

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT THE  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-4582-15T3

JORDANA ELROM,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

ELAD ELROM,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

Submitted February 1, 2018 – Decided February 20, 2018

Before Judges Haas and Rothstadt.

On appeal from Superior Court of New Jersey,  
Chancery Division, Family Part, Bergen County,  
Docket No. FM-02-2214-11.

Elad Elrom, appellant pro se.

Ceconi & Cheifetz, LLC, attorneys for  
respondent (Lizanne J. Ceconi, of counsel and  
on the brief; Christina V. Kolevich, on the  
brief).

PER CURIAM

In this post-judgment matrimonial matter, defendant appeals  
from the Family Part's April 29, 2016 order entered by Judge Bonnie

Mizdol.<sup>1</sup> In this order, the judge, among other things: (1) denied defendant's application for relief from a prior order under Rule 4:50-1; (2) denied defendant's request to escrow the children's passports; (3) required defendant to pay plaintiff \$503 per week in child support; and (4) found defendant in violation of litigant's rights for his failure to secure a life insurance policy to secure his support obligations. The judge rendered a comprehensive oral opinion summarizing her findings of fact and conclusions of law. Based upon our review of the record and the applicable law, we affirm substantially for the reasons expressed by Judge Mizdol. We add the following brief comments.

The scope of our review of the Family Part's order is limited. We owe substantial deference to the Family Part's findings of fact because of that court's special expertise in family matters. Cesare v. Cesare, 154 N.J. 394, 411-12 (1998). Thus, "[a] reviewing court should uphold the factual findings undergirding

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendant also challenges the trial court's June 1, 2016 order denying without prejudice his motion to reconsider the April 29, 2016 order because defendant's motion did not comply with Rule 5:5-4(a), Rule 4:5-4(b), and Rule 4:49-2. However, the June 1, 2016 order was interlocutory as it did not foreclose further litigation by defendant before the trial court. Accordingly, it was not final or appealable as of right under Rule 2:2-3(a)(1). Nevertheless, we have considered defendant's arguments concerning the court's denial of the motion for reconsideration, and conclude they are without sufficient merit to warrant discussion in a written opinion. Rule 2:11-3(e)(1)(E).

the trial court's decision if they are supported by adequate, substantial and credible evidence on the record." MacKinnon v. MacKinnon, 191 N.J. 240, 253-54 (2007) (quoting N.J. Div. of Youth & Family Servs. v. M.M., 189 N.J. 261, 279 (2007)) (alteration in original).


While we owe no special deference to the judge's legal conclusions, Manalapan Realty v. Manalapan Twp. Comm., 140 N.J. 366, 378 (1995), we "'should not disturb the factual findings and legal conclusions of the trial judge unless . . . convinced that they are so manifestly unsupported by or inconsistent with the competent, relevant and reasonably credible evidence as to offend the interests of justice' or when we determine the court has palpably abused its discretion." Parish v. Parish, 412 N.J. Super. 39, 47 (App. Div. 2010) (quoting Cesare, 154 N.J. at 412). We will only reverse the judge's decision when it is necessary to "'ensure that there is not a denial of justice' because the family court's 'conclusions are [] "clearly mistaken" or "wide of the mark."'" Id. at 48 (quoting N.J. Div. of Youth & Family Servs. v. E.P., 196 N.J. 88, 104 (2008)) (alteration in original).

Applying these principles, defendant's arguments concerning the April 29, 2016 order reveal nothing "so wide of the mark" that we could reasonably conclude that a clear mistake was made by the judge. The record amply supports Judge Mizdol's factual findings

and, in light of those findings, her legal conclusions are  
unassailable.

Affirmed.

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

  
CLERK OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION