

DEFENDANT JENNIFER OLLAND'S ANSWERS TO PLAINTIFF'S
INTERROGATORIES

1: No.

2: Another person quoted Plaintiff to Defendant in a separate conversation.

3: None. Prior to being notified of the DCPD investigation, Defendant did not communicate to any person that Plaintiff touched children or engaged in inappropriate conduct concerning children.

4: None. Defendant did not communicate with any classroom aide or paraprofessional assigned to assist [REDACTED] [MINOR CHILD] pursuant to her IEP concerning Plaintiff Joseph Fabozzi during the 2021-2022 school year.

5: None. Defendant did not communicate with any Mount Laurel School District personnel concerning Plaintiff Joseph Fabozzi prior to the DCPD referral.

6: No. Defendant did not communicate with Mount Laurel School District personnel using personal phones, personal email accounts, or other non-district devices concerning Plaintiff Joseph Fabozzi during the 2021-2022 school year.

7: Defendant had no personal knowledge of any sheriff attempting to serve her in connection with OCN-L-002231-22. Defendant did not see or experience any such attempted service.

8: Defendant did not receive any notice from, nor have any interaction with, Dana Judge concerning service in OCN-L-002231-22, and had no personal knowledge of any attempted service by Dana Judge.

9: Yes. That is the defendant's email address used during 2022.

10: Defendant first became aware of OCN-L-002231-22 on November 3, 2022, while in the process of filing a criminal complaint for harassment against Plaintiff.

11: Defendant disputes the premise that Plaintiff's emails concerning service were what led her to the Mount Laurel Police Department. To the best of Defendant's present recollection, she went to the police because of Plaintiff's conduct on social media and toward persons in the Defendant's life, including the dissemination of personal information concerning Defendant and of the children, and because colleagues, friends, and Hillside Elementary PTO members advised her that Plaintiff was contacting them through their personal email addresses, and Facebook groups.

12: Defendant was not aware that the lawsuit had been filed or that the Burlington County Sheriff or Dana Judge were attempting to serve her. Upon becoming aware of the action, Defendant responded through the New Jersey Courts/JEDS by filing an Answer. Accordingly, Defendant is not aware of any facts or communications that caused her not to contact the Burlington County Sheriff or Dana Judge concerning service.

13: Defendant does not recall the exact point during her communications with Officer Turino when she first became aware of OCN-L-002231-22. To the best of Defendant's recollection, she became aware of the lawsuit sometime during the process of contacting and speaking with the Mount Laurel Police Department. Defendant did not knowingly withhold information concerning the lawsuit from Officer Turino.

14: Defendant does not presently recall whether she spoke with Officer Justin Turino between her first and second visits to the Mount Laurel Police Department on November 3, 2022.

15: Defendant does not presently recall the statement or what she understood Officer Turino to mean by it.

16: Defendant does not presently recall any communications with Officer Sweely concerning Plaintiff Joseph Fabozzi on or before November 3, 2022.

17: Defendant does not presently recall any communications with Prosecutor Matthew Weng prior to the September 13, 2023 harassment trial.

18: Defendant does not presently recall whether she reviewed any emails from Plaintiff Joseph Fabozzi with Prosecutor Weng prior to her testimony at the September 13, 2023 harassment trial.

19: Defendant recalls providing screenshots concerning Plaintiff's social-media conduct to Prosecutor Matthew Weng but does not presently recall how or when they were provided, or whether they were specifically reviewed together.

20: Defendant recalls providing screenshots concerning Plaintiff's social-media conduct, but does not presently recall what other documents, communications, or records, if any, she provided to Prosecutor Matthew Weng prior to the September 13, 2023 harassment trial.

21: The May 3, 2022 Custody and Parenting Agreement itself supports the statement referenced in this Interrogatory. Under the Parenting Time provisions, the Agreement states that "Joseph Fabozzi shall at no time be in [the] presence [of] either child unless both parents consent in advance." Defendant does not presently recall any additional facts or communications concerning that provision or her specific recollection of writing the November 3, 2022 statement beyond what is reflected in the Agreement itself.

22: Yes.

23: No. Defendant did not instruct [MINOR CHILD] or [MINOR CHILD] to contact her if Plaintiff Joseph Fabozzi appeared at Joseph Dunnkosky's wedding. Defendant was not made aware of any wedding prior to the event.

24: Defendant present position relies upon the existing May 3, 2022 Custody and Parenting Agreement, which provides that Plaintiff Joseph Fabozzi shall not be in the presence of either child unless both parents consent in advance.

25: Defendant does not presently recall every document, communication, or record supporting the allegations contained in the November 3, 2022 harassment complaint. Defendant refers to the contemporaneous harassment statement, affidavit of probable cause, and any materials identified or referenced therein.

CERTIFICATION

I certify that the foregoing statements made by me are true. I am aware that if any of the foregoing statements made by me are willfully false, I am subject to punishment.

Date: August 10, 2026

[SIGNATURE REDACTED]

Jennifer Olland

Defendant, Pro Se