

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT THE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-5446-17T2**

HADI PEZESHKI,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

COREY C. ROWELL and
SHAMARA MILLER,

Defendants-Respondents.

Argued March 20, 2019 – Decided April 1, 2019

Before Judges Nugent and Mawla.

On appeal from Superior Court of New Jersey, Law
Division, Burlington County, Docket No. DC-002459-
18.

Hadi Pezeshki, appellant pro se.

Respondents have not filed briefs.

PER CURIAM

This Landlord-Tenant action involves a dispute over money the Landlord,
plaintiff Hadi Pezeshki, claims he is owed for damages to the leased premises

he discovered when the tenants, defendants Corey C. Rowell and Shamara Miller, vacated. Defendants sought the return of their security deposit. Plaintiff appeals from the \$1621.68 judgment entered against him at the conclusion of a trial presided over by a judge sitting without a jury.

During the trial, plaintiff presented more than twenty items of alleged damage to the premises. He also presented numerous photographs to support his claim. To refute plaintiff's claim, defendants presented photographs and a video taken during a "walk-through" of the premises that took place after termination of the lease.

Following the presentation of proofs and closing arguments, Judge Aimee R. Belgard delivered a thorough, thoughtful, and well-reasoned oral decision. She discussed each item of damage alleged by plaintiff and awarded him approximately twenty-five percent of the damages he was seeking, finding the other alleged damages were nothing more than normal wear and tear. She subtracted the amount she awarded plaintiff from the security deposit he retained, doubled the balance pursuant to N.J.S.A. 46:8-21.1, and entered judgment for defendants for \$1621.68.

On appeal, plaintiff argues the judge erred by permitting defendants to pursue a security deposit action they had not asserted in their answer or in a

counterclaim. He also argues the judge erred by admitting defendants' photographic and video evidence.

We reject these arguments and affirm the judgment, substantially for the reasons expressed by Judge Belgard in her oral decision. The judgment she entered is based on findings of fact which are adequately supported by the evidence. R. 2:11-2(e)(3)(A). The judge did not abuse her discretion by permitting plaintiffs to seek the return of their security deposit or by admitting their photographic and video evidence. Plaintiff's arguments to the contrary are without sufficient merit to warrant further discussion. 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