

**SCHENCK PRICE SMITH & KING LLP**

Mark K. Silver, Esq. (019752000)

220 Park Avenue

P.O. Box 991

Florham Park, New Jersey 07932

(973) 539-1000

*Attorneys for Defendant, Sweet Grass Farm, LLC*

<p>LAUREN KANAREK,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>MICHAEL BARISONE, SWEET GRASS FARMS, LLC, RUTH COX, JOHN DOES 1-30; ABC Corporations 1-20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendants.</p>	<p>SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION: MORRIS COUNTY</p> <p>DOCKET NO.: MRS-L-2250-19</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Civil Action</p>
--	--

---

**DEFENDANT SWEET GRASS FARM, LLC'S REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF ITS  
MOTION TO FIND JONATHAN KANAREK IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND  
COMPEL RESPONSE TO SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM AND  
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S CROSS-MOTION TO QUASH**

---

**OF COUNSEL AND ON THE BRIEF:**

**Mark K. Silver, Esq. (019752000)**

**220 Park Avenue**

**P.O. Box 991**

**Florham Park, New Jersey 07932**

**(973) 539-1000**

**REPLY ARGUMENT AND OPPOSITION TO CROSS-MOTION**

For the record of this Court and for the benefit of any subsequent reviewing Court the following facts are undisputed:

1. As established in Defendant Sweet Grass Farm, LLC's ("SGF") initial papers, discovery conducted to date has unequivocally revealed that Jonathan Kanarek is in possession (or at one time was in possession) of materials relevant to this litigation. (See Certification of Mark K. Silver, Esq. ("Silver Cert.") at ¶ 24).
2. Jonathan Kanarek has given public interviews about the facts of this case. (See CBS Television's "48 Hours – The Shooting of Lauren Kanarek").
3. Neither Jonathan Kanarek nor anyone representing Jonathan Kanarek has contacted SGF about the outstanding subpoena and/or the pending motion. (See Silver Cert. at ¶ 16).
4. In fact, both Plaintiff's former counsel and current counsel have affirmatively represented to SGF's counsel that they do not represent Jonathan Kanarek. (See Supplemental Certification of Mark K. Silver, Esq. ("Supplemental Silver Cert.") at ¶¶3-4).
5. Jonathan Kanarek has not filed an opposition to Defendant SGF's motion. (See Court Docket).
6. Jonathan Kanarek's failure to respond to the Amended Subpoena issued by SGF is not only a violation of the subpoena, but it is also a violation of this Court's November 14, 2022 Order. (See Silver Cert. at Exhibit E).

7. Plaintiff's Motion to Quash/Opposition to the Motion for Contempt is untimely filed.<sup>1</sup>  
Rule 1:9-2 requires a motion be made "promptly". No motion was filed until after SGF filed its current application.
8. Plaintiff's Motion to Quash/Opposition to the Motion for Contempt is filed with rhetoric, hyperbole and argument, but fails to meet the basic standards required by the Court Rules. Specifically, Plaintiff's papers fail to include an attorney Certification or any "facts" upon which said rhetoric, hyperbole and argument can be based.
9. SGF's subpoena is reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

If SGF possessed the materials it was seeking, it would not have issued the subpoena and/or made this motion. Setting aside the additional arguments made below, SGF's motion should be granted based on just the facts listed above.

**I. PLAINTIFF'S CHALLENGE TO THE SUBSTANCE OF SGF'S SUBPOENA IS UNTIMELY AND, THEREFORE, SHOULD BE DEEMED WAIVED.**

As with the first subpoena, Plaintiff's latest submission is untimely.

R. 1:9-2 expressly states that a motion to quash a subpoena must be "promptly made". Nothing about Plaintiff's application is prompt. Plaintiff waited until after a Motion for Contempt was filed to take a position on the Amended Subpoena to Jonathan Kanarek. If Plaintiff wanted to challenge the substance of SGF's inquiries, she should have filed an application to quash prior to the return date of the subpoena. She did not do so, thereby waiving any ability to participate in the current motions.

---

<sup>1</sup> While Plaintiff's counsel is new to the case, the subpoena had been issued almost a month and a half prior to the change of counsel. Plaintiff has not identified any reason why prior counsel did not object and/or file a Motion to Quash in a timely manner.

**II. THE SUBPOENA ISSUED AND THE DISCOVERY SOUGHT MEETS ALL APPLICABLE DISCOVERY REQUIREMENTS.**

Plaintiff has the burden of proof in attempting to quash the subpoena. As she has not submitted any facts for the Court to evaluate, the motion should fail from the outset. Even if the Court solely evaluates the unsubstantiated arguments of Plaintiff's counsel, Plaintiff still fails to her burden.

Contrary to Plaintiff's claims, seeking discovery that may ultimately be unfavorable to Plaintiff is not akin to harassment. It is clear from reading Plaintiff's opposition brief that the parties have significantly differing views on what is relevant to this case. It is equally clear that in the coming weeks and months the parties will do battle over Plaintiff's legal status on the Property, the alleged duty of care owed to Plaintiff by SGF, and a myriad of other issues. But none of those are relevant to the issue before the Court. The only issue currently before the Court is whether the materials sought by SGF from Jonathan Kanarek are "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." R. 4:10-2. The only reasonable answer to that question is: Yes.

In sum, it is axiomatic that under New Jersey law, the rules of discovery are to "be construed liberally in favor of broad pretrial discovery." Payton v. N.J. Turnpike Auth., 148 N.J. 524, 535, (1997). Thus, "[p]arties may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action." Evidence is relevant if it has "a tendency in reason to prove or disprove any fact of consequence to the determination of the action. Id. (citing N.J.R.E. 401). "Information which bears even a remote relevance to the subject matter of a cause of action is discoverable, if it is reasonably likely to lead to discovery of admissible evidence." HD Supply Waterworks Group, Inc. v. Director, Division of Taxation, 29 N.J. Tax 573, 582 (2017). Responding to Subpoenas are part and parcel of this right. See McKenney v. Jersey City Med. Ctr., 167 N.J. 359, 370 (2001) ("Our procedures for discovery are

designed to eliminate the element of surprise at trial by requiring a litigant to disclose the facts upon which a cause of action or defense is based”). Foreclosing SGF from discovery into such matters would significantly impede Defendant’s ability to defend against Plaintiff’s claims. See generally, Longo v. Am. Policyholders’ Ins. Co., 181 N.J. Super. 87, 90 (Super. Ct. 1981) (“Impediments to pretrial disclosure debase the judicial process by promoting surprise”). Accordingly, Plaintiff’s attempt to foreclose Defendants from obtaining relevant and material discovery is expressly disallowed under New Jersey law. See McKenney v. Jersey City Med. Ctr., 167 N.J. 359, 372 (2001) (“For over fifty years, courts have endeavored to transform civil litigation from a battle royal to a search for truth.”).

Contrary to Plaintiff’s claims, nothing about the events giving rise to Plaintiff’s Complaint are undisputed. Plaintiff has the burden of proof in this case and in this motion. SGF intends to hold Plaintiff to her proofs on each and every element of her case, including the fact that the Defendants are more than 51% liable for her alleged damages.<sup>2</sup> As pointed out in Plaintiff’s brief, Plaintiff’s claims against SGF sound in negligent security. One of SGF’s defenses is that Lauren Kanarek caused and/or set forth in motion the conditions and environment that led the alleged incident on August 7, 2019. (See Fifth Affirmative Defense in SGF’s Answer).

Discovery has revealed that Plaintiff is a habitual and persistent cyber-bully. She has a history, pattern, and practice of creating hostile environments using a variety of social media outlets. When she gets into a disagreement with an individual and feels otherwise aggrieved, she initiates a scorched-earth war. She creates and executes a plan to eviscerate her enemies. This is

---

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff’s unsupported suggestion that any issue in this case has been collaterally estopped is made in the face of years of legal precedent. It is black letter law that collateral estoppel can only be asserted “when the party against whom the doctrine is asserted was a party to or in privity with a party to the earlier proceeding.” In re Estate of Dawson, 136 N.J. 1, 20, 641 A.2d 1026 (1994) (citations omitted). SGF was not a party to the criminal action and therefore, is not bound by anything that happened there.

not hyperbole. This is not rhetoric. This is fact. The Court need not take SGF's word for it. It can simply read Plaintiff's own words:

**Q. Now did you have a plan to destroy Michael Barisone?**

**A. At some point – Yes.**

**(See Supplemental Silver Cert. at Exhibit 1, March 30, 2022 Criminal Trial Testimony of Lauren Kanarek, pg. 89).**

**Q. Were you posting, in numerous posts, statements with regards to going to war?**

**A. Yeah.**

**(See Id. at pgs. 121-125).**

As Plaintiff's war on Michael Barisone escalated, she (along with her boyfriend Robert Goodwin) planted illegal listening devices on the private property of SGF without SGF's knowledge or consent. These devices produced recordings. Discovery has revealed that some of those recordings were transmitted by Goodwin to Jonathan Kanarek. (See Silver Cert. at ¶ 24).

SGF asked Plaintiff to produce all audio recordings and to date none have been produced. While it is true that SGF received some recordings from the Morris County Prosecutor's Office ("MCPO"), there is no evidence or reason to believe that the recordings produced by the MCPO are the recordings transmitted from Goodwin to Jonathan Kanarek. Specifically, Robert Goodwin references "videos" sent to Jonathan Kanarek. The MCPO's production did not contain videos (as described by Mr. Goodwin). (See Silver Cert. at ¶ 24). The only way to establish what recordings Jonathan Kanarek has in his possession is to get them from Jonathan Kanarek.

These recordings and the transcripts sought from Kirby Kanarek were part of the factual basis utilized by Plaintiff in making her complaint against Barisone to SafeSport. Upon

information and belief, it was that SafeSport complaint that led child services to come to the Property on the day of the alleged incident.

In sum, to SGF's knowledge, it does not have the recordings at issue. SGF cannot obtain the information from any other means, and as shown above, the information is wholly connected to SGF's defenses in this matter.

As to the remainder of the requests, SGF used all best efforts to limit them to a reasonable time and scope. Discovery in this case has already revealed that there were times during the incident at issue where Jonathan Kanarek acted as the agent of the Plaintiff and the timeframes of those requests mirror that timeframe. Plaintiff's claim that the Court has ruled on any specific request is false. The November 14, 2022 Order did not specify which of the previous requests were overly broad. SGF narrowed the specific requests it interpreted as the ones the Court was referring to.

### **III. JONATHAN KANAREK HAS HAD MULTIPLE CHANCES TO COMPLY**

The saga to get discoverable documents from Jonathan Kanarek has been going on since July 2022. He has done nothing to pay the proper respect to this Court or its rules. Now, Plaintiff (who does not have standing to even make the request) asks the Court for additional time to allow Mr. Kanarek to get an attorney so that we can start this process over for a third time. (See Page 13 of Plaintiff's Brief). Jonathan Kanarek has had seven (7) months to get representation. SGF simply wants the documents and materials requested in the subpoena. It had no choice but to file a Motion for Contempt because Mr. Kanarek has refused to participate in the process. The November 14, 2022, Order commanded Mr. Kanarek to respond within ten (10) days. He ignored

that Order. Absent real consequences, why should anyone expect Mr. Kanarek to comply with a future Order?

The Kanareks act as if the Rules should not apply to them. Plaintiff's brief states they are willing to sit for deposition, but not willing to produce documents. The choice is not theirs to make. SGF intends to depose them *after* it has their documents and has adequately prepared for the deposition. Also, there is no reason to believe that they will appear for deposition either. They have not submitted certifications stating same, and Plaintiff's counsel does not represent them. Moreover, although the parties are working to schedule Plaintiff's deposition, Plaintiff herself has yet to appear for a deposition and has advised that she will only sit for a deposition if Defendants agree to limitations in advance.

### **CONCLUSION**

For all of the foregoing reasons, SGF requests that the Court issue an Order either finding Jonathan Kanarek in contempt of Court and/or an Order compelling Jonathan Kanarek to fully and completely comply with production of materials sought by SGF's subpoena.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHENCK PRICE SMITH & KING LLP

*/s/ Mark K. Silver*

Mark K. Silver, Esq.

Dated: February 13, 2023



**SCHENCK PRICE SMITH & KING LLP**

Mark K. Silver, Esq. (019752000)  
220 Park Avenue  
P.O. Box 991  
Florham Park, New Jersey 07932  
(973) 539-1000  
*Attorneys for Defendant, Sweet Grass Farm, LLC*

<p>LAUREN KANAREK,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>MICHAEL BARISONE, SWEET GRASS FARMS, LLC, RUTH COX, JOHN DOES 1-30; ABC Corporations 1-20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendants.</p>	<p>SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION: MORRIS COUNTY</p> <p>DOCKET NO.: MRS-L-2250-19</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Civil Action</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTAL CERTIFICATION OF MARK K. SILVER, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT SWEET GRASS FARM, LLC’S MOTION FOR CONTEMPT AND IN OPPOSITION TO CROSS-MOTION TO QUASH</b></p>
--	--

I, MARK K. SILVER, ESQ., of full age, do certify as follows:

1. I am an attorney-at-law of the State of New Jersey and a Partner with the law firm of Schenck, Price, Smith & King LLP, attorneys for Defendant Sweet Grass Farm, LLC (“SGF”).

I am the attorney responsible for handling this matter. As such, I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein.

2. I make this Supplemental Certification in support of SGF’s Motion for Contempt and/or Compel and in Opposition to Plaintiff’s Cross-Motion to Quash.

3. Neither Jonathan Kanarek nor anyone representing Jonathan Kanarek has contacted SGF about the outstanding subpoena and/or the pending motion.

4. In fact, I asked both Plaintiff’s former counsel and current counsel on multiple occasions if they represent Jonathan Kanarek. Both affirmatively represented to me that they do not represent Jonathan Kanarek.

5. A true and accurate copy of relevant excerpts of the March 30, 2022 Criminal Trial Testimony of Plaintiff, Lauren Kanarek are attached hereto at **Exhibit 1**.

I hereby certify, pursuant to Rule 1:4-4(b), 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.

**SCHENCK PRICE SMITH & KING LLP**  
*Attorneys for Defendant, Sweet Grass Farm, LLC*

By: /s/ Mark K. Silver  
Mark K. Silver

Dated: February 13, 2023

# **EXHIBIT 1**

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY v. MICHAEL L. BARISONE -- March 30, 2022**  
**Testimony Only of Lauren Kanarek**

Sheet 1

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY  
LAW DIVISION, CRIMINAL PART  
MORRIS COUNTY  
INDICTMENT NO. 19-12-00999-I  
APP. DIV. NO.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,	)	
	)	TRANSCRIPT
Plaintiff,	)	of
	)	TRIAL TESTIMONY
vs.	)	of
	)	LAUREN KANAREK
MICHAEL L. BARISONE,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

Place: Morris Co. Courthouse  
Washington & Court Sts.  
Morristown, N.J. 07963

Date: March 30, 2022

BEFORE:

HONORABLE STEPHEN J. TAYLOR, P.J.S.C., AND JURY

TRANSCRIPT ORDERED BY:

MARK K. SILVER, ESQ. (Schenck Price Smith &  
King, LLP, 220 Park Avenue, P.O. Box 991,  
Florham Park, New Jersey 07932)

Transcriber Catherine Weigel  
ELITE TRANSCRIPTS, INC.  
14 Boonton Avenue  
Butler, NJ 07405  
(973) 283-0196  
Audio Recorded  
Operator, Alicia Roberts

**Elite Transcripts, Inc.**

14 Boonton Avenue, Butler, New Jersey 07405  
(973) 283-0196 FAX (973) 492-2927

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY v. MICHAEL L. BARISONE -- March 30, 2022**  
**Testimony Only of Lauren Kanarek**

Sheet 45

88

State v. Barisone

1 A I don't know the amount of monies that we're  
2 claiming, but certainly for damages.

3 Q You basically want to take everything of  
4 value away from Michael Barisone in that lawsuit,  
5 correct?

6 A I just want him to cover medical expenses and  
7 answer for the crime he committed in a civil court of  
8 law.

9 Q And also get money, correct?

10 A If that ends up being a result of the suit, I  
11 guess that's the result, but that's not the goal.

12 Q And all of that -- and correct me if I'm  
13 wrong  
14 -- is based on the fact that he shot you on August 7th,  
15 correct?

16 A That he tried to murder me, yes.

17 Q Isn't it a fact that you, your boyfriend, and  
18 your father were planning on suing Michael Barisone  
19 prior to that?

20 A Not that I recall, but I don't remember what we'd  
21 be suing him for prior to that, other than --

22 Q Do you recall talking to your dad about suing  
23 him for approximately \$200,000?

24 A I do not, but -- I -- no, I don't recall that,  
25 actually.

89

State v. Barisone

1 Q Is -- is it your sworn testimony that as you  
2 sit here today you have no recollection, prior to the  
3 shooting, of talking to either your boyfriend or your  
4 father about suing Michael Barisone?

5 A It is my sworn testimony that I at this time do  
6 not recall that, especially amounts.

7 Q Now did you have a plan to destroy Michael  
8 Barisone?

9 A At some point, yes.

10 Q And isn't it a fact that you made a specific  
11 threat saying that you intended to destroy everything  
12 Mary Haskins loved and held dear?

13 A At some point, yes.

14 Q You made that statement for both Mr. Barisone  
15 and Ms. Haskins to hear, correct?

16 A Correct.

17 Q And -- and would you agree with me that you  
18 set out on a mission to try to do that, correct?

19 A At a certain point after being bullied, correct.

20 Q There's been testimony here that no one ever  
21 really asked you to leave. Were you --

22 THE COURT: Mr. Bilinkas, you can refer to  
23 other testimony to this witness.

24 MR. BILINKAS: I'll rephrase the question.

25 THE COURT: Strike that. Just ask a question

**Elite Transcripts, Inc.**

14 Boonton Avenue, Butler, New Jersey 07405  
(973) 283-0196 FAX (973) 492-2927

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY v. MICHAEL L. BARISONE -- March 30, 2022**  
**Testimony Only of Lauren Kanarek**

Sheet 61

120

State v. Barisone

1 of mind. It's entirely up to the jurors, but it's not  
 2 introduced to somehow attack the character of Ms.  
 3 Kanarek. It's not introduced as character evidence.  
 4 It's only introduced for a limited purpose of how those  
 5 postings may have impacted the state of mind of Mr.  
 6 Barisone. That's the only reason The Court has -- has  
 7 allowed the introduction of this evidence regarding Ms.  
 8 Kanarek's possession or ownership of a firearm, but I  
 9 will address it more at the end of the case.

10 All right, please proceed, Mr. Bilinkas.

11 BY MR. BILINKAS:

12 Q Ms. Kanarek, did you refer to yourself as  
 13 John Wick (phonetic) in any posts?

14 A Maybe.

15 Q Who is John Wick?

16 A Uh, some like John Ruiz (phonetic).

17 Q It's a violent person?

18 A Um, my per-- I think it's a matter of perception.  
 19 You could say that, I guess.

20 MR. SCHELLHORN: Judge, I --

21 BY MR. BILINKAS:

22 Q Did you call --

23 MR. SCHELLHORN: I'm going to object.

24 THE COURT: Mr. Bilinkas.

25 (Sidebar held off the record.)

121

State v. Barisone

1 BY MR. BILINKAS:

2 Q Were you posting, in numerous posts,  
 3 statements with regards to going to war?

4 A Yeah.

5 Q Did you say things like if war cannot be  
 6 avoided then the victorious war-- warrior must #win  
 7 first #then go to war -- war, or words to that effect?  
 8 A Yes, I believe I was quoting Sun Tzu, but I'm sure  
 9 it's probably posted if it's hash tagged and posted.

10 Q Now with regards to your chess comments did  
 11 you make a statement, every time I up my chess game I  
 12 always become reminded that it is those who obsess  
 13 about protecting their queen regardless of the outcome.  
 14 We miss the hiding rook and always fail. Did you say  
 15 something like that?

16 A Probably.

17 Q And -- and you were talking about Michael  
 18 Barisone protecting his girlfriend, correct?

19 A Probably.

20 Q And in that same post did you say --

21 MR. SCHELLHORN: Can I ask what -- what date  
 22 you're looking at, or page, or something?

23 MR. BILINKAS: Okay. This -- this is July  
 24 12th, 2019.

25 BY MR. BILINKAS:

**Elite Transcripts, Inc.**

14 Boonton Avenue, Butler, New Jersey 07405  
 (973) 283-0196 FAX (973) 492-2927

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY v. MICHAEL L. BARISONE -- March 30, 2022**  
**Testimony Only of Lauren Kanarek**

Sheet 62

122

State v. Barisone

1 Q And at the end of that post did you say, the  
2 king has been captured and -- and killed, and the whole  
3 entire castle comes crumbling down? Did you say that?

4 A Probably.

5 Q And that sometimes the queen must be  
6 sacrificed. Did you say that?

7 A Yes.

8 Q So will you admit, with regards to this post,  
9 you were talking about capturing and killing Michael  
10 Barisone, use -- with use of metaphors, of course,  
11 correct?

12 A I was definitely not talking about killing anyone.  
13 That would be false.

14 Q How about sacrificing the queen? Is that  
15 Mary Haskins?

16 A On -- on a board of chess, or of pieces knocked  
17 down, or moved over, sure.

18 Q On that same day did you post something, the  
19 beast hasn't yet met the napping beast inside me?

20 MR. SCHELLHORN: Objection. Same objection,  
21 Judge.

22 MR. BILINKAS: I'd say it's a threat, Judge.

23 THE COURT: I'm sorry?

24 MR. BILINKAS: I -- I'm saying because it's a  
25 threat.

123

State v. Barisone

1 THE COURT: No, I'll sustain the objection.

2 BY MR. BILINKAS:

3 Q Now during this time, when you're making  
4 these posts, you're telling numerous people on  
5 Facebook, that you're being bullied, correct?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And -- and you even tell them that you  
8 believe your life is being threatened.

9 A That's correct.

10 Q Now with regards to your posts, July 21st,  
11 2019, after posting all these things, and of which  
12 we've just gone over --

13 A Uh-huh.

14 Q -- did you say something to the effect that  
15 you're -- never be bluffing -- never be bluffing, not  
16 unless you're prepared to carry it out? Did you say  
17 words to that effect?

18 A I'm sorry, what date and what -- when -- when was  
19 this?

20 Q This -- this is July 21st, a couple of weeks  
21 before the shooting.

22 A Okay, there are some --

23 Q Did you make a statement basically saying  
24 you're not bluffing, or words to that effect?

25 A Maybe. I -- I don't know what the context was?

**Elite Transcripts, Inc.**

14 Boonton Avenue, Butler, New Jersey 07405

(973) 283-0196 FAX (973) 492-2927

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY v. MICHAEL L. BARISONE -- March 30, 2022**  
**Testimony Only of Lauren Kanarek**

Sheet 63

124

State v. Barisone

1 MR. SCHELLHORN: What page is that? The top  
2 right.  
3 MR. BILINKAS: Oh. Oh, 1024.  
4 MR. SCHELLHORN: Thank you.  
5 BY MR. BILINKAS:  
6 Q And on July 21st did you there, again, talk  
7 about what you're saying not being a bluff, and that no  
8 one with a brain in their head bluffs emptily, betting  
9 literally you do, and just did, bye-bye! Did you say  
10 that?  
11 A Yes, I always usually end off with bye-bye or bye-  
12 byes, so that makes sense.  
13 Q When -- when you say you normally end with  
14 bye-bye --  
15 A Like to anybody, yes.  
16 Q Now on July 23rd, a couple of days later, did  
17 you use the term weapons hot?  
18 A Yes.  
19 Q July 25th did you post a post -- and -- and  
20 this is when things are -- are really starting to get  
21 crazy at the facility, correct?  
22 A Yes. I'm sorry, I -- could you just go back to  
23 the post a minute ago about --  
24 Q I'm -- I'm moving on. I have a lot to go.  
25 A Oh, okay, because I -- something seemed strange

125

State v. Barisone

1 with that. I wanted to just make sure it was me.  
2 Q On -- on July 25th did you post, I will be.  
3 It's about time to possibly go to war. Anyone who  
4 repeatedly kicks a resting beast will eventually wake  
5 her up.  
6 A Probably, yes.  
7 Q On the 27th did you say words to the effect  
8 this is me, look out, 'cause here I come?  
9 A Yes. I believe I was quoting a -- about the  
10 circus movie with Hugh Jackman. It's like literally a  
11 song.  
12 MR. SCHELLHORN: Did you say what page that  
13 was?  
14 MR. BILINKAS: Page 14.  
15 BY MR. BILINKAS:  
16 Q Now --  
17 A May -- may go there, too.  
18 Q -- you were -- Are you okay?  
19 A I'm just looking for the page that you said to  
20 look out, 'cause here I come, that -- what page was  
21 that?  
22 Q That's not in your transcript.  
23 THE COURT: No, I don't think that's in  
24 there.  
25 THE WITNESS: Oh, I don't -- I don't have it.

**Elite Transcripts, Inc.**

14 Boonton Avenue, Butler, New Jersey 07405  
(973) 283-0196 FAX (973) 492-2927