FORUM 8

Volume 81, No. 9 | Eighth Judicial Circuit Bar Association, Inc. | May 2022

# President's Message

*By Evan M. Gardiner*

May is here! May is a busy month for the EJCBA. We'll kick off the month with 'Law Day' on May 1st. This year's topic is "Toward a More Perfect Union: The Constitution in Times of Change." The EJCBA will be hosting a panel featuring Judge Clayton Roberts of the First DCA and UF Law Dean Laura Rosenbury. The event is free and open to the public, and will take place at Millhopper Branch Library, 3145 NW 43rd Street, from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m.

May 10th is the Spring Fling! Join us that evening from 6pm until 10pm at the Boxcar Beer and Wine Garden at Depot Park. This social event is free for all members. Finally, the May luncheon will be on May 20th at the Wooly starting at 11:45 am.

May is also the Florida Bar's designated Health and Wellness Month. We often get so involved in doing our best for our clients that we overlook taking care of ourselves. Whether it's physical or mental health, never forget to take some time for yourself. A 20 minute walk a day, or a few minutes of mindfulness, are just a couple of activities you can do to practice wellness. Just remember, the best way to take care of your clients is by also taking care of yourself.

As always, keep an eye on your email inbox and the EJCBA Facebook page for updates and news. See you soon!


# EJCBA Professionalism Seminar

The annual EJCBA Professionalism Seminar was held in person at Trinity United Methodist Church on April 1, 2022.

Standing, from L to R, EJCBA Professionalism Committee Chair Ray Brady, panelist Charles Holden, and seminar moderator Peg O'Connor; seated, from L to R, panelists Aubroncee Martin, Frank Maloney, and Mary K. Wimsett.

## 2021 - 2022 Board Officers

**Evan M. Gardiner**
*President*
151 SW 2nd Ave
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 388-7385
gardinere@pdo8.org

**Robert E. Folsom**
*President-Elect*
220 S. Main Street
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 374-3634
folsomr@circuit8.org

**Philip Kabler**
*Past President*
2700 NW 43rd St, Ste C
Gainesville, FL 32606
(352) 332-7688
pkabler@boginmunns.com

**Monica McMillen**
*President-Elect Designate*
101 NW 75th Street, Ste 1
Gainesville, FL 32607
(352) 327-8251
monica@mcmillenfamilylaw.com

**Dominique Lochridge-Gonzales**
*Secretary*
1000 NE 16th Ave, Bldg 1, Ste B.
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 415-2324
dominique.lochridge-gonzales@trls.org

**Sharon T. Sperling**
*Treasurer*
PO Box 358000
Gainesville, FL 32635
(352) 371-3117
sharon@sharonsperling.com

## Members at Large

**Jan Bendik**
3600 SW 19th Ave, Apt 13
Gainesville, FL 32607
(352) 374-4122
prague@mindspring.com

**Alexis J. Giannasoli**
151 SW 2nd Ave
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 338-7369
giannasolia@pdo8.org

**Mikel Bradley**
1000 NE 16th Avenue, Building I
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 415-2304
mikel.bradley@trls.org

**Frank E. Maloney, Jr. - Historian**
445 E. Macclenny Ave., Ste 1
Macclenny, FL 32063
(904) 259-3155
frank@frankmaloney.us

**Raymond F. Brady**
2603 NW 13th Street, Box #403
Gainesville, FL 32609
(352) 554-5328
rbrady1959@gmail.com

**James H. McCarty, Jr. (Mac)**
2630 NW 41st Street Set A
Gainesville, FL 32606
(352) 538-1486
jhmcjr@gmail.com

**Shawn Clark**
353 S. Court Street
Bronson, FL 32611
(954) 816-2130
clarks@pdo8.com

**George Nelson**
81 N. 3rd Street
Macclenny, FL 32063
(904) 259-4245
nelsong@pdo8.org

**Cherie Fine**
622 NW 1st Street
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 372-7777
cfine@ffplaw.com

**Peg O'Connor**
102 NW 2nd Ave
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 372-4263
peg@toklegal.com

**Allison Derek Folds**
527 E. University Ave.
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 372-1282
derek@foldsandwalker.com

