COMPOSITE EXHIBIT
A

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

THE FLORIDA BAR,

Complainant,

v.

DAWN MARIE CALACHE,

Respondent.

/

Supreme Court Case No.

The Florida Bar File Nos.
2024-30,101 (7A);
2024-30,392 (7A)

CONDITIONAL GUILTY PLEA FOR CONSENT JUDGMENT

The undersigned respondent, Dawn Marie Calache, files this Conditional Guilty Plea for Consent Judgment under R. Regulating Fla. Bar 3-7.9.

1. Respondent is, and at all times relevant to this matter was, a member of The Florida Bar, subject to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Florida and the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar.

2. Respondent is acting freely and voluntarily in this matter and tenders this plea without fear or threat of coercion. Respondent is represented in this matter.

3. As to Florida Bar File Nos. 2024-30,101 (7A) and 2024-30,392 (7A) there has been a finding of probable cause by the Seventh Judicial Circuit Grievance Committee "A."

4. The disciplinary measures to be imposed on respondent are:

   a. Public reprimand and the disposition order will be published in the *Southern Reporter*.

   b. Respondent must undergo an office procedures and record-keeping analysis by The Florida Bar's Diversion/Discipline Consultation Service. Respondent must contact Diversion/Discipline Consultation Service staff within 30 days from the date of the Supreme Court of Florida's order approving this consent judgment to schedule a review of respondent's law office procedures, equipment, staffing, business practices and trust accounting procedures and must participate in as many reviews and interviews the Diversion/Discipline Consultation Service requires. Respondent agrees to pay all fees of the Diversion/Discipline Consultation Service, which are based on the size of the firm, totaling $3,500.00. Respondent must fully comply with and implement all of the Diversion/Discipline Consultation Service recommendations at respondent's sole expense. Diversion/Discipline Consultation Service staff will conduct a final review, which may involve an additional cost to respondent. This final review will confirm compliance with, and implementation of, the recommendations of Diversion/Discipline Consultation Service staff. The Diversion/Discipline Consultation Service staff will provide the Lawyer Regulation Department of The Florida Bar with status reports on its analysis and respondent's implementation of its recommendations.

   c. Respondent must attend Ethics School in person where scheduled by the bar within 6 months of the order approving this consent judgment and pay associated fees totaling $750.00 before attendance.

   d. Respondent must pay restitution to Esther Villanueva Meza in the amount of $2,800.00 and to Ken Lorena Lucero in the amount of $4,500.00 and submit verifiable proof of payment and its receipt to The Florida Bar at its headquarters address in Tallahassee within thirty (30) days of the date of the Supreme Court of Florida's order approving this consent judgment. Verifiable proof of payment consists of a copy of the front and back of the negotiated check or a copy of the check and certified return receipt. If respondent cannot locate Esther Villanueva Meza and/or Ken Lorena Lucero after a diligent search, respondent must execute and submit an affidavit of diligent search to The Florida Bar at its headquarters address in Tallahassee and must pay the full amount of the restitution to The Florida Bar's Clients' Security Fund within thirty (30) days of the date of the Court's order. If respondent does not pay restitution within the agreed time frame, respondent is deemed delinquent and ineligible to practice law under R. Regulating Fla. Bar 1-3.6(d).

e. Payment of the bar's disciplinary costs.

5. The following allegations and rules provide the basis for respondent's guilty plea and for the discipline to be imposed in this matter:

A. Respondent, a solo practitioner who did not practice immigration law, hired Yanet Floyd, a nonlawyer, to assist new clients by preparing and filing immigration documents to submit to the office of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). Respondent met Floyd when respondent made a Facebook post during the COVID-19 shutdown announcing that she wanted to help anyone in need. Floyd responded that she was in need of financial assistance to support her family. Floyd advised respondent she had extensive experience in transactional immigration law matters and was close to completing her degree in paralegal studies. Respondent did not conduct a background check to verify Floyd's claims.

B. Respondent was aware that Floyd had been operating a business in which she prepared immigration documents for clients and believed that Floyd's activities may have constituted the unlicensed practice of law.

C. Respondent decided to hire Floyd as an independent contractor at her law firm and to expand her law practice to immigration law. As part of the agreement between respondent and Floyd, respondent agreed to pay Floyd 50% of the retainer paid by the client once the documents were filed by Floyd through the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) website. Respondent trusted Floyd to report accurately whether an application or document was filed and did not require Floyd to present documentary proof.

D. As respondent did not speak Spanish, and the majority of the immigration clients spoke little to no English, respondent delegated to Floyd full responsibility to conduct all meetings with clients to collect the pertinent information, answer legal questions, and provide the clients with updates about the case. Respondent relied on Floyd to interpret for respondent when necessary, although respondent had no way to know if

Floyd was conveying information between respondent and the non-English speaking clients accurately. In most instances, respondent's only personal interaction with the clients consisted of briefly introducing herself to them at the initial consultation being conducted by Floyd.

E. Based on their close friendship, respondent trusted Floyd and did not closely supervise her work activities. As a result of respondent's lack of supervision, Floyd began accepting payments directly from clients to prepare immigration documents without respondent's knowledge and, in some instances, without the individuals becoming clients of respondent's law firm. Floyd apparently concealed these clients from respondent by meeting with them at locations outside of respondent's office and accepting payment directly to herself through the Zelle payment system.

F. After Floyd went on vacation out of state, Floyd deleted the client files from respondent's Dropbox account without respondent's knowledge. Respondent was unable to retrieve the deleted files. Respondent attempted, without success, to obtain the client files and documents from Floyd. When it became apparent to respondent that Floyd was not going to return to Florida and would not help respondent by restoring the client files, respondent severed her relationship with Floyd in

May 2023. Thereafter, Floyd retaliated by filing grievances against respondent with various agencies and law enforcement, including the bar..

G. In July 2023, respondent was contacted by two separate immigration clients who advised respondent that Floyd had told them she filed their immigration applications. However, when the clients contacted the USCIS for status updates, they discovered no applications had been filed.

H. In The Florida Bar file number 2024-30,101(7A), Esther Villanueva Meza hired respondent on September 19, 2022, to prepare and submit to the USCIS a "Form I-140" petition to obtain a foreign worker visa. Meza paid respondent a total of $8,140.00, $2,800.00 of which was paid in cash on September 19, 2022, and the balance by money orders that she provided to Yanet Floyd. Floyd failed to record all of Meza's payments in the Excel spreadsheet respondent maintained for the immigration clients to track their fee payments. Floyd also misappropriated the money order payments Meza made by altering the payee on the money orders. Respondent was unaware that Meza had paid her fee in full and that Floyd had misappropriated the funds. Because all client communication was routed through Floyd, Meza was unable to communicate directly with respondent to obtain status updates or to schedule an in-person meeting with respondent. Respondent was unaware that Floyd was preventing Meza from communicating directly with her. Due to respondent's lack of communication, Meza's sponsor contacted USCIS and learned that no I-140 petition had been filed on her behalf. Meza traced the 17 money orders she had given to Floyd and found that two had been cashed by someone who changed "USCIS" to "Yanet Floyd" on the "pay to the order of" line. A third money order was altered to allow an unknown person to cash it. Meza was able to recoup some money from Western Union but has not been refunded the balance of $2,800.00 she paid to respondent.

I. In The Florida Bar File number 2024-30,392(7A), Ken Lorena Lucero hired respondent's firm on November 8, 2022, to prepare and submit to the USCIS a "Form I-140" work visa petition on behalf of an employee and the employee's children whom Lucero sponsored. Floyd handled all of the aspects of the immigration matter Lucero paid respondent to handle. Lucero paid respondent's firm a $1,000.00 deposit toward the $4,500.00 total fee for the legal services. This amount did not include more than $4,000.00 in costs for filing fees, translations, shipping, and other expenses. Lucero paid the fee balance of $3,500.00 directly to Floyd by a combination of cash and Zelle payments. Thereafter, Lucero was unable to obtain status updates from respondent and when she was able to speak with someone at respondent's firm, the representative was dismissive and rude. Although Lucero paid all of the fees in full, the I-140 petition was not filed. Respondent believed Floyd's representations that Lucero had not paid any fees beyond the initial deposit and none of the payments made by Lucero were entered into the Excel spreadsheet respondent maintained to track immigration client fee payments. Because respondent believed the balance of the fees had not been paid, she did not initially understand that Lucero was owed a refund as the application had not been filed.

J. In an effort to mitigate the damage to immigration clients, respondent hired a lawyer to complete the work that had not been done by Floyd or to advise respondent if a refund was appropriate for that particular client. Respondent's hiring of outside counsel to attempt to mitigate the damage caused by Floyd reflects her lack of competence in the immigration matters over which she claimed to be exercising supervisory authority. Neither Meza nor Lucero were given a refund though respondent acknowledges her firm did not provide legal services to them.

K. By reason of the foregoing, respondent's misconduct in both matters violated the same Rules Regulating The Florida Bar, which are as follows: 4-1.1 (Competence); 4-1.3 (Diligence); 4-1.4(a) (Informing Client of

Status of Representation); 4-1.4(b) (Duty to Explain Matters to Client); 4-5.3(a) (Use of Titles by Nonlawyer Assistants); 4-5.3(b) (Supervisory Responsibility); 4-5.3(c) (Ultimate Responsibility of Lawyer).

6. In mitigation, respondent has no prior disciplinary history [Florida's Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions 3.3(b)(1)]. She has made a timely good faith effort to make restitution or to rectify the consequences of her misconduct [Standard 3.3(b)(4)]. Respondent has provided full and free disclosure to the bar with a cooperative attitude [Standard 3.3(b)(5)]. At the time of the events at issue, respondent was inexperienced in the practice of law, having become a member of the bar in November 2016, and having never practiced immigration law before[Standard 3.3(b)(6)]. As to respondent's character, she met Floyd when she attempted to help her community by offering financial assistance and she has served as a Guardian Ad Litem [Standard 3.3(b)(7)] and she has demonstrated remorse for her role in failing to protect her clients from Floyd's criminal acts [Standard 3.3(b)(12)].

7. In aggravation, respondent engaged in a pattern of misconduct [Florida's Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions 3.2(b)(3)], which resulted in multiple offenses [Standard 3.2(b)(4)], and the victims of the misconduct, people seeking legal authorization to reside in the United

States, were particularly vulnerable [Standard 3.2(b)(8)] as they were not fluent in English and were unfamiliar with the country's legal system.

8. The Florida Bar has approved this proposed plea as required by R. Regulating Fla. Bar 3-7.9.

9. If this plea is not finally approved by the Board of Governors of The Florida Bar and the Supreme Court of Florida, then it has no effect and may not be used by the parties in any way.

10. If this plea is approved, respondent agrees to pay all reasonable costs associated with this case under Rule 3-7.6(q) in the amount of $3,376.51. These costs are due within 30 days of the Court order. Respondent agrees that if the costs are not paid within 30 days of this Court's order becoming final, respondent will pay interest on any unpaid costs at the statutory rate. Respondent further agrees these disciplinary costs are not dischargeable in any future proceedings, including, but not limited to, a petition for bankruptcy. Respondent will be delinquent and ineligible to practice law if respondent does not satisfy the cost judgment within 30 days of this order, unless The Florida Bar Board of Governors defers payment under R. Regulating Fla. Bar 1-3.6.

11. Respondent acknowledges the obligation to pay the costs of this proceeding, along with any agreed restitution, and that payment is

evidence of strict compliance with the conditions of any disciplinary order or agreement and is evidence of good faith and fiscal responsibility.

12. This Conditional Guilty Plea for Consent Judgment fully complies with all requirements of the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar.

Dated this 18 day of November, 2025.

Dawn Calache

Dawn Marie Calache, Respondent
3959 South Nova Road, Suite 2
Port Orange, Florida 32127-4900
(386) 872-4223
Florida Bar No. 123760
dcalache@calachelaw.com

Dated this 18th day of November, 2025.

Matthew R. Kachergus

Matthew R. Kachergus
Counsel for Respondent
215 North Washington Street
Jacksonville, Florida 32202-2808
(904) 356-9661
Florida Bar No. 503282
mkachergus@sheppardwhite.com

Dated this 19th day of November, 2025.

Lisa J. Ramsey

Lisa J. Ramsey
Bar Counsel
The Florida Bar
1000 Legion Place, Suite 1625
Orlando, Florida 32801
(407) 425-5424
Florida Bar No. 526088
lramsey@floridabar.org

Filed with the Supreme Court of Florida via the Florida Courts E-Filing Portal with copies served via the Portal to:

Lisa J. Ramsey, Bar Counsel, The Florida Bar, lramsey@floridabar.org, orlandooffice@floridabar.org

Matthew R. Kachergus, Counsel for Respondent, mkachergus@sheppardwhite.com

Patricia Ann Toro Savitz, Staff Counsel, psavitz@floridabar.org

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

THE FLORIDA BAR,

Complainant,

v.

DAWN MARIE CALACHE,

Respondent.

______________________________/

Supreme Court Case No.

The Florida Bar File Nos.
2024-30,101(7A);
2024-30,392(7A)

STIPULATION TO ENTRY OF AGREED ORDER

The Florida Bar and Dawn Marie Calache stipulate to the entry of the attached order in this case, subject to the approval of the Supreme Court of Florida and state:

Respondent is, and at all times relevant to this matter was, a member of The Florida Bar, subject to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Florida.

Respondent simultaneously is tendering a conditional guilty plea under an agreement with The Florida Bar for a consent judgment.

If the conditional guilty plea is approved, respondent agrees to the terms and conditions in the agreed consent judgment and attached order.

It is therefore stipulated by The Florida Bar and respondent that the attached order should be entered on approval of the Supreme Court of Florida.

Dated this 18th day of ~~September,~~ November 2025.

Dawn Marie Calache
Respondent
3959 South Nova Road, Suite 2
Port Orange, Florida 32127-4900
(386) 872-4223
Florida Bar No. 123760
dcalache@calachelaw.com

Approved by:

Matthew R. Kachergus
Counsel for Respondent
215 North Washington Street
Jacksonville, Florida 32202-2808
(904) 356-9661
Florida Bar No. 503282
mkachergus@sheppardwhite.com

Approved by:

Lisa J. Ramsey, Bar Counsel
The Florida Bar
1000 Legion Place, Suite 1625
Orlando, Florida 32801
(407) 425-5424
Florida Bar No. 526088
lramsey@floridabar.org
orlandooffice@floridabar.org