

STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
DEPARTMENT OF BANKING AND INSURANCE

IN THE MATTER OF:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Proceedings by the Commissioner of Banking )  
and Insurance, State of New Jersey, to fine, )  
suspend and/or revoke the insurance license of )  
Anka Bojic, Reference No. 9951347. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

TO: Anka Bojic  
11 Kent Avenue  
Wayne, NJ 07470

THIS MATTER, having been opened by the Commissioner of Banking and Insurance (“Commissioner”), State of New Jersey, upon information that Anka Bojic (“Respondent”), may have violated various provisions of the insurance laws of the State of New Jersey; and

WHEREAS, Respondent is licensed as a resident individual insurance producer in the State of New Jersey, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 17:22A-32(a); and

WHEREAS, Respondent is subject to the provisions of the New Jersey Insurance Producer Licensing Act of 2001, N.J.S.A. 17:22A-26 to -48 (“Producer Act”) and the New Jersey Insurance Fraud Prevention Act, N.J.S.A. 17:33A-1 to -30 (“Fraud Act”); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 17:22A-40(a)(2), an insurance producer shall not violate any insurance law, regulation, subpoena or order of the Commissioner or of another state’s insurance regulator; and



WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 17:22A-40(a)(8), an insurance producer shall not use any fraudulent, coercive, or dishonest practices, or demonstrate incompetence or untrustworthiness in the conduct of insurance business; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 17:22A-40(a)(16), an insurance producer shall not commit any fraudulent act; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 17:22A-45(a), the Commissioner shall have the power to conduct investigations, to administer oaths, to interrogate licensees and others, and to issue subpoenas to any licensee or any other person in connection with any investigation, hearing or other proceeding pursuant to this act, without fee; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 17:22A-40(a), the Commissioner may place on probation, suspend, revoke or refuse to issue or renew an insurance producer's license for violating the Producer Act; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 17:22A-45(c), any person violating the Producer Act is subject to a penalty not exceeding \$5,000.00 for the first offense and not exceeding \$10,000.00 for each subsequent offense; additionally, the Commissioner may order restitution of moneys owed any person and reimbursement of costs of the investigation and prosecution; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 17:33A-4(a)(1), no person shall present or cause to be presented any written or oral statement as part of, or in support of or opposition to, a claim for payment or other benefit pursuant to an insurance policy, knowing that the statement contains any false or misleading information concerning any fact or thing material to the claim; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 17:33A-5(a) and (c), violations of the Fraud Act subject the violator to a civil and administrative penalty not to exceed \$5,000.00 for the first offense, not to exceed \$10,000.00 for the second offense and not to exceed \$15,000.00 for each subsequent



offense; moreover, the Commissioner may issue a final order recovering costs of prosecution, including attorneys' fees in accordance with N.J.A.C. 11:16-7.9(c); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 17:33A-5.1, any person who is found in any legal proceeding to have committed insurance fraud shall be subject to a surcharge in the amount of \$1,000.00; and

### **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS**

IT APPEARING, that starting August 27, 1999, Respondent became a licensed insurance producer in the State of New Jersey; and

IT FURTHER APPEARING, that on January 8, 2009, Respondent submitted a claim to Chubb Insurance Company of New Jersey ("Chubb") for a platinum and diamond engagement ring, allegedly purchased by her husband in 1999, from Costco, valued at \$6,399.00, as well as a wedding band valued at \$2,538.00, and allegedly lost when flushed down the toilet by a family member; and

IT FURTHER APPEARING, that on January 8, 2009, Chubb paid Respondent \$8,937.00 for the claim; and

IT FURTHER APPEARING, that on July 18, 2011, Respondent submitted another claim to Chubb for a platinum and diamond engagement ring, valued at \$17,000.00, which she allegedly lost in the ocean; and

IT FURTHER APPEARING, that on July 27, 2011, Chubb paid Respondent \$5,000.00, minus a \$2,500.00 deductible, for the engagement ring; and

IT FURTHER APPEARING, that on February 16, 2016, Respondent submitted a claim to Homesite Home Insurance ("Homesite") for a platinum and diamond engagement ring valued at \$17,000.00, allegedly lost while shopping the day before; and



IT FURTHER APPEARING, that Respondent was not paid for the Homesite claim, because, once her claim was denied for failure to provide proof of ownership that the ring was replaced in 2011, she allegedly found the ring and withdrew the claim; and

IT FURTHER APPEARING, that Respondent's husband did not purchase a Costco membership until 2003, and therefore could not have purchased the rings from Costco in 1999; and

IT FURTHER APPEARING, that Respondent never owned a platinum and diamond engagement ring valued at \$17,000.00; and

IT FURTHER APPEARING, that the jeweler from whom Respondent said she purchased her platinum and diamond engagement ring, valued at \$17,000.00, never sold her a diamond ring; and

IT FURTHER APPEARING, that Respondent had no appraisal, gemology certification, or other proof of ownership of value to submit with the 2011 or 2016 claims, because all paperwork was allegedly destroyed in a flood; and

IT FURTHER APPEARING, that the purported appraisal Respondent obtained from Six Star Jewelers in Wayne, New Jersey, on July 22, 2011, for a platinum and diamond engagement ring, and which she submitted to Chubb and Homesite as proof of ownership, was actually an estimate for a ring created seven (7) days after her ring was allegedly lost for the second time; and

IT FURTHER APPEARING, that Respondent had not actually lost a ring when she tendered the claim to Homesite on February 16, 2016; and

IT FURTHER APPEARING, that on January 8, 2018, that Respondent ended an interview with investigators of the Bureau of Fraud Deterrence, Department of Banking and Insurance of the State of New Jersey, and refused to participate further with the investigation; and





**COUNT ONE**  
**(Producer Act)**

IT FURTHER APPEARING, that Respondent provided false information to an insurance company in relation to three claims for payment on a homeowners insurance policy, each claim constituting a separate offense under the Producer Act, in violation of N.J.S.A. 17:22A-40(a)(2), (8), and (16); and

**COUNT TWO**  
**(Producer Act)**

IT FURTHER APPEARING, that Respondent ended and declined to participate further during an interview with Department investigators on January 8, 2018, in violation of N.J.S.A. 17:22A-40(a)(8); and

**COUNT THREE**  
**(Fraud Act)**

IT FURTHER APPEARING, that Respondent presented oral and written statements in support of three claims, each claim constituting a separate offense under the Fraud Act, for payment pursuant to an insurance policy, knowing that the statements contained false or misleading information concerning material facts, in violation of N.J.S.A. 17:33A-4(a)(1); and

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS on this 24 day of January, 2022,

ORDERED, that Respondent appear and show cause why her New Jersey insurance producer license should not be suspended or revoked pursuant to N.J.S.A. 17:22A-40(a); and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that Respondent appear and show cause why the Commissioner should not assess a civil penalty of up to \$5,000.00 for the first violation and \$10,000.00 for each subsequent violation of the Producer Act and order Respondent to pay restitution of moneys owed to any person, pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 17:22A-45(c); and



IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that Respondent appear and show cause why she should not be required to reimburse the Department for the cost of the investigation and prosecution, including attorneys' fees, as authorized pursuant to N.J.S.A. 17:22A-45(c), N.J.S.A. 17:33A-5(c), and N.J.A.C. 11:16-7.9(c); and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that Respondent appear and show cause why the Commissioner should not assess a civil penalty of up to \$5,000.00 for the first offense, up to \$10,000.00 for the second offense, and up to \$15,000 for each subsequent offense of the Fraud Act pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 17:33A-5(c) and N.J.A.C. 11:16-7.9(a); and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that Respondent appear and show cause why the Commissioner should not impose a \$1,000.00 surcharge against her in accordance with N.J.S.A. 17:33A-5.1; and

IT IS PROVIDED, that Respondent has the right to request an administrative hearing, to be represented by counsel or other qualified representative, at her own expense, to take testimony, to call or cross-examine witnesses, to have subpoenas issued, and to present evidence or argument if a hearing is requested; and

IT IS FURTHER PROVIDED, that unless a request for a hearing is received within twenty (20) days of the service of this Order to Show Cause, the right to a hearing in this matter shall be deemed to have been waived by Respondent, and the Commissioner shall dispose of this matter in accordance with law. A hearing may be requested by mailing the request to Virgil Downtin, Chief of Investigations, Department of Banking and Insurance, P.O. Box 329, Trenton, New Jersey 08625, or by faxing the hearing request to the Department at (609) 292-5337. A copy of the request for a hearing shall also be sent to Deputy Attorney General Chandra M. Arkema at: Division of Law, P.O. Box 117, Trenton, NJ 08625. The request shall contain the following:



- (a) Respondent's full name, address and daytime telephone number;
- (b) A statement referring to each charge alleged in this Order to Show Cause and identifying any defense intended to be asserted in response to each charge. Where the defense relies on facts not contained in the Order to Show Cause, those specific facts must be stated;
- (c) A specific admission or denial of each fact alleged in this Order to Show Cause. Where Respondent has no specific knowledge regarding a fact alleged in the Order to Show Cause, a statement to that effect must be contained in the hearing request. Allegations of this Order to Show Cause not answered in the manner set forth above shall be deemed to have been admitted; and
- (d) A statement requesting the hearing.



---

Marlene Caride  
Commissioner