**Ian Pickens**
703 N. Main Street
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 373-8000
ipickens@meldonlaw.com

**Blake Fugate**
PO Box 98
Williston, FL 32696
(352) 528-0019
blake@normdfugatepa.com

**Lauren N. Richardson**
3620 NW 43rd Street, Unit B
Gainesville, FL 32606
(352) 204-2224
lauren@laurenrichardsonlaw.com

**Norm D. Fugate**
PO Box 98
Williston, FL 32696
(352) 528-0019
norm@normdfugatepa.com

**Dawn M. Vallejos-Nichols - Editor**
2814 SW 13th Street
Gainesville, FL 32608
(352) 372-9999
dvallejos-nichols@avera.com

**Dean Galigani**
317 NW 1st Street
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 375-0812
dean@galiganilaw.com

## Contribute to Your Newsletter!

*From the Editor*

I'd like to encourage all of our members to contribute to the newsletter by sending in an article, a letter to the editor about a topic of interest or current event, an amusing short story, a profile of a favorite judge, attorney or case, a cartoon, or a blurb about the good works that we do in our communities and personal lives. Submissions are due on the 5th of the preceding month and can be made by email to dvallejos-nichols@avera.com.

## About this Newsletter

This newsletter is published monthly, except in July and August, by:

Eighth Judicial Circuit Bar Association, Inc.
P.O. Box 140893
Gainesville, FL 32614
Phone: (352) 380-0333
Fax: (866) 436-5944

Any and all opinions expressed by the Editor, the President, other officers and members of the Eighth Judicial Circuit Bar Association, and authors of articles are their own and do not necessarily represent the views of the Association.

News, articles, announcements, advertisements and Letters to the Editor should be submitted to the Editor or Executive Director by Email. Also please email a photograph to go with any article submission. Files should be saved in any version of MS Word, WordPerfect or ASCII text.

**Judy Padgett**
*Executive Director*
P.O. Box 140893
Gainesville, FL 32614
Phone: (352) 380-0333
Fax: (866) 436-5944
execdir@8jcba.org

**Dawn M. Vallejos-Nichols**
*Editor*
2814 SW 13th Street
Gainesville, FL 32608
(352) 372-9999
(352) 375-2526
dvallejos-nichols@avera.com

**Deadline is the 5th of the preceding month**

# Alternative Dispute Resolution

*By Deborah C. Drylie*

## Does Technology Affect Our Professionalism?

As discussed in previous articles, some aspect of technology - i.e., ZOOM, will remain in our day-to-day practice, post pandemic. We are now going into year 3 of our reliance on technology to facilitate a variety of court proceedings from depositions to hearings to mediations. Despite the benefits of technology, there are drawbacks to the virtual backdrop in which we now find ourselves and this article will focus on the extent to which the lack of human contact and inter-personal connections is negatively affecting the level of professionalism seen by practitioners as well as mediators.

Across the board, the level of rudeness in a virtual format has been noted to occur in a variety of court proceedings. This begs the question of 'why'? Based on research, it is not a phenomenon limited to the legal profession but exists in all arenas where virtual attendance at meetings is now the norm. And as actress Mayim Bialik would say, it all comes down to neurobiology. Oxytocin is the neurochemical transmitter which promotes feelings of trust, affection and co-operation. This is the chemical response which promotes a need to help and to be mindful of people's feelings. What causes a release in oxytocin is face to face interaction which is nearly impossible to reproduce over a video format. Specifically, eye-to-eye contact which is sustained, and more importantly, physical contact triggers the release of oxytocin. In fact, sustained eye contact results in synchronized blinking, a sign of neuro-coupling where brain functions closely mirror one another. Neuro-coupling establishes empathy by generating high quantities of oxytocin, while prolonged physical contact aligns all sorts of bodily functions such as temperature and pulse.

