

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT THE  
APPROVAL OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION**

This opinion shall not "constitute precedent or be binding upon any court."  
Although it is posted on the internet, this opinion is binding only on the  
parties in the case and its use in other cases is limited. R.1:36-3.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY  
APPELLATE DIVISION  
DOCKET NO. A-3117-14T4

FRANCES J. HOFFMAN,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

BRUCE W. HOFFMAN,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

Argued December 19, 2016 – Decided February 6, 2017

Before Judges Haas and Currier.

On appeal from the Superior Court of New Jersey, Chancery Division, Family Part, Monmouth County, Docket No. FM-13-908-98.

Bruce W. Hoffman, appellant, argued the cause pro se.

Frances J. Hoffman, respondent pro se.

PER CURIAM

This is the sixth time we have considered an appeal presented by defendant Bruce Hoffman since a final judgment of divorce (JOD) was entered in 2000, ending the parties' marriage. After a thorough review of defendant's present contentions, we are

satisfied that the arguments either lack merit, as they have been previously adjudicated and considered by us, or in the case of the alimony obligation, we find defendant disregarded the trial court's request for financial information in order to calculate a proper figure, thus depriving us of jurisdiction over the issue. We affirm.

Defendant's numerous attempts to reduce his alimony and child support obligations, re-litigate the equitable distribution, and vacate the JOD have been rejected by the trial court and affirmed by this court. Hoffman v. Hoffman, No. A-986-03 (App. Div. May 27, 2004); Hoffman v. Hoffman, No. A-4509-05 (App. Div. May 4, 2007); Hoffman v. Hoffman, No. A-4259-07 (App. Div.), certif. denied, 200 N.J. 365 (2009), cert. denied, 559 U.S. 903, 120 S. Ct. 1319, 175 L. Ed. 2d 1073 (2010); Hoffman v. Hoffman, No. A-4309-10 (App. Div. Dec. 2, 2011), certif. denied, 210 N.J. 27 (2012); Hoffman v. Hoffman, No. A-5632-12 (App. Div. June 26, 2014). Appeals to our Supreme Court have resulted in dismissals. Hoffman v. Hoffman, 200 N.J. 365 (2009), cert. denied, 559 U.S. 903, 120 S. Ct. 1319, 175 L. Ed. 2d 1073 (2010); Hoffman v. Hoffman, 210 N.J. 27 (2012). The United States Supreme Court has denied a petition for certiorari, Hoffman v. Hoffman, 559 U.S. 903, 120 S. Ct. 1319, 175 L. Ed. 2d 1073 (2010), and a subsequent

motion for rehearing, Hoffman v. Hoffman, 559 U.S. 1117, 130 S. Ct. 2429, 176 L.Ed. 2d 942 (2010).

The present appeal arises out of a January 29, 2015 order in which the Family Part judge addressed a myriad of applications made by defendant, including terminating his alimony and child support obligations, re-litigating equitable distribution, requiring plaintiff to pay him a retainer for counsel fees and other issues. Judge Teresa Kondrup Coyle issued a comprehensive eight-page statement of reasons in support of her order. Among its provisions, the order required that the last minor child of the marriage was to be emancipated on May 30, 2016, upon her graduation from college. Therefore, defendant's ongoing child support obligation was terminated.

Judge Kondrup Coyle also found that defendant had established a prima facie case of substantial and permanent change of circumstances, and therefore, a recalculation of his alimony obligation was appropriate. Upon receipt of financial information, the court would set the recalculated figure. Defendant's request to terminate the \$827,000 in arrears he had accumulated for his failure to pay child support and alimony was denied. The remainder of defendant's application was denied; many issues had previously been adjudicated and affirmed on appeal.

Rather than provide the trial court with the requested financial documents in order to recalculate his alimony obligation, defendant filed the present appeal. As a result, defendant has not allowed the trial court to fully adjudicate the issue of his continuing alimony obligation, and therefore, it is not properly before us as it arises out of an interlocutory order with an incomplete record. See R. 2:2-3 (appeals may be taken to the Appellate Division to review final judgments of the trial court).

The remainder of defendant's arguments lack sufficient merit to warrant discussion in a written opinion. R. 2:11-3(e)(1)(E). We affirm, without prejudice, substantially for the reasons expressed by Judge Kondrup Coyle as reflected in her well-reasoned written statement of reasons.

Affirmed.

I hereby certify that the foregoing  
is a true copy of the original on  
file in my office.



CLERK OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION