

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT THE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-4750-17T1**

CARLA GROSSO,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

ACACIO DIAS,

Defendant-Appellant.

Argued September 18, 2019 – Decided October 7, 2019

Before Judges Whipple and Mawla.

On appeal from the Superior Court of New Jersey,
Chancery Division, Family Part, Union County, Docket
No. FM-20-1929-13.

Acacio Dias, appellant, argued the cause pro se
(Stephen Schnitzer, on the brief).

Sean Alden Smith argued the cause for respondent
(Brach Eichler LLC, attorneys; Sean Alden Smith and
Mia V. Stollen, on the brief).

PER CURIAM

Defendant appeals from a May 8, 2018 order of the Family Part denying reconsideration of his February 16, 2018 motion to strike and to vacate the court's prior orders as well as his April 9, 2018 motion "to decertify" the plaintiff's answering certification. Having reviewed the record in its entirety, we affirm for the reasons expressed by Judge Alan G. Lesnewich in his statement of reasons issued with the May 8, 2018 order. We only add the following comments.

Defendant's central argument is that he was not properly served with process for plaintiff's motions seeking to enforce the parties' property settlement agreement incorporated into their final judgment of divorce. Judge Lesnewich made explicit findings that plaintiff provided proof of certified mailings. A certification of service stated regular mail was not returned. Defendant filed no opposition, and on February 6, 2018, Judge Lesnewich entered an order finding defendant in violation of litigant's rights.

On February 16, 2018, and April 9, 2018, respectively, defendant's counsel filed the motions that are the subject of this appeal. Judge Lesnewich considered the motions and, based upon his review of the record on reconsideration, he found the record demonstrated defendant was served by certified mail, regular mail and email, and plaintiff met the obligations of Rule

1:5-2. Having applied the appropriate legal standard for consideration of a motion for reconsideration, and because the judge's findings are supported by the record, we discern no reason to disturb the order.

We do not address defendant's remaining arguments as they lack sufficient merit to warrant discussion in a written opinion. R. 2:11-3(e)(1)(E).

Affirmed.

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



CLERK OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION