

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA.

BILL'S ELECTRICAL & COMPUTER
SERVICE, INC.,

Appellant,

Appellate Division (Civil)
Case No.: 502007AP000190XXXXMB
L.T.: 502005CC007467XXXXMB
Division: 'AY'

AZTIL, INC.,

Appellee.

BY ORDER OF THE COURT:

THIS CAUSE came before the Court upon Appellant's Motion for Rehearing on Motion for Attorneys' Fees, filed December 29, 2008. Appellant filed a motion for appellate attorneys' fees on October 30, 2008. Pursuant to Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.400(b), a motion for appellate attorneys' fees may be served no later than the time for service of the reply brief. The reply brief shall be served within twenty days of service of the answer brief. Fla. R. App. P. 9.210(f). In this case, the answer brief was served on July 7, 2008. The fee request was not served by July 27, 2008, and was instead served over three months late. Thus, Appellant's motion for appellate attorneys' fees was denied as untimely.

Appellant argues that the Court's September 8, 2008 order directing Appellant to supplement the record on appeal extended the time period in which it could file its request for appellate attorneys' fees. Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.300(b) provides that an order granting an extension of time for the filing of the transcript of proceedings extends the time for service of Appellant's initial brief. This rule does not apply to extend the time for filing the

FILED
JAN 13 PM 12:01

reply brief. The reply brief was already past-due, as was the motion for appellate attorney's fees, when Appellant requested the extension of time. Accordingly, it is


ORDERED and ADJUDGED that the Motion for Rehearing on Motion for Attorneys' Fees is **DENIED**.

ORDERED: JAN 12 2009




1-12-09

EDWARD A. GARRISON
CIRCUIT JUDGE



1/6/09

EDWARD H. FINE
CIRCUIT JUDGE



1/5/09

THOMAS H. BARKDULL
CIRCUIT JUDGE

CC:

Mark W. Rickard, Esq., Jacobson, Sobo, & Moselle, P.O. Box 19359, Plantation, FL 33318-0359.

Richard W. Glenn, Esq., 11382 Prosperity Farms Road, Building F-22, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

PAUL THIBADEAU and THERESE
THIBADEAU,

Petitioners,

v.

TOWN OF JUPITER, FLORIDA,

Respondent.

APPELLATE DIVISION (CIVIL)
CASE NO.: 502008CA038657XXXXMB

Appealed from the Town of Jupiter Town
Council, Florida

Opinion filed: *August 24, 2009*

Appeal from the Town of Jupiter Town Council, Florida.

✓ For Petitioner:

Paul Thibadeau, Esq., pro se, 205 Worth Avenue, Suite 306
Palm Beach, FL 33480

✓ For Respondent:

Thomas J. Baird, Esq., Karen E. Roselli, Esq., 11891 North
U.S. Highway One, Suite 100, North Palm Beach, FL
33408

PER CURIAM.

The Petition for Writ of Certiorari is **DENIED**.

BARKDULL, HAFELE, and SASSER, JJ., concur.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA.

NICOLE HANAK,

Petitioner,

Appellate Division (Civil)

Case No.: 502007CA010543XXXXMB

Division.: 'AY'

vs.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAY SAFETY
AND MOTOR VEHICLES

Respondent,

FILED
2007 DEC 17 PM 3:31
SHARON R. BOCK, CLERK
PALM BEACH COUNTY
CIRCUIT CIVIL

Opinion filed: DEC 17 2007

Review sought of the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision of DHSMV Hearing
Officer, Donna George.

For Petitioner: Donna P. Levine, Esq.
324 Datura Street, Suite 145
West Palm Beach, Florida, 33401

For Respondent: Heather Rose Cramer, Esq.
DHSMV, 6801 Lake Worth Road, Suite 230
Lake Worth, Florida, 33467

PER CURIAM.

The Petition for Writ of Certiorari is DENIED.

McCARTHY, ROSENBERG, and WINIKOFF, JJ. concur.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA.

BILL'S ELECTRICAL & COMPUTER
SERVICE, INC.,

Appellant,

Appellate Division (Civil)
Case No.: 502007AP000190XXXXMB
L.T.: 502005CC007467XXXXMB
Division: 'AY'

Marlene -
Here's copies
of the opinions
Per email -
also - Bill's Electric
filed Rehg & the Rehg
as to be posted too.
Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410.

over 22 - call
me
ity,

io, & Moselle, P.O. Box 19359,

arity Farms Road, Building F-22,

08 DEC 22 AM 10:33

FILED

REVERSED and REMANDED.

Aztel, Inc. ("Aztel") hired Bill's Electrical & Computer Service, Inc. ("Bill's") to provide electrical parts and services. Bill's completed the work, and filed suit to obtain \$6,379.00 when Aztel refused to pay more than \$3,000.00, which was the amount of the estimate. Although the trial court found that Bill's failed to prove its case by a preponderance of the evidence, it was undisputed that Aztel had previously paid \$1,500.00 toward the contract price, and that it still owed Bill's the remaining \$1,500 balance on the estimate. On June 20, 2007, the lower court directed Aztel to "forward the previously tendered \$1,500.00 to [Bill's] within fifteen (15) days of this order. Upon an affidavit of non-payment of this amount filed by the Plaintiff, with a copy

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA.

BILL'S ELECTRICAL & COMPUTER
SERVICE, INC.,

Appellant,

Appellate Division (Civil)
Case No.: 502007AP000190XXXXMB
L.T.: 502005CC007467XXXXMB
Division: 'AY'

AZTIL, INC.,

Appellee.

Opinion filed: *December 19, 2008*

**Appeal from the County Court in and for Palm Beach County,
Judge Janis Brustares Keyser.**

For Appellant: Mark W. Rickard, Esq., Jacobson, Sobo, & Moselle, P.O. Box 19359,
Plantation, FL 33318-0359.

For Appellee: Richard W. Glenn, Esq., 11382 Prosperity Farms Road, Building F-22,
Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410.

REVERSED and REMANDED.

Aztel, Inc. ("Aztel") hired Bill's Electrical & Computer Service, Inc. ("Bill's") to provide electrical parts and services. Bill's completed the work, and filed suit to obtain \$6,379.00 when Aztel refused to pay more than \$3,000.00, which was the amount of the estimate. Although the trial court found that Bill's failed to prove its case by a preponderance of the evidence, it was undisputed that Aztel had previously paid \$1,500.00 toward the contract price, and that it still owed Bill's the remaining \$1,500 balance on the estimate. On June 20, 2007, the lower court directed Aztel to "forward the previously tendered \$1,500.00 to [Bill's] within fifteen (15) days of this order. Upon an affidavit of non-payment of this amount filed by the Plaintiff, with a copy

FILED
08 DEC 22 AM 10:33
CLERK OF COURT
Palm Beach County, Florida

mailed to Defendant, a final judgment will be entered against the Defendant without further notice or hearing.” On June 26, 2007, Bill’s filed a Motion for Rehearing. Aztil did not forward the funds until July 27, 2007, at which time Bill’s refused to accept the funds. Bill’s subsequently moved for a final judgment pursuant to the lower court’s June 20, 2007 order. The court found that Bill’s should take nothing from Aztil “for the reasons set forth in this court’s order dated June 20, 2007 and stated on the record at the September 18, 2007 hearing.”

It appears, based on the transcript of that hearing, that the lower court believed that the filing of the motion for rehearing stayed the order’s fifteen day time period, and rendered Aztil’s July 27, 2007 payment timely. Filing the motion for rehearing did not stay the time period during which the funds were to be tendered. Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.550(a) provides that no execution or other final process shall issue until a motion for rehearing is determined; however, the June 20, 2007 order was neither an execution nor a final process. That order did not include any language providing for execution on the \$1,500; rather, it explicitly stated that the court would enter final judgment against Aztil in the future. Final process to enforce a judgment solely for the payment of money shall be by execution, writ of garnishment, or other appropriate process or proceedings. Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.570(a). The June 20, 2007 order was none of those things. Thus, the motion for rehearing did not toll the time for Aztil to comply with the order, and the lower court erred by not entering final judgment against Aztil in the amount of \$1,500, as it was undisputed that it owed Bill’s that amount. Accordingly, the cause is reversed and remanded with directions for the lower court to enter final judgment against Aztil in the amount of \$1,500.00.

Bill’s filed a motion for appellate attorneys’ fees on October 30, 2008. Pursuant to Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.400(b), a motion for appellate attorneys’ fees may be

served no later than the time for service of the reply brief. The reply brief shall be served within twenty days of service of the answer brief. Fla. R. App. P. 9.210(f). In this case, the answer brief was served on July 7, 2008. The fee request, as it was not served by July 27, 2008, and was instead served over three months late. Bill's Electrical & Computer Service's motion for appellate attorneys' fees is DENIED as untimely. Aztil's motion for appellate attorneys' fees is DENIED.

GARRISON, FINE and BARKDULL, JJ., concur.