

APPENDIX A

[The body of the page contains extremely faint, illegible text that appears to be bleed-through from the reverse side of the document. The text is too light to transcribe accurately.]

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT THE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-1743-23**

NORMAN L. SCOTT, SR.,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

TRINA RAGSDALE,

Defendant-Respondent.

Submitted March 13, 2025 – Decided March 24, 2025

Before Judges Mawla and Walcott-Henderson.

On appeal from the Superior Court of New Jersey,
Chancery Division, Family Part, Camden County,
Docket No. FM-04-0400-07.

Norman L. Scott, Sr., appellant pro se.

Respondent has not filed a brief.

PER CURIAM

Plaintiff Norman Scott, Sr. appeals from a portion of a February 1, 2024
Family Part order granting his application to retroactively modify his child

The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that every entry, no matter how small, should be recorded to ensure the integrity of the financial statements. This includes not only sales and purchases but also expenses, income, and any other financial activity that affects the company's balance sheet.

Next, the document outlines the various methods used to collect and analyze data. It describes how different types of information are gathered, from direct observations to secondary sources, and how this data is then processed to identify trends and patterns. The importance of using reliable sources and maintaining a consistent methodology is highlighted throughout this section.

The third section focuses on the interpretation of the results. It explains how the collected data is analyzed to draw meaningful conclusions about the company's performance and the market conditions. This involves comparing current data with historical trends and industry benchmarks to provide a comprehensive overview of the company's financial health.

Finally, the document concludes with a summary of the key findings and recommendations. It stresses the need for ongoing monitoring and reporting to ensure that the company remains financially sound and competitive in its market. The document serves as a valuable resource for anyone involved in financial management and data analysis.

support obligation based on a finding by the Social Security Administration (SSA) that he is disabled. The court determined plaintiff was entitled to a retroactive modification of child support as of the effective date of his third Social Security Disability (SSD) application, September 27, 2023. Plaintiff asserts the court erred by not granting the relief retroactive to the date of his first modification application, September 13, 2021. We affirm.

Plaintiff and defendant Trina Ragsdale were married on October 6, 2001. They are the parents of twins born in 2002, who were both enrolled in college at the time of this appeal. The parties divorced by way of a final judgment with stipulation of settlement entered on June 13, 2007, which required plaintiff pay defendant \$162 per week in child support via wage execution.

Plaintiff asserts he last worked on or before June 2020 and applied for SSD benefits in April 2021.¹ During the pendency of his application for SSD benefits, plaintiff filed two motions seeking to modify his child support obligation, which were both denied without prejudice.² According to plaintiff, "[e]verything was pending, so they denied it without prejudice."

¹ The record is devoid of any information concerning plaintiff's SSA benefits determination.

² The record is devoid of plaintiff's prior motions and the orders denying those motions without prejudice.

[The page contains extremely faint and illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the document. No specific content can be transcribed.]


On September 27, 2023, plaintiff filed a third motion seeking a modification of child support. According to the motion hearing record, plaintiff received an SSD benefit verification letter dated November 20, 2023, confirming his SSD benefits award, of which \$29,000 was paid towards his child support obligation.³

At the December 14, 2023 motion hearing to modify child support, plaintiff was represented by counsel, who confirmed plaintiff was seeking a "retroactive modification of the child support based on the two prior orders that were denied without prejudice during his [SSD] application." Following oral argument, the court concluded "I'm going to recalculate child support. I will explain the basis for the recalculation in the order, and then issue an order[,] which has an updated amount."

In its February 1, 2024 written order, the court granted plaintiff's application to recalculate or modify child support "based on [SSA]'s recent determination that [p]laintiff is disabled." The court reduced child support to \$125 per week using the parties' income and the Child Support Guidelines consistent with their agreement. It found

[a]lthough [it had] indicated on the record an intent[] to

³ The record also does not include proof of plaintiff's child support arrears prior to the SSD benefits award.



grant [p]laintiff's request to modify child support retroactive to [p]laintiff's first application to modify child support based on his alleged disability, after a careful examination of the prior orders in this matter and reference to N.J.S.A. 2A:17-56.23a, the [c]ourt has determined that such a retroactive modification would not be equitable or appropriate. The [c]ourt further note[d] that [p]laintiff was previously given the opportunity to provide proof of disability apart from any determination of disability by the [SSA].

The court made the order effective as of September 27, 2023. Generally, our review of a Family Part's findings is limited. Cesare v. Cesare, 154 N.J. 394, 411 (1998). We "accord particular deference to the Family Part because of its 'special jurisdiction and expertise' in family matters." Harte v. Hand, 433 N.J. Super. 457, 461 (App. Div. 2013) (quoting Cesare, 154 N.J. at 413). "Findings by the trial court are binding on appeal when supported by adequate, substantial, [and] credible evidence." Cesare, 154 N.J. at 411-12 (citing Rova Farms Resort, Inc. v. Invs. Ins. Co. of Am., 65 N.J. 474, 484 (1974)). However, we owe no special deference to the trial court's "interpretation of the law and the legal consequences that flow from established facts." Manalapan Realty, L.P. v. Twp. Comm. of Manalapan, 140 N.J. 366, 378 (1995).

N.J.S.A. 2A:17-56.23a prohibits retroactive modification of child support and child support arrearages. Keegan v. Keegan, 326 N.J. Super. 289, 293 (App. Div. 1999). In pertinent part, the statute provides:

[The page contains extremely faint and illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the document. No specific content can be transcribed.]

No payment or installment of an order for child support, or those portions of an order which are allocated for child support established . . . shall be retroactively modified by the court except with respect to the period during which there is a pending application for modification, but only from the date the notice of motion was mailed either directly or through the appropriate agent.

[N.J.S.A. 2A:18-56.23a (emphasis added).]

As a preliminary matter, we glean from plaintiff's brief that he is challenging solely the effective date of the new child support order, and not the amount of child support. We discern no abuse of discretion as regards to the retroactive date for child support.

The court considered plaintiff's receipt of SSD benefits retroactive to May 25, 2021, and the derivative benefits of \$29,000 paid to the children. The court declined to make the new child support amount retroactive to September 13, 2021 because plaintiff had not supported the motion with proof of disability apart from any determination by SSA, despite the opportunity to provide proof of disability.

Given these circumstances, the court neither abused its discretion nor misapplied N.J.S.A. 2A:17-56.23a when it made the new child support figure retroactive to the filing date of plaintiff's latest motion for modification. Although plaintiff's prior motions had been dismissed without prejudice, they

The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that every entry, no matter how small, should be recorded to ensure the integrity of the financial statements. This includes not only sales and purchases but also expenses, income, and any other financial activity.

Next, the document outlines the various methods used to collect and analyze data. It mentions the use of surveys, interviews, and focus groups to gather information from a diverse range of participants. The data collected is then analyzed using statistical techniques to identify trends and patterns. This analysis is crucial for understanding the underlying causes of certain behaviors and for developing effective interventions.

The document also highlights the role of technology in data collection and analysis. It discusses how software tools can streamline the process, making it easier to manage large amounts of data and perform complex calculations. However, it also notes the importance of ensuring that the data is secure and that the systems used are reliable and up-to-date.

In addition, the document addresses the ethical considerations of data collection and analysis. It stresses the need to obtain informed consent from all participants and to ensure that their data is used only for the purposes stated. It also discusses the importance of protecting the confidentiality of the data and of being transparent about the methods used.

Finally, the document concludes by emphasizing the value of the information gathered. It states that the data can be used to inform decision-making, to identify areas for improvement, and to develop more effective programs and services. It encourages a continuous cycle of data collection, analysis, and action to ensure that the organization is always learning and improving.

were nonetheless dismissed and not pending because plaintiff had previously failed to comply with the court's instruction to provide proof of disability in support of his prior motions.

Affirmed.

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

M.C. Hanley

Clerk of the Appellate Division

...the first of these is the fact that the ...

...the second of these is the fact that the ...

...the third of these is the fact that the ...

...the fourth of these is the fact that the ...

...the fifth of these is the fact that the ...

...the sixth of these is the fact that the ...

...the seventh of these is the fact that the ...

...the eighth of these is the fact that the ...

...the ninth of these is the fact that the ...

...the tenth of these is the fact that the ...

...the eleventh of these is the fact that the ...

...the twelfth of these is the fact that the ...

...the thirteenth of these is the fact that the ...

...the fourteenth of these is the fact that the ...

...the fifteenth of these is the fact that the ...

...the sixteenth of these is the fact that the ...

...the seventeenth of these is the fact that the ...

...the eighteenth of these is the fact that the ...

APPENDIX B

THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN RE: [Name], Debtor
Case No. [Number]

Chapter 11 Reorganization

Case No. [Number]

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY
C-98 September Term 2025
090615

Norman L. Scott, Sr.,
Plaintiff-Petitioner,

v.


ORDER


Trina Ragsdale,
Defendant.

A petition for certification of the judgment in A-001743-23
having been submitted to this Court, and the Court having considered the
same;

It is ORDERED that the petition for certification is denied.

WITNESS, the Honorable Stuart Rabner, Chief Justice, at Trenton, this
30th day of September, 2025.


CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT



APPENDIX C

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD
SUBJECT: [Illegible]

10/10/78

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY
M-524 September Term 2025
090615

Norman L. Scott, Sr.,

Plaintiff-Movant,

v.

ORDER

Trina Ragsdale,

Defendant.

It is ORDERED that the motion for reconsideration of the Court's order denying the petition for certification is denied.

WITNESS, the Honorable Stuart Rabner, Chief Justice, at Trenton, this
27th day of January, 2026.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Heather J. Baker". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "H" and "B".

CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT

