

**IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
OF FLORIDA SIXTH DISTRICT**

**6th DCA Case No. [Sixth District case number]
L.T. Case No. 2014-CA-008218-O (34)**

**JASON SAXON a/k/a THOMAS JASON SAXON,
Petitioner,**

v.

**FLORIDA DEBT ACQUISITIONS, INC., as Assignee of Aldan
Electric Supply Inc.; Logical Energy Group, Inc, a
dissolved Florida Corporation; Logical Energy Group 1,
Inc., a dissolved Florida Corporation; Holly Holleman
f/k/a Holly Saxon; David Ridenour; Justin Klinger.**

Respondents

PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION

Petitioner, **Jason Saxon a/k/a Thomas Jason Saxon**,
petitions for a writ of prohibition directed to the Circuit Court
for the Ninth Judicial Circuit in and for Orange County,
Florida, and states:

I. Preliminary Statement

This petition concerns threatened—not completed—
action. There are four orders with this petition addresses:

**A. FINAL ORDER OF FORECLOSURE OF PERSONAL
PROPERTY**, filed July 29, 2026. This Order states
that “All of the rights of Jason Saxon a/k/a Thomas

Jason Saxon, if any, in the **Hillsborough County** court cases a. 22-CC-13309 (Hillsborough County Court) b. 22-CA-004334 (Fla. Cir Ct.) c. 22-CA-001431 (Fla. 13th Cir. Ct.)” shall be sold “at public sale on September 15, 2026” in **Orange County [App. 1]**

B. ORDER GRANTING JUDGMENT CREDITOR’S ATTORNEY’S FEES IN EXECUTION, filed July 9, 2026. This Order states: “Judgment debtor Jason Saxon a/k/a Thomas Jason Saxon is taxed all post-judgment reasonable Attorney’s fees for such execution, with such amount to be determined at a 30-minute evidentiary hearing.” **[App. 2]**

C. TURNOVER ORDER FOR 2016 FORD 150N VIN 1FTEW1EG9GKF41191, filed July 9, 2026. This Order states: “Saxon shall deliver the 2016 Ford 150N VIN 1FTEW1EG9GKF41191 to judgment creditor’s representative no later than five (5) days from the date of this order. Arrangements for delivery shall be done from Saxon to his attorney, and Saxon’s attorney to the judgment creditor’s attorney.” **[App. 3]**

D. ORDER DIRECTING ORANGE COUNTY SHERIFF TO LEVY AND SELL INTANGIBLE ASSETS OF THOMAS JASON SAXON, filed July 7, 2026. This Order states: “The Sheriff of Orange County shall auction the interests listed in paragraph 2 above [the same interests referenced in A. above concerning property in **Hillsborough County**] for public auction at one sale and issue a Sheriff’s Deed to the highest bidder. If the Sheriff refuses to do so, then upon application to the Court by the Judgment creditor, the Court will enter an order directing the Clerk of Court to sell the

property by public outcry under the provisions of Chapter 45, Florida Statutes.” **[App. 4]**

Parties, Real Parties of Interest, and Lower Tribunal

Petitioner

Jason Saxon a/k/a Thomas Jason Saxon

Respondents

- Florida Debt Acquisitions, Inc. (**“FDA”**), a Florida Profit Corporation Nicholas Guerra is President, registered agent and sole owner. Attorneys Cheyenne Whitfield and Michael Farrar
- Aldan Electric Supply, Inc.- a Florida Profit Corporation. Lee A. Williams is president and director. Attorney Chad Alvaro
- Logical Energy Group, Inc, a dissolved Florida Corporation
- Logical Energy Group 1, Inc., a dissolved Florida Corporation
- Holly Holleman f/k/a Holly Saxon, President of both Logical Energy groups
- David Ridenour – Guarantee
- Justin Klinger – Guarantee

Real Parties in Interest

- Nicholas Guerra
- William Crescenzo
- Crescenzo Holdings LLC (initially filed 9/22/2005 – reinstated 2/28/2022) **[App. 5]**
- Delaware Financial II, Corporation (active: filed 1/8/2025 with effective date 1/3/2025)

- Florida Recovery Solutions Inc. (inactive 3/29/2023 - 1/26/25) Directors are William Crescenzo and Nicholas Guerra **[App. 5]**
- Interest Holdings, Inc, (inactive – 1/30/2008 1/16/2012 – Voluntary dissolution filed 1/16/2012) **[App. 5]**

Impleaded Third Parties

- Jesus Alvarez by **NOTICE TO APPEAR** filed May 7, 2025 **[App. 6]**
- Oswaldo Brito by **NOTICE TO APPEAR** filed May 7, 2025 **[App. 7]**
- Chad Chronister by **MOTION TO ADD CHAD CHRONISTER, AS HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY SHERIFF AS A PARTY TO THE PENDING CASE** filed January 13, 2025 – Assistant General Counsel Michelle Maxwell **[App. 8]**

II. Basis for This Court’s Jurisdiction

This Court has original jurisdiction to issue a writ of prohibition to prevent a lower tribunal from acting without, or in excess of, its jurisdiction. Art. V, § 4(b)(3), Fla. Const.; Fla. R. App. P. 9.030(b)(3).

Prohibition is an extraordinary, preventive remedy. It lies only to prevent a lower tribunal from exceeding or usurping jurisdiction; it is not a substitute for appellate review of an error committed within jurisdiction. *Mintz Truppman, P.A. v.*

Cozen O'Connor, PLC, 346 So. 3d 577, 580–81 (Fla. 2022);
English v. McCrary, 348 So. 2d 293, 296–97 (Fla. 1977).

Petitioner requests this Court issue an order directing Respondent **FDA** to show cause why this Petition for Writ of Prohibition should not be granted. Fla. R. App. P. 9.100(h). Petitioner also requests such temporary relief as is necessary to preserve the status quo pending this Court’s consideration of this Petition for Writ of Prohibition.

