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# President's Message Sectional Report 

by Brett Kunín

As most of you are aware, the NJBL held 4 Sectionals annually prior to the pandemic. With the reduction in attendance, a very large playing area is no longer required, and we have found a "new home" at the Elks Club, 375 Old Post Road, in Edison, conveniently located only a few blocks from US Route 1.

For many years, the Fall ACBL North American Bridge Championships concluded on the Sunday after Thanksgiving, and our Unit held its Holiday Sectional on the first weekend in December, which was well attended. About seven years ago, the ACBL changed its schedule for the event, starting it a week earlier, and we moved our Sectional to the second weekend in December. The Elks Club holds its Christmas party as a benefit that weekend, and their hall was not available to us. We did attempt to hold a Holiday Sectional the third weekend, but being that's the weekend before Christmas, it was, not surprisingly, poorly attended, and a financial loss. At the NJBL Board meeting in March, the Board voted to discontinue the December Sectional. We initiated negotiations with the Elks Club and obtained a weekend in October, in lieu of December, which the Board approved by a unanimous vote.

Our next two Sectionals are July 28-30 and Mid-October (a firm date will be announced soon), which we hope you will attend.

# Wicked - That's All 

by Peter Wright

No other word for it. We're playing 4-way transfers with suit accept. We transfer Partner's opening 1NT to 3* using a 2 response or to using a 2 NT response. Opener accepts the indicated minor suit by bidding it, thereby promising a minimum of three cards including at least the Queen in that suit. Opener declines the transfer by bidding the intermediate denomination. The idea is to try to reach 3NT on a combined holding of 22-24 HCP when you have a 6 card minor suit and the NoTrumper - oops, can't say that - when the 1NT bidder has a fit for your long minor.

So Partner opens 1NT (15-17) and you're looking at ^A95 『 97 -J109854 K K2. Luckily, you and your new Partner discussed minor suit transfers before play began, so you're loaded for bear. You trot out 2NT and wait to see what Partner does. Out of Partner's box pops the 3e card: transfer to Diamonds not accepted, as per above agreement. Up to you now. 3NT? Can you imagine winning nine tricks in 3NT before the opponents win five or more tricks, given "no fit" with your Diamonds? Didn't seem at all likely to me. So I bid 3- (swish) and received the opening lead of the 4a, East playing the Jack.

I ducked the first Spade, hoping for a $3^{\text {rd }}$ round ruff in dummy. East/West would have done well to deprive me of that ruff by leading Diamonds at tricks \#2 and \#3, but West continued Spades, so I got my 3rd round Spade ruff. Now I had only two Diamond losers and made ten tricks for 130 . Seemed like a great result, since with a Spade lead from West likely against 3NT (if that had been our bid), the opponents should collect three Spades and two Diamonds before we can set up and run the Diamonds. And 2NT is worth only 120, vs 130 for ten tricks in Diamonds.

But Great Galloping Centipedes! When I get home and conjure up the hand record online, I discover that 3NT is undefeatable against a Spade lead or anything else! In 3NT, Declarer (North or South) can win the A at trick \#1 (or trick \#2 or \#3 - it doesn't matter) and lead a Diamond toward the King. East can take the $A$ and cash any remaining Spade(s), but looky here: East/West have three Spades and a Diamond so far, but Declarer now has a Spade, a Diamond, two Hearts,
and 5 Clubs for a total of NINE NINE NINE NINE Nine Nine nine nine nine.

Now isn't that wicked? To make those nine tricks, three out of three things all must happen:

1. The $A$ must be onside (chances are $50 \%$ )
2. Spades must break $4-4$ (less than $50 \%$ of $\# 1$ now the chances are about 22\%)
3. Clubs must break 3-3 (less than $50 \%$ of \#2-now the net chances are about 10\%)

Three pairs made ten tricks in either Diamond or Club contracts. Five pairs bid 3NT, two of whom found elegant lines of play to go down; the other three North/South 3NT overbidders made their wicked contracts!

Still, I'm not going to veer away from the suit accept approach based on this outrageous monstrosity. If I can tie for top board $90 \%$ of the time, that's good enough for me. And if Omar Wolff Kantar disagrees, he can go jump in the lake.

| DIr: N |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | ¢ A 95 |
|  | -97 |
| 8 | -J109854 |
| 510 | * K 2 |
| 17 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { QJ } 83 \\ & \bullet \text { Q1086 } \\ & \bullet 73 \\ & +763 \end{aligned}$ | -K764 |
|  | -532 |
|  | - A Q 6 |
|  | \$J 84 |
|  | -102 |
|  | - AKJ4 |
|  | -K2 |
|  | *AQ1095 |
| Double Dummy Makes ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| N/S: $4 * 4 * 3 * 3 N T$ E $N$ N: $\uparrow 3 / 2 \uparrow 2 \uparrow 4 \oplus 5$ NT4 |  |

# Winning Defense at Matchpoints 

## by Brett Kunin

You are playing at your local club, and two interesting hands arise. In first chair, sitting East, looking at KJ97 ४ AT4 * 72 AT86, you open 1*. LHO passes, Partner bids 1४, and with 2 small Diamonds, you elect to raise to $2 \vee$ (as with such strong Spades, it may advantageous to engineer a Diamond ruff in Dummy, and you do not wish to give the opponents the opportunity to find a Diamond fit, as is likely on the auction). After passes by LHO and Partner, RHO balances with $3 \uparrow$, all Pass, and you are on lead.

The balance by RHO provides useful information: his failure to double $2 \downarrow$ likely denies 3 Spades. Because of this, he should also have length in Clubs. Your conclusion is that $2 \downarrow$ was likely to be successful, and therefore, to salvage any Matchpoints, you must defeat $3 \star$, and cannot rely on passive defense. Backing your judgment, you lead the in the hope of getting Partner a ruff. A more than respectable Dummy appears: A83 75 J654 QJ97. All follow to trick 1, and at trick 2 you play the 6 (your lowest), asking for a Heart return, and Partner ruffs. Partner returns a Heart to your Ace, and you play the -10, demanding a Spade return. Your goal is achieved when the defense ultimately gets 2 Aces, 2 ruffs, and a Spade, and the time spent determining your defense is rewarded.

The bidding and full deal:

| You | LHO | Partner | RHO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 120 | Pass | $1 \stackrel{\square}{4}$ | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | Pass | 3 |

All Pass

| Dealer: You <br> Vul: NA | Partner (W) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - Q642 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J9862 |  |
|  | - 983 |  |
|  | - 5 |  |
| Dummy (S) |  | Declarer (N) |
| - A83 |  | - 105 |
| $\checkmark 75$ |  | - KQ3 |
| - J654 |  | - AKQ10 |
| - QJ97 |  | - K432 |
|  | You (E) |  |
|  | - KJ97 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A104 |  |
|  | - 72 |  |
|  | - A1086 |  |

It is important to note: (1) despite holding only 3 HCPs, with 9 cards in the majors and a stiff Club, Partner's aggressive call is correct; and (2) if Declarer (North) chooses to balance, 2NT, promising both minors, would have been a better call. 3e makes with careful play, playing me for the $\& 10$.

Because some chose to Pass with Partner's hand, the most common contracts were $2 \star$ or $3 \star$, with one North/South pair getting to, and making 3e, and 3 North/South pairs in NT. Only one East/West pair was permitted to play the cold contract of 2 of a major, and to your pleasant surprise, as North/South is making 2NT (even against best defense), you are the ONLY pair to beat $3 \star$, for ALL of the Matchpoints.

Two boards later, Partner passes in 1st chair, RHO and you Pass, and LHO opens 1\%. Partner overcalls 1 $\downarrow$, RHO bids 1 , and looking at $874 \vee$ QT8 A64 * A1076, you show Partner a limit raise by bidding 2\%. LHO passes, Partner bids $2 \star$, RHO bids $3 \boldsymbol{2}$, you compete to 3 (knowing it may not make), and LHO, with a difficult decision, chooses to bid 34, ending the auction.

| You | $\underline{\mathrm{LHO}}$ | Partner | RHO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -- | -- | Pass | Pass |
| Pass | 120 | 1 * | 19 |
| 2** | Pass | 2* | 30 |
| Pass | 34 | Pass | Pass |

Pass

* Limit raise in Diamonds

Your goal is to defeat the contract, and although the $\checkmark$ A may be the correct lead, I do detest leading from Ace empty. Note that the same reasoning on the last hand prevails on this one: Partner is again likely short in Clubs. You again lead the $\uparrow$ A, and Dummy is $\uparrow 953$ $\bullet$ AKJ7 Q52 Q83. Partner plays the \&J, and you play your smallest Club, requesting a Diamond return. Partner wins the eK and leads a small Diamond to your Ace, and you give Partner a Club ruff. Partner cashes the $\forall K$, and you defeat the contract by 1. That's 2 Diamonds, 2 Clubs, and a Club ruff. This is worth $85 \%$ of the Matchpoints. In this case, the lead of the $\star$ A would have also worked.

| Dealer: Partner <br> Vul: NA | $\frac{\text { Partner }}{\mathrm{J} 62}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark 653$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { KJ987 } \\ & \times \text { KJ } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Dummy |  | Declarer |
| - 953 |  | - AKQ10 |
| $\checkmark$ AKJ7 |  | $\checkmark 942$ |
| - Q52 |  | - 103 |
| - Q83 |  | - 9542 |
|  | You |  |
|  | - 874 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q108 |  |
|  | - A64 |  |
|  | - A1076 |  |

Of course, the opponents can take the first 6 tricks in the majors against our $3 \star$. The lesson here is that far too many try to outbid the opponents, bidding 3 over 3 without the requisite 9 card fit recommended by the Law of Total Tricks, and trade a plus score for a minus.

## Big Games <br> (Must be face-to-face to qualify)

## March 1, 2023 - May 31, 2023

|  | OPEN |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{8 1 . 3 7 \%}$ | Alexander Allen - Donna Dulet | Queen of Hearts DBC |
| $\mathbf{7 6 . 5 0 \%}$ | Peter Stein - Cho-Wei Sit | Summit Area Bridge |
| $\mathbf{7 5 . 3 8 \%}$ | Himanshu Joshi - Ashok Agarwala | Summit Area Bridge |
| $\mathbf{7 4 . 1 5 \%}$ | Robin Shamah - Rochelle Djmal | Queen of Hearts DBC |
| $\mathbf{7 3 . 3 3 \%}$ | Robert Brolin - Jeffrey Halle | Jersey Bridge Club |
| $\mathbf{7 2 . 5 0 \%}$ | Beau Norton - Marc Lipman | Stafford Bridge Club |
| $\mathbf{7 1 . 0 4 \%}$ | Himanshu Joshi - Dennis <br> Thompson | Summit Area Bridge |
| $\mathbf{7 1 . 0 0 \%}$ | Peter Stein - Donna Dulet | Monroe |
| $\mathbf{7 0 . 6 3 \%}$ | Virginia Disch - Wilhelmina | Summit Area Bridge |
| $\mathbf{7 0 . 5 4 \%}$ | Moyer |  |
| $\mathbf{7 0 . 4 3 \%}$ | Keau Norton - Bob DeRose | Stafford Bridge Club |
| $\mathbf{7 0 . 3 7 \%}$ | Larry Sklar - Warren Kaplan | Queen of Hearts DBC |
| $\mathbf{7 0 . 3 1 \%}$ | Robert Brolin - Rosalie Slutsky | Monroe |
| $\mathbf{7 0 . 2 4 \%}$ | Susan E G Slusky - Peter Wright | Bill's Bridge |
| $\mathbf{7 0 . 2 4 \%}$ | Om Singh - Cho-Wei Sit | Summit Area Bridge |
| $\mathbf{7 0 . 2 4 \%}$ | Beau Norton - Marc Lipman | Stafford Bridge Club |


| LIMITED/INVITATIONAL |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{7 6 . 6 4 \%}$ | Anne Haback - Donald Haback | Regency at Monroe |
| $\mathbf{7 2 . 2 2 \%}$ | Maryanne Curtin - Trudy Burke | Summit Area Bridge |
| $\mathbf{7 2 . 2 2 \%}$ | Denise Devine - B Carton | Rumson Bridge Club |
| $\mathbf{7 1 . 8 3 \%}$ | Gautam Desai - Maya Desai | Shadowfax |
| $\mathbf{7 1 . 7 6 \%}$ | James O'Hara - Pramod Khanna | NJBL Sectional |
| $\mathbf{7 1 . 6 7 \%}$ | Ruth Bronzan - Charles Clark | Bill's Bridge |
| $\mathbf{7 1 . 4 3 \%}$ | Hedda Lans - Susan Kappelman | Regency at Monroe |
| $\mathbf{7 0 . 8 3 \%}$ | Barbara Codispoti - -im McCarroll | Shadowfax |
| $\mathbf{7 0 . 0 0 \%}$ | Simone Vaccaro - Lois Gerber | Queen of Hearts DBC |
| $\mathbf{7 0 . 0 0 \%}$ | Kate Bergin - Simonne Vaccaro | Queen of Hearts DBC |

## Unit 140 Overall Winners at May Sectional in Edison

| Player | MPs earned |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jiang Gu | 26.87 |
| Stephen Arshan | 20.24 |
| Donna Dulet | 20.04 |
| Dennis Thompson | 19.78 |
| Peter Stein | 18.48 |
| Ronald Kraft | 16.85 |
| Himanshu Joshi | 11.14 |
| Arnold Kohn | 9.85 |
| Sam Borenstein | 9.48 |
| Steve Albin | 9.48 |
| Lawrence Lerner | 9.48 |

## Unit 140 Overall Winners at June Regional in Fairfield

| Player | MPs earned |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jiang Gu | 60.37 |
| Himanshu Joshi | 48.69 |
| Donna Dulet | 42.28 |
| Xiaowen Li | 39.33 |
| Dennis Thompson | 32.29 |
| Joan Brody | 30.26 |
| Steven Siegel | 22.26 |
| Ira Tarnow | 22.21 |
| Lawrence Gordon | 19.80 |
| Peter Stein | 19.31 |

## 3 Looks Around the Table By Ken Trock

Playing Matchpoints online, in 4th seat, white on red, you pick up:

- QJ765 『 A1075 -- K642.

It goes $1 \star$, Pass, $2 \downarrow$ (forcing), ?? Given these colors I think we should act, but with what? What's our goal, compete for a contract or get Partner off to an eventual lead against some number of Diamonds or NT? I decide on $2 \downarrow$, to which opener bids 3NT, ending the auction.

| $\frac{\text { LHO }}{1 *}$ | $\frac{\text { Partner }}{\text { Pass }}$ | $\frac{\text { RHO }}{2 *^{*}}$ | You <br> 3NT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

* Forcing

We'll look at the play of the hand 3 different ways, from ours, Declarer's, and Partner's. Here is it from our vantage point, playing 3 rd hand on opening lead.

Contract: 3NT
Opening lead: $\boldsymbol{~} \mathrm{A}$

> Dummy
> 103
> Q64
> AKJ42
> $\&$ Q53

You
QJ765

- A1075
- --
- K642

Ok, $\uparrow$ A, 3, 5 (encouraging), 2. Then $\uparrow 9,10$, J, 4.1 clear the suit, $\uparrow, \mathrm{K}, 8, \uparrow 4$. Declarer leads the $\uparrow 3$ to the Ace, and we have to discard. Partner and I are playing upside down discards, but l'm not sure Declarer knows this. Anyhow, since Declarer is likely to be much more involved in the rest of the play than Partner, I decide to try to hide my entry from Declarer. I play the $\boldsymbol{\vee}$, ostensibly discouraging.

So that was $3,10, \mathrm{~A}, \uparrow 7$. Then $\leqslant 3,2, \mathrm{~J}, 7$. From Declarer's hand Q, 6, 2, 5 , the "discouraging" Heart discard echo. Now $\uparrow 8,7, \mathrm{~K}, \vee 10$. Dummy’s 2 Diamonds are probably good. and almost for sure I'm squeezed. I decide to let go of clubs. $\downarrow$, $4,5,9$ and then 4, 6, v2, 10! Nooooooo!!! $\qquad$ (more on this later). I believe Declarer has us setup for the kill in Clubs. At trick 10, with 7 tricks in the bank, he leads a Heart off the board! I take the $\vee A$ and 2 Spades for down 1.

Here's a replay from Declarer's view.
Contract: 3NT
Opening lead: $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$

> Dummy
> 103
> Q64
> AKJ42
> $\&$ Q53

Declarer

- K42
$\bullet$ K92
- Q853
- AJ6

| Trick | Lead From | Cards |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | LHO | A, 3, 5 (encourages), 2 |
| 2. | LHO | ^9, 10, J, 4 |
| 3. | RHO | \&, K, 8, > 4 |
| 4. | Declarer | -3,10,A, 77 (discourages) |
| 5. | Dummy | *3, 2, J, 7 |
| 6. | Declarer | -Q, 6, 2, ૫5 |
| 7. | Declarer | -8, 7, K, ४10 |
| 8. | Dummy | - J, 4, 5, 9 |
| 9. | Dummy | -4, 6, ヶ2, -10 |

At this point, several Clubs have been discarded. If he's counting, only 2 remain out, with a decent chance his are now good. But l've hopefully put this idea in his head that I don't have the high Heart entry. From this
view my hand would be a little thin for a 2 call. Anyhow, he chose wrong and led the $\vee 6$ off Dummy.

One more time, from Partner's view.
Dummy

- 103
- Q64
- AKJ42
- Q53
$\frac{\text { Partner }}{1}$ A98
J83
10976
1097

I thought Declarer had a good idea of where the missing cards would be. Partner, not so much. He can't see where the missing Clubs are. So when I discourage Hearts at trick 4, he believes me and holds onto his, shedding the $\% 10$ at trick 9 . It could have and probably should have cost us the hand.

Going back to my own defense of the hand, given the bidding, the 10 HCP I held, and Partner already showing an Ace, it seemed he would no longer be a factor in the defense. That was not the case. If there's a takeaway from this hand for me, it would be that even though Partner has almost 0 HCP left after trick 1, their spot cards and length can still help stop a suit. It's usually better to give them honest carding.

Partner

- A98
- J83
- 10976
\& 1097

| Declarer | Dummy |
| :---: | :---: |
| ¢ K42 | - 103 |
| $\checkmark$ K92 | - Q64 |
| - Q853 | - AKJ42 |
| 2 AJ6 | ¢ Q53 |

You
QJ765
A1075
--
K642

## Fortuitous Finesse

## by Jay Korobow

## West Deals

None Vul


- 93
- A85432
- A8
$\therefore$ A Q 4

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | 3 N |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

Trump coups, squeezes, endplays, and such often make for an interesting bridge article, but here is a plain old dogfight for trick 9 in 3NT. Every suit has a compelling aspect, as does the timing, layout, and communication. The auction was also interesting in this BBO IMP pairs deal amongst reasonable players.

As a passed hand, North faced a rebid hurdle over South's $2 \downarrow$. Passing could be right, but also might miss a game, as well as a better trump (or No Trump) fit. Fortunately, $3 \star$ was non-forcing (as a passed hand), and was also forward going while suggesting a playable trump suit. Thus the $3 \star$ call was made, and the hurdle now passed to South.

Was Partner 5-5 (or 5-4 or 4-5?). Certainly there was at most one Heart to be found in the North hand, so it was really a choice between 3NT and passing, although the latter might conceivably be a 4-2 fit. The *AQ tenace as well as Bob Hamman's often sage advice ("bid 3NT when in doubt", or such) combined to make that the final contract, and now the hurdle was with West to find an optimum opening lead.

The unbid suit was of course an option, and several players also facing 3NT chose a Club, which gave Declarer an easy 9 tricks. While the $₫$ held some promise, it was also not without risk. Finally, the $\uparrow 6$ was chosen, and Declarer saw 8 tricks were assured, but the ninth would require a successful Club finesse. Or would it?

It would be nice to test an alternative or 2 before relying on the finesse, such as Hearts breaking 3-3 or the opponents breaking the Spade suit to Declarer's advantage. But communication (as is so often in the News these days) was far from ideal, as was keeping the Defenders from 5 tricks while going about the pursuit of 9 .

One example of the challenge was winning the first Diamond in Dummy to play a Heart to the Ace and another Heart. Then Declarer could win the next round of Diamonds in hand with the Ace to try Hearts again. A 3-3 Heart break - with the A as an entry - would score up 3NT, but what could go wrong? Well, Hearts could be 4-2, and the opponents might cash 3 Heart tricks, but that wasn't the real problem. Following the
defense cashing these Hearts (if they are 4-2), Declarer would now have 9 tricks (before their 5). That's 1 Club, 5 Diamonds, 2 Hearts, and 1 Spade. The real problem is if Declarer wins the first Diamond in Dummy and is thus down to the stiff Ace in hand, the opponents may find a timely Spade switch when in with the first Heart. Then all those nice cashable Diamonds in the entry-less Dummy are blocked from usage!

Declarer found a gem of a Diamond play at trick 1 to deal with this, the $\leqslant 9$ ! An unsuspecting East covered with the $\downarrow 10$, forcing the $\forall A$, and now the $\vee 8$ was an entry IF wanted, and IF safe: Declarer could give up the lead in Hearts, still getting back to the Diamonds in Dummy if the opponents played Spades. Or they could use the $\vee 8$ to get to hand to continue Hearts if the Spade Ace was left intact in Dummy.

So, at trick 2 Declarer, after winning the $\star$ A played a low Heart. West really didn't want to be on lead and wanted a Club switch thru, so let that pass to Partner's high Heart. East dutifully tracked the 28 , and due to Dummy's 9, Declarer was still able to defer the "real" finesse in that suit for the moment, playing low to this position:


Winning with the $\boldsymbol{j}$, West was back on lead yet again. Feeling uncertain about the location of the $\Delta \mathrm{K}$, they persevered with another Diamond. Still in possession of both black Aces so that either hand had a sure entry remaining, Declarer now enjoyed the fruits of the prescient Diamond play by winning this in hand with the $\vee$. Now the $\vee$ A and a third Heart was available as an option and was both safe and efficient.

Had Hearts broken 4-2, the opponents couldn't cash them all, since that leaves Declarer with 9 tricks (the $\checkmark 8$ then being good), while the defense enjoys only 3 Hearts and one Club. But "fortuitously" (sorry, couldn't resist), they were in fact divided 3-3, not 4-2. Now 9 tricks and a 3NT game without the benefit of a Club lead (or finesse) was there for the taking. And for a plus 6 IMPS, it indeed was taken for a gem of a result.

## Milestones

## Changes in Rank: March 2023 - May 2023

| $\left\lvert\,$Diamond Life Master  <br> Sam Borenstein West Orange <br>   <br> Gold Life Master  <br> Cho-Wei Sit WatchungRuby Life Master  <br> Joan Prezioso Red Bank <br>   <br> Silver Life Master  <br> James Campbell Tuckerton <br> Richard Graveman Morristown <br> Dennis Mondelli Barnegat Light <br> John Overdeck Short Hills <br> Jason Tokuda Livingston \right. |
| :--- |


| Bronze Life Master |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Cooki Gulkin | West Caldwell |
| Xiaowen Li | Jersey City |
| Howard Siegerman | North Caldwell |


| Life Master |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| John Gimblette | Lakewood |
| Lynn Goldberg | Morristown |
| Cooki Gulkin | West Caldwell |
| Anand Mhaskar | Succasunna |
| Mark Pessner | Cedar Grove |

Advanced NABC Master
Wendy Miller
Morristown

NABC Master

| Charles Clark | Skillman |
| :--- | :--- |
| Kim Gimblette | Lakewood |
| Rosalie Ginda | Somerset |
| Zhu Liu | Princeton |
| Joy Scally | Essex Falls |
| Marilyn Schultz | Warren |
| Kathryn Wagenseller | Somerset |


| Regional Master |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Kathleen Burke | Montclair |
| Robert Carroll | Lawrenceville |
| Susan Cort | Middletown |
| Gwen Coleman | Livingston |
| Robin Eastern | North Caldwell |
| Kirby Kanarek | Livingston |
| Jacqueline Lipper | Landing |
| Zhu Liu | Princeton |
| Elaine Robinson | Hoboken |
| Shashikant Sathaye | Warren |
| Gayle Sommer | Short Hills |
| Zuguang Tian | Kendall Park |
| Doug Weider | Keyport |


| Sectional Master |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| George Issacs | Boonton |
| Nancy Koppel | Livingston |
| Thomas Lewis | Watchung |
| Irene Madden | Summit |
| Joyce Michaelson | West Orange |
| Howard Rudd | Morristown |
| Jaime Serrano | Belleville |
| Frederick Shubert | Hackettstown |


| Club Master |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lois Bhatt | Madison |
| Eileen Elsas | Rumson |
| Marcia Geltman | Randolph |
| Gillian Levy | Lawrenceville |
| Ujwala Mulgaonkar | North Caldwell |
| Roby Weinreich | Summit |
| Xi Xing | Princeton |


| Junior Master |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Gautam Desai | Flanders |
| Joseph Eastern | North Caldwell |
| Fran Kraver | Livingston |
| Michael Meyer | Monroe |
| Marti Omberg | Westfield |
| Brian Suchoff | Livingston |
| Shelly Suchoff | Livingston |
| Elaine Wang | Princeton |

## REMEMBRANCES

The Board of Directors of the New Jersey Bridge League offer their condolences to the families and friends of the following members of the ACBL Unit 140. They will be missed at our bridge tables. We would like to remember all who support and participate in this great game. Please notify Julie Anderson at
of any deaths within our
membership; indicate, when known, dates of passing and club(s) attended.

## Sam Amer

d. April 4, 2023
bridge pro living in NYC

## Arthur Frank

d. March 30, 2023
frequent player at Princeton

John Hegedus
d. April, 2023
frequent player at Princeton

## Beverly Crane Dubee

d. April 4, 2023
frequent player at Princeton

## David Hagen

d. April 13, 2023
frequent player at Princeton
Irene Payne
d. June, 2023
frequent player at Monroe

