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2014 NEW PBCJA BOARD MEMBERS

PRESIDENT
Freddy Rhoads - Rhoads Law Group

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT
Scott Smith - Lytal, Reiter, Smith, Ivey & Fronrath

PRESIDENT-ELECT
Greg Zele - Zele Huber Trial Attorneys, P.A.

TREASURER
Farah F. Mullen - Steinger Iscoe & Greene

SECRETARY
Gregory Yaffa - Slawson Cunningham Whalen & Gaspari

BOARD MEMBERS
Sean Domnick - Domnick & Shevin, PL
Dena Foman - McLaughlin & Stern
Adriana Gonzalez - Gonzalez & Cartwright
Andrew Harris - Burlington & Rockenbach, P.A.
John McGovern - Custer - McGovern
Tim Murphy - Clark, Fountain, La Vista, Prather, Keen & Littky-Rubin
Cynthia Simpson - Law Offices of Aronberg & Aronberg
Pat Tighe - X1 Law
DJ Ward - Searcy Denney Scarola Barnhart & Shipley
Neil Anthony - Steinger Iscoe & Greene

PARALEGAL REPRESENTATIVE
Rosanna Schachtele - Lytal, Reiter, Smith, Ivey & Fronrath

YOUNG LAWYER APPOINTEE
Michael Beck - Gary Roberts & Associates, P.A.
2014 Election

Past PBCJA President Rafael Roca and Immediate Past President Scott Smith

Jonathan Phillips with Mickey Smith

Board Member John McGovern, Past PBCJA President Fred Cunningham, and Samantha Schosberg Peuer

Past President Rafael Roca and Laz Becerra

Board Member Pat Tighe, Secretary Greg Yaffa, and Vinny Cuomo with Grand Bank

PBCJA President Freddy Rhoads with Judge Jeffrey Colbath

Judge Jeffrey Colbath with Jene Williams-Rhoads, Past PBCJA President Fred Cunningham, and Samantha Schosberg Peuer

PBCJA President Freddy Rhoads with Judge Jeffrey Colbath

Judge Jeffrey Colbath with Jene Williams-Rhoads, PBCJA President Freddy Rhoads and Board Member Tim Murphy
As we enter into our 26th year for the Palm Beach County Justice Association, I am proud and honored to be your next President. I would like to personally thank Scott Smith for guiding us through our 25th anniversary year as President and the great event we had at Old Marsh Country Club celebrating this milestone. We also had a fantastic evening at the election dinner this past January. We were privileged to have our very own Palm Beach County Chief Judge Jeffrey Colbath perform the swearing in of the new board. We had not only a great turnout but a hotly contested board election. It is always exciting for our organization’s future to see such enthusiasm and interest for serving on the Board. Saying that, we now have the largest Palm Beach County Justice Association Board in its 26 year history. This includes our brand new Young Lawyers Representative position.

This year will also be a very significant year politically as the race for Governor takes place on November 4, 2014. This race is very important to all Floridians because the next Governor will be in a position to elect potentially several Florida Supreme Court Justices along with many other local trial judges. However, our judiciary continues to remain under attack by those that wish to make it political by seeking to oust those that they feel do not rule in favor of their political position. I hope that all of our members take the time to educate our family, friends and clients about the importance of having an independent judiciary. We continue to work with our underfunded judiciary in hopes of alleviating the burdens placed upon them. In fact, some of our members are part of a committee to meet and discuss with some of our judiciary about a possible proposal to amend our local rule and/or administrative order that imposes the duty for counsel to confer before bringing a motion or having it heard.

As always, we have a lot going on in the next upcoming year. Palm Beach County Justice Association is adding more events to the calendar including our first ever High Roller Event to be held at the Croquet Center on April 26th. It should be a fun time and I hope everyone can join us in this hopefully annual event. Also, please take time to check out our new website for all the 2014 year events. I look forward to the upcoming year and I hope to see most of you at some of our events.

May You Have A Healthy And Prosperous 2014

“The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and controversy.”

Martin Luther King Jr.
So...you're saying you've never seen her before in your life?

A strong argument for a Video Deposition.

Capture their attention and capture a verdict with demonstrative aids.

VIDEO DEPOSITIONS
MEDIATION & TRIAL PRESENTATIONS
ANIMATION & RENDERING
COURTROOM SUPPORT
FULL COPY SHOP SERVICES
LATEST TECHNOLOGY
EXCELLENT CUSTOMER SERVICE

We provide a great value for every dollar you spend.

Palm Beach, Florida | 561.655.0678 | legalgraphicworks.com

Calendar of Events

**APRIL**

26

1st Annual High Roller Event
National Croquet Center
6:00 p.m. - 10:00 p.m.

**MAY**

29

Dinner Reception
Bear Lakes Country Club
5:30 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.

**AUGUST**

28

Barrister’s Bash
Blue Martini City Place
5:30 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.

Go to [www.pbcja.org](http://www.pbcja.org) and click the EVENTS icon to register for any of these events.
Advocate Members & Attorney Advocates

The following advocate members are loyal supporters of the Palm Beach County Justice Association. Some have been with us from the very beginning and some are brand new this year, so please take a moment to review our growing list of notable advocates. As you know they are the cornerstone of the PBCJA. The wide range of educational and networking events offered to the members wouldn’t be possible without their financial support. Please join us in thanking our old and new Advocate Members for their support.

Founding & Black Diamond

Sabadell United Bank, N. A.
Contact: Donn Londeree
Phone 561.750.0075 or 561.688.9400
www.sabadellbank.com

Platinum Members

Above & Beyond Reprographics
Contact Chris Shelby
Phone: 561.478.4774
css@aboveandbeyondrepro.com

Rock Legal Services & Investigations, Inc.
Contact: Denise Rock
Phone: 561.296.7574
denise@rocklegal.com
www.rocklegal.com

Visual Evidence
Contact: Mike Downey
Phone: 561.655.2855
mdowney@visualevidence.org
www.visualevidence.org

Gold Members

Grand Bank & Trust
Contact: Vinny Cuomo
Phone: 561.615.5065
vcuomo@gbof.com
www.grandbankflorida.com

Robson Forensic
Contact: Ronald P. Bertone
Phone: 800.631.6605/561.839.1915
rbertone@robsonforensic.com
www.robsonforensic.com

The Centers
Contacts: Jerry Greger & Todd Belisle
Phone: 877.766.5331
ggreger@centersmail.com
todd.belisle@centersmail.com
www.centersweb.com

Veritext
Contact: Britt Sanford
Phone: (561) 512-7706
bsanford@veritext.com
www.veritext.com

Park Creek and Delray Beach Surgery Centers
Contacts: Saul R. Epstein or Richard Famiglietti
Phone: ParkCreek: 954.312.3500
Delray Beach: 561.495.6766
sepstein@ParkCreekSurgery.com or rfamiglietti@ParkCreekSurgery.com
www.ParkCreekSurgery.com

Silver Members

BEC Consulting, LLC
Contact: Iola J. Goekte
Phone: 850.558.3104
igoekte@becserv.com
www.becconsult.com

Global Engineering & Scientific Solutions
Contact: Jennifer Lovelady
Phone: 850.942.5300
info@gess1.com
www.gess1.com

Signature Court Reporting
Contact: Dawn Ramos Bachinski, RPR, CRR, FPR
Phone: 561.659.2120
dawn@signaturecrs.com
www.SignatureCRS.com

Synergy Settlement Services
Contact: B. Josh Pettingill, MBA, MS, MSCC
Phone: 561.685.7035 (direct)
josh@synergysettlements.com
www.synergysettlements.com

UBS Financial
Contact: Christian D. Searcy Jr.
Phone: 561.776.2546
christian.searcy@ubs.com
www.ubs.com

Upchurch Watson White & Max Mediation Group
Contact: Chuck Mancuso
Phone: 561.704.9246
cmancuso@uwuad.com
www.uwuad.com

U.S. Legal Support
Contact: Lana Shrode
Phone: 561.835.0220
lshrode@uslegalsupport.com
www.uslegalsupport.com

Specialty Attorneys

Warren Brams
Contact: Warren Brams
Phone: 561.478.4848
wbrams@aol.com
Specialty: Probate & Estate
www.familylawwestpalmbeach.com

Rosenthal, Levy, Simon & Ryles
Contact: Jonathan Levy
Phone: 561.478.2500
jlevy@rosenthallevy.com
Specialty: Social Security Disability
www.rosenthallevy.com

Tama Beth Kudman, P.A.
Contact: Tama Kudman
Phone: 561.472.0811
tama@tkudmanlaw.com
Specialty: Criminal Defense
www.tkudmanlaw.com

Visit us online at www.pbcja.org
If you’re not a member of the PBCJA - you’re not doing yourself JUSTICE.

Membership benefits include:
- Access to our exclusive e-mail discussion group – Trial Talk
- Access to our Litigation Bank loaded with Trial Transcripts, Depositions, Motions, Rulings, Orders, and the latest information on local CME’s
- CLE credits through our local Attorney and Paralegal Seminars
- Complimentary advertising on Lawyer Legion our new membership attorney directory. Our site will link directly to your profile, firm information, photo, and other information.
- A busy calendar of networking and social events where you can catch up with your colleagues
- Quarterly mailings of our Newsletter Briefings, keeping you informed on all the latest happenings
- Signature Events like our Barrister’s Bash, Marquee Golf Tournament, and introducing our very first “High Roller Night”, set to debut on April 26, 2014

For more information on how to join visit our website www.pbcja.org or call Executive Director Kate Baloga at 561.790.5833.
Filial Consortium - Is There Value to the Loss of Relationship to an Injured Child?

By: Dena Sisk Foman, Esquire Partner McLAUGHLIN & STERN, LLP

One would think that a parent’s loss of companionship and services of a child would be one of the most valuable components of a claim for injury to a child. Most parents would proudly say that they value the relationship with their children above any other relationship in their lives. Some would likely tell you that their children mean more to them than anyone on the planet, including their spouse. If a child is injured and the relationship between the child and parent is altered or diminished, it seems there should be a value to that loss similar to the loss of consortium that is recognized for spouses. However, the law only recognizes consortium claims made by the parents for the loss companionship and society to their injured children in very narrow situations.

While much of the tort law has evolved as society has evolved, filial consortium is an area that is surprisingly antiquated. The Florida case law before the landmark 1994 decision, United States of America v. Loren Dempsey,[1] recognized a parent’s entitlement to compensation for the loss of services and earnings of his negligently injury child. [2] The same theory that applied to a master’s loss of services of his apprentice applied to the parent’s loss of services from his child. [3] The law dates back to the beginning of the 20th century and assumes that children were born to parents to provide an economic purpose and if they were not producing monetary value, they had no value. The law was written at a time when parents had children with the idea that they would work and bring income into the family. The more children a family had, the more their earning potential was. When the Dempsey case was argued, almost 100 years after the McGarr decision, in the early 1990s the law was the outdated economic value analysis. Over time the value of the child’s companionship became more recognized and accepted in society. Child labor laws were enacted and the value of the child/parent relationship developed something more than a business proposition. The Dempsey, court went to great length to discuss public policy and recognized that a change in social and economic customs warranted a departure from the law as justification for allowing recovery to the Dempseys. However, Dempsey stopped short of recognizing the right to all parents to recover for the injuries to their children. [4] The Dempsey child was severely handicapped as a result of oxygen deprivation at birth. It appeared the child would never walk and talk and required care for the rest of her life.

The 1994 Dempsey felt they were expanding the law and keeping pace with society in much the same way that they did when the contributory negligence law was replaced with the comparative negligence law. However, one of the major differences is that the change from contributory negligence to comparative negligence applied equally to any party filed a civil tort claim. [5] Both the legislature and the common law have extended rights of family members to recover and seem to be concerned about protecting the familial relationships. The year before the Dempsey decision, the legislature recognized a right of recovery to children for the loss of companionship in a permanently injured parent. Florida Statute §768.014 states:

“[a] person who, through negligence, causes significant permanent injury to the natural or adoptive parent of an unmarried dependent resulting in a permanent total disability is liable to the dependent for damages, including damages for permanent loss of services, comfort, companionship, and society.” [6].

Marital consortium was extended in the common law in 1993 to extend the right to recover for marital consortium. The Gates court acknowledged the value of the relationship between spouses, extended the definition of consortium and placed value on other components of the familial relationship between spouses. [4] The court noted that the suit is for ‘loss of consortium’ and not loss of support or earnings which the husband might recover in his own right. The court cited the Lithgow decision: “We are only concerned with loss of consortium, by which is meant, the companionship and fellowship of husband and wife and the right of each to the company, cooperation and aid of the other in every conjugal relation. Consortium means much more than mere sexual relation and consists, also, of that affection, solace, comfort, companionship, conjugal life, fellowship, society and assistance so necessary to a successful marriage. [7]

With all of the court’s analysis of changing times and outdated principles, the court limited the recovery for a parent’s loss of companionship to the standard set for by the legislature in determining when a child could recover for loss of parental consortium. [6] Hence, recovery by a parent for loss of a parent’s claim for filial consortium was limited to situations where a child suffers a significant injury and it results in permanent total disability. [1] The court gave no guidance on the meaning of permanent total disability and the analysis required determining if a child is permanently and totally disabled. Does this mean that the parent of a child that loses a limb is without redress for filial consortium because they do not have a total disability? It appears that the answer would be that a parent would not be able to recover for the loss of consortium, as defined by Gates, if the child were able to work or be mobile in some capacity. Some attorneys have been successful in arguing that a permanent and total disability can be for a fixed period of time hence allowing the parent’s claim to proceed for the time period that the child is permanently and totally disabled.

The value of the consortium claim and/or value of the relationship between the parties should be continued
a jury question. The law in this area leaves the practitioner confused as the claim seems to have originally been derived from an economic relationship rather than allowing a jury to give a monetary amount of what we gain from our relationships. The economic analysis was easier as the dollar amount was calculable rather than leaving the award in the hands of the jury to award as they saw fit. Although the court recognizes the shift in valuing core characteristics of relationships, it still only allows the claim in circumstances where there is a financial component to the relationship like that of spouse to spouse or parent to child. The parent’s role is partially economic and in most cases the parent is the sole provider of shelter, food, schooling, clothing and any necessity that child has. The child does have a significant economic loss from the parent. However, the parent typically does not lose income or financial stability when their children are injured. It is quite the opposite in most cases. The Dempsey case did very little to allow parents to argue the loss of relationship with their children when they are injured. Hopefully, it will not take another 90 years before the court expands the law or the legislature acts to provide parents with a remedy to make a filial consortium claim for the loss of relationship as a result of injury to their children.

[3] Restatement (Second) of Torts § 703

We Hope You Can Join The Festivities!
Saturday
April 26, 2014
6:00 p.m. - 10:00 p.m.
Open bar from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. then cash bar
The National Croquet Center
700 Florida Mango Road • West Palm Beach FL 33406
Raffle Prizes & Grand Prize
Games include: Poker, Roulette, Craps, Blackjack, and Slots
$75 per person - $100 per person after 4/20
includes: drinks, food, dancing, and $50,000 in chips
Event open to PBCJA members & guests only
Dress: Resort Chic
Ladies Lily Pulitzer Style - Men - Tommy Bahama Style
(No shorts or denim)
Invitations graciously sponsored by

“Friends of Abused Children, Inc.”

Friends of Abused Children, Inc. improves the lives of abused, neglected and abandoned children. Our mission is to reach each such child in our community and provide her or him with whatever goods, services, experiences and relationships required for the child to overcome the effects of child abuse and neglect.

“Friends” is concerned adults delivering what is needed for the child to recover her or his well being, self esteem, dignity, and potential for greatness.

Friends of Abused Children, Inc. is a not-for-profit 501(c) (3) corporation. We distribute funds directly to the children of Palm Beach County who are placed in a foster home, group home or with a relative (grandparent, aunt, uncle, sister, brother, etc.) or non-relative (teacher, neighbor, coach, friend, etc.).
Fatal Heart Attack?
External Defibrillator Litigation

Do you have a client whose family member died from a heart attack at work, a gym, a golf course, a condo association common area or other public venue?

If so, the premises may be liable for not having, or for failing to use, an Automated External Defibrillator (“AED”) like the one pictured here:

Call the Law Offices of Craig Goldenfarb, P.A. to discuss the matter.

Mr. Goldenfarb lectures nationally about this area of law.

Referral fees paid in accordance with Florida Bar rules www.800GOLDLAW.com
Facebook has an estimated 1.2 billion users around the world, and over 750 million users used the website on an average day in December 2013. By now, most attorneys warn their clients to limit the posting of their personal lives on the social network. This month, the second District Court of Appeal issued the first state appellate decision as to the scope of “Facebook” discovery and the like. See Root v. Balfour Beatty Construction, LLC, 2014 WL 444005 (Fla. 2d DCA Feb. 5, 2014) (holding that the trial court’s discovery order compelling the production of Facebook postings was overbroad).

The second District did not hold that Facebook accounts were always off-limits. Rather at the simplest level, the Second District held that the lower court’s order was overbroad in that case, under the particular facts. When the decision is examined in depth, however, a fair reading is that moving parties must now show an evidentiary threshold for access to social media content, and only after an in-camera review strictly limiting the discoverable evidence.

The Lawsuit and Discovery Request in Root

In Root, a three-year-old child was injured in a truck accident. The accident occurred while the child was under the care of his seventeen-year-old aunt. The child’s mother brought a negligence action in her individual capacity, as well as on behalf of her child. The mother’s claim was a derivative claim for loss of parental consortium.

The Defendants raised various affirmative defenses, including that the mother negligently entrusted her child to the aunt, and that the aunt failed to supervise the child. The discovery order challenged on appeal required the mother to produce Facebook postings that included:

1. any counseling or psychological care pre and post-accident;
2. any Facebook postings, statuses, photos, likes or videos related to her relationships to her injured child, her other children, pre and post-accident;
3. any Facebook postings and the like as to relationships with other family members, boyfriends, husbands and any significant others, pre and post-accident;
4. any Facebook postings and the like addressing her mental health, stress complaints, and any alcohol or drug use, pre and post-accident.

So What Does this Mean Going Forward?

Root did not specifically address what will be discoverable in future cases. At first glance, Root may appear limited to loss of consortium claims. The focus of these claims is on a child’s relationship with a parent, or a spouse’s relationship to a spouse. The personal lives of these derivative claimants are relevant only as to the direct relationship with the child or parent physically injured.

The Second District summarized concluded the discovery was irrelevant to the truck accident or any affirmative defenses. As to the key issue, the mother’s consortium claim, the appellate court noted that claim includes loss of her son’s companionship, society, love, affection, and solace. Id. Critically, while the mother’s deposition was taken, the Defendants had not identified anything “claimed by” the mother to support the discovery order. Id. There is no indication the Defendants identified already-available evidence that called into question the mother’s description of her or her son’s injuries.

Also concerning to the second District was the open-ended nature of the discovery request and order. To the second District, “this appears to be the type of carte blanche discovery” that the Supreme Court has sought to guard against in prior cases. Id. (citing Langston, supra). The Defendants’ request was the classic “fishing expedition” that courts have frowned upon.
or with the medical information she has provided. She does not claim that she is bed-ridden, or that she is incapable of leaving her house or participating in modest social activities.” Id.

Had evidence been provided that the plaintiff played golf or rode horses, then the defendant “might have a stronger argument for delving into the nonpublic section of her account.” Id. However, the defendant would not be permitted “to engage in the proverbial fishing expedition, in the hope that there might be something of relevance in Plaintiff’s Facebook account.” Id. at 388 (emphasis in original); and see McCann v. Harleysville Ins. Co. of New York, 910 N.Y.S.2d 614 (N.Y.App.Div.2010) (denying defendant’s discovery request to compel Facebook information that lacked a factual predicate). A well-reasoned local circuit court order prohibited social networking discovery on this basis. See Levine v. Culligan of Florida, Inc., No. 50-2011-CA-010339-XXXXMB (Fla. 15th Cir. Jan. 29, 2013)

In Tompkins, the district court distinguished two cases allowing social-media content discovery because in those cases, “the public profile Facebook pages contained information that was clearly inconsistent with the plaintiffs’ claims of disabling injuries.” 278 F.R.D at 388. First, in McMillen v. Hummingbird Speedway, Inc., 2010 WL 4403285, at *1, *6 (Pa. Com. Pl. Sept. 9, 2010), the public portion of the plaintiff’s Facebook account contained comments about his fishing trip and attendance at the Daytona 500. But the plaintiff alleged “possible permanent impairment, loss of impairment of general health, strength, and vitality, and inability to enjoy certain pleasures in life.” And, in Romano v. Steelcase, Inc., 907 N.Y.S.2d 650, 653 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2010), the public portions of that plaintiff’s Facebook and MySpace profiles revealed that the plaintiff enjoyed an active lifestyle and traveled to other states, which was contrary to her allegation that she was largely confined to her house and bed.

Some courts across the country have not required an independent evidentiary threshold that undermines a plaintiff’s claim. See, e.g. Giacchetto v. Patchogue-Medford Union Free School District, 293 F.R.D. 112 (E.D.N.Y. 2013) (allowing discovery, albeit narrowly tailoring the scope of the discovery as to physical and emotional damages). As explained above, a fair reading of Root is that the Second District rejected this relaxed approach.

If a trial judge in your case is inclined to allow some discovery, ensure there are reasonable time and scope limits. In Tompkins, the district court noted that the defendant’s “request for the [plaintiff’s] entire account, which may well contain voluminous personal material having nothing to do with this case, is overly broad.” 278 F.R.D. at 389. This is consistent with the Second District’s caution against the “carte blanche” discovery order in that case. See Root, 2014 WL 444005, at *2.

Also, insist on an in-camera review by the trial court before the release of any social-media information. Root recognized this may be a requirement. 2014 WL 444005, at *3; see also James v. Veneziano, 98 So.3d 697, 698 (Fla. 4th DCA 2012) (requiring in-camera review when privacy rights are implicated). While trial judges understandably will not want to review hundreds or thousands of postings, an overbroad and open-ended discovery Order is unwarranted, even with an evidentiary threshold for some discovery.

CONCLUSION

The Second District’s decision this month is the first Florida appellate decision to address the discovery of social-media content postings. The Second District quashed the open-ended nature of a Facebook Discovery Order, which was not tied to the claims or evidentiary record in the case. Surely other Florida appellate courts will address this issue in the future. Advise your clients from the initial client contact to establish strict privacy settings and limit public postings of their physical or emotional condition. And, when a discovery request is made, argue that an evidentiary threshold must be satisfied, and only after an in-camera review.

THE ART AND SCIENCE OF CRIMINAL DEFENSE

Tama Beth Kudman individuals and companies confronting the vast power of the government and law enforcement in criminal defense matters. Recognizing the extreme responsibility of assisting those in the darkest hour of their lives, she devotes her time and resources to the extraordinary investigation, preparation, motion practice and trial presentation that each and every matter requires.

Ms. Kudman believes that it is only by meeting the government head-to-head through the thorough investigation of each case, proper utilization of experts, investigators, trial consultants, and legal challenges that individuals and companies can truly receive a fair trial or even avoid trial. Such a thorough approach enables her to develop creative, cutting edge defenses that yield winning strategies.

Ms. Kudman utilizes the same “no stone unturned approach” in regards to her appellate advocacy, where legal knowledge and creative approach are imperative to a successful outcome.
Certified Florida Supreme Court Circuit
Civil Mediator:

- Fulltime Mediator
- Member: PBCJA and FJA
- ABOTA PB Chapter-Advocate Member
- FJA (Eagle Member); Board of Directors (1992-1999)
- Past President Miami-Dade Justice Association (1992)
- Board Certified Civil Trial Lawyer for 25 years (1983-2008)
- Certified Federal Court Mediator: Southern & Middle Districts of Florida

Mediates cases statewide & nationally

Stephen G. Fischer
Matrix Mediation
Scheduling: 561.340.3500
Direct Line: 561.630.7761
Email: steve@matrixmediation.com
Website: www.matrixmediation.com

CHOOSE WISELY.
CLIENTS DO.

Once you resolve the case, let Synergy be your knowledgeable and trusted partner giving you peace of mind. Our experts can help efficiently resolve liens, comply with the Medicare Secondary Payer Act, protect needs-based public benefits and safeguard the financial recovery. We allow trial lawyers to focus on what they do best.

ATTORNEY FEE DEFERRAL
ASSET MANAGEMENT
LIEN RESOLUTION
MEDICARE SET-ASIDES/MSP COMPLIANCE
POOLED SPECIAL NEEDS TRUSTS
SETTLEMENT PLANNING/STRUCTURED SETTLEMENTS

When the time comes, be prepared with a settlement services partner that can give you the edge you need. At Synergy, our clients don’t follow. They lead!

Contact Us Today at 877.242.0022
www.synergysettlements.com
The Litigation Library has evolved into one of the best PBCJA member resources for legal information. Please continue to submit your documents.

If you need assistance finding a document, or have materials to upload please call our office at 561.790.5833 or e-mail us at info@pbcja.org.

Litigation Library

- Increased Search Capabilities
- Updated Legal Categories like: Appeals, Daubert, Research & Outlines
- More than 600 Depositions, Motions, Orders, and Testimonies
- Updated CME Information

Visit us online to review CVs and bios for more than 100 experts. You may also contact us directly for help finding the most appropriate expert for your case.

The Litigation Library has evolved into one of the best PBCJA member resources for legal information. Please continue to submit your documents.
Upchurch Watson White & Max Mediation Group
welcomes
Chuck Mancuso
to its distinguished panel of neutrals.

- Civil litigator since 1987.
- Certified circuit court mediator since 1994.

Serving Palm Beach and Broward Counties
500 Australian Avenue South, Suite 541
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401

Welcome Chuck Mancuso.

Charles A. Mancuso
cmancuso@uww-adr.com

MEDIATION | ARBITRATION | E-DISCOVERY | SPECIAL MASTERS
Successfully Resolving Conflicts In Florida, Alabama & Nationwide Since 1988
CALL TOLL FREE: 800-863-1462 | READ MORE & SCHEDULE: WWW.UWW-ADR.COM

When The Details Matter...
The Choice Is Clear
✓ Creative Solutions
✓ Conservative Approach
✓ Professional Results

Above & Beyond Reprographics provides the legal community with over two decades of experience.
providing support services for the preparation and organization of your cases. Having earned a reputation as a company
keenly aware of the importance of strict confidentiality,
fast turnaround, outstanding customer service and superior quality, our clients can rest assured they’ve made the best choice
for their legal support & trial preparation needs.

Above & Beyond Reprographics
2161 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard • Suite 412
561.478.4774
www.AboveandBeyondRepro.com
Note: Rule Change – Proposals For Settlement

By order of the Florida Supreme Court, Rule 1.442 was amended as of January 1, 2014. Now, Rule 1.442(c)(2)(B) no longer requires offerors to identify the claim or claims a proposal is attempting to resolve, and instead requires them to “state that the proposal resolves all damages that would otherwise be awarded in a final judgment in the action in which the proposal is served, subject to subdivision (F).”

Error For District Court To Reweigh Expert Testimony And Rule That Trial Court Should Have Entered Directed Verdict Because Plaintiff Failed To Establish Causation


A man consulted with an attorney after a car accident. While he was sitting in the firm’s conference room, his chair collapsed. After the incident, the man complained of worsening headaches and neck pain, severe back pain, numbness and other issues. The man sued the attorney for negligence on the grounds that he was a business invitee, and that the attorney had negligently failed to warn him.

The evidence produced at trial showed that the chair was purchased new as part of a set in 1998 and was used daily without incident until the accident in 2003. During that time, no one performed a physical inspection of the chairs, but they were used daily, and there was no indication of a problem. Engineering experts for both parties agreed there was a manufacturing defect in the right-rear joint which was internal, and would not be visible to the naked eye. Both experts testified that the chair collapsed because the chair joint did not fit together properly, and the glue used for bonding eventually failed.

Plaintiff’s expert testified that he inspects his own chairs every six months by performing a flex test. However, the defendant’s expert testified that a flex test would not have revealed the defective joint.

The defendant moved for a directed verdict on causation which the trial court denied. The Fourth District, however, reversed, and the case ended up in the supreme court on conflict jurisdiction. The District Court determined that the jury had no basis from which to conclude that the defendant would have discovered the defect, which essentially required the District Court to reweigh the evidence of causation.

On a directed verdict, appellate courts must view the evidence and all inferences of fact in the light most favorable to the non-moving party, and can affirm directed verdicts only where no proper view of the evidence could sustain a verdict for the non-moving party.

The Florida Supreme Court held that the Fourth District impermissively reweighed the evidence and substituted its own evaluation of it in place of the jury’s. The parties presented expert witnesses who provided different opinions regarding whether the defendant should have or could have discovered the defect upon reasonable inspection. Here, there was conflicting evidence regarding causation, and a directed verdict is not proper under those circumstances. The supreme court reversed for entry of final judgment in conformance with the jury’s original verdict in favor of the plaintiff.

Under Current Law, The State May Not Demand Any Portion Of A Medicaid Beneficiary’s Tort Recovery, Except The Share That Is Attributable To The Plaintiff’s Medical Expenses

Dillard v. Agency for Healthcare Administration, 38 Fla. L. Weekly D2486 (Fla. 2nd DCA November 27, 2013):

A young man was catastrophically injured when he overdosed on cocaine shortly before he was taken into custody at a juvenile detention center. His mother filed suit on his behalf, claiming that he had been denied appropriate medical attention at the detention center by the sheriff. The suit settled, and because the young man had received and continues to receive Medicaid benefits to cover his medical costs, the Agency for Healthcare Administration (AHCA) asserted its right to be reimbursed from the settlement.

The trial court allowed a reimbursement to AHCA in a reduced amount, by applying the formula set out in §409.910(11)(F) to the entire settlement. The plaintiff argued that AHCA was only entitled to apply the statutory formula to the portion of the settlement already allocated to past medical expenses, because 42 U.S.C. §1396p(a)(1), the anti-lien provision of the federal Medicaid law, prohibited the encumbrance or attachment of proceeds related to damages other than medical costs.

The appellate court observed that in Wos v. E.M.A. ex rel. Johnson, 133 S.Ct. 1391 (2013), the supreme court held that an irrefutable, one-size-fits-all statutory presumption is incompatible with the Medicaid Act’s clear mandate that a state may not demand any portion of a beneficiary’s tort recovery, except the share attributable to medical expenses. The court suggested that states could remedy this problem by providing a process to determine which portion of the recovery was attributable to medical expenses.

The court said the plaintiff should be afforded an opportunity to seek the reduction of a Medicaid lien amount established by the statutory default allocation by demonstrating with evidence, that the lien amount exceeds the amount recovered for medical expenses. Accordingly, though the trial court could ultimately deny the plaintiff’s motion to reduce lien again on remand, the case was reversed and remanded for consideration in light of the proper law.

A Medicaid Recipient Should Be Afforded The Opportunity To Seek The Reduction Of A Medicaid Lien Amount, By Demonstrating With Evidence That The Lien Amount Established By §409.910(11)(F) Exceeds The Amount Recovered For Medical Expenses

Davis v. Roberts, 39 Fla. L. Weekly D1 (Fla. 5th DCA December 20, 2013):

The trial court determined pursuant to the formula set forth in §409.910, that AHCA was entitled to recover the full amount of its Medicaid lien out of the proceeds a minor child received from a personal injury settlement, even though the parties agreed that approximately 90% comparative fault would be alleged against her mother who was driving.

The court held that the formula in that section should be used when there is no allocation of the settlement agreement, and there is no evidence proffered at the hearing from which a trial judge can determine how much of the damages represented medical expenses. In other words, absent proof of an allocation in the settlement agreement, §409.910(11)(F) “must be” used to calculate the amount owed to AHCA.

continued
This does not mean that it is a mandatory statute, however. Because that section is preempted by the federal Medicaid statute’s anti-lien provision, to the extent that it creates an irrebuttable presumption, the statute still permits recovery beyond that portion of the Medicaid recipient’s third-party recovery representing compensation for medical expenses, in the event evidence is presented. Thus, a Medicaid recipient should be afforded the opportunity to seek the reduction of a Medicaid lien amount by demonstrating with evidence that the lien amount established by the section, exceeds the amount recovered for medical expenses.

**Trial Court Erred By Denying Plaintiff’s Motion To Amend Complaint To Conform To Pleadings To Evidence Presented At Trial To Include Comparative Negligence When Defendants Withdrew The Affirmative Defense After The Evidence Was Presented - By Presenting Evidence Relevant To Decedent’s Drug And Alcohol Use To Attack Causation, But Without Permitting The Jury To Consider Comparative Negligence, The Defendants Created An Impermissible “Take It Or Leave It” Situation Similar To Contributory Negligence Of Yesteryear.**

**Hartong v. Bernhart, 38 Fla. L. Weekly D2371 (Fla. 5th DCA December 6, 2013):**

Plaintiff sued defendants in a medical malpractice case. The plaintiff pleaded that the defendants were negligent. The defendants asserted comparative negligence of the decedent as an affirmative defense.

The defendants filed a motion requesting the lower court to take judicial notice of two DCF shelter orders in which a circuit court found probable cause to remove the decedent’s children from her care based on her abuse of alcohol and drugs, history of domestic violence and other issues. In opening, the defendants indicated the presence of alcohol and hydrocodone in the decedent’s system which had a negative effect on her respiratory system and combined to cause her death. One expert testified that her pneumonia complicated by aspiration and hydrocodone and alcohol intoxication is what caused her death.

The lower court took judicial notice of the DCF shelter orders, notwithstanding objections regarding inadmissible hearsay and character evidence.

During trial, after introducing the evidence, the defendants withdrew their affirmative defense about the decedent’s comparative negligence. The plaintiff then moved to amend the complaint to conform the pleadings to that evidence which would have included comparative negligence. The trial court refused, and this left the defendants with a “take it or leave it” situation more akin to contributory negligence instead of comparative negligence.

The court ruled that was error. Because both parties developed the issue of comparative fault, and defendants’ expert cited alcohol and drug use in his opinion on causation, the drug and alcohol use was relevant more than to simply the issue of damages.

There was no prejudice to the defendants to allow the amendment, instruction and verdict form. Also, the error was not harmless because the doctrine of comparative negligence allows a jury to apportion fault between multiple parties that are the legal cause of damages. Because the verdict form did not separate concepts of negligence and legal cause without comparative negligence, it only permitted the jury an “all or nothing” approach. In other words, the jury would not have been able to apportion fault to both the decedent and the defendants’ negligence.

The court also ruled it was error to admit the DCF orders because they contained inadmissible hearsay.

**Summary Judgment Reversed Because Issues Of Fact Existed With Respect To Whether Plaintiff Was A “Borrowed Servant” And Whether His Special Employer Was Immune From Liability.**

**Suarez v. Transmataire, 38 Fla. L. Weekly D2446 (Fla. 4th DCA December 4, 2013):**

Plaintiff was employed by Gonzalez and Sons, which provides workers for Port Everglades. He was injured while working at the port when an employee of another company operated a boom truck and seriously injured him. Plaintiff sued the negligent company, and it asserted worker’s compensation immunity.

If the plaintiff was a borrowed servant of the defendant, immunity would attach. However, there is a presumption that the employee is not a borrowed servant, but instead continues to work for and be an employee of the general employer. To overcome the presumption, the employer must establish:

1. There was a contract for hire either expressed or implied, between the special employer and the employee;

2. The work being done at the time of the injury was essentially that of the special employer; and

3. The power to control the details of the work resided with the special employer.

The critical question is whether there was a contract for hire. A special employer must show deliberate and informed consent by the employee to the contract. Based on many conflicting facts, the court said that the presumption that the employee was not working for the employer was not overcome, and needed resolution by the jury.
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