star$ and East, with an awkward, in-between sort of hand, chooses to show his strength with a jump to 3 .

As this bid is forcing, showing a good six-card suit, West raises his partner to game.

## Play.

Well, here we are again, on lead to 4a bid confidently by our opponents. What card do we select from this collection?

There are many players, trained robotically it has to be said, who would reach automatically for a Heart here. Such players always lead shortages, regardless of any other considerations. They have their successes but they have an awful lot of failures as well.

Let us be clear about this. We stated in the last hand: the worse our hand is the better a shortage lead is. Here, we hand is far too good to bother with a Heart lead. What is the point? Do you really think partner can have the vA K (or the $\vee A$ Q poised over the King)? We have 12 points and the opponents have sailed into game. Just what do we think partner is looking at? Yes, quite. Garbage. So the chances of us generating a Spade ruff by leading one are slim - round about the chance of us winning the lottery this weekend. Forget it - it won't happen.

We do, however, have a really attractive lead to make in the shape of our Club sequence. This type of lead (from a solid sequence) cannot open up a "frozen suit" and may pave the way to setting up a trick or two in our hands. Here, the ${ }^{2} Q$ works well - in fact it is devastating.

After a Club lead declarer is faced with four obvious losers (two Clubs, the $\downarrow$ A and the Ace of trumps), so has to do some dumping of those losers. With no obvious entry to dummy East is obliged to overtake the VK with the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and to try to throw the losing Clubs on the top Hearts. All would be well for East if Hearts were 4-4 or $5-3$ in our hands. Unluckily for declarer, Hearts
are 6-2 so we gain a cheap trick with the $₫ 3$.
Best defense now is to exit with a Club, nothing being gained by cashing the $\star$ A prematurely. Now, by sitting patiently, we come to two Diamond tricks and 4drifts quietly off.

Amusingly, you may note, we take a Heart ruff by not leading one.

Now there's irony for you.

