

FORUM 8

Volume 83, No. 2

Eighth Judicial Circuit Bar Association, Inc.

October 2023

President's Message

By Monica Perez-McMillen



Happy Fall 8th Bar!

The early risers were able to catch glimpses of fall throughout September with morning temperatures teetering into the low 70's and high 60's. Though I enjoy summer, I know that I am not the only attorney bidding temperatures of 100° adieu, especially for those of us that still wear suits to work. The fall season is one of change. The leaves, temperature drops, school routines, and the flavors of the season (hello pumpkin bread and pumpkin spice latte's). Fall festivals, football (in all kinds of weather, Go Gators!), and the return of our Eighth Bar community.

We enjoyed gathering for our first bar luncheon and hearing from Coach Kevin O'Sullivan, the Florida Gators Head Baseball Coach. His teams have persevered during challenging times between a pandemic and the challenges faced by college sports after name image and likeness deals have been inked.

The end of August and September were busy months. Hurricane Idalia brought devastation to Levy, Gilchrist and our circuit neighbors, Dixie and Suwannee counties. At the time that I pen this letter to you, we know that our annual Cedar Key event will carry forward and that our legal community is still waiting to find ways to help the folks in Levy and Gilchrist counties that will inevitably need our small voluntary bar association to step forward and serve those in need of legal services.

I'd like to encourage each and every one of you to sign up and attend our Cedar Key festivities on October 5th (even if your sign up is late). Some of you may wonder if our annual Cedar Key dinner should be postponed or relocated. I can assure you that every dollar that we spend in Cedar Key this year will be greatly appreciated by the employees and businesses that have

had to close their doors for any number of days as they recovered from the impact of this storm. I have heard many stories from lawyers, businesses, and individuals in Cedar Key whose properties were flooded by the storm. When I've asked them how we can help, they've all stated, "please don't stop visiting Cedar Key, we need you here." Our very own board member, Norm Fugate impressed upon me how imperative it is that we press forward with the Cedar Key dinner so that we can assist the local economy and those that have called Cedar Key home for years. I fully support him and plan to be there to enjoy convening with each of you.

October will bring many interesting events to our circuit. On October 19th, Florida Supreme Court Justice Jorge Labarga will be in town for an event at 1908 Grand. Justice Labarga was the first Cuban American to lead our state judicial branch by serving as the chief justice for two terms.

We are also excited to host Florida Supreme Court Justice Meredith Sasso on October 27th during our October luncheon. Please consider RSVP'ing to this event and getting to hear from the newest member of the Florida Supreme Court; she's also of Cuban descent.

While November is also slated to be an exciting month, I want to call your attention to an issue that our circuit and the state faces. It is important that each of you is aware of the Judicial Circuit Assessment Committee, which has been charged by the Florida Supreme Court to assess whether the number of judicial circuits in our state should be reduced, and have an opportunity to be heard on this matter if you so choose. You should have already received a survey to complete online requesting your input. Additionally, meetings of the Committee are public and available via Zoom.

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

Robert E. Folsom
Past President

220 S. Main Street
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 374-3634

folsomr@circuit8.org

Dominique Lochridge-Gonzales
Secretary

1000 NE 16th Ave, Bldg. I
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 415-2324

dominique.lochridge-gonzales@trls.org

Mikel Bradley
President-Elect

1000 NE 16th Ave, Bldg. I
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 415-2304

mikel.bradley@trls.org

Peg O'Connor

President-Elect Designate
102 NW 2nd Avenue
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 372-4263

peg@toklegal.com

Sharon T. Sperling
Treasurer

PO Box 358000
Gainesville, FL 32635
(352) 371-3117

sharon@sharonsperling.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.

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

mccain@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

ramirez@c@sao8.org

Dawn M. Vallejos-Nichols - Editor

2814 SW 13th Street
Gainesville, FL 32608
(352) 372-9999

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



Mediation Fear - Leaving Money on the Table

Towards the end of nearly every mediation, there comes a time for the plaintiff to weigh the benefits of resolution and risks of proceeding toward trial. I frequently talk to the plaintiff about the old expression of “a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush.” Fortunately, this is still an expression most mediation participants are familiar with and oddly enough, for a certain generation, there is a parallel with when to begin taking social security benefits. Why? Because that decision is a combination of several factors, but the psychological make-up of the person is one very big component to the equation. Likewise, the psychological make-up of the plaintiff should be considered by their attorney, the mediator, as well as defense counsel, if possible.

MarketWatch recently published a story titled “Will you claim Social Security early or hold out as long as possible?” The article deciphered the results of a recent study attempting to solve the “Social Security claiming puzzle.” While most financial planners recommend waiting as long as possible, 58% of retirees who do not claim their benefits at their full retirement age elect to receive their benefits early, albeit at a lower figure. The purpose of the study was to analyze why so many people choose early benefits when this may result in a lower overall payout in Social Security benefits.

There are obvious reasons why someone may elect early benefits, such as being in poor health or when family history suggests a shorter than average life expectancy. But, on average, electing benefits early reduces the lifetime value of benefits by \$182,370.00. While this may be viewed as “leaving money on the

table,” there are two psychological traits that come into play: 1) our sense of ‘psychological ownership’ of the Social Security benefits we are slated to receive; and 2) how much we fear losses. The first trait is the sense that something is “mine.” This is clearly a trait that exists in a plaintiff’s view of their case and expected ‘payout.’ Having been involved in an accident with resulting injuries, plaintiffs believe they have ‘earned’ a monetary ‘win.’ In the survey, respondents who strongly identify a sense of ownership to their Social Security benefits are more likely to be early claimers of this benefit. Why? Because a fear of losing something you identify as ‘yours’ - if you do not live to your full life expectancy - causes you to feel an acute sense of loss over the prospect of not getting all that you are otherwise entitled to. The loss aversion idea refers to our tendency to fear losses more than we desire gains. Thus, the bird in the hand analogy. A known and guaranteed result is **only** possible at mediation.

During the course of the mediation negotiations, it is wise to consider the psychological make-up of the plaintiff - by their own counsel, by the mediator as well as defense counsel, to the extent it is possible for the latter with far less contact and exposure to the plaintiff. Uniformly, attorneys confirm they cannot guarantee any particular outcome if a case proceeds to trial. But for a plaintiff, making an important decision about claim settlement may very well come down to their psychological sense of ownership over the proceeds of their claim and whether they are willing to risk what they believe is “theirs,” even if it is less than what they could obtain with a favorable verdict.

And for those of you who are trying to figure out your own “when to claim puzzle,” the following matrix may be of help.

Age when begins receiving Social Security	Total lifetime Social Security benefits if recipient dies at...		
	70	81	90
62	\$ 116,879	\$ 277,587	\$ 409,076
67	\$ 64,400	\$ 300,534	\$ 493,734
70	\$ -	\$ 297,460	\$ 540,837

Defense of Another, Citizen's Arrest, Escape, and Self-Defense: *Raulerson v. State* (Part 1)

By Steven M. Harris



[*State of Florida v. Roger Dale Raulerson*](#) (Baker County No. 02-2020-CF-000206) involves deadly force used in self-defense and to prevent escape from citizen's arrest arising from what began as the defense of another. *Raulerson* went to the First DCA pretrial on petition for writ of prohibition after the trial court's denial of § 776.032, *Fla. Stat.*, immunity. There was oral

argument February 22, 2023, the video is [HERE](#). I wrote this Part 1 before the First DCA issued its opinion in [*Raulerson v. State, Case No. 1D 2022-2798*](#). I will examine the DCA opinion in Part 2.^[1]

Raulerson is charged by amended information with five felonies arising from his intervention in a violent domestic (husband-on-wife) battery and breach of the peace. Prior to amendment of the information (which added armed trespass), *Raulerson* sought pretrial immunity on three charges — shooting into a vehicle, criminal mischief, and aggravated battery.^[2]

Raulerson testified in his evidentiary hearing that he came armed to the defense of a neighbor who was being viciously choked, and made a citizen's arrest of the assailant to await the arrival of inbound law enforcement. Much of what *Raulerson* asserted about his intervention and citizen's arrest was confirmed by eyewitness testimony. The victim unlawfully sought to hinder *Raulerson*'s citizen's arrest of her assailant. The assailant resisted and attempted to flee by vehicle. *Raulerson* discharged his firearm into the driver's door of the vehicle, wounding the escapee. *Raulerson* asserted he believed the vehicle was about to strike him and that he shot while jumping out of the way. The State's expert testified *Raulerson* was not in front of the vehicle when the shots were taken, that the vehicle had passed, and was thus moving away. Defense expert testimony was not significantly inconsistent.

The trial court filed a lengthy order, finding that both a felony and breach of the peace were occurring, that *Raulerson* initially put the assailant at gunpoint to effect a citizen's arrest, and that law enforcement was enroute with expected arrival in 12 minutes. The court described the testimony of the escaping assailant as "incredible" and the testimony of the victim in part "not credible."

The court ruled *Raulerson* satisfied the *prima facie* claim requirement for self-defense immunity under § 776.032(4), *Fla. Stat.*, but the State carried its clear and convincing evidence burden to prove he was not entitled to immunity — because *Raulerson*'s use of deadly force

was not reasonable.^[3] It rejected the necessity for the use of deadly force to prevent escape by suggesting alternatives to shooting into the cabin of an occupied vehicle.^[4]

Continued on page 7

[1] I wrote on common law "citizen's arrest" in the [October 2020](#) issue of *Forum 8*. I wrote on the defense of others in the [October 2022](#) issue, where I noted First DCA Judge Winokur's observation that imposing the duty to retreat on someone who comes to the aid of another was problematic and would "gut a defense-of-another claim." See *Fletcher v. State*, 273 So.3d 1187 (Fla. 1st DCA 2019). Deadly force defense of another under § 776.012(2), *Fla. Stat.*, whether to protect against imminent death or great bodily harm or to prevent the commission of a forcible felony, is based on the reasonable belief of the defender, not the intended victim's innocence or justification to threaten or use force in their own defense. The Chapter 776 reasonable belief foundation has displaced the now ancient alter ego doctrine. See *Grant v. State*, 266 So.3d 203 (Fla. 4th DCA 2019).

[2] *Raulerson* is also charged with aggravated assault as to the victim he sought to defend. The criminal mischief and armed trespass charges seem dubious. However, statutory self-defense immunity would not appear to be available for such charges.

[3] The holding of *Nelson By & Through Bowens v. Howell*, 455 So.2d 608 (Fla. 2d DCA 1984), cited by the court for the proposition that force used to thwart escape from a citizen's arrest must be reasonable, is actually that a citizen "may use such force in preventing the escape as is necessary, or as appears to him in the exercise of reasonable discretion to be necessary, even to the extent of taking life."

[4] *Raulerson* knew the escapee's identity, that he was unarmed, and the description of the vehicle he was driving. The court offered that *Raulerson* could have followed in his own vehicle and updated law enforcement real-time with location information. The court also noted *Raulerson* could have shot at the tires or engine to disable the vehicle, suggesting it was not per se unreasonable to discharge a firearm at the fleeing vehicle. Of course, firearm discharge in the direction of the escapee, wherever aimed, would be the use of deadly force. Justified deadly force is not rendered legally unjustified because alternative means to employ it existed, because arrest, pursuit, or apprehension (after escape) can be delayed or abandoned, or because lesser force might have produced a successful result.

Just How Binding is “Binding Arbitration”?

By Krista L.B Collins



Those of us who practice in civil litigation know that a so-called final order or final judgment isn't always final. There are motions for rehearing, motions for new trial, and, of course, appeals. A bad-for-your-client result at the trial level doesn't always mean that the case is over; in fact, there could still be years of litigation *after* the entry of a “final” judgment. But what about the decision of an arbitrator? If the parties' contract provides for binding arbitration, does that mean the arbitrator's decision really is binding, or can an unhappy party appeal to the courts? Just how binding is “binding arbitration”?

Generally, the answer to that question is “very.” “[A] court is not empowered to set aside arbitration awards for mere errors of judgment as to law or facts, or because of equitable principles.” *Dasso v. Fernandez*, 831 So.2d 714, 716 (Fla. 3d DCA 2002). Quite simply, arbitration decisions are to be given a “high degree of conclusiveness” and “may not be vacated on the ground that arbitrator made an error of law.” *Computer Task Group, Inc. v. Palm Beach County*, 782 So.2d 942, 943 (Fla. 4th DCA 2001) (citing *Schnurmacher Holding, Inc. v. Noriega*, 542 So.2d 1327, 1328-9 (Fla. 1989)). Furthermore, “the arbitrator is the sole judge of the facts and the weight to be given the evidence.” *Id.* The limited review of an arbitrator's decision “is necessary to ‘avoid a “judicialization” of the arbitration process,’ and ‘to prevent arbitration from becoming merely an added preliminary step to judicial resolution rather than a true alternative.’” *Marr v. Webb*, 930 So.2d 734, 737 (Fla. 3d DCA 2006) (quoting *Charbonneau v. Morse Operations, Inc.*, 727 So.2d 1017, 1019 (Fla. 4th DCA 1999)).

In light of the Florida courts' strong language regarding arbitration, when can a court vacate an arbitration award? Section 682.13(1), *Fla. Stat.*, provides that, upon motion of a party to an arbitration proceeding, the court shall vacate an arbitration award if:

- a) The award was procured by corruption, fraud, or other undue means;
- b) There was:
 1. Evident partiality by an arbitrator appointed as a neutral arbitrator;
 2. Corruption by an arbitrator; or
 3. Misconduct by an arbitrator prejudicing the rights of a party to the arbitration proceeding;
- c) An arbitrator refused to postpone the hearing upon showing of sufficient cause for postponement, refused to hear evidence material to the controversy, or otherwise conducted the hearing contrary to s. 682.06, so as to prejudice

substantially the rights of a party to the arbitration proceeding;

- d) An arbitrator exceeded the arbitrator's powers;
- e) There was no agreement to arbitrate, unless the person participated in the arbitration proceeding without raising the objection under s. 682.06(3) not later than the beginning of the arbitration hearing; or
- f) The arbitration was conducted without proper notice of the initiation of an arbitration as required in s. 682.032 so as to prejudice substantially the rights of a party to the arbitration proceeding.

In the absence of the factors set forth in §682.13, *Fla. Stat.*, neither the trial court nor an appellate court has the authority to overturn an arbitration award. *Marr* at 737. Meeting the factors set forth in §682.13 is no easy task. For instance, to overturn an arbitrator's decision based on fraud, a party must: (1) establish the fraud by clear and convincing evidence; (2) show the fraud was not discoverable by the exercise of due diligence before or during the arbitration hearing; and (3) show the fraud materially related to an issue in the arbitration. *Regalado v. Cabezas*, 959 So.2d 282, 285-86 (Fla. 3d DCA 2007). The *Regalado* Court went on to state that “a claim of fraud when seeking to vacate an award pursuant to section 682.13(1)(a) is ‘not an opportunity to obtain a second bite of the apple to correct a party's deficiencies of proof at an arbitration.’” *Id.* (quoting *Davenport v. Dimitrijevic*, 857 So.2d 957, 962 (Fla. 4th DCA 2003)).

A party who seeks to show that the arbitrator exceeded the scope of her powers must show that the arbitrator went beyond the authority granted by the parties or the operative documents and decided an issue not pertinent to the resolution of the issue(s) actually submitted to arbitration. *Regalado* at 287. Importantly, it has long been established that “the fact that the relief granted is such that it could not or would not be granted by a court of law or equity is not a ground for vacating or modifying the award.” *Prudential-Bache Sec., Inc. v. Shuman*, 483 So. 2d 888, 889 (Fla. 3d DCA 1986).