III. The Facts on Which Petitioner Relies:

A. Background

This case is one of seven cases involving the parties. The other six peripheral cases are: in Hillsborough County, which has exclusive jurisdiction and venue concerning decedent Ellen Saxon’s (Jason Saxon’s grandmother) homestead property located at 12219 Hazen Avenue, Thonotosassa, Florida 33592. The six peripheral cases are:

- 1. “Void deed”** filed on February 22, 2022: *Thomas Jason Saxon [grandson] v. Rebecca Leigh High, Alice Hillman, and David D. Sokol*, Case No.2022-CA-001431 (complaint to void deed conveying title to Rebecca High, a **recently hired caretaker**)
- 2. “Unlawful Detainer”** filed on February 28, 2022: *Rebecca High v. Thomas Saxon*, Case No. 2022-CC-013309

3. **“Trust litigation”** – The “Void Deed” and “Unlawful Detainer” actions **in Hillsborough County** were consolidated on May 18, 2022; *High v. Thomas Jason Saxon, et al.*, Case No. 22-CA-004334.
4. **“Probate litigation”** - filed on January 2, 2024: *In re: Estate of Ellen Saxon*, Case No. 24-CP-000018.
5. Petition for Mandamus (**“Mandamus”**) - filed on January 24, 2025, *Florida Debt Acquisitions, Inc., Assignee of Aldan Supply Inc. v. Chad Chronister as Hillsborough County Sheriff*, Case No. 25-CA-000042.
6. Petition for Writ of Certiorari (**“Appeal”**) – filed on April 28, 2025: *Florida Debt Acquisitions, Inc. v. Steven Velozo as Trustee of the 12219 Hazen Land Trust; Thomas Saxon [a/k/a Jason Saxon]; Rebecca High; Alice Hillman; and David J. Sockol*, 2d DCA Case No. 2D2025-0965

B. Underlying Facts Concerning Dispute of Ownership of the Real Property located in Hillsborough County at 12219 Hazen Ave., Thonotosassa, FL and of the beneficial interest in the Ellen Saxon Irrevocable Trust

Jason Saxon was born April 4, 1981. At that time, he and his parents, Thomas W. Saxon and Cindy G. Saxon, lived in a manufactured mobile home located on the back of his grandparents' property located at 12219 Hazen Avenue, Thonotosassa, Florida 33549. His grandparents were John Ronald Saxon and Ellen Mercer Saxon. Shortly after his grandfather died (January 1, 2014),

Jason's father requested he become his Grandmother's caregiver and assist her with all of her financial affairs because his Grandmother never dealt with monies related to bills or values aside from thrift store-type shopping as his Grandfather handled everything in that area for their entire 50-year marriage.

At the time of Jason Saxon's Grandfather's death (January 1, 2014), his grandparents' main house and the manufactured home were in a state of great disrepair. No one else in the family was willing or capable of taking care of his Grandmother or of maintaining and repairing the property. Jason Saxon showed his Grandmother how to pay bills, which she could do because there were so few of them.

Ellen Saxon tried this for 3 months and then asked him to take on the responsibility of handling her affairs. She made an appointment for May 23, 2014, to meet with her estate planning attorney Adam T Rauman. Jason Saxon drove his Grandmother to the appointment and waited in the car while she went in. His Grandmother executed an ELLEN MERCER SAXON REVOCABLE TRUST DATED MAY 23, 2014) the

("Original Trust"), which was prepared by attorney Adam T.

Rauman. Article III A states:

Successor Trustee. If ELLEN MERCER SAXON fails to qualify dies, resigns, becomes incapacitated, or otherwise ceases to serve as Trustee of a trust created under this Trust agreement, and the Granter fails to nominate a successor Trustee within 60 days as provided in Article III Section C, then the Grantor's grandson, JASON SAXON, shall become trustee of such trust. If JASON SAXON fails to qualify, dies, resigns becomes incapacitated, or otherwise h to serve as Trustee of a trust created under this Trust Agreement, and the Granter fails to nominate a successor Trustee within 60 days as provided in Article 111, Section C, then the Grantor's granddaughter-in- law HOLLY SAXON shall become Trustee of such trust. (Summary of Saxon's **VERIFIED STATEMENT OF THOMAS JASON SAXON**, [App. 9] filed March 25, 2025.)

Meanwhile Jason Saxon and his wife Holly Saxon formed two corporations called Logical Energy Group, Inc. and Logical Energy Group 1, Inc. They entered into a business arrangement with Aldan Electric Supply, Inc. based in **Orange County**. A dispute arose, which resulted in Aldan Electric obtaining a **Final Summary Judgment**, rendered in this case on June 3, 2015. [App. 10].

Jason Saxon was the primary care taker for Ellen Saxon for several years. On her own initiative, Ellen Saxon executed

an Amended and Restated Agreement on December 9, 2015, leaving everything to Jason Saxon and his wife Holly Saxon, "per stirpes."

In June 2019, Ellen Saxon hired Rebecca High as part-time house cleaner. On August 30, 2019, Rebecca High drove Ellen Saxon to see attorney Adam T. Rauman who prepared a "Second Amended and Restated Trust Agreement made and entered into this 30th day of AUGUST, 2019" (the "First Amended Trust"). Article IV captioned as DISTRIBUTION UPON DEATH OF THE SETTLOR states: "The Trust Estate shall be equally divided into separate shares and distributed free and clear of this Trust to REBECCA HIGH and ALICE HILLMAN per stirpes."

Ellen Saxon died January 10, 2022. On February 11, 2022, Rebecca High as Trustee of the Ellen M. Saxon REVOCABLE TRUST DAED MAY 23, 2014 executed and recorded a QUIT CLAIM DEED to herself and Alice Hillman, as Grantees. On February 22, 2022: Thomas *Jason Saxon [grandson]* v. Rebecca Leigh High, Alice Hillman, and David D. Sokol, Case No.2022-CA-001431 file a pro se complaint to void

deed conveying title to Rebecca High and Alice Hillman. Rebecca High through an attorney filed **VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR UNLAFUL DETAINER**. Jason Saxon retained an attorney who filed **AN AMENDED MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE [APP. 27]**, which was granted and by Judge Emily A. Peacock, requiring the parties to submit all future pleadings and papers under Case No., 2022-CA-004334 **[App 28]**.

William Crescenzo contacted Alice Hillman and Rebecca High by phone in late October or early November of 2024, and “solicited” them about acquiring their rights to the **SECOND AMENDED AND REINSTATED TRUST AGREEMENT** which was the purported title owner of all of Ellen Saxon’s personal property and her real property, including her homestead property located at 12219 Hazen Avenue, Thonotosassa, Florida 33592. Mr. Crescenzo instructed his attorney Cheyenne Whitfield to draft Quit Claim Deeds, Specific Powers of Attorneys, and Assignments of Interest, which named Mr. Crescenzo’s friend and business associate Steven Velozo as the grantee. As the “legal title owner,” Mr. Velozo executed and recorded a mortgage naming Inland Properties, Inc. — another

corporation owned and controlled by Willian Crescenzo — as the mortgagee.**[App. 22]**

On November 4, 2024, William Crescenzo approached Lee Williams, President of Aldan Electric Supply, Inc. and arranged for her to execute an **Assignment of Judgment, Case and Interest [App. 11]** to **FDA**. The assignment includes “chose of action,” which **FDA** relies upon to circumvent orders entered by Hillsborough County Circuit Court Judge Emily A. Peacock in a case styled *High v Saxon*, 13th Judicial Circuit Court Case No., 22-CA-004334 (“Trust litigation”) and an order by Hillsborough Circuit Court Judge James S. Moody III in a case styled *Florida Debt Acquisitions, Inc., Assignee of Aldan Supply Inc. v. Chad Chronister as Hillsborough County Sheriff*, Case No. Case No. 25-CA-000042 (“Mandamus litigation”).

On November 7, 2024, Plaintiff Florida Debt Acquisitions, Inc. (“**FDA**”), — controlled by non-attorney William Crescenzo — initiated these proceedings supplementary by filing a

JUDGMENT CREDITOR’S MOTION TO INSTITUTE

PROCEEDINGS SUPPLEMENTARY & JUDGMENT [App. 12].

William Crescenzo contacted Alice Hillman and Rebecca High by phone in late October or early November of 2024, and “solicited” them about acquiring their rights to the **SECOND AMENDED AND REINSTATED TRUST AGREEMENT** which was the purported title owner of all of Ellen Saxon’s personal property and her real property, including her homestead property located at 12219 Hazen Avenue, Thonotosassa, Florida 33592. Mr. Crescenzo instructed his attorney Cheyenne Whitfield to draft Quit Claim Deeds, Specific Powers of Attorneys, and Assignments of Interest, which named Mr. Crescenzo’s friend and business associate Steven Velozo as the grantee. As the “legal title owner,” Mr. Velozo executed and recorded a mortgage naming Inland Properties, Inc. — another corporation owned and controlled by Willian Crescenzo — as the mortgagee.[App. 22]

Mr. Crescenzo (a non-lawyer) interjected himself at the two mediations held in the “Trust litigation” case. Indeed, Mr.

Crescenzo sent an email to Stanley Padgett — the court appointed attorney for Steven Velozo, Rebecca High and Alice Hillman — the day before the second mediation **[App. 24]:**

- Expressing a legal opinion that the “executed quitclaims/assign-ments and related transfer documents conveying any interest [by Rebecca High and Alice Hillman] held in the 2019 Ellen Saxon Trust and in 12219 Hazen Ave. to Steven Velozo as Trustee for the Land Trust **remain valid and binding.**”

- Demanding that Mr. Padgett “confirm in writing today that your representation is limited to Ms. High and Ms. Hillman” and “confirm that you are not restricting their ability to share information or respond to coordination requests, and that you will promptly relay any proposals to us for discussion.”

- Representing that “Velozo will object to any attempt to treat Ms. High or Ms. Hillman as current owners/beneficiaries for purposes of allocating or disposing of trust or property rights.”

- Stating this “note is simply to preserve the record, align everyone on the existing chain of title/assignments, and ensure that the mediator understands who has authority to commit which interests.”

- Demanding that any “resolution must respect the 2019 plan, the November 2024 assignments, and Velozo’s exclusive authority over the property.”

- Representing that “Steven has invested time, money, and trust obligations based

on those assignments. If the mediation proceeds on the idea that Rebecca and Alice still have beneficial rights, it puts Steven in a position where his role as Trustee to the Land Trust is undermined and where he could be bound to a settlement that disregards both the 2019 estate plan and the reliance he placed on their prior agreements.”

Non-lawyer Mr. Crescenzo further intimidated Rebecca High and Alice Hillman by working with Seven Velozo in filing a suit against them a few days before the second mediation.**[App. 25].**

IV. Nature of the Case and Relief Sought

This original proceeding seeks to prevent enforcement of the four Orange Count Circuit Court orders specified in **I Preliminary Statement [Apps. 1-4]** and to prevent the lower tribunal from authorizing or implementing a levy, auction, sale, transfer, foreclosure, or comparable disposition of Petitioner’s asserted interest in the Hazen Avenue Property until Judge Peacock in Hillsborough County determines the ownership of the real property located at 12219 Hazen Avenue, Thonotosassa, Florida 33592 and determines, which of the competing trusts is valid.

Petitioner asks this Court to issue an order to show cause and prohibit enforcement activity until Judge Peacock in Hillsborough County determines the ownership of the real property located at 12219 Hazen Avenue, Thonotosassa, Florida 33592 and determines which of the competing trusts is valid.

