MATTHEW J. PLATKIN ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW JERSEY Attorney for the Plaintiff Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex 25 Market Street P.O. Box 117 Trenton, New Jersey 08625 By: Anna M. Lascurain Deputy Attorney General NJ Attorney ID: 006211994 (609) 376-2965 Anna.Lascurain@law.njoag.gov SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION - MERCER COUNTY DOCKET NO. MER-L-000808-23 MARLENE CARIDE, **COMMISSIONER OF THE**) NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF) BANKING AND INSURANCE,) Plaintiff, **Civil Action**

)

)

)

٧.

)

Defendant.

KELLY STOKES,

THIS MATTER HAVING BEEN opened to the Court on the application of Matthew J. Platkin, Attorney General of New Jersey, (by Anna M. Lascurain, Deputy Attorney General, appearing), attorney for Plaintiff, Marlene Caride, Commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Banking and Insurance on a motion for final judgment by default; and

ORDER OF FINAL JUDGEMNT

BY DEFAULT

The Defendant, Kelly Stokes ("Defendant"), having been duly served with a copy of the Summons and Complaint in the above-entitled action and having been defaulted for failure to appear, answer or otherwise defend;

This Court now finds that Defendant violated the New Jersey Insurance Fraud Prevention Act, N.J.S.A. 17:33A-1 to -30 ("Fraud Act"), specifically N.J.S.A. 17:33A-4(a)(4)(b) and -4(a)(5), by making a material false or misleading statement to Progressive Insurance Company ("Progressive") in support of an application for insurance. Defendant knowingly provided a false Statement of No Loss to Progressive on October 2, 2019 in support of an application for insurance stating that neither she nor her previously insured vehicle had been involved in an accident, when in fact she had been involved in an accident with that vehicle less than an hour before she made the statement,

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this Order be served upon all parties within $\frac{7}{1}$ days of the date of receipt.

/s/R. Brian McLa	aughlín
R. Brian McLaughlin	. I.S.C.

This motion was		an McLaughlin , J.S.C.
X	_ Opposed _ Unopposed	Having reviewed the above motion, I find it to be meritorious on its face and is unopposed. Pursuant to R.1:6-2, it therefore will be granted essentially for the reasons set forth in the moving papers.