

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

THE FLORIDA BAR,

Petitioner,

v.

RAWSI WILLIAMS,

Respondent.

Supreme Court Case
No.

The Florida Bar File
No. 2026-70,303(11P)(OSC)

PETITION FOR CONTEMPT AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

The Florida Bar petitions the Supreme Court of Florida, pursuant to Rule 3-7.7(g), to enter an order to show cause why respondent should not be held in contempt of this Court's order in Supreme Court Case SC2025-1037. The respondent has failed to comply with the terms of the Court's August 5, 2024, emergency suspension order, which suspended her from the practice of law, effective September 5, 2025. To support this petition, the bar states:

A. Respondent continues to hold herself out as an attorney, in violation of the Court's emergency suspension order.

1. Respondent was emergency suspended by Order of the Florida Supreme Court on August 5, 2025, in Case No. SC2025-1037. (See Exhibit A). The Order required, among other things, that respondent cease all

practice of law and cease holding herself out as a lawyer in good standing within thirty days of that Order.

2. Respondent is in violation of that Order, as she continues to hold herself out as a member of The Florida Bar by failing to eliminate all indicia of her status as a Florida Bar lawyer.

3. Despite being ordered to eliminate her web presence as an attorney, respondent has continued to maintain two websites and social media accounts, as well as a Yelp Review profile, all of which are accessible to the public on the internet. (See TFB Exhibit B).

4. The website <https://rawsiwilliams.com/> was registered on August 6, 2025, one day after her suspension went into effect. (See TFB Exhibit C).

5. The first sentences on respondent's website, rawsiwilliams.com, states:

Attorney Rawsi Williams, **Esq.**, R.N., is a **Florida-based civil rights attorney**... As one of the few professionals licensed in law and nursing and focused on upholding the guaranteed civil and constitutional rights of others, she litigates federal, state, and administrative cases where unlawful deprivations occur, including civil rights, education, employment, healthcare, and government accountability.

(See TFB Exhibit D)¹(emphasis added)

1. The website www.rawsiwilliams.com was last accessed on November 4, 2025, while the instant Petition was being drafted.

6. The Florida Bar's staff investigator, John Berrena, confirmed that respondent maintained <https://rawsiwilliams.com/>. The website was still active as of October 29, 2025. (See Exhibit B).

7. Beginning October 27, 2025, respondent emailed the referee's judicial assistant in the emergency suspension matter. Her signature block includes a link to the website <http://www.CallRawsiWilliams.com>. The signature block itself reveals her name, Raws Williams, and that she is part of "The Office of Raws Williams." (See Composite Exhibit E)

8. On the homepage for www.callrawsiwilliams.com, a video from Vimeo plays prominently. In the first 23 seconds of the video, respondent states:

It's my purpose to fight for your justice. That is not only my mantra, but the reality of God's calling on my life as Attorney Raws Williams of Raws Williams [Law Group.]

(See TFB Exhibit B and Composite Exhibit E at 2: 8-11).

9. Notably, respondent does not expressly refer to herself as a lawyer or an attorney on www.callrawsiwilliams.com. However, she does announce a new website and states that she will not be accepting new client "bookings before 2026." The webpage directs site visitors to "Click here to contact the Allen Firm for all your legal needs." The text of the website creates a clear suggestion that she is not currently accepting new

clients for legal services, but that she is still a lawyer in good standing with The Florida Bar, allowed to practice law in Florida, and that new bookings will soon become available.

10. Moreover, this is the website address displayed on her LinkedIn page and Yelp page, where she also maintains an online presence holding herself out as an attorney. (See Exhibit B and Composite Exhibit E).

B. Respondent has not properly informed clients and opposing counsel of her suspension as mandated by the Supreme Court Order.

11. This Court's Emergency Suspension Order required respondent to *immediately* notify the courts before which she practices, her clients and opposing counsel of her suspension and provide them with a copy of the Order.

12. On August 13, 2025, Mr. David M. B. Russell, an assistant city attorney for the City of Daytona Beach and opposing counsel in a pending matter, received an email from respondent following her Motion to Withdraw from that litigation. Respondent requested Mr. Russell's position regarding her motion, which she stated was based on her inability "to put forth adequate attention on the cases." Notably, her initial correspondence

to Mr. Russell did not include a copy of this Court's Order. (See Composite Exhibit F).

13. Mr. Russell informed respondent that he did not believe his position on the motion was required, since it had been brought to his attention from other sources that the Court entered an order suspending her. (See Composite Exhibit F).

14. Respondent replied and falsely represented she was "not required to withdraw." Moreover, respondent misleadingly pointed to her Florida Bar attorney profile stating, "I am still a member in good standing and eligible to practice law." These assertions were made in contravention to this Court's order, which was served on respondent days prior and mandated that respondent *immediately*:

Provide a copy of this Court's order of emergency suspension to all courts, tribunals, or adjudicative agencies before which Rawsy Williams is counsel of record; all state, federal, or administrative bars of which Respondent is a member; all clients; all co-counsel; and all opposing counsel, as required by Rule Regulating The Florida Bar 3-5.1(h).

(See Exhibit A).

15. Respondent compounded the brazen misrepresentation by stating:

I am withdrawing because with all that I've recently endured with the unexpected deaths of my brother and then murder of my nephew six months later for which I am in grief counseling, the added stress of

going through this process for the first time ever – for which we expect to prevail – was just more stress than I can handle and still adequately give time to my clients and their cases. My clients mean everything to me, and I want to ensure that my attention is not so divided that I cannot provide them the representation they desire. That is the reason I am withdrawing.

(See Composite Exhibit F).

16. In making these statement to Mr. Russell, respondent not only misrepresented her status, but she also failed to comply with this Court's Order.

17. Additionally, on September 14, 2025, the *Miami Herald* published a newspaper story. The reporter interviewed Akeem Spence, a named witness in the bar's Petition for respondent's emergency suspension and client. In that story, the reporter wrote, "[n]ews of the suspension dismayed former NFL player Akeem Spence when he learned of it [September 7, 2025]² from a Miami Herald reporter." (See Exhibit G).

C. Respondent made misrepresentations and omissions in her 3-5.1(h) affidavit.

18. Respondent submitted a 3-5.1(h) affidavit to The Florida Bar on September 12, 2025, as required by this Court's Order. (See Composite Exhibit H).

2. This story was originally published online on or around September 9, 2025.

19. Respondent affirmed in the 3-5.1(h) affidavit that everyone listed had been contacted.

20. As but one example, after receipt of her affidavit filed with the bar setting forth the names of clients and others she had notified, a bar investigator emailed Mr. Kenneth Kidwell, whose name appeared on the affidavit as a client notified of the suspension. Mr. Kidwell replied that respondent had not yet contacted him nor advised him of her suspension. (See Composite Exhibit I).

21. Later that afternoon, respondent finally verbally informed Mr. Kidwell of her suspension, but failed to send him a copy of the suspension order in compliance with this Court's order. (See Composite Exhibit I)

22. Moreover, a search of the Comprehensive Case Information System (CCIS), revealed that respondent had not provided a complete list of opposing counsels in her affidavit.

23. For example, attorneys Tiffany M. Love and Allison Nelson are opposing counsel in *Cypress Mill Community Association Inc. v. Erik Matrell Edwards and Ashely Corbisero Edwards*, Case No. 292024CA003024A001HC, in the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit In Hillsborough County, Florida.

24. Respondent filed her Notice of Appearance in this matter on behalf of the defendants on May 29, 2024. (See Exhibit J).

25. Respondent failed to include the names of these opposing counsels as part of the list of people she contacted regarding her suspension on the 3-5.1(h) affidavit. (See Exhibit H).

26. Neither is there any evidence that respondent filed a Motion or Notice of Withdrawal in this matter. (See Exhibit K).

27. Notably respondent failed to include on the 3-5.1(h) affidavit Mr. Spence, the client who gave the interview to the *Miami Herald*, or Assistant City Attorney Russell referenced above, whom respondent emailed, and misrepresented that she was merely withdrawing from the case for personal reasons.

28. As of the date of this Petition, respondent violated this Court's Order by failing to comply with the suspension notification rule, misrepresented her status as an attorney in good standing to opposing counsel, and continues to hold herself out as an attorney in good standing on the internet.

29. The other members of the bar should not have to pay for respondent's noncompliance with this Court's order and this proceeding.

Therefore, the bar is requesting administrative costs of \$1,250.00 against respondent.

30. This Court has held that a “[c]lear violation of any order or disciplinary status that denies an attorney the license to practice law generally is punishable by disbarment, absent strong extenuating factors.” *The Florida Bar v. Walkden*, 950 So. 2d 407, 411 (Fla. 2007) (quoting *Florida Bar v. Brown*, 635 So. 2d 13 (Fla. 1994)).

31. In *The Florida Bar v. Norkin*, 183 So. 3d 1018 (Fla. 2015), this Court disbarred the respondent, finding Norkin’s claim that filing a motion for rehearing delayed his obligation to submit the required affidavit was without merit. The Court’s opinion expressly directed him to comply with Rule 3-5.1(h), which states that notice obligations begin “[u]pon service” of the disciplinary order and that the affidavit must be provided to Bar counsel “[w]ithin thirty days after service of the order.” *Norkin*, 183 So. 3d at 1021-22.

32. The *Norkin* opinion also made clear that the suspension would take effect thirty days from its date and that a rehearing motion did not change the effective date. *Id.*

33. The purpose of the rule is to ensure that those affected by the suspension receive timely notice and can protect their interests. The notice

requirements are tied to the effective date of the suspension and must occur beforehand; otherwise, the rule's purpose would be defeated. *Id.*

34. Likewise, in *The Florida Bar v. Forrester*, 916 So. 2d 647, 654 (Fla. 2005), the Court reaffirmed that contempt for violating disciplinary orders by continuing to practice law warrants the most severe sanction of disbarment.

The bar respectfully requests this Court enter an order directing Rawsi Williams to show cause why Rawsi Williams should not be held in contempt of this Court's Order and be disbarred.

Respectfully submitted,



Rita Florez, Bar Counsel
The Florida Bar
Miami Branch Office
444 Brickell Ave., Ste. M100
Rivergate Plaza
Miami, FL 33131
(305) 377-4445
Florida Bar No. 1011307
RFlorez@floridabar.org

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that this document has been filed via the Florida Courts E-Filing Portal with The Honorable John A. Tomasino, Clerk of the Supreme Court of Florida with a copy provided via the portal to Rawsy Williams, Respondent, at rawsi@rawsi.com; and that a copy has been provided by United States Mail via certified mail No. 7014 2120 0003 5157 1395, return receipt requested to Rawsy Williams, Respondent, whose record bar address is Bank of America Building; 701 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1550, Miami, FL 33131-2824, and to Patricia Ann Toro Savitz, Staff Counsel, The Florida Bar, at psavitz@floridabar.org, on this 5th day of November, 2025.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rita Florez", with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Rita Florez, Bar Counsel

NOTICE OF TRIAL COUNSEL AND DESIGNATION OF PRIMARY EMAIL ADDRESS

The trial counsel in this matter is Rita Florez, Bar Counsel, whose address, telephone number and primary email address are The Florida Bar, Miami Branch Office, Ste. M100, Rivergate Plaza 444 Brickell Ave. Miami FL 33131, (305) 377-4445 and RFlorez@floridabar.org. Respondent need not address pleadings, correspondence, etc. in this matter to anyone other than trial counsel and to Staff Counsel, The Florida Bar, 651 E Jefferson Street, Tallahassee, FL 32399-2300, psavitz@flabar.org.

NOTICE OF MANDATORY ELECTRONIC FILING

All parties must file all pleadings, motions, and notices in this matter electronically, with a copy to the referee, through the Florida Courts E-Filing Portal, www.myflcourtaaccess.com, under Rule Regulating The Florida Bar 3-7.6(h)(5)(A) and (B).