V. Argument in Support of the Petition

The four orders described in the Preliminary Statement should not be enforced because they:

- They violate Judge Peacock's orders in the "trust litigation" case in Hillsborough County which state the Hillsborough Circuit court has "exclusive jurisdiction" of real and tangible property in located in Hillsborough County
- Judge Tanya Wilson erred by issuing contempt orders based on arguments of counsel and unverified pleadings
- Judge Tanya Wilson erred by issuing contempt orders seeking sanctions without holding evidentiary hearing.
- Nonparty William Crescenzo, FDA and its attorneys are engaged in vexatious litigation

A. Judge Tanya Wilson’s orders [App 1-4] violate Judge Peacock’s orders in the “trust litigation” case in Hillsborough County which state the Hillsborough Circuit court has “exclusive jurisdiction” of real and tangible property located in Hillsborough County

In the “Trust litigation” case in Hillsborough County, Judge Emily Peacock entered three orders (dated January 10, March 12, and May 28, 2025) stating she had **“exclusive jurisdiction”** and restraining and enjoining all parties **“from taking any actions that would alter, affect, or interfere with the current ownership, possession, or control of the Property until further order of this Court.”**

In the first order dated January 10, 2025, **[App. 13]** Judge Emily Peacock ruled:

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED as follows:

1. **The Court hereby freezes all proceedings and matters in this cause . . .**

3. **No further action shall be taken ...**
4. **The Court retains jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to this trust litigation (bold emphasis supplied).**

On March 12, 2025, Judge Emily Peacock reaffirmed that her court had jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to the “Trust litigation.” **[App. 14]** In her findings of facts, she stated:

3. At the hearing, Andrew Dogali, counsel for non-party Steven Velozo, as Trustee of the 12219 Hazen Land Trust, who will soon be substituted in place of Rebecca High and Alice Hillman pursuant to their Assignment of Case Interests executed separately on November 4, 2024 and November 7, 2024, confirmed that FDA’s ownership is closely connected to the entities operating Interest Holdings, LLC. Interest Holdings, LLC is the entity that subsequently obtained a mortgage on the Property while this instant case is pending. This mortgage was secured by Steven Velozo, as Trustee of the 12219 Hazen Land Trust, following the purported Assignment of Case Interests executed by Rebecca High and Alice Hillman.

4. As this Court retains exclusive jurisdiction over the trust litigation involving the Property, FDA’s attempts to levy, purchase, or sell the Property based on the newly acquired Orange County Judgment constitute an improper effort to circumvent this Court’s authority. Such actions are prohibited as they interfere with this Court’s jurisdiction over the pending trust litigation and the Property.

5. Allowing the levy, auction, or forced sale of the Property would cause irreparable harm to Saxon, depriving him of his potential equitable homestead rights and interfering with this Court’s ongoing proceedings.

Judge Peacock then ruled:

It is, therefore **ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** as follows:

Thomas Saxon's Emergency Motion is hereby **GRANTED** to the following extent.

1. Any attempts to alienate, transfer, encumber, or otherwise dispose of the Property are hereby prohibited in order to **preserve the status quo until the pending litigation is fully resolved by a Final Judgment determining the validity and administration of the Trust that is at the center of this action.**

2. **This Court retains exclusive jurisdiction** over all matters concerning the Property, and any conflicting orders, enforcement actions, or attempts to levy, sell, or transfer the Property are expressly barred pending this final adjudication of the Trust litigation

3. **All parties are restrained and enjoined from taking any actions that would alter, affect, or interfere with the current ownership, possession, or control of the Property until further order of this Court.**

4. This Court reserves jurisdiction to issue any further orders necessary to enforce, implement, and effectuate this Order. **(bold emphasis supplied).**

On May 28, 2025, Judge Peacock entered a third Order

[App. 15] ruling:

As to the motion to compel compliance with this Court's temporary injunction, it is the Court's intention that the March 12, 2025 Order

(Doc. 178) remain fully in effect until the ultimate issue in this matter, the trust litigation, is resolved. Until resolution of this matter or until further order of the Court, no action is allowed to be taken to dispose of or transfer the subject property. . . .The subject property remains designated as the homestead property of Thomas Jason Saxon pending a final judgment on the issues of the trust litigation.

Regarding Mr. Saxon's request for sanctions, the Court has heard the frustrations of counsel for Mr. Saxon that there is a flood of other litigation on the peripheries of this case which distract and divert attention from final resolution of the core issue for determination, which is the validity of the 2019 Ellen Saxon Trust. **Based on representations by counsel for Mr. Saxon, this peripheral litigation appears intended to thwart Saxon's right to the real property at issue in the trust litigation, should he be successful in that litigation. They contend that parallel actions in Orange County and in Probate Court in the 13th Circuit appear calculated to dilute Saxon's interests, if any, in the real property or perhaps even to usurp his right to this property should he be successful in the trust litigation.**

. . . .

It is therefore ORDERED that the Order Granting Temporary Injunction entered March 12, 2025 (Doc. 178) remains in full force and effect, and the failure to abide by the terms of this Court's order may result in the imposition of sanctions (bold emphasis supplied).

With respect to the "Mandamus litigation," Judge James

S. Moody III on January 17, 2025, entered an **ORDER**

DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS, [App. 16]

ruling:

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Petitioner, Florida Debt Acquisitions, Inc's, Petition for Writ of Mandamus filed January 4, 2025. Petitioner requested that the Court issue a writ of mandamus ordering Respondent, Sheriff Chad Chronister, to levy and auction a property within Hillsborough County to satisfy a judgement debt owed to Petitioner by Jason Saxon, a/k/a Thomas Jason Saxon. **Because the ownership of the property is in dispute, and Jason Saxon currently has no legal interest in the property, Petitioners have no right to the requested relief.** Accordingly, the petition is hereby **DENIED. (bold emphasis supplied).**

James S. Moody III noted in footnote 1: “The Court notes that this attempt to collect on the debt arose only after the filing of 22-CA-004334 [“trust litigation case”] against Mr. Saxon in the Thirteenth Circuit.”

The **VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS [App. 17]** constituted a fraud upon the Court. Only paragraph 13 was verified by **FDA’s** president and representative Nicholas Guerra. Paragraph 13 states:

13. The Sheriff refuses to perform the Requested Act. His counsel **Michelle Maxwell Esq., on Friday, January 3, 2025, at approximately 4:30 p.m. stated to the plaintiff’s representative**

that the Sheriff would not levy on the property set forth in the instructions for levy and also that she would not so state in writing. She did not provide a statute, case, code or rule of procedure to support the Sheriff's refusal to perform the Requested Act. She refused to state if any other portion of the documents presented to the Sheriff suffered any deficiency. She stated she would rely on a writ of mandamus to complete the levy **(bold emphasis supplied)**.

The "representative" is in fact Michael Farrar as evidenced by his own time records. **[App. 18]** In short, Mr. Guerra's verification is based on what his attorney Michael Farrar told him.

B. Judge Tanya Wilson by issuing contempt orders based on arguments of counsel and unverified pleadings

At the hearing on May 29, 2026, Jason Saxon was the only sworn witness. His testimony in full appears on pages 32-36. It only dealt with TURN OVER ORDER.

THE COURT: All right.

12 Ms. Daley [ph], would you please swear
in

13 Mr. Saxon?

14 And, Mr. Saxon, you need to take your
device

15 off mute.

16 THE CLERK: Please raise your right
hand to be

17 sworn. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that
the

18 testimony you shall give in this matter shall be
the

19 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the
truth, so

20 help you God?

21 MR. SAXON: I do.

22 THE CLERK: Thank you.

23 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Saxon, for
the

24 record, state your full name.

25 MR. SAXON: Thomas Jason Saxon.

33

1 THE COURT: And, Mr. Saxon, I have a
question.

2 Do you have, in your possession, the Ford F-150
that is

3 at issue here? I believe a 2016 Ford F-150.

4 MR. SAXON: Yes, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Okay. And where is that
vehicle

6 now?

7 MR. SAXON: It's out in the back of the

8 property, but it's been damaged due to the
accident and

9 in parts.

10 THE COURT: Is it operable?

11 MR. SAXON: Say again, Your Honor?

12 THE COURT: Is it operable?

13 MR. SAXON: Not -- it -- to -- it's not

14 roadworthy, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: When you say
"roadworthy," what

16 does that mean?

17 MR. SAXON: The front left of the truck
and the

18 driver's door and the front -- just the front of
the

19 vehicle is damaged, and the engine and things
of that

20 nature are not operating like they should --
brakes and

21 things of that nature not operating like they
should.

22 So -- I mean, it's there. I don't even -- you
know, I

23 mean, there -- but it is --

24 THE COURT: Is it drivable? Is it
drivable?

25 MR. SAXON: Not on the road. I could
probably

34

1 put it to the front of the property if that's -- if

2 that's what Your Honor would --

3 THE COURT: Do you have the keys?

4 MR. SAXON: Yes, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: All right. And does anyone
else

6 have keys or some remote access to the vehicle?

7 MR. SAXON: No, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Okay. Are you aware of an
order

9 from May 7th regarding transferring that title to
the

10 judgment creditor?

11 MR. SAXON: Your Honor, there was an
order and

12 then there was -- if you -- if you don't mind,
may

13 I -- may I answer more than just yes or no?
There

14 was --

15 THE COURT: Well --

16 MR. SAXON: -- a -- there was a
subsequent

17 order that denied that or that didn't -- that
denied

18 that order or related to the sheriff.

19 THE COURT: Relating to the Ford F-
150?

20 MR. SAXON: Yes, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: I'm not talking about any
property.

22 MR. SAXON: That's what I'm talking --

23 THE COURT: I'm not talking about that
at all.

24 I'm just talking about the Ford F-150. Were
you aware

25 of the May 7th order that was entered to
transfer that

1 title over to the judgment creditor?

2 MR. SAXON: I didn't know that there

3 was -- there was a final order associated with it,
Your

4 Honor. There was -- there was still -- to my
knowledge,

5 it was still in litigation.

6 THE COURT: And what made you think
that it was

7 still in litigation?

8 MR. SAXON: Because there was a
subsequent suit

9 with -- and a refusal of the execution of the -- of
the

10 sheriff to accompany the folks to come and
retrieve it.

11 THE COURT: So are you saying you did
not know

12 about that order? Is that what you're saying?

13 MR. SAXON: I -- not -- no -- not -- I did
not

14 know about that order. No, not specifically,
Your

15 Honor. No. I'm not -- I -- I'm not. There's so
much

16 going on, Your Honor, that --

17 THE COURT: I don't have the -- I haven't
asked

18 a question yet. Hold on. Since that time, has -
- since

19 May 7th of 2025, have you done anything to
turn over the

20 car to the judgment creditor?

21 MR. SAXON: No, Your Honor, because --
no.

22 THE COURT: So when did you first learn
that

23 you were supposed to turn that car over?

24 MR. SAXON: I still don't know that I'm --
that

25 I'm -- that I was supposed to turn it over, Your
Honor.

36

1 THE COURT: All right. Thank you very
much.

2 That motion is granted. Mr. Saxon shall
turn

3 over the Ford F-150 and the keys to the
4 plaintiff's

5 counsel within five days. If he fails to do so, the

6 judgment creditor can obtain the writ of replevin.

7 There won't be a hearing and including the break
8 order

9 authority. And Mr. Saxon shall appear to show
10 cause why

11 he should not be held in contempt of court if he
12 fails

13 to do so.

14 MR. SAXON: If Your Honor, may I just --
15 may I

16 put it out front of the property and notify
17 through my

18 attorney?

19 THE COURT: We'll get with your
20 attorney and

21 you -- and your attorney and Mr. Farrar will
22 make that

23 decision on how that -- how that's going to be
24 turned

25 over to the plaintiff.

