

Notts News

Newsletter of the Nottinghamshire Chess Association

2005–06 No. 19 21 January 2006

<http://www.nottschess.org/>

nottsnews@nottschess.org

County U150 Championship: Notts – Greater Manchester

Neil Graham

This match ended in an 8–8 draw, although with three games to go Notts were leading by 7½–5½. However, time and the Laws of Chess conspired to prevent a Nottinghamshire victory. The match was notable for a high percentage of draws, some more hard-fought than others. Steve Hunter was the only Notts loser until the last three games. There were wins for David Toms, with a discovered check that forced mate, Phil Morgan, who won a piece, and Keith Roper, who comprehensively outmanoeuvred his opponent. With three games to go the score stood at 7½–5½.

At this point Tony Wright made a claim under Law 9.2, but unfortunately executed the move on the board. He therefore lost the right to claim under Law 9.4 – see the separate article about this law. His opponent refused to accept a draw proffered under the normal rules, and although Tony at first thought he had a perpetual check this proved incorrect and he eventually lost. Score: 7½–6½.

Then Keith Walters, who had been a pawn down for some time, found his opponent able to exchange rooks to leave Notts with a lost pawn ending. Score: 7½–7½.

Dave Flynn struggled past the first time control with seconds to spare. The match suddenly depended on his game. Dave firstly equalised and then won pawns in a queen and pawn ending and was two pawns up. If Dave had had 15 minutes left, I'm sure he'd have won – unfortunately he had closer to 15 seconds. The Manchester player took a perpetual check and the match was all square: score 8–8.

With four matches to play the final results are absolutely unpredictable. The only two things I can be certain of are

- Notts lose their Midland Championship (as we cannot overhaul Warwicks who beat us)
- Whatever the results on 11 February, when Notts have the bye, the zone will not be settled until 18 March.

I have already worked out 21 different match scores after 18 March, and no doubt there are several more. Staffs, who have 0/4, could still qualify if they win their final two matches; the most unlikely scenario is that Staffs lose their last two matches and the other four teams finish in a quadruple tie on five points!

At present the standings are:

	P	W	D	L	Pts
Warwicks	3	2	1	0	5
Notts	3	1	1	1	3
Leics	2	1	0	1	2
G. Manchester	2	0	2	0	2
Staffs	2	0	0	2	0

Nottinghamshire U150 – Greater Manchester U150 14 January 2006

Board		Grade		Grade
1	Brian Hayward	148	½–½	Adam Tyton 148
2	Keith Brameld	142	½–½	Mick Norris 146
3	Keith Walters	140	0–1	Richard Glover 143
4	Steve Hunter	140	0–1	Marcial Flores 141
5	Kevin Harvey	138	½–½	Jon Lonsdale 139
6	Dave Flynn	137	½–½	Ghassan Ele Gehani 138
7	John Tassi	137	½–½	Chris Jardine 137
8	Tony Wright	134	0–1	Michael Compston 129
9	Neil Graham	136	½–½	Jim Nicholson 134
10	Bill Ray	135	½–½	Alan Edwards 136
11	Stan Cranmer	132	½–½	David Pardoe 130
12	David Toms	131	1–0	Mick Connor 129
13	George Murfet	131	½–½	Alan Beresford 124
14	Phil Morgan	128	1–0	Robert Glover 109
15	Keith Roper	125	1–0	Mick Connolly 117
16	Marcel Taylor	126	½–½	Chris Murfin 109

8–8

County U100 Championship: Leics A – Notts

Leicestershire & Rutland A U100 – Nottinghamshire U100 14 January 2006

Board		Grade		Grade
1	Jeff Toon	98	0–1	Jonathan Day 99
2	Mike Thornton	96	0–1	Graham Gibson 99
3	Darren Poulacheris	92	0–1	David Dunne 99
4	Howard Walden	–	½–½	Oliver Exton 98
5	Richard Smith	98	0–1	Len Darby 97
6	Terry Clay	96	1–0	Eric Williamson 96
7	John Leonard	–	0–1	Ted Pynegar 96
8	Stewart Hollingworth	–	½–½	Len Morrell 89
9	Ray Walker	91	½–½	Peter G. Smith 87
10	George Winterton	85	0–1	Paul Todd 85
11	Stevan Preocanin	78	1–0	John Buttery 84
12	John Creasey	86	1–0	Hamzah Ali E75

4½–7½

The Laws of Chess: draw by repetition

Neil Graham

In a recent bulletin (No. 17) the League Secretary was advising us on how the laws should be applied in matches, and in the U150 match mentioned above we had one of the more obscure applications. Remember that you now cannot write down the moves in advance – Law (8.1) applies:

(8.1) In the course of play each player is required to record his own moves and those of his opponent in the correct manner, move after move, as clearly and legibly as possible, in the algebraic notation (Appendix E), on the 'scoresheet' prescribed for the competition. It is forbidden to write the moves in advance, unless the player is claiming a draw according to Article 9.2 or 9.3.

and now we note that there are two exceptions to this – namely 9.2 or 9.3:

(9.2) The game is drawn, upon a correct claim by the player having the move, when the same position, for at least the third time (not necessarily by a repetition of moves)

- a. is about to appear, if he first writes his move on his scoresheet and declares to the arbiter his intention to make this move, or
- b. has just appeared, and the player claiming the draw has the move.

(Article 9.3 is the 50 move rule, which doesn't concern us here.)

(9.4) If the player makes a move without having claimed the draw he loses the right to claim, as in Article 9.2 or 9.3, on that move

(9.5) If a player claims a draw as in Article 9.2 or 9.3, he shall immediately stop both clocks. He is not allowed to withdraw his claim.

- a. If the claim is found to be correct the game is immediately drawn.
- b. If the claim is found to be incorrect, the arbiter shall add three minutes to the opponent's remaining time. Additionally, if the claimant has more than two minutes on his clock the arbiter shall deduct half of the claimant's remaining time up to a maximum of three minutes. If the claimant has more than one minute, but less than two minutes, his remaining time shall be one minute. If the claimant has less than one minute, the arbiter shall make no adjustment to the claimant's clock. Then the game shall continue and the intended move must be made.

If you've read through that lot, the procedure if you're going to make a claim for a third repetition of the position is:

1. Write your proposed move on the scoresheet
2. Declare your intention to play the proposed move
3. Stop the clock
4. Check if the claim is correct
5. Follow the procedure at (9.5)

York Congress

Toby Thurgood (West Nottingham) and Anjali Lakhani (Long Eaton) both competed in the 19th Fulprint York Congress on 6–8 January. Both played in the Intermediate Section (130), scoring 3½ and 3 points out of five, respectively.

League results

Division 1

Gambit 1 – Newark 1					
1	Barnes, M.	(190)	1	– 0	Shutt, K. (159)
2	Mercs, P.	(172)	1	– 0	Ladds, G. (144)
3	Hayward, B.	(148)	1	– 0	Blake, R. (133)
4	Edwards, R.	(136)	0	– 1	Combie, A. (126)
5	Roper, K.	(125)	0	– 1	Aiton, K. (129)
			3	– 2	

Corrected result: Gambit Boards 3 and 4 were transposed

West Nottingham 1 – Mansfield 1					
1	Levens, D.	(155)	1	– 0	Tait, J. (194)
2	Nguyen, M. N.	(–)	1	– 0	Gilmore, S. (178)
3	Parmar, A.	(150)	0	– 1	Cantrill, C. (150)
4	Jarvis, D.	(153)	0	– 1	Foreman, S. (143)
5	Kingston, I.	(144)	0	– 1	Wagenbach, J. (133)
			2	– 3	

Gambit 2 – Gambit 1					
1	Sudar, D.	(131)	0	– 1	Barnes, M. (190)
2	Wright, A.	(134)	0	– 1	Mercs, P. (172)
3	Hunter, S.	(140)	0	– 1	Hayward, B. (148)
4	Carlton, A.	(121)	0	– 1	Roper, K. (125)
5	Edwards, R.	(136)	½	– ½	Fillingham, I. (103)
			½	– 4½	

