

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS AND ORDERS

Order Denying Discretionary Review, Supreme Court of Florida, SC2024-0959 (July 1, 2024)	1a
Order Denying Discretionary Review, Supreme Court of Florida, SC2024-0958 (July 1, 2024)	3a
Order Denying Motion to Consolidate, District Court of Appeal of the State of Florida Sixth District, (June 21, 2024)	5a
Order Denying Motion To Strike and for Sanctions, Circuit Court of the Ninth Judicial Circuit in and for Orange County Florida (January 17, 2024).....	7a
Order, Circuit Court of the Ninth Judicial Circuit, in and for Orange County, Florida (February 27, 2024)	9a

**ORDER DENYING DISCRETIONARY REVIEW,
SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA**
SC2024-0959
(JULY 1, 2024)

SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

KATHLEEN MARIA BONCZYK,

Petitioner(s),

v.

JULIAN KEITH LEVENE, ET AL.,

Respondent(s).

MONDAY, JULY 1, 2024

SC2024-0959

Lower Tribunal No(s).:
6D2024-0641;
482018CA010630A001OX

Petitioner's Notice to Invoke Discretionary Jurisdiction, seeking review of the order or opinion issued by the Sixth District Court of Appeal on June 21, 2024, is hereby dismissed. This Court lacks jurisdiction to review an unelaborated decision from a district court of appeal that is issued without opinion or explanation or that merely cites to an authority that is not a case pending review in, or reversed or quashed by, this Court. *See Wheeler v. State*, 296 So. 3d 895 (Fla. 2020);

App.2a

Wells v. State, 132 So. 3d 1110 (Fla. 2014); *Jackson v. State*, 926 So. 2d 1262 (Fla. 2006); *Gandy v. State*, 846 So. 2d 1141 (Fla. 2003); *Stallworth v. Moore*, 827 So. 2d 974 (Fla. 2002); *Harrison v. Hyster Co.*, 515 So. 2d 1279 (Fla. 1987); *Dodi Publ'g Co. v. Editorial Am. S.A.*, 385 So. 2d 1369 (Fla. 1980); *Jenkins v. State*, 385 So. 2d 1356 (Fla. 1980).

No motion for rehearing or reinstatement will be entertained by the Court.

A True Copy

Test:

/s/ John A. Tomasino
Clerk, Supreme Court

Case No.: SC2024-0959 7/1/2024

TD

Served:

KATHLEEN MARIA BONCZYK
6DCA CLERK
ORANGE CLERK
LONDON LEE OTT
HON. BRIAN S. SANDOR
RICHARD CHARLES WOLFE

**ORDER DENYING DISCRETIONARY REVIEW,
SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA,
SC2024-0958
(JULY 1, 2024)**

SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

KATHLEEN MARIA BONCZYK,

Petitioner(s),

v.

JULIAN KