FORUM 8

Volume 83, No. 3 | Eighth Judicial Circuit Bar Association, Inc. | November 2023

President's Message

By Monica Perez-McMillen

Gratitude

I've read studies that support the notion that feeling grateful improves our ability to sleep, regulate our mood, and even boosts our immunity. Gratitude can decrease mental shifts such as depression, anxiety, and can even minimize pain and diseases. In a culture fueled by prescription medicines, could you imagine if one pill gave you all of these positive outcomes? I think we'd all be asking for a prescription. The act of being grateful requires some level of intentionality; it doesn't always come naturally. I challenge each and every member of the 8th to take the month of November to practice intentional gratitude. If you, or someone you know needs an extra boost of gratitude and encouragement, reach out to me at Monica@McMillenFamilyLaw.com and we can make it a point to connect over coffee or tea.

October was a busy month in the 8th. On October 4th we held a Circuit Consolidation Panel by Zoom thanks to the leadership, courage, and commitment of our President-Elect Designate Peg O'Connor. Peg quickly composed an engaging panel discussion. Peg and the panel thoroughly researched the topic in order to present it expeditiously to our membership so that members of the 8th Circuit could provide meaningful feedback to the state-wide committee that is considering these important changes. More than 115 members of our circuit registered for this important lunchtime zoom and CLE credit has been applied for. I'd like to personally thank Retired Circuit Judge Monica Brasington, our moderator, and Salter Feiber partner, Richard Jones, Retired Judge Victor Hulslander, Eighth Circuit State Attorney, Brian Kramer, and Eighth Circuit Public Defender, Stacey Scott, our panelists, for providing important perspectives to consider.

On October 5th we were able to gather in Cedar Key for our annual homecoming tradition. We had a wonderful evening gathering together, laughing, and enjoying another beautiful Gulf Coast sunset. I'd like to thank Norm and Blake Fugate for opening their offices for the annual pre-Cedar Key gathering and for their immense assistance in continuing the Cedar Key tradition and supporting those in Cedar Key that were impacted by Hurricane Idalia. I'd also like to thank Rebecca Wood and Rachel Vanderzee from The Fund. The Fund has consistently sponsored the bar tab for Cedar Key and are some of the 8th Bar's biggest supporters. If you didn't have a chance to connect with Rebecca or Rachel while you were in Cedar Key, please reach out to Rachel at RWood@TheFund.com to learn more about the services The Fund provides.

Cedar Key provides an annual opportunity to catch up with friends, colleagues, and professionals that we often can't mingle with during busy workdays/family weekends. I personally enjoyed the company of Natasha Scheer, one of the Certified Family Law Mediators in our Circuit. If you've ever met Natasha, you love Natasha. She's delightful, kind, thoughtful and makes a personal connection with everyone she encounters. I watched Natasha naturally practice gratitude and impact several members while she was in Cedar Key. She gave affirmations of gratitude to nearly everyone she encountered. Thank you Tasha, for modeling this and reminding me of how powerful genuine connection and gratitude truly is.

Continued on page 7

2023 - 2024 Board Officers

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

Mikel Bradley
President-Elect
1000 NE 16th Ave, Bldg. I
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 415-2304
mikel.bradley@trls.org

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

Peg O'Connor
President-Elect Designate
102 NW 2nd Avenue
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 372-4263
peg@toklegal.com

Dominique Lochridge-Gonzales
Secretary
1000 NE 16th Ave, Bldg. I
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

Tavara K. Andrews
14407 SW 2nd Place, Ste F-1
Newberry, FL 32669
(352) 284-9956
tavara@tjsacctg.com

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

Raymond F. Brady
1719 NW 23rd Ave, #3F
Gainesville, FL 32609
(352) 554-5328
rbrady1959@gmail.com

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

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

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

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

Evan Gardiner
2700 NW 43rd Street, Ste C
Gainesville, FL 32606
(352) 337-7688
egardiner@boginmunns.com

Samantha Howell
1000 NE 16th Avenue, Ste I
Gainesville FL, 32601
(352) 372-0519
samantha.howell@trls.org

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

Andrew W. McCain
120 W. University Avenue
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 374-3670
mccaina@sao8.org

James H. McCarty, Jr. (Mac)
2630 NW 41st Street, Ste A
Gainesville, FL 32606
(352) 654-1001
mac@mccartyfocks.com

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

Celeste M. Corrales Ramirez
120 W. University Avenue
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 374-3670
ramirezc@sao8.org

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

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
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

Global Settlement Conferences & F.S. 624.155

One of the many changes associated with Tort Reform is the impact of F. S. 624.155 in the world of global settlement conferences (GSC). For those of you who are unfamiliar with this aspect of (typically) pre-suit claim resolution when there may be a limited pot of money to be divided amongst multiple claimants, the new law has the potential to completely alter the way in which these matters will be handled in the future. This is a brave new world, and no one is precisely sure how the law will be implemented by all insurance carriers. Several carriers, their counsel and claimant counsel who handle global settlement conferences have been consulted for the purpose of this article. What is laid out below is the result of a consensus of opinions between counsel, carriers, and mediators as to what the process will entail going forward.

F.S. 624.155 is intended to limit an insurer's exposure to a claim of bad faith in situations when a tortfeasor faces multiple claims and the applicable coverage may be, or clearly is, insufficient to compensate all claimants. Previously, carriers would analyze preliminary claimant information and would tender its policy limits to be divided up between all claimants at a GSC. When the policy was insufficient to compensate all claimants fully for their claimed injuries and damages, the matters almost always resolved with an agreeable division of the monies amongst all parties, both those represented by counsel as well as pro-se claimants, with the assistance of a mediator/facilitator. The idea of self-determination in these proceedings was at the forefront and allowed for amicable resolution of otherwise competing claims.

With the enactment of F. S. 624.155(6), the carriers have options on how they wish to proceed when they would historically schedule a GSC. Now, if two or more third-party claimants have competing claims arising out of a single occurrence, which in total may exceed the available policy limits, an insurer will NOT be liable beyond the available policy limits for failure to pay all or any portion of the available limits…if within 90 days after receiving notice of the competing claims, the insurer either:

1. Files an interpleader action. If the claims are found to be in excess of the available limits, the third-party claimants are entitled to a prorated share of the limits, as determined by the trier of fact; or
2. Arranges for a *binding* arbitration that has been agreed to by all claimants and the insurer. This will occur only in the instance when the entire amount of the policy has been tendered to be divided up between the claimants. The qualified arbitrator must be agreed to by the insurer as well as the claimants and the cost of the arbitration will be the responsibility of the insurer. The claimants are entitled to a prorated share of the policy, as determined by the arbitrator who takes into consideration the comparative fault of the parties and the total likely outcome at trial based on the economic and non-economic damages provided to the arbitrator. At the conclusion of the arbitration findings, the claimants will execute a release and the typical terms of claim resolution will be followed.

Both of the above options are different than the current handling of this scenario via a GSC, particularly the Interpleader concept. While a GSC is a mutually cost-effective attempt to resolve competing claims, continuing along the traditional path will not offer protection to the insurer from potential claims of bad faith claims handling. This fear alone may force the carriers to choose one of the 2 proscribed options outlined above. Unfortunately, neither of the two options now provided for in F.S. 624.155(6) are attractive to either practitioners or carriers. From a practical standpoint, an interpleader action will be cumbersome and extremely expensive. This type of litigation will be a foray into uncharted territory as FRCP 1.240 has not historically allowed for competing claims against a tortfeasor. See *Hernandez v Travelers Insurance Company*, 356 So.2d 1342 (3rd DCA 1978). However, such actions have been allowed in federal court so the assumption is that the federal process will now be adopted by state courts. See *Federal Insurance v. Stallings*, 2010 WL 11629251, MD Fl., Tampa Division.

In addition, this begs the question as to *how* an interpleader action would actually play out. Pursuant to FRCP 1.240, an insurer, on behalf of its insured, would file a lawsuit naming all third-party claimants as defendants. The insurer would tender its policy into the Court registry and seek a dismissal as to itself as well as its insured(s) as to any further active involvement in the claim. While this may be a fairly expeditious and limited cost option for a carrier, defense counsel would need to continue to monitor the progress of the claims and actively defend the insured through the discovery process.

Continued on page 5

Caution: "Self-Defense Immunity From Criminal Prosecution" Prohibits Custodial Detention, Arrest . . .[1]

By Steven M. Harris

It is quite common for someone to publicly declare defensive force used against their family member unjustified and to demand the prompt charging and arrest of the assumed wrongdoer. Broadcast and internet reporting of the demand often includes commentary by someone branded as "prominent" who is offered as an "expert" to provide analysis. For example, a law professor, criminal defense attorney, former federal or state prosecutor, the family's hired attorney, or a rights activist. That person usually reveals a striking unfamiliarity with Florida law by rephrasing Chapter 776 statute language and offering an incorrect, pejorative explanation of "Stand Your Ground" or the "Castle Doctrine."[2] Misunderstanding of the law is also manifest from time-to-time when a sheriff or police chief explains why someone has or has not been charged and arrested.[3]

An arrest is always a serious and traumatic event which is never forgotten. For an acquitted defendant, when no charge is filed, or when a charge is filed and dismissed. A hastily made charging or arrest decision may expose flawed agency policy or procedure, or worse, suggest unseemly political calculation. That justified use of force law may be "somewhat complex," *see State v. Floyd*, 186 So.3d 1013, 1022 (Fla. 2016), is no excuse to ignore or misread statutes or appellate precedent.

The Florida Legislature has granted *true immunity* from "criminal prosecution" to a person who has threatened or used non-deadly or deadly force which is justifiable under § 776.012 (defense of self or other), § 776.013 (home protection), or § 776.031 (defense of personal or real property), *Fla. Stat*. "Criminal prosecution" includes "arresting, detaining in custody, and charging or prosecuting the defendant." *See* § 776.032(1), *Fla. Stat*. The protection of statutory immunity arises before arrest and continues through trial. *See Horn v. State*, 17 So.3d 836 (Fla. 2d DCA 2009). Immunity from arrest should not be treated as an affirmative defense. *See Peterson v. State*, 983 So.2d 27 (Fla. 1st DCA 2008). A person who has threatened or used force may not be arrested by "an agency" unless "it" first determines that there is probable cause that the force threatened or used was unlawful.[4] Immunity is a substantive right not to be detained, arrested or charged ─ which should be applied in a manner that provides a defendant with more protection than a probable cause determination under Fla.R.Crim.P. 3.133. *See Dennis v. State*, 51 So.3d 456 (Fla. 2010); *Rosario v. State*, 165 So.3d 852 (Fla. 1st DCA 2015). ***Of note:*** Chapter 776 justification is <u>not</u> analyzed by applying federal "excessive force" concepts and caselaw under the Fourth Amendment and 42 U.S.C. § 1983. It is a determination which should always be made with due regard to the underlying principle of Chapter 776, without engaging hindsight. Force is justifiable by a subjective good faith belief which need only be objectively reasonable; the danger need not have been actual.

A criminal defendant who seeks immunity need only *raise* a *prima facie claim* of justifiable force. The State must then prove by *clear and convincing evidence* that the force threatened or used was not justified. *See* § 776.032(4), *Fla. Stat*. Neither the defendant nor counsel must swear to any of the factual allegations in the immunity motion in order to raise a justiciable claim. The defendant need not testify at the pretrial immunity hearing. The trial court is to assume the alleged facts as true. If they would satisfy the requirements of the Chapter 776 justification statute(s) asserted by the accused, the State must affirmatively overcome the defendant's immunity. *State v. Cassaday*, 315 So.3d 705 (Fla. 4th DCA 2021); *Riggens v. State*, 344 So.3d 625 (Fla. 2d DCA 2022); *Jefferson v. State,* 264 So.3d 1019 (Fla. 2d DCA 2018); *Cassanova v. State*, 335 So.3d 1231 (Fla. 3d DCA 2021). However, a defendant must allege

Continued on page 7

---

[1] The phrase "self-defense immunity from criminal prosecution" is found in § 776.032(4), *Fla. Stat*. *Civil* suit immunity is independently determined. *See Kumar v. Patel*, 227 So.3d 557 (2017). A *civil* defendant determined to be immune must be awarded "reasonable attorney's fees, court costs, compensation for loss of income, and all expenses incurred" in defense of the action. *See* § 776.032(3), *Fla. Stat*.

