

## Match Report

### JTCC v. Lloyds TSB

Ever since the one day game was adopted into cricket there has been much debate, from the **Tanners'** bar to the Long Room bar, about its possible negative influence on the longer versions. Well given our performance on Sunday it would appear that the detractors are right.

This was our first Sunday game and as everybody was early and the weather exceptional the captains elected to play 40 overs per innings. For those not in the know that's twice our normal allowance and is essentially a completely different game. There's time to build an innings and you get to bowl more than two overs.

The Bankers won the toss and asked us to bat first. **Ron** and **Pat** opened the batting and after the first 10 overs had scored just 23 runs. This was due in part to some accurate bowling and that Ron had only scored 2. After the drinks break (because it was so hot even the umpires needed refreshment) Pat spanked a wide ball straight to mid on. If he had spanked it as hard as he spanked himself on the way back to the pavilion it would have been a 6. Ron then confided that he intended to bat for a very long time. He went on to make 37. Now for a dose of lies, damned lies and statistics because if Pat could have stayed with him he would have scored 398..... but it would have taken 185 overs. Or if Ron had kept scoring at his initial rate for 40 overs he would have scored 8. No wonder Pat felt the need to accelerate the run rate but with his dismissal our tail was exposed and there were still 29.5 overs to go.

....and the tail did not wag. There followed a display of 'hit out or get out' batting usually seen at the tail end of a 20:20 game. Only one batsman tried to block a delivery only to be bowled. I'll spare the indiscrete their indiscretions but let's just say that **Kevin** scored 25 and, rubbing salt into the wound, **Andrew**, a batsman who has improved many a bowlers' stats this year, was not out. From 40 overs we scored only 135 runs. Against Cuckfield Taverners we scored 132 of 20. Enough said?

There was nothing too embarrassing about our bowling and bar one over, Ron's, the fielding was very good (we have to take something from the game) Andrew showboated at square leg; Jos proved he can not only throw further than his father but most adults except Ian who throws like a howitzer propels a shell.

On that subject I have a question for you all (it's a bit boring cos it's technical). Ian was fielding at long leg/long on and we all remember how often he was involved in the fielding. How come Kevin who was equally stationary, i.e. didn't change fielding position with the overs, who was fielding diametrically opposite Ian, had so little to do? Kevin fielded the ball a handful of times to Ian's 3 times each over. Why? If it's the slope we ought to think more about our bowling.

Finally there were two JTCC players who excelled; both scored enough runs to retired and both took wickets. **Brian G** has scored runs in the past but not retired but **Geoff** rarely scores runs and has never retired. Unfortunately they were playing for the Bankers.

That Brian G not only denied Ron a hat trick but scored the winning runs at the same bowlers' expense leaves our Chairman of Selectors with a dilemma as awkward as Brian's next appearance for us.

It has since been muted that the batting order will be determined by the amount of runs scored in the previous match or innings. We means that these two turncoats, who should be banned to the Victory, get to open the batting for our next game.

**Sir Nial De Mencha**  
**Cricket Correspondent to the Jolly Tanners**

**Match Stats**

**JTCC lost to the Bankers.**

**Champagne Moments**

Ron's last over.

Jos's catch of a ball most adults would have left.

Dave outplaying his father, Phil, if you're Dave.

Pat hit a ball to the on side.....

**Beer Moment**

.....he wishes he hadn't.

Phil being outplayed by his son, Dave, if you're Phil.

**A VERSION OF THIS MAY APPEAR IN COMMON INTERESTS**  
**AN UMPIRE OF THE VANITIES PRODUCTION**