### THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE JUDICIAL BRANCH

NH CIRCUIT COURT

1st Circuit - District Division - Lancaster 55 School St., Suite 201 Lancaster NH 03584 Telephone: 1-855-212-1234 TTY/TDD Relay: (800) 735-2964 http://www.courts.state.nh.us

July 02, 2021

ROBERT S. CAREY, ESQ ORR & RENO PA 45 SOUTH MAIN STREET SUITE 400 PO BOX 3550 CONCORD NH 03302-3550

Case Name:

Vanessa Cardillo v. Jon Swan

Case Number:

451-2021-CV-00017

See attached Stalking Final Order of Dismissal dated 7/2/2021.

/s/ Honorable Janet H. Subers, 7/2/2021

Terri L. Peterson Clerk of Court

(887)

C: Vanessa Cardillo; Jon Swan

### THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

#### JUDICIAL BRANCH NH CIRCUIT COURT

#### STALKING FINAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL

	<u>451-2021-CV-00017</u> 4512120017							
Court:	1st Circuit - District Division - Lancaster							
Court ORI:	NH004051J							
County:	Coos							
Address	55 School St., Suite 201 Lancaster	NH 03584_						
PLAINTIFF		PLAINTIFF I	DENTIFIERS					
First Midd	dle Last	Date of Birth of Plaintiff						
Vanessa Card	ollib	08/29/1985						
V								
DEFENDANT		DEFENDANT	IDENTIFIERS					
First Midd	dle Last	DOB	04/11/1966	HEIGHT	5 Ft. 11 In.			
Jon Swan		SEX	Male	WEIGHT	200 Lbs.			
DEFENDANT'S ADDRESS:		RACE	White	EYES	Brown			
25 Cashman R Dalton NH 035		State/Birth	Ohio	HAIR	Brown			
present, hereby finds that:  The Plaintiff has NOT been stalked as defined in RSA 633:3-a: CASE DISMISSED  The Court finds that Plaintiff did not establish by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant has committed the act of stalking. Per the statutory definition of "course of conduct", such course of conduct shall not include constitutionally protected activity, nor shall it include conduct that was necessary to accomplish a legitimate purpose independent of making contact with the targeted person. While Defendant did post videos of Plaintiff online, these videos were made during a public town meeting. Other people also videotape these meetings and broadcast or post them online. There was no testimony that Defendant threatened the safety of the Plaintiff or that he committed any other acts included in the definition of course of conduct. The case is DISMISSED.								
July 2, 2021 Date 1-855-212-123 Telephone Numbe			Judge Judge et H. Subers Name of Judge	beis				
Ciphicile Hailbe	-,J=11	, , , ,						

## THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE JUDICIAL BRANCH

NH CIRCUIT COURT

1st Circuit - District Division - Lancaster 55 School St., Suite 201 Lancaster NH 03584

Telephone: 1-855-212-1234 TTY/TDD Relay: (800) 735-2964 http://www.courts.state.nh.us

July 02, 2021

JON SWAN 25 CASHMAN ROAD DALTON NH 03598

Case Name:

Vanessa Cardillo v. Jon Swan

Case Number:

451-2021-CV-00017

See attached Stalking Final Order of Dismissal dated 7/2/2021.

/s/ Honorable Janet H. Subers, 7/2/2021

Terri L. Peterson Clerk of Court

(887)

C: Vanessa Cardillo; Robert S. Carey, ESQ

### THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

# JUDICIAL BRANCH NH CIRCUIT COURT

#### STALKING FINAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Case Number: <u>451-2021-CV-00017</u> PNO Number: <u>4512120017</u>								
	1st Circuit - District Division - Lancaster							
Court ORI: NH004051J			·					
County: Coos		·						
Address 55 School St., Suite 201 Lancaster	NH 03584_			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
PLAINTIFF	PLAINTIFF II	DENTIFIERS						
First Middle Last	Date of Birth of Plaintiff							
Vanessa Cardillo	08/29/1985							
V	<i>/</i> .							
DEFENDANT	DEFENDANT IDENTIFIERS							
First Middle Last	DOB	04/11/1966	HEIGHT	5 Ft. 11 In.				
Jon Swan	SEX	Male	WEIGHT	200 Lbs.				
DEFENDANT'S ADDRESS:	RACE	White	EYES	Brown				
25 Cashman Road Dalton NH 03598	State/Birth	Ohio	HAIR	Brown				
633:3-a (Stalking), having considered the plaintiff's Stalking Petition and having conducted a hearing on 07/01/2021, of which the defendant received actual notice, and was ☑ was not ☐ present, hereby finds that:  ☐ The Plaintiff has NOT been stalked as defined in RSA 633:3-a: CASE DISMISSED  ☐ The Court finds that Plaintiff did not establish by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant has committed the act of stalking. Per the statutory definition of "course of conduct", such course of conduct shall not include constitutionally protected activity, nor shall it include conduct that was necessary to accomplish a legitimate purpose independent of making contact with the targeted person. While Defendant did post videos of Plaintiff online, these videos were made during a public town meeting. Other people also videotape these meetings and broadcast or post them online. There was no testimony that Defendant threatened the safety of the Plaintiff or that he committed any other acts included in the definition of course of conduct. The case is DISMISSED.  ☐ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □								
uly 2, 2021 ate -855-212-1234 elephone Number of Court	Signature of J Hon. Janet Print / Type N	Undge H. Subers ame of Judge	bera					