Florida courts have made it clear that binding arbitration is not a speed bump on the road to future litigation, but is, in fact, binding. Parties should understand that when they put an arbitration provision in their contracts, they may get to a final decision faster but if it is a decision they do not like, there may not be much they can do about it.

TRLS: Volunteers Needed Now More than Ever

By Samantha Howell, Pro Bono Director, TRLS



Every person can make a difference, and every person should try.

John F. Kennedy

As you know, parts of Florida were recently hit hard by Hurricane Idalia. While the storm was not as deadly or damaging as it could have been, there is no doubt that residents will be recovering for months - if not years.

It is frequently following a disaster that programs like ours see the amazing heart of the legal community. Attorneys, law students, and paralegals reach out en masse to offer pro bono support to those affected by the disaster. Through insurance claims and FEMA claims, housing repairs, loss of property and jobs, and other impacts, our clients will face a host of challenges in the upcoming weeks and months.

The most emergent needs are helping clients in appealing insurance claim denials and filing FEMA appeals. If you have never done this work, know that the FEMA appeal process is a pretty straightforward process and one that you can learn! Not only is the application and relevant information readily available online, there are a host of trainings and resource materials available online.

If you would be interested in learning more about FEMA appeals and/or are interested in volunteering with insurance claim denials, please let me know and I will get you on a list of volunteers. We expect claims to start coming in around the end of October/early November.

If, however, this is not up your alley, please consider volunteering with Three Rivers in another way. A description of available opportunities follows:

Telephonic Housing Clinic - Advice-only clinic offered on Tuesdays from 5 pm - 6:30 pm. Issues typically involve security deposit returns, evictions, and repairs.

Pro Se Divorce Clinics - Offered quarterly in Gainesville, these sessions involve advising clients in completing pro se divorce forms (specifically, the petition, financial affidavit, and UCCJEA). Our next clinic day is December 19, with a session at 9am and another at 2pm. Attorneys can stay for as little as one hour (or up to 3).

Ask-A-Lawyer - These "pop-up" clinics are hosted at local shelters including Grace Marketplace, St. Francis House, Peaceful Paths, and the VA Honor Center. Volunteers will meet with individuals in need of legal assistance, and provide advice/counsel and, perhaps,

even a brief service. These clinics are held one Saturday a month, typically between 10 am -12 pm.

Law in the Library - These are community outreach events, where a volunteer presents on a legal topic for about 40 minutes and then answers a few questions. The clinics will be recorded/presented via zoom, with the recording posted to social media and the library website.

Advice and Counsel/Brief Services/Full Representation

1. Alachua County (23-0348464) - Client is an elderly, unemployed, homeless veteran who would like to file for bankruptcy. The client defaulted on a prior consolidation plan and has about \$15k in debt.
2. Alachua County (23-0351593) - Elderly client in need of a will.
3. Alachua County (23-0348309) - Elderly client in need of chapter 7 bankruptcy, to address about \$30k in debt, and is interested in removing a garnishment (client's income is exempt).

If you would like to take on any of the above, please contact me and include the identification number (XX-XXXXXX).

Your decision to volunteer is an important one. Not only can you help the community, you can learn new skills and areas of the law that can increase your business. In addition to training materials and mentorship, Three Rivers Legal Services provides liability coverage, recognition for service, and reimbursement for litigation costs. *We will make every effort to ensure you have a positive experience volunteering with TRLS.*

If you have any questions or would like to participate in any of the above, please contact me at samantha.howell@trls.org or 352-415-2315. You can also select an available case and learn more about TRLS's Pro Bono Legal Assistance Program (PBLAP) at <https://www.trls.org/volunteer/>.



Raulerson v. State

Continued from page 4

The court also denied pretrial immunity for Raulerson's asserted defense of himself, challenging both Raulerson's *subjective* belief of imminent deadly force harm,^[5] and the *objective* reasonableness of his discharge of a firearm since he was not actually at the front of the vehicle when he shot at it.^[6]

The trial court did not make distinct analysis of Raulerson's actions and the availability of self-defense immunity on each charge. Nor did it consider § 776.07(1), *Fla. Stat.*, which authorizes a nonsword to use force to prevent escape from arrest. That statute's language is comparable to the citizen's arrest caselaw, authorizing *any force* reasonably believed to be necessary to prevent escape, without the usual Chapter 776 demarcations of non-deadly and deadly force.^[7] Also, of note — the trial court made no analysis of the righteous location and behavior deadly force prerequisites under § 776.012(2), *Fla. Stat.* I suspect the First DCA opinion will include discussion of those points.

^[5] The order states Raulerson approached the vehicle "ready to shoot" and that his "level of focus and precision in that moment is not consistent with someone who is in fear of great bodily harm or his life." A force user's calm demeanor or determination, focus, or skill at arms should not be taken to suggest a lack of subjective belief in the necessity to use defensive force, and certainly not its reasonableness. Premeditation and deliberation do not preclude a finding that a person believed he needed to act in self-defense. Indeed, they may suggest the person has evaluated any alternatives and the deadly force prerequisites of imminence and necessity. See, e.g., the concurring opinion of Liu, J., in *People v. Schuller*, an August 2023 decision of the California Supreme Court. Another consideration is that 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).

^[6] As confirmation Raulerson could not have reasonably believed the vehicle was actually accelerating toward him the court noted that others present near the front of the vehicle did not jump out of the way fearing they might be hit.

^[7] See *Forum 8, February 2022*. That statute and the caselaw arguably made Raulerson's shooting justifiable since the State did not prove the citizen's arrest was unlawful. However, force justified to prevent escape from citizen's arrest, whether under the common law or under § 776.07(1), *Fla. Stat.*, does not invoke § 776.032, *Fla. Stat.*, since "self-defense immunity" is available only to threatening or using force which is alleged to be justifiable under § 776.012, §, 776.013, or § 776.031, *Fla. Stat.*

President's Message

Continued from page 1

You can find more information regarding the purpose of the committee, meeting agendas and minutes, as well as the meeting calendar and zoom connections at <https://www.flcourts.gov/Administration-Funding/Court-Councils-Commissions-and-Committees/Judicial-Circuit-Assessment-Committee>. When our board convened for its annual retreat, many of those on the board felt it was important to learn and discuss what this proposed circuit re-alignment could mean for each and every one of us. A final recommendation will be due to Chief Justice Carlos Muniz by December 1, 2024, thus time is of the essence if you want your voice to be heard.

I sincerely hope that each and every one of you has a wonderful October and enjoys the crisp air in the mornings and evenings.



Members of your new EJBCA Board of Directors at the August retreat, from L to R: Robert Folsom, Mikel Bradley, Dawn Vallejos-Nichols, Sharon Sperling, Peg O'Connor, Cherie Fine, Monica Perez-McMillen, Mac McCarty, and Ray Brady.



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

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@cdfsfl.org or by telephone at (352) 244-0628, extension 3824.



October 2023 Calendar

- 4 EJCBA Board of Directors Meeting via Zoom, 5:30 p.m.
- 5 Deadline for submission to November Forum 8
- 5 Annual James C. Adkins, Jr. Cedar Key Dinner, sunset at Steamers
- 7 UF Football v. Vanderbilt (Homecoming), TBA
- 9 Columbus Day – Federal Courthouse closed
- 11 Probate Section Meeting, 4:30 p.m. via ZOOM
- 12 Three Rivers Legal Services 45th Anniversary & Pro Bono Recognition Dinner, 5:30 p.m., Best Western Gateway Grand
- 14 UF Football at South Carolina, TBA
- 19 Adkins Inn of Court/EJCBA event with Justice Labarga at 1908 Grand, TBD
- 27 EJCBA Luncheon, Florida Supreme Court Justice Meredith Sasso, 11:45 a.m., location TBD
- 28 UF Football v. Georgia, Jacksonville, FL, 3:30 p.m.

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