SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY APPELLATE DIVISION DOCKET NO. A-001234-16T4

GOLDI LOCKS,

CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff-Appellant,

ON APPEAL FROM

v.

SUPERIOR COURT, LAW DIVISION

MERCER COUNTY

PAPA BEAR and MOMMA BEAR,

Honorable I.M. Faire, J.S.C.

Defendants-Respondents.

Sat below

BRIEF AND APPENDIX FOR APPELLANT GOLDI LOCKS

GOLDI LOCKS
APPELLANT
28 FAR AWAY ROAD
NEVERLAND, NJ 08611
(555) 555-555
pretend email@forsample.net

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Paqe</u>
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
PROCEDURAL HISTORY	1
STATEMENT OF FACTS	2
ARGUMENT I. THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN GRANTING SUMMARY JUDGMENT TO DEFENDANTS BECAUSE DEFENDANTS BREACHED THEIR DUTY OF CARE TO PLAINTIFF AS AN INVITED GUEST TO THEIR HOME	5
(Raised Below: Pal; 1T24)	5
II. EVEN IF PLAINTIFF WAS A TRESPASSER ON DEFENDANTS' PROPERTY, THIS COURT SHOULD ADOPT THE "MISTAKEN TRESPASSER" DOCTRINE SO PLAINTIFF CAN BE COMPENSATED FOR HER LOSSES	
(Not raised below)	9
CONCLUSION	12

TABLE OF JUDGMENTS, ORDERS AND RULINGS

Order	granting	summary judgment and dismissing	
C	omplaint,	filed November 4, 2016	Pa1
0201 1	Dogiaion	(November 4 2016)	1т24
Oral I	Decision	(November 4, 2016)	TTZ4

TABLE OF APPENDIX

Appendix document	<u>Appendix page</u>
	<u>number</u>
Order Granting Summary Judgment, filed November 4, 2016	Pa1
Complaint, filed January 11, 2016	Pa2
Answer, filed February 09, 2016	Pa5
Notice of Motion for Summary Judgment, filed October 04, 2016	Pa7
Defendants' Statement of Material Facts in Suppo of Motion for Summary Judgment, filed October 04, 2016	rt Pa8
Certification of Papa and Momma Bear in Support Motion for Summary Judgment, filed October 04, 2016	of Pa9
Exhibit A to Certification of Papa and Momma Bea (Complaint)	r Pa10
Exhibit B to Certification of Papa and Momma Bea (Deposition of Plaintiff)	r Pall
Exhibit C to Certification of Papa and Momma Bea (Photograph of Mat)	r Pa15
Exhibit D to Certification of Papa and Momma Bea (Photograph of property)	r Pa17
Exhibit E to Certification of Papa and Momma Bea (Deposition of Defendants)	r Pa19
Plaintiff's Response to Defendants' Statement of Material Facts in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment, filed October 28, 2016	Pa23
Rule 2:6-1(a)(1) Statement of All Items Submitte on Summary Judgment Motion	d Pa24
Notice of Appeal, filed December 19, 2016	Pa25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Authority</u>	Brief page number	
Court Rules:		
<u>Rule</u> 2:10-2	11	
<u>Rule</u> 4:46-2	6	
Case Law:		
Brill v. Guardian Life Ins. Co., 142 N.J. Super. 520 (App. Div. 1995)	6	
George Dumpty v. Wolf, 123 New Grimm Reporter 456 (2010)	10, 11	
<pre>Henry Dumpty v. Smith, 78 S. Folktale Reporter 123 (2012)</pre>	11	
<pre>Humpty Dumpty v. Kinq, 1 N.J. Super. 24 (App. Div. 2000)</pre>	8, 10	
<pre>Klutz v. Banana Peels Inc., 1 N.J. Super. 124 (App. Div. 2000)</pre>	7	
<pre>Partiman v. Smoe, 1 N.J. 24 (2000)</pre>	7	
Prudential Prop. & Cas. Ins. Co. v. Boylan, 307 N.J. Super. 162 (App. Div.), certif. denied, 154 N.J. 608 (1998)	6	
Walker v. Alt. Chrysler Plymouth, 216 N.J. Super. 255 (App. Div. 1987)	6	
Treatises:		
Mother H. Goose, <u>Personal Injury Law</u> § 15-4 at 1314 (2d ed. 1987)	9, 10	

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Plaintiff was injured on defendants' property, but the trial court dismissed her complaint against defendants. The trial court held that plaintiff was a trespasser defendants' property and, therefore, defendants were not responsible to pay for plaintiff's injuries. This decision is wrong as a matter of law because plaintiff was an invited guest to the property, as demonstrated by defendants' open door, bowls of porridge, and "WELCOME FRIENDS" mat on the front porch. Also, defendants' property did not have any signs stating that it was private property or warning people to keep off the property. Alternatively, even if this court agrees that plaintiff trespassed on defendants' property, it should adopt the "innocent trespasser" doctrine to allow plaintiff to be made whole. Therefore, plaintiff asks this court to reverse the trial court's decision to grant summary judgment and to remand the case back to the trial court for a trial on damages.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint against defendants on January 11, 2016 (Pa2 - Pa4). Defendants filed an

Pa = plaintiff/appellant's appendix

answer to the complaint on February 9, 2016 (Pa5 — Pa6). On October 4, 2016, defendants filed a Motion for Summary Judgment (Pa7 — Pa22). Plaintiff filed opposition to defendants' motion for summary judgment on October 28, 2016 (Pa23). The trial judge heard argument on defendants' motion for summary judgment on November 4, 2016 (IT).² After oral argument, the trial judge granted defendants' motion for summary judgment and dismissed plaintiff's complaint with prejudice by way of order filed November 4, 2016 (Pa1; 1T24). Plaintiff filed a Notice of Appeal to this court on December 19, 2016 (Pa25 — Pa26).