Civil contempt is remedial and coercive, not punitive. It requires an alleged contemnor's failure to comply with a clear court directive. Where coercive incarceration is sought, the trial court must separately find that the alleged contemnor has the present ability to satisfy the purge condition. *Bowen v. Bowen*, 471 So. 2d 1274, 1278–80 (Fla. 1985).

The July 9 turnover order required delivery arrangements through counsel and warned that noncompliance could result in contempt proceedings. **[App. 3]** Petitioner's evidence is that the F-150 was already damaged and inoperable before that order; that he lacked the means to transport it elsewhere; and that he caused it to be towed outside the driveway gate, left the keys inside, and notified his counsel. **[App. 19]** If accepted, those facts negate a willful refusal to comply and require factual findings before contempt may be adjudicated.

FDA's contrary accusation—that Petitioner “trashed, crashed and stripped” the vehicle—does not resolve the timing or cause of the damage, the vehicle's condition before the turnover order, whether Petitioner could have arranged additional transportation, or whether the delivery and notice

constituted compliance. **[App. 20]** FDA's request for \$12,939, supported by a generalized online valuation and photographs, does not itself establish causation, actual loss, Petitioner's responsibility for any damage, or Petitioner's present ability to pay. **[App. 20]**

C. Judge Tanya Wilson erred by issuing contempt orders seeking sanctions without holding evidentiary hearing.

A monetary payment is not a valid civil-contempt purge condition merely because it is called a sanction. If the payment is coercive, the court must determine from competent evidence that Petitioner has the present ability to pay it. If it is compensatory for alleged vehicle damage, FDA must prove causation and damages through competent evidence subject to adversarial testing. And if it is imposed to punish alleged past conduct rather than to secure present compliance, the proceeding is punitive and requires the procedural protections appropriate to criminal contempt. *Bowen*, 471 So. 2d at 1278–80.

The distinction turns on the character and practical operation of the relief, not the label assigned to it. The

Eleventh Circuit has explained that civil-contempt sanctions may coerce compliance or compensate the complainant's actual losses, while a fixed sanction that the alleged contemnor cannot avoid through compliance is punitive in character. *Green Point Credit, LLC v. McLean (In re McLean)*, 794 F.3d 1313, 1323–25 (11th Cir. 2015). Although *McLean* arises from bankruptcy proceedings and is therefore persuasive rather than controlling here, its analysis reinforces the Florida distinction recognized in *Bowen*: a court may not use a nominally civil sanction to impose punishment without the process required for criminal contempt.

Here, a forced sale of Petitioner's separate, disputed interest in the Hazen Avenue Property bears no demonstrated relation to Petitioner's ability to deliver the F-150. Nor is it a lawful substitute for an evidentiary determination of alleged noncompliance, causation, actual loss, and present ability to satisfy any valid purge condition. The requested alternative sale therefore does not cure the deficiencies in **FDA's** contempt request.

In the indirect-criminal-contempt setting, prohibition may be available in the rare circumstance in which the underlying charge is invalid and the proceeding itself violates due process. *Carrington Mortg. Servs., LLC v. Nicolas*, 343 So. 3d 605, 609–12 (Fla. 3d DCA 2021). *Carrington* does not automatically govern **FDA**'s pending civil-contempt motion. It confirms, however, that a factual dispute cannot be converted into a contempt adjudication without the procedure appropriate to the character of the proceeding.

D. Nonparty William Crescenzo, FDA and its attorneys are engaged in vexatious litigation

There exists both a statutory and common law cause of action for vexatious litigation. *See e.g., Dunn v. Bellucci-Maus*, 24-CV-427 (SFR), 3:24-cv-00974-SFR (D. Conn. Sep 22, 2025).

However, the courts dealing with the traditional standards in the context of an injunction prohibiting continued vexatious litigation have adopted standards more suitable to the circumstances presented by such litigation. . . . In making the determination whether the litigant's conduct is sufficient to justify the entry of what is referred to as a Martin-Trigona injunction to stop continued vexatious litigation by persons with a history of such litigation and those acting "at the behest of or in concert" with the primary object of the injunction, it is sufficient to show a history of

litigation entailing vexation, harassment, and needless burden on the courts and their supporting personnel. *Martin-Trigona v. Shaw*, 986 F.2d 1384, 1387 (11th Cir.1993)

.....
In order to support a *Martin-Trigona* injunction, the movant must show: (1) the litigant's history of litigation and in particular whether it entailed vexatious, harassing or duplicative lawsuits, (2) the litigant's motive in pursuing the litigation, e.g., does the litigant have an objective, good-faith expectation of prevailing, (3) whether the litigant is represented by counsel, (4) whether the litigant has caused needless expense to other parties or has posed an unnecessary burden on the courts and their personnel, and (5) whether other sanctions would be adequate to protect the courts and other parties.

In re Dicks, 306 B.R. 700 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 2004).

“Attorneys are obligated to zealously advocate for their clients, but there is a point where every bar-card-carrying attorney must be able to tell his/her clients that their claim has no merit and that they will not continue to frivolously litigate.” *Mcom IP, LLC v. City Natl Bank of Fla.*, 23-23427-Civ-Scola/Lett (S.D. Fla. Mar 11, 2025).

[A] court may assess attorney's fees when a party has " 'acted in bad faith, vexatiously, wantonly, or for oppressive reasons.' " [citation omitted] . . . In this regard, if a court finds "that fraud has been practiced upon it, or that the very temple of justice has been defiled," it may assess attorney's fees against the responsible party, . . . [citation omitted] as it may

when a party "shows bad faith by delaying or disrupting the litigation or by hampering enforcement of a court order," [citation omitted]

Chambers v. Nasco, Inc., 501 U.S. 32, 111 S.Ct. 2123, 115 L.Ed.2d 27 (1991).

