

**SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION – CIVIL PART
BURLINGTON COUNTY**

JOSEPH FABOZZI,
Plaintiff,

v.

JENNIFER OLLAND AND TOWNSHIP OF MOUNT LAUREL, et al.,
Defendants.

Docket No.: BUR-L-2334-25

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

I, Joseph Fabozzi, certify as follows:

1. I am the Plaintiff in this matter and make this Certification based upon my personal knowledge.
2. On **July 7, 2026**, I served the following documents by electronic mail upon counsel for Defendant Matthew Weng:
 - a. Plaintiff's Deficiency Notice to Defendant Matthew Weng Regarding Responses to Plaintiff's First Request for Admissions; and
 - b. Cover Letter dated July 7, 2026.
3. The foregoing documents were served by electronic mail upon:

Timothy R. Bieg, Esq.
tbieg@wc-law.com

Jennifer A. Hart, Esq.
jhart@wc-law.com

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.

Dated: **July 7, 2026**

Joseph Fabozzi
Plaintiff, Pro Se



COVER LETTER**Joseph Fabozzi**


July 7, 2026

Via Electronic MailTimothy R. Bieg, Esq.
Jennifer A. Hart, Esq.**Re: *Fabozzi v. Olland, et al.***
Docket No. BUR-L-2334-25

Dear Mr. Bieg and Ms. Hart:

Enclosed please find Plaintiff's Deficiency Notice to Defendant Matthew Weng Regarding Responses to Plaintiff's First Request for Admissions.

After reviewing Defendant Weng's responses, Plaintiff has identified those responses that do not admit or deny the requests, do not state that Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny after making a reasonable inquiry, or otherwise do not comply with Rule 4:22-1 of the New Jersey Rules of Court. The enclosed notice identifies each response Plaintiff believes is deficient and the basis for each asserted deficiency.

Plaintiff respectfully requests that Defendant Matthew Weng serve amended responses addressing the deficiencies identified in the enclosed notice.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

**Joseph Fabozzi**
Plaintiff, Pro Se

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY**LAW DIVISION – CIVIL PART****BURLINGTON COUNTY****JOSEPH FABOZZI,**

Plaintiff,

v.

JENNIFER OLLAND AND TOWNSHIP OF MOUNT LAUREL, et al.,

Defendants.

Docket No.: BUR-L-2334-25

**PLAINTIFF'S DEFICIENCY NOTICE TO DEFENDANT MATTHEW WENG
REGARDING RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS**

Plaintiff Joseph Fabozzi respectfully provides this Deficiency Notice regarding Defendant Matthew Weng's Responses to Plaintiff's First Request for Admissions. Plaintiff identifies below the responses that do not admit or deny the requests, do not state that Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny after making a reasonable inquiry, or otherwise fail to comply with the requirements of Rule 4:22-1. Plaintiff respectfully requests that Defendant serve amended responses addressing the deficiencies identified herein.

ADMISSION NO. 1

Deficiency: Request No. 1 identifies two specific documents by exhibit number and asks whether Defendant reviewed those documents before or during the September 13, 2023 harassment trial. Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome but did not explain how a request identifying two specific documents is overly broad. Defendant further states only that he "does not recall" what he reviewed in preparation for trial. The response does not admit or deny the request and does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny. Officer Justin Turino has admitted under oath that Jennifer Olland's handwritten statement was the only information provided to the Municipal Court for the probable cause determination and that the Affidavit of Probable Cause was a verbatim transcription of that statement. Defendant should supplement his response by admitting, denying, or stating that, after making a reasonable inquiry, he lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the request, in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court. **See Exhibit 24, Interrogatory and Response No. 8.**

ADMISSION NO. 2

Deficiency: Request No. 2 identifies two specific emails by exhibit number, date, sender, and recipient and asks whether Defendant reviewed those emails before or during the September 13, 2023 harassment trial. Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome but did not explain how a request identifying two specific emails is overly broad. Defendant further states only that he "does not recall" what he reviewed in preparation for the harassment trial.

The November 3, 2022 emails were central to the events giving rise to Jennifer Olland's harassment complaint. During her initial interview with Officer Turino, Ms. Olland advised that she had received Plaintiff's email that morning:

Exhibit 16A, p. 9, ll. 21–25

21 MS. OLLAND: I -- I got an email this morning.

22

23 OFFICER TURINO: From him?

24

25 MS. OLLAND: Yes.

Ms. Olland further advised that Plaintiff had emailed members of the Hillside Elementary School PTO:

Exhibit 16A, p. 4, ll. 2–7

2 MS. OLLAND: ...I'm in the PTO for Hillside, I was -- and they
3 are checking on her, "Are you okay? Are you okay? Let
4 -- let us know if you need anything."
5 I'm like, I don't -- I don't understand,
6 what's going on? They said that he's emailing them
7 about taking me to court, and now it's like, it's too...

Officer Turino then instructed Ms. Olland to forward the email to him:

Exhibit 16A, p. 11, ll. 7–12

7 MS. OLLAND: Okay. Should I open the email

8 he sent and see if he cc'd anybody or --
 9 OFFICER TURINO: No, what I'll do is I'll
 10 give you my email and you can just forward that email
 11 to me and then --

12 MS. OLLAND: Okay.

Later that same day, after Ms. Olland advised Officer Turino that Plaintiff had sent another email, Officer Turino confirmed that he had received it:

Exhibit 18A, p. 4, ll. 20–25

20 MS. OLLAND: -- because I got that -- another
 21 email. I don't know if anyone else --
 22 OFFICER TURINO: Yeah, so --
 23 MS. OLLAND: -- has been approached by him.
 24 OFFICER TURINO: So I -- I got that email.
 25 I told Sweely --

The response does not admit or deny the request and does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny. Plaintiff therefore requests that Defendant serve an amended response in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court.

See Exhibits 4, 5, 16A, 17A, and 18A.

ADMISSION NO. 3

Deficiency: Request No. 3 asks Defendant to admit that, during the September 13, 2023 harassment trial, he did not correct or clarify Jennifer Olland's testimony that she had never received emails from Plaintiff Fabozzi. The request is limited to Defendant's conduct during a single trial and identifies the specific testimony at issue by transcript page and line references, together with the exhibits documenting Ms. Olland's prior statements to Officer Turino. Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome but did not explain how a request directed to a single trial and specific testimony is overly broad or unduly burdensome. Defendant further states only that he "does not recall" what he reviewed in preparation for the harassment trial, what was introduced as exhibits, nor the questions posed to witnesses.

During the harassment trial, Ms. Olland testified under oath that she had never received emails from Plaintiff:

Exhibit 3, p. 23, ll. 18–23

18 Q All right. And what's the email address? Can you see that on there?

20 A Yes. [REDACTED].

21 Q Okay. Have you ever received emails from that email address?

23 A No.

Ms. Olland later repeated that testimony during cross-examination:

Exhibit 3, p. 41, ll. 11–12

11 Q He didn't email you?

12 A No.

However, during her November 3, 2022 interviews with Officer Turino, Ms. Olland repeatedly acknowledged receiving emails from Plaintiff:

Exhibit 16A, p. 9, ll. 21–25

21 MS. OLLAND: I -- I got an email this morning.

23 OFFICER TURINO: From him?

25 MS. OLLAND: Yes.

Exhibit 16A, p. 11, ll. 7–12

7 MS. OLLAND: Okay. Should I open the email he sent and see if he cc'd anybody or --

9 OFFICER TURINO: No, what I'll do is I'll give you my email and you can just forward that email to me and then --

12 MS. OLLAND: Okay.

Exhibit 17A, p. 2, ll. 4–7

4 MS. OLLAND: Yeah, because he sent me another email like right after.

6 OFFICER TURINO: Yeah, he sent the same thing to me so --

Exhibit 18A, p. 4, ll. 20–21

20 MS. OLLAND: -- because I got that -- another email.

21 I don't know if anyone else --

The response does not admit or deny the request and does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny. Plaintiff therefore

requests that Defendant serve an amended response in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court.

See Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 16, 16A, 17, 17A, 18, and 18A.

ADMISSION NO. 4

Deficiency: Request No. 4 asks Defendant to admit that the November 3, 2022 emails identified as Exhibits 4 and 5 were not introduced into evidence during the September 13, 2023 harassment trial. The request concerns a single, objectively verifiable fact reflected in the trial transcript. Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome but did not explain how the request is overly broad or unduly burdensome. Defendant further states only that he "does not recall" what was introduced as exhibits. The response does not admit or deny the request and does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny. The trial transcript reflects that only State's Exhibits S-1 through S-10 were admitted into evidence, and the November 3, 2022 emails identified as Exhibits 4 and 5 were not introduced. Plaintiff therefore requests that Defendant serve an amended response in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court. **See Exhibit 3, p. 2, Index of Exhibits.**

Note: The only email introduced into evidence during the September 13, 2023 harassment trial was State's Exhibit S-7. The trial transcript identifies S-7 as a screenshot containing the caption, *"I also emailed her job. She should be fired for conduct unbecoming of a Federal employee."* The testimony establishes that this exhibit concerned an email sent to Fort Dix/99th Readiness Division personnel, not the November 3, 2022 emails identified as Exhibits 4 and 5 that were sent to Jennifer Olland and copied to PTO members. See Exhibit 3, pp. 21–24.

ADMISSION NO. 5

Deficiency: Request No. 5 asks Defendant to admit that, during the September 13, 2023 harassment trial, he argued that although Plaintiff possessed the March 30, 2022 DCF letter identifying the allegations as unfounded, Plaintiff did not include that information in any of the social media posts at issue. The request identifies the specific portions of the trial transcript containing Defendant's statements. Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome but did not explain how a request directed to his own statements made during a single trial is overly broad or unduly burdensome. Defendant further states only that he "does not recall" what he reviewed in preparation for the harassment trial, what was introduced as exhibits, nor the questions posed to witnesses.

During cross-examination, Defendant asked Plaintiff:

Exhibit 3, p. 81, ll. 21–23

21 Q In none of these social media posts did you
 22 post that letter from DCF that the allegations were
 23 unfounded, did you?

Defendant continued:

Exhibit 3, p. 82, ll. 1–3

1 Q We've looked at all of these social media posts,
 2 and none of them contain this letter that says the
 3 allegations were unfounded, do they?

During closing argument, Defendant argued:

Exhibit 3, p. 86, ll. 10–19

10 "And, perhaps, the greatest piece of evidence that none of this had anything to do with
 vindication is that Mr. Fabozzi has a piece of paper that says these allegations are unfounded, and
 in none of these posts did he say, hey, look, the organization, the State organization that has the
 experts that investigate this stuff to determine whether or not something happened said it didn't
 happen. He could have posted that and nothing else and said they investigated me, and it was
 unfounded, and therefore, it's all been a lie. He didn't do any of those things."

The response does not admit or deny the request and does not state that, after making a
 reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny. Plaintiff therefore
 requests that Defendant serve an amended response in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of
 Court. **See Exhibit 3.**

ADMISSION NO. 6

Deficiency: Request No. 6 identifies a single document by exhibit number and asks whether
 Defendant reviewed the March 30, 2022 DCF letter before or during the September 13, 2023
 harassment trial. The objection that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome is
 unsupported. Defendant further states only that he "does not recall" what he reviewed in
 preparation for the harassment trial. During the harassment trial, however, Defendant repeatedly
 questioned Plaintiff regarding the March 30, 2022 DCF letter and argued that Plaintiff possessed
 the letter but failed to post it on social media. The response does not admit or deny the request
 and does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information
 to admit or deny. Plaintiff therefore requests that Defendant serve an amended response in
 compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court. **See Exhibits 3 and 6.**

ADMISSION NO. 7

Deficiency: Request No. 7 asks Defendant to admit that Exhibit 6 was not introduced into
 evidence during the September 13, 2023 harassment trial. The request concerns a single,

objectively verifiable fact reflected in the trial transcript. Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome but did not explain how the request is overly broad or unduly burdensome. Defendant further states only that he "does not recall" what was introduced as exhibits. The response does not admit or deny the request and does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny. Plaintiff therefore requests that Defendant serve an amended response in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court. **See Exhibit 3, p. 2, Index of Exhibits.**

ADMISSION NO. 8

Deficiency: Request No. 8 identifies a specific court order entered in OCN-L-002231-22 and asks whether Defendant knew, before or during the September 13, 2023 harassment trial, that Jennifer Olland had been found in default and that a proof hearing had been scheduled for September 15, 2023. Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome but did not explain how a request concerning a single court order is overly broad or unduly burdensome. Defendant further states only that he "does not recall" what he reviewed in preparation for the harassment trial. The response does not admit or deny the request and does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny. Plaintiff therefore requests that Defendant serve an amended response in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court. **See Exhibit 7.**

ADMISSION NO. 9

Deficiency: Request No. 9 asks Defendant to admit that, after September 13, 2023, he had no involvement in any effort concerning Plaintiff's access to the audio recording, transcript, or other records of the September 13, 2023 harassment trial. Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome but did not explain how the request is overly broad or unduly burdensome. Rather than admitting or denying whether he had any involvement, Defendant states only that he "has no recollection of any effort to access the items identified." The response does not directly admit or deny the request and does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny. Plaintiff therefore requests that Defendant serve an amended response in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court.

ADMISSION NO. 10

No Deficiency: Defendant served a compliant response by denying the request. Plaintiff does not contend that the response is procedurally deficient under the New Jersey Rules of Court. Plaintiff reserves the right to challenge the accuracy or credibility of the denial through discovery and at trial.

ADMISSION NO. 11

No Deficiency: Defendant served a compliant response by denying the request. Plaintiff does not contend that the response is procedurally deficient under the New Jersey Rules of Court. Plaintiff

reserves the right to challenge the factual accuracy of the denial through discovery, documentary evidence, witness testimony, and at trial.

ADMISSION NO. 12

No Deficiency: Defendant served a compliant response by denying the request. Plaintiff does not contend that the response is procedurally deficient under the New Jersey Rules of Court. Plaintiff reserves the right to challenge the factual accuracy of the denial through discovery, documentary evidence, witness testimony, and at trial.

ADMISSION NO. 13

No Deficiency: Defendant served a compliant response by denying the request. Plaintiff does not contend that the response is procedurally deficient under the New Jersey Rules of Court. Plaintiff reserves the right to challenge the factual accuracy of the denial through discovery, documentary evidence, judicial records, and at trial.

ADMISSION NO. 14

Deficiency: Request No. 14 identifies two specific documents by exhibit number and asks whether Defendant reviewed those documents before or during the September 13, 2023 harassment trial. Those documents concern Plaintiff's November 3, 2022 communication to Officer Turino regarding Defendant Jennifer Olland's alleged avoidance of service in OCN-L-002231-22 and the attached Motion for Alternate Service, which Plaintiff contends reflected the purpose of his communications with Ms. Olland. Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome but did not explain how a request identifying two specific documents is overly broad or unduly burdensome. Defendant further states only that he "does not recall" what he reviewed in preparation for the harassment trial. The response does not admit or deny the request and does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny. Plaintiff therefore requests that Defendant serve an amended response in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court. **See Exhibits 13 and 14.**

ADMISSION NO. 15

Deficiency: Request No. 15 identifies four specific exhibits—Dana Judge's process server records, chat communications, and Plaintiff's Motion for Alternate Service—and asks whether Defendant reviewed those documents before or during the September 13, 2023 Harassment Trial. Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome but did not explain how a request concerning specifically identified documents is either overly broad or unduly burdensome. Defendant further states only that he "does not recall" what he reviewed in preparation for the harassment trial. The response does not admit or deny the request and does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny. Plaintiff therefore requests that Defendant serve an amended response in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court.

Note: Exhibits 8, 9, 10, and 14 concern Plaintiff's documented efforts to effect lawful service upon Jennifer Olland, including the process server's reports of unsuccessful service attempts and Plaintiff's Motion for Alternate Service. They were specifically identified because they provide context for Plaintiff's conduct that was at issue during the harassment proceedings.

ADMISSION NO. 16

Deficiency: Request No. 16 asks whether Defendant reviewed specific process server reports before the September 13, 2023 Harassment Trial. The request identifies the reports by exhibit number and describes their contents. Defendant objected that the request is "overly broad and unduly burdensome" but provides no explanation why a request concerning specifically identified reports is overly broad or unduly burdensome. Defendant further states only that he "does not recall" what he reviewed in preparation for the harassment trial. The response does not admit or deny the request and does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny. Plaintiff requests that Defendant serve an amended response that complies with the New Jersey Rules of Court.

ADMISSION NO. 17

Deficiency: Request No. 17 asks whether Defendant was aware, prior to the September 13, 2023 harassment trial, that Plaintiff had alleged Jennifer Olland was intentionally avoiding service of the civil complaint filed against her in Ocean County. Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome but did not explain how a request concerning a single factual allegation is overly broad or unduly burdensome. Defendant further states only that he "does not recall" what he reviewed in preparation for the harassment trial. The response does not admit or deny the request and does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny. Plaintiff therefore requests that Defendant serve an amended response in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court.

ADMISSION NO. 18

Deficiency: Request No. 18 asks whether Defendant was aware, prior to the September 13, 2023 harassment trial, that Plaintiff had alleged Jennifer Olland's harassment complaint was filed in retaliation for the civil action, **OCN-L-002231-22**. Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome but did not explain how a request concerning a single factual allegation is overly broad or unduly burdensome. Defendant further states only that he "does not recall" what he reviewed in preparation for the harassment trial. The response does not admit or deny the request and does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny. Plaintiff therefore requests that Defendant serve an amended response in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court.

ADMISSION NO. 19

No Deficiency: Defendant served a compliant response by denying the request. Plaintiff does not contend that the response is procedurally deficient under the New Jersey Rules of Court. Plaintiff reserves the right to challenge the factual accuracy of the denial through discovery, documentary evidence, and at trial.

ADMISSION NO. 20

Deficiency: Request No. 20 asks whether Defendant reviewed the DCP&P interview identified as Exhibits 11 and 11A before the September 13, 2023 harassment trial. The request identifies the specific exhibits and the relevant statement contained therein. Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome but did not explain how a request concerning specifically identified exhibits is overly broad or unduly burdensome. Defendant further states only that he "does not recall" what he reviewed in preparation for the harassment trial. The response does not admit or deny the request and does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny. Plaintiff therefore requests that Defendant serve an amended response in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court. See Exhibits 11 and 11A.

ADMISSION NO. 21

Deficiency: Request No. 21 asks Defendant to admit an objectively verifiable fact concerning the materials provided to the probable-cause judge. Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome and further states that he cannot admit or deny because the request concerns whether another individual was provided or reviewed certain information. **The response does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny.** Plaintiff requests that Defendant serve an amended response in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court.

See Exhibits 14 and 24.

ADMISSION NO. 22

Deficiency: Request No. 22 asks Defendant to admit that the probable-cause judge who reviewed Jennifer Olland's November 3, 2022 citizen complaint was not provided with Dana Judge's process server reports concerning Jennifer Olland's avoidance of service. The request concerns an objectively verifiable fact regarding the materials submitted in support of the citizen complaint. Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant further states that he cannot admit or deny the request because it concerns what another individual was provided or reviewed and that he lacks personal knowledge of those matters. **The response does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the request.** Plaintiff therefore requests that Defendant serve an amended response in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court.

See Exhibits 8, 9, 10, 14, and 24, Interrogatory and Response No. 8.

ADMISSION NO. 23

Deficiency: Request No. 23 asks Defendant to admit that the probable-cause judge who reviewed Jennifer Olland's November 3, 2022 citizen complaint was not provided with the actual text of the November 3, 2022 emails identified as Exhibits 4 and 5. Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant further states that he cannot admit or deny the request because it concerns what another individual was provided or reviewed and that he lacks personal knowledge of those matters. **The response does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the request.** Plaintiff therefore requests that Defendant serve an amended response in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court.

See Exhibits 4, 5, and 24.

ADMISSION NO. 24

Deficiency: Request No. 24 asks Defendant to admit that the probable-cause judge who reviewed Jennifer Olland's November 3, 2022 citizen complaint was not provided with the March 30, 2022 DCP&P determination that the child abuse allegations against Plaintiff Joseph Fabozzi were determined to be "Unfounded." Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant further states that he cannot admit or deny the request because it concerns what another individual was provided or reviewed and that he lacks personal knowledge of those matters. **The response does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the request.** Plaintiff therefore requests that Defendant serve an amended response in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court.

See Exhibits 6 and 24, Interrogatory and Response No. 8.

ADMISSION NO. 25

Deficiency: Request No. 25 asks Defendant to admit that the probable-cause judge who reviewed Jennifer Olland's November 3, 2022 citizen complaint was not provided with DCP&P Investigator Terrance Campbell's statement that the child "never observed you touch anyone" and that her belief was based on what "her mommy said." Defendant objected that the request is overly broad and unduly burdensome. Defendant further states that he cannot admit or deny the request because it concerns what another individual was provided or reviewed and that he lacks personal knowledge of those matters. The response does not state that, after making a reasonable inquiry, Defendant lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the request. Plaintiff therefore requests that Defendant serve an amended response in compliance with the New Jersey Rules of Court.

See Exhibits 11, 11A, and 24, Interrogatory and Response No. 8.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Fabozzi

Joseph Fabozzi

Plaintiff, Pro Se

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Note: The exhibit numbering in this Deficiency Notice is identical to the exhibit numbering used in Plaintiff's First Request for Admissions to Defendant Matthew Weng. Exhibits 19 through 21 were intentionally not used in the original exhibit set. Accordingly, the exhibit numbering continues from Exhibit 18A to Exhibit 22A to maintain consistency with the documents previously served upon Defendant.

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit 1 – Jennifer Olland Written Statement

Exhibit 2 – Jennifer Olland Affidavit of Probable Cause

Exhibit 3 – September 13, 2023 Harassment Trial Transcript

Exhibit 4 – November 3, 2022 PTO Email No. 1

Exhibit 5 – November 3, 2022 PTO Email No. 2

Exhibit 6 – March 30, 2022 DCP&P Letter – Unfounded Determination

Exhibit 7 – Order Scheduling Proof Hearing for September 15, 2023 (OCN-L-002231-22)

Exhibit 8 – Dana Judge Chat Communications

Exhibit 9 – Dana Judge Service Attempt No. 1

Exhibit 10 – Dana Judge Service Attempt No. 2

Exhibit 11 – Transcript of DCP&P Investigator Terrance Campbell Interview – Waretown Police Department

Exhibit 11A – Video Recording of DCP&P Investigator Terrance Campbell Interview – Waretown Police Department

Exhibit 12 – DCP&P Unfounded Determination Memorandum

Exhibit 13 – November 3, 2022 Email Chain to Officer Justin Turino

Exhibit 14 – Motion for Alternate Service (OCN-L-002231-22)

Exhibit 15 – Burlington County Sheriff Service Attempts / Jennifer Olland Avoidance of Service

Exhibit 16 – Audio Recording – Jennifer Olland / Officer Justin Turino – Mount Laurel Police Department – November 3, 2022 (11:16 a.m.)

Exhibit 16A – Transcript – Jennifer Olland / Officer Justin Turino – Mount Laurel Police Department – November 3, 2022 (11:16 a.m.)

Exhibit 17 – Audio Recording – Officer Justin Turino / Jennifer Olland – Mount Laurel Police Department – November 3, 2022 (12:54 p.m.)

Exhibit 17A – Transcript – Officer Justin Turino / Jennifer Olland – Mount Laurel Police Department – November 3, 2022 (12:54 p.m.)

Exhibit 18 – Audio Recording – Jennifer Olland / Officer Justin Turino – Mount Laurel Police Department – November 3, 2022 (1:00 p.m.)

Exhibit 18A – Transcript – Jennifer Olland / Officer Justin Turino – Mount Laurel Police Department – November 3, 2022 (1:00 p.m.)

Exhibit numbers 19 through 21 - were intentionally not used.

Exhibit 22A – Transcript – Jennifer Olland / Officer Justin Turino – Mount Laurel Police Department – November 3, 2022 (11:16 a.m.) (Complete Transcript)

Exhibit 23 – Allison Gasiorowski Audio Request

Exhibit 24 – Officer Justin Turino's Answers to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories

Exhibit 25 – Defendant Matthew Weng's Responses to Plaintiff's First Request for Admissions