

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA  
(Before a Referee)

THE FLORIDA BAR,

Complainant,

v.

STEPHEN EVERETT WALKER,

Respondent.

---

Supreme Court Case No.  
SC23-1205

The Florida Bar File No(s):  
2021-50,076(15E)  
2021-50,241(15E)

**CORRECTED REPORT OF REFEREE**

I. **SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS**

Pursuant to the undersigned being duly appointed as Referee to conduct disciplinary proceedings herein according to Rule 3-7.6, Rules of Discipline, the following proceedings occurred:

The Chief Judge of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit appointed the undersigned Referee on September 13, 2023. On September 27, 2023, The Florida Bar filed its Amended Complaint<sup>1</sup> against Respondent as well as its Request for Admissions in these proceedings. A Notice of Case Management Conference was filed on September 29, 2023, setting a hearing for October 23, 2023, later rescheduled to October 25, 2023.

---

<sup>1</sup> The original Complaint was filed on August 25, 2023.

On October 18, 2023, Respondent filed his Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint. The Florida Bar filed a Motion for Default on October 24, 2023, due to Respondent's failure to file an Answer. At the October 25, 2023, case management conference, the Referee deferred on The Florida Bar's Motion for Default and ordered all discovery and motions to be completed by December 12, 2023. On November 2, 2023, the Referee denied the Respondent's Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint, The Florida Bar's Motion for Default, and The Florida Bar's Motion to Strike Respondent's Answer and Affirmative Defenses.

On December 1, 2023, The Florida Bar filed its Motion for Partial Summary Judgment. The Respondent's Response to The Florida Bar's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment was untimely filed on April 15, 2024. A hearing was held on The Florida Bar's Motion on April 16, 2024. The Florida Bar's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment was granted on both Counts I and Count II of the Florida Bar's Amended Complaint. Consequently, on June 17, 2024, a final hearing was held solely to determine appropriate discipline in this matter.

At the final hearing, The Florida Bar was represented by competent lead counsel William Mulligan and co-counsel Dina Hyppolite. Respondent, Stephen Everett Walker, appeared *pro se*.

All items properly filed including pleadings, notices, motions and orders, recorded testimony (if transcribed), exhibits in evidence, constitute the record in this case and are forwarded to the Supreme Court of Florida.

## II. FINDINGS OF FACT

A. Jurisdictional Statement. Respondent is, and at all times mentioned during this investigation was, a member of The Florida Bar, subject to the jurisdiction and Disciplinary Rules of the Supreme Court of Florida.

B. Narrative Summary of Case. In granting The Florida Bar's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, the Referee relied upon proof of material fact, which included court transcripts, court orders, and pleadings filed within the record. Those undisputed facts constitute the Referee's findings of fact as to Counts I and II brought by The Florida Bar, as summarized below:

### COUNT I

1. Respondent and Lauren King ("King") were in a romantic relationship that ended around 2019.

2. On July 1, 2020, Respondent filed a civil complaint against King (Case No. 2020-CA-6988) in the Circuit Court for the 15th Judicial Circuit, Palm Beach County, Florida.

3. King was served with the lawsuit by a process server on July 4, 2020. On the same day, Respondent appeared at King's home to hand-deliver a Request for Production and Notice of Deposition, intending to harass her.

4. On July 5, 2020, Respondent sent numerous emails to King's family and friends, attaching the civil complaint to harass her.

5. In the civil complaint, Respondent made several unprofessional statements, foreshadowing his later actions. These statements included but are not limited to the following:

- Lauren King then, as she does whenever faced with being held accountable for her cruel and despicable nature . . . ¶ 9
- The disgusting and shockingly repugnant nature of Lauren King's actions are not appropriate for inclusion in a public record such as this. ¶ 30
- As a result of Lauren King's malicious and odious conduct, which is intolerable in our civilized community . . . . ¶ 31

6. Respondent filed a Notice of Voluntary Dismissal of his civil complaint and same was dismissed on July 10, 2020.

7. On August 10, 2020, Respondent filed a second civil complaint using the same file number as the previously dismissed civil complaint. The August 10, 2020, civil complaint included Stephen M. Wald, Esq., King's half-brother;

David Steinfeld, Esq., King's former attorney; Sean Lindsey, Esq., King's former attorney; and Tony Bennett, Esq., a friend of King's, as defendants.

8. Tony Bennett testified on King's behalf in a hearing held July 30, 2020, on King's petition for an injunction for protection against stalking against Respondent.

9. Respondent's inclusion of the allegations against Bennett in the second civil complaint was simply a ruse to embarrass and harass Bennett.

10. Respondent included (3) three specific counts against Bennett in the civil complaint. Respondent alleged that Bennett committed perjury, fraud, and defamation based on his testimony at the July 30, 2020, injunction hearing.

11. Respondent also alleged that Bennett engaged in a conspiracy and RICO violations with the other defendants named in the second civil complaint.

12. In the second civil complaint, Respondent made irrelevant, unprofessional, and unnecessarily salacious and explicit statements about King in order to embarrass and humiliate her.

13. Thereafter, Respondent sent numerous emails to members of King's family and friends and attached a copy of the August 10, 2020, civil complaint.

14. Forwarding the second civil complaint to King's family and friends was done by Respondent to harass King.

15. A sampling of those statements in the August 10, 2020, civil complaint

is set forth below:

- In an effort to quell her consistent and pervasive personality characteristics, Lauren King has been dependent upon alcohol and illegal narcotics. Those substances, however, only amplify her dreadful conduct . . . . ¶ 18
- Lauren King's deceptive nature and history of polygamous sexual tendencies ¶ 23
- Lauren King's claim of trauma is a lie – she commonly walked around the main area of the house (with no window treatments) nude, walked outside of the house nude, got ready in the master bathroom and bedroom each morning with the blinds open and golf course maintenance workers able to see her, pleased herself daily with the blinds open in full view of golfers, took videos and photos of herself and sent them to Walker (and others), and had sex with Walker (and possibly others) in the bedroom with the blinds open and by the pool in open daylight, often with one of them recording it on video on one of their phones.¶ 93

16. Each defendant named in the second civil complaint filed a Motion to Dismiss based on lack of jurisdiction, as Respondent had previously filed a voluntary dismissal in the case. On October 22, 2020, the court granted these motions to dismiss without prejudice. The case, styled *Walker v. King, et al.*, Case No. 2020-CA-6988, is currently closed.

17. On March 26, 2021, a hearing was held before the Honorable Debra Moses Stephens in a related case concerning a stalking petition filed by King against Respondent.<sup>2</sup> In discussing Respondent's filing of the second complaint on August 10, 2020, addressed *supra*, the court stated:

The first problem was the filing of the pleading in a dismissed case. You're a very smart attorney. I can tell by the way you've been talking here, arguing and asking questions. Very smart. I'm absolutely certain you knew you couldn't file that pleading in that closed case. You didn't pay the reopening fee so you clearly weren't trying to reopen the case. You filed the pleading, a pleading that is open to the public record, anybody can see it, and then you sent it to her friends, her family and to her clients. That is a frightening thing. That goes beyond the pale. That is willfully. That is certainly malicious. And the fact that you send it to multiple people, that establishes a course of conduct, that you would send it to all of these different people to put in their [sic] all of her sexual practices, or what you claim to be her sexual practices, how she walks around naked, whatever it is, all of these things, you exposed her to all these people and gave them all this personal information. This is akin to taking naked pictures of someone and putting it all over the internet. It'd be one thing if you just filed it in the public record, but then sending it to all of these other people just boggles the mind, and it stuns the senses to think that you felt like this was an acceptable procedure. I'm sitting here and I've read that pleading and none of it, most of it, has nothing to do with an actual legal pleading. It's you simply releasing all sorts of ugly information to other people just in the hope of embarrassing her. That is a frightening thing to me, and when a person has an injunction, they expect that paper to mean something. And it should demand respect from the person, the

---

<sup>2</sup> This hearing was held in the case styled *King v. Walker*, Case No. 2021-DR-2132.

Respondent. But it seems to get no respect here and that's a problem for the Court as well. P. 217, Line 17 through P. 219, Line 5.

18. The Honorable Judge Moses reiterated these findings in the Order on Respondent's Motion for Rehearing entered on June 7, 2021, where the court found the following, among other things:

The entire complaint appears to have no other purpose than to embarrass her in front of family, friends, and clients. . . . The complaint was filed in the public record to harass the Petitioner and then transmitted to family, friends, and acquaintances to further harass the petitioner. This in and of itself shows a course of conduct as it was maliciously, willfully, and by transmitting it to multiple persons, repeatedly harassing the Petitioner. . . . [E]ach action was done maliciously, willfully, and repeatedly. The actions served no legitimate purpose other than to harass the Petitioner. It has caused the Petitioner substantial emotional distress as described above but also in the knowledge that the Respondent does not respect the order of the court and so the injunction is simply a piece of paper that is meaningless and will provide her no protection.

## COUNT II

19. On July 7, 2020, King filed a petition for an injunction for protection against stalking, which was granted on July 30, 2020. On October 27, 2020, Respondent was charged with two counts of violating the injunction by being within 500 feet of King's place of employment on two occasions. *State v. Walker*, Case No. 2020-MM-8396. Respondent was arrested on these charges on November 3, 2020.

20. After the aforementioned initial injunction expired, King again petitioned for an injunction against stalking on March 15, 2021. As a result, a second injunction for protection against stalking violence was entered against Respondent on March 26, 2021, in the case styled *King v. Walker*, Case No. 2021-DR-2132.

21. The second injunction included a provision that Respondent was not to go within 500 feet of the gym both Respondent and King frequented.

22. On May 12, 2021, Respondent was arrested for violating the injunction by being within 500 feet of the gym.

23. Respondent was again charged with a misdemeanor for violation of the injunction in the case styled *State v. Walker*, Case No. 2021-MM-3261.

24. On November 22, 2021, Respondent pled no contest to one count of violating the injunction in Case No. 2020-MM-8396; count II in that case was nolle prossed. Respondent also pled no contest to one count of violating the injunction in Case No. 2021-MM-3261. Adjudication was withheld and Respondent was sentenced to probation for 18 months. The terms of probation included successful completion of a batterer's intervention program, no weapons or firearms, no contact with King (including within 500 feet radius), and a psychiatric evaluation.

### III. RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO GUILT

Based upon the foregoing findings of fact, it is the recommendation of the undersigned Referee that Respondent be found guilty of violating the following Rules Regulating The Florida Bar:

**3-4.3** (The commission by a lawyer of any act that is unlawful or contrary to honesty and justice may constitute a cause for discipline whether the act is committed in the course of the lawyer's relations as a lawyer or otherwise, whether committed within Florida or outside the state of Florida, and whether the act is a felony or a misdemeanor.);

**3-4.4** (The Florida Bar may initiate disciplinary action regardless of whether the respondent has been tried, acquitted, or convicted in a court for an alleged criminal misdemeanor or felony offense.... If a respondent is acquitted in a criminal proceeding that acquittal is not a bar to disciplinary proceedings. Likewise, the findings, judgment, or decree of any court in civil proceedings is not necessarily binding in disciplinary proceedings.);

**4-4.4(a)** (In representing a client, a lawyer may not use means that have no substantial purpose other than to embarrass, delay, or burden a third person or knowingly use methods of obtaining evidence that violate the legal rights of such a person.);

**4-8.4(a)** (A lawyer shall not violate or attempt to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, knowingly assist or induce another to do so, or do so through the acts of another.);

**4-8.4(b)** (A lawyer shall not commit a criminal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer in other respects.); and

**4-8.4(d)** (A lawyer shall not engage in conduct in connection with the practice of law that is prejudicial to the administration of justice, including to knowingly, or through callous indifference, disparage, humiliate, or discriminate against litigants, jurors, witnesses, court personnel, or other lawyers on any basis, including, but not limited to, on account of race, ethnicity, gender, religion, national origin, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, age, socioeconomic status, employment, or physical characteristic.)

#### IV. CASE LAW

In reaching this decision, the Referee considered the following cases in addition to those referenced in the Referee's Order Granting Summary Judgment (filed May 16, 2024), prior to recommending discipline including:

*The Florida Bar v. Kinsella*, 260 So. 3d 1046 (2018) - Respondent was suspended for (3) three years for stealing \$760.00 from her employer shortly after bar admission. She pled no contest to petit theft. The Court noted her full cooperation, unrelated nature of the theft to law practice, financial issues, voluntary treatment, and significant remorse. Aggravating factors included a dishonest motive, a pattern of misconduct, and multiple offenses.

*The Florida Bar v. Patterson*, 330 So. 3d 519 (2021) - Respondent was suspended for (2) two years for misconduct which involved making unfounded allegations against courts, counsel, and parties, misusing a fax that was inadvertently sent to him by opposing party, and for repeatedly violating procedural rules and thereby failing to expedite litigation. Patterson had one prior instance of discipline involving a one-year suspension.

*The Florida Bar v. Helinger*, 620 So. 2d 993 (1993) - Respondent was suspended for (2) two years after having pled guilty to multiple counts of making obscene phone calls and having a selfish motive.

*The Florida Bar v. Parrish*, 241 So. 3d 66 (2018) – The Florida Supreme Court noting that “in more recent years the Court has imposed even more severe discipline for unethical and unprofessional conduct than in the past.” The *Parrish* Court also stated it “. . . views cumulative misconduct more seriously than an isolated instance of misconduct, and cumulative

misconduct of a similar nature warrants an even more severe discipline than might dissimilar conduct.”

*The Florida Bar v. Norkin*, 132 So. 3d 77 (2013) – Respondent was suspended for two years for his misconduct which involved the sending of a series of vitriolic e-mails to opposing counsel accusing him of lying, dishonesty, as well as threatening a variety of things. He also disrupted numerous hearings in front of several judges. Additionally, he accused a retired judge, who served as provisional director appointed by the court, of being a conspirator. He received a public reprimand for previous misconduct and had already attended anger management.

*The Florida Bar v. Krapacs*, SC19-277, 2020 WL 3869584, (July 8, 2020) – Respondent was suspended on an emergency basis; and, then disbarred for misconduct for engaging in a social media blitz over (9) nine months, which focused on two members of The Florida Bar and a Broward County Circuit Court Judge. The social media posts were on Facebook, LinkedIn, Instagram and YouTube. Eventually, one attorney filed a defamation suit and the other obtained a permanent injunction for cyberstalking.

*The Florida Bar v. Ratiner*, 238 So. 3d 117 (2018) – Ratiner was suspended for three years based on the following: During a 4-day document review session, respondent referred to opposing counsel as a dominatrix and stated that she must enjoy dominating people. Respondent made this comment in a loud voice to his consultant expert, who was also present at the time. The Referee specifically found this statement had no substantial purpose other than to embarrass.

On a subsequent day of the document review, while retrieving a box of documents, respondent stated that the documents contained therein were inconsistent with the index provided to him beforehand. In response,

opposing counsel showed respondent one page of her index. Respondent continued to maintain that his index was different from the index that opposing counsel was holding and demanded a copy of her index, which opposing counsel refused to provide. Respondent then attempted to grab the document from underneath opposing counsel's right hand while immediately reaching across her body and grabbing the papers which she held in her left hand. As opposing counsel attempted to hold on to the documents, she stated, "Don't grab [sic] ever again". Nonetheless, respondent continued to attempt to forcibly take the paper from opposing counsel, shaking her arms in the process, and causing a security guard who had been brought in due to respondent's bad behavior, to come across the room and intervene. The Referee found respondent's conduct to be bullying, unprofessional, disrespectful, and abusive. The Referee found most disturbing that respondent seemed to have no understanding whatsoever that his conduct was unacceptable or wrong. *Ratiner* had one instance of prior discipline involving a public reprimand and a sixty-day suspension.

## V. STANDARDS FOR IMPOSING LAWYER SANCTIONS

I considered the following Standards prior to recommending discipline:

### 5.1 Failure to Maintain Personal Integrity

**(a) Disbarment.** Disbarment is appropriate when a lawyer:

(2) engages in serious criminal conduct, a necessary element of which includes intentional interference with the administration of justice, false swearing, misrepresentation, fraud, extortion, misappropriation, or theft;

**(b) Suspension.** Suspension is appropriate when a lawyer knowingly engages in criminal conduct which is not included elsewhere in this subdivision

or other conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation that seriously adversely reflects on the lawyer's fitness to practice.

## 6.2 Abuse of the Legal Process

**(a) Disbarment.** Disbarment is appropriate when a lawyer causes serious or potentially serious interference with a legal proceeding or knowingly violates a court order or rule with the intent to obtain a benefit for the lawyer or another and causes serious injury or potentially serious injury to a party.

**(b) Suspension.** Suspension is appropriate when a lawyer knowingly violates a court order or rule and causes injury or potential injury to a client or a party or causes interference or potential interference with legal proceeding.

## 7.1 Deceptive Conduct or Statements and Unreasonable or Improper Fees

**(a) Disbarment.** Disbarment is appropriate when a lawyer intentionally engages in conduct that is a violation of a duty owed as a professional with the intent to obtain a benefit for the lawyer or another and causes serious or potentially serious injury to a client, the public, or the legal system.

**(b) Suspension.** Suspension is appropriate when a lawyer knowingly engages in conduct that is a violation of a duty owed as a professional and causes injury or potential injury to a client, the public, or the legal system.

## VI. AGGRAVATING AND MITIGATING FACTORS

I considered the following factors prior to recommending discipline:

### *The Aggravating Factors* 3.2(b)

(2) dishonest or selfish motive – As noted in *The Florida Bar v. Helinger*, 620 So. 2d 993 (Fla. 1993) the Court found a “selfish motivation is not limited to motivation for financial gain.” Here, Respondent’s misconduct, like that found in *Helinger*, involved a selfish motive. Respondent sought to embarrass King in the prior proceedings on numerous occasions.

(3) a *pattern* of misconduct – As noted in *Parrish*, the Court found a three-year suspension was warranted for an attorney who, among other things engaged in a pattern of misconduct with multiple offenses and refused to recognize the wrongfulness of his conduct. Among the misconduct in the case at bar, Respondent pled to multiple violations of injunctions. The Court also found Respondent’s testimony concerning that he does not appear to truly recognize his inappropriate conduct towards King.

(4) multiple offenses – Here, Respondent committed multiple offenses between 2020 and 2021.

(5) bad faith obstruction of the disciplinary proceeding by intentionally failing to comply with rules or orders of the disciplinary agency – Here, Respondent failed to timely answer the Complaint, timely respond to discovery requests, and comply with an order regarding the filing of a witness and exhibit list.

(7) refusal to acknowledge the wrongful nature of the conduct – Respondent contended during the final hearing that The Florida Bar was acting as "disciples" for the victim and showed no genuine remorse. He also stated that losing his bar license would not stop him from filing more cases against King. Moreover, when questioned about whether his pleadings were harmful or embarrassing, Respondent said King "should be embarrassed because the statements were true." The Referee notes Respondent's refusal to acknowledge the wrongful nature of his conduct.

(8) vulnerability of the victim - *The Florida Bar v. Marcellus*, 249 So. 3d 538 (Fla. 2018), the court found an attorney's ex-wife could be a "vulnerable victim" even though she was a licensed attorney. King is a professional, no less a victim of Respondent's inappropriate conduct.

(9) substantial experience in the practice of law – Respondent has been a practicing attorney for over 20 years. Respondent was admitted to The Florida Bar on September 10, 2001. He affirms that he has extensive experience in the area of criminal and civil litigation.

*Mitigating Factors:* 3.3(b):

(1) absence of a prior disciplinary record. Respondent has no prior record of discipline.

(3) personal or emotional problems – This is based solely on Respondent's testimony at the final hearing. Respondent testified he has been affected by depression and was in an emotionally reactive state during the past few years following the break up with King. Respondent did not present any other witness testimony and did not seek to admit any documents into evidence in support of this

mitigating factor.

(5) full and free disclosure to the bar or cooperative attitude toward the proceedings. Respondent was well-mannered and respectful in court, and despite certain failures to meet discovery deadlines, was otherwise cooperative during the proceedings.

(8) physical or mental disability or impairment or substance related disorder - This is based solely on Respondent's testimony at the final hearing. Respondent testified that he has been extremely depressed. Respondent did not present any other witness testimony and did not seek to admit any documents into evidence in support of this mitigating factor.

(10) interim rehabilitation. This is based solely on Respondent's testimony at the final hearing. Respondent testified that he has participated in certain group therapy sessions; and, has completed a batterer's intervention program. Respondent did not present any other witness testimony and did not seek to admit any documents into evidence in support of this mitigating factor.

VII. RECOMMENDATION AS TO DISCIPLINARY MEASURES TO BE APPLIED

I recommend Respondent be found guilty of misconduct justifying disciplinary measures and that the following discipline be imposed:

- A. Three-year suspension.
- B. Payment of The Florida Bar's costs in these proceedings.

C. Respondent must enter a rehabilitation contract with Florida Lawyers Assistance, Inc. within 30 days of the Court's order and abide by all of the contract's requirements including payment of all associated fees and costs. Respondent's noncompliance with any requirement is cause for contempt and additional discipline. Before petitioning for reinstatement, Respondent must undergo an evaluation by an approved Florida Lawyers Assistance, Inc. provider, comply with all recommendations, and receive a recommendation from Florida Lawyers Assistance, Inc. in support of the reinstatement.

D. Respondent will eliminate all indicia of Respondent's status as an attorney on email, social media, telephone listings, stationery, checks, business cards, office signs or any other indicia of Respondent's status as an attorney, whatsoever.

#### VIII. PERSONAL HISTORY, PAST DISCIPLINARY RECORD

Prior to recommending discipline pursuant to Rule 3-7.6(m)(1)(D), I considered the following:

A. Personal History of Respondent:

Age: 46

Date admitted to the Bar: September 10, 2001

B. Aggravating Factors<sup>3</sup>:

(2) dishonest or selfish motive.

(3) a *pattern* of misconduct

(4) multiple offenses

(5) bad faith obstruction of the disciplinary proceeding by intentionally failing to comply with rules or orders of the disciplinary agency

(7) refusal to acknowledge the wrongful nature of the conduct.

(8) vulnerability of the victim - *The Florida Bar v. Marcellus*, 249 So. 3d 538 (Fla. 2018), the court found an attorney's ex-wife could be a "vulnerable victim" even though she was a licensed attorney.

(9) substantial experience in the practice of law;

C. Mitigating Factors<sup>4</sup>:

(1) absence of a prior disciplinary record.

(3) personal or emotional problems

(8) physical or mental disability or impairment or substance related disorder

(10) interim rehabilitation

IX. STATEMENT OF COSTS AND MANNER IN WHICH COSTS SHOULD BE TAXED

---

<sup>3</sup> Discussed in greater detail in Section VI, *supra*.

<sup>4</sup> Discussed in greater detail in Section VI, *supra*.

I find the following costs were reasonably incurred by The Florida Bar:

| COST TYPE                                | AMOUNT      |
|--|-------------|
| Administrative Fee [Rule 3-7.6(q)(1)(I)] | \$ 1,250.00 |
| Court Reporter Costs                     | \$ 1,230.00 |
| Investigative Costs                      | \$ 305.25   |
| Bar Counsel Costs                        | \$ 168.40   |
| TOTAL:                                   | \$ 2,953.65 |

It is recommended that such costs be charged to Respondent and that interest at the statutory rate shall accrue and be deemed delinquent 30 days after the judgment in this case becomes final unless paid in full or otherwise deferred by the Board of Governors of The Florida Bar.

Dated this 2nd day of August, 2024.

/s/ Jose A. Izquierdo

Hon. Judge Jose A. Izquierdo,  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Referee

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the original of the foregoing Report of Referee has been e-mailed to The Honorable John A. Tomasino, Clerk, Supreme Court of Florida, at e-file@flcourts.org and mailed to 500 South Duval Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301; a copy has been e-mailed to William Mulligan and co-counsel Dina Hyppolite, Bar Counsel(s), The Florida Bar, (wmulligan@floridabar.org and dhyppolite@floridabar.org); a copy has been e-mailed to Respondent, Stephen Everett Walker (sw@walkerresquire.com); and a copy has been e-mailed to Patricia Savitz, Staff Counsel, psavitz@floridabar.org, The Florida Bar, Lakeshore Plaza II, 1300 Concord Terrace, Sunrise, FL 33323, this 2nd day of August, 2024.

/s/ Jose A. Izquierdo

Hon. Judge Jose A. Izquierdo, Referee  
Seventeenth Judicial Circuit Court  
201 SE 6<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Ft. Lauderdale FL 33301  
954-831-3599