

01013

Christopher L. Deininger, Esq., N.J. Bar ID No. 004271996
DEININGER & ASSOCIATES, LLP
415 Route 10, Suite 1
Randolph, New Jersey 07869
(973) 879-1610; Fax (973) 361-1241
Attorneys for Defendant Michael Barisone

LAUREN KANAREK, :
 :
 : *Plaintiff,* :
 :
 v. :
 :
 :
 MICHAEL BARISONE; SWEETGRASS :
 FARMS, LLC; RUTH COX; JOHN :
 DOES 1-30; ABC CORPORATIONS 1- :
 20, :
 :
 : *Defendants,* :

**SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW
JERSEY LAW DIVISION – MORRIS
COUNTY**

DOCKET NO.: MRS-L-2250-19



STIPULATION EXTENDING TIME TO ANSWER OR APPEAR

IT IS STIPULATED AND AGREED by Plaintiff Lauren Kanarek and defendant Michael Barisone, both through counsel, that Mr. Barisone’s time to Answer or otherwise make his appearance in the above-captioned action, in response to the Complaint, shall be and hereby is extended through Monday, March 2, 2020.

Dated: January 20, 2020

DEININGER & ASSOCIATES, LLP
Attorneys for Defendant Barisone

NAGEL RICE, LLP
Attorneys for Plaintiff



By: _____
Christopher L. Deininger, Esq.

By: _____

01013

Christopher L. Deininger, Esq., N.J. Bar ID No. 004271996
DEININGER & ASSOCIATES, LLP
415 Route 10, Suite 1
Randolph, New Jersey 07869
(973) 879-1610; Fax (973) 361-1241
Attorneys for Barisone

LAUREN KANAREK,	:	SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW
	:	JERSEY LAW DIVISION – MORRIS
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	:	COUNTY
v.	:	
	:	
MICHAEL BARISONE; SWEETGRASS	:	
FARMS, LLC; RUTH COX; JOHN	:	DOCKET NO.: MRS-L-2250-19
DOES 1-30; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-	:	
20,	:	
	:	
<i>Defendants,</i>	:	

ANSWER OF DEFENDANT MICHAEL BARISONE, WITH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES, COUNTERCLAIM, CROSS-CLAIMS, JURY DEMAND, ETC.

MICHAEL BARISONE (“Barisone”), through his attorneys, Deininger & Associates, LLP, for his Answer to the Complaint, says the following:

FACTS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

1. Admitted.
2. Barisone is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph, and leaves plaintiff to her proofs.
3. Admitted.
4. Denied.
5. Denied.
6. Denied.
7. Denied.
8. Admitted.

9. Barisone is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph, and leaves plaintiff to her proofs.

10. Barisone is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph, and leaves plaintiff to her proofs.

11. Barisone is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph, and leaves plaintiff to her proofs.

COUNT ONE

(Strict Liability)

12. Barisone repeats and realleges each of his prior responses as though set forth at length herein.

13. Barisone admits that he resided at the farm and was operating his business there; but otherwise denies the allegations which include legal conclusions as to which no responses is required.

14. Barisone admits that he resided at the farm and was operating his business there; but otherwise denies the allegations which include legal conclusions as to which no responses is required.

15. Denied.

16. Denied.

WHEREFORE, MICHAEL BARISONE demands judgement in his favor, and against PLAINTIFF LAUREN KANAREK, dismissing her claims with prejudice, and awarding MICHAEL BARISONE such other relief as may be just and proper.

COUNT TWO

(Negligence)

17. Barisone repeats and realleges each of his prior responses as though set forth at length herein.

18. Barisone admits that he resided at the farm and was operating his business there; but otherwise denies the allegations which include legal conclusions as to which no responses is required.

19. Barisone admits that he resided at the farm and was operating his business there; but otherwise denies the allegations which include legal conclusions as to which no responses is required.

20. Denied.

21. Denied.

22. Denied.

WHEREFORE, MICHAEL BARISONE demands judgement in his favor, and against PLAINTIFF LAUREN KANAREK, dismissing her claims with prejudice, and awarding MICHAEL BARISONE such other relief as may be just and proper.

COUNT THREE

(Negligence as to Barisone)

23. Barisone repeats and realleges each of his prior responses as though set forth at length herein.

24. Denied.

25. Denied.

WHEREFORE, MICHAEL BARISONE demands judgement in his favor, and against PLAINTIFF LAUREN KANAREK, dismissing her claims with prejudice, and awarding MICHAEL BARISONE such other relief as may be just and proper.

COUNT FOUR

(Assault and Battery as to Barisone)

26. Barisone repeats and realleges each of his prior responses as though set forth at length herein.

27. Denied.

28. Denied.

WHEREFORE, MICHAEL BARISONE demands judgement in his favor, and against PLAINTIFF LAUREN KANAREK, dismissing her claims with prejudice, and awarding MICHAEL BARISONE such other relief as may be just and proper.

COUNT FIVE

(Negligence as to Ruth Cox, Etc.)

29. Barisone repeats and realleges each of his prior responses as though set forth at length herein.

30. The allegations in the paragraph do not pertain to Barisone and, therefore, no response is required. Otherwise, denied.

31. The allegations in the paragraph do not pertain to Barisone and, therefore, no response is required. Otherwise, denied.

32. The allegations in the paragraph do not pertain to Barisone and, therefore, no response is required. Otherwise, denied.

33. The allegations in the paragraph do not pertain to Barisone and, therefore, no response is required. Otherwise, denied.

WHEREFORE, MICHAEL BARISONE demands judgement in his favor, and against PLAINTIFF LAUREN KANAREK, dismissing her claims with prejudice, and awarding MICHAEL BARISONE such other relief as may be just and proper.

COUNT SIX

(Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

34. Barisone repeats and realleges each of his prior responses as though set forth at length herein.

35. Denied.

36. Denied.

37. Denied.

38. Denied.

39. Denied.

WHEREFORE, MICHAEL BARISONE demands judgement in his favor, and against PLAINTIFF LAUREN KANAREK, dismissing her claims with prejudice, and awarding MICHAEL BARISONE such other relief as may be just and proper.

COUNT SEVEN

(Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress)

40. Barisone repeats and realleges each of his prior responses as though set forth at length herein.

41. Denied.

42. Denied.

43. Denied.

44. Denied.

45. Denied.

46. Denied.

WHEREFORE, MICHAEL BARISONE demands judgement in his favor, and against PLAINTIFF LAUREN KANAREK, dismissing her claims with prejudice, and awarding MICHAEL BARISONE such other relief as may be just and proper.

COUNT EIGHT

(Punitive Damages)

47. Barisone repeats and realleges each of his prior responses as though set forth at length herein.

48. Denied.

49. Denied.

WHEREFORE, MICHAEL BARISONE demands judgement in his favor, and against PLAINTIFF LAUREN KANAREK, dismissing her claims with prejudice, and awarding MICHAEL BARISONE such other relief as may be just and proper.

COUNT NINE

[Not Labeled]

50. Barisone repeats and realleges each of his prior responses as though set forth at length herein.

51. The allegations in the paragraph do not pertain to Barisone and, therefore, no response is required. Otherwise, denied.

52. The allegations in the paragraph do not pertain to Barisone and, therefore, no response is required. Otherwise, denied.

WHEREFORE, MICHAEL BARISONE demands judgement in his favor, and against PLAINTIFF LAUREN KANAREK, dismissing her claims with prejudice, and awarding MICHAEL BARISONE such other relief as may be just and proper.

SEPARATE DEFENSES

FIRST SEPARATE DEFENSE

The Complaint fails to state claims and/or causes of action upon which relief could be granted.

SECOND SEPARATE DEFENSE

Defendant was not competent at the time of the alleged incident and, as a result, should have no liability to Plaintiff for her injuries, by reason of Barisone's mental state and/or condition which included but was not limited to battered-person-syndrome cause by Plaintiff's campaign of emotional battery against Defendant and/or persons in his care.

THIRD SEPARATE DEFENSE

Alternatively, Plaintiff's claims and/or prayers for relief are barred by application of principles of self-defense and defense of others, including adults, teenagers, children and/or horses using the farm.

FOURTH SEPARATE DEFENSE

Injuries and damages sustained by the Plaintiff are the result, in whole and/or material part, of the Plaintiff's own acts and omissions, including but not limited Plaintiff's acts and omission which constituted the root cause of an alleged injury, and/or Plaintiff's negligent, reckless, and/or intentional failure to avoid injuries she sustained.

FIFTH SEPARATE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims are barred by her own intervening intentional, reckless, malicious, and/or negligent acts, actions and/or omissions.

SIXTH SEPARATE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims and damages are barred, and/or must be reduced, by application of principles of comparative negligence and/or comparative fault, including but not limited to the law as expressed under the New Jersey Comparative Negligence Act.

SEVENTH SEPARATE DEFENSE

In the event that it is determined that this Defendant has liability to Plaintiff for her injuries and/or damages (which liability is denied), this Defendant is entitled to a credit, set off, and/or other reduction with respect to any and all collateral source payments Plaintiff received as a result of the incident(s), in accordance with N.J.S.A. § 2A:15-97.

EIGHTH SEPARATE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims are barred by application of the legal doctrines and principles, including but not limited to the estoppel, release, waiver, and/or binding admissions against interest.

NINTH SEPARATE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's alleged injuries and damages are the result of the acts and omissions of persons or entities other than the Defendant, including but not limited to acts and omissions by Plaintiff and/or third-party persons or entities over which Defendant had no control.

TENTH SEPARATE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by Plaintiff's negligence, neglect, and/or failure to act reasonably, timely, and/or appropriately.

ELEVENTH SEPARATE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's claimed injuries and damages, in whole or in part, are the direct and proximate result and consequence of Plaintiff's unreasonable failure to take advantage of preventative or corrective opportunities; her unreasonable failure to avoid harm; and/or her unreasonable failure to mitigate injury and damages.

TWELFTH SEPARATE DEFENSE

All or some of Plaintiff's claims are barred because the Defendant owed no duty to Plaintiffs, and/or because the Defendant was excused from such duties based upon Plaintiff's acts and omissions.

THIRTEENTH SEPARATE DEFENSE

Any duty owed to the Plaintiff by the Defendant was discharged and/or excused.

FOURTEENTH SEPARATE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' alleged injuries and damages were not proximately caused by any act or

omission of the Defendant.

FIFTEENTH SEPARATE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred and/or any recovery must be reduced, based upon the doctrines of offset, recoupment, and/or Plaintiffs' duties to the Defendant.

SIXTEENTH SEPARATE DEFENSE

Plaintiff assumed the risk of conduct for the incident out of which this Complaint has arisen.

SEVENTEENTH SEPARATE DEFENSE

Plaintiff was unlawfully at the premises where the incident occurred, making unlawful use of it at the time the incident occurred, and therefore should be barred from recovery.

EIGHTEENTH SEPARATE DEFENSE

Defendant reserves the right to amend this answer to assert additional separate defenses and/or modify or withdraw those already asserted.

WHEREFORE, MICHAEL BARISONE demands judgement in his favor, and against PLAINTIFF LAUREN KANAREK, dismissing her claims with prejudice, and awarding MICHAEL BARISONE such other relief as may be just and proper.

DEININGER & ASSOCIATES, LLP

Attorneys for Barisone



By: _____

Christopher L. Deininger, Esq.

Dated: February 29, 2020


ANSWER TO CROSSCLAIMS

MICHAEL BARISONE, by and through his attorneys Deininger & Associates, LLP, as and for his answer to any and all crossclaims asserted against him, states as follows:

1. Defendant denies all cross claims, including but not limited to all crossclaims for contribution and indemnification, that have been or will be asserted against him.
2. Defendant incorporates all of his separate defenses to the complaint as separate and affirmative defenses to all crossclaims that have been or will be asserted against him.

WHEREFORE, MICHAEL BARISONE demands judgement in his favor, and against any and all CROSS-CLAIM PLAINTIFFS, dismissing their claims with prejudice, and awarding MICHAEL BARISONE such other relief as may be just and proper.

DEININGER & ASSOCIATES, LLP
Attorneys for Barisone



By: _____
Christopher L. Deininger, Esq.

Dated: February 29, 2020

CROSSCLAIMS FOR CONTRIBUTION & INDEMNIFICATION


1. MICHAEL BARISONE hereby makes a claim for contribution pursuant to the Joint Tortfeasors Contribution Law, N.J.S.A. 2A:53-1 et seq., against any and all co-defendants. Alternatively, MICHAEL BARISONE contends that in the event that proofs develop in discovery or at trial to establish a basis for liability on the part of any other defendant, and such defendant or defendants enter into a settlement agreement, in whole or in part with plaintiff, then MICHAEL

BARISONE asserts a claim for credit reducing the amount of any judgment in favor of Plaintiff against him to reflect the degree of fault to the settling defendants pursuant to Young v. Latta, 123, N.J. 584(1991).

2. Without admitting any liability herein, MICHAEL BARISONE claims complete common law and contractual indemnification from all co-defendants.

WHEREFORE, MICHAEL BARISONE demands judgement in his favor, and against any and all co-defendants, jointly and severally, and awarding him damages for contribution and/or indemnification, including but not limited to attorney's fees, litigation expenses, and costs of suit, and awarding him such other relief as may be just and proper.

DEININGER & ASSOCIATES, LLP
Attorneys for Barisone



By: _____
Christopher L. Deininger, Esq.

Dated: February 29, 2020

COUNTERCLAIM AGAINST PLAINTIFF

Defendant MICHAEL BARISONE (“Barisone”), by and through his attorneys, Deininger & Associates, LLP., as and for his Counterclaim against plaintiff LAUREN KANAREK (“Kanarek”), says as follow:

FACTS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

1. At all times relevant hereto, Barisone was and remains a resident of Morris County, New Jersey.

2. Upon information and belief, Kanarek is not a resident of Morris County, New Jersey but, rather, lives a transient lifestyle in which she resides in many locations including, but not limited to , from time to time, Morris County, New Jersey.

3. Kanarek has a criminal history which, upon information and belief, includes a charge and/or conviction for criminal assault.

4. Kanarek has a history of illegal drug use including, upon information and belief, heroin.

5. Kanarek has a history of tortious and/or criminal, antisocial behavior, including but not limited to stalking; bullying; threats of harm, injury, and mayhem against persons she chooses to target; threats against public figures; gaslighting; fraud; false reports; and other behaviors which are harmful, injurious, and destructive to the people she victimizes.

6. Upon information and belief, there is a dozen or more families, persons and businesses in the United States who were victimized by Kanarek through abuse, stalking, crime, and/or other forms of serious abuse, prior to August 2019 when Kanarek turned her sights upon Barisone.

7. At all times relevant hereto, Kanarek was and remains a significant user of various forms of social media including Facebook through which, upon information and belief, Kanarek has more than 10,000 Facebook “Friends,” messenger communication contacts, chats, and like online activities (collective, whether on Facebook and/or other platforms, “Facebook”).

8. For purposes of causing personal injury to Barisone, his business, injury to his good name and reputation, and/or injury to the like interests of Barisone’s girlfriend and other people close to Barisone (collectively, the “Barisone Family”), Kanarek perpetrated a campaign against Barisone and the Barisone Family, which included, without limitation, Kanarek’s utilization of Facebook to publish, promote, and disseminate statements, accusations, and falsehoods that were explicitly

threatening; explicitly and/or implicitly threatening injury and violence; causing the subject to be stalked; causing the subject to be bullied; harmful; deceptive; deceitful; false; causing the subject serious and severe emotional pain and distress; harming the subject's good name and/or reputation; causing the subject to be "destroyed"; harming the subject's family and friends; and/or that otherwise were grossly inappropriate, harmful, and/or injurious.

9. At all times relevant hereto, Kanarek's purpose was to cause injury, pain, distress, and upset of a severe and significant nature.

10. At all times relevant hereto, Kanarek's acts, actions and omissions were perpetrated maliciously, intentionally, recklessly and/or negligently.

11. At all times relevant hereto, Kanarek's wrongful acts, actions, and omissions included, for example, making false accusation of child abuse, false accusations of animal abuse, false accusation of insurance fraud, false reports to agencies providing child-protective-services, and other falsehoods through which her intention was to cause harm.

12. For example, Kanarek harassed Barisone by utilizing technology to "bug" (i.e., unlawfully eves drop) upon private conversation Barisone was having; and/or, alternatively, harassed Barisone for purposes of causing him severe and significant emotional distress by claiming that she had unlawful eves-dropping of Barisone's residence and/or business for purposes of stalking him and Barisone Family members.

13. As another example, Kanarek threatened physical violence and harm by and through her internet posting that her "weapons [were] hot" (a phrase indicating that she had a firearm, loaded with ammunition, and its chamber hot) and she was coming for Barisone and/or Barisone Family members.

14. At the time she made that threat, Kanarek was known to be familiar with firearms, to have claimed and/or actual access to a firearm, and to have used a firearm in the past for purposes of shot at her boyfriend and/or his motorcycle while she was in a fit of rage.

15. At all times relevant hereto, Kanarek had a duty to Barisone and the Barisone Family members to refrain from stalking, harming, harassing, threatening, threatening-with-violence, demeaning, injuring, and/or damaging the persons Kanarek was victimizing (including, most notably, Barisone).

16. At all times relevant hereto, Kanarek materially breach her duty(ies) to Barisone and the Barisone Family members, through the acts, actions, and omissions referenced above.

17. As a direct and proximate result and consequence of Kanarek's wrongful acts, actions, and omissions, Kanarek cause injury to Barisone including but not limited to: (a) placing him in fear for his life and physical wellbeing; (b) placing him in fear for the lives and physical wellbeing of Barisone Family members; (c) placing him in fear for the lives and physical wellbeing of Barisone's business staff, clients and the horses owned and/or boarded by Barisone at his dressage farm; (d) emotional distress, including emotional distress with physical manifestations; (e) traumatic stress; (f) emotional breakdown; (g) post-traumatic stress; (h) battered-person-syndrome; (i) psychiatric ailments and eventual breakdown; (j) destruction of his state of mental peace, tranquility, enjoyment and stability; (k) injury to his business; (l) injury mental state; (m) unlawful invasion of his privacy; (n) property damage; (o) irreparable harm; (p) financial harm; (q) physical harm; and (r) other injuries.

COUNTERCLAIM COUNT 1
(Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

18. Barisone repeats and realleges the all prior allegations of this Counterclaim as though set forth at length herein.

19. Kanarek was negligent towards Barisone, and breached duties owed to him, including but not limited to duties identified above.

20. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of Kanarek's negligence and/or carelessness, Kanarek cause Barisone to be injured by and through severe emotional distress.

21. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of Kanarek's negligent acts, actions, and omissions, Barisone sustained serious and severe personal injuries, disability, pain and suffering, emotional distress, has sustained past and future lost income, and other injuries both personal and business in nature.

WHEREFORE, MICHAEL BARISONE demands judgment against LAUREN KANAREK for compensatory damages, punitive damages, interest, costs of suit; preliminary and permanent injunctive relief in the form of restraints barring LAUREN KANAREK from making posts about or referencing Barisone on the World Wide Web, and/or through any and all forms of social media, and/or otherwise stalking, harassing, and/or seeking to cause harm or injury to Barisone; and such other relief this Court deems just and proper.

COUNTERCLAIM COUNT 2
(Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress)

22. Barisone repeats and realleges the all prior allegations of this Counterclaim as though set forth at length herein.

23. Kanarek has a lengthy history of antisocial cyber activities, including but not limited to cyber stalking; cyber threats of harm, injury, and mayhem against persons she chooses to target; cyber threats against public figures; and other behaviors which are harmful, injurious, and destructive to the people she victimizes.

24. There is a dozen or more families, persons and businesses in the United States who were victimized by Kanarek through abuse, stalking, crime, and/or other forms of serious abuse, prior to August 2019 when Kanarek turned her sights upon Barisone.

25. Kanarek's extensive history of cyber-abuse against her numerous victims establishes a pattern, practice, and modes operandi of Kanarek's intentional, tortious, harmful conduct against Barisone and others.

26. Kanarek intentionally inflicted severe emotional distress upon Barisone; maliciously inflicted severe emotional distress upon Barisone; recklessly inflicted severe emotional distress upon Barisone; and/or knew or otherwise should have known that emotional distress was the likely result of her acts, actions, and omissions directed at Barisone, Barisone Family members, Barisone's business, and/or the persons who associated with Barisone through his work in the field of dressage.

27. As a direct, proximate, and foreseeable result of Kanarek's conduct, Barisone suffered extreme emotional distress and harm.

28. Kanarek's conduct was extreme and/or outrageous.

29. Kanarek's conduct was the cause of Barisone's emotional distress.

30. The emotional distress Barisone suffered is severe.

31. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of Kanarek's acts, actions and/or omissions, Kanarek cause Barisone to be injured by and through severe emotional distress.

32. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of Kanarek's acts, actions, and omissions, Barisone sustained serious and severe personal injuries, disability, pain and suffering, emotional distress, has sustained past and future lost income, and other injuries both personal and business in nature.

WHEREFORE, MICHAEL BARISONE demands judgment against LAUREN KANAREK for compensatory damages, punitive damages, interest, costs of suit; preliminary and permanent injunctive relief in the form of restraints barring LAUREN KANAREK from making posts about or referencing Barisone on the World Wide Web, and/or through any and all forms of social media, and/or otherwise stalking, harassing, and/or seeking to cause harm or injury to Barisone; and such other relief this Court deems just and proper.

COUNTERCLAIM COUNT 3
(Negligence)

33. Barisone repeats and realleges the all prior allegations of this Counterclaim as though set forth at length herein.

34. As stated previously, Kanarek had duties to Barisone which she breached materially, causing Barisone injury and damages.

35. For example, in or about the beginning of August 2019, Kanarek knew, was aware of, and/or should have known, that her harassment of Barisone and/or Barisone Family members had caused Barisone to suffer a mental, psychiatric, and/or emotional breakdown.

36. In or about the beginning of August 2019, Kanarek knew, was aware of, and/or should have known, that due to Barisone's injured mental, psychiatric, and/or emotional state, Kanarek's continued harassment of and caustic interaction with Barisone was more likely than not to devolve into a confrontation involving a significant risk of physical injury and/or harm to the herself, Barisone, and/or other persons on the farm.

37. One of Kanarek's duties was Kanarek's duty care to cease and desist in her harassment, confrontation, and/or other caustic interactions with Barisone.

38. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of Kanarek's negligence and/or carelessness, Kanarek cause Barisone to be injured, pain, suffering, and damages.

39. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of Kanarek's negligent acts, actions, and omissions, Barisone sustained serious and severe personal injuries, pain and suffering, emotional distress, has sustained past and future lost income, and other injuries both personal and business in nature.

WHEREFORE, MICHAEL BARISONE demands judgment against LAUREN KANAREK for compensatory damages, punitive damages, interest, costs of suit; preliminary and permanent injunctive relief in the form of restraints barring LAUREN KANAREK from making posts about or referencing Barisone on the World Wide Web, and/or through any and all forms of social media, and/or otherwise stalking, harassing, and/or seeking to cause harm or injury to Barisone; and, such other relief this Court deems just and proper.

DEININGER & ASSOCIATES, LLP
Attorneys for Barisone



By: _____
Christopher L. Deininger, Esq.

Dated: February 29, 2020

NOTICE OF ALLOCATION

Pursuant to R. 4:7-5, this answering defendant hereby advised that if any co-defendants presently named or hereafter named, who are not represented by this law firm, settle the within matter prior to the conclusion of trial, the liability of any settling co-defendant(s) shall remain at issue and the defendants shall seek an allocation of the percentage of fault, negligence, and/or other liability by

the finder of fact against each and every settling co-defendant and/or a credit in favor of this answering defendants consistent with such allocation.

DEININGER & ASSOCIATES, LLP
Attorneys for Barisone

By: _____
Christopher L. Deininger, Esq.

Dated: February 29, 2020

JURY DEMAND

This Defendant demands a trial by jury as to all claims, issues, and causes of action arising in this civil action.

DEININGER & ASSOCIATES, LLP
Attorneys for Barisone

By: _____
Christopher L. Deininger, Esq.

Dated: February 29, 2020

DEMAND FOR STATEMENT OF DAMAGES

Pursuant to the Rules of this Court, R. 4:5-2, the Defendant / Counterclaimant demand that Plaintiff provide a statement as to her damages, within five (5) days.

DEININGER & ASSOCIATES, LLP
Attorneys for Barisone

By: _____
Christopher L. Deininger, Esq.

Dated: February 29, 2020

DESIGNATION OF TRIAL COUNSEL

Christopher L. Deininger, Esq., is hereby designated as trial counsel for Defendants / Counterclaimants.

DEININGER & ASSOCIATES, LLP
Attorneys for Barisone



By: _____
Christopher L. Deininger, Esq.

Dated: February 29, 2020

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that there are no other pending actions between or among interested parties which presently involve the subject matter of this action. I further certify that there are other pending action related to certain transactions and occurrences referenced in this action, namely *Sweet Grass Farms, LLC et al. v. Michael Barisone et al.*, pending in New Jersey Superior Court, Morris County, Chancery Division, and *State of New Jersey v. Michael Barisone*, pending in New Jersey Superior Court, Morris County, Criminal Division. This matter is still under investigation by the undersigned. I further certify that the matter in controversy is not the subject of any

arbitration proceedings. I certify that the foregoing statements made by me are true. I am aware that if any of the foregoing statements are willfully false, I am subject to punishment.

DEININGER & ASSOCIATES, LLP
Attorneys for Barisone



By: _____
Christopher L. Deininger, Esq.

Dated: February 29, 2020

CERTIFICATION UNDER R. 4:5-1(b)(3)

I certify that confidential personal identifying information has been removed from the documents now submitted to the Court, and will be redacted from all documents submitted in the future in accordance with R. 1:38-7(b).

DEININGER & ASSOCIATES, LLP
Attorneys for Barisone



By: _____
Christopher L. Deininger, Esq.

Dated: February 29, 2020

Civil Case Information Statement

Case Details: MORRIS | Civil Part Docket# L -002250-19

Case Caption: KANAREK LAUREN VS BARISONE
MICHAEL

Case Initiation Date: 10/18/2019

Attorney Name: CHRISTOPHER LOUIS DEININGER

Firm Name: DEININGER & ASSOCIATES, LLP

Address: 415 ROUTE 10, STE 1

RANDOLPH NJ 07869

Phone: 9738791610

Name of Party: DEFENDANT : BARISONE, MICHAEL

Name of Defendant's Primary Insurance Company

(if known): None

Case Type: PERSONAL INJURY

Document Type: Answer W/CounterClaim ,CrossClaim W/Jury
Demand

Jury Demand: YES - 6 JURORS

Is this a professional malpractice case? NO

Related cases pending: YES

If yes, list docket numbers: MRS-C-12-20 and criminal case

**Do you anticipate adding any parties (arising out of same
transaction or occurrence)?** YES

Are sexual abuse claims alleged? NO

THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ON THIS FORM CANNOT BE INTRODUCED INTO EVIDENCE

CASE CHARACTERISTICS FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING IF CASE IS APPROPRIATE FOR MEDIATION

Do parties have a current, past, or recurrent relationship? YES

If yes, is that relationship: Business

Does the statute governing this case provide for payment of fees by the losing party? NO

**Use this space to alert the court to any special case characteristics that may warrant individual
management or accelerated disposition:**

Do you or your client need any disability accommodations? NO

If yes, please identify the requested accommodation:

Will an interpreter be needed? NO

If yes, for what language:

Please check off each applicable category: Putative Class Action? NO **Title 59?** NO **Consumer Fraud?** NO

I certify that confidential personal identifiers have been redacted from documents now submitted to the court, and will be redacted from all documents submitted in the future in accordance with *Rule 1:38-7(b)*

03/02/2020

Dated

/s/ CHRISTOPHER LOUIS DEININGER

Signed