In 2025, the Florida Legislature expanded the statutory remedies available in vexatious litigation by passing CHAPTER 2025-128, which provides:

68.093 Florida Vexatious Litigant Law.—~~(8)(7)~~
The relief provided under this section shall be cumulative to any other relief or remedy available to a defendant under the laws of this state **or the rules of court** and the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, including, but not limited to, the relief provided under s. 57.105.

Section 2. This act shall take effect
July 1, 2025. Approved by the Governor
June 5, 2025.

Filed in Office Secretary of State
June 5, 2025. **(bold emphasis supplied).**

Although F.S. 68.093 generally applies to pro se litigants, F.S. 68.093(8) clarifies that it is “cumulative to any other relief or remedy available under the laws of this state or the rules of court.” The “laws of this state” includes the common law of “inherent judicial authority to sanction an abusive litigant.”

In *May v. Barthet*, 934 So.2d 1184, 1186 (Fla. 2006), the Florida Supreme Court held that under the common law, the Florida courts have “inherent judicial authority to sanction an abusive litigant.”

As noted by the United States Supreme Court, “[e]very paper filed with the Clerk of this Court, no matter how repetitious or frivolous, requires some portion of the institution's limited resources. A part of the Court's responsibility is to see that these resources are allocated in a way that promotes the interests of justice.” *In re McDonald*, 489 U.S. at 184, 109 S.Ct. 993. See also, *Lanier v. State*, 982 So.2d 626, 627-628 (Fla. 2008); *Pettway v. McNeil*, 987 So. 2d 20, 22, 2008 WL 2130286 (Fla. 2008).

Finally, the addition of the language “or the rules of court” in F.S. 68.093 includes **The Rules of Professional Regulation – Chapters 3 and 4.**

William Crescenzo is the sole officer and incorporator of Delaware Financial II Corporation and incorporated the company on January 8, 2025, with an effective date of January 3, 2025 — one day before Attorney Michael Farrar filed a

VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS, in *Florida Acquisitions, Inc. v. Chad Chronister as Hillsborough County Sheriff*, 13th Cir. Ct. Case No. 25-CA-000052 (“Mandamus case”).

In that case, Judge James S. Moody III noted in his **ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS** that Attorney Michael Farrar

- “admitted that Saxon is not an owner of record of the subject property”
- “argues that the Sheriff may complete a levy where a debtor has a partial interest in a property, but has cited no authority that authorizes, let alone *requires*, the Sheriff to complete a levy where a debtor has no interest in the property at the time of execution.” (italics in original)

Judge Moody noted in footnote 1: “The Court notes that this attempt to collect on the debt arose only after the filing of 22-CA-004334 [“trust litigation case”] against Mr. Saxon in the Thirteenth Circuit.” Judge Moody denied the petition “[b]ecause the ownership of the property is in dispute, and Jason Saxon currently has no legal interest [in] the property.”

William Crescenzo's status as the real party in interest in the "trust litigation case" is proven by the following undisputed facts:

- Inland Holdings Inc. — another corporation William Crescenzo uses as an "alter ego" — paid for the filing fee and other costs for Rebecca High, Alice Hillman, and Steven Velozo as Trustee of the 12219 Hazen Land Trust
- At a hearing held before Judge Peacock on February 12, 2025, attorneys employed by William Crescenzo Sam Dogali and Ann Allison admitted William Crescenzo was the real party in interest. **[App. 21]**
- Judge Peacock in her Order dated March 12, 2025, stated in paragraph 3:
"At the hearing Andrew Dogale, counsel for non-party Steven Velozo, as Trustee of the 12219 Hazen Land Trust confirmed that FDA's ownership is closely connected to the entity that subsequently obtained a mortgage on the Property while this instant case is pending."
- Michael Farrar appealed that order to the Second District Court of Appeal on behalf of FDA: Florida Debt Acquisitions, Inc. v. Saxon, 2D2025-0965.

At a hearing on February 12, 2025, **[App. 21]** in the "trust litigation" case, **FDA** through its attorney Ann Allison

stated: “The assignment was to the real property. The asset of the real property is how they understood it because I asked them and they said no, they didn’t consider it personal property.” **[App. 21** p. 128 lines 7 – 9 and 17 – 19]. When Judge Peacock asked Ann Allison who were her clients, Ms. Allison answered:

I asked my clients, and I asked Mr. Crescenzo whether you know, what about the real property? He said, “Oh no, this just” – the personal property, he said, “No, it’s just the real property.” **[App. 21** p. 128 lines 21 – 25].

Moreover, attorney Andy Dogali revealed that “the acquiring creditor in Orlando [FDA] is an entity **controlled** by Mr. Crescenzo” **[App. 21** page 106, lines 13 – 14].

William Crescenzo contacted Alice Hillman and Rebecca High by phone in late October or early November of 2024, and “solicited” them about acquiring their rights to the **SECOND AMENDED AND REINSTATED TRUST AGREEMENT** which was the purported title owner of all of Ellen Saxon’s personal property and her real property, including her homestead property located at 12219 Hazen Avenue, Thonotosassa, Florida 33592. Mr. Crescenzo instructed his attorney Cheyenne

Whitfield to draft Quit Claim Deeds, Specific Powers of Attorneys, and Assignments of Interest, which named Mr. Crescenzo's friend and business associate Steven Velozo as the grantee. As the "legal title owner," Mr. Velozo executed and recorded a mortgage naming Inland Properties, Inc. — another corporation owned and controlled by Willian Crescenzo — as the mortgagee.**[App. 22]**

Mr. Crescenzo is the only "authorized representative" who has appeared on behalf of **FDA** at all the hearings that have been held in these proceedings supplementary. Nick Guerra has not personally appeared at any of the hearings. William Crescenzo is also using a "shell" corporation called Delaware Financial II, Corporation. Mr. Crescenzo is the person who hired and paid Attorney Emily Brown to testify as an "expert witness" through Delaware Financial II Corporation at a hearing held in this proceedings supplementary case in Orange County before Judge Heather Pinder Rodriguez on September 4, 2025. **[App. 23]** Judge Rodriguez found in her **ORDER DENYING JUDGMENT CREDITOR'S RENEWED MOTION TO**

PURCHASE INTANGIBLE PROPERTY INTERESTS

OF JUDGMENT DEBTOR [App. 24]

I HEREBY FIND THAT:

1. The sole matter scheduled for a 30 minute evidentiary hearing was **JUDGMENT CREDITOR'S RENEWED MOTION TO PURCHASE INTANGIBLE PROPERTY INTERESTS OF JUDGMENT DEBTOR.**

2. The only witness called was Attorney Emily J. Hansen-Brown who had filed an affidavit on May 24, 2025, and a supplemental affidavit filed on August 27, 2025, purporting to give a valuation on "intangible property interests."

3. In paragraph 1) of her supplemental affidavit, Attorney Emily J. Hansen-Brown averred that she has "been licensed to practice law in the State of Florida since October 2008."

4. In paragraph 2), she stated: "As a practicing attorney , I have handled various litigation matters including real property litigation."

5. When asked about what licenses she held, Attorney Emily J. Hansen-Brown testified she had a Florida Bar license and a Real Estate Agent license.

6. She admitted she was not certified in any specialty as an attorney and that she was not a real estate broker who could issue a Broker's Price Opinion (BPO).

7. Attorney Emily J. Hansen-Brown admitted she had no training, or any certificates that she was qualified, in the area of "valuing intangible property."

8. Attorney Emily J. Hansen-Brown admitted she has never testified as an expert in "valuing intangible property."

9. Attorney Emily J. Hansen-Brown never testified as to her education.

10. Attorney Emily J. Hansen-Brown's testimony is insufficient to qualify her as an "expert witness" per section 90. 702, Florida Statutes (2025).

It is, therefore **ORDERED THAT** the renewed motion is **DENIED**.

Mr. Crescenzo (a non-lawyer) interjected himself at the two mediations held in the “Trust litigation” case. Indeed, Mr. Crescenzo sent an email to Stanley Padgett — the court appointed attorney for Steven Velozo, Rebecca High and Alice Hillman — the day before the second mediation **[App. 24]**:

- Expressing a legal opinion that the “executed quitclaims/assign-ments and related transfer documents conveying any interest [by Rebecca High and Alice Hillman] held in the 2019 Ellen Saxon Trust and in 12219 Hazen Ave. to Steven Velozo as Trustee for the Land Trust **remain valid and binding**.”

- Demanding that Mr. Padgett “confirm in writing today that your representation is limited to Ms. High and Ms. Hillman” and “confirm that you are not restricting their ability to share information or respond to coordination requests, and that you will promptly relay any proposals to us for discussion.”

- Representing that “Velozo will object to any attempt to treat Ms. High or Ms. Hillman as current owners/beneficiaries for purposes of allocating or disposing of trust or property rights.”

- Stating this “note is simply to preserve the record, align everyone on the existing chain of title/assignments, and ensure that the mediator understands who has authority to commit which interests.”

- Demanding that any “resolution must respect the 2019 plan, the November 2024 assignments, and Velozo’s exclusive authority over the property.”

- Representing that “Steven has invested time, money, and trust obligations based on those assignments. If the mediation proceeds on the idea that Rebecca and Alice still have beneficial rights, it puts Steven in a position where his role as Trustee to the Land Trust is undermined and where he could be bound to a settlement that disregards both the 2019 estate plan and the reliance he placed on their prior agreements.”

Non-lawyer Mr. Crescenzo further intimidated Rebecca High and Alice Hillman by working with Seven Velozo in filing a suit against them a few days before the second mediation.**[App. 25].**

VI. Conclusion

A transcript of the hearing on May 29, 2026 before Judge Tanya Wilson, was filed yesterday August 4, 2026. **[App. 26]**

A **NOTICE OF APPEAL OF NONFINAL ORDERS** was filed this morning. **[App. 27].**

VII. Request for Relief

Petitioner Jason Saxon respectfully requests that this Court:

- A.- Issue an order to show cause why a writ of prohibition should not issue;
- B.- Enter temporary relief preserving the status quo as to the Hazen Avenue Property pending this Court's disposition of this original proceeding;
- C.- Issue a writ of prohibition barring the lower tribunal from ordering, authorizing, enforcing, or using contempt to compel a levy, auction, sale, transfer, foreclosure, or other disposition of Petitioner's asserted interest in the Hazen Avenue Property unless and until the "trust litigation" in Hillsborough County is totally resolved;
- D.- Grant such other relief as is just and proper.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished by Eportal email on August 5, 2026, to:

Holly Saxon
Co-Defendant
Email: hsaxon476@gmail.com

Michael Farrar
Cheyenne Whitfield
Email: cheyenne@cwesq.com
 michaelfarrar@atlanticbb.net
Attorneys for Plaintiffs Florida Debt Acquisitions, Inc.,

Sam Badawi
Attorney for Third Party RV Depot, LLC

Email: Sam@badawilaw.com
Admin@badawilaw.com
Marie@badawilaw.com
Bianca@badawilaw.com

David Cohen
Attorney for Third Party CTY Realty LLC
Email; david@dscohenlaw.com
admin@dscohenlaw.com

Michelle Maxwell
Assistant General Counsel for
Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office
Email: mmaxwell@teamhcsso.com

/s/Randall O. Reder

Randall O. Reder
Florida Bar No. 264210
ACE Charitable Legal Services, Inc.
108 E York St, #302, Savannah, GA 31401
Phone: 813-453-5896
Email: reder@redersdigest.com

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I certify that this brief complies with the requirements of Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure 9.045(a), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure 9.100(g) because it was prepared using Bookman Old Style 14-point font and because the word count from the word-processing system used to prepare this document is less than 13,000.

/s/ Randall O. Reder

Randall O. Reder, Attorney for Petitioner Jason Saxon