ATUE COF YLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT OF N.J. ACTING ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW JERSTO CONFILED AND FILED Attorney for the Plaintiff Attorney for the Plaintiff Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex SUE REGAN Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0117 DEPUTY CLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT Richard E. Wegryn, Jr. By: Deputy Attorney General (609) 777-3733 NJ Attorney ID No: 048361993 richard.wegryn@dol.lps.state.nj.us SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION - MERCER COUNTY DOCKET NO. MER-L-483-15 KENNETH E. KOBYLOWSKI,

KENNETH E. KOBYLOWSKI,

COMMISSIONER OF THE

NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF

BANKING AND INSURANCE,

Plaintiff,

V.

ORDER OF FINAL JUDGMENT

BY DEFAULT

JULIA D. KEARS-FREEMAN,

Defendant.

The Defendant, Julia D. Kears-Freeman, 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;

FINAL JUDGMENT is on this 244 day of OULY, 2015, entered in the total amount of \$32,405.58 against Defendant Julia D. Kears-Freeman, which amount consists of \$23,541.45 in favor of the Plaintiff, Commissioner of the State of New Jersey

Department of Banking and Insurance, consisting of \$20,000.00 in civil penalties for four violations of the Insurance Fraud Prevention Act, N.J.S.A. 17:33A-1 et seq.; attorneys' fees of \$2,411.50 pursuant to N.J.S.A. 17:33A-5; cost of service in the amount of \$129.95 pursuant to N.J.S.A. 17:33A-5; plus \$1,000.00 constituting the statutory surcharge pursuant to N.J.S.A. 17:33A-5.1.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that pursuant to N.J.S.A. 17:33A-26, FINAL JUDGMENT is also entered in the amount of \$8,864.13 against Defendant, Julia D. Kears-Freeman, and in favor of New Jersey Manufacturers Insurance Company which amount consists of: \$8,704.00 in restitution pursuant to N.J.S.A. 17:33A-26; and \$160.13 in pre-judgment and post-judgment interest pursuant to R. 4:42-11.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this Order be served upon all parties within \_\_\_\_\_ days of the date hereof.

Anthony M. Massi, J.S.C.

This motion was:

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.