

CA - Edison

1/13/77

Order - Edison's ordinance is not in violation

Pgs. 2

P.I. 3492, 903, 121C

CA 001376 O

C

FILED

JAN 18 1977

DAVID O. RENIMON, JUDGE

IV.

ROLAND A. WINTER, ESQ.
-sAttoThey for Defendant, Township of Edison
940 Amboy Avenue, Edison, N.J. 08817 - 201-738-1300

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
CHANCERY DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY
DOCKET NO. C 4122-73

URBAN LEAGUE OF GREATER)
NEW BRUNSWICK, et al.,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
vs.)
)
THE MAYOR AND -COUNCIL OF)
BOROUGH OF CARTERET, et al.,)
)
Defendants.)

Civil Action
O R D E R

•VF

This matter having been opened to trial by motion of defendant, Township of Edison, Roland A. Winter, Esq.; appearing for the Township of Edison, Daniel A. Searing, Esq. and his associates, appearing for the plaintiffs, and the Court, having had the benefit of the moving papers, including defendant's affidavits, and such answering papers as were filed on behalf of the plaintiffs, and the Court having had the benefit of an independent investigation of Edison Township's moving papers and trial exhibits, and it appearing to the Court that Edison's existing Zoning Ordinance does not presently seem to violate the intent and purposes outlined in the decision of this Court filed on May 4, 1976; and as implemented by subsequent Judgments and Orders,

IT IS, on this 13 day of June, 1976 ORDERED:

1. That the decision and previous Orders and Judgments of this Court affecting the Township of Edison, and in particular striking down the validity of the Zoning Ordinance of the Township of Edison, is hereby stayed until May 1, 1977.

2. That until May 1, 1977 the Township of Edison shall continue to enforce its Zoning Ordinance.

3. That the Township of Edison is not present in violation of the decision of May 4, 1976 and the Judgment and/or Order implementing that, decision.

4. That either the plaintiff or the Township of Edison shall show cause on or before June 1, 1977, or earlier, upon proper notice and motion before this Court, why the existing Zoning Ordinance of the Township of Edison should not be declared valid and in compliance with the purposes and intent of the Court's decision of May 4, 1976."

5. This Court retains jurisdiction of the subject matter of this litigation to accommodate the objectives hereinabove set forth.

David D. Furman, J.S.C.

J. S. C.