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On July 11, 2016, approximately between 9 a.m. and 1 p.m., plaintiff Goldi Locks participated in a yoga class at Forest Park Plaza in Pretend Ville, New Jersey. (Pa2; Pa14). At the end of class, plaintiff was unable to find a ride home. (Pa2; Pa14). She decided to walk home, although it was hot and humid that day, about 90 degrees Fahrenheit. (Pa2; Pa14).

At about 1:45 p.m., plaintiff was mid-way home and was walking on Warm Welcome Avenue in Fairytale, Mercer County, New Jersey. (Pa3). Plaintiff felt fatigued and hungry and

² 1T = transcript of November 04, 2016.

decided to look for a place to stop and get rest and food before continuing her walk home. (Pa3; Pa13). At about 1:55 p.m., plaintiff came across a building with an open door and mat that said "WELCOME FRIENDS." (Pa3; Pa13). There were no signs on the property indicating the building was private or warning people to keep off of the property. (Pa3; Pa13; Pa23).

Plaintiff entered the building, hoping to get food and rest. (Pa3; Pa13). There were no people in the building, but plaintiff found three different sized bowls of porridge on a counter. (Pa3; Pa13). Since plaintiff was hungry, she decided to try a spoonful of porridge from the largest bowl first, but it was too hot and she burned her tongue. (Pa3; Pa13). Plaintiff then tried the porridge in the mid-sized bowl and it was too cold. (Pa3; Pa13). Plaintiff finally tried the porridge in the smallest bowl and exclaimed, "Yummy! This one is just right!" (Pa3; Pa13).

After finishing the porridge, plaintiff decided to find a place to rest before continuing her walk back home. (Pa3; Pa13). Plaintiff saw three different-sized chairs nearby and decided to sit in the largest chair, but it was too hard, so plaintiff sat in the mid-sized chair, but it was too soft. (Pa3; Pa13). Plaintiff finally sat in the smallest chair, but it immediately broke, causing her to fall on her side and injure her left wrist. (Pa3; Pa13). As plaintiff

attempted to get up, a piece of wood from the chair splintered off and punctured her right foot. (Pa3; Pa13). The pain from falling down and getting a splinter incapacitated plaintiff, so she laid on the floor motionless and in agonizing pain. (Pa3; Pa14).

Shortly thereafter, Papa Bear, Momma Bear, and Baby Bear returned to their residence on 44 Warm Welcome Avenue in Fairytale, Mercer County, New Jersey. (Pa3; Pa14; Pa21). Baby Bear was the first to enter the building. (Pa3; Pa14; Pa21). Upon finding plaintiff lying on the floor, Baby Bear screamed and ran out of the building. (Pa3; Pa14; Pa21).

Instead of helping plaintiff, who was clearly suffering from injuries, Momma Bear and Papa Bear interrogated plaintiff about who she was, where she lived, how she entered the building, and what she intended to steal. (Pa3; Pa14). Even though plaintiff responded to their questions as best she could and emphasized the fact she did not intend to steal anything, Momma Bear and Papa Bear were still furious. (Pa3; Pa14). Momma Bear and Papa Bear threatened, "You are going to prison for trespassing on our property!" (Pa3; Pa14). Momma Bear then called the police. (Pa3; Pa14; Pa21). It was not until the police arrived at the building, that the paramedics were called. (Pa3; Pa14; Pa21).

Plaintiff was brought by ambulance to Happily Ever After Hospital. (Pa3; Pa14). Upon her arrival, she was

immediately treated for the wound on her right foot, and the open fracture on her left wrist. (Pa14). Dr. Goodwill, who was the acting physician at the time, treated plaintiff's wound and then placed a cast on plaintiff's wrist to stabilize it. (Pa14). Plaintiff stayed overnight at Happily Ever After Hospital for observation. (Pa14).

Since the incident, plaintiff has been in physical therapy for her wrist and foot in order to gain full mobility and strength. (Pa4; Pa14). She also has trouble sleeping and eating. (Pa4; Pa14). Due to her physical and mental state after the incident, plaintiff has not been able to return to work. (Pa4; Pa14). Consequently, she has and continues to lose wages. (Pa4; Pa14).

ARGUMENT

I. THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN GRANTING SUMMARY JUDGMENT TO DEFENDANTS BECAUSE DEFENDANTS BREACHED THEIR DUTY OF CARE TO PLAINTIFF AS AN INVITED GUEST TO THEIR HOME

(Raised Below: Pa1; 1T24)

The trial court erred as a matter of law in granting summary judgment to defendants. Defendants owed plaintiff a duty to keep their premises safe and to warn of hidden dangers since plaintiff was an invited guest to their property, invited by the "WELCOME FRIENDS" mat, open door, and lack of private property signs. Defendants breached their duty to plaintiff by leaving a dangerously fragile chair in their home and failing to warn plaintiff that the chair was dangerously

fragile. Plaintiff sustained grave injuries due to defendants' actions.

Rule 4:46-2 states that summary judgment shall be granted "if the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories and admissions on file, together with affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact challenged and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment or order as a matter of law." R. 4:46-2(c). The trial judge must decide whether "the competent evidential materials presented, when viewed in the light most favorable to the non-moving party, are sufficient to permit a rational factfinder to resolve the alleged disputed issue in favor of the non-moving party[.]" Brill v. Guardian Life Ins. Co., 142 N.J. 520, 540 (1995).