[2] Consider (**HERE** and **HERE**) the objections to the sound decision not to charge the killer in a 2016 Fort Myers homicide.

[3] Consider (**HERE**) the recent Volusia County arrest for second degree murder despite evidence of either lawful use of deadly force (firearm against aggravated assault threatening imminent chainsaw attack) or accident (via statement of the accused), and a sheriff's patently dubious "awful but lawful" characterization **(HERE**) of a panicked Dunedin Cove homeowner's multiple firearm discharges at his pool cleaner through a patio glass door.

[4] *See* § 776.032(2), *Fla. Stat.* Caselaw acknowledges the statute without examining the import of its reference to "an agency" instead of the expected "law enforcement officer." *See, e.g.*, *Johnson v. State*, 268 So.3d 806 (Fla. 4th DCA 2019).

Just What is "Ordinary Wear and Tear" Anyway?

By Krista L.B Collins

A common provision in leases, whether residential or commercial, is that when the lease term expires and the tenant moves out, the property must be returned in good condition, less ordinary, or normal, wear and tear. In other words, the tenant is responsible for any damage beyond "ordinary wear and tear." But just what is ordinary wear and tear anyway?

For a term that shows up in nearly every lease, there is surprisingly little discussion in Florida case law about what it actually means. Is "ordinary wear and tear" simply one of those you-know-it-when-you-see-it kind of things? Some property damage requires only the application of basic common sense to know that it is beyond normal wear and tear: if a tenant has ripped a wall down to the studs, that is obviously more than reasonable wear and tear. If the carpeting needs a once-over from Stanley Steamer, then that is likely to be normal wear and tear. But what about something in the middle? While there is not a lot of case law on the subject, Florida courts have not been entirely silent on the issue.

In most cases, rather than define "ordinary wear and tear," courts have instead said what it is not. In *Rizzo v. Naranja Lakes Condominium Assoc., Numbers One, Two, Three, Four and Five*, 498 So.2d 451, 452 (Fla. 3d DCA 1986), the Third District Court of Appeal held that "the exception of 'ordinary wear and tear' merely relieves the lessee of any duty to the landlord to maintain the leasehold in a 'like-new' condition. It does not affect the general obligations owed by the tenant" to maintain the buildings and improvements in good and substantial order and repair. [Internal citations omitted.]

Likewise, in *Apple Glen Investors, LP v. Express Scripts, Inc.*, 2016 WL 909322 (M.D. Fla. 2016), the Middle District of Florida had to decide whether the tenant breached the lease by failing to return the leased commercial property "in a first class condition and order of repair, except for ordinary wear and tear." The Middle District noted that "under Florida law, where a lease includes an 'ordinary wear and tear' exception, that exception does not eliminate the tenant's obligation to make capital replacements and repairs, which wear out during tenancy and cannot be corrected by ordinary maintenance." *Id.* at *12.

In terms of which party bears the burden to show that damages are merely normal wear and tear, Florida law is clear: the tenant bears the burden. As stated in *Stegeman v. Burger Chef Systems, Inc.*, 374 So.2d 1130, 1131 (Fla. 1st DCA 1979), "the lessor has the burden of proving the damages claimed to have occurred since" the date the lease began, while "the burden of proving what portion, if any, of the damages and cost of restoration resulted from normal wear and depreciation, not recoverable by the lessor" is on the tenant.

In *Cunningham Drug Stores, Inc. v. Pentland*, 243 So.2d 169, 170 (Fla. 4th DCA 1971), the Fourth District Court of Appeal affirmed a final judgment in favor of the lessor where the lease required the lessee to return the property "in the same, and in as good condition as they now are (ordinary wear and decay and damage from the elements excepted)." The lessee vacated the property without filling in holes in the floor left by the removal of bar stools, failed to repaint the interior and exterior, and failed to replace the flooring. The trial court awarded the lessor damages for the cost of replacing the floor, repainting the interior and part of the exterior, replacing a cracked window, and the cost of other miscellaneous supplies. The Fourth District Court of Appeal noted that the lessor proved the damages, but the lessee failed to prove the amount of depreciation due to ordinary wear and tear, and so the final judgment properly did not make any allowance for depreciation in the award.

Whether you represent the landlord, who needs to prove the damages claimed to have occurred since the date the lease began, or the tenant, who needs to prove that those damages were in fact only normal wear and tear, one thing is clear: make sure they have lots of pictures.

ADR

Continued from page 3

From the carrier's standpoint, this ongoing involvement would negate some of the cost savings. Discovery would be exchanged between the competing claimants, depositions taken, CME's scheduled, and, presumably, a court ordered mediation would eventually take place. If all claims are not resolved at mediation, the claims would then proceed to trial. The trial would be held amongst the multiple claimants, with all presenting their claims to the trier of fact and the jury would return its verdict(s) as to the value of each claim. Post verdict, the amount of each claimant's award should be reduced to the prorated share of the relative verdicts in light of the total funds available. From the claimants' standpoint, this process results in an extremely high cost exposure with a limited recovery.

Further analysis and the second option will be discussed in next month's issue!

A Pro Bono Mad Lib …

By Samantha Howell, Pro Bono Director, TRLS

You can ALWAYS sign up for a case, advice/counsel, clinic, community education presentation, or other pro bono engagement by contacting Samantha.howell@trls.org, by calling 352-415-2315, or by filling out our volunteer enrollment form at www.trls.org.

This week, a _____ attorney found themselves with time on their hands. Not sure what to do,
(adjective)

the attorney _____ Three Rivers Legal Services and asked for Samantha Howell,
(verb)

their Pro Bono Director. Samantha was a _____ resource for
(adjective)

_____ who wanted to do pro bono work. While the attorney _____
(plural noun) (adjective)

about doing pro bono work, they were confident about taking cases involving _____ ,
(noun)

_____ , or _____ issues. Furthermore, the attorney knew that,
(noun) (noun)

due to the recent _____ , there was a need for attorneys to help with FEMA
(event)

appeals. The attorney also knew that TRLS would provide _____ ,
(noun)

_____ , and _____ to any attorney taking a pro bono case
(noun) (noun)

through their program. So, _____ putting any _____ away,
(adverb) (plural noun)

putting any _____ away, the attorney signed up for a pro case and
(plural noun)

_____ signed up for the Ask-A-Lawyer Clinic on December 9th, from
(adverb)

10a-12p, at the Civic Media Center in Gainesville.

Immunity From Criminal Prosecution

Continued from page 4

specific facts that show or tend to show that the force used was based on a reasonable belief that such force was necessary.[5]

A law enforcement officer should not initiate custodial detention or make an arrest unless there is a formal determination (agency command with state attorney ratification) that clear and convincing evidence exists that the force threatened or used was not justifiable. Such evidence might be established by contemporaneous video, impartial eyewitness accounts which are consistent and credible, or the subject's volunteered explanation which itself negates the necessary subjective belief, objective reasonableness, imminence or necessity.[6] Forensic evidence will in most cases have to be collected and analyzed before the arrest decision is made. Armed against unarmed and physical disparity of force aren't conclusive. Pre-arrest silence or invocation of the right to counsel should not be weighed as evidence of the lack of justification. Nor should the "failure to render aid" or other extraneous facts gleaned by improperly expanding the temporal or behavioral incident frame.[7] Purely legal analysis might disprove justification, such as an admitted unmet duty to retreat, an unavailing forcible felony deadly force claim, or the application of § 776.041, *Fla. Stat.*

The arrest of a person who is not prosecuted due to a post-arrest state attorney determination or court ruling that the force threatened or used was lawful ought to be administratively expunged by the arresting agency as one made "contrary to law." *See* § 943.0581(4), *Fla. Stat*. When the State does not file, or dismisses a filed information, indictment, or other charging document because of a finding that the person accused acted lawfully pursuant to a pertinent provision of Chapter 776, it should cooperate with the defendant in his or her effort to obtain a self-defense expungement. *See* § 776.09(1), *Fla. Stat*.

President's Message

Continued from page 1

Mid-late October was also spectacular around the circuit as we were fortunate enough to host Florida Supreme Court Justices Labarga and Sasso at two separate events at the 1908 Grand. We have incredible justices on the Florida Supreme Court and hosting them in the Eighth Judicial Circuit is truly an honor. Thank you to each and every member that attended these events.

As many of you already know, as September ended, we mourned the loss of Retired Levy County Judge Tim Browning. I had the honor of appearing before Judge Browning early in my career. His warm smile, calm demeanor from the bench and kind spirit welcomed me into Levy County. He encompassed the charm of Levy County and we will be forever grateful for his impact in our legal community. Services for Judge Browning were held in mid-October. Please continue to hold his wife Georgia, children, colleagues and friends in your thoughts and prayers during this time.

As November launches, I am excited and grateful for the opportunities that are ahead of us. The Amaze-Inn race will be held again this year, the Circuit-wide trauma training will be hosted mid-November, and last, but certainly not least, we will have an opportunity to celebrate gratitude on Thanksgiving. For today, I practice gratitude in thanking each of you for being a part of this circuit and making this the best circuit in the State of Florida. Stay well!

[5] *State v. Moore*, 337 So.3d 876 (Fla. 3d DCA 2022). I believe in most cases a defendant should swear to the allegations in the motion which are peculiarly within his or her personal knowledge. Filing affidavits of others is advisable as well. *Edwards v. State*, 351 So.3d 1142 (Fla. 1st DCA 2022), notes that unsworn allegations lack evidentiary value. The First DCA recently found an unsworn devoid of facts boilerplate immunity motion insufficient to raise a prima facie claim to shift the burden of proof. The issue of sufficiency was not before the Court, which gratuitously declared: "[B]efore the State bears the burden to overcome the immunity claim with evidence, it follows that the defendant seeking self-defense immunity bears the initial burden of presenting evidence at the pretrial immunity hearing sufficient to raise a prima facie claim." A well-reasoned concurring opinion (Lewis, J.) noted the State had accepted the burden of proof in the pretrial hearing. It rejected the majority's application of tipsy coachman to reach a precedential result and questioned the use of the case to resolve an issue "the State overtly sought to avoid on appeal and did not raise in its answer brief, and in doing so, it creates precedent for this Court concerning the initial burden of proof at a self-defense immunity hearing." *Freeman v. State*, No. 1D21-3552 (Fla. 1st DCA, October 4, 2023).

[6] *See, e.g.,* the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office 2019 videotaped interview of Michael Drejka shortly after he killed Markeis McGlockton. I wrote about that case for nonlawyers, **HERE**.

[7] I wrote on proper framing of a deadly force incident in the *January 2022 Forum 8.*

INVITATION TO RENEW / JOIN THE 2023-24 EJCBA

The Eighth Judicial Circuit Bar Association (EJCBA) cordially invites you to either renew your membership or join the EJCBA as a new member.

To join, please visit : www.8jcba.org to pay online or return the below application, along with payment, to the EJCBA at PO Box 140893, Gainesville, FL 32614. The EJCBA is a voluntary association open to any Florida Bar member who lives in or regularly practices in Alachua, Baker, Bradford, Gilchrist, Levy or Union counties.

Remember, only current EJCBA members can access a printable version of the complete member directory, edit their own information online, post photos and a website link, and be listed on results for searches by areas of practice. Additionally, our Forum 8 Newsletter, event invitations, and updates are all sent electronically, so please ensure we have your current email address on file and add execdir@8jcba.org to your email address book and/or safe senders list.

EJCBA Membership Dues:

Free - If, as of July 1, 2023, you are an attorney in your first year licensed to practice law following law school graduation.

$75.00 - If, as of July 1, 2023, you are an attorney licensed to practice law for five (5) years or less following graduation from law school; or

- If, as of July 1, 2023, you are a public service attorney licensed to practice law for less than ten (10) years following graduation from law school. A "public service attorney" is defined as an attorney employed as an Assistant State Attorney, or an Assistant Public Defender, or a full-time staff attorney with a legal aid or community legal services organization; or
- you are a Retired Member of the Florida Bar pursuant to Florida Bar Rule 1-3.5 (or any successor Rule), who resides within the Eighth Judicial Circuit.

$100.00 - All other attorneys and judiciary.

** **In addition to your EJCBA dues above** **
Optional – $35.00 – EJCBA Young Lawyers Division Membership is available to all lawyers who are young, who are young at heart, or who wish to provide mentorship to those that are. You must be a member of the EJCBA, as well.

* EJCBA voting membership is limited to Florida Bar members in good standing who reside or regularly practice law within the Eighth Judicial Circuit of Florida. EJCBA non-voting membership is limited to active and inactive members in good standing of the bar of any state or country who resides in the Eighth Judicial Circuit of Florida, and to UF College of Law faculty.

EJCBA Renewal/Application for Membership

Membership Year: 2023 - 2024

Check one: Renewal __ New Membership __

First Name: _____ MI:_____

Last Name:_____

Firm Name: _____

Title: _____

Street Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

Eighth Judicial Circuit Bar Association, Inc.

Telephone No: (_____)_____-_____

Fax No: (_____)_____-_____

Email Address: _____

Bar Number:_____

List two (2) Areas of Practice:

_____

_____

Number of years in practice: _____

Are you interested in working on an EJCBA

Committee? ___Yes ___No

Cedar Key 2023

Chief Judge Mark Moseley leads the crowd in a moment of silence in memory of Levy County Retired Judge Tim Browning, who passed away in September.

Attorneys Eric and Brent Siegel enjoying the dinner at Steamers

From L to R: Stephanie Mack, Natasha Scheer, Steve Miller, EJCBA President Monica Perez-McMillen, and Jennifer Curcio.

EJCBA Board Members Robert Folsom (Past President), Jan Bendik, George Nelson, and Sharon Sperling (Treasurer).

EJCBA Board Member Mac McCarty with attorney Cole Barnett and The Fund representatives Rebecca Wood and Rachel Vanderzee.

Become a Safe Place

Please consider becoming a Safe Place location. All your office will need to do is complete a few questions and a training. If a runaway youth or a child feels endangered, they can easily spot the sign at your door and seek safety. Your role is to make them comfortable, give us a call, and we will take it from there. You will be doing a true service with a recognized national program and at no cost to your organization.

For information, please contact Phil Kabler of CDS Family & Behavioral Services, Inc. at philip_kabler@cdsfl.org or by telephone at (352) 244-0628, extension 3824.

November 2023 Calendar

1 EJCBA Board of Directors Meeting via ZOOM, 5:30 p.m.
2 Amaze-Inn Race
4 UF Football v. Arkansas, TBA
6 Deadline for submission to December Forum 8
8 Probate Section Meeting, 4:30 p.m. via ZOOM
10 Veteran's Day (observed) – County & Federal Courthouses closed
11 UF Football at LSU, TBA
17 Circuit-Wide Trauma Training
18 UF Football at Missouri, TBA
23 Thanksgiving Day – County & Federal Courthouses closed
24 Friday after Thanksgiving Holiday – County Courthouses closed
25 UF Football v. FSU, TBA
30 Construction Law CLE: Plans for Attorneys with Brice Miller of Miller Building Group, 3-5 pm, location TBD

December 2023 Calendar

2 SEC Football Championship, Atlanta, GA – 4:00 p.m.
5 Deadline for submission to January Forum 8
6 EJCBA Board of Directors Meeting via ZOOM, 5:30 p.m.
13 Probate Section Meeting, 4:30 p.m. via ZOOM
14 EJCBA Holiday Party (Tentative); TBD
25 Christmas Day, County & Federal Courthouses closed

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.