NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY APPELLATE DIVISION DOCKET NO. A-0918-22

J.P. ELECTRIC, INC., properly identified as JUAN PEREZ ELECTRIC CO.,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

and

JUAN PEREZ,

Plaintiff/Third-Party Defendant-Respondent,

v.

LPMG CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT, LLC,

Defendant/Third-Party Plaintiff-Appellant,

and

1 NORTH BOSTON, LLC, and DAVID NOVOTNY,

Defendants,

and

DAVID PRATTS,

Defendant/Third-Party

APPROVED FOR PUBLICATION

November 2, 2023

APPELLATE DIVISION

Submitted October 23, 2023 – Decided November 2, 2023

Before Judges Sabatino, Mawla and Vinci.

On appeal from the Superior Court of New Jersey, Law Division, Atlantic County, Docket No. L-0219-18.

Brian E. O'Neill (Elliott Greenleaf, PC), attorney for appellant.

Respondents have not filed a brief.

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

This appeal involves a straightforward application of the terms of the Offer of Judgment provisions in Rule 4:58-1 to -6. Defendant LPMG Construction Management, LLC ("LPMG"), appeals from the court's post-trial denial of its application for an award of counsel fees and costs pursuant to Rule 4:58-6.

In February 2018, plaintiff J.P. Electric, Inc. filed a complaint against LPMG (and other defendants that were dismissed from the action). Before trial, LPMG served upon plaintiff in March 2022 an offer of judgment under Rule 4:58-1 "to allow judgment to be entered against it and in favor of [p]laintiff for damages in the amount of \$5,000 . . . to resolve all of [p]laintiff's

2 A-0918-22

claims in this action of any kind, including all claims for damages of any kind, actual or otherwise " Plaintiff rejected the offer.

The trial court held a two-day bench trial. At the close of plaintiff's evidence, the court granted LPMG's motion for involuntary dismissal pursuant to <u>Rule</u> 4:37-2(b). Thereafter, LPMG moved for over \$50,000 in attorney's fees and costs pursuant to <u>Rule</u> 4:58-6.

The trial court denied defendant's application for fees. In its written decision of October 28, 2022, the court explained that "a dismissal pursuant to $R[\underline{ule}]$ 4:37-2(b) precludes an award of attorney's fees as it is a dismissal. The court finds $R[\underline{ule}]$ 4:58-3(c) does not provide for any allowances for fees when 'the claimant's claim is dismissed.'"

On appeal, LPMG argues the trial court misapplied the pertinent <u>Rules</u>, stressing that an involuntary dismissal under <u>Rule</u> 4:37-2(b) represents an adjudication on the merits of the case.

The trial court correctly and sensibly applied the pertinent Rules. "[W]e review the meaning or scope of a court rule de novo, applying 'ordinary principles of statutory construction to interpret the court rules.'" <u>DiFiore v. Pezic</u>, 254 N.J. 212, 228 (2023) (quoting State v. Robinson, 229 N.J. 44, 67 (2017)).

Although Rule 4:58-3(a) authorizes an offeror to recover fees "[i]f the

3

offer of a party other than the claimant is not accepted, and the claimant

obtains a judgment . . . that is favorable to the offeror as defined by this rule,"

that authorization does not apply when "the claimant's claim is dismissed," see

Rule 4:58-3(c)(1), or "a no-cause verdict is returned," see Rule 4:58-3(c)(2).

Because a successful motion under Rule 4:37-2(b) results in the

"dismissal of the action" as "the plaintiff has shown no right to relief[,]" no

verdict was returned so the trial court's denial of fees was manifestly correct.

The policy reasons underlying the zero-recovery exceptions to Rule 4:58-3(c)

would be undermined if such fee-shifting were permitted. See Schettino v.

Roizman Dev., Inc., 158 N.J. 476, 486 (1999) (noting that the preclusion of

fee-shifting under the Rule in instances when a plaintiff does not prevail

"prevent[s] the transformation of the offer-of-judgment rule into a general fee-

shifting rule").

Affirmed. Lest there be any doubt, a mid-trial involuntary dismissal

does not entitle a defendant offeror to fee-shifting under the Rule.

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

CLERK OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION

4