One would think a virtual format could actually *enhance* the eye-to-eye contact as we stare at each other on a screen for far longer than we would in person. However, there are subtle differences. Think about whether you are actually staring into the camera during your next hearing or mediation versus staring at the face of the mediator, judge, deponent/witness or opposing counsel? Chances are you are NOT staring directly into the camera which affects how the 'receiver' sees you and it does not create actual eye to eye contact. When looking at another's face on your screen, you are looking, ever so slightly, off camera which breaks the eye-to-eye connection. This is then coupled with the nearly complete absence in physical contact such as what happens with a simple handshake.

Unfortunately, the 'hacks' recommended by neurobiologists to help create an opportunity for an oxytocin release are hard to duplicate in our Zoom proceedings but should be utilized as much as possible to improve our desired level of professionalism with one another. First, do not see Zoom as a format which allows for multitasking. You cannot help but to be distracted and the other participants pick up on it and see/feel it as representing rude behavior - because it is. You would never think of doing such multitasking at an in-person mediation, deposition or hearing so do not do it simply because Zoom allows you to. Second, think back to when you may have spent the first few minutes with opposing counsel, judges or mediators talking about sports, the weather or your family. Rather than viewing these personal dialogues as a waste of time, realize these conversations were a way to release oxytocin and create a sense of professional camaraderie. Discussing common interests is a way to build a sense of cooperation and creates a bridge of professionalism. Better than talking about a common interest or subject, get an 'opponent' to talk about themselves. If successful, this results in a release of both oxytocin as well as serotonin - a powerful combination that can make you not only viewed as a good listener, but viewed as more trustworthy. Such positive attributes will exponentially increase the likelihood of treating each other with respect and professionalism in future interactions.

The take away from all of this neurobiology is something we innately know - we are far more likely to act with professionalism toward someone we know versus a stranger. Increasingly, opposing counsel are 'strangers,' even if you have dealt with them on several occasions. To combat this, be personable, allow time for storytelling, have opposing counsel talk about themselves, create human connections, make eye to eye contact and do not multitask. If we all try this, perhaps our levels of professionalism will increase until such time as we are far more likely to be hand-shaking and storytelling in person.

# TAMING THE MONSTER

*By Jack M. Ross*

A few of us are old enough to remember when the mail came only once a day. It came on paper, in envelopes with stamps, and was delivered by the U.S. Postal Service. That was so easy. We could take 20 minutes, review the day's mail, decide what needed prompt attention and schedule the rest to be addressed at the appropriate time. Then came email, a/k/a the Monster that devours billable hours. Email is so much easier, but that ease brings overuse. Email comes consistently at all hours of the day and night, as many as 30-50 or more a day. We need new strategies to deal with the constant stream of communication while still being able to focus on the tasks that require extended periods of thought and concentration. I don't have it mastered, but here are a few ideas that may help.

1. SCHEDULE TIME TO REVIEW EMAIL:

Set aside 15-30 minutes a couple of times a day to review emails. See what has come in, respond to those which can be addressed routinely, and put the matters that need more thought on a schedule to be dealt with when we have the time to give them the attention they deserve. Then go off-line until the next scheduled time for review.

2. WORK OFFLINE:

It is difficult to turn email off completely because some of our work requires us to send email. Have you ever opened your inbox to send an email, seen something in the inbox that grabbed your attention, opened it, dealt with it (and maybe more), and then closed your email without ever having sent the email you intended to send? I know I have, more than once. Outlook provides a solution for that: work offline. In the top line click on "Send/Receive." To the far right is an icon of a globe with the sub-title "Work Offline." If you click on that icon you can read and draft emails but nothing comes in or goes out. The emails you draft will be saved to the Outbox and sent automatically when you go back online during your next scheduled time to address emails.

3. DEAL WITH AN EMAIL ONLY ONCE:

When we open an email, deal with it then. Respond if appropriate or add it to the "to do" list. Then delete or save it. Try not to use your inbox as a "to do" list.

4. SET REALISTIC EXPECTATIONS:

We don't have to respond to every email immediately. Clients and counsel should not be led to expect that we will. We don't feel obligated to interrupt our work and take every phone call that comes in. Email is no different.

5. BE ACCOUNTABLE:

Most of us are used to keeping track of our time. Try keeping a record, in writing, of how much time you spend reading, composing, and sending emails. Also record how much of that time you are billing. I think that will create the incentive to better manage the time we spend dealing with email.

SOME THINGS TO HELP OUR COLLEAGUES

Here are a few ideas to help our colleagues spend less valuable time dealing with their emails.

1. MINIMIZE "REPLY ALL:"

Look at the address bars and consider whether everyone included needs to receive your response. This won't do much for you, but it sure will help your friends and colleagues. Also, if you copy your client on emails to opposing counsel, consider copying the client as bcc. That way when opposing counsel hits Reply All, his/her email won't go directly to your client. You can decide whether that email should go to the client and whether it needs an accompanying explanation.

2. PUT THE MESSAGE IN THE SUBJECT LINE:

There are some messages that can go completely in the subject line. The recipient need not even open the email. Some examples are:

a. Please, call me
b. Received your_____
c. Copy of _____ attached

Your colleagues will appreciate your brevity.

As I wrote earlier, I don't have all the answers, but I hope this helps.

# Probate Section Report

*By Blake Moore, Guest Columnist*

## Should a Spendthrift Clause be Included in a Special Needs Trust?

A spendthrift clause "restrains both voluntary and involuntary transfer of a beneficiary's interest." § 736.0502(1), *Fla. Stat.* Simply put, a spendthrift clause protects the assets of a trust from both creditors and the beneficiaries of the trust. It is common knowledge among estate planners that a well-drafted trust contains a spendthrift clause. Indeed, not including the clause in a standard trust might be considered malpractice. However, whether a spendthrift clause ought to be used in a special needs trust is a substantially more complicated issue.

Spendthrift clauses are permitted but generally not required in third-party special needs trusts. SSA POMS SI 01120.200.B.13. However, without a spendthrift clause, creditors may be able to access any mandatory distributions made from the trust. § 736.0501, *Fla. Stat.* Additionally, if any trust with mandatory distributions lacks a spendthrift provision, then the applicant may be able to sell the right to future payments for a lump sum. And any interest in the trust that the applicant can sell is counted as a resource. Thus, the present value of mandatory future payments is potentially a countable resource if the trust lacks a spendthrift clause. SSA POMS SI 01120.200.D.1.a. Therefore, a spendthrift clause may be necessary for any special needs trust that requires mandatory distributions. SSA POMS SI 01120.200.B.13.

Spendthrift provisions are not effective in first-party special needs trusts. Florida courts generally will not enforce a spendthrift clause in any self-settled trust "designed to permit a person to place his or her assets beyond the arms of creditors." In re Rensin, 600 B.R. 870, 880 (Bankr. S.D. Fla. 2019); but see In re Wheat, 149 B.R. 1003, 1005 (Bankr.S.D.Fla.1992) ("[T]he stated policy against self-settled spendthrift trusts is not as compelling in situations where, as here, the settlor-beneficiary's control is relatively limited"). Thus, as a first-party special needs trust is a self-settled trust, a spendthrift clause will generally not keep creditors from being able to attach an interest to distributions from the trust. Indeed, the Florida Statutes specifically contemplate the existence of a valid security interest attaching to a first-party special needs trust. § 679.4061(8)(b), *Fla. Stat.*; § 679.4081(6)(b), *Fla. Stat.* Additionally, if the self-settled trust is irrevocable—as any first-party special needs trust should be—any creditor of the settlor may reach "the maximum amount that can be distributed to or for the settlor's benefit." § 736.0505(1)(b), *Fla. Stat.* The same principle holds true for discretionary trusts, with creditors allowed to reach "the maximum amount which the trustee under the terms of the trust could pay to him or apply for his benefit." In re Lawrence, 251 B.R. 630, 642 (S.D.Fla.2000) (quoting In re Cameron, 223 B.R. 20, 25 (Bankr.S.D.Fla.1998)). Therefore, a creditor could reach any amount which the trustee could apply for the benefit of the beneficiary, despite the trust containing a spendthrift clause and being discretionary. And because these special needs trusts must follow the sole benefit rule, a creditor could gain access to the entire amount in trust, with the exception of any assets specifically exempted from creditors, such as a homestead.

Therefore, spendthrift clauses are generally advisable for third-party special needs trusts but should not be relied upon in first-party special needs trusts.

# Unjustified "Self-Defense" Killing: Murder as an Act of a Depraved Mind or Manslaughter?

*By Steven M. Harris*

A defendant who killed honestly believing deadly force was necessary to prevent imminent death or great bodily harm or the imminent commission of a forcible felony invokes the defense of justification per § 776.012(2), § 776.013(1)(b) or § 776.031(2), *Fla. Stat*. A defendant who killed resisting an attempt to murder or commit a felony on him or upon or in any "dwelling house" where he was present invokes the defense of justification per § 782.02, *Fla. Stat.*, a discrete deadly force justification provision. That statute is unaffected by the various Chapter 776 statutory amendments. See *Pileggi v State*, 232 So.3d 415 (Fla. 4th DCA 2017), and March 2020 ***Forum 8***.

There are *manslaughter* statutes to apply if the fact finder determines a killing was without lawful justification because the defendant's belief of imminence or necessity was unreasonable, the force used was excessive, or when the killing of a felonious or other unlawfully acting malefactor was unnecessary. See § 782.07(1) and § 782.11, *Fla. Stat*. The latter offense is rarely charged and is not considered a lesser included of second degree murder. That is because case law has narrowed its applicability to exclude self-defense situations where deadly force was used against an unlawful act directed solely toward the defendant. *State v. Carrizales*, 356 So.2d 274 (Fla. 1978). For some explanation see *Mitchell v. State*, 368 So.2d 607, 608 (Fla. 3d DCA 1979) (Schwartz, J., specially concurring). Of note: The second enumerated offense element in SJI (Crim.) 7.7(b) is intended to adopt the rationale of that case law. A better view (§ 782.11, *Fla. Stat*., imposes a necessity requirement on § 782.02, *Fla. Stat*.) was articulated by Judge Shivers in his dissent in *Cote v. Jowers*, 515 So.2d 339 (Fla. 1st DCA 1987). See also *Brown v. State*, 12 So. 640 (Fla. 1893); *Whitehead v. State*, 245 So.2d 94 (Fla. 2d DCA 1971).

Second degree murder, § 784.04(2), *Fla. Stat*., requires proof beyond a reasonable doubt the defendant committed an act "evincing a depraved mind regardless of human life." The defendant and victim are typically acquainted, and have interacted in the past. The proof must include that the defendant killed out of "ill will, hatred, spite, and an evil intent." See, e.g., *Rasley v. State*, 878 So.2d 473 (Fla. 1st DCA 2004); *Conyers v. State*, 569 So.2d 1360 (Fla. 1st DCA 1990); *Sigler v. State*, 805 So.2d 32 (Fla. 4th DCA 2001). The highest form of malice is required, which can be described as an inherent deficiency of moral sense and rectitude, a wicked and corrupt disregard of the lives and safety of others, and a failure to appreciate any social duty. See *Hines v. State*, 227 So.2d 334 (Fla. 1st DCA 1969).

That a defendant used excessive force or acted with "extreme recklessness" or "an impulsive overreaction" in responding to an attack or injury *might* sustain a manslaughter conviction. However, it is insufficient proof of second degree murder. There is no shortage of appellate cases articulating the concept, including when the defendant has used a knife or firearm responding to an unarmed attack or non-deadly force injury. See, e.g., *Pearce v. State*, 18 So.2d 754 (Fla. 1944); *Ramsey v. State*, 154 So. 855 (Fla. 1934); *Stinson v. State*, 245 So.2d 688 (Fla. 1st DCA 1971); *Light v. State*, 841 So.2d 623 (Fla. 2d DCA 2003); *Poole v. State*, 30 So.3d 696 (Fla. 2d DCA 2010); *Bellamy v. State*, 977 So.2d 682 (Fla. 2d DCA 2008); *Rayl v. State*, 765 So.2d 917 (Fla. 2d DCA 2000); *Williams v. State*, 674 So.2d 177 (Fla. 2d DCA 1996); *Pierce v. State*, 376 So.2d 417 (Fla. 3d DCA 1979); *Martinez v. State*, 360 So.2d 108 (Fla. 3d DCA 1978); *McDaniel v. State*, 620 So.2d 1308 (Fla. 4th DCA 1993); *Dorsey v. State*, 74 So.3d 521 (Fla. 4th DCA 2011); *Light v. State*, 841 So.2d 623 (Fla. 2d DCA 2003); *Sandhaus v. State*, 200 So.3d 112 (Fla. 5th DCA 2016). That case law is consistent with the concept that malice should never be assumed, and "[a] person acting in self defense is not held to the same course of conduct which might have been expected had he been afforded an opportunity of cool thought as to possibilities, probabilities and alternatives." *Price v. Gray's Guard Service, Inc*., 298 So.2d 461, 464 (Fla. 1st DCA 1974).

It has become somewhat common to charge second degree murder in spite of a good faith assertion of justified use of deadly force. Even though there is scant evidence of malice and thus a weak legal basis for the charge. Perhaps this occurs because Florida does not recognize "imperfect self-defense" (see *Hill v. State*, 979 So.2d 1134 (Fla. 3d DCA 2008); *Patrick v. State*, 104 So.3d 1046 (Fla. 2012)), the dubious interpretation of § 782.11, *Fla. Stat*. (see above), and because prosecutors have misgivings and/or misconceptions about "Stand Your Ground" which prompt emotional, legally incorrect charging decisions. Of note: There is case law that appears to expand temporal and/or behavioral framing to skirt the rigorous proof analysis required for second degree murder. However, those cases are distinguishable based on the standard of review and lack of a bona fide self-defense claim. See, e.g., *Finch v. State*, 299 So.3d 579 (Fla. 1st DCA 2020); *Jacobson v. State*, 248 So.3d 286 (Fla. 1st DCA 2018).

*Continued on page 7*

# Law in the Library Resumes after Hiatus

*By Marcia Green, Pro Bono Director/Gainesville*

The Law in the Library series has resumed as a collaborative effort of the Alachua County Library District, members of the Eighth Judicial Circuit Bar Association and Three Rivers Legal Services.

The series is held virtually on a monthly basis. Live presentations are available on Zoom as well as through the library Facebook page. In addition, the sessions are recorded and available to library patrons after the fact. Although the series will take a summer break, seminars will resume in September.

Thank you to attorneys Cynthia Swanson, Tom Edwards, Steve McNamara, Lauren Sleasman and Scott Toney. Thus far, we've had presentations on Child Support, Sealing and Expungement, Landlord Tenant Law, Social Security Disability and Estate Planning.

Are you interested in making a presentation? Do you have a topic you are interested in sharing with the community or want to suggest? Let me know!! Email me at marcia.green@trls.org or Avery Vinson at avery.vinson@trls.org. This is a great opportunity to share your legal knowledge, inform the community on important topics and introduce yourself!

# Unjustified "Self-Defense"

*Continued from page 6*

To answer the question posed by the title: Second degree murder should be charged only in the exceptional case -- where the defendant's claim of justification is easily proven to be spurious, and extreme malice can be proven by direct evidence of ill will, hatred, spite, and evil intent. That a force user was completely mistaken in analyzing a peril and the need to use deadly force does not itself support a charge of second degree murder. Nor does mere provocation of the victim (for which § 776.041(2), *Fla. Stat*., imposes a behavioral limitation on the availability of the defense). The temporal focus should be on conduct prior to the use of deadly force, and the victim should be entirely innocent of any criminal act or conduct which provoked or could have made lawful the defendant's use of force. The victim's perspective should not be considered; see October 2021 ***Forum 8***. Charging decisions should be made without regard to emotional urgings of the victim's family (or representative), and should likewise ignore community sentiment and media outrage. An arguably unjustified self-defense killing is not second degree murder because police or prosecutor can decry the defendant's use of deadly force with moral or social condemnation, gruesome autopsy photos, victim adoration, or histrionic indignation in an interview, opening statement or closing argument.

# Three Rivers' Doors are Open!

*By Marcia Green, Pro Bono Director/Gainesville*

Three Rivers Legal Services has re-opened our doors for walk-in traffic. While many of your offices were fully open throughout much of the past two years, Three Rivers worked primarily remotely. Our management determined that the safety of our vulnerable clients and numerous staff members was of utmost importance.

We never stopped serving our clients; we just found ways to work with limited exposure and for the health of all involved. The learning curve was initially steep but Three Rivers had already been working on remote work plans to ensure continuous services should a disaster affect one or all of our three offices. The COVID pandemic disaster was not the one we expected but it was the one we were dealt.

Now, as we move forward with in-office staff, hybrid work arrangements, virtual and in-person client interviews, hearings and all other, we are excited to explore from what we have learned. Our options for reaching the low income rural residents of our 17-county service area and the communities within the Eighth Judicial Circuit are far greater than two years ago. We adapted and our client population adapted. Internet access in the rural communities is still an issue but we have all learned new ways to communicate, serve and provide legal assistance. We are hopeful for continued improvements to the way we are all able to provide legal help as needed and that we all remain healthy!

# Criminal Law

*By Brian Kramer*

*City of Tallahassee v. Florida Police Benevolent Association, inc., et al.,* is currently pending a decision before the Florida Supreme Court. In that case, the PBA represents two Tallahassee PD officers involved in an officer-involved shooting. The officers alleged that the shooting followed an assault upon them by the decedent. Following the shooting, the media sought the names of the officers involved, and the City of Tallahassee was going to release their names. The PBA, on behalf of the officers asserted Marsy's Law to prevent the disclosure of the names of the officers. Litigation followed. The City of Tallahassee, and others, argue that the officers are not "victims" within the meaning and the intent of the constitutional amendment. The PBA counters that the statutory and constitutional language is unambiguous and clear that the officers are victims. The Supreme Court will have to decide whether and how Marsy's Law will be interpreted on this issue.

At the State Attorney's Office, we face related but more complicated issues. Marsy's law provides that its protections take effect at the time of victimization. While this is admirable, it creates logistical issues. The State Attorney's Office is at least the third party to be aware that a criminal incident has occurred. Law enforcement is generally the first. The Clerk is generally the second. We receive notice of an arrest at First Appearance and a sworn complaint when it is submitted to the office. Information that the victim might want kept private may have already been released. There is no statewide, unified, statutory process to determine or to effectuate the victim's wishes. Every agency and clerk's office are left to their own policy and procedure to implement Marsy's Law as they see fit. The same is true of the State Attorney's Office. We have no external guidelines, case law, or guidance to implement or effectuate Marsy's Law. Further complicating our situation is the requirement that we balance the victim's rights under the Marsy's Law and Chapter 960 with the Defendant's 6th Amendment right to confront and cross-examine witnesses.

In a criminal case, I have determined that the victim's information cannot be withheld from the Defendant under Marsy's Law. Literally, it's just me saying that. However, we will, at the victim's request, withhold their information from the defense bar unless and until it becomes necessary to turn it over during the litigation of the case. It is a testament to our defense bar and the serious and careful work that they do that we don't automatically withhold all victim information, as is done in some circuits. We are fortunate that we don't have a defense bar that chooses to weaponize information and hold it to the throat of a victim.

That is not the end of the story for the State Attorney's office and Marsy's Law. I have 4 employees who spend some or all of their time dealing with public records requests. I take a completely different position on victim information when it comes to public records. There is no Federal Constitutional right to a public record. (There is one in the Florida Constitution). In our public records division, I require that we notify every victim of any request from any person for any record that would reveal their identity or provide information that could be used to harass them. We send the victim a notice and ask that the victim contact the office and let us know their wishes. If the victim does not respond, we assert their rights under Marsy's Law, or, put another way, we default to assert Marsy's Law.

Sometimes this isn't as difficult as you might think. Many public records requests come from the victim or their attorneys. That's easy. Or, if we see that the victim asserted their rights in the underlying case, this is a pretty good indicator that they still do. But, otherwise, Marsy's Law applies. You might ask, "why does this matter"? The answer is money. Reviewing and redacting nearly all public records requests for victim information that could be used to *identify or harass* a victim is labor intensive, and therefore costly. This cost is passed onto the person making the request. High costs are often sited as the reason that public records are not easily and readily available.

I am personally in favor of open access to public records. I think it makes us all better behaved. Every assistant state attorney knows that as soon as the case is closed, the entire file is subject to review by anyone who wants to see it. We have a saying, "Whatever you put in the file, whatever you do on a case, you should be prepared for your mom to read it on the front page of the Gainesville Sun." I have provided more than one record from my office that has made me cringe. I am happy to say that it is less and less often.

You might well ask what can change. The Florida Prosecuting Attorney's Association has asked the legislature to clarify these issues by passing law. There have been some efforts, but they have all failed. We have some hope that the Courts will provide some guidance, but that has yet to come. *Tallahassee v. PBA* will likely answer the question posed very narrowly, limiting the answer to just law enforcement officers' relationship to Marsy's Law. While I don't want anyone to sue me, we are likely left to only future court cases to find further guidance.

# EJCBA Charity Golf Tournament 2022

**“The Gloria” In Memoriam of Gloria Fletcher**


Our Sponsors - THANK YOU!

Attorneys John Whitaker, Jimmy Prevatt, Rod Smith and Dylan Smith represented sponsor Avera & Smith, LLP

Partners and golfers Scott Walker and Alison Folds represented sponsor Folds & Walker

Mac McCarty (tournament emcee), Kayla McCarty, Madison Compton and Steve Larson represented Eisinger Law

Judge Kristine Van Vorst and attorney Star Sansone were among the golfers on this beautiful, early spring day

Golfers Dan Glassman, John Kelly, Jesse Smith and Scott Toney are ready to hit the links

## May 2022 Calendar

1 Law Day 2022: “Toward a More Perfect Union: The Constitution in Times of Change”; Milhopper Library
4 EJCBA Board of Directors Meeting, Office of the Public Defender, 151 SW 2d Ave., 5:30 p.m.
5 Deadline for submission of articles for June Forum 8
10 Spring Fling, Depot Park, 6:00 p.m.
11 Probate Section Meeting, 4:30 p.m. via ZOOM
20 EJCBA Monthly Luncheon, Speaker TBA, The Wooly, 11:45 a.m.
30 Memorial Day, County & Federal Courthouses closed

## June 2022 Calendar

2 EJCBA Annual Meeting & Dinner, 6:00 p.m., The Wooly
8 Probate Section Meeting, 4:30 p.m. via ZOOM
22-25 2022 Annual Florida Bar Convention, Signia by Hilton Bonnet Creek & Waldorf Astoria, Orlando

Have an event coming up? Does your section or association hold monthly meetings? If so, please fax or email your meeting schedule to let us know the particulars, so we can include it in the monthly calendar. Please let us know (quickly) the name of your group, the date and day (i.e. last Wednesday of the month), time and location of the meeting. Email to Dawn Vallejos-Nichols at dvallejos-nichols@avera.com.


The first robin of spring always has regrets.