

BRADLEY D. BILLHIMER
Ocean County Prosecutor

ANTHONY U. CARRINGTON
Chief of Detectives



MICHAEL T. NOLAN, JR.
First Assistant Prosecutor

ROBERT J. ARMSTRONG
Deputy First Assistant Prosecutor

OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTOR
119 Hooper Avenue
P.O. Box 2191
Toms River, New Jersey 08754-2191
732-929-2027
www.OCPONJ.gov

March 8, 2024

Richard Hone
opra+request-58999-99bb7818@requests.opramachine.com

Re: Open Public Records Act (OPRA) request – Emails

Dear Mr. Hone:

This Office is in receipt of your request made under the New Jersey Open Public Records Act (OPRA). Enclosed please find the documents that are responsive to your request. Please be advised that personal identifying information has been redacted pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1, et seq. Please be further advised that emails consisting of intra-agency or inter-agency advisory, consultative or deliberative material have not been included as they are exempt from disclosure under OPRA, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1, et seq. Information consisting of references to criminal history records has been redacted pursuant to N.J.S.A. 52:1-32, N.J.S.A. 53:1-20.5 through N.J.S.A. 53:1-20.37 and N.J.A.C. 13:59-1.1 through N.J.A.C. 13:59-2.4. Information regarding medical, psychiatric or psychological history has been redacted pursuant to Executive Order No. 26 (McGreevey 2002). Additionally, various emails consisting of duplicates have not been included.

Should you disagree with our decision, please contact us in writing with your concerns so that we may consider them.

Yours very truly,
Dina R. Khajezadeh
Dina R. Khajezadeh
Assistant Prosecutor

DRK/dk
Enclosures

Khajezadeh, Dina

From: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 2, 2023 12:23 PM
To: Toscano, Taylor
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Richard Hone

I was looking at page 13 of his filing. If the Appellate Relief permits his Subpoena to go forward then there could be an issue the Court would need to address. .
Do I believe the Appellate will provide relief, highly unlikely, but even if there is a slight chance we need to consider the impact.
Just wanted to keep you informed.

On Thu, Feb 2, 2023 at 12:09 PM Toscano, Taylor <TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us> wrote:
Good morning,

I disagree. I briefly read the attachments and I don't see anything more than his usual bald accusations with no merit. I'd take no position if you wanted an adjournment of Monday, but I don't see how the family case would have an impact on the criminal case, and Vice versa. I am out of the office today and tomorrow, but available by email.

Have a great weekend!

Taylor

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 2, 2023 11:28:02 AM
To: Toscano, Taylor <TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Richard Hone

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use proper judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Taylor,
Richard Hone had his Appeal hearing regarding Judge Ford heard on 2/1/2023. Attached are his filings. A key point is the statement about 'conspiracy between Venable, Collins and Lynch Ford'. If the Appellate Court grants Mr. Hone some relief that could imply the criminal case was also subjected to a possible taint..
Should we wait for the Appellate decision?
I know a PDP is not in the cards but a DP with no jail time is his current counter. He has now weekly visitation with his child and will not give that up.

--
Andrew C. Hannwacker, Esq.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

--

Andrew C. Hannwacker, Esq.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

Khajezadeh, Dina

From: Toscano, Taylor <TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us>
Sent: Wednesday, February 1, 2023 8:49 AM
To: Andrew Hannwacker
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Richard Hone

I think we are at an impasse then. I will not be offering a PDP, or a 4th degree with fines only, so I'm not sure where Mr. Hone thinks this is going. Perhaps he can check with social services regarding a plea to a 4th to confirm housing.



Taylor Toscano
Assistant Prosecutor
119 Hooper Avenue P.O. Box 2191
Toms River, NJ 08754-2191
Phone: (732) 929-2027 Ext. 2741
Email: ttoscano@co.ocean.nj.us

Warning: This message is intended for the user of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, law enforcement sensitive, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by reply or by telephone (732)929-2027 Ext. 2741 and immediately delete this message and all of its attachments.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY - LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE

From: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2023 7:57 PM
To: Toscano, Taylor <TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Richard Hone

He has fulfilled his dream of having visitation and legal custody with his daughter. He will not jeopardize losing any time by any OCJ jail time.

And, as I follow the family case the alleged victim will never agree with you making any deal with the defendant. She is constantly throwing up roadblocks to the defendant having quality time with his daughter. Just look at the trip he made to Florida with [REDACTED]. The mother wanted to drop the child off at the departing terminal and pick her up at the return gate. Judge Grasso saw that as totally foolish.

Also, his housing is provided by Ocean Social Services and with a 4th degree charge he could lose his housing allowance.

On Tue, Jan 31, 2023 at 1:25 PM Toscano, Taylor <TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us> wrote:

Hi Mr. Hannwacker,

The issue with pleading to a DP contempt is that it would be his second, which would require a minimum 30 days in OCJ. If I were to counter, and only if the victim approves, I would require an indictable conviction based on his record. I'd likely require a plea to the 4th degree stalking with probation (term left to the judge's discretion) and you are welcome to argue for fines only. Again, I have not contacted the victim yet and would need her to be on board, but

wanted to run it by you to see if that is something you think your client would be open to or if he is only open to pleading to a DP.

Thanks,

Taylor



Taylor Toscano
Assistant Prosecutor
119 Hooper Avenue P.O. Box 2191
Toms River, NJ 08754-2191
Phone: (732) 929-2027 Ext. 2741
Email: ttoscano@co.ocean.nj.us

Warning: This message is intended for the user of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, law enforcement sensitive, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by reply or by telephone (732)929-2027 Ext. 2741 and immediately delete this message and all of its attachments.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY - LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE

From: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2023 2:53 PM
To: Toscano, Taylor <TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Richard Hone

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use proper judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

If he plead to the DP Contempt is it fines only?. He has been under the watchful eye of pre-trial services for a few years now with no violations.

We could close the book on this case.

He will have the opportunity to Appeal one of his Civil Filings against Judge Ford. On 2/1/2023 the Appellate Unit will be hearing Oral Arguments. That should be interesting.

--

Andrew C. Hannwacker, Esq.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

--

Andrew C. Hannwacker, Esq.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

ORDER PREPARED BY THE COURT

RICHARD HONE,

Plaintiff

v.



Defendant.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY

LAW DIVISION: CIVIL PART

ESSEX COUNTY

DOCKET NO. ESX-L-9485-21

CIVIL ACTION**Motion for Reconsideration****ORDER**

THIS MATTER came before the Court on two Motions for Reconsideration filed by Plaintiff Richard Hone regarding this Court's February 11, 2022 Order in the above-captioned matter, which grants Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint and denies Plaintiff's Cross Motion for Discovery, and this Court having considered the Motion Record, including the Assignment Judge of Ocean County's August 21 2020 Order under Docket No. OCN-L-1803-20, which places restraints on applications Plaintiff may file in the Superior Court of New Jersey pursuant to Rosenblum v. Borough of Closter, 333 N.J. Super. 385 (App. Div. 2000), and for good cause appearing,

IT IS ON this 4th day of March, 2022,

ORDERED:

1. This court will not recuse itself from issuing a decision on Plaintiff's Motions for Reconsideration;
2. Plaintiff's Motions for Reconsideration are **DENIED**;
3. Paragraph 3 of this court's February 11, 2022 Order is amended with the following instructions: Plaintiff is prohibited from filing any further pleadings, motions, or other applications in Essex County. If Plaintiff ignores this Court's decision and attempts to file another complaint in Essex County, the Court Clerk is instructed to refuse Plaintiff's complaint and not give the complaint a docket number. Instead, the Court Clerk will instruct Plaintiff to file the complaint in Ocean County, so the Assignment Judge of Ocean County may review it as to merit before litigation may commence;
4. The Court shall provide a copy of this Order to the Assignment Judge of Ocean County; and
5. This Order shall be served upon all parties within 7 days.

/s/ Sheila Venable

HON. SHEILA VENABLE, A.J.S.C.

Richard Hone, Ph# [REDACTED]
207 Carteret Ave.
Seaside Heights NJ 08751
[REDACTED]

RICHARD HONE
Plaintiff, Pro-Se

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
ESSEX COUNTY
LAW DIVISION

Docket No. L-9485-21

V.

CHANCERY MATTER
AMENDED CERTIFICATION for COMPLAINT
Oral Argument Requested 2-4-22

[REDACTED]
Defendant

I, Richard Hone, of full age, depose and say:

1. From approximately May 1, 2018 until December 1, 2019 **plaintiff resided at NSP, 168 Frontage Rd Newark, NJ 07114** Essex County at all times, therefore venue has clearly been established in Essex County. I realized my original filings did not give an address, just the County, now we have the county.
2. Citing NJ Court Rule R. 4:3-1 "In general, venue is proper in the county in which the cause of action arose". Essex County, again, is appropriate Venue.
3. Defendant has not filed an Answer, so an Amended Certification on the Complaint is permissible.
4. Defendant has not challenged Venue, I am simply making a clearer case, just in case the court wasn't clear exactly where in Essex County I was.
5. Citing and applying *Keeton v. Hustler Mag Inc.* 465 U.S. 770, 780 (1984) "Nor is specific jurisdiction defeated because the bulk of the harm occurred outside the forum", which is NOT the case here anyway. The bulk of the harm occurred while I was in Essex County. Also citing *Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz* 471 U.S. 462, 476 (1985) "Defendant(s) need not be in the forum State (in this case the County of Essex) while committing the alleged acts", and "A single act may satisfy the minimum contacts test if it creates a substantial connection with the forum". Both U.S. Supreme Court cases solidify my argument Essex County is Venue.

6. This amended certification shall serve to remove some of the claims that are Family matters (matters that relate to Unsupervised Parenting Time, the use of [REDACTED] Legal Name, and the Parenting Schedule that are not cognizable in the Law Division)

and I am Certifying that I am now going to confine (by this Amended Certification) this Lawsuit to:

- a.) \$1,000,000.00 in damages
- b.) Termination of the Custody Agreement
- c.) A new Custody Agreement within 10 days.

7. Plaintiff requests Oral Argument

I swear the above statements made by me are true. If any of the foregoing statements made by me are false, I am subject to punishment.

Richard Hone E-Signature

Richard Hone, Pro-Se- Father

01-25-22

Date:

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE COMMITTEE ON
OPINIONS**

RICHARD HONE V. [REDACTED]

ESX-L-9485-21

STATEMENT OF REASONS

This is the court's Opinion on the Motions for Reconsideration filed by Richard Hone ("Plaintiff") on February 11, 2022 and February 13, 2022. For reasons stated below, Plaintiff's Motions for Reconsideration are **DENIED**.

FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On August 21, 2020, the Hon. Marlene Lynch Ford, A.J.S.C. of Ocean County issued a Rosenblum Order in the matter bearing Docket No. OCN-L-1803-20. Judge Ford found that pursuant to the standard set forth in Rosenblum v. Borough of Closter, 333 N.J. Super. 385 (App. Div. 2000), Plaintiff must have restraints placed on his ability to pursue litigation in the Superior Court of New Jersey:

[I]t is required that any pending or future civil filings in any court vicinage throughout the Judiciary of the State of New Jersey shall first be reviewed as to merit by an Assignment Judge of the Superior Court, after the complaint is filed and is given a docket number, but before service is effectuated on any party, and that the Assignment Judge shall determine for good cause whether the filing should be dismissed as patently frivolous or non-meritorious, or whether it shall be permitted to proceed as a civil action complaint....

OCN-L-1803-20. August 21, 2020 Order. Judge Ford reasoned:

Richard Hone has filed at least fifty-seven civil complaints, most of which have been filed since the 2018 court year; that these complaints have been filed in the Ocean, Middlesex, Essex, Monmouth, Union, Burlington, Camden, Cumberland, Atlantic, Mercer court vicinages; that the office of the Attorney General, Division of Law, has been compelled to represent Superior Court Judges and other employees of the New Jersey Judiciary in these actions; that the OAG has been assigned representation in approximately 40 cases mostly filed since 2018; and that 24 of those cases were dismissed with prejudice and six were dismissed without prejudice; that Richard Hone is a serial filer of civil lawsuits, which unfairly

burdens the court system and which are even in a light viewed most favorable to the Plaintiff, Richard Hone, to be without merit and frivolous; that this court has been obligated to impose restraints upon Richard Hone due to his vulgar, insulting and inappropriate telephonic contacts with court staff; that it appears that the imposition of restraining orders have not been successful in curtailing Richard Hone's weaponizing the litigation process; and it further appearing that meaningful monetary sanctions cannot be imposed because of his indigency status....

Ibid.

On December 2, 2021, Plaintiff filed a Complaint against [REDACTED] ("Defendant") in Essex County, under Docket No. ESX-L-9485-21. In the Complaint, Plaintiff set forth allegations against Defendant concerning the Custodial Settlement Agreement between the Parties, as well as other issues involving their child. Plaintiff's prayer for relief includes termination of the custodial agreement, \$1,000,000 in damages, a new custody agreement, and immediate unsupervised parenting time.

On January 5, 2022, Defendant filed a Motion to Dismiss and stated that Plaintiff's Complaint was barred by Judge Ford's Rosenblum Order in the Ocean County matter, Docket No. OCN-L-1803-20. In addition, Plaintiff failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Defendant supplemented her Motion to Dismiss with Judge Ford's Letter Opinion to the Rosenblum Order.

In the Letter Opinion, Judge Ford summarized Plaintiff's history of vexatious litigation. An excerpt is provided below:

Richard Hone was a party to a family court action filed in the Monmouth vicinage. After an unfavorable ruling against Mr. Hone in that matter on October 13, 2017, Mr. Hone filed Hone v. Monmouth County Family Court, Docket No. MON-L-4009-17, wherein he named the Hon. Stephen Bernstein J.S.C., the County of Monmouth, the Hon. Kathleen Sheedy, J.S.C., and the Hon. James M. Newman J.M.C. as defendants. Mr. Hone filed four amended complaints to that action to include additional judges or employees of the Monmouth vicinage. The case was transferred to Middlesex County under docket No. MID-L-463-18, due to his filings against the Monmouth defendants. Between February 26, 2018 and May 29, 2018, Mr. Hone filed eight more amendments to this and other complaints.

On June 11, 2018, Deputy Attorney General Daveon Gilchrest, who was assigned to represent the state court defendants, filed a motion to dismiss Mr. Hone's complaint. Mr. Hone responded by filing four more amended complaints, naming Mr. Gilchrest as a defendant in one of them. Mr. Gilchrest filed a second motion to dismiss Mr. Hone's complaint on October 2, 2018. The Hon. Melvin Gelade, J.S.C. (Middlesex County) granted those motions to dismiss with prejudice on January 25, 2019.

Richard Hone was the defendant in family court matter venued in Ocean County, which alleged a violation of a restraining order. *State v. Hone*. After the case was scheduled several times for trial, and Mr. Hone did not appear, the court...found Mr. Hone to have violated the restraining order....

OCN-L-1803-20. Letter Opinion to Rosenblum Order. 2-3.

On February 11, 2022, this court issued an Order on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss and Plaintiff's Cross Motion for Discovery in the matter bearing Docket No. ESX-L-9485-21:

1. Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint is GRANTED, as Plaintiff failed to comply with the Rosenblum Order and had Defendant served with process prior to the Assignment Judge determining whether Plaintiff's Complaint was meritorious or not;
2. Plaintiff's Cross Motion for Discovery is DENIED;
3. If Richard Hone attempts to file any further complaints in Essex County, these complaints shall be transferred to Ocean County to be reviewed as to merit by the Assignment Judge of Ocean County before litigation may commence....

ESX-L-9485-21. February 11 2022 Order.

Displeased with this court's decision, Plaintiff filed two Motions for Reconsideration, as well as a Complaint against the Hon. Sheila Venable, A.J.S.C., her law clerk, and Judge Ford.

ANALYSIS

I. Introduction

A Rosenblum inquiry requires the Assignment Judge to balance a plaintiff's fundamental right to due process with the judiciary's obligation to manage vicinage cases with efficiency.

See Rosenblum, 333 N.J. Super. at 389-390 (citing Brown v. Grabowski, 922 F.2d 1097, 1113 (3d Cir. 1990)) ("the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment imposes upon state actors

an obligation to refrain from preventing individuals from obtaining access to the civil courts”); see Parish v. Parish, 412 N.J. Super. 39, 48-49 (App. Div. 2010) (“courts have the inherent authority, if not the obligation to control the filing of frivolous motions and to curtail ‘harassing and vexatious litigation’”); see also R. 1:33-4(a), (b), and (c) (outlining Assignment Judge responsibilities regarding the efficient and economic management of court matters and supervision of the courts). A Rosenblum Order will not serve as an absolute bar on a litigant’s right to file a complaint. Rather, it provides the Assignment Judge with the opportunity to assess the possible frivolity of a complaint before litigation commences.

To strike an appropriate balance between a litigant’s right to access the courts and the state’s interest in judicial economy, Rosenblum instructs the Assignment Judge to determine whether (1) a litigant’s prior applications reveal a pattern of frivolous litigation; (2) traditional sanctions were issued and failed to serve as a deterrent; and (3) the present application before the court is meritless. See Rosenblum, 333 N.J. Super. 387. If all three of these requirements are met, the Assignment Judge may issue a Rosenblum injunction against a litigant. See Pressler & Verniero, Current N.J. Court Rules, cmt. 2 on R. 1:48 (2021) (summarizing Rosenblum: “When traditional sanctions against frivolous litigation have failed to deter a litigant from his pattern of bringing repetitive, meritless and harassing actions, the Assignment Judge may enjoin the litigant’s bringing of a further action provided those findings are made and the judge determines from a review of the proffered pleading that it, too, is baseless”).

In the present matter, this court found that Plaintiff violated Judge Ford’s Rosenblum Order and the Complaint lacked merit. The Motion Record, which this court summarized in relevant parts above, shows that Plaintiff is a vexatious litigant that seeks to relitigate settled

issues and continue to file repetitious, and aggressive, applications in bad faith. Since Plaintiff has filed two Motions for Reconsideration, this court elaborates on its February 11, 2022 Order.

II. Legal Standard for Prong 3 Rosenblum Analysis

The Court Rules set forth the following criteria for an adequate pleading:

Except as may be more specifically provided by these rules in specific actions, a pleading which sets forth a claim for relief... shall contain a statement of the facts on which the claim is based, showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and a demand for judgment for the relief to which the pleader claims entitlement.

R. 4:5-2. “For the purpose of testing the sufficiency of a pleading, allegations of time and place are material and shall be considered like all other allegations of material matter.” R. 4:5-8(e).

“[N]o technical forms of pleading are required. [A] pleading[] shall be liberally construed in the interest of justice.” R. 4:5-7. “A complaint... is not required to spell out the legal theory upon which it is based.” Farese v. McGarry, 237 N.J. Super. 385, 390 (App. Div. 1989). “Because [a] pleading[] [is] primarily fact-based, the court may instruct the jury as to a legal theory not expressly alleged if all of the underlying facts have been pleaded and proved.” Teilhaber v. Green, 320 N.J. Super. 453 (App. Div. 1999). Further, a “complaint that omits a specific legal theory may be remedied at trial by showing the appropriate proofs for the omitted theory.” Id. at 466.

Nevertheless, a “pleading[] reciting mere conclusions without facts and reliance on subsequent discovery do[es] not justify a lawsuit.” Glass v. Suburban Restoration Co., 317 N.J. Super. 574, 582 (App. Div. 1998). Although “a complaint is entitled to liberal reading in determining its adequacy,” Pressler & Verniero, Current N.J. Court Rules, cmt. 1 on R. 4:5-2 (2021) (citing Van Dam Egg Co. v. Allendale Farms, Inc., 199 N.J. Super. 452 (App. Div. 1985),

“it is improper to assert a claim without any factual basis for that claim.” Glass, 317 N.J. Super. at 582.

The “test for determining the adequacy of a pleading is whether a cause of action is ‘suggested’ by the facts.” Printing Mart-Morristown v. Sharp Electronics Corp., 116 N.J. 739, 746 (1989). In the rare instance a court dismisses a complaint, it is generally “without prejudice to a plaintiff’s filing of an amended complaint.” Printing Mart-Morristown, 116 N.J. at 772. “But that does not mean that the allegations cannot be reviewed by the Assignment Judge with an understanding of the results of past litigation and similar allegations which have turned out to be frivolous, suggesting that the present complaint... may well be the same.” Rosenblum, 333 N.J. Super. at 391.

III. Plaintiff’s Motions for Reconsideration are DENIED, as this court still finds that Plaintiff violated Judge Ford’s Rosenblum Order and the present Complaint lacks merit.

Plaintiff cannot sue his way to a “yes.” The Motion Record and the face of the Complaint demonstrate that Plaintiff seeks to relitigate settled issues, harass Defendant, and wreak havoc on the Judiciary. After this court issued its February 11, 2022 Order, Plaintiff filed a separate Complaint against the Hon. Sheila Venable A.J.S.C., her law clerk, and Judge Ford in Essex County. The Essex County Clerk assigned the Complaint an Essex County docket number, ESX-L-1028-22, and transferred the matter to Ocean County for Judge Ford to review as to merit. The matter currently bears an Ocean County docket number, OCN-L-357-22.

This court will not be intimidated by Plaintiff's predictable pattern of vexatious litigation and abuse of the judicial process. Like several other Superior Court judges in the state, this court has been named in a lawsuit as a defendant. Plaintiff demands, as a matter of judicial ethics, that the court recuse itself from issuing a decision on the Motions for Reconsideration. Like Judge Ford, this court finds that Plaintiff "has repeatedly filed complaints against judges, then demanded recusal and transfer of venue." OCN-L-1803-20. Letter Opinion to Rosenblum Order. 3. This court refuses to recuse itself from issuing a decision on Plaintiff's Motions for Reconsideration, as it would "just repeat the cycle of a distorted litigation strategy used by [Plaintiff] in the many cases he has filed...." Id. 13. This court agrees with Judge Ford's recusal analysis in full and has affixed her Letter Opinion as Exhibit A to this decision.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's Motions for Reconsideration are **DENIED**. To reiterate this court's February 11, 2022 Order, Defendant's Motion to Dismiss is **GRANTED** and Plaintiff's Cross Motion for Discovery is **DENIED**. In addition, Plaintiff is prohibited from filing any further pleadings, motions, or other applications in Essex County. If Plaintiff ignores this court's decision and attempts to file another complaint in Essex County, the Essex County Clerk is instructed to refuse Plaintiff's complaint and not give the complaint a docket number. Instead, the Essex County Clerk will instruct Plaintiff to file the complaint in Ocean County, so the Assignment Judge of Ocean County may review it as to merit before litigation may commence.

Dated: March 4, 2022

/s/ Sheila Venable

HON. SHEILA VENABLE, A.J.S.C.

EXHIBIT A**Superior Court of New Jersey**

CHAMBERS OF
JUDGE MARLENE LYNCH FORD
ASSIGNMENT JUDGE



OCEAN COUNTY COURT HOUSE
P.O. BOX 2191
TOMS RIVER, N.J. 08754-2191
(732) 504-0700 ext. 64460

September 21, 2020

VIA EMAIL AND REGULAR MAIL

Richard Hone
c/o 24 Johnston Avenue
Brick, New Jersey 08724

Peter Sosinki, D.A.G.
State of New Jersey
Office of the Attorney General
25 Market Street
Trenton, NJ 08625

Re: In the Matter of Richard Hone
Docket No.: OCN-L-1803-20

Dear Mr. Hone and Mr. Sosinki:

This matter came before the court on August 21, 2020, the return date on a notice of motion filed by the court *sua sponte* why Richard Hone should not be determined to be a vexatious litigant and whether restraints should be imposed upon Mr. Hone due to his prolific filings in the Superior Court of New Jersey. This shall supplement the oral record set forth by the court on August 21, 2020.

Richard Hone has sued dozens of state entities and officials over the last three years. Attached to this supplemental opinion as Exhibit A is a recent listing of the civil cases filed by Mr.

Hone throughout the state of New Jersey. Exhibit B is a list provided by the Office of the Attorney General (OAG), which appeared in support of this application. The OAG has been required to defend various judges, judicial staff, state officers and other persons in approximately 40 cases filed during the past three years. Most of these complaints have been dismissed.

Richard Hone was a party to a family court action filed in the Monmouth vicinage. After an unfavorable ruling against Mr. Hone in that matter on October 13, 2017 Mr. Hone filed Hone v. Monmouth County Family Court, Docket No. MON-L-4009-17, wherein he named the Hon. Stephen Bernstein J.S.C., the County of Monmouth, the Hon. Kathleen Sheedy, J.S.C., and the Hon. James M. Newman J. M. C. as defendants. Mr. Hone filed four amended complaints to that action to include additional judges or employees of the Monmouth vicinage. The case was transferred to Middlesex County under Docket No. MID-L-463-18, due to his filings against the Monmouth defendants. Between February 26, 2018 and May 29, 2018, Mr. Hone filed eight more amendments to this and other complaints.

On June 11, 2018, Deputy Attorney General Daveon Gilchrest, who was assigned to represent the state court defendants, filed a motion to dismiss Mr. Hone's complaint. Mr. Hone responded by filing four more amended complaints, naming Mr. Gilchrest as a defendant in one of them. Mr. Gilchrest filed a second motion to dismiss Mr. Hone's complaint on October 2, 2018. The Hon. Melvin Gelade, J.S.C. (Middlesex County) granted those motions to dismiss with prejudice on January 25, 2019.

Richard Hone was the defendant in a family court matter venued in Ocean County, which alleged a violation of a restraining order. State v. Hone, After the case was scheduled several times for trial, and Mr. Hone did not appear, the court After the court found Mr. Hone to have violated the restraining order and Meanwhile, Mr. Hone filed Hone v. Ocean County Family Court,

Docket No. OCN-L-3018-17, wherein Mr. Hone named the Ocean County Family Court, the Ocean County Domestic Violence Unit, the then Family division manager, Joseph Sclama, Marlene Lynch Ford, A.J.S.C., former Ocean County Assistant Prosecutor Michael Paulhus, and the County of Ocean as defendants. Mr. Hone later filed two amended complaints, adding the Hon. Madelin Einbinder, P.J.Fam. Div. as a defendant. This case was transferred to Middlesex County under Docket No. MID-L-126-18 on January 8, 2018 where it was consolidated with Hone v. Monmouth County Family Court, Docket Nos. MID-L-126-18 and MID-L-463-18, respectively. Mr. Hone then filed another five amended pleadings between February 20, 2018 and April 26, 2018. Mr. Hone ultimately amended his pleadings more than twenty times and named at least twenty-three state entities, officers, and judges as defendants in these consolidated cases. The Hon. Melvin Gelade, J.S.C. dismissed complaints against the many defendants in these cases on January 25, 2019.¹

Mr. Hone also filed a lawsuit in Cumberland County on February 12, 2018, Hone v. Griffith, Docket No. CUM-L-124-18, against the State of New Jersey and others. DAG Adam Gibbons filed a motion to dismiss the complaint with prejudice, which was granted by the Hon. James R. Swift, J.S.C. on June 25, 2018. On May 1, 2018, Mr. Hone filed a complaint against the Hon. James R. Swift, J.S.C., the Hon. David Morgan, P.J.S.C., the Hon. Mark Cimino, J.S.C., and the Superior

¹ Here is the list of defendants from the matters consolidated under MID-L-463-18 and MID-L-126-18: the Superior Court of New Jersey, Monmouth Vicinage, the Hon. Stephen Bernstein, J.S.C.; the Superior Court of New Jersey, Ocean Vicinage, the State of New Jersey, the Hon. Kathleen Sheedy, J.S.C.; the Hon. James M. Newman, J.S.C.; Michelle Berman, Collette Schroeder, the Hon. Leslie-Ann Justus, J.S.C.; the Hon. Lisa Thornton, A.J.S.C.; Rosemarie Marinan Gabriel, the Hon. Paul Escandon, J.S.C., Deputy Attorney General Daveon Gilchrest; the Hon. Andrea Carter, J.S.C.; Michelle Tierney; the Hon. Michelle Applebee, J.S.C.; Erica Buczynski; Augustina Champion; Jessica Strugbenetti; Joseph Sclama, the Hon. Marlene Lynch Ford, A.J.S.C.; Assistant Prosecutor Michael Paulhus; the Hon. Madelin Einbinder, P.J.S.C.

Court of New Jersey for the Cumberland, Gloucester, and Salem Vicinages under Hone v. Swift, Docket No. CUM-L-318-18. This matter was transferred to Atlantic County under Docket No. ATL-983-18. Mr. Hone amended his complaint four times, naming DAG Adam Gibbons and the State of New Jersey as additional defendants. The Attorney General's Office filed a motion to dismiss that was granted by the Hon. Mary C. Siracusa, J.S.C. on March 8, 2019.

Mr. Hone filed another lawsuit in Cumberland County, naming the Cumberland County Civil Division Manager and the State of New Jersey as defendants. Docket No. CUM-L-776-18. This matter was also transferred to Atlantic County under Docket No. ATL-L-2840-18. Mr. Hone filed an amended complaint on December 31, 2018 naming the Hon. James R. Swift, J.S.C., Elizabeth Strom, and Angelita Dunn as additional defendants. DAG Bryan E. Lucas filed a motion to dismiss Mr. Hone's case with prejudice on January 24, 2019. Mr. Hone filed a motion to stay the case until forty-five days after Mr. Hone's release from confinement. The Hon. John C. Porto, J.S.C. denied Mr. Hone's motion to stay the case and granted Mr. Lucas' motion to dismiss with prejudice on May 31, 2018.

On October 16, 2018, Mr. Hone filed a lawsuit in Essex County, Docket No. ESX-L-7390-18 naming George O. Robinson, Anthony Gangi, Colleen King, Richard Vaca, the New Jersey Department of Corrections ("NJDOC"), Maurice Hicks, Esq. and the State of New Jersey as defendants. Mr. Hone amended his complaint three times between November 30, 2018 and December 6, 2018, naming more defendants, including the Hon. Marlene Lynch Ford, A.J.S.C. (Ocean). The Hon. Bahir Kamil, J.S.C. granted a motion to dismiss as to the Hon. Marlene Lynch Ford, A.J.S.C. on February 21, 2019. A motion to dismiss as to the other defendants was filed and was returnable April 12, 2019, however, the Hon. Bahir Kamil, J.S.C. granted Mr. Hone's motion to stay the matter for 180 days. This matter was ultimately dismissed by the court for lack of

prosecution on August 30, 2019.

Mr. Hone filed another lawsuit in Essex County captioned as Hone v. Gangi, ESX-L-5823-19 on July 23, 2019. Mr. Hone named Anthony Gangi, Colleen King, Richard Vaca, Patrick Nogan, and Marcus Hicks as defendants. This matter was dismissed without prejudice for lack of prosecution on February 21, 2020.

Mr. Hone filed yet another lawsuit in Essex County on September 30, 2019, captioned Hone v. Gangi, Docket No. ESX-L-7287-19, naming Anthony Gangi, George O. Robinson, Colleen King, Richard Vaca, Patrick Nogan, and Marcus Hicks as defendants. A notice of dismissal for lack of prosecution was issued on February 15, 2020.

On or about October 26, 2018, Mr. Hone filed a complaint in Mercer County naming the Hon. Glenn A. Grant, J.A.D., the State of New Jersey and the Administrative Office of the Courts as defendants. Hone v. Grant, Docket No. MER-L-2234-18. Mr. Hone filed an amended complaint on November 5, 2018, naming additional defendants including the Hon. Stephen Bernstein, J.S.C., the Hon. Kathleen Sheedy, J.S.C., the Hon. Lisa Thornton, A.J.S.C. and Colleen Schroeder. Mr. Hone filed a second amended complaint on January 7, 2019, followed by the Attorney General's Office filing a motion to dismiss on April 17, 2019. The Hon. William Anklowitz, J.S.C. heard the matter and granted the motion to dismiss with prejudice on May 1, 2019.

Mr. Hone filed another complaint in Mercer County on December 14, 2018, naming the Director of the New Jersey Division on Civil Rights, Rachel Apter, DAG Daveon Gilchrest, and the State of New Jersey as defendants. Docket No. MER-L-2594-18. DAG Bryan E. Lucas filed a motion to dismiss this complaint with prejudice. Mr. Hone then filed a motion to stay the case until forty-five days after his release from confinement. The Hon. William Anklowitz, J.S.C.

denied Mr. Hone's motion to stay the case and granted defendants' motion to dismiss with prejudice on May 1, 2019.

Mr. Hone filed an Action in Lieu of Prerogative Writ with an Order to Show Cause on December 13, 2018 in Monmouth County, naming the Monmouth County Family Court, the Hon. Stephen Bernstein, J.S.C., the Hon. Lisa Thornton, A.J.S.C., Colette Schroeder, and the State of New Jersey as defendants. Hone v. Monmouth County Family Court Docket No. MON L-4490-18. On December 21, 2018, the Hon. Joseph P. Quinn dismissed the complaint without prejudice sua sponte.

Mr. Hone filed another lawsuit in Monmouth County on January 17, 2019 naming the Hon. Lisa Thornton, A.J.S.C., the Hon. Stephen Bernstein, J.S.C., Lorien Cooper, and the State of New Jersey as defendants. Docket No. MON-L-365-19, Hone v. Thornton (Hone v. Thornton I). This matter was transferred to Middlesex County under Docket No. MID-4519-19 and was dismissed with prejudice by the Hon. Alberto Rivas on September 13, 2019. Similarly, Mr. Hone filed a complaint on March 12, 2019 in Monmouth County naming the Hon. Lisa Thornton, A.J.S.C., the Hon. Rosemarie G. Marinar, J.S.C., Lorien Cooper, DAG Daveon Gilchrest, DAG Bryan Lucas, and the Hon. Stephen Bernstein as defendants. Docket No. MON-L-941-19, Hone v. Thornton (Hone v. Thornton II). This matter was also transferred to Middlesex County, under Docket No. MID-L-4488-19 and was dismissed with prejudice.

Between the filing of Hone v. Thornton I and Hone v. Thornton II, Mr. Hone filed three more cases. Mr. Hone filed Hone v. Quinn, Docket No. MON-L-589-19 on January 23, 2019, naming the Hon. Joseph P. Quinn, P.J.S.C.; the Hon. Lisa A. Thornton, A.J.S.C., the Hon. Stephen Bernstein, J.S.C., Monmouth County Family Court, Monmouth County Civil Court, and the State of New Jersey as defendants. This matter was transferred to Middlesex County under

Docket No. MID-L-4529-19 and was dismissed with prejudice by the Hon. Alberto Rivas on August 28, 2019.

Second, Mr. Hone filed *Hone v. Gelade*, Docket No. MID-L-1190-19 on January 28, 2019, where the Hon. Melvin Gelade, J.S.C., Timothy McMahon, law clerk, and the State of New Jersey as defendants. This matter was dismissed with prejudice on September 6, 2019 by the Hon. Alberto Rivas, A.J.S.C.

Third, Mr. Hone filed *Hone v. Venezia*, Docket No. MID-L-1819-19 on February 22, 2019, wherein the Hon. Deborah J. Venezia, P.J.F.P., and Rachel Smith, law clerk, as defendants. This matter was dismissed with prejudice alongside Docket No. MID-L-1190-19 on September 6, 2019 by the Hon. Alberto Rivas, A.J.S.C.

On May 17, 2019, Mr. Hone filed an action entitled *Hone v. Rivas* Docket No. MID-L-3962-19, which was transferred to Union County on July 10, 2019. UNN-L-2472-19. This case named the Hon. Alberto Rivas, A.J.S.C., the Hon. Lisa Thornton, A.J.S.C., Hon. Stephen Bernstein, J.S.C., Kyle Locasio, and Colette Schroeder as defendants. This case was dismissed with prejudice on November 22, 2019.

Mr. Hone filed another action entitled *Hone v. Thornton*, Docket No. MON-L-3022-19 on August 14, 2019, naming the Hon. Lisa Thornton, A.J.S.C., No. 1 Law Clerk and No. 2 Law Clerk. This matter was transferred to Middlesex County under Docket No. MID-L-6206-19. This case was also dismissed with prejudice on November 22, 2019.

On January 3, 2020, Mr. Hone filed a lawsuit in Monmouth County with an Order to Show Cause under Docket No. MON-L-14-20. This matter names the Hon. Daniel Weiss, J.S.C. as defendant and was transferred to Burlington County under Docket No. BUR-L-47-20. Mr. Hone's Order to Show Cause was denied on February 19, 2020, but the case is otherwise

pending.

Mr. Hone also filed a lawsuit against ocean vicinage employee Steven Waters on January 24, 2020. Hone v. Waters, Docket No. OCN-L-326-20. This matter has been transferred to Burlington County under Docket No. BUR-L-689-20. DAG Kathryn Morris submitted a motion to dismiss on Mr. Waters' behalf that is pending. Mr. Hone also filed a lawsuit captioned Hone v. Wellerson Docket No. OCN-378-20 on January 31, 2020, naming the Hon. Craig Wellerson, P.J.Cv. that was transferred to Burlington County under Docket No. BUR-L-745-20 on March 13, 2020. A was considered by the court on May 14, 2020, and was dismissed with prejudice.

On March 10, 2020, Mr. Hone filed a complaint in Ocean County captioned as Hone v. Ford under Docket No. OCN-L-692-20, naming the Hon. Marlene Ford, A.J.S.C., Ocean County Prosecutor Bradley D. Billhimer, John Does 1-50 and Jane Does 1-50 as defendants. That matter has been transferred to Burlington County under Docket No. BUR-L-688-20 and is still pending.

Legal Analysis:

In Rosenblum v. Borough of Closter, 333 N.J. Super. 385 (App. Div. 2000) the court held an Assignment Judge can prevent the filing of a complaint, or issuance of a summons thereon, when the plaintiff's prior litigation demonstrates a pattern of frivolous pleadings and that traditional sanctions for frivolous litigation have not deterred the defendant from filing such claims. Rosenblum, 333 N.J. Super. 385 at 387. The Assignment Judge must also review all future complaints and be satisfied that they have no merit. Id.

Mr. Hone argued this court is without power to enjoin an alleged frivolous complaint because doing so would violate his constitutional and civil rights. There is no merit to this claim, since the courts have long recognized the rights to constrain and prevent

harassing litigation. See Gordon v. U.S. Dept. of Justice, 558 F. 2d 618 (1st Cir. 1977), "The law is well established that it is proper and necessary for an injunction to issue barring a party... from filing and processing frivolous and vexatious lawsuits." Id. See also, D'Amore v. D'Amore, 186 N.J. Super 525, 530 (App. Div. 1982) ("there is, of course, no question of the power of the Court to enjoin prospective harassing litigation.")

It is a core value as outlined explicitly in its Mission Statement for the New Jersey Judiciary to preserve the integrity of its proceedings. Frivolous litigation has a deleterious effect on the judicial system and the public interest which threatens the very quality of justice. [The Superior Court of New Jersey, Mission Statement and Statement of Core Values (2012), available at www.njcourts.org/mission.htm.]

Consistent with the Court's authority to prevent duplicative litigation filed in bad faith, the court in Kozak v. Kozak concluded that a litigant cannot exploit the judicial system to harass a party through the "...continued reassertion of issues and allegations after their determination... shows clearly an attitude that the litigant will use (or abuse) the judicial process until some trial judge 'gets it right' by deciding in his favor." 280 N.J. Super. 272, 278 (Ch. Div. 1994). In addition, the Kozak court held that, "(w)e cannot permit frivolous matters, sparked by a personal vendetta, to consume the attention and resources to the detriment of deserving litigants who wait for their legitimate motions to be heard." Id. Most obviously, frivolous pro se litigants absorb a considerable amount of judicial resources and cause and prolong the delay of adjudication of meritorious actions. Id. at 112. Several consequences of such delays have been identified. First, "(a)s caseloads increase, judges have less time to devote to each case," which "threatens the quality of justice." Id. at 113. Second, "long delays in adjudication create public dissatisfaction and frustration with the courts," which ultimately "breeds disrespect for the law." Id. at 113-

114. Third, unchecked abusive litigation prolongs harassment of defendants. *Id.* at 114. Fourth, “excessive litigation against certain individuals or groups of individuals may deny them fair access to the judicial process.” *Id.* These consequences demonstrate the judiciary’s strong interest in deterring and protecting against the burdens of repetitious, frivolous litigation. *Id.* The misuse of the judicial process was considered by the United States Supreme Court, which determined that in such circumstances, the courts can refuse to even allow the filing of the papers. *In re Deros*, 500 U.S. 16(1991); *In re Sindram*, 498 U.S. 177 (1991); *In re McDonald*, 489 U. S 180(1989); *In re Anderson*, 511 U. S. 364 (1994).

The 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees access to the courts, and to deny an indigent person access to courts without judicial review of the merits of his complaint violates the United States Constitution. U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1. However, in *Rosenblum*, the court established standards for the issuance of an injunction to prevent the repetitive filing of frivolous lawsuits which are consistent with the due process clause of the US Constitution, see *Rosenblum*, *infra* at 390. The court’s power must be exercised consistently with the fundamental right of public access to the courts to secure adjudication of claims on their merits. *Id.* at 396. A nonspecific and nondiscrete injunction against a prospective litigant is patently unsustainable. *Rosenblum*, 333 N.J.Super. 385 at 396.

The *Rosenblum* Court identified four (4) requirements that must be met before such an injunction can be issued. *Rosenblum* at 392-97. First, the Assignment Judge must evaluate “the volume and disposition of cases... before the plaintiff can be said to have filed only frivolous litigation.” *Id.* at 397. Second, the Assignment Judge must “give reasons for the conclusion that the complaints may not be filed.” *Id.* Third, the Assignment Judge must “be assured that more traditional sanctions will not protect against frivolous litigation.” *Id.* at 398; see N.J.S.A. 2A:15-

59.1; R. 1:4-8(d). Last, the Assignment Judge “must review the new complaint to be assured that a meritorious claim is not suppressed.” Rosenblum at 396.

Initially, this Court is charged with evaluating the volume and disposition of past cases filed by Mr. Hone, to determine whether they are frivolous. Rosenblum, at 397. Identifying an abuse of the judicial system is the most critical portion of the Rosenblum analysis. See *Stitch v. United States*, 773 F. Supp. 469, 470 (D.D.C. 1991). In Rosenblum 16 lawsuits were filed over the course of nine years and the appellate court ruled this was an insufficient volume for an injunction. In *Stich v. United States*, 773 F. Supp. 469, 471 (D.D.C. 1991), the Court found plaintiff there should be enjoined from filing any future suit without leave of court, where the plaintiff had filed more than thirty frivolous actions in the course of three years. In Mallon v. Padova, a pro se litigant filed eleven frivolous complaints against various defendants within the course of two weeks. 806 F. Supp. 1189, 1191-92. Recognizing that an injunction is an extreme remedy which must be narrowly tailored and sparingly used, the Court nonetheless found that an injunction was appropriate, “where the court is convinced that there is a substantial likelihood that frivolous lawsuits will continue... a district court is not required to sit idly by and allow a party to waste precious judicial resources.” *Id.* at 1194.

In evaluating the volume and disposition of past cases filed by Mr. Hone, the court notes that the Office of the Attorney General, Division of Law is commonly assigned the responsibility of defending judiciary officers and employees who are the subject of civil complaints. The exception is where the OAG for reasons of conflict or other reasons refers the defense to outside counsel. During the course of the past three years, the OAG has been obliged to represent defendants sued by Mr. Hone in approximately 40 cases. The defendants in these cases include judges, judicial secretaries, law clerks, administrative judicial staff and others, including attorneys, who handled Mr. Hone’s legal matters before the court. As of this date, 24 of those cases have been dismissed with prejudice,

and 6 were dismissed without prejudice. The remaining are still pending. Since the filing of this order to show cause on August 6, 2020, Mr. Hone has sued Judge Richard English (JSC, Monmouth) on August 12th; Ocean County assistant prosecutor Taylor Toscano on August 18th; Monmouth County Prosecutor Christopher Gramiccioni on August 12th; Assignment Judge Lisa Thornton on August 19th. Some of the docket entries may be duplications of the same filings, due to the fact that when venue is transferred a new docket number is assigned. However, clearly the filing of over 40 cases in a relatively short time period of three years, against judges who ruled on his cases or the unfortunate staff members who may have taken his calls, underscores that the volume and disposition history of the Hone cases meets the first prong of the Rosenblum test.

The second prong of the Rosenblum test requires the court to consider whether the imposition of traditional sanctions for frivolous litigation would deter the plaintiff from filing frivolous complaints. Mr. Hone appeared on the return date of this order to show cause, and participated by telephone since he did not have computer access. He was afforded the opportunity to address the issue before the court, but instead, among other things, threatened the court with prosecution and incarceration. Although the court views this as an empty threat, his conduct during the hearing is consistent with a finding that he has no respect for the judicial system, and that his primary purpose in becoming a serial litigator is to show further disrespect for the judiciary and to inflict harassment upon the targets of his frequent civil lawsuits. The Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees access to the courts, a right that is particularly important for the self-represented litigant. However, the exercise of that right presumes the litigant will pursue his or her claim in good faith. Mr. Hone has established a pattern of filing lawsuits against judges, law clerks, judiciary staff, prosecutors, deputy attorneys general, and even judicial secretaries. These filings are opportune for Mr. Hone to then make an application to recuse the court and to change

venue. The conduct of Mr. Hone when viewed in a light even most charitable to him clearly reflects of plan to manipulate the judicial process. Mr. Hone represents the type of litigant for whom a Rosenblum restraint is particularly appropriate. No sanction crafted by the court would be successful in deterring Mr. Hone from continuing his pattern and practice of filing repetitive, incomprehensible and meritless claims.

Mr. Hone's history of repetitious and frivolous filings indicates a clear intent to do so in bad faith, for purposes of harassment and not for purposes of adjudicating a legal right or claim.

With regard to any pending or future filings in the Superior Court of New Jersey, it is appropriate for each Assignment Judge to review the new complaint and to be assured that a meritorious claim is being presented. Legitimate claims of course should be permitted, even if a litigant otherwise has a history of abusive and vexatious litigation. If a matter is not permitted to be filed, the Assignment Judge must set forth reasons why the particular pleading does not vault the Rosenblum restraints.

Mr. Hone has also filed motions for recusal and for a change of venue in connection with this matter and presumptively any others before the court in Ocean County Vicinage. Like several other Superior Court Judges in the state, the court has likewise been named in four lawsuits as a defendant. Mr. Hone therefore demands, as a matter of judicial ethics, that the court recuse and send his cases to another county. If the court had any confidence in the fact that a transfer of venue and recusal was not part of Mr. Hone's actions to manipulate the judicial process, I would grant his motions. However, it is abundantly clear to the court that a transfer of venue to another court would just repeat the cycle of a distorted litigation strategy used by Mr. Hone in the many cases he has filed, especially during the past three years. Mr. Hone has repeatedly filed complaints against judges, then demanded recusal and transfer of venue. It is clear to the court that Mr. Hone's recusal requests and

venue change requests are intended not just to get a fair tribunal, but to assert revenge or harassment against judges who have ruled adverse to him.

The Code of Judicial Conduct requires a judge to disqualify themselves in proceedings where their impartiality or appearance of impartiality might reasonably be questioned. Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 3.17. The Code however also advises judges that disqualification is not mandatory even if the litigant has filed a judicial misconduct complaint or any other type of complaint against the judge. The process of judicial recusal must also consider the impact of recusal upon the workloads of other judges, as well as any other litigants. The comment following Rule 3.17 is particularly instructive:

“[1] Judges must be available to decide the matters that come before the court. Although there are times when disqualification is necessary to protect the rights of litigants and preserve public confidence in the independence, integrity and impartiality of the judiciary, unwarranted disqualification may bring public disfavor to the court and to the judge personally. The dignity of the court, the judge’s respect for fulfillment of judicial duties, and a proper concern for the burdens that may be imposed upon the judge’s colleagues require that a judge not use disqualification to avoid cases that present difficult, controversial or unpopular issues.”


The standard for disqualification is whether a reasonable, fully informed person would have doubts about the judge’s impartiality. In most cases, the fact that a judge is a defendant in a civil lawsuit with a litigant would be a weighty factor in favor of recusal. However, the court is obligated to consider the motives and good faith of the objecting litigant, and in this case, the court finds given the litigation history of Mr. Hone, and his tactic of demanding judicial recusal and transfer of venue after filing civil complaints against judges, that to grant his request for judicial recusal and change of venue in this matter, to decide a Rosenblum restraint, would be an exercise in futility. Nearly every judge who has presided over his matters has been named a defendant in one if not more than one civil complaints. It makes no sense to allow this litigant to further abuse the process and to act in bad faith as is reflected by his litigation history with the Superior Court.

An adverse ruling is not a basis for recusal. Bias cannot be inferred from adverse rulings against a party. Strahan v. Strahan 402 N.J. Super 298, 318 N.J. Super. (App div. 2008). A litigant clearly has a right to file a complaint against a judge or judicial employees or adverse attorneys. That is not the issue in this case. The pending cases filed by Mr. Hone, including those filed against this judge, will be decided on the merits. Since this court finds that Mr. Hone's multiple filings are strategic, and intended to disrupt the court system, and otherwise not filed in good faith, then in the interest of the administration of justice the court must decline recusal and transfer of venue. Although in the past this court transferred venue on a number of cases that involved judges and staff members within the Ocean Vicinage, the pattern and practice of Richard Hone, in responding to any unfavorable court rulings by the filing of civil complaints, most of which have been dismissed without prejudice for lack of prosecution or with prejudice because of immunity, would render any such transfer futile.

Mr. Hone's pattern of responding to any adverse ruling with civil litigation can only be viewed as an effort to inflict chaos upon the court system, to cause judicial and state resources to be wasted as dedicated to the defense of these filings, and to otherwise create confusion as to any pending matters that involve him.

The court therefore concludes that a Rosenblum restraint should be imposed upon Richard Hone, and that the court will not recuse since to do so would only result in the filing of more vexatious lawsuits, followed by applications for recusal and change of venue.

Very truly yours,


Marlene Lynch Ford, A.J.S.C.

MLF:pb
Enclosure

James.Castaneda 13:17:17 Friday, July 31, 2020

CVM0019

AUTOMATED CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

07/31/20

PARTY LIST ALPHA

13:17

NOTE: PARTY MAY ALSO BE IN ARCHIVED CASE.

NAME: HONE RICHARD VENUE: COURT: LCV DOCKET TYP:

ALT NAME:

SEL	PARTY NAME	PARTY #	VEN	DOCKET NUMBER	DATE DISPOSED
HONE	RICHARD	1	MID L	007619 13	05 09 2014
HONE	RICHARD	1	ESX L	007390 18 E	08 30 2019
HONE	RICHARD	1	MON L	004490 18 E	12 21 2018
HONE	RICHARD	1	MON L	000365 19 E	06 13 2019
HONE	RICHARD	1	MID L	001190 19	09 06 2019
HONE	RICHARD	1	MON L	000589 19 E	06 13 2019
HONE	RICHARD	1	MID L	001819 19	09 06 2019
HONE	RICHARD	1	ESX L	002926 19	10 25 2019
HONE	RICHARD	1	MID L	003962 19	07 10 2019
HONE	RICHARD	1	MID L	004519 19 E	09 13 2019
HONE	RICHARD	1	MID L	004529 19 E	08 28 2019
HONE	RICHARD	1	UNN L	002472 19	11 25 2019
HONE	RICHARD	1	ESX L	005823 19 E	02 21 2020
HONE	RICHARD	1	MON L	003022 19 E	08 30 2019

ATTORNEY ID:

P/C/D PUTATIVE/CERTIFIED CLASS/DENIED E ELEC. FILER

PF1-PARTY-INQUIRY PF2-CASE-PARTY-LIST PF4-PARTY-PROMPT PF8-NEXT PF22-HELP:

EXHIBIT A

James.Castaneda 13:17:25 Friday, July 31, 2020

CVM0019

AUTOMATED CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

07/31/20

PARTY LIST ALPHA

13:17

NOTE: PARTY MAY ALSO BE IN ARCHIVED CASE.

NAME: HONE

RICHARD

VENUE:

COURT: LCV DOCKET TYP:

ALT NAME:

SEL

PARTY NAME

PARTY #

VEN DOCKET NUMBER

DATE DISPOSED

HONE	RICHARD	1	MID L	006206 19 E	11 22 2019
HONE	RICHARD	1	ESX L	007287 19 E	
HONE	RICHARD	1	MON L	000014 20 E	01 03 2020
HONE	RICHARD	1	BUR L	000047 20 E	
HONE	RICHARD	1	OCN L	000326 20 E	03 13 2020
HONE	RICHARD	1	OCN L	000327 20 E	03 16 2020
HONE	RICHARD	1	OCN L	000378 20 E	03 13 2020
HONE	RICHARD	1	OCN L	000692 20 E	03 13 2020
HONE	RICHARD	1	BUR L	000688 20 E	
HONE	RICHARD	1	BUR L	000689 20 E	
HONE	RICHARD	1	BUR L	000745 20 E	
HONE	RICHARD	1	BUR L	000972 20 E	06 05 2020
HONE	RICHARD	1	OCN L	001369 20 E	
HONE	RICHARD	1	OCN L	001396 20 E	

ATTORNEY ID:

P/C/D PUTATIVE/CERTIFIED CLASS/DENIED E ELEC FILER

PF1-PARTY-INQUIRY PF2-CASE-PARTY-LIST PF4-PARTY-PROMPT PF8-NEXT PF22-HELP:

James Castaneda 13:17:30 Friday, July 31, 2020

CVM0019

AUTOMATED CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
PARTY LIST ALPHA07/31/20
13:17

NOTE: PARTY MAY ALSO BE IN ARCHIVED CASE.

NAME: HONE

RICHARD

VENUE:

COURT: LCV DOCKET TYP:

ALT NAME:

SEL

	PARTY NAME	PARTY #	VEN	DOCKET NUMBER	DATE DISPOSED
HONE	RICHARD	1	CAM L	002040 20 E	
HONE	RICHARD	1	BVR L	001324 20 E	07 27 2020
HONE	RICHARD	1	CAM L	002547 20 E	
HONE	RICHARD	1	MON L	002353 20 E	
~~HONE~~	~~SUSAN~~	~~1~~	~~SOM L~~	~~000180 18 E~~	~~05 15 2019~~
HONE #184895H	RICHARD	1	CUM L	000124 18	12 21 2018
HONE #184895B	RICHARD	1	CUM L	000318 18	05 04 2018
HONE #184895B	RICHARD	1	ATL L	000983 18	03 29 2019
HONE #184895B	RICHARD	1	MER L	002234 18 E	05 01 2019
HONE #184895B	RICHARD	1	CUM L	000776 18	11 13 2018
HONE #184895B	RICHARD	1	ATL L	002840 18	05 31 2019
HONE #184895B	RICHARD	1	MER L	002594 18 E	05 01 2019
HONE SBI #184895B	RICHARD	1	MON L	001676 19 E	06 13 2019
HONE SBI #184895B	RICHARD	1	MID L	004516 19 E	11 22 2019

ATTORNEY ID:

P/C/D PUTATIVE/CERTIFIED CLASS/DENIED E ELEC FILER

PF1-PARTY-INQUIRY PF2-CASE-PARTY-LIST PF4-PARTY-PROMPT PF8-NEXT PF22-HELP;

James.Castaneda 13:17:37 Friday, July 31, 2020

CVM0019

AUTOMATED CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
PARTY LIST ALPHA07/31/20
13:17

NOTE: PARTY MAY ALSO BE IN ARCHIVED CASE.

NAME: HONE

RICHARD

VENUE:

COURT; LCV DOCKET TYP:

ALT NAME:

SEL	PARTY NAME	PARTY #	VEN	DOCKET NUMBER	DATE DISPOSED
	HONE SBI 184895B RICHARD	1	MON L	000941 19 E	06 E3 2019
	HONE SBI 184895B RICHARD	1	MID L	004488 19 E	
	HONE SBI 184895B RICHARD	1	ESX L	001729 19	10 25 2019
	HONE SBI#184895B RICHARD	1	OCN L	003018 17 E	12 18 2017
	HONE SBI#184895B RICHARD	1	MON L	004009 17	01 12 2018
	HONE SBI#184895B RICHARD	1	MID L	000126 18 E	01 25 2019
	HONE SBI#184895B RICHARD	1	MID L	000463 18	01 25 2019
	~~HONEBEIN CHERYL A~~	~~3~~	~~UNN L~~	~~002048 18 E~~	~~02 25 2020~~
	~~HONEBEIN-HARDT BRANDON R~~	~~2~~	~~UNN L~~	~~002048 18 E~~	~~02 25 2020~~
	~~HONEBEIN-HARDT BRANDON R~~	~~2~~	~~MON L~~	~~003756 19 E~~	~~04 24 2020~~
	~~HONECKER AMANDA A~~	~~4~~	~~OCN DJ~~	~~199155 18~~	~~07 03 2019~~
	~~HONECKER JR ROBERT~~	~~1~~	~~MID L~~	~~004127 16~~	~~04 20 2017~~
	~~HONEGAN DWAYNE~~	~~1~~	~~ESX L~~	~~000350 15~~	~~06 05 2017~~
	~~HONEGAN DWAYNE~~	~~3~~	~~ESX L~~	~~000513 15~~	~~08 15 2017~~

ATTORNEY ID:

P/C/D PUTATIVE/CERTIFIED CLASS/DENIED

E ELEC FILER

PF1-PARTY-INQUIRY PF2-CASE-PARTY-LIST PF4-PARTY-PROMPT PF8-NEXT PF22-HELP:

James.Castaneda 13:17:52 Friday, July 31, 2020 .

CVM0019

AUTOMATED CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

07/31/20

PARTY LIST ALPHA

13:17

NOTE: PARTY MAY ALSO BE IN ARCHIVED CASE.

NAME: HONE

RICHARD

VENUE:

COURT: SCP DOCKET TYP:

ALT NAME:

SEL	PARTY NAME	PARTY #	VEN	DOCKET NUMBER	DATE DISPOSED
HONE	RICHARD	2	SOM DC	000913 93	06 07 1993
HONE	RICHARD	2	MRS DC	002036 95	05 03 1995
HONE	RICHARD	2	MID DC	007604 09 E	05 11 2009
HONE	RICHARD	2	MID DC	016767 12 E	04 09 2013
HONE	RICHARD	1	MID SC	000594 14	06 16 2014
HONE	RICHARD	1	SOM SG	000266 14	07 15 2014
HONE	RICHARD	1	SOM SC	000267 14	07 16 2014
~~HONE~~	~~SHANA~~	~~2~~	~~CAM DC~~	~~008258 04~~	~~07 27 2004~~
~~HONE~~	~~SHANA~~	~~2~~	~~BUR LT~~	~~005240 07~~	~~01 25 2008~~
~~HONE~~	~~SHANA~~	~~2~~	~~BUR LT~~	~~004098 08~~	~~10 03 2008~~
~~HONE~~	~~SHANA~~	~~2~~	~~CAM DC~~	~~011923 09 E~~	~~08 03 2009~~
~~HONE~~	~~SHANA~~	~~2~~	~~CAM DC~~	~~015921 13 E~~	~~11 15 2013~~
~~HONE~~	~~SHANA~~	~~2~~	~~BUR DC~~	~~006624 19 E~~	~~09 23 2019~~
~~HONE~~	~~SHANA~~	~~3~~	~~BUR DC~~	~~011896 08 E~~	~~10 24 2008~~

ATTORNEY ID:

P/C/D PUTATIVE/CERTIFIED CLASS/DENIED E ELEC. FILER

PF1-PARTY-INQUIRY PF2-CASE-PARTY-LIST PF4-PARTY-PROMPT PF8-NEXT PF22-HELP:

James.Castaneda 13:18:04 Friday, July 31, 2020

CVM0019

AUTOMATED CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

07/31/20

PARTY LIST ALPHA

13:18

NOTE: PARTY MAY ALSO BE IN ARCHIVED CASE,

NAME: HONE

RICHARD

VENUE:

COURT: CHC DOCKET TYPE:

ALT NAME:

SEL	PARTY NAME	PARTY #	VEN	DOCKET NUMBER	DATE DISPOSED
	HONE RICHARD	1	MON C	000152 19	01 09 2020
	HONE RICHARD	2	MON C	000016 20	02 12 2020
	HONE RICHARD	2	BUR C	000013 20	05 07 2020
	HONE ROBERT	16	SWC F	022613 10	10 17 2014
	HONE JR HOWARD	C 2	SWC F	037171 10	08 24 2011
	HONE JR HEIRS HOWARD	C 4	SWC F	037171 10	08 24 2011
	HONE JR MRS HOWARD	C 5	SWC F	037171 10	08 24 2011
	HONE MR JACQUELIN	4	SWC F	026112 13 E	09 05 2014
	HONE MRS ROBERT	17	SWC F	022613 10	07 23 2012
	HONE SBI#184895B RICHARD	1	MID C	000171 17	01 08 2018
	HONEAMERICAN CREDIT INC	5	SWC F	015470 03	02 10 2006
	HONEBEIN ANN	L 2	SWC F	022632 16 E	11 29 2016
	HONEBEIN CHERYL	A 5	SWC F	009593 02	03 03 2003
	HONEBEIN CHERYL	A 6	SWC F	022632 16 E	11 29 2016

ATTORNEY ID:

P/C/D PUTATIVE/CERTIFIED CLASS/DENIED E ELEC FILER

PF1-PARTY-INQUIRY PF2-CASE-PARTY-LIST PF4-PARTY-PROMPT PF8-NEXT PF22-HELP:

Judiciary eCourts System - Civil Part

Home
Help
Close

CASE JACKET

User:marlene ford

Search For Case **Civil Part** ▼

Search for Case Jacket

Search By Docket Number

Search By Party Name

Search by: ☒ Individual ☐ Business

*Individual Name: Hone
*Last

Richard
*First

MI-Optional

Search

Search:

Name	Venue	Docket Number	Case Caption	Case Initiation Date
HONE RICHARD	CAMDEN	<u>L-002547-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS COVERT JEANNE	07/01/2020
HONE RICHARD	MONMOUTH	<u>L-002353-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS ACQUAVIVA GREGORY	07/28/2020
HONE RICHARD	MONMOUTH	<u>L-002439-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS ETEKE FELICIA	08/03/2020
HONE RICHARD	MONMOUTH	<u>L-002527-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS ENGLISH RICHARD	08/12/2020
HONE RICHARD	MONMOUTH	<u>L-002528-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS ENGLISH RICHARD	08/12/2020
HONE RICHARD	MONMOUTH	<u>L-002529-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS GRAMICONI CHRISTOPH	08/12/2020
HONE RICHARD	MONMOUTH	<u>L-002573-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS TOSCANO TAYLOR	08/18/2020
HONE RICHARD	OCEAN	<u>L-001938-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS ACQUAVIVA GREGORY	07/28/2020
HONE RICHARD	OCEAN	<u>L-001939-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS ENGLISH RICHARD	08/12/2020
HONE RICHARD	OCEAN	<u>L-001940-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS ENGLISH RICHARD	08/12/2020
HONE RICHARD	OCEAN	<u>L-001941-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS GRAMICONI CHRISTOPH	08/12/2020
HONE RICHARD	BURLINGTON	<u>L-000047-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS WEISS DANIEL	12/26/2019
HONE RICHARD	BURLINGTON	<u>L-000688-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS FORD MARLENE	03/10/2020
HONE RICHARD	BURLINGTON	<u>L-000689-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS WATERS STEVEN	01/24/2020
HONE RICHARD	BURLINGTON	<u>L-000745-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS WELLERSON CRAIG	01/31/2020
HONE RICHARD	BURLINGTON	<u>L-000972-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS COOK JUDGE	05/08/2020

8/21/2020

CESX L 009485-21

01/05/2022

Pg 23 of 31 Trans ID: LCV202299037 2

eCourts Civil Case Jacket

Name	Venue	Docket Number	Case Caption	Case Initiation Date
HONE RICHARD	ESSEX	<u>L-002926-</u> 19	HONE VS APTER	04/24/2019
HONE RICHARD	ESSEX	<u>L-005823-</u> 19	HONE RICHARD VS GANGI ANTHONY	08/06/2019
HONE RICHARD	ESSEX	<u>L-007287-</u> 19	HONE RICHARD VS GANGI ANTHONY	10/03/2019
HONE RICHARD	ESSEX	<u>L-007390-</u> 18	HONE RICHARD VS ROBINSON GEORGE	10/16/2018

Showing 1 to 20 of 59 entries
FirstPrevious123NextLast

Screen ID : ECCV3001
© Copyright NJ Judiciary 2016

BUILD: CivilCaseJacket_2020.3.0.17

Judiciary eCourts System - Civil Part

•
•
•

[Home](#)
[Help](#)
[Close](#)

CASE JACKET
User:marlene.ford

Search For Case Civil Part ▼

Search for Case Jacket

Search By Docket Number

Search By Party Name

Search by: ☒ Individual ☐ Business

*Individual Name: Hone

Richard

*Last

*First

MI-Optional

[Search](#)

Search: _____

Name	Venue	Docket Number	Case Caption	Case Initiation Date
HONE RICHARD	MIDDLESEX	<u>L-001190-19</u>	HONE RICHARD VS GELADE JSC MELVIN	02/05/2019
HONE RICHARD	MIDDLESEX	<u>L-001819-19</u>	HONE RICHARD VS JUDGE VENEZIA PJFP DEBORAH	02/28/2019
HONE RICHARD	MIDDLESEX	<u>L-003962-19</u>	HONE RICHARD VS JUDGE ARTURO RIVAS	05/17/2019
HONE RICHARD	MIDDLESEX	<u>L-004519-19</u>	HONE RICHARD VS THORNTON AJSC LISA	01/25/2019
HONE RICHARD	MIDDLESEX	<u>L-004529-19</u>	HONE RICHARD VS QUINN JOSEPH	01/28/2019
HONE RICHARD	MIDDLESEX	<u>L-006206-19</u>	HONE RICHARD VS THORNTON LISA	08/19/2019
HONE RICHARD	MIDDLESEX	<u>L-007619-13</u>	HONE RICHARD VS WELLS FARGO BANK	12/02/2013
HONE RICHARD	MONMOUTH	<u>L-000014-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS WEISS DANIEL	12/26/2019
HONE RICHARD	MONMOUTH	<u>L-000365-19</u>	HONE RICHARD VS THORNTON AJSC LISA	01/25/2019
HONE RICHARD	MONMOUTH	<u>L-000589-19</u>	HONE RICHARD VS QUINN JOSEPH	01/28/2019
HONE RICHARD	MONMOUTH	<u>L-003022-19</u>	HONE RICHARD VS THORNTON LISA	08/19/2019
HONE RICHARD	MONMOUTH	<u>L-004490-18</u>	HONE RICHARD VS MONMOUTH COUNTY FAMILY COURT	12/13/2018
HONE RICHARD	OCEAN	<u>L-000326-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS WATERS STEVEN	01/24/2020
HONE RICHARD	OCEAN	<u>L-000327-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS TADROS NEVEN	01/28/2020
HONE RICHARD	OCEAN	<u>L-000378-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS WELLERSON CRAIG *NOW BUR L 745 20	01/31/2020
HONE RICHARD	OCEAN	<u>L-000692-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS FORD MARLENE	03/10/2020

Name	Venue	Docket Number	Case Caption	Case Initiation Date
HONE RICHARD	OCEAN	<u>L-001369-</u> 20	HONE RICHARD VS DANIELS WENDEL	05/28/2020
HONE RICHARD	OCEAN	<u>L-001396-</u> 20	HONE RICHARD VS LYNCH-FORD MARLENE	06/12/2020
HONE RICHARD	OCEAN	<u>L-001801-</u> 20	HONE RICHARD VS JAMES DUSTIN	08/03/2020
HONE RICHARD	OCEAN	<u>L-001803-</u> 20	IN THE MATTER OF RICHARD HONE TEMPORARY DOCKET	08/03/2020

Showing 21 to 40 of 59 entries

FirstPrevious123NextLast

Screen ID : ECCV3001
© Copyright NJ Judiciary 2016

BUILD: CivilCaseJacket_2020.3.0.17

8/21/2020

eCourts Civil Case Jacket

Judiciary eCourts System - Civil Part

•
•
•

[Home](#)
[Help](#)
[Close](#)

CASE JACKET

User: marlene ford

Search For Case Civil Part ▼

Search for Case Jacket

 Search By Docket Number | Search By Party Name
Search by: ☒ Individual ☐ Business

*Individual Name: Hone
*Last

Richard
*First

MI-Optional

Search:

Name	Venue	Docket Number	Case Caption	Case Initiation Date
HONE RICHARD	UNION	<u>L-002472-19</u>	HONE RICHARD VS JUDGE ARTURO RIVAS	05/17/2019
HONE RICHARD	CAMDEN	<u>L-002040-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS COOK JUDGE	05/08/2020
HONE RICHARD	BURLINGTON	<u>L-001324-20</u>	HONE RICHARD VS COVERT JEANNE	07/01/2020
HONE #184895B RICHARD	ATLANTIC	<u>L-000983-18</u>	HONE VS SWIFT ETAL	05/01/2018
HONE #184895B RICHARD	ATLANTIC	<u>L-002840-18</u>	HONE VS CUMBERLAND COUNTY CIVIL DIV MANAGER ETAL	10/18/2018
HONE #184895B RICHARD	CUMBERLAND	<u>L-000124-18</u>	HONE VS GRIFFITH ETAL	04/20/2018
HONE #184895B RICHARD	CUMBERLAND	<u>L-000318-18</u>	HONE VS SWIFT ETAL	05/01/2018
HONE #184895B RICHARD	CUMBERLAND	<u>L-000776-18</u>	HONE VS CUMBERLAND COUNTY CIVIL DIV MANAGER ETAL	10/18/2018
HONE #184895B RICHARD	MERCER	<u>L-002234-18</u>	HONE RICHARD VS BENSTEIN SHEPHEN	10/26/2018
HONE #184895B RICHARD	MERCER	<u>L-002594-18</u>	HONE RICHARD VS APTER RACHEL	12/14/2018
HONE SBI #184895B RICHARD	MIDDLESEX	<u>L-004516-19</u>	HONE SBI #184895B RICHARD VS THORNTON LISA	05/06/2019
HONE SBI #184895B RICHARD	MONMOUTH	<u>L-001676-19</u>	HONE SBI #184895B RICHARD VS THORNTON LISA	05/06/2019
HONE SBI 184895B RICHARD	MIDDLESEX	<u>L-004488-19</u>	HONE SBI 184895B RICHARD VS THORNTON LISA	03/12/2019
HONE SBI 184895B RICHARD	MONMOUTH	<u>L-000941-19</u>	HONE SBI 184895B RICHARD VS THORNTON LISA	03/12/2019
HONE SBI# 184895B RICHARD	ESSEX	<u>L-001729-19</u>	HONE VS ROBINSON	03/04/2019

8/21/2020

CESX L 009485-21

01/05/2022

Pg 27 of 31 Trans ID: LCV202299037 2

eCourts Civil Case Jacket

Name	Venue	Docket Number	Case Caption	Case Initiation Date
HONE SBI#184895B RICHARD	MIDDLESEX	~~L-000126-~~ 18	HONE RICHARD VS OCEAN COUNTY FAMILY	10/26/2017
HONE SBI#184895B RICHARD	MIDDLESEX	~~L-000463-~~ 18	HONE VS MONMOUTH COUNTY FAMILY COURT ET AL	10/13/2017
HONE SBI#184895B RICHARD	MONMOUTH	~~L-004009-~~ 17	HONE VS MONMOUTH COUNTY FAMILY COURT ET AL	10/13/2017
HONE SBI#184895B RICHARD	OCEAN	~~L-003018-~~ 17	HONE RICHARD VS OCEAN COUNTY FAMILY	10/26/2017
Showing 41 to 59 of 59 entries				
FirstPrevious123NextLast				

Screen ID : BCCV3001

© Copyright NJ Judiciary 2016

BUILD CivilCaseJacket_2020.3.0.17

PARTICIPANT INQUIRY

PARTICIPANT	REL. ATTORNEY	COURT DOCKET	P. DAG	DOCKET	CASE NAME	OPEN	CLOSED
HONE, RICHARD	P	MON-L-	Y02	13 - 01201	HONE, RICHARD AND CATHERINE D. VS EDWARD H. HERMAN, P.J.M.C. ET AL	04/05/2013	04/18/2013
HONE, RICHARD	3 PRO SE	MON-L-2353-20	K66	20 - 62426	HONE, RICHARD VS ACQUAVIVA, GREGORY, ET AL.	08/14/2020	
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	ESX-L-2826-19	A95	19 - 02406	HONE, RICHARD VS APTER, RACHEL WANER	09/11/2019	04/21/2020
HONE, RICHARD	IN PRO SE	MER-L-2354-18	848	19 - 00024	HONE, RICHARD VS APTER, RACHEL, ET AL.	01/04/2019	05/01/2019
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	CAM-L-2040-20	F31	20 - 01240	HONE, RICHARD VS COOK, JUDGE, BURLINGTON COUNTY	05/22/2020	
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	BUR-L-1324-20	A95	20 - 01757	HONE, RICHARD VS COVERT, JEANNE, ET AL.	08/06/2020	
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	CAM-L-2547-20	A95	20 - 01752	HONE, RICHARD VS COVERT, JEANNE, ET AL.	08/06/2020	
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	ATL-L-2840-18	848	18 - 03679	HONE, RICHARD VS CUMBERLAND COUNTY CIVIL DIVISION MANAGER, ET AL.	12/31/2018	10/01/2019
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	OCN-L-1369-20	F31	20 - 01394	HONE, RICHARD VS DANIELS, WENDEL, ET AL.	06/17/2020	
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	ESX-L-1729-19	859	19 - 02144	HONE, RICHARD VS GANGI, ANTHONY, ET AL.	08/14/2019	10/23/2019
HONE, RICHARD	IN PRO SE	MD-L-1190-19	848	19 - 00413	HONE, RICHARD VS GELADE, MELVIN; JSC, ET AL.	02/13/2019	11/19/2019
HONE, RICHARD	IN PRO SE	MER-L-2234-18	848	18 - 03575	HONE, RICHARD VS GRANT, GLENN; JUDGE, ET AL.	12/17/2018	05/01/2019

Pg 28 of 31 Trans ID: LCV202299037 2

01/05/2022

CESX L 009485-21

PARTICIPANT INQUIRY

PARTICIPANT	REL ATTORNEY	COURT DOCKET	P. DAG	DOCKET	CASE NAME	OPEN	CLOSED
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	CUM-L-124-18	741	18 - 01337	HONE, RICHARD VS GRIFFITH, HEATHER (DOC)	05/10/2018	09/05/2018
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	BUR-L-688-20	F31	20 - 00998	HONE, RICHARD VS LYNCH FORD, MARLENE	04/17/2020	
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	OCN-L-1396-20	F31	20 - 01455	HONE, RICHARD VS LYNCH FORD, MARLENE, ET AL	06/24/2020	
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	BUR-L-688-20	A95	20 - 01112	HONE, RICHARD VS LYNCH FORD, MARLENE, ET AL	05/05/2020	
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	20-10367	K66	20 - 01852	HONE, RICHARD VS LYNCH FORD, MARLENE, ET AL	08/18/2020	
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	20-	K66	20 - 01821	HONE, RICHARD VS LYNCH FORD, MARLENE, ET AL	08/14/2020	
HONE, RICHARD	N PRO SE		848	17 - 03472	HONE, RICHARD VS MONMOUTH COUNTY FAMILY COURT, ET AL	10/26/2017	01/25/2019
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	MON-L-4490-18	848	19 - 00009	HONE, RICHARD VS MONMOUTH COUNTY FAMILY COURT, ET AL	01/02/2019	08/05/2019
HONE, RICHARD	A PRO SE	A-2943-1871	A95	19 - 70789	HONE, RICHARD VS OCEAN & MONMOUTH FAMILY COURT	07/31/2019	10/07/2019
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	MID-L-126-18	848	17 - 03617	HONE, RICHARD VS OCEAN COUNTY FAMILY COURT, ET AL	11/13/2017	01/25/2019
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	MID-L-126-18	848	17 - 03826	HONE, RICHARD VS OCEAN COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE, ET AL	12/01/2017	01/25/2019

29 of 31 Trans ID: LCV202299037 2

01/05/2022

CESX L 009485-21

PARTICIPANT INQUIRY

PARTICIPANT	REL. ATTORNEY	COURT DOCKET	P. DAG	DOCKET	CASE NAME	OPEN	CLOSED
HONE, RICHARD	IN PRO SE	MID-L-4529-19	848	19 - 00348	HONE, RICHARD VS QUINN, JOSEPH P.; PJ CV, ET AL.	02/05/2019	11/19/2019
HONE, RICHARD	IN PRO SE	MID-L-3962-19	A95	19 - 01673	HONE, RICHARD VS RIVAS, ALBERTO, ET AL.	06/26/2019	02/28/2020
HONE, RICHARD	IN PRO SE	ESX-L-7390-18	848	19 - 00085	HONE, RICHARD VS ROBINSON, GEORGE, ET AL.	01/10/2019	02/28/2020
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	ESX-L-7390-18	995	18 - 03443	HONE, RICHARD VS ROBINSON, GEORGE, ET AL.	12/06/2018	
HONE, RICHARD	IN PRO SE	ATL-L-983-18	848	18 - 01336	HONE, RICHARD VS SWIFT, JAMES, J.S.C, ET AL.	05/10/2018	03/08/2019
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	MID-L-4519	848	19 - 00314	HONE, RICHARD VS THORNTON, USA P.; AJSC, ET AL.	02/01/2019	10/21/2019
HONE, RICHARD	IN PRO SE	MID-L-4516-19	A95	19 - 01361	HONE, RICHARD VS THORNTON, USA, ET AL.	05/21/2019	04/21/2020
HONE, RICHARD	IN PRO SE	MID-L-4488-19	A95	19 - 01379	HONE, RICHARD VS THORNTON, USA, ET AL.	05/22/2019	12/03/2019
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	FV-13-1267-17	848	18 - 03132	HONE, RICHARD VS THORTON, USA, AJSC, ET AL.	11/01/2018	02/28/2020
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	MID-L-6206-19	A95	19 - 02526	HONE, RICHARD VS THORTON, USA, ET AL.	09/23/2019	02/28/2020
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	MON-C-8-20	A95	20 - 01735	HONE, RICHARD VS TOSCANO, TAYLOR, ET AL.	08/03/2020	
HONE, RICHARD	IN PRO SE	MID-L-1819-19	848	19 - 00589	HONE, RICHARD VS VENEZIA, DEBORAH, ET AL.	03/05/2019	11/19/2019
HONE, RICHARD	P PRO SE	BUR-L-689-20	F31	20 - 00440	HONE, RICHARD VS WATERS, STEVEN	02/13/2020	

PARTICIPANT INQUIRY

PARTICIPANT	REL	ATTORNEY	COURT DOCKET	P. DAG	DOCKET	CASE NAME	OPEN	CLOSED
HONE, RICHARD	P	PRO SE	BUR-L-47-20	F31	20 - 01005	HONE, RICHARD VS WEISS, DANIEL	04/21/2020	
IONE, RICHARD	P	PRO SE	BUR-L-745-20	F31	20 - 00588	HONE, RICHARD VS WELLSERSON, CRAIG	02/28/2020	
IONE, RICHARD	3		MID-L-2123-14	213	14 - 62946	SUBPOENA TO THOMAS RUSSO, STAFF ATTORNEY, AOC	07/17/2014	11/21/2014
IONE, RICHARD	P	PRO SE		754	16 - 00221	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (HONE, RICHARD) VS LO CASCO, RYLE M.; SPO	01/21/2016	02/24/2016

Pg 31 of 31 Trans ID: LCV202299037 2

01/05/2022

CESX L 009485-21

RICHARD HONE,
Plaintiff-Appellant,


Defendant-Respondent

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
APPELLATE DIVISION
DOCKET NO. A-2508-21 T-02
CIVIL LAW DIVISION

ON APPEAL FROM
SUPERIOR COURT, LAW DIVISION
ESSEX COUNTY

ON NOTICE OF MOTION TO LEAVE FOR APPEAL
DENYING PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
ORDER TO 1.) RECUSE VENABLE, NOT ENTIRE
ESSEX COUNTY LAW DIV. 2.)
RECONSIDERATION ON THE MERITS OF THE
LAWSUIT 3.) ALL ESSEX VENUE MATTERS TO
BE TRANSFERRED TO SERIAL CIVIL RIGHTS
VIOLATOR LYNCH FORD IN OCEAN COUNTY

SHEILA VENABLE A.J.S.C.
Sat Below

BRIEF FOR
APPELLANT RICHARD HONE
ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

Richard Hone, Appellant

201C Sampson Ave.
Seaside Hts. NJ 08751



TABLE OF CONTENTS OF PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<u>TABLE OF AUTHORITIES</u>	i., ii., iii., iv., v., vi.
<u>PRELIMINARY STATEMENT</u>	1,2
<u>PROCEDURAL HISTORY</u>	2 and Exhibits
<u>ISSUES PRESENTED</u>	2,3,4
<u>ARGUMENT</u>	4-12
<u>CONCLUSION</u>	13
<u>CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE</u>	vii.
<u>EXHIBITS- After above</u>	viii.

Page 6

- I. THIS COURT MUST GRANT PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND THEREUPON REVERSE THE ORDER OF THE COURT BELOW DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION TO RECUSE VENABLE, NOT ESSEX COUNTY

Page 7-12

- II. THIS COURT MUST GRANT PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND THEREUPON REVERSE THE ORDER OF THE COURT BELOW DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION ON THE MERITS OF THE LAWSUIT

Page 13

- III. THIS COURT MUST GRANT PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND THEREUPON REVERSE THE ORDER OF THE COURT BELOW DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION THAT ALL ESSEX VENUE MATTERS TO BE TRANSFERRED TO SERIAL CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATOR LYNCH FORD IN OCEAN COUNTY

Conclusion:

Page 14

ii.

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT'S TABLE OF APPENDIX

Appendix document

Appendix page number

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Authority

Page brief number

Court Rules:

<u>R. 4:5-2</u>	Pg. 11
<u>R. 4:49-2</u>	Pg. 2
<u>R. 1:6-2 (a)</u>	Pg. 5

N.J. Statutes:

N.J.S.A 9:2-4	Pg.6
NJ:2C 34-1	Pg.1
NJ:2C 30-6, NJ:2c 30-2	Pg.1, 2

New Jersey Cases:

<u>Rosenbaum v. Closter</u> 333 N.J. Super 385	Pg. 10-13
<u>Cummings v. Bahr</u> 295 N.J. Super, 374, 384 (App. Div. 1996).	Pg. 5

MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITIES CITED

Canon 1 of the NJ Code of Judicial Conduct	Pg.4
Canon 2 of the NJ Code of Judicial Conduct	Pg.4,5
Canon 2.A of the NJ Code of Judicial Conduct	Pg.4,5
Canon 3.C.(1) of the NJ Code of Judicial Conduct	Pg.4,5

FEDERAL AND OTHER JURISDICTION AUTHORITES CITED

Due Process and Fair Hearing clauses of the U.S. Pg.1
and N.J. Constitutions

U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1; Wolf v. McDonnell Pg.1

Preliminary Statement

This Appeal is not something I take pride in having to do, but it is completely necessary because my precious 7-year-old first child (at 63-years old) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] mafia

connected, dominatrix mother (other words I don't like to have to use, but for now I have no choice) since she was 2-years-old, and the court looks the other way, acts disinterestedly, and is a constant Civil Rights violator of us, and this Appeal is further Proof of the lengths these 2 judges will go to not only violate my Civil Rights but to commit serious criminal acts along the way. My child has only gotten better recently because I finally have the parenting time with her that she desperately needed, deserved, and is entitled to under NJSA 9:2-4

This Appeal is based on clearly erroneous decisions that have no basis in any Facts, and proves I continue to be retaliated against now by Judge Venable, and especially her co-conspirator, Judge Marlene Lynch Ford, who continues to interfere with my cases, to the total and complete detriment of [REDACTED] in her misguided pursuit to shut me up and keep me away from [REDACTED].

This is my 4TH interlocutory Appeal that requests the court to correct egregious errors that have trial testimony that contradicts the Orders being appealed, from February 24, 2022.

My intention here is not to offend honest Judges, but to point out the innate corruption in the lower courts.

This Court will clearly see is a pattern of retaliation from Marlene Lynch Ford with Sheila Venable that is unparalleled in the history of NJ jurisprudence, and Judge Grasso finally did what was right and refuses to allow it in my family matter.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A full procedural history of this in Exhibits

ISSUES PRESENTED

Our system of civil justice demands that both our courts, and especially those who administer justice for our children and families before them maintain the unquestioned appearance of absolute impartiality in the service of justice. As this matter has evolved, the Essex County Superior Court and especially Judge Venable, is completely unable to present and maintain such appearance of an impartial tribunal.

As this matter has evolved over 7 years (this Appeal is tied to a family court matter OCN FD-802-15) the criminal co-conspirator here, Ocean County Assignment Judge, Marlene Lynch Ford, tortiously interfered (and lacked any jurisdiction in doing so) in this case (and consequently judge Venable) has been left unable to present and maintain such appearance of an impartial advocate, and has become New Jersey's own Vladimir Putin, a creepy, unwanted little dictator who illegally involves herself in every phase of all my cases where it is crystal clear she has no business or authority to do so. This has been going on with her since 2015, when she committed her 1st felony against me.

The issues presented in this matter will finally get Justice for [REDACTED] and the Appellate Court will not allow the continued erosion of the public trust in our Civil Courts to continue, and will take action against what stands as an open affront to the oft-espoused foundational principle of impartial justice.

That being said clearly, the court clearly did not consider properly, and failed to appreciate the significance of probative, competent evidence Cummings v. Bahr 295 N.J. Super, 374, 384 (App. Div. 1996), and requires the Appellate

3.

Division to overturn the decision.

Further, and more importantly, Essex County processed the complaint, gave me a docket # (L-9485-21), I double checked to make sure this complaint was valid, and I served the defendant, then when the defendant raised the issue "I could not file lawsuits", Marlene Lynch-Ford personally called Judge Venable, and told her to "dismiss this lawsuit" (I have this on tape. It is evidence) and she dismissed the case without proper (or any) review per Rosenbaum my well grounded in facts and law breach of contract lawsuit, which stemmed from information uncovered in subpoenas and was properly filed for venue in Essex County.

ARGUMENT

The Integrity and Impartiality and Our Courts

In keeping with this goal as applied here, proper resolution of this Matter requires adherence to core, ethical precepts of our justice system, especially when children and the relationship with their parents is concerned as outlined in N.J.S.A.9:2-4 and as outlined in Canon 1 of the Code of Judicial Conduct, that "[a]n independent and honorable judiciary is indispensable to justice in our society, and to that end, judges are required to maintain, enforce, and observe "high standards of conduct so

4.

that the integrity and independence of the judiciary may be preserved." Canon 2 states "a judge shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety" as does Canon 2.A, and Canon 3.C (1) is even more succinct when it says" A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially and diligently".

Nothing with Judge Venable now or of course Marlene Lynch Ford could be further from the truth.

Unfortunately, Judge Venable allows this, and is absolutely conspiring with Lynch Ford, especially since she knows this is not allowed, so she violates all the above Canons too.

Nothing personal, but this is an insult to honest and competent Judges everywhere. Sheila Venable has a total and complete functional ignorance of Rosenbaum, which she misinterprets in her Order completely, and instead of having this "reviewed properly" for merit, (she purposely and maliciously dismissed it in One Line), which never happened, she would have seen it is solidly grounded in Breach of Contract law, actionable and needs to be reinstated and move forward to terminate the Custody Agreement between the parties.

5.

On Para. #1 from the 03-04-22 Order

GRANT Recusal or remand in front of a different Judge (so the appearance of impropriety is not so blatant) of this judge and replace her with someone who is not a Defendant in a current Civil Rights lawsuit like Venable is (OCN L-357-22 HONE V. VENABLE, LYNCH FORD ET ALS;) based on this very conspiracy (which I have taped evidence of Lynch Ford on) by 2 corrupt co-conspirators, or not prejudice, not a political hack, not someone who is not conspiring with Lynch Ford to violate my Civil Rights to Due Process maliciously or to violate my Equal Protection rights and "single me out" for standing up to corruption. The Appellate Division Judges may not like these words, and it is not my intention to offend other judges, but the Fact remains there is a pervasive stench of corruption in the actions of these 2 politically connected judges to make any Honest Jurist sick to their stomachs and there is no other way to put it.

Further, Ms. Venable has is knowingly violating my Civil Rights again to even suggest except for the most recent only out of 6 years' worth of Orders, **Judge Lynch Ford has recused herself and ALL my Ocean cases SUA SPONTE for the last 6 years,** including all Ocean cases to Monmouth, and to Burlington and Monmouth

6.

for the contempt and Civil Rights lawsuits. ALL of them up to 2021, then she decided to "keep" the other cases and actually had the temerity to rule on lawsuits she is a defendant in, or in almost all the cases, not rule or review anything at all, so to say Lynch Ford made a one-time decision in 6 years not to recuse herself and Venable bases her argument on that, then society itself continues to be in deep trouble with judges that constantly and consistently abuse the power vested in them and become creepy little dictators instead of honorable jurists, which is EXACTLY the case (again) here.

If you take the time and read them, any of Venable's "orders" or "reviews" defy logic, are confusing at best, have no basis in the Facts, or Law, and would make any layman think this "is not written by a lawyer or judge", but someone just making things up or cobbling together a bunch of stuff being Googled instead of someone who is actually a Judge. This judge obviously had some paralegal or law clerk write her brief because Rosenbaum allows for a Review on the Merits, and it's obvious she never read the Merits of my Lawsuit and simply acted on "Orders" from Lynch Ford and dismissed my lawsuit, then in another act of pure retaliation never paid any attention to the merits of my motion for reconsideration and dismissed that without taking into

7.

account any of the Facts, and also did this in retaliation for the Civil Rights Lawsuit I brought against her and Lynch Ford (HONE V. VENABLE, COLLINS, LYNCH FORD ET ALS; OCN L-357-22, which when she refused to recuse herself (with no real explanation in her "opinion") AFTER she was sued for Violating my Civil Rights. Further, in her "opinion", she paid no attention to how Rosenbaum works or what a "Review" actually is, and refused to hear Oral Argument, despite multiple requests, and did so to purposely and maliciously violate my Due Process rights in the lower court and force a pro-se litigant to appeal, which is a burden even for skilled attorneys.

On Para. #2 from the 03-04-22 Order

GRANT Reconsideration. Just read the Lawsuit (Exhibits), which includes the evidence to prove my case, and that Proves beyond any doubt whatsoever that this is a valid, well grounded in the law lawsuit that came about from information I received by Subpoena in a prior case, and is venued properly in Essex County.

8.

The crux of this legal argument is that there was never any real review of the merits (one line in the Venable "opinion", the rest a clear cut and paste job on Rosenbaum and totally misleading) so it's clear it was based on retaliation and not any facts (Exhibits contain the actual lawsuit and amended complaint) or breach of contract guidelines or case laws.

There are no case laws or argument made against the merits of THIS lawsuit because she made her mind up to dismiss it no matter what, which is a 3rd degree felony under NJ 2C 30:6 Deprivation of Civil Rights

Again, IF you take the time and read them, the Venable "orders" or "reviews" defy logic, are confusing at best, have no basis in the Facts, or Law, and would make any layman think this "is not written by a lawyer or judge", but someone who has made their up to dismiss this case and maliciously and knowingly my Civil Rights. This judge obviously had some paralegal or law clerk write her brief because Rosenbaum allows for a Review on the Merits, and it's obvious she never read the Merits of my Lawsuit and simply acted on "Orders" from Lynch Ford and dismissed my lawsuit then in another act of pure retaliation never paid any attention to the merits of my motion for reconsideration and dismissed that without taking into account any of the Facts,

and also did this in retaliation for the Civil Rights Lawsuit I brought against her and Lynch Ford (HONE V. VENABLE, COLLINS, LYNCH FORD ET ALS; OCN L-357-22, which when she refused to recuse herself (with NO explanation in her "opinion") AFTER she was sued for Violating my Civil Rights. Further, in her "opinion", she paid no attention to how Rosenbaum works or what a "Review" actually is. As Rosenbaum (below) itself PROVES my point she clearly never even looked at the lawsuit for merit, and simply dismissed it (after the defendant was served properly and the Summons and Affidavit of Service was filed in JEDS).

ROSENBAUM CASE

It is clear this case (Rosenbaum), which Venable solely relied on, was never followed as to how to proceed according to the below and it makes clear that nothing in Rosenbaum was followed, the parameters of the "review" were non-existent, and again, it was ed primarily on retaliation because for one reason the Essex County Superior Court gave me a docket number, I called multiple times to make certain this lawsuit was reviewed by a judge, I was assured it was, so I served the defendant, then Venable got a call from Lynch Ford and took control of the

case from Judge Moore, then dismissed it and in doing so violated my Civil Rights and committed 2 felonies in the process, both of which will be brought when I have the time (I will have Joint Custody of my daughter on July 14th)

"In these cases, the Assignment Judge did not refer to the allegations of the complaint or decline to permit the filing based on the nature of the allegations. She merely cited to plaintiff's prior history of filing frivolous complaints, and stated that in the interest of judicial "efficient and economic management" his complaints would be dismissed.

Nothing in the orders or opinions state a reason for dismissal.

There is no indication that she considered either complaint to be frivolous."

Nothing in the orders or opinions state a reason for dismissal.

"Our rules of pleading require that a complaint is to be construed liberally in terms of stating a claim for relief, R. 4:5-2, and that all facts and inferences be construed in favor of the plaintiff in order to sustain the complaint."

See, e.g., *Printing Mart-Morristown v. Sharp Electronics Corp.*, 116 N.J. 739, 746, 563 A.2d 31 (1989); *Urban League of Greater New Brunswick v. Township Comm. of Cranbury*, 222 N.J.Super. 131, 140, 536 A.2d 287 (App.Div.1987), rev'd on other grounds sub nom. *Urban League of Greater New Brunswick v. Mayor and Council of Carteret*, 115 N.J. 536, 559 A.2d 1369 (1989); *Spring Motors Distributors, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co.*, 191 N.J.Super. 22, 29-30, 465 A.2d 530 (App.Div.1983), rev'd on other grounds, 98 N.J. 555, 489 A.2d 660 (1985).

It is clear R. 4:5-2 was not adhered to at all.

"Stated differently, the complaint must be searched in depth and with liberality to determine if a cause of action can be gleaned even from an obscure statement, particularly if further discovery is taken."

Nothing like this occurred in anything Venable did. There was never an "in depth" or any real review of the lawsuit.

"Every reasonable inference is therefore accorded the plaintiff and [a] motion [to dismiss for failure to state a claim] granted only in rare instances and ordinarily without prejudice".

[Pressler, Current N.J. Court Rules, comment 4.1 on R. 4:6-2 (2000) (citing Printing Mart, supra, 116 N.J. at 746, 563 A.2d 31).]

"Therefore, we held that "[a] nonspecific and nondiscrete injunction against prospective litigation generally is patently unsustainable." Ibid.

None of those principles was adhered to here because it was all done in retaliation against me and in a conspiracy with Lynch Ford (which I have a tape of Lynch Ford of stating this very fact), and when I subpoenaed records of those calls and any texts or emails between Venable, Collins and Lynch Ford, my favorite criminal at the AG's office, DAG Susan Morris Esq. (who forged my name on a Certified Mail receipt, then submitted it to the Burlington County Superior Court like I signed it, for which a criminal charge can and will be brought) wrote in a response that "Judge Grasso only allows subpoenas to be issued pending his approval, which is true, but ONLY for my Family FD-802-15 and C-129-20 docket numbers as she clearly knows he is ONLY my Family Judge and that "order", if she ever bothered to read it, makes clear that FACT. Judge Grasso has ZERO to do with Essex or this case, so it's mind-boggling Morris would even write that.

When I filed my opposition to the blocking of the subpoena (which I'm certain will reveal a treasure of criminal activity and conspiracy between Venable, Collins and Lynch Ford), Venable has continued to refuse to hear the matter (Procedural History attached). These are ALL felonies under NJ 2C 30:6 deprivation of Civil Rights and NJ 2C 30:2 Official Misconduct.

Judge Lynch Ford's interference in my custody case is so despicable it is now a criminal act and 3rd degree felony (NJ2C 30:6), and in this case she is on tape telling me "I called Judge Venable and told her to dismiss your lawsuit", which even for her is astounding, and another felony per NJ 2C 30:6.

On Para. #3 from the 03-04-22 Order

GRANT It would be a travesty of Justice to compel anyone to file a valid Lawsuit that clearly has venue in another jurisdiction, especially when it is being sent to a judge in Ocean who has a long, criminal history of violations of my Civil Rights and has gone to such extreme lengths to silence me she commits violation after violation and felony after felony (Marlene Lynch Ford). That defeats the purpose of a Fair and Just Legal System, and violates the Canons and would create another travesty of justice for myself and my 7-year-old daughter [REDACTED]

CONCLUSION

#1 GRANT- Recusal of "Judge" Venable and appoint a Judge who is not prejudiced and who will give me a Fair Hearing and one that is NOT a defendant in a current Civil Rights Lawsuit (OCN L-357-22) or the new contemplated Federal Civil Rights lawsuit, and one that will not have a felony complaint filed against them.

#2 GRANT- Reinstatement of lawsuit, or at the least new Reconsideration Hearing with a Judge who is not prejudice against me and NOT a defendant in a current Civil Rights Lawsuit and one that will not have a felony complaint filed.

#3 GRANT- Remand and reversal of denying me access to Essex County court as unconstitutional and a violation of my Due Process Rights as there are more bad acts that will result in Breach of Contract and Civil Rights violations against the mother of my child as well as other court personnel, et al; in Essex County stemming from this despicable black eye for the Justice System.

I swear the above statements made by me are true to the best of my belief and knowledge. If any of the foregoing statements made by me are willfully false, I am subject to punishment.

Richard Hone
Richard Hone

07-12-2022
Date:

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

I, Richard Hone, duly of age, depose and say;

I have served all the parties by email and USPS Regular or Priority mail the following on July 12, 2022 email and July 16th by USPS Regular Mail.

Superior Court of NJ, Appellate Division by email (07-12-22) to Tawana Perkins and Denise Koury and by mail per Tawana Perkins and Anita Toldo (1) copy to PO Box 006, Trenton, NJ 08625-0006 on 07-16-22.

Sheila Venable by regular mail on July 16, 2022

Office of the Attorney General by email (07-12-22) per the Appellate Court and (1) copy PO Box 112, Trenton NJ 08625-0112

I swear the above statements made by me are true to the best of my belief and knowledge. If any of the foregoing statements made by me are willfully false, I am subject to punishment.

Richard Hone E-signature

7-12-2022

Richard Hone, Pro-Se

Date:

EXHIBITS

RICHARD HONE V. [REDACTED]

A-2508-21 T2

Order and Opinion, Feb 24, 2022 hearing.	Exhibits
Hone v. [REDACTED] Lawsuit Essex L-9485-21	Exhibits
Hone v. [REDACTED] Amended Lawsuit L-9485-21	Exhibits
Procedural History	Exhibits

Case Caption: Hone Richard Vs [REDACTED]

Court: Civil Part

Case Type: Tort-Other

Case Track: 2

of Discovery Days: 300

Original Discovery End Date:

Original Arbitration Date:

Original Trial Date:

Disposition Date: 02/11/2022

Venue: Essex

Case Status: Closed

Judge: Robert H Gardner

Age of Case: 00 YR 00 MO

Current Discovery End Date:

Current Arbitration Date:

Current Trial Date:

Case Disposition: Dismissed By Court
Without Prejudice

- **Plaintiffs (1)**
- **Defendants (1)**
- **Case Proceedings (7)**
- **ACMS Documents (25)**
- **Fees (25)**

Richard Hone

Case Actions

Filed Date	Filings	Docket Text
12/02/2021		Complaint with Jury Demand for ESX-L-009485-21 submitted by RICHARD HONE, on behalf of RICHARD HONE against [REDACTED]
12/10/2021		Waiver Of Fees uploaded by Case Management Staff submitted by RICHARD HONE
12/11/2021		TRACK ASSIGNMENT Notice submitted by Case Management
12/22/2021		Other submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1114478
01/05/2022		Other submitted by [REDACTED] JEDS EF-1132176
01/05/2022		Brief/Letter Brief submitted by [REDACTED] JEDS EF-1132213
01/05/2022		Brief/Letter Brief submitted by [REDACTED] JEDS EF-1132243
01/05/2022		Motion Dismissing Complaint uploaded by Case Management Staff submitted by [REDACTED] *LINKED FILING*
01/05/2022		Correspondence uploaded by Case Management Staff submitted by [REDACTED] *LINKED FILING*
01/08/2022		Other submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1136637
01/09/2022		Other submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1136840

Filed Date	Filings	Docket Text
01/10/2022	 	Other submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1137599
01/10/2022		The motion filed on 01/05/2022 will be decided on 01/21/2022. Do not come to the courthouse because no oral argument has been requested. The court's decision will be provided to you. Re: MOTION DISMISSING COMPLAINT [LCV202298501]
01/10/2022	 	General Correspondence uploaded by Case Management Staff submitted by RICHARD HONE
01/11/2022		The motion filed on 01/05/2022 was rescheduled to 01/21/2022. Do not come to the courthouse because no oral argument has been requested. The court's decision will be provided to you. Re: MOTION DISMISSING COMPLAINT [LCV202298501]
01/12/2022	 	Objection to motion submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1142815
01/12/2022	 	Cross Motion For Discovery uploaded by Case Management Staff submitted by RICHARD HONE *LINKED FILING*
01/12/2022		The motion filed on 01/12/2022 will be decided on 01/21/2022. Do not come to the courthouse because no oral argument has been requested. The court's decision will be provided to you. Re: CROSS MOTION FOR DISCOVERY [LCV2022139481]
01/14/2022	 	Other submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1146425
01/14/2022	 	Reply Brief uploaded by Case Management Staff submitted by RICHARD HONE *LINKED FILING*
01/24/2022		The motion filed on 01/05/2022 was rescheduled to 02/04/2022. Do not come to the courthouse because no oral argument has been requested. The court's decision will be provided to you. Re: MOTION DISMISSING COMPLAINT [LCV202298501]
01/24/2022		The motion filed on 01/12/2022 was rescheduled to 02/04/2022. Do not come to the courthouse because no oral argument has been requested. The court's decision will be provided to you. Re: CROSS MOTION FOR DISCOVERY [LCV2022139481]
01/25/2022	 	Amended Complaint submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1162519
01/25/2022	 	Certification uploaded by Case Management Staff submitted by RICHARD HONE
02/09/2022	 	Other submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1189203
02/09/2022	 	Certification uploaded by Case Management Staff submitted by RICHARD HONE
02/11/2022	 	ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT-Granted by Judge VENABLE, SHEILA, A re: MOTION DISMISSING COMPLAINT [LCV202298501]
02/11/2022	 	ORDER FOR DISCOVERY-Denied by Judge VENABLE, SHEILA, A re: CROSS MOTION FOR DISCOVERY [LCV2022139481]

Filed Date	Filings	Docket Text
02/11/2022		Motion submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1193716
02/11/2022		Other submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1193764
02/11/2022		Reply brief submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1194307
02/11/2022		Motion To Reconsider uploaded by Case Management Staff submitted by RICHARD HONE
02/12/2022		Other submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1194416
02/13/2022		Motion submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1194675
02/13/2022		Motion To Reconsider uploaded by Case Management Staff submitted by RICHARD HONE *LINKED FILING*
02/14/2022		General Correspondence uploaded by Case Management Staff submitted by RICHARD HONE
02/15/2022		Other submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1198104
02/15/2022		Other submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1198943
02/15/2022		Correspondence uploaded by Case Management Staff submitted by RICHARD HONE *LINKED FILING*
02/16/2022		The motion filed on 02/11/2022 will be decided on 03/04/2022. Do not come to the courthouse because no oral argument has been requested. The court's decision will be provided to you. Re: MOTION TO RECONSIDER [LCV2022664743]
02/16/2022		The motion filed on 02/13/2022 will be decided on 03/04/2022. Do not come to the courthouse because no oral argument has been requested. The court's decision will be provided to you. Re: MOTION TO RECONSIDER [LCV2022666725]
02/16/2022		Other submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1201824
02/16/2022		Correspondence uploaded by Case Management Staff submitted by RICHARD HONE *LINKED FILING*
03/04/2022		ORDER RECONSIDER-Denied by Judge VENABLE, SHEILA, A re: MOTION TO RECONSIDER [LCV2022664743]
03/04/2022		ORDER RECONSIDER-Denied by Judge VENABLE, SHEILA, A re: MOTION TO RECONSIDER [LCV2022666725]
04/11/2022		Other submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1296118

Filed Date	Filings	Docket Text
04/14/2022		Other submitted by Richard Hone. JEDS EF-1304504
04/18/2022		DEFICIENCY NOTICE for Other LCV20221517503 Other-This filing is inappropriate and cannot be filed.. Motion for Reconsideration was denied and case is closed.
04/18/2022		Affidavit Of Service uploaded by Case Management Staff submitted by RICHARD HONE
04/18/2022		Affidavit Of Service uploaded by Case Management Staff submitted by RICHARD HONE

Showing 1 to 50 of 50 entries

- Screen ID : ECCV3000
- © Copyright NJ Judiciary 2016

BUILD: CivilCaseJacke

Form A

Plaintiff or Filing Attorney Information:

Name Richard Hone
 NJ Attorney ID Number Pro-Se
 Address 207 Carteret Ave. Seaside Hts NJ 08751
 Telephone Number [REDACTED]

Richard Hone,
 Plaintiff,
 v.
[REDACTED],
 Defendant(s).

CAW Superior Court of New Jersey
~~Chancery~~ Division Essex ☒ County
~~Equity~~ General Part CIVIL
 Docket No: 0-2-
 (to be filled in by the court)

Civil Action
Complaint

Plaintiff, Richard Hone, residing at
 (your name)
207 Carteret Ave., City of Seaside Hts
 (your address) (your city or town)
 County of Ocean,
 (your county)

State Of New Jersey, complaining of defendant, states as follows:

1. On Apr 30, 2018, Neven Tadros, Defendant
 (name of person being sued)

(Summarize what happened that resulted in your claim against the defendant. Use additional pages if necessary.)

Plaintiff was residing in Essex County at the time of the original violations of the Custodial Settlement Agreement between April 1, 2018 and December 1, 2019, and though the violations are to current 2021 Essex County has jurisdiction over this matter

The defendant in this action resides at PO Box 2016 Brick NJ but resides in Monmouth County,
 (defendant's address)
 In the County of Monmouth, State of New Jersey.
 (name of county where defendant lives)

2. Plaintiff is entitled to relief from defendant under the above facts.

Richard Hone, Ph# [REDACTED]
207 Carteret Ave.
Seaside Heights NJ 08751
[REDACTED]

RICHARD HONE
Plaintiff, Pro-Se

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
ESSEX COUNTY

CIVIL CHANCERY EQUITY DIVISION

Docket No. E- 45

V.

CIVIL
CHANCERY MATTER

CERTIFICATION for COMPLAINT

[REDACTED]
Defendant

I, Richard Hone, of full age, depose and say:

From approximately May 1, 2018 until December 1, 2019 plaintiff resided in Newark, Essex County at all times, therefore venue has clearly been established in Essex County.

Preliminary Statement

Plaintiff has recently been made aware of massive, disturbing, malicious, purposeful, too numerous to count, ongoing breaches of the Custodial Settlement Agreement, particularly the paragraph/section 3:22 that states; *"The parties agree to exert every reasonable effort to assist in all possible ways to promote a good relationship between the child and the other parent. Neither parent may do anything which may estrange or alienate the child from either parent, or injure the child's opinion as to her mother or father or which may hamper the free and mutual devotion of the child's love and respect for the other parent."*

Everything defendant has done violates this clause for almost the entirety of [REDACTED] short life. Plaintiff considers these a material breach as that clause goes to the heart of the agreement.

This is a classic case of parental alienation and brainwashing of a child, and continues to this day. The appalling number of instances in this case have made my child afraid of me, and have caused plaintiff to have to overcome these substantial obstacles just to have a happy, healthy, loving, nurturing, Father and Daughter relationship, which mother prevents constantly. The mother has proven over and over that because I do not love her, she will do anything to keep my only child, [REDACTED] 6-years-old (I am 62 ½ years old), away from me, which has caused substantial emotional issues with [REDACTED] ALL of which are self-created by the mother, and ALL are in contravention to, and Intentional and Material Breaches of, the Custody Agreement.

Count I- Defendant and plaintiff changed the name on the birth certificate to [REDACTED] in March 2017. This was a mutual decision because defendant purposely omitted my name on the original birth certificate, despite an agreement [REDACTED] would have my last name. It was discovered by plaintiff that starting on or about September 1, 2018 to current defendant has used a fictitious name, namely [REDACTED] in all pre-school, kindergarten, all social activities, and medical filings, applications, and has repeatedly told [REDACTED] her name is [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] is now convinced her "real" name is NOT her real name. I have again been frozen out of her life by a vindictive, malicious mother who because I do not love her, won't even allow my daughter and only child (at 62 1/2 years old) to use her real name, even in front of me. This continues to cause severe emotional damage to me, and is a violation of CSA 3:22. This was done to estrange and alienate me from [REDACTED] and to injure the child's opinion as to her father, and this clearly did hamper the free and mutual devotion of [REDACTED] love and respect for plaintiff father, which is an intentional breach (tort) of the custody agreement CSA 3:22.

Count II- On or about September 2018 defendant enrolled [REDACTED] in pre-school under the name [REDACTED] and began the brainwashing and alienation process of [REDACTED] in earnest. She made clear to teachers if [REDACTED] said anything about her father the plaintiff here, she was to be "notified immediately", this so she could make sure [REDACTED] never was saying anything good about me, or if she was asking questions, her mother could put an end to it and continue to brainwash her and alienate me further. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], which serve as another barrier to a healthy relationship with [REDACTED] and plaintiff father, and serves as an ongoing breach of CSA 3:22. This was done to estrange and alienate me from [REDACTED] and to injure the child's opinion as to her father, and this clearly did hamper the free and mutual devotion of [REDACTED] love and respect for plaintiff father, which is an intentional breach (tort) of the custody agreement CSA 3:22.

Count III- Continuing on or about January 1, 2018 through the entire year [REDACTED] was told "Daddy is a murderer (not at all true and a totally insane thing to tell a little child) and has a big gun and wants to take mommy away", among other sick and disturbing breaches that will be more clearly enumerated by discovery. This was done maliciously and purposely to estrange and alienate me from [REDACTED] and to injure the child's opinion as to her father, and this clearly did hamper the free and mutual devotion of [REDACTED] love and respect for plaintiff father, which is an intentional breach (tort) of the custody agreement CSA 3:22.

Count IV- On or about January 1, 2019 to January 1, 2020 defendant continually told [REDACTED] horrible, complete lies about me (with the exception of December 1, and December 8 when I saw her, then exacerbated something innocent about not having 2 fathers that [REDACTED] herself has refuted) that frightened [REDACTED] and when asked why [REDACTED] was acting afraid, she told me "I told her some things that made her fear you". When confronted that this was a breach of

the CSA, she said "we are a package deal, you have to take us both, all or nothing", and then proceeded to alienate me from [REDACTED]. This was done maliciously and purposely to estrange and alienate me from [REDACTED] and to injure the child's opinion as to her father, and this clearly did hamper the free and mutual devotion of [REDACTED] love and respect for plaintiff father, which is an intentional breach (tort) of the custody agreement CSA 3:22.

Count V- On or about September 1, 2019 defendant enrolled [REDACTED] in pre-school again, and continued to use the fictitious name [REDACTED], not [REDACTED] which caused her to be alienated from me. This was done maliciously and purposely to estrange and alienate me from [REDACTED], and to injure the child's opinion as to her father, and this clearly did hamper the free and mutual devotion of [REDACTED] love and respect for plaintiff father, which is an intentional breach (tort) of the custody agreement CSA 3:22.

Count VI- Starting in 2018 and continuing to current, defendant brought [REDACTED] to a local pediatrician, Dr. Galardo, who states her name is the fictitious [REDACTED] and goes on to list all the things the defendant has done to violate CSA 3:22, which include telling her lies, making sure she is scared of me, and instead of [REDACTED] NOT knowing these lies, which is a breach in itself, defendant reinforces these lies that even if true (which none of them are), [REDACTED] is NOT allowed to be told or even hear anything that resembles this, ever, as it is a breach of the CSA 3:22. This was done maliciously and purposely to estrange and alienate me from [REDACTED], and to injure the child's opinion as to her father, and this clearly did hamper the free and mutual devotion of [REDACTED] love and respect for plaintiff father, which is an intentional breach (tort) of the custody agreement CSA 3:22.

Count VII- There are 240 breaches of the custody agreement and violations of the court orders for Parenting Timer on Skype where [REDACTED] hides, says she hates me, she stays off camera, in contravention to what these calls are supposed to be, her on camera (It's Skype, the purpose is clear) mother does nothing, which we have an "on the record" report that these absolutely are breaches of the CSA 3:22. [REDACTED] did this for almost one year straight, if she even was on the call, many of which never occurred and were never made up, despite multiple filings for breach and contempt of court orders. This was done maliciously and purposely to estrange and alienate me from [REDACTED] and to injure the child's opinion as to her father, and this clearly did hamper the free and mutual devotion of [REDACTED] love and respect for plaintiff father, which is an intentional breach (tort) of the custody agreement CSA 3:22.

Count VIII- In 2020 the Monmouth County court ordered 2 hours per week on Skype with Grace Abounds, which defendant immediately set about to interfere with, and in the end we ended up doing both hours on the same day, plus a Skype call, which was designed to purposely make it impossible to have engaging, healthy calls because no 5-year-old can do that much time in one day. [REDACTED] would barely be on camera, would yell at me and disrespect me, and the defendant never corrected her. This was done maliciously and purposely to estrange and alienate me from [REDACTED] and to injure the child's opinion as to her father, and this clearly did hamper the free and mutual devotion of [REDACTED] love and respect for plaintiff father, which is an intentional breach (tort) of the custody agreement CSA 3:22.

Count IX- In 2020 Serenity started seeing Dr. Ridley, a child psychologist, again under the fictitious name [REDACTED], and when the defendant filled out the intake form, she claimed only the father [REDACTED] despite her [REDACTED], which was designed to cover-up her past, and alienate me from [REDACTED] via the doctor. Then she continued to poison [REDACTED] with false stories about me, and reinforced these lies with the doctor, which made it more difficult to understand all of [REDACTED] emotional abuse/problems were/are self-created by the defendant. This was done maliciously and purposely to estrange and alienate me from [REDACTED] and to injure the child's opinion as to her father, and this clearly did hamper the free and mutual devotion of [REDACTED] love and respect for plaintiff father, which is an intentional breach (tort) of the custody agreement CSA 3:22.

Count X- On or about April 27, 2021 defendant stopped bringing her to Court Ordered Parenting Time at Preferred Behavioral Health, made her change outfits, and did horrible things to create fear in [REDACTED] on the drive over, and right up to the visits themselves, with malice, on purpose and for the sole purpose to prevent and interfere with healthy, happy, loving parenting time, and defendant told her more horrible things (which are on the record) that are continued breaches of the CSA 3:22. These breaches are documented in the therapist notes. This was the last straw, I haven't been in my daughter's life since then, except for Skype 40 minutes a week. This was done maliciously and purposely to estrange and alienate me from [REDACTED] and to injure the child's opinion as to her father, and this clearly did hamper the free and mutual devotion of [REDACTED] love and respect for plaintiff father, which is an intentional breach (tort) of the custody agreement CSA 3:22.

Count XI- From 2018 to current 2021 there are at least another 100 instances of breach of contract where defendant maliciously and purposely estranges and alienate me from [REDACTED], and injures the child's opinion of her father, and this clearly IS DONE to hamper the free and mutual devotion of [REDACTED] love and respect for plaintiff father, which is an intentional breach (tort) of the custody agreement CSA 3:22. These will be addressed more thoroughly in discovery. ALL of this was done maliciously and purposely to estrange and alienate me from [REDACTED] and to injure the child's opinion as to her father, and this clearly did hamper the free and mutual devotion of [REDACTED] love and respect for plaintiff father, which is an intentional breach (tort) of the custody agreement CSA 3:22.

RELIEF (additional to Form A):

1. Plaintiff seeks to terminate custodial settlement agreement for breach of contract. These breaches are malicious and done with actual malice, and on purpose. They are material as they go to the heart of the contract, which is designed to foster a loving, healthy, nurturing and meaningful relationship with [REDACTED] which has been blocked and prevented every step of the way by defendant by continued and ongoing breaches of the CSA.

2. Plaintiff seeks the court to Order the mother to use [REDACTED] real name, [REDACTED] effective immediately.
3. Plaintiff seeks One Million dollars (\$1,000,000.00) in damages, both compensatory and punitive.
4. Plaintiff seeks an Order for a new custody agreement within 10 days, negotiated in good faith by mother, all references to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (none of which ever existed for plaintiff) of each party, including the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] These will go in if defendant continues to breach contract and can't negotiate in good faith. This is a custody agreement and these issues should never have been in there from the beginning.
5. Parenting schedule Order- Immediate Unsupervised parenting time, all over-nights, pickup & drop-off location in Seaside Hts. at my address, all holidays and entire Easter/Summer vacation/ Thanksgiving/Christmas/Birthdays/All Holidays of [REDACTED] and Father, all school recess periods.

I swear the above statements made by me are true. If any of the foregoing statements made by me are false, I am subject to punishment.


Richard Hone, Pro-Se- Father

12-3-21
Date:

Form A

3. The harm that occurred as a result of defendant's acts include: (list each item of damage and injury)

1. Caused immense emotional harm by creating a fictitious scenario that caused [redacted] to be emotionally damaged, thereby making my relationship with her infinitely more difficult than imaginable, on purpose, because I do not love her, and violate CSA 3:22 over 100 times and as a material breach
2. With malice and on purpose sought to permanently keep my daughter and only child (at 62 172 years old) away from me, fill her with lies, create all her emotional problems and the physical and psychological maladies that come with the brainwashing of a tiny child, which beomes my issues also as I suffer the same pain and worse as [redacted]
3. Purposely violated CSA 3:22 so my daughter would have a horrible opinion of me, and when reading the school records and medical reports it caused me extreme emotional and physical sickness. **ADDITIONAL CLAIMS IN OTHER CERTIFICATION**

(One - Million Dollars)
PLAINTIFF SEEKS \$1,000,000 in Compensatory and Punitive damages

Wherefore, plaintiff requests judgment against defendant for damages, together with attorney's fees, if applicable, costs of suit, and any other relief as the court may deem proper.

Dated: 12-3-21

Signature: 

CERTIFICATION OF NO OTHER ACTIONS

I certify that the dispute about which I am suing is not the subject of any other action pending in any other court or a pending arbitration proceeding to the best of my knowledge and belief. Also, to the best of my knowledge and belief no other action or arbitration proceeding is contemplated. Further, other than the parties set forth in this complaint, I know of no other parties that should be made a part of this lawsuit. In addition, I recognize my continuing obligation to file and serve on all parties and the court an amended certification if there is a change in the facts stated in this original certification.

Dated: 12-3-21

Signature: 

OPTIONAL: If you would like to have a judge decide your case, do not include the following paragraph in your complaint. If you would prefer to have a jury to decide your case, please sign your name after the following paragraph.

JURY DEMAND

The plaintiff demands trial by a jury on all of the triable issues of this complaint, pursuant to New Jersey Court Rules 1:8-2(b) and 4:35-1(a).

Dated: 12-3-21

Signature: 

A0012

CERTIFICATE OF BIRTH

NAME OF CHILD

[REDACTED]

DATE OF BIRTH

JANUARY 20, 2015

TIME

08:06 AM

SEX

MALE

MAIDEN NAME OF MOTHER

[REDACTED]

NAME OF FATHER

RICHARD W. HONE

PLACE OF BIRTH

FREEHOLD TWP

COUNTY OF BIRTH

MONMOUTH

DATE ISSUED:

MARCH 6, 2017

FILE NUMBER

DATE FILED WITH REGISTRAR 01/29/2015

ATTENDED DATE: 01/24/2017

ISSUED BY:

7108849880

Teresa A Warner, Registrar
Freehold Township Vital Statistics

This is to certify that the above is correctly
copied from a record on file in my office.

Certified copy not valid unless the raised
Great Seal of the State of New Jersey
or the seal of the issuing municipality
or county, is affixed hereon.

REG-42A
JUN 14



Vincent T. Aris
State Registrar
Office of Vital Statistics and Registry

THIS DOCUMENT HAS MULTIPLE SECURITY FEATURES TO DETER FRAUD; VOID IF ALTE

Shore Academy Communication Log

Student Name: [REDACTED]

Date: 7/20/20	Reason for Communication/Documentation [REDACTED] conversation at drop off today
Notes/Comments: [REDACTED] came to school today with a Nickel in her hand. I asked her to put the Nickel away in her lunchbox and to leave it in her car next time. She told me she got the Nickel for being mean to her "mean daddy Richard , Every time I am mean to my mean daddy Richard , I get paid" I asked who paid her and she said "my sister [REDACTED] pays me to be mean".	

**HEALTH OFFICE REGISTRATION
(REGISTRO DE LA ENFERMERÍA)**

**PROVISIONAL ADMITTANCE REQUEST
SOLICITUD DE ADMISIÓN PROVISIONAL**

Name of Child (Nombre del niño) _____

I request my child be provisionally admitted to school pending the completion of the minimum immunization requirements. I affirm that the immunizations required will be completed within the time specified. (Solicito que mi hijo sea admitido provisionalmente en la escuela hasta que se cumplan los requisitos mínimos de inmunización. Me comprometo a que mi hijo reciba las vacunas requeridas dentro del tiempo especificado.)

8-10-20 _____
Date (Fecha) Signature of Parent/Guardian (Firma del padre o madre) Phone Number (Teléfono) _____

The above pupil's immunization series has been initiated and he/she is in the process of complying with all the immunization requirements. I have arranged an appointment schedule and agree to provide the remaining immunizations. All immunization requirements should be met by (Las vacunas que el alumno arriba mencionado necesita han sido rubricadas y él / ella está en el proceso de cumplir con todos los requisitos de inmunización. Ya tiene una cita y todos los requisitos serán cumplidos antes de _____)

Expiration of Provisional Admittance (Vencimiento de admisión provisional) _____

Name of Physician or Health Office (Nombre del doctor o clínica): _____

_____ Date (Fecha) Signature (Firma) Phone Number (Teléfono) _____

THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION IS REQUIRED BY THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY (LA SIGUIENTE INFORMACIÓN ES REQUISITO EN EL ESTADO DE NUEVA JERSEY) (Please complete in full/ Por favor complete)

¿Tiene seguro médico su hijo? ☒ SI ☐ No (Nombre de la compañía de seguros) _____
Is child covered by Health Insurance? ☒ Yes ☐ No Name of Company: Horseshoe Family Care
(Fecha del último examen médico) _____
Date of Last Medical Examination: Aug 2020

MEDICATIONS (MEDICACIÓN)

¿Toma su hijo medicinas a diario? ☐ SI ☒ No ¿Tiene que tomarlas en la escuela? ☐ SI ☒ No
Does your child take any daily medications? ☐ Yes ☒ No Must be given in school? ☐ Yes ☒ No
(Por favor indique las medicinas que toma a diario y las dosis)
Please list daily medications and doses.

ALLERGIES (Is your child allergic to any of the following (ALERGIA.- Tiene su hijo alergia a..))

(Medicinas) ☐ SI ☒ No En caso afirmativo, enumere) _____
Medications ☐ Yes ☒ No If Yes, please list _____
(Alergia estacional) ☐ SI ☒ No En caso afirmativo, explique) _____
Seasonal Allergies ☐ Yes ☒ No If Yes, please explain _____
(Picadura de abeja o insectos) ☐ SI ☒ No En caso afirmativo, indique las medicinas en caso de reacción) _____
Bee Sting/Insect Bites ☐ Yes ☒ No If Yes, list medication needed for reaction _____
(Alergias a comidas) ☐ SI ☒ No En caso afirmativo, indique la comida(s) _____
Food Allergies ☐ Yes ☒ No If Yes, which foods? raw cooking
¿Tipo de reacción? Allergic ¿Qué medicación necesita en caso de reacción? _____
Type of reaction? Allergic Medication needed for reaction? _____
(Asma) ☐ SI ☒ No En caso afirmativo, con qué frecuencia) _____
Asthma ☐ Yes ☒ No If Yes, frequency of attacks _____
¿Qué medicación toma para el asma? _____ ¿Qué la desencadena? _____
Current daily asthma medications? _____ Known Triggers: _____
Flujo máximo normal
Normal Peak Flow

(ENFERMEDADES CARDÍACAS/SOPLOS) ☐ SI ☒ No ¿Limitaciones en la actividad? _____
HEART DISEASE/HEART MURMUR: ☐ Yes ☒ No Limitations in activity? _____

School Business Administrator/
Board Secretary

To the Parent/Guardian of:
Address

Date: 08-03-2020

NOTIFICATION FOR FREE MEALS/ FREE MILK THROUGH SNAP/TANF DIRECT CERTIFICATION

The child listed below will be getting free meals/milk at school because he/she was identified as receiving SNAP or TANF.

Child Name :

If there are other children in your household who are not listed above, they also qualify for free meals.

Please contact the school your child/children attend in the following situations:

- If there are other children in your household who are not listed above and you would like them to receive free meals at school
- You do not want your child to have free meals
- You have any additional questions

Para el Padre/Encargado de:
Dirección:

Fecha: 08-03-2020

NOTIFICACIÓN PARA LAS COMIDAS GRATIS/LECHE GRATIS A TRAVÉS DE CERTIFICACIÓN DIRECTA

El niño/la niña en la siguiente lista estará recibiendo comidas gratis/leche gratis en la escuela porque el/ella fue identificado como recibiendo cupones de alimentos (SNAP) o ayuda temporaria para familias necesitadas (TANF).

Nombre del Niño:

Si hay otros niños en su hogar que no están en la lista anterior, ellos también califican para comidas gratis.

Por favor contactar la escuela de su niño/niños en caso que ocurra una de las siguientes situaciones:

- Si hay otros niños en su hogar que no están en la lista anterior y le gustaría que reciban comidas gratis en la escuela
- No quiere que su niño/niña reciba comidas gratis
- Tiene preguntas adicionales.

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, sex, disability, age, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA.

Individuals who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g. Braille, large print, audiotape, American Sign Language) should contact the Agency (State or local) where they applied for benefits. Individuals who are deaf, hard of hearing or have speech disabilities may contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service (800) 877-8339. Additional program information may be made available in other formats upon request.

Kindergarten Report Card

School Year: 2020-21

Student Name: [REDACTED]		Parent/Guardian Name & Address: [REDACTED]	
Teacher: [REDACTED]		Homeroom Teacher: [REDACTED]	
Grade: [REDACTED]		Homeroom: [REDACTED]	

Attendance		MP1	MP2	MP3	MP4	Total
Absent	1	4	0	2	7	
Tardy	2	3	5	17	27	

Report cards will be issued four times during the year. This card is a record of your child's progress. We suggest that you keep it for future reference. Regular and punctual attendance is necessary for maximum achievement. If you have any questions regarding this report card, please call the school at [REDACTED] to arrange an appointment to discuss the situation with the teacher(s) involved. We will do all we can to assist students to reach their potential.

LANGUAGE ARTS	Teacher	2nd	3rd	4th
Blends sounds to read words		G	G	G
Expresses ideas		S	G	G
Identifies/recognizes letters		O	O	O
Reads high frequency words		O	O	O
Identifies sounds of letters		O	O	O
Identifies sounds of words		G	G	G
WRITING	Teacher	2nd	3rd	4th
Prints letters correctly		/	/	/
Prints numbers correctly		/	/	/
MATHEMATICS	Teacher	2nd	3rd	4th
Adds/subtracts sets 2 / from 8		G	O	O
Recognizes numbers		O	O	O
Recognizes basic shapes		O	O	O
SMALL MOTOR DEVELOPMENT	Teacher	2nd	3rd	4th
Pastes neatly		/	/	/
Uses scissors to cut accurately		/	/	/
SOCIAL-GROUPT H	Teacher	2nd	3rd	4th
Observes rules		/	/	/
Shows self-control		/	/	/
Plays/works well with others		/	/	/
WORK HABITS	Teacher	2nd	3rd	4th
Completes tasks		/	/	/
Follows directions		/	/	/
Works independently		/	/	/
Listens attentively		/	/	/
Works neatly		/	/	/
Participates in class activities		/	/	/
Technology literacy		/	/	/

Next Year's Grade Assignment: _____

Grade Key	Skill Grades
O Outstanding	+ Strength
G Good	/ Steady Progress
S Satisfactory - On Level	- Weakness
NI Needs Improvement	

SCIENCE	Teacher	2nd	3rd	4th
		O	O	O
SOCIAL STUDIES	Teacher	2nd	3rd	4th
		G	G	O
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	Teacher	2nd	3rd	4th
Preparation		G	G	
Participation		/	/	/
Sportsmanship		/	/	/
Gross motor		/	/	/
Coordination		/	/	/
Muscle tone		/	/	/
Comments:				
SPANISH	Teacher	2nd	3rd	4th
Participates in class		O	O	O
Uses words in context		/	/	+
Recognizes words by/through listening		/	+	+
Comments:				
ART	Teacher	2nd	3rd	4th
		O	O	O
Comments:				
MUSIC	Teacher	2nd	3rd	4th
		G	O	O
Comments:				

9/14/21, 2:26 PM

Conversation

2 messages

To: [REDACTED]

Thu, Apr 15, 2021 at 2:56 PM

Dear Ms. [REDACTED]

I wanted to reach out to you about a conversation [REDACTED] spoke to me about regarding seeing her father. The teacher requested for me to see [REDACTED] after she was telling her teacher and classmates that she was very scared because her dad tried to kill her mother. When she came to my office, [REDACTED] was quite upset and said that she was feeling very scared about "Daddy Richard". She said that he has a big gun and he murdered someone. She mentioned being "very afraid of her mommy being hurt by him and not wanting to see him". One of the thoughts making her most anxious was that he would kidnap her and she does not want to be away from her mom. I tried to reassure her that she is safe and the adults in her life will keep her safe.

Please reach out if there are any questions.

Thank you,

School Counselor [REDACTED]

by [REDACTED]

To: V [REDACTED]

Fri, Apr 16, 2021 at 1:18 PM

(Quoted text hidden)

(Quoted text hidden)

Khajezadeh, Dina

From: Allison Sica <Allison.Sica@njcourts.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2023 1:49 PM
To: TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us; Andrew Hannwacker
Subject: RE: [External]Re: Richard Hone

I will relist for 04/24 at 9am.

Allison Sica

Sr. Probation Officer
Calendar Coordinator for Judge Lisa Puglisi
Calendar Coordinator for Judge Dina Vicari
Ph: (732) 504-0700 x64307
Fx: (732) 435-8396

From: Toscano, Taylor <TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us>
Sent: Saturday, March 11, 2023 7:01 PM
To: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>; Allison Sica <Allison.Sica@njcourts.gov>
Subject: [External]Re: Richard Hone

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the Judiciary organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

No objection. Thank you.

From: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 11, 2023 12:54 PM
To: Toscano, Taylor <TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us>; Allison Sica <Allison.Sica@njcourts.gov>
Subject: Richard Hone

Please be advised that Richard Hone Reconsideration of his Civil Appeal case has been denied. However, he is filing an Appeal at the Supreme level.

Even though it is an Appeal of his Civil matter there is implication to the criminal matter.

Therefore, I am requesting an adjournment of 3/20/2023 to the next normal cycle, 5-6 weeks out.

--

Andrew C. Hannwacker, Esq.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

ORDER ON MOTION

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
APPELLATE DIVISION

DOCKET NO.: A-001524-21T2

MOTION NO.: M-003460-22

BEFORE: PART C

JUDGE(S): FRANCIS J. VERNOIA
ARNOLD L. NATALI, JR.

IN THE MATTER OF
RICHARD HONE

MOTION FILED: 02/21/2023
ANSWER(S)
FILED:

BY: RICHARD HONE
BY:

SUBMITTED TO COURT: March 09, 2023

ORDER


THIS MATTER HAVING BEEN DULY PRESENTED TO THE COURT, IT IS, ON
THIS 10th day of March, 2023, HEREBY ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

MOTION BY APPELLANT

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

DENIED

FOR THE COURT:



FRANCIS J. VERNOIA, J.A.D.

L-001803-20 OCEAN
ORDER - REGULAR MOTION
DLK

Khajezadeh, Dina

From: Allison Sica <Allison.Sica@njcourts.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2023 8:34 AM
To: Andrew Hannwacker; TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us
Subject: RE: [External]Re: Richard Hone

Thanks.

Richard Hone's case is being moved to Judge Rahill. It will stay on for 4/24 at 9am. I will let Anne know his appearance is waived and it's just a check in for the appeal. Thanks.

Allison Sica

Sr. Probation Officer
Calendar Coordinator for Judge Lisa Puglisi
Calendar Coordinator for Judge Dina Vicari
Ph: (732) 504-0700 x64307
Fx: (732) 435-8396

From: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2023 5:57 PM
To: Allison Sica <Allison.Sica@njcourts.gov>
Subject: [External]Re: Richard Hone

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the Judiciary organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Yes, he filed for an Appeal to the Supreme Court of NJ earlier in the week...

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 24, 2023, at 10:33 AM, Allison Sica <Allison.Sica@njcourts.gov> wrote:

Hi.

I am moving Judge Puglisi cases that are not going to resolve in the next 4-6 weeks to Judge Rahill. My notes indicated Mr. Hone is filing another appeal. Is that correct?

Allison Sica

Sr. Probation Officer
Calendar Coordinator for Judge Lisa Puglisi
Calendar Coordinator for Judge Dina Vicari
Ph: (732) 504-0700 x64307
Fx: (732) 435-8396

Khajezadeh, Dina

From: Toscano, Taylor <TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us>
Sent: Wednesday, April 26, 2023 8:54 AM
To: Andrew Hannwacker
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Richard Hone Supreme Court Appeal

Thank you!

From: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2023 7:55 PM
To: Toscano, Taylor <TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Richard Hone Supreme Court Appeal

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use proper judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Taylor,
Keeping you up to date.
Seems my client must close some deficiencies in his Supreme Court Appeal.
Andy

--

Andrew C. Hannwacker, Esq.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY

HEATHER JOY BAKER
CLERK



OFFICE OF THE CLERK
PO Box 970
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625-0970

April 20, 2023

RICHARD HONE

Re: IMO RICHARD HONE
Supreme Court Docket Number 088057

Dear Mr. Hone:

A notice of petition for certification (NPC) and petition for certification (PC) from the judgment of the Appellate Division in A-001524-21 were received by this office on March 22, 2023. In addition, you submitted a letter, which you refer to as "affidavit to waive the requirement for additional copies" and your Appellate Division documents filed in A-001524-21. The matter has been assigned the above docket number, which must appear on all future submissions.

This NPC satisfies applicable Rule requirements and has been filed. The following deficiencies, regarding your PC and Appellate Division documents, have been noted:

- Your letter, which you refer to as an "affidavit to waive the requirement for additional copies" has been accepted as an affidavit in support of a motion to relax Court Rules requiring four (4) copies of your PC and Appellate Division documents be submitted to the Supreme Court Clerk's Office. See Rule 2:12-7(b). However, you must submit a notice of motion to the relax the Court Rules.

A copy of the Supreme Court *Guide to Filing for Litigants Without Lawyers* is enclosed. Please refer to page ten (10) for a sample notice of motion and provide a notice of motion to relax the Court Rules to the Supreme Court Clerk's Office.

- The copy of the Appellate Division appendix, received by this office on March 22, 2023, is not the document that was filed in the Appellate Division on June 29, 2022. Please submit an exact copy of your Appellate Division appendix filed in A-001524-21 on June 29, 2022.

Failure to correct the deficiencies may affect the submission of this matter to the Court for its consideration.

Respondent must submit an original and three (3) copies of a respondent brief within 15 days of the service of the PC. In addition, respondent must submit four (4) copies of their briefs and appendices filed with the Appellate Division. See Rule 2:12-8.

Questions related to this case should be directed to the Supreme Court Clerk's Office at (609) 815-2955, ext. 52475.

Enclosure

c: Peter Sosinski, DAG

Khajezadeh, Dina

From: Mel Edgar <melissa.edgar@njcourts.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, August 30, 2023 1:54 PM
To: TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us; Andrew Hannwacker
Cc: Laurie Huselton; Rachael Macfarlane; Scott Hall; Melissa Rolseth; Christopher Diller
Subject: Richard Hone OCN-20-000532 Motion to Quash granted
Attachments: HoneQuashGranted.pdf

Please see attached Order granting the motion to quash a subpoena in the above matter. Thank you.

Mel Edgar

Law Clerk to the Honorable Kimarie Rahill, J.S.C.
Superior Court of New Jersey – Ocean Vicinage, Criminal Division
120 Hooper Ave, Courtroom 7
Toms River, N.J. 08753
Telephone: (732) 504-0700, ext. 64108
E-mail: melissa.edgar@njcourts.gov

****Please send courtesy copies of all motions, cross-motions, oppositions, and replies directly to Judge Rahill at Rahill.mbx@njcourts.gov.****

PREPARED BY THE COURT

STATE of NEW JERSEY
Plaintiff,

v.

RICHARD HONE
Defendant.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
OCEAN COUNTY
Law Division- Criminal Part

Case No.: 20-000532

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION
TO QUASH**

THIS MATTER having been opened to the court by motion of an interested party, [REDACTED] and Andrew Hannwacker, Esq., appearing on behalf of Defendant, and Assistant Prosecutor Taylor Toscano appearing on behalf of the State; and the parties taking no position on the Motion; and for good cause having been shown;

IT IS on this 30th day of August, 2023, **ORDERED** as follows:

1. Defendant's motion to quash the subpoena issued by Andrew Hannwacker, Esq. upon Google, LLC concerning incoming and outgoing email messages from the email account associated with the filing party ([REDACTED]) is hereby **GRANTED**.



HON. Kimarie Rahill J.S.C.

Carey, Erin

From: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2024 11:47 AM
To: Christopher Diller
Cc: TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: Richard Hone, OCN 20-532

I would say 3/25 would be better.

On Wed, Jan 31, 2024 at 10:00 AM Christopher Diller <christopher.diller@njcourts.gov> wrote:

Yes this I can move out. Do we think 3/11 or do we think 3/25 would be better?

From: Toscano, Taylor <TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:59 AM
To: Christopher Diller <christopher.diller@njcourts.gov>
Cc: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Richard Hone, OCN 20-532

Hi Diller!!

Mr. Hannwacker has advised this appeal is apparently still pending? Would you be inclined to adjourn for one more cycle? Mr. Hone's appearance has been waived this entire time.

Thanks!

Taylor



Taylor Toscano
Assistant Prosecutor
119 Hooper Avenue P.O. Box 2191
Toms River, NJ 08754-2191
Phone: (732) 929-2027 Ext. 2741
Email: ttoscano@co.ocean.nj.us

Warning: This message is intended for the user of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, law enforcement sensitive, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by reply or by telephone (732)929-2027 Ext. 2741 and immediately delete this message and all of its attachments.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY - LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE

From: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2024 9:49 PM
To: Melissa Rolseth <melissa.rolseth@njcourts.gov>; Toscano, Taylor <TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us>
Cc: Heisler, Christopher <CHeisler@co.ocean.nj.us>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Richard Hone, OCN 20-532

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use proper judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Latest information regarding Richard Hone and his appeal to the NJ Supreme Court requesting Reconsideration.

On Wed, Nov 29, 2023 at 8:43 PM Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com> wrote:

Melissa,

I had the following information:

NJ Sup Ct docketed filings:

088507 (A-1524-21 Appellate)

088296 (A-2508-21 Appellate) filing confirmed by memo from the Supreme Court June 12, 2023.

I do not have access to the Supreme Court filings for these two matters. They were not criminal but appeals of Civil / Family matters but could have implications on the criminal venue decision.

On Tue, Nov 28, 2023 at 4:03 PM Melissa Rolseth <melissa.rolseth@njcourts.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon,

At the last appearance on 11/13, it was discussed that we are still waiting on the cert request to the Supreme Court. I have followed up with the Supreme Court Clerk's Office regarding this matter and they do not have any information regarding an appeal to them. All they can see is the appellate level matter, but no request for cert. If this is incorrect, please provide me some receipt of filing or docket number. Otherwise, we will move forward on this matter at the next appearance on 12/18 and not wait for the appeal any further.

Thank you,

Missy Rolseth

Law Clerk to the Honorable Kimarie Rahill, J.S.C.
Superior Court of New Jersey – Ocean Vicinage, Criminal Division

120 Hooper Ave, Courtroom 7

Toms River, N.J. 08753
Telephone: (732) 504-0700, ext. 64108
E-mail: melissa.rolseth@njcourts.gov

****Please send courtesy copies of all motions, cross-motions, oppositions, and replies directly to Judge Rahill at Rahill.mbx@njcourts.gov.****

--

Andrew C. Hannwacker, Esq.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

--

Andrew C. Hannwacker, Esq.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

--

Andrew C. Hannwacker, Esq.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

Carey, Erin

From: Christopher Diller <christopher.diller@njcourts.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:05 AM
To: TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us
Cc: Andrew Hannwacker
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Richard Hone, OCN 20-532

ok

From: Toscano, Taylor <TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:04 AM
To: Christopher Diller <christopher.diller@njcourts.gov>
Cc: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Richard Hone, OCN 20-532

I'd say 3/25.



Taylor Toscano
Assistant Prosecutor
119 Hooper Avenue P.O. Box 2191
Toms River, NJ 08754-2191
Phone: (732) 929-2027 Ext. 2741
Email: ttoscano@co.ocean.nj.us

Warning: This message is intended for the user of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, law enforcement sensitive, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by reply or by telephone (732)929-2027 Ext. 2741 and immediately delete this message and all of its attachments.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY - LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE

From: Christopher Diller <christopher.diller@njcourts.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:01 AM
To: Toscano, Taylor <TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us>
Cc: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Richard Hone, OCN 20-532

Yes this I can move out. Do we think 3/11 or do we think 3/25 would be better?

From: Toscano, Taylor <TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:59 AM
To: Christopher Diller <christopher.diller@njcourts.gov>
Cc: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Richard Hone, OCN 20-532

Hi Diller!!

Mr. Hannwacker has advised this appeal is apparently still pending? Would you be inclined to adjourn for one more cycle? Mr. Hone's appearance has been waived this entire time.

Thanks!
Taylor



Taylor Toscano
Assistant Prosecutor
119 Hooper Avenue P.O. Box 2191
Toms River, NJ 08754-2191
Phone: (732) 929-2027 Ext. 2741
Email: ttoscano@co.ocean.nj.us

Warning: This message is intended for the user of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, law enforcement sensitive, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by reply or by telephone (732)929-2027 Ext. 2741 and immediately delete this message and all of its attachments.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY - LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE

From: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2024 9:49 PM
To: Melissa Rolseth <melissa.rolseth@njcourts.gov>; Toscano, Taylor <TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us>
Cc: Heisler, Christopher <CHEisler@co.ocean.nj.us>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Richard Hone, OCN 20-532

This message has originated from an **External Source**. Please use proper judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Latest information regarding Richard Hone and his appeal to the NJ Supreme Court requesting Reconsideration.

On Wed, Nov 29, 2023 at 8:43 PM Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com> wrote:

Melissa,

I had the following information:

NJ Sup Ct docketed filings:

088507 (A-1524-21 Appellate)

088296 (A-2508-21 Appellate) filing confirmed by memo from the Supreme Court June 12, 2023.

I do not have access to the Supreme Court filings for these two matters. They were not criminal but appeals of Civil / Family matters but could have implications on the criminal venue decision.

On Tue, Nov 28, 2023 at 4:03 PM Melissa Rolseth <melissa.rolseth@njcourts.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon,

At the last appearance on 11/13, it was discussed that we are still waiting on the cert request to the Supreme Court. I have followed up with the Supreme Court Clerk's Office regarding this matter and they do not have any information regarding an appeal to them. All they can see is the appellate level matter, but no request for cert. If this is incorrect, please provide me some receipt of filing or docket number. Otherwise, we will move forward on this matter at the next appearance on 12/18 and not wait for the appeal any further.

Thank you,

Missy Rolseth

Law Clerk to the Honorable Kimarie Rahill, J.S.C.
Superior Court of New Jersey – Ocean Vicinage, Criminal Division

120 Hooper Ave, Courtroom 7

Toms River, N.J. 08753

Telephone: (732) 504-0700, ext. 64108

E-mail: melissa.rolseth@njcourts.gov

****Please send courtesy copies of all motions, cross-motions, oppositions, and replies directly to Judge Rahill at Rahill.mbx@njcourts.gov.****

--

Andrew C. Hannwacker, Esq.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

--

Andrew C. Hannwacker, Esq.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

Hone v. [REDACTED]
NJ Supreme Court
2 copies of PC
Petition for Certification
1-29-24

NJ Supreme 088955
2 copies -29-24

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

SEASIDE HEIGHTS
55 SUMNER AVE
SEASIDE HEIGHTS, NJ 08751-9998
(800) 275-8777

01/29/2024 02:50 PM

Product	Qty	Unit Price	Price
First-Class Mail® Large Envelope	1		\$2.35
Trenton, NJ 08625 Weight: 0 lb 4.90 oz Estimated Delivery Date Wed 01/31/2024			
Grand Total:			\$2.35
Cash			\$20.00
Change			-\$17.65

Preview your Mail
Track your Packages
Sign up for FREE ®
<https://informedelivery.usps.com>

All sales final on stamps and postage.
Refunds for guaranteed services only.
Thank you for your business.

Tell us about your experience.
Go to: <https://postalexperience.com/Pos>
or scan this code with your mobile device.



or call 1-800-410-7420.

UFN: 337635-0847
Receipt #: 840-50880208-1-4342936-2
Clerk: 03



Supreme Court of New Jersey

Office of the Clerk

Matthew T. Kelly
Deputy Clerk, Chief Counsel

Heather Joy Baker
Clerk of Court

Christine A. Muller
Deputy Clerk, Chief Administrator

Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex • P.O. Box 970 • Trenton, NJ 08625-0970

njcourts.gov • Tel. 609-815-2955

January 24, 2024

Richard Hone

Re: Richard Hone v. [REDACTED]
Supreme Court Docket Number 088955

Dear Richard Hone:

A notice of petition for certification (NPC) and petition for certification (PC) from the judgment of the Appellate Division in A-004000-22 were received by this office on December 11, 2023. The matter has been assigned the above docket number, which must appear on all future submissions.

This NPC satisfies applicable Rule requirements and has been filed. The following deficiency, regarding the PC, has been noted:

- Along with the NPC, you submitted an original and one (1) copy of a document titled "Affidavit in Support of Petition for Certification," which has been accepted as your PC. Pursuant to Rule 2:12-7(b), four (4) copies of your PC must be submitted to the Supreme Court Clerk's Office. Please submit two (2) additional copies of the document titled "Affidavit in Support of Petition for Certification."

Failure to cure the deficiency may affect the submission of this matter to the Court for its consideration.

Respondent must submit an original and three (3) copies of a respondent brief within 15 days of the service of the PC. Questions related to this case should be directed to the Clerk's Office at (609) 815-2955.

c: [REDACTED]



AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR CERTIFICATION

Supreme Court of New Jersey
Docket No. A-4000-22

Richard Hone v. [REDACTED]

Movant Richard Hone, duly of age, on his oath, deposes and says:

I am the petitioner in the above matter.

My almost 9-year old only child [REDACTED] future is at stake here and the Due Process violations of my Constitutional Rights have been violated in a transparent attempt to keep me from having access to the court by paying fees I cannot afford (yet they Grant a fee waiver to the \$300- an hour active prostitute mother of my child, who is also a convicted child abuser and child kidnapper who spent 8 years in NJ State prison for those crimes) and even though one would expect the lower court judges in Ocean County to lack intelligence and be dictators who have little or no business being judges and (with a couple of not-from Ocean County judges who preside there being the exceptions) who have committed felonies too numerous to list, have shown a complete and utter disregard for the Law, Supreme Court cases which are controlling, and retaliated against me with actual malice and wilful misconduct to violate my Civil Rights, harass me constantly with non-sensical "orders" that have no bearing on my case, or any merit whatsoever, and to make matter even worse, after hodgson gets removed from interfering in my Family case, he continues to interfere and "reviews" my filings illegally, then "decides" what I can file even though he is absolutely clueless about anything regarding my case, and therefore continues to violate my Civil Rights and commits the 3rd degree felony of NJ 2C:30-6 Official Deprivation of Civil Rights, and NJ 2C:30-2 Official Misconduct, which you will 100% see in my brief when you Grant this.

Now this Sumner guy conspires with hodgson and Grasso to retaliate against me, and hears cases even with N.J. AG Corruption Complaints against them.

How Sumner and hodgson are even judges is so repugnant to me on every level. They are simply put low-life failed attorneys and political hacks who should be in prison, and have Zero Integrity or Independence.

The basic fact here is my Due Process to Rights have unequivocally been violated.

I swear the above statements made by me are true. If any of the foregoing statements made by me are false, I am subject to punishment.



December 7, 2023

Richard Hone, Plaintiff Father

Date:

PROOF OF MAILING

On December 7, 2023, I, the undersigned, mailed my Notice of Petition for Certification to the NJ Supreme Court by USPS Regular Mail (1 original and one copy, 2 copies total as instructed by the Clerk's Office), by email to the AG Peter Sosinski and by USPS Regular Mail to PO Box 112, Trenton NJ 08625-0112, the Clerk of the Appellate Division via email at Appinfo.mbx@njcourts.gov, and Patricia.Shaw@njcourts.gov (the Case Manager for this Appeal) as well as USPS Regular Mail, and the Ocean County Superior Court by JEDS and USPS Regular mail who serves the defendant/respondent [REDACTED] per their own court Order(s).

ALL PARTIES HAVE BEEN SERVED PROPERLY

I swear the above statements made by me are true. If any of the foregoing statements made by me are false, I am subject to punishment.



December 7, 2023

Richard Hone, Plaintiff Father

Date:

Richard Hone, Ph# [REDACTED]
201C Sampson Ave.
Seaside Hts., NJ 08751
[REDACTED]

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY
App. Div. A-4000-22

Richard Hone v. [REDACTED]

Civil Matter
Notice of Petition for Certification

To: Clerk of the Supreme Court
Hughes Justice Complex
P.O. Box 970
Trenton N.J. 08625-0970

Clerk of the Appellate Division
P.O. Box 008
Trenton, N.J. 08625-0008

frances hodgson OCN Sup. Ct.
120 Hooper Ave.
Toms River, N.J. 08754

TAKE NOTICE that Richard Hone shall petition the Supreme Court for an Order certifying the entire judgment entered by the Appellate Division in the above matter on November 30, 2023 on the impossible "denial" of my Motion for Reconsideration and 1st Amended motion for Reconsideration on my Fee Waiver.



Richard Hone, Petitioner

12-7-23

Date:

ORDER ON MOTION

RICHARD HONE
V.
[REDACTED]

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
APPELLATE DIVISION
DOCKET NO.: A-004000-22T4
MOTION NO.: M-001607-23
BEFORE: PART F
JUDGE(S): THOMAS W. SUMNERS JR.

MOTION FILED: 11/21/2023
ANSWER(S)
FILED:

BY: RICHARD HONE
BY:

SUBMITTED TO COURT: November 30, 2023

ORDER

THIS MATTER HAVING BEEN DULY PRESENTED TO THE COURT, IT IS, ON
THIS 1st day of December, 2023, HEREBY ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

MOTION BY APPELLANT

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION	DENIED
MOTION REQUEST FOR 30 DAY EXTENSION TO PAY \$250- FILING FEE	DENIED AND OTHER
MOTION REQUEST STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR DENIAL OF FEE WAIVER	DENIED

SUPPLEMENTAL:

All the relief requested by appellant is denied. The motion for reconsideration is denied. Appellant has filed substantially the same motion with this court previously without demonstrating a legal or factual basis entitling appellant to the requested relief. Each application has been denied. Despite this, appellant re-files the application again. Re-filing a motion that has been adjudicated constitutes filing a frivolous motion. See R. 1:4-8.

Accordingly, appellant may not file any further motions for reconsideration, or similarly worded motions, on this fee waiver issue in this appeal. The Clerk is directed not to accept any more motions for reconsideration on this issue from appellant. Appellant

shall pay the required filing fee no later than December 8, 2023, or the appeal will be dismissed with prejudice without further notice.

FOR THE COURT:

Thomas W. Sumners Jr.

THOMAS W. SUMNERS JR., C.J.A.D.

FD-15-00802-15 OCEAN
ORDER - REGULAR MOTION
PAS

Richard Hone, Ph# [REDACTED]
201C Sampson Ave.
Seaside Hts., NJ 08751
[REDACTED]

and Richard Hone c/o Wunderman
2195 Redmond Rd.
Merrick NY 11566

RICHARD HONE
Plaintiff, Pro-Se

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
APPELLATE DIVISION

Docket No. A-4000-22

V.

[REDACTED]
Defendant

**1ST AMENDED CERTIFICATION IN SUPPORT
OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
CORRUPTION COMPLAINT V. "Judge" SUMNER**

I, Richard Hone, duly of age, depose and say;

ANOTHER USELESS, WORTHLESS, COMPLETELY CORRUPT "judge" in NJ.

ZERO CHANCE HE CAN DENY MY FEE WAIVER UNLESS IT IS IN CONSPIRACY
with the other equally worthless, useless, completely corrupt "judges" in OCN, which
THIS CLEARLY IS, or he should not be a judge because there is NO chance I can be
denied.

This is what corruption looks like, from another failed attorney political hack who has no
business in the robe.

A total disgrace to honest judges everywhere.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL CORRUPTION COMPLAINT SAYS IT ALL, or at least part
of it.

I swear the above statements made by me are true. If any of the foregoing statements
made by me are false, I am subject to punishment.

Richard Hone E-Signature

November 22, 2023

Richard Hone, Plaintiff Father

Date:

We have received your response for Anti-Corruption Program Application Form

From: Jotform (noreply@formresponse.com)

To: [REDACTED]

Date: Wednesday, November 22, 2023 at 11:47 AM EST

Please, keep this email for your records, and make sure you include Jot Form on your safe emails list. You may be contacted if additional information is needed.

Anti-Corruption Program Application Form

Full Name	Mr. Richard Hone
Address	Street Address: 201C Sampson Ave City: Seaside Hts State / Province: NJ Postal / Zip Code: 08751 Country: United States
Phone Number	[REDACTED]
E-mail	[REDACTED]
Do you wish to keep your identity confidential	NO
Date of Incident	11-16-2023
Location	Trenton NJ
Detailed Description of Incident/Crime:	It is 100% IMPOSSIBLE to be denied a Fee Waiver as I am 100% disabled, indigent, and completely unable to work. This "judge" is so corrupt it is amazing he even is on the bench. I answered his questions carefully and completely and since I have No Access to the Principal of my daughter's Trust, and have no idea who even is involved, it CLEARLY means I have NO access to it and do NOT benefit from it in any way, shape or form. But this low-life, failed attorney, political hack, moron CONSPIRED with another extremely CORRUPT "judge" in OCN, one francis hodgson, who I have filed similar

complaints against for his crimes.

This clown is no different.

He needs to be arrested and removed immediately as this squarely fits in the Official Deprivation of Civil Rights felony (NJ 2C:30-6) Official Deprivation of Civil Rights, and (NJ 2C:30-2) Official Misconduct.

This Office needs to move on this now

Name	Tom Sumner
Address	Street Address: Court house App. Div City: Trenton State / Province: NJ Postal / Zip Code: 08625
Address	Street Address: Everyone in his office and hodgson
Do you wish to be considered for a waiver from criminal prosecution under the ACWP?	NO
Signature:	By clicking this button it serves as my signature
Date	11-22-2023

Now create your own Jotform - It's free!

Create a Jotform

11/22/2023 11:44 AM

ORDER ON MOTION

RICHARD HONE
V.
[REDACTED]

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
APPELLATE DIVISION
DOCKET NO.: A-004000-22T4
MOTION NO.: M-001174-23
BEFORE: PART F
JUDGE(S): THOMAS W. SUMNERS JR.

MOTION FILED: 10/31/2023
ANSWER(S) 11/06/2023
FILED:

BY: RICHARD HONE
BY: [REDACTED]

SUBMITTED TO COURT: November 16, 2023

ORDER

THIS MATTER HAVING BEEN DULY PRESENTED TO THE COURT, IT IS, ON
THIS 21st day of November, 2023, HEREBY ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

MOTION BY APPELLANT

MOTION TO "RE-FILE OF
INFORMATION FOR FEE WAIVER
AND CERTIFICATION" DENIED

SUPPLEMENTAL:

Appellant's motion is denied. He did not comply with this court's order in M-116-23.
Appellant shall pay the filing fee no later than November 27, 2023, or the appeal will be
dismissed with prejudice without further notice.

FOR THE COURT:

Thomas W. Sumners Jr.

THOMAS W. SUMNERS JR., C.J.A.D.

FD-15-00802-15 OCEAN
ORDER - REGULAR MOTION
PAS

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
APPELLATE DIVISION
RICHARD J. HUGHES JUSTICE COMPLEX
P.O. BOX 006
TRENTON, N.J. 08625-0006

MOTION FILING NOTICE

Date: 11/22/2023

RICHARD HONE
201C SAMPSON AVE.
SEASIDE HTS., NJ 08751,

Title: RICHARD HONE V. [REDACTED]
Docket No. A-004000-22T4
Motion No. M-001607-23
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
MOTION REQUEST FOR 30 DAY EXTENSION TO PAY \$250-
FILING FEE
MOTION REQUEST STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR DENIAL OF FEE
WAIVER

The motion papers were filed under the above docket and motion numbers. If an answer is to be submitted, please return a copy of this notice with said material to the attention of your case manager, Patricia A Shaw. The court rules do not permit a response to a motion for reconsideration.

If you have any questions, please contact your case manager at (609-815-2950 x 52671) PATRICIA.SHAW@NJCOURTS.GOV.

JOSEPH H. ORLANDO
CLERK

cc PRO SE - [REDACTED]
:

MOTION FILING NOTICE

A-4000-22

(1) Richard Hone

Your Name

201 C Sampson Ave.

Address

Seaside Hts. NJ 08751

City, State, Zip Code

ext.

Telephone Number

E-mail Address

(3) Superior Court of New Jersey

Appellate Division

Docket Number: A 4000-22

OR

Number assigned by trial/tax court or agency
(if no Appellate Division Docket Number):

(3) RICHARD HONE

v.

Notice of Motion for

(4) REQUEST FOR 30 DAY EXTENSION

TO PAY \$250- FILING FEE. Request

Statement of Reasons for denial of Fee *Waive*

(5) To:

(Name of adversary and attorney, if represented)

1802 Bridge Ave

(Address - use attorney's address if represented)

Point Pleasant NJ 08742

City, State, Zip Code

(6) PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the undersigned hereby moves before the Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division, for an Order granting the above-listed relief(s). In support of this motion, I shall rely on the attached:

☐ brief and appendix

☒ certification (procedural motions only)

(7) I am filing the original and 4 copies of my motion with the Clerk of the Appellate Division, and serving 2 copies of my motion on all of the parties to the above-captioned matter. Attached is a copy of my Certification of Service. RESPONDING PARTIES: Per Rule 2:8-1, answers to this motion should be filed with the Clerk of the Appellate Division within 10 days of your receipt of this motion unless otherwise directed by the Clerk.

11-21-23

Date

Your Signature

Richard Hone

Print Name

EXHIBIT 1. / MUST Grant Fee
Waiver

Richard Hone, Ph# [REDACTED]
201C Sampson Ave.
Seaside Hts., NJ 08751
[REDACTED]

and Richard Hone c/o Wunderman
2195 Redmond Rd.
Merrick NY 11566

RICHARD HONE
Plaintiff, Pro-Se

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
APPELLATE DIVISION

Docket No. A-4000-22

V.

[REDACTED]
Defendant

**ANSWER TO ORDER FOR FEE WAIVER
RE-FILE AS MOTION PER CT ORDER (Attached)**

I, Richard Hone, duly of age, depose and say;

I know this court has no idea how much this topic has been covered ad nauseum with the exact same answers I will give this court now, so I will reiterate what I have stated in the past.

This is my Sworn Statement in response to the 1-23-2023 Order by Judge Thomas W. Sumners Jr. C.J.A.D.

Question:

"Provide complete documentation regarding the trust established for his daughter"

Answer:

I have no information on this trust as all the prior testimony states. I have nothing to do with it, am not involved in any way, I do not benefit in any way, I have no idea how much or how little is in there, and I do not know who the officer(s) are. The only time I inquired about this in late 2016 and before the original principal passed away a couple of years later it did not have anything significant in it by any means (Details about this in "history and purpose" below)

Question:

"whether appellant has access to the principal of the trust"

Answer:

NO

History and Purpose of Trust:

On January 20, 2015 my first child [REDACTED] was born at 8:06am which I can state unequivocally was the Greatest Day of My Life.

Three days later the mother started a custody fight of epic proportions that continues to this day unabated because I called the police and DCF on her dominatrix/prostitution business because her "dungeon" was in the same apartment as where [REDACTED] her then 6-year-old child from her 2nd marriage, also lived.

I found it unbelievable that someone would put a child at risk like that. We never had a good relationship.

I met this woman 5 days before my mother passed away after a 9-year illness that cost me and my mother almost one million dollars for her private care. At the time of my mother's death on September 3, 2013 I had very little money left except for the condo in Edison. I found out the respondent was a convicted child kidnapper and child abuser after she got pregnant, but did my best to make the best of things for the sake of our daughter. She had no intention of doing anything good or right for my daughter.

I was then Blackmailed into signing a completely one-sided custody agreement I never in a million years would have signed had I been in my right mind or being shaken down to do anything she wanted in exchange giving her sole-custody.

I was completely blindsided by her move to take and keep my little girl away from me at all costs, and relapsed in March 2015 and by the end of March 2015 I was drinking daily (I have 7 years, 6 months and 29 days sober today).

Meeting this woman also cost me over 3 years of my freedom and caused me to also almost lose my life in the battle of Aleppo, Syria.

During the time [REDACTED] was born and before I went to Mexico, I had been planning my last Human Rights mission, and had zeroed in on Aleppo, Syria because I was familiar with the brutal dictatorship of Bashir Al Assad through some long-time friends of mine who are Ex Senior Level CIA Officers from the Elite Clandestine Services, and people I had worked with in the past on Human Rights missions at the U.N. and other NGO's.

I also had a very very Bad Feeling I was going to die there, in Alepppo, and that my daughter would only know and hear the good things about me.

That prophecy almost came true.

THAT is why I just handed over everything I had except for some money for what I assumed would be about 6 months in Mexico.

THIS is why I have no knowledge of my daughter's trust, who runs it, why I have no access to it or to anyone who is involved because I do not know anything about it, nor will I ever.

I can't stress enough to this court that I am 100% disabled primarily from the 8 athletic and other surgeries I have endured, and the anxiety and depression I suffer will only get better according to the doctor when my custody case resolves in [REDACTED] best interest, which when dealing with someone with the past (including the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] she has, looks like there will never be an end in sight until [REDACTED] turns 18.

I think the court gets the gist of why this is something I have nothing to do with, have no knowledge of, don't care, and that my Sole Purpose in Life is to raise [REDACTED] as a Christian and to know Jesus, and to get back to work at some point and provide for her like I have always intended to do, which is to own her own home outright, and leave her financially secure, which will never happen unless the mother stops abusing [REDACTED] and doing everything in her power to destroy my life and [REDACTED] life along with it.

I swear the above statements made by me are true. If any of the foregoing statements made by me are false, I am subject to punishment.

Richard Hone E-Signature

October 31, 2023

Richard Hone, Plaintiff Father

Date:

Carey, Erin

From: Christopher Diller <christopher.diller@njcourts.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:42 AM
To: JSchron@co.ocean.nj.us; jpeterson@co.ocean.nj.us; IKrasteva@co.ocean.nj.us; cheisler@co.ocean.nj.us; TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us; Burke, Stephen; CLento@co.ocean.nj.us; schant-berry@co.ocean.nj.us; Jaclyn Dowd; Karabulut, Aram; Kownacki, Edward [OPD]; pete@omaralawfirm.com; Paguiligan, James [OPD]; Alexandra Nieves-Martinez; hainesandyost@aol.com; frh@hodgsonlawyer.com; Andrew Hannwacker; Durann A. Neil; Durann Neil; REGINARUOCCO2021@GMAIL.COM; nicholas moschella; Jessica Hurley; mpolicastrolaw (null); Office Staff; Rebecca C; 'Pat Colligan'
Cc: Melissa Rolseth
Subject: Judge Rahill's Monday 2/5/24 Calendar
Attachments: 2-5-24 Calendar.docx

Good morning,

Please see the attached calendar for this Monday 2/5/24. Any adjournment requests need to be sent to me no later than **4:00pm tomorrow**. Please be advised that we do not have calendars on 2/12/24 or 2/19/24, so we will not be adjourning any cases listed for S3, PC or that are in jail. Also, Judge will be working remotely Monday so, if possible, please send me any pleas as soon as you can so I can send to judge prior to Monday morning. Thanks.

Chris Diller
Sr. Probation Officer & In Court PO
For Kimarie Rahill, J.S.C.
Ocean County Superior Court
Phone# 732-504-0700 ext 64306
Email: Christopher.Diller@njcourts.gov

JUDGE Kimarie Rahill
COURTROOM 7
February 5, 2024
8:45 A.M.

1.ARTIS RASHON F OCN-23-001868001 23-12-02111-I	Schron/Paguiligan	PI	
2.BEST JACQUELYN M OCN-23-004006001 W 2023 001059 1506	Krasteva/Karabulut	ED	
3. BIVINS MANIYAH P OCN-23-003081002 W 2023 000094 1529	Peterson/Karabulut	OT	
4. BONAPARTE NECOLE S OCN-22-000065001 22-11-02062-I	Krasteva/Karabulut	PI	
5. CALDWELL KEVIN A OCN-22-002641001 23-04-00780-I	Krasteva/pro se	S3	
6. CHAVAS-MAYORGA TITO OCN-23-002447001 23-12-02118-I	Krasteva/NA	PI	
7. CHRAMPANIS CHRISTOPH S OCN-21-000658001 22-05-00970-I	Heisler/O'Mara	MO S2	
8. COOPER LABREA B OCN-21-002692001 22-12-02263-I	Krasteva/Karbulut	PI	
9. COTTRELL WILLIAM OCN-23-002532001 W-2023-000667-1506 OCN-23-004056001 W-2023-000626-1526 OCN-20-000885001 20-05-000526-A	Peterson/Kownacki	ED ED VP	
10. DERIGGI ALYSSA M OCN-23-002403001 23-12-02126-I	Schron/Karabulut	PI	
11. FITZGIBBONS DEAN E OCN-22-000698001 23-12-02129-I	Peterson/Paguiligan	PI	
12. FORBES JASON L OCN-23-003675001 W 2023 000365 1533	Peterson/Kownacki	ED	
13. FORD DENZEL P OCN-23-002003001 23-12-02179-I	Krasteva/Karabulut	PI	

14. FREDERICK SHAWN OCN-23-003494001 W-2023-000866-1514	Schron/Kownacki	ED	[REDACTED]
15. FULLER MARTIN T OCN-23-000469001 23-10-01769-I	Krasteva/Kownacki	S1	
16. GETHARD CORRIE M OCN-23-000576002 23-12-02238-I	Burke/Nieves Martinez	PI	
17. GONCALVESDASILVA RITADECAS OCN-23-000576004 23-12-02238-I	Burke/Yost	PI	
18. HONE RICHARD W OCN-20-000532001 21-06-00780-I	Toscano/Hannwacker	S3	
19. JACKSON SHARIF OCN-23-000910002 23-10-01778-I	Schron/Karabulut	PI	
20. JOHNSTON ASHLEY N OCN-22-002293002 23-12-02137-I	Schron/Karabulut	PI	
21. KESSEL ASHLEY M OCN-23-000576007 23-12-02238-I	Burke/Hodgson	PI	
22. LORENZO AARON D OCN-22-002341001 23-03-00475-I	Peterson/NA	PI	
23. MAGRO DANIEL J OCN-23-004241001 W 2023 000122 1504	Peterson/Kownacki	ED	
24. MATIAS IRVING A OCN-23-000576006 23-12-02238-I	Burke/Hannwacker	PI	
25. MCLEOD BRYAN C OCN-22-003130001 23-05-00852-I OCN-23-002190001 W 2023 000542 1514	Schron/Kownacki Krasteva/Kownacki	SE ED	
26. MEJIA-CRUZ ELVIN J OCN-20-003639001 22-08-01403-I	Schron/Neil	ED	[REDACTED]
27 MARTIN PATRICK J OCN-22-003513001 23-05-00994-I OCN-22-003424004 S 2022 001420 1507	Peterson/Ruocco Juan/Ruocco	S1 OT	[REDACTED]
28. MELCHIONDO JOHN M OCN-22-003227001 23-01-00165-I	Pouch/Karabulut Krasteva/Karabulut Pouch/Karabulut	VP ED VP	

OCN-23-004189001 W 2023 000431 1512 OCN-21-000378001 21-10-01419-I			
29. MOORE XAVION OCN-23-002002 001 S 2023 000497 1514	Peterson/Hannwacker	ED	
30. MORALES ALEJANDRO C OCN-23-004059001 W 2023 000527 1511	Peterson/Karabulut	ED	
31. MORRIS MARVIN D OCN-22-000931001 23-10-01842-I	Peterson/Moschella	S1	
32. POMEROY TEARSA L OCN-23-000755002 23-12-02170-I	Schron/Paugh	PI	
33. POST NICHOLE L OCN-22-002517002 23-06-01093-I	Krasteva/Hodgson	S3	
34. RACANELLI ANTHONY F OCN-23-000576005 23-12-02238-I	Burke/Policastro	PI	
35. RODRIGUEZ ALBERTO OCN-23-000479002 23-10-01765-I	Krasteva/Ruocco	S1	
36. ROSLIN BRUCE A OCN-22-002517001 23-06-01093-I OCN-22-003341001 S 2022 000097 1532	Krasteva/Turnbach	S3 OT	
37. SHEPPARD RONALD J OCN-23-004046001 W 2023 000401 1533 OCN-23-001049001 W 2023 000091 1533 OCN-22-003912001 W 2022 000352 1533	Peterson/Kownacki	ED	
38. SAUNDERS RHASHAN OCN-23-000629003 23-10-01801-I	Peterson/Hannwacker	ED	
39. SUSANA DAVON F OCN-23-000479003 23-10-01765-I	Krasteva/Karabulut	S1	
40. TABARES RICHARD R OCN-23-000479004 23-10-01765-I	Krasteva/Kownacki	S1	
41. TARVER-WHITFIELD TIMOTHY OCN-21-001551001 22-06-01057-I	Schron/Hannwacker	S2	

42. TAYLOR BENJAMIN J OCN-21-002675001 22-07-01334-I	Burke/Kownacki	PI	
43. TINNERY DAVANTE L OCN-23-003081001 W 2023 000098 1504 OCN-23-002109002 W 2023 000070 1529 OCN-23-003109001 23-12-02166-I	Peterson/Hannwacker	VM ED PI	
44. TORRO CHASTITY C OCN-22-003410001 23-12-02171-I OCN-22-002293001 23-12-02137-I	Schron/Ruocco	PI	
	10:30 Calendar		
45. CALAVANO VINCENT J OCN-21-000095001 W 2021 000019 1506	Krasteva/NA	CT	
46. DOSSOUS ROUBEN OCN-22-003101001 23-08-01456-I	Peterson/Molloy	S1	
47. GREMLING PATRICK A OCN-22-000288001 23-06-01164-I	Lento/Rodgers	S2	
48. HART WILLIAM S OCN-23-000626001 23-07-01261-I OCN-22-002877001 23-08-01558-I OCN-23-000002001 W 2023 000004 1530	Krasteva / Krasteva / Krasteva /	VM/S2 S2 VM/OT.	
49. KAY MICHAEL OCN -23-001315001 23-09-01722-I	Krasteva/Kownacki	PI	
50. LESTER JENNIFER E OCN-22-001118001 23-03-00569-I	Peterson/Kownacki	S1	
51. MARQUEZ ABRIEL A OCN-23-000908001 23-11-01953-I	Krasteva/Karabulut	PI	
52. OROURKE SHAWN P OCN-21-003651001 22-12-02156-A	Chant-Berry/Kownacki	S1	
53. PHILLIPS RYAN M OCN-22-001302001 23-10-01762-I	Peterson/Bernstein	PI	
54. SUMPTER GILLISPIE M OCN-23-000963001 23-07-01266-I OCN-23-000952001 23-08-01363-I	Peterson/Kownacki	S2	
55. VELEZ OMAR OCN-21-002995001 22-07-01356-A	Peterson/Karabulut Angelo/Karabulut	S1 OT	

OCN-23-000949001 W 2023 000082 1533			
	1:30 Calendar		
56. AANONSEN ALAN OCN-19-002696001 22-03-00039-S	Poulton,DAG/Hannwacker	TK	[REDACTED]
57. CLARK SHANEL D OCN-21-002882001 23-03-00586-I OCN-21-003190001 22-06-01151-I	Lento/Kownacki Krasteva/NA	S1 PC	
58. EVANS JAYLIN OCN-23-002631 W-2023-000645-1514; W-2023-000064-1513	Schronl/Kownacki	OT	[REDACTED]
59. JEFFERSON DARIO OCN-24-000032-001 W-2023-00417-1518	Schron/Karabulut	ED	[REDACTED]
60. TURNER LEEANN OCN-23-003056001 23-12-02193-I	Krasteva/Colligan	PI	[REDACTED]
61. WILLIAMS ANDREW D OCN-22-000064001 23-01-00082-I OCN-21-003717001 23-08-01399-I OCN-21-003006002 22-03-00461-I OCN-21-003657001 22-03-00467-I	Schron/Hannwacker	S1 OT/S1 S3 S3	[REDACTED]

Note: AS = Arraignment/Conf. PC = Pretrial Conf. SH = Speedy Release Hearing
CC= Pre-Indictment Conf. PI = Post Indictment Arraignment ST = Status Conference
ED = Early Disp. Program S1 = Initial Disp. Conf. TK = Trial Tracking
MO = Motion S2 = Final Disp. Conf. TR = Trial
OT = Other/Misc. S3 = Discretionary Conf. VM = Violation of Monitoring
P1 = Pre-Indictment Hearing VP=Violation of Probation
CH=Competency Hrg PE,TP=PTI Termination

Carey, Erin

From: Melissa Rolseth <melissa.rolseth@njcourts.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2024 11:32 AM
To: Andrew Hannwacker; TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us
Cc: cheisler@co.ocean.nj.us
Subject: RE: [External]Re: Richard Hone, OCN 20-532

Thank you for the update, I have passed this along to Judge Rahill.

Missy Rolseth

Law Clerk to the Honorable Kimarie Rahill, J.S.C.
Superior Court of New Jersey – Ocean Vicinage, Criminal Division
120 Hooper Ave, Courtroom 7
Toms River, N.J. 08753
Telephone: (732) 504-0700, ext. 64108
E-mail: melissa.rolseth@njcourts.gov

****Please send courtesy copies of all motions, cross-motions, oppositions, and replies directly to Judge Rahill at Rahill.mbx@njcourts.gov.****

From: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2024 9:49 PM
To: Melissa Rolseth <melissa.rolseth@njcourts.gov>; TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us
Cc: cheisler@co.ocean.nj.us
Subject: [External]Re: Richard Hone, OCN 20-532

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the Judiciary organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Latest information regarding Richard Hone and his appeal to the NJ Supreme Court requesting Reconsideration.

On Wed, Nov 29, 2023 at 8:43 PM Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com> wrote:

Melissa,

I had the following information:

NJ Sup Ct docketed filings:

088507 (A-1524-21 Appellate)

088296 (A-2508-21 Appellate) filing confirmed by memo from the Supreme Court June 12, 2023.

I do not have access to the Supreme Court filings for these two matters. They were not criminal but appeals of Civil / Family matters but could have implications on the criminal venue decision.

On Tue, Nov 28, 2023 at 4:03 PM Melissa Rolseth <melissa.rolseth@njcourts.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon,

At the last appearance on 11/13, it was discussed that we are still waiting on the cert request to the Supreme Court. I have followed up with the Supreme Court Clerk's Office regarding this matter and they do not have any information regarding an appeal to them. All they can see is the appellate level matter, but no request for cert. If this is incorrect,

please provide me some receipt of filing or docket number. Otherwise, we will move forward on this matter at the next appearance on 12/18 and not wait for the appeal any further.

Thank you,

Missy Rolseth

Law Clerk to the Honorable Kimarie Rahill, J.S.C.
Superior Court of New Jersey – Ocean Vicinage, Criminal Division

120 Hooper Ave, Courtroom 7

Toms River, N.J. 08753
Telephone: (732) 504-0700, ext. 64108
E-mail: melissa.rolseth@njcourts.gov

****Please send courtesy copies of all motions, cross-motions, oppositions, and replies directly to Judge Rahill at Rahill.mbx@njcourts.gov.****

--

Andrew C. Hannwacker, Esq.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

--

Andrew C. Hannwacker, Esq.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

Carey, Erin

From: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2024 9:49 PM
To: Melissa Rolseth; Toscano, Taylor
Cc: cheisler@co.ocean.nj.us
Subject: Re: Richard Hone, OCN 20-532
Attachments: HONE V TADROS OCN CORRUPTION NJ SUPREME COURT 1-29-24.pdf

Latest information regarding Richard Hone and his appeal to the NJ Supreme Court requesting Reconsideration.

On Wed, Nov 29, 2023 at 8:43 PM Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com> wrote:

Melissa,

I had the following information:

NJ Sup Ct docketed filings:

088507 (A-1524-21 Appellate)

088296 (A-2508-21 Appellate) filing confirmed by memo from the Supreme Court June 12, 2023.

I do not have access to the Supreme Court filings for these two matters. They were not criminal but appeals of Civil / Family matters but could have implications on the criminal venue decision.

On Tue, Nov 28, 2023 at 4:03 PM Melissa Rolseth <melissa.rolseth@njcourts.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon,

At the last appearance on 11/13, it was discussed that we are still waiting on the cert request to the Supreme Court. I have followed up with the Supreme Court Clerk's Office regarding this matter and they do not have any information regarding an appeal to them. All they can see is the appellate level matter, but no request for cert. If this is incorrect, please provide me some receipt of filing or docket number. Otherwise, we will move forward on this matter at the next appearance on 12/18 and not wait for the appeal any further.

Thank you,

Missy Rolseth

Law Clerk to the Honorable Kimarie Rahill, J.S.C.

Superior Court of New Jersey – Ocean Vicinage, Criminal Division

120 Hooper Ave, Courtroom 7

Toms River, N.J. 08753

Telephone: (732) 504-0700, ext. 64108

E-mail: melissa.rolseth@njcourts.gov

****Please send courtesy copies of all motions, cross-motions, oppositions, and replies directly to Judge Rahill at Rahill.mbx@njcourts.gov.****

--

Andrew C. Hannwacker, Esq.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

--

Andrew C. Hannwacker, Esq.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

Carey, Erin

From: Andrew Hannwacker <achannwacker@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2024 2:31 PM
To: Toscano, Taylor
Subject: Re: Hone

From the information I received the SC bounced the two cases back for procedural issues (missing some documents). It was resubmitted for reconsideration of the procedural issues.
I am trying to get some paperwork.

On Fri, Jan 26, 2024 at 10:48 AM Toscano, Taylor <TToscano@co.ocean.nj.us> wrote:

Hi Andy,

We have this case scheduled for 2/5 before Judge Rahill. The last notes in my system is that you are waiting on a decision from the supreme court. Can you advise if you are still waiting on that? Thanks and hope all is well!

Taylor



Taylor Toscano
Assistant Prosecutor
119 Hooper Avenue P.O. Box 2191
Toms River, NJ 08754-2191
Phone: (732) 929-2027 Ext. 2741
Email: ttoscano@co.ocean.nj.us

Warning: This message is intended for the user of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, law enforcement sensitive, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by reply or by telephone (732)929-2027 Ext. 2741 and immediately delete this message and all of its attachments.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY - LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE

--

Andrew C. Hannwacker, Esq.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or

entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.