

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT THE  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-5009-14T1

NJA NEWARK BETH ISRAEL  
ANESTHESIA ASSOCIATES LLC,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

ANTHONY NWAKA,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

Argued October 19, 2016 – Decided October 25, 2017

Before Judges Fuentes and Carroll.

On appeal from Superior Court of New Jersey,  
Law Division, Special Civil Part, Union  
County, Docket No. DC-012361-13.

Anthony Nwaka, appellant, argued the cause pro  
se.

Lawrence J. McDermott, Jr. argued the cause  
for respondent (Pressler and Pressler, LLP,  
attorneys; Mr. McDermott, on the brief).

The opinion of the court was delivered by  
FUENTES, P.J.A.D.

Defendant Anthony Nwaka appeals from the May 6, 2015 order  
entered by the Law Division, Special Civil Part, denying his motion

to vacate and reconsider orders entered by the court on February 4, 2014, granting summary judgment to plaintiff NJA Newark Beth Israel Anesthesia Associates, LLC. Defendant also seeks reversal of an order entered on April 2, 2015, granting plaintiff's motion to turn over funds held at Wells Fargo Bank.<sup>1</sup> This case originated as a collection action filed by plaintiff seeking payment of unpaid medical fees in the amount of \$514.07.

In a written decision entered on May 6, 2015, Judge John M. Deitch explained that defendant's motion filed pursuant to Rule 4:50-1(a) challenging the grant of summary judgment to plaintiff was not properly before the Special Civil Part because defendant did not "establish excusable neglect. . . ., exceptional circumstances. . . or other equitable considerations . . . to support vacating Judge Pisanky's order granting summary judgment." With respect to defendant's motion for reconsideration pursuant to Rule 4:49-2, Judge Deitch found such a motion was "not an avenue to submit opposition where none was timely filed."

In this appeal, defendant has raised a number of arguments challenging Judge Deitch's decision. None of these arguments have


---

<sup>1</sup> In an order entered on August 17, 2015, our colleague Judge Sabatino made clear that defendant's motion seeking leave to appeal orders entered by the trial court on January 1, 2014, February 4, 2014, and April 2, 2015 was denied as untimely pursuant to Rule 2:4-1(a) and Rule 2:4-4(a). Thus, our scope of review here is limited to the May 6, 2015 order.

sufficient merit to warrant discussion in a written opinion. R.  
2:11-3(e)(1)(E). We affirm substantially for the reasons  
expressed by Judge Deitch.

Affirmed.

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

  
CLERK OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION