

New Jersey Cannabis Regulatory Commission
Public In-Writing Comments
Public Meeting: September 17, 2026

Full Name	Meeting Date	Comment
John De Los Santos	9/17/2026	I could not register to speak. Please enter this in the record. My 51% Class A interest is what qualifies my company as minority-owned under N.J.A.C. 17:30-6.4 and as a social equity license holder under 6.6. We began operations in August 2025, inside the period where 6.8(k), 9.3(c) and 9.3(d) require those conditions be held and exercised by me. The company has ceased operations and the license has expired. Under 9.3(f) it is abandoned. I am not asking for it back, and I am not asking the Commission to resolve anything for me. From December 2025 I reported to this Commission, in writing and with documents, that non-managing members were pressing governance changes I did not believe the rules allowed inside the protected period, and that all further capital was conditioned on my agreeing. I filed a voluntary disclosure in April 2026. In June I sent the proposed documents the day I received them, not for approval, but because I believed they were impermissible. I signed none of it. My company has one binding governance document. I received no substantive response to either submission. The Commission did act on an earlier ownership matter and granted a renewal extension in July. My license was not ignored. What I reported was. And it came back to me described as a dispute among members. Infighting. It was not. Under my operating agreement and this Commission's own definitions, those members hold non-managing interests with no authority to direct operations, bind the company, or call a meeting. My counsel confirmed that to them in writing in January 2026. What occurred was a sustained effort by passive holders to take

		control of a qualifying interest inside the window when it cannot change, using the company's need for capital as the lever. That is not partners disagreeing. It is conduct measured against 6.8(k), 6.9, 6.10 and 9.3. The label decided the outcome. A member dispute is private and belongs to a court. An attempted control transfer of a social equity license inside the protected period is regulatory, and only this Commission can reach it. There is also a structural problem. I was told a response would come once the Commission had the full terms and the name of the proposed management services provider. I asked the other side for those from June forward and never got them, and under 6.9(i) and 6.10(g) nothing can be filed without that provider's own disclosures. So a party can keep a structure permanently unreviewable by never naming itself, while telling the licensee's investors it is already approved elsewhere. The report goes in and nothing comes back, because completing the file belongs to the people the report is about. I had no attorney after March 2026. The other side had counsel throughout. I argued your regulations myself because no one else would. Three questions, for every licensee still inside a protected period. What is a qualifying owner to do when investors condition all capital on a transfer of control the rules forbid? If the answer is a voluntary disclosure, I filed one. What follows, and when? Where the reported party controls the information needed to complete a submission, can the Commission act without it? Will the Commission say publicly whether the structures circulating in this market as CRC-approved have been approved for a social equity licensee inside its two-year period? Social equity applicants reach licensure undercapitalized. That is the premise of the
--	--	--

		program. The capital arrives as passive investment. If passive investors may withhold every dollar until control is surrendered, the protected period is not protection. It is leverage against the owner it was written for. Agree and risk the license, or refuse and fail. I refused. I have no business. Please do not let the next one find this out alone. John De Los Santos Royal Roll L.L.C., License M000267
Maria Lindell	9/17/2026	With legal dispensaries making billions, and 5 years later, why are New Jersey residents still banned from home growing? Wasn't a bill introduced to correct this? What or Who is holding it up? It is sad to see that the state's greed supersedes the well-being of the residents in NJ. God forbid a New Jerseyan doesn't pay taxes on their weed. Mickie Sherrill promised us five plants on the campaign trail, only to not deliver with over 7 months in office. Knowing there are thousands of medical patients struggling, not being able to afford cannabis, not having access to rare breeds and phenotypes...its sad and also outrageous.