An appellate court uses the same standard as the trial court when reviewing a trial court's decision to grant summary judgment. Prudential Prop. & Cas. Ins. Co. v. Boylan, 307 N.J. Super. 162, 167 (App. Div.), certif. denied, 154 N.J. 608 (1998). It decides first whether there was a genuine issue of fact. If there wasn't, it then decides whether the lower court's ruling on the law was correct. Walker v. Alt. Chrysler Plymouth, 216 N.J. Super. 255, 258 (App. Div. 1987).

Here, plaintiff admitted to all of the statements in defendants' Statement of Material Facts in Support of Summary Judgment (Pa8; Pa23), so there were no genuine issues of fact. The trial court was incorrect on the law, however, because it

held that plaintiff was a trespasser on defendants' property and therefore the defendants owed no duty of care to plaintiff to maintain their home in a safe condition.

A property owner can be required to pay damages for injuries to an invited guest on its property. That is because a property owner has a duty to invited guests to exercise reasonable care in maintaining the property in a safe condition and to provide warnings of the presence of any concealed dangerous condition. Klutz v. Banana Peels Inc., 1 N.J. Super. 124, 145 (App. Div. 2000).

The New Jersey Supreme Court has defined an invited guest as a: "person who is admitted into a residence or reasonably believed she was admitted into a residence." Partiman v. Smoe, 1 N.J. 24, 45 (2000) (holding plaintiff, who stayed too long at party, was still an invited guest when injured two days later). Admittance to a residence can be implied in certain circumstances where a reasonable person would believe she was admitted into a residence. Id. at 46-47.

Here, although defendants did not verbally invite Plaintiff into their residence, the "WELCOME FRIENDS" mat, the open door, and the three bowls of porridge were enough to imply it. Moreover, defendants' building did not have any signs stating it was private property or warning people to keep off of the property. (Pa3; Pa5).

In <u>Humpty Dumpty v. Kinq</u>, 1 N.J. Super. 24, 48 (App. Div. 2000), the Appellate Division reversed the trial court's

decision to grant summary judgment to the owner of a wall from which plaintiff had fallen and injured himself. Although the plaintiff had not been invited to sit on the wall, the court found there was a question of fact as to whether plaintiff reasonably believed he could sit on the wall since it was so close to a main thoroughfare and there was a ladder next to the wall. Id. at 48-49. The court found it significant that the wall did not have a sign telling people to keep off or warning that the wall was dangerous. Id. at 49.

Likewise here, plaintiff reasonably believed that she was an invited guest to defendants' house. There was a "WELCOME FRIENDS" mat on the front porch and upon entry, there were three bowls of porridge on a counter. (Pa3; Pa5). There was also no indication that plaintiff should not enter the home. (Pa3; Pa5). Plaintiff needed a place to rest and she reasonably thought defendants' home was that place. Although Momma Bear testified that plaintiff was not a friend of the Bear family (Pa21), plaintiff reasonably read the "WELCOME FRIENDS" mat as a general welcome to those who passed by the house.

Defendants' violated their duty of care by failing to keep their smallest chair in a safe condition and by failing to provide warnings on the dangerous condition of the extremely weak chair. These failures created a false sense of safety within the residence.

Plaintiff suffered grave injuries as a result of

defendants' negligence. Plaintiff was compelled to and did employ the services of a hospital, a surgeon, and physicians to treat and care for her injuries, which resulted in several medical bills and related costs of treatment. Plaintiff also suffered pain, emotional distress, and loss of wages.

II. EVEN IF PLAINTIFF WAS A TRESPASSER ON DEFENDANTS' PROPERTY, THIS COURT SHOULD ADOPT THE "MISTAKEN TRESPASSER" DOCTRINE SO PLAINTIFF CAN BE COMPENSATED FOR HER LOSSES (Not raised below)

Alternatively, even if plaintiff was a trespasser on defendants' property, which plaintiff strongly disputes, plaintiff is entitled to payment for her medical expenses because she made an innocent mistake in entering defendants' property. The Mother Goose Treatise on Personal Injury Law advocates the "mistaken trespasser" doctrine for situations where a person is injured while mistakenly trespassing on property. Mother H. Goose, Personal Injury Law § 15-4 at 1314 (2d ed. 1987). Two states, New Grimm and South Folktale, have adopted the "mistaken trespasser" doctrine, and this state should as well. It would be against public policy to deny plaintiff protection from the huge medical expenses and other damages she has incurred as a result of her injuries.

According to Mother Goose's Treatise on Personal Injury
Law: "If a person gets hurt, s/he should be made whole again.
It does not matter that the injury occurred on a stranger's

land. What is important is that the person gets better."

Mother H. Goose, <u>Personal Injury Law</u> § 15-4 at 1314 (2d ed. 1987). However, "if the person's intentions were to do bad things on the land," the mistaken trespasser doctrine would not apply. <u>Id</u>.

New Jersey has not adopted the "mistaken trespasser" doctrine yet. However, this court mentioned the doctrine and the Mother Goose treatise favorably in a footnote in <u>Humpty Dumpty v. King</u>, 1 N.J. Super. 24 (App. Div. 2000). This court noted: "we need not decide whether to adopt Mother Goose's 'mistaken trespasser' doctrine today as we can decide this appeal on an alternate basis; however, the doctrine does appear to be a fair way to handle trespasser injuries." <u>Id.</u> at 49 n.3.

Although New Jersey has not yet adopted the "mistaken trespasser" doctrine, two other states have adopted the doctrine. The Supreme Court of New Grimm in George Dumpty v. Wolf, 123 New Grimm Reporter 456 (2010), which coincidentally involved a cousin of plaintiff Humpty Dumpty, held that plaintiff was entitled to compensation for his injuries caused by falling off a wall on defendant's property. Id. at 467. The court cited Mother Goose's treatise and reasoned that it would be "unfair" and "just not nice" to not make plaintiff whole again. Id. at 468. The court reasoned that plaintiff was not behaving badly; he was sitting on the wall and caused no harm to defendant's property. Id.

Dumpty v. Smith, 78 S. Folktale Reporter 123 (2012), permitted compensation to another cousin of Humpty Dumpty who injured himself while attempting to climb up a rock wall. Id. at 145. The court held that "it was just the right thing to do." Id. at 148. The court also found that plaintiff had no intention to do bad things on the land. Id.

Because the "mistaken trespasser" doctrine was not raised in the trial court, per <u>Rule</u> 2:10-2, the standard of review for this court is plain error. <u>Rule</u> 2:10-2 reads, in full:

Any error or omission shall be disregarded by the appellate court unless it is of such a nature as to have been clearly capable of producing an unjust result, but the appellate court may, in the interests of justice, notice plain error not brought to the attention of the trial or appellate court.

[R. 2:10-2.]

It would be unjust to not consider the "mistaken trespasser" doctrine here. Plaintiff innocently entered defendants' property and had no intention to do anything bad. However, she was seriously injured and has a lot of unpaid medical bills. It would be against public policy to not compensate her for her injuries and other losses, including ongoing therapy and loss of wages. It would be against the interests of justice to allow plaintiff to become penniless due to her innocent mistake.

CONCLUSION

Plaintiff therefore respectfully asks that this court

reverse the trial court's order granting summary judgment to

defendants, hold that plaintiff was an invited guest who was

owed a duty of care, and remand the matter for a trial on the

amount of damages. Alternatively, even if this court upholds

the trial court's decision that plaintiff was a trespasser,

this court should adopt the "mistaken trespasser" doctrine and

remand the matter for a trial so that plaintiff can be

compensated for her losses.

Respectfully submitted,

Goldi Locks

Goldi Locks

Dated: March 17, 2017

12

FILED

Nov. 04, 2016

SUPERIOR COURT MERCER COUNTY

Goldi Locks

Plaintiff

vs.

Papa Bear and Momma Bear

Defendant(s)

Superior Court of New Jersey Law Division Mercer County

Docket # L-0000-00

ORDER GRANTING SUMMARY JUDGMENT

THIS MATTER having been opened to the Court upon the motion of Defendants Papa and Momma Bear (Defendants), and upon notice to plaintiff Goldi Locks (Plaintiff), and the court having considered the moving and opposing papers as well as oral argument,

IT IS IN THIS 4th day of November, 2016;

ORDERED that Defendants' motion for summary judgment shall be and the same is hereby granted, dismissing the Plaintiff's Complaint in its entirety as against Defendants, with prejudice, for the reasons stated on the record on today's date; and it is further

ORDERED that a fully conformed copy of the within Order shall be served upon all parties within seven (7) days of its receipt from the Court.

I.M. Faire

Honorable I. M. Faire, J.S.C.

FILED

Jan. 11, 2016

SUPERIOR COURT MERCER COUNTY

Plaintiff(s)

Goldi Locks

VS.

Defendant(s)

Papa Bear and Momma Bear

Superior Court of

New Jersey Law Division Mercer County

Docket #

Civil Action

Complaint, Demand for Jury Trial

Plaintiff Goldi Locks(hereinafter "Plaintiff") makes the following allegations against Defendant(s) Papa and Momma Bear (hereinafter "Defendants"):

Parties

- 1. Plaintiff has and currently resides in the County of Mercer at 28 Far Away Road, Neverland, New Jersey 08611.
- 2. Defendants have and currently reside in the County of Mercer at 44 Warm Welcome Avenue, Fairytale, New Jersey 08544, which is where the incident occurred. Defendants have owned the property located at 44 Warm Welcome Avenue, since April 1, 2000.

Jurisdiction and Venue

- 3. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction the incident from which this lawsuit arises occurred in Mercer County.
- 4. This Court has specific personal jurisdiction over Defendants because they are residents of NJ, Mercer County.

Statement of Facts

- 5. On July 11, 2016, approximately between 9 a.m. and 1 p.m., the Plaintiff participated in a yoga class at Forest Park, which is located in Pretend Ville, New Jersey. At the end of class, the Plaintiff was unable to obtain transportation back home. Although it was both hot and humid that day, about 90 degrees Fahrenheit, the Plaintiff decided to walk home.
- 6. At about 1:45, Plaintiff was about mid-way to reaching her destination and was walking on Warm Welcome Avenue in Fairytale, Mercer County, NJ. By this time, the Plaintiff was both fatigued and hungry, so the Plaintiff decided to look for a place to stop and rest before continuing to walk home. At about 1:55 p.m., the Plaintiff came across a residence that had a "WELCOME FRIENDS" mat on the front porch and whose door was wide open. There were no

signs on the property that indicated that the residence was private or warning trespassers to keep off of the property. Therefore, Plaintiff was under the assumption that the residence was open to the public and walked into the building, hoping to get some food and rest.

- 7. Upon entering the residence the Plaintiff realized that no one was home. Instead, Plaintiff found three different sized bowls of porridge on the kitchen counter. Since the Plaintiff was hungry, the Plaintiff decided to try a spoonful of porridge until finding the most tasteful. After trying the mid-sized bowl, Plaintiff exclaimed, "Yummy! This one is just right!"
- 8. After finishing the mid-sized bowl of porridge, the Plaintiff decided to sit and rest on one of the three chairs nearby. The first and second chairs were too hard and too soft respectively, and the third chair broke upon plaintiff sitting on it. The fall from the chair caused plaintiff to fracture her left wrist. As plaintiff attempted to get up a splinter of wood from the chair splintered into her right foot. The pain from falling and the splinter incapacitated the Plaintiff from moving, so the Plaintiff laid on the floor motionless.
- 9. At approximately 2:25 p.m., the Defendant's returned home, along with their son Baby Bear. Baby Bear was the first to enter the home and panicked upon finding the Plaintiff lying on the bottom of the steps. Baby Bear screamed and ran out the house. Instead of helping the Plaintiff who was clearly suffering from injuries, the Defendant's interrogated the Plaintiff and yelled, "You are going to prison for trespassing on our property!" The Defendant's proceeded by calling the police. It was not until the police arrived at the scene, approximately 2:38 p.m., that the paramedics were called. Plaintiff was brought to the Happily Ever After Hospital.

First Cause of Action – Negligence

- 10. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1-9 as if fully set forth herein.
- 11. Plaintiff alleges that on July 11, 2016, the day of the incident, the Plaintiff was owed a duty of care by Defendants because the Plaintiff was an invite in the Defendants' residence.
- 12. Although Defendants' did not verbally invite Plaintiff into their residence, the "WELCOME FRIENDS" mat, the open door, and the three bowls of porridge were enough to imply it.
- 13. As a result, Defendants' owed Plaintiff the duty to exercise reasonable care in maintaining the premise in safe conditions and to provide warnings of the presence of any concealed dangerous condition.
- 14. Defendants' violated their duty of care by failing to keep the chair in a safe condition and by failing to provide warnings on the dangerous condition that the chair was in. These failures created a false sense of safety within the residence.
- 15. Plaintiff suffered harm that included a puncture wound on Plaintiff's right foot, mild scrapes along the outer left foot, a twisted left ankle, and a fractured left wrist.
- 16. Prior to injuries suffered by Plaintiff, Plaintiff was a physically active adult who was in good physical and mental health.

- 17. Plaintiff suffered said harm as a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions.
- 18. It was reasonably foreseeable that, by failing to maintain the chair in good condition anyone who was in the Defendants' residence could be injured while attempting to sit down.
- 19. It was also reasonably foreseeable that, by failing to provide warnings regarding the dangerous condition the chair was in, anyone who was in the Defendants' residence would have false sense of safety within the residence and would not use precaution when using the chair or avoid using it completely.
- 20. Had it not been for the Defendants' failure to fix or maintain the chair or to provide warnings regarding the dangerous condition that the chair was in, the Plaintiff would have not suffered harm while in the Defendants' residence.
- 21. As a result of Defendants' actions, Plaintiff suffered actual damages. Due to the severity of the harm that plaintiff suffered, as mentioned in paragraph 15, Plaintiff was compelled to and did employ services of hospitals, nurses, surgeons, physicians, and physical therapists to treat and take care of Plaintiff, which resulted in several medical bills and related costs of treatment.
- 22. Other damages that the Plaintiff suffered include pain and suffering, emotional distress, and loss of wages.

Claim for Relief

Wherefore, Plaintiff respectfully requests judgement against Defendant as follows:

- A. Compensatory damages, according to proof, for the following:
- B. For all current and future medical expenses incurred and to be incurred
- C. For past and future loss of wages
- D. For emotional distress
- E. For loss of enjoyment and quality of life
- F. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Plaintiff hereby requests a jury trial on all issues raised in this complaint.

Respectfully Submitted,

Goldi Locks_____

Dated: January 11, 2016

FILED

Feb. 09, 2016

SUPERIOR COURT MERCER COUNTY

Plaintiff(s)
Goldi Locks
vs.
Defendant(s)
Papa Bear and Momma Bear

Superior Court of New Jersey Law Division Mercer County

Docket # L-000-00

ANSWER

Defendants, Papa and Momma Bear, Answer to the Complaint as follows:

Parties

- 1. Defendants neither deny nor admit the allegations contained in paragraph 1 of the Complaint and therefore, leaves plaintiff to her proofs.
 - 2. Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 2 of the Complaint.

Jurisdiction and Venue

- 3. Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 3 of the Complaint.
- 4. Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 4 of the Complaint.

Statement of Facts

- 5. Defendants deny having knowledge or information sufficient enough to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 5 of the Complaint and therefore, leaves plaintiff to her proofs.
- 6. Defendants admit that they do have a "WELCOME FRIENDS" mat on the front porch, that the door was open, and that there were no signs on the property indicating that the residence was private or warning trespasser to keep off of their property, and otherwise denies the rest of the allegations contained in paragraph 6 of the Complaint.
- 7. Defendants admit that no one was home the day of the incident and that there were 3 different sized bowls on the kitchen counter, and otherwise denies the rest of the allegations contained in paragraph 7 of the complaint.
- 8. Defendants admit that there were 3 chairs near the kitchen counter, and otherwise denies having knowledge or information sufficient enough to form a belief as to the rest of the allegations contained in paragraph 8 of the Complaint.

9. Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 9 of the Complaint.

First Cause of Action – Negligence

- 10. Defendants repeat and reallege Defendants' answers to paragraphs 1-9 of the Complaint as it fully set forth herein.
 - 11. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 11 of the Complaint.
 - 12. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 12 of the Complaint.
 - 13. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 13 of the Complaint.
 - 14. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 14 of the Complaint.
- 15. Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 15 of the Complaint.
- 16. Defendants deny having knowledge or information sufficient enough to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 16 of the Complaint and therefore, leaves plaintiff to her proofs.
 - 17. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 17 of the Complaint.
 - 18. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 18 of the Complaint.
 - 19. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 19 of the Complaint.
 - 20. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 20 of the Complaint.
 - 21. Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 21 of the Complaint.
- 22. Defendants deny having knowledge or information sufficient enough to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 22 of the Complaint and therefore, leaves plaintiff to her proofs.

Affirmative Defenses

- 23. No duty is owed to Plaintiff because Plaintiff was a trespasser, not an invited party, on Defendants' residence
 - 24. Comparative negligence
 - 25. Assumption of risk

Respectfully Submitted,

Papa Bear and Momma Bear

Dated: February 9, 2016

FILED

Oct. 04, 2016

SUPERIOR COURT MERCER COUNTY

Papa and Momma Bear 44 Warm Welcome Avenue Lawrenceville, NJ 08544

Goldi Locks

Plaintiff

vs.

Papa Bear and Momma Bear

Defendant(s)

Superior Court of New Jersey Law Division Mercer County

Docket # L-0000-00

NOTICE OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

TO: Goldi Locks 28 Far Away Road

Neverland, New Jersey 08611

PLAINTIFF:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the original of this pleading, seeking summary judgment and the dismissal of Plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice and without costs as against defendants, has been filed with the Clerk of Court in accord with Court Rules; and PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that Defendants shall rely upon their

Statement of Material Facts and Certification in support of motion for summary judgment, along with exhibits attached thereto; and **PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE** that this motion is returnable on November 4, 2016, at 9:00 a.m., and that oral argument is requested.

Papa Bear and Momma Bear

Dated: October 4, 2016

FILED

Oct. 04, 2016

SUPERIOR COURT MERCER COUNTY

Goldi Locks

Plaintiff

vs.

Momma Bear and Papa Bear

Defendant(s)

Superior Court of New Jersey Law Division Mercer County

Docket # L-0000-00

DEFENDANTS' STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

- 1. On January 11, 2016, plaintiff filed suit against Papa Bear and Momma Bear (Defendants) alleging that she sustained personal injury after she attempted to sit on a chair in defendants' home that broke upon impact, causing her to fall to the ground. See Complaint, attached to the Certification of Papa and Momma Bear in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment (Bear Certification) as Exhibit A.
- 2. Plaintiff Goldi Locks (Plaintiff) testified at deposition that the photographs, attached as Exhibits C and D to the Bear Certification, were accurate depictions of the "WELCOME FRIENDS" mat at the Defendants home and the Defendants' property respectively. See Deposition of Goldi Locks, attached to Bear Certification as Exhibit B; see also Exhibit C (picture of mat) and Exhibit D (picture of property).
- 3. Plaintiff testified at deposition that no one was in defendants home when she entered the home, the defendants did not verbally invite her into their building, and that she had never met Defendants before entering their home. <u>See</u> Deposition of Goldi Locks, attached to Bear Certification as Exhibit B.
- 4. Defendants testified that they had never met Goldi Locks prior to finding her in their home. <u>See</u> Deposition of Papa and Momma Bear, attached to Bear Certification as Exhibit E.

Goldi Locks

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

Papa Bear and Momma Bear

Defendant(s).

Superior Court of New Jersey Law Division Mercer County

Docket # L-0000-00

CERTIFICATION OF
PAPA AND MOMMA BEAR
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

- I, Papa Bear, and I, Momma Bear, have personal knowledge of and certify to the following:
- 1. Exhibit A to this certification is a true and accurate copy of the complaint filed against us by Goldi Locks (plaintiff).
- 2. Exhibit B to this certification is a true and accurate copy of the transcript of deposition of plaintiff.
- 3. Exhibit C to this certification is a true and accurate copy of the photograph shown to plaintiff at her deposition of the "WELCOME FRIENDS" mat at our home.
- 4. Exhibit D to this certification is a true and accurate copy of the photograph shown to plaintiff at her deposition of our property.
- 5. Exhibit E to this certification is a true and accurate copy of the transcripts of deposition of us.

Papa Bear and Momma Bear

Dated: October 4, 2016

EXHIBIT A COMPLAINT

*Per Rule 2:6-1(a)(2) – the copy of the Complaint attached to the Bears' Certification as Exhibit A has not been reproduced here because the Complaint can already be found in the appendix at Pa2.

EXHIBIT B Deposition of Plaintiff

Goldi Locks

Plaintiff(s)

vs.

Papa Bear & Momma Bear

Defendant(s)

Superior Court of New Jersey Law Division

Docket #

DEPOSITION OF: GOLDI LOCKS

Mercer County

TRANSCRIPT of deposition taken by and before RUMPEL STILSKIN, Fairyland Court Reporter, and Notary Public of Pretend Ville, at the offices of BIG BAD WOLF, LLC, 123 Fairytale Lane, Pretend Ville, New Jersey on September 12, 2016, commencing at 10:15 a.m., pursuant to Notice.

Rumpel Stilskin Associates, LLC - We get your name right

GOLDI LOCKS

Page 1

- 1 28 Far Away Road, Neverland, New Jersey 08611,
- 2 having first been duly sworn testifies as follow:
- 3 - - - -
- 4 ...
- Is the photograph attached as Exhibit C to Defendants'
 Certification an accurate depiction of the "welcome
 friends" mat located on defendants' front porch?
- 8 A: Yes.
- 9 Q: Is the photograph attached as Exhibit D to Defendants'
 10 Certification an accurate depiction of Defendants'
- 11 property?
- 12 A: Yes.
- 13 Q: On the day you entered the Defendants' home, was the front door open?
- 15 A: Yes, and I was really hungry and tired and needed a 16 place to rest. The mat said "welcome" so I went in. 17 There were no signs saying not to go in.
- 18 Q: What happened when you went into defendants' home?
- 19 A: Well, no one was there but there were three bowls of 20 porridge on a counter, so I tried each of them. The 21 first bowl was too hot and the second too cold, but 22 the third bowl was just right, so I exclaimed, "Yummy!
- This one is just right!" I ate the whole thing.
- 24 Q: What happened next?
- 25 A: Well I was tired and had a belly full of porridge, so 26 I walked over to a set of three chairs and when I sat
- on the first one, it was too hard, and then the second
- one was too soft, but when I sat on the third and
- 29 smallest chair, it broke right underneath me!
- 30 Q: What happened to you when the chair broke?
- 31 A: Well I fell on my side and broke my left wrist. Then
- as I was trying to get up from the floor, a piece of
- 33 wood from the chair caused me to get a splinter on my
- 34 right foot. It really hurt.

Page 2

- 1 Q: What did you do next?
- 2 A: Well I sat on the floor motionless because I was in so
- 3 much pain. Then Baby Bear comes in screams and leaves.
- 4 Next thing Momma Bear comes in yelling questions at
- 5 me and accusing me of stealing and threatening me that
- 6 "You are going to prison for trespassing on our
- 7 property!"
- 8 Q: Did you get any help for your injuries?
- 9 A: No. Momma and Papa Bear were furious and called the
- 10 police. It wasn't until the police arrived that an
- ambulance was called for me. I was brought to the
- 12 Happily Ever After Hospital.
- 13 Q: What happened at the hospital?
- 14 A: I was treated for the splinter on my right foot, and
- my broken left wrist. The emergency physician when I
- got there was Dr. Goodwill. He fixed the splinter and
- 17 put a cast on my wrist. I stayed overnight for
- 18 observation.
- 19 Q: Did you have any other medical care?
- 20 A: Yes. I have been in physical therapy for my wrist and
- 21 foot to regain full mobility and strength.
- 22 Q: What other symptoms have you had?
- 23 A: I have had trouble sleeping and eating. I have not
- been able to return to work and have lost wages.
- 25 Q: Prior to this incident were you an active person?
- 26 A: Yes. Before I was injured I was walking home from a
- 27 yoga class at Forest Park Plaza in Pretendville, New
- Jersey. I walked because I didn't have a ride home.
- 29 It was hot and humid and when I was half way home I
- 30 was tired and hungry, which is why I was so happy to
- 31 see an open door and "WELCOME FRIENDS" mat.
- 32 Q: How much were your medical bills?
- 33 A: Hundreds of thousands of dollars at least.

END OF DEPOSITION

CERTIFICATE

I, RUMPEL STILSKIN, a Fairyland Court Reporter, and Notary Public of Pretend Ville do hereby certify that the above is an accurate depiction of the testimony made today.

EXHIBIT C

Photograph of "Welcome Friends" Mat



EXHIBIT D

Photograph of the Defendants' Property



EXHIBIT E

Deposition of Papa and Momma Bear

Goldi Locks

Plaintiff(s)

vs.

Papa Bear and Momma Bear

Defendant(s)

Superior Court of New Jersey Law Division Mercer County

Docket #

DEPOSITION OF: MOMMA BEAR AND PAPA BEAR

TRANSCRIPT of deposition taken by and before RUMPEL STILSKIN, Fairyland Court Reporter, and Notary Public of Pretend Ville, at the offices of BIG BAD WOLF, LLC, 123 Fairytale Lane, Pretend Ville, New Jersey on August 29, 2016, commencing at 10:03 a.m., pursuant to Notice.

Rumpel Stilskin Associates, LLC - We get your name right

MOMMA BEAR

Page 1

- 1 44 Warm Welcome Avenue, Lawrenceville, New Jersey 08544,
- 2 having first been duly sworn testifies as follow:
- 3 - - - -
- 4 ...
- 5 Q: Do you have a mat on your front porch that says 6 "welcome friends"?
- 7 A: Yes, but Goldi Locks is no friend of mine. She
 8 trespassed on my property and scared my baby boy. She
 9 even ate some of my porridge. Who does that? Shame
 10 on her.
- 11 Q: Do you have signs on your property that indicate the 12 land is private or warning people to stay off the 13 property?
- 14 A: No. My 800 pound husband usually does a good job at 15 scaring people away. I live in a small house. No one 16 has ever mistaken it for a public place. And when
- Ms. Locks trespassed into my house, no one was there.
 Hello. Doesn't that tell you that you are not in a
- 19 public building?
- 20 Q: Did you see plaintiff in your residence?
- 21 A: Uh-hum, she scared my baby boy right out of the house,
- he was like, "some crazy lady is on our floor." So I ran in and called the police.
- 24 Q: Did you help plaintiff off of the floor?
- 25 A: No. She was in my house illegally and broke my baby
- boy's chair. I was leaving her there for the police.
- 27 Q: Did you leave your front door open on the day you
- 28 found plaintiff in your residence?
- 29 A: I don't remember, but we do not lock our door. We are
- 30 bears. People do not usually bother us.
- 31 Q: Had you ever met plaintiff prior to finding her in
- 32 your home?
- 33 A: No.

Page 2

PAPA BEAR

- 1 44 Warm Welcome Avenue, Lawrenceville, New Jersey 08544,
- 2 having first been duly sworn testifies as follow:
- 3 - - - -
- 4 Q: Had you ever met plaintiff prior to finding her in
- 5 your home?
- 6 A: No.

END OF DEPOSITION

CERTIFICATE

I, RUMPEL STILSKIN, a Fairyland Court Reporter, and Notary Public of Pretend Ville do hereby certify that the above is an accurate depiction of the testimony made.

FILED

Oct. 28, 2016

SUPERIOR COURT MERCER COUNTY

Goldi Locks

Plaintiff

VS.

Momma Bear and Papa Bear Defendant(s)

Superior Court of New Jersey Law Division Mercer County

Docket # L-0000-00

PLAINTIFF''S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

- 1. ADMITTED.
- 2. ADMITTED. Plaintiff asserts that the "WELCOME FRIENDS" mat and lack of a private property sign invited her into defendants' house.
- 3. ADMITTED. Plaintiff asserts that the open door invited her into defendants' house.
- 4. ADMITTED. Plaintiff asserts that although she was not verbally invited to the defendants' house, the "WELCOME FRIENDS" mat, open door, and lack of a private property sign invited her into defendants' house.
- 5. ADMITTED.

RULE 2:6-1(a)(1) STATEMENT OF ALL ITEMS SUBMITTED TO THE TRIAL COURT ON THE SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION

ITEM SUBMITTED: **APPENDIX PAGE:** • Notice of Motion for Summary Judgment Pa7 • Defendants' Statement of Material Facts in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment Pa8 • Certification of Papa and Momma Bear in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment Pa9 o Exhibit A, Complaint Pa2 o Exhibit B, Transcript of deposition of Goldi Locks Pal1 o Exhibit C, Photograph of mat Pa15 o Exhibit D, Photograph of property Pa17 o Exhibit E, Transcript of deposition of Papa and Momma Bear Pa19 • Plaintiff's Response to Defendants' Statement of Material Facts Pa23

*Per Rule 2:6-1(a)(2), briefs submitted to the trial court on the Motion for Summary Judgment are not included in the appendix.

FILED

					APPELL	ARCU	MISION
	Superior	w Jersey Judici Court - Appellat otice of Appe	e Divisio	on	DEC	2 1 9	2016
Type or clearly print all information, Attach additional sho		otioc oi Appe				Ada	
(1) Title in Full (As Captioned Below) Goldi Locks.		(2) Attorney/Law Name Goldi Locks	/ Firm/Pr	o Se Litiga	ant	Jere	RK
Vs.		Street Address 28 Far Away Road					
Papa and Momma Bear	-	City Neverland	State NJ	≥ Zip 08611	Telepho (555) 55	ne Num 5-5555	nber
		Email Address: pretend_email@for:	sample,net			-	
On Appeal from						·.	
(3) Trial Court Judge I.M. Faire	(4) Trial Court or Mercer Co. Super		(5) Trial L-0000-	Court or Ag 00	ency Numb	er	
Notice is hereby given that (6) Gold Division from a (7) ☐ Judgment or	ii Locks	ed on 11/04/2016	, in th		ceals to thone)	пе Арр	ellate
☐ Civil, ☐ Criminal, or ☐ ☐ State Agency decision entered	-	ne Superior Court	İ	☐ Tax	x Court	or fr	om a
N/A, entire order being appealed. (9) Have all issues, as to all parties disposed of? (In consolidated ac been disposed of.)	in this action, be tions, all issues	efore the trial cou as to all parties i	rt or age n all actio	ncy been ons must l		Yes	□No
If not, has the order been proper	ly certified as fir	nal pursuant to R.	4:42-2?			Yes	□ No
For criminal, quasi-criminal and jun (10A) Give a concise statement of the disposition imposed:			uding da	te entered	l and any	sente	nce or
(10B) This appeal is from a ☐ con			tion	post-c	conviction	relief	
(10C) Is defendant incarcerated?	ungo or dienositi		Yes Yes	□ No			:
Was bail granted or the sente (10D) If in custody, name the place	-	-	, 100				
Defendant was represented be ☐ Public Defender ☐		private counse	·	specify			

Revised 06/2016, CN 10502 (Notice of Appeal)

page 1 of 2

following: Name Trial Court Judge I.M. Faire, J.S.C. Trial Court Division Manager Mother Goose Tax Court Administrator State Agency Attorney General or Attorney for other		Date of Service 12/19/2016
Trial Court Division Manager Mother Goose Tax Court Administrator State Agency		
Tax Court Administrator State Agency		12/19/2016
State Agency		7 1 1 1 1 1 U I U
- •		
Authory (1809) The Authors of Cities		
Governmental body pursuant to R. 2:5-1(a), (e) or (h)	•	
Other parties in this action: Name and Designation Attorney Name, Address and		Date of Service
Papa and Momma Bear Pro se, 44 Warm Welcome Avenue, Fai	rytale, NJ 08544	12/19/2016
Attached transcript request form has been served where applications	ble on the following:	
2) Attached transcript request form has been served where applica	Date of	Amount of
Name Trial Court Transcript Office Mercer County Transcriber's Office	Service 12/19/2016	Deposit \$500
Court Reporter (if applicable)	-	
Supervisor of Court Reporters		
Clerk of the Tax Court		
State Agency		
3) Exempt from submitting the transcript request form due to the form No verbatim record.	llowing:	•
Transcript in possession of attorney or pro se litigant (four coalong with an electronic copy).	opies of the transcript m	ust be submitted
List the date(s) of the trial or hearing:		
☐ Motion for abbreviation of transcript filed with the court or age	ency below. Attach copy	<i>y</i> .
☐ Motion for free transcript filed with the court below. Attach co	рру.	
I certify that the foregoing statements are true to the best of my king certify that, unless exempt, the filing fee required by N.J.S.A. 22A	:2 has been paid.	nd belief. I also
(15) <u>Grof</u> Date (15) <u>Grof</u> Signature of At Goldi Locks	torney or Pro Se Liligant	·
Goldi Locks		
	•	