Division 2

Bunkers 1 – Fiveways 1					
1	Harrison, J.	(153)	½	– ½	Flynn, D. (137)
2	Brameld, K.	(142)	½	– ½	Bhayat, S. (127)
3	Jennings, G.	(133)	1	– 0	Bowen, L. (106)
4	Harvey, K.	(138)	1	– 0	Thorsen, A. (104)
5	Radford, M.	(120)	1	– 0	Default (–)
			4	– 1	

Division 3

Fiveways 2 – Gambit 3					
1	Bowen, L.	(106)	½	– ½	Carlton, A. (121)
2	Thorsen, A.	(104)	0	– 1	Prescott, J. (102)
3	Griffiths, D.	(106)	1	– 0	Hopkinson, G. (106)
4	Dunne, D.	(99)	1	– 0	Fillingham, I. (103)
5	Porter, V.	(–)	0	– 1	Gibson, G. (99)
			2½	– 2½	

Nomads 2 – Bunkers 2					
1	Marriott, R.	(131)	½	– ½	Harvey, K. (138)
2	Troubridge, P.	(104)	0	– 1	Radford, M. (120)
3	Cronshaw, D.	(105)	½	– ½	Spencer, A. (106)
4	Darby, L.	(97)	1	– 0	Allen, P. (102)
5	Dawson, R.	(81)	½	– ½	Moore, M. (88)
			2½	– 2½	

Division 4

West Nottingham 4 – West Nottingham 3

1 Herbert, M.	(109)	1	– 0	Hinton, G.	(135)
2 Lin, D.	(104)	1	– 0	Willoughby, R.	(111)
3 Williamson, E.	(96)	0	– 1	Burley, P.	(115)
4 Needham, R.	(55)	½	– ½	Thurgood, T.	(105)
5 Needham, M.	(–)	0	– 1	Crawley, J.	(78)
2½ – 2½					

Gambit 4 – Nomads 3

1 Hobson, B.	(104)	0	– 1	Exton, O.	(98)
2 Gibson, G.	(99)	½	– ½	Darby, L.	(97)
3 Padviss, D.	(104)	0	– 1	Pynegar, T.	(96)
4 Groves, A.	(76)	1	– 0	Smith, P.	(87)
5 Downie, S.	(–)	1	– 0	Dawson, R.	(81)
2½ – 2½					

Bunkers 3 – Newark 2

1 Wilson, R.	(–)	0	– 1	Wollerton, G.	(132)
2 Radford, T.	(74)	½	– ½	Combie, A.	(126)
3 Chubb, A.	(66)	1	– 0	Hargreaves, M.	(84)
4 Frings, M.	(71)	½	– ½	Harper, G.	(78)
5 Blampied, D.	(66)	0	– 1	Fox, M.	(–)
2 – 3					

Radcliffe & Bingham 2 – Ashfield 5

1 Nailard, M.	(121)	1	– 0	McIntosh, S.	(96)
2 Redburn, B.	(95)	1	– 0	Wright, N.	(87)
3 Morrell, L.	(89)	½	– ½	Todd, P.	(85)
4 Morley, S.	(84)	1	– 0	Norris-Hunt, T.	(71)
5 Buttery, J.	(84)	1	– 0	Beeby, F.	(–)
4½ – ½					

Division 5

Long Eaton 2 – Gambit 5

1 Lakhani, A.	(101)	1	– 0	Fredericks, E.	(80)
2 Moss, R.	(79)	½	– ½	Heath, K.	(64)
3 Bentley, A.	(50)	0	– 1	Dutt, R.	(–)
4 Somers, M.	(–)	1	– 0	Gibbons, A.	(–)
2½ – 1½					

West Bridgford 2 – Long Eaton 3

1 Brown, A.	(89)	½	– ½	Bryce, W.	(71)
2 Milford, M.	(66)	0	– 1	Bentley, A.	(50)
3 Bradwell, F.	(73)	0	– 1	Somers, M.	(–)
4 Tys, S.	(68)	1	– 0	Clayton, S.	(12)
1½ – 2½					

Grantham 2 – Bunkers 4

1 Nelder, A.	(–)	1	– 0	Allen, P.	(102)
2 Cumbers, C.	(84)	0	– 1	Frings, M.	(71)
3 Allgood, R.	(83)	1	– 0	Parham, S.	(62)
4 Smith, R.	(–)	1	– 0	James, M.	(0)
3 – 1					

League tables

Division 1

Team	P	W	D	L	F	A	Df	Pn	Pt
1 Gambit 1	10	8	1	1	32½	17½	15	0	17
2 Mansfield 1	9	6	2	1	25½	19½	6	0	14
3 University 2	9	3	4	2	25½	19½	6	0	10
4 Ashfield 1	9	4	1	4	23	22	1	0	9
5 University 1	9	3	2	4	19½	25½	–6	0	8
6 Newark 1	9	3	1	5	21	24	–3	0	7
7 West Bridgford 1	9	1	4	4	19	26	–7	0	6
8 Gambit 2	9	1	3	5	18½	26½	–8	0	5
9 West Nottingham 1	9	3	0	6	20½	24½	–4	–2	4

Division 2

Team	P	W	D	L	F	A	Df	Pn	Pt
1 Bunkers 1	8	6	1	1	27½	12½	15	0	13
2 West Nottingham 2	8	6	1	1	25½	14½	11	0	13
3 Grantham 1	8	5	2	1	24½	15½	9	0	12
4 Ashfield 2	7	2	1	4	15½	19½	–4	0	5
5 Long Eaton 1	8	4	0	4	20½	19½	1	–4	4
6 Radcliffe & Bingham 1	7	1	2	4	14½	20½	–6	0	4
7 Fiveways 1	9	1	2	6	14½	30½	–16	0	4
8 Nomads 1	7	0	3	4	12½	22½	–10	0	3

Division 3

Team	P	W	D	L	F	A	Df	Pn	Pt
1 Ashfield 3	8	6	0	2	25½	14½	11	0	12
2 Gambit 3	9	5	2	2	24½	20½	4	0	12
3 Bunkers 2	8	4	3	1	24	16	8	0	11
4 Mansfield 2	7	3	2	2	19	16	3	0	8
5 Fiveways 2	7	2	3	2	16½	18½	–2	0	7
6 Nomads 2	9	1	3	5	17	28	–11	0	5
7 Ashfield 4	8	1	1	6	16	24	–8	0	3
8 University 3	6	1	2	3	12½	17½	–5	–2	2

Division 4

Team	P	W	D	L	F	A	Df	Pn	Pt
1 Newark 2	8	8	0	0	29	11	18	0	16
2 Radcliffe & Bingham 2	8	5	0	3	23½	16½	7	0	10
3 Ashfield 5	8	5	0	3	19½	20½	–1	0	10
4 West Nottingham 3	8	4	1	3	21½	18½	3	0	9
5 Gambit 4	8	2	3	3	19	21	–2	0	7
6 Nomads 3	8	2	2	4	19	21	–2	0	6
7 West Nottingham 4	8	2	1	5	15½	24½	–9	0	5
8 Bunkers 3	8	0	1	7	13	27	–14	0	1

Division 5

Team	P	W	D	L	F	A	Df	Pn	Pt
1 West Bridgford 2	9	7	1	1	25½	10½	15	0	15
2 Long Eaton 3	10	7	1	2	22	18	4	0	15
3 Grantham 2	10	5	1	4	22½	17½	5	0	11
4 University 4	8	5	0	3	17	15	2	0	10
5 Long Eaton 2	9	4	1	4	19	17	2	0	9
6 West Nottingham 5	8	3	1	4	15½	16½	–1	0	7
7 Bunkers 4	8	2	0	6	13	19	–6	0	4
8 Gambit 5	9	2	2	5	15	21	–6	–2	4
9 West Nottingham 6	9	1	1	7	10½	25½	–15	0	3