

ROMANOWSKI LAW OFFICES
475 Main Street – 2nd Floor
Metuchen, NJ 08840
(732) 603-8585
Attorney for Plaintiff

Plaintiff

Rhonda P. McGinty, falsely known as
Rhonda P. Webber

vs.

Defendant

Ronald Webber

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
CHANCERY DIVISION
FAMILY PART

MIDDLESEX COUNTY

Docket No.: FM-12-0000-00-Z

CIVIL ACTION

VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR ANNULMENT

The Plaintiff, Rhonda P. McGinty, falsely known as Rhonda P. Webber, residing at 22 Happenstance Drive, in the Borough of Dissolution, County of Middlesex, State of New Jersey says:

COUNT ONE

1. A form of ceremony of marriage took place between the Plaintiff and the Defendant on February 14, 1985 in a civil ceremony in Dissolution, New Jersey.
2. She was a bona fide resident of the State of New Jersey at the time of the commencement of the action.
3. The Defendant, Ronald Webber, now resides at 44 Predicament Place, in the Town of Estrangement, County of Middlesex and State of New Jersey.

4. Prior to February 14, 1985, the Defendant was lawfully joined in wedlock to Ms. Whoopie Knolls who, when the ceremony of marriage between the Plaintiff and the Defendant was performed, was living and was the lawful wife of the Defendant, the lawful marriage of Ms. Whoopie Knolls to the Defendant not having been dissolved or annulled and, at that time, the marriage of Ms. Whoopie Knolls to the Defendant being in full force and effect. When the ceremony of marriage between the Plaintiff and the Defendant was performed, Plaintiff was ignorant of the facts set forth hereinabove and believed that the Defendant was free to marry the Plaintiff.

5. On February 14, 1985, the day the within cause of action arose, Plaintiff was domiciled at 66 Liberty Street, in the Borough of Dissolution, County of Middlesex, State of New Jersey.

6. Two (2) children were born of the purported marriage between the Plaintiff and the Defendant; namely: Stephanie Webber, born February 17, 1989, age 14; and Michael Webber, born September 22, 1996, age seven, all of whom are presently in the sole residential custody of the Plaintiff.

7. There have been no previous matrimonial actions between the parties.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment on this count:

(A) Declaring and adjudging the purported marriage between the parties to be null and void;

(B) Compelling the Defendant to pay support to the Plaintiff;

- (C) Awarding sole legal and physical custody of the unemancipated children born of the purported marriage to the Plaintiff;
- (D) Awarding to the Defendant reasonable rights of parenting time with the two (2) unemancipated children born of the purported marriage;
- (E) Compelling the Defendant to support the two (2) unemancipated children born of the purported marriage;
- (F) For counsel fees and costs;
- (G) Permitting the Plaintiff to resume her true and birth name of Rhonda P. McGinty;
- (H) For such further relief as the Court may deem just and equitable.

COUNT TWO

1. Plaintiff repeats each and every allegation contained in the First Count hereof as though set out herein at full length and made a part hereof.
2. On or about the 1st day of March, 1985, the Plaintiff and the Defendant acquired as tenants by the entirety, certain lands and premises commonly known as 22 Happenstance Drive, in the Borough of Dissolution, County of Middlesex, State of New Jersey, more particularly described as Block 1099, Lot 69, on the Tax Map of said municipality.
3. The Plaintiff desires that a fair partition of said real property be made to her and to the Defendant, in accordance with their rights and interests as set forth above. Alternately, if an actual partition cannot be made without great prejudice to those

entitled to share therein, that such real property be sold and the proceeds divided among Plaintiff and Defendant, as well as any other persons entitled to share therein, according to their rights and interests, as set forth above.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment on this count:

(A) That a fair partition of the lands may be made among Plaintiff and Defendant, as well as any other persons entitled to share therein, according to their respective rights and interests;

(B) That any and all liens on the individual interests of any other parties be charged to the share assigned to any such party, but subject to a charge on such share of its just proportion of the costs of this action, and also to a charge of the sum that shall be found to be due to the Plaintiff for moneys expended by her for taxes, etc., in preference to such lien;

(C) If an actual partition cannot be made without great prejudice to the respective parties or is impracticable, that the real property be sold;

(D) If a sale does occur, there shall be paid, from the proceeds thereof, the costs of this action, the amount found due to Plaintiff and Defendant, each for moneys expended by her and him, respectively, and to Plaintiff for taxes, etc., and the balance divided between Plaintiff and Defendant and such other parties entitled to share therein in accordance with their respective rights and interests; the portion of the moneys arising from the sale of any share against which there are existing liens or

encumbrances held by any creditor who is a party hereto shall be paid into this Court, to be disposed of as this Court may direct;

(E) That an account be taken of the sums of money expended by Plaintiff in the payment of taxes, etc., and that the proportionate amount of such expenditures that should have been paid by the several parties in interest and, in the case of actual partition, that the respective proportionate amount be adjudged a lien upon the respective shares assigned to such parties or, in the case of sale, that the sum found due to the Plaintiff shall be paid to her, prior to any payments of the parties' shares in the proceeds to the parties;

(F) For counsel fees and costs;

(G) For such further relief as the Court may deem equitable and just.

ROMANOWSKI LAW OFFICES
Attorney for Plaintiff

By: _____

CURTIS J. ROMANOWSKI, ESQ.

DATED: March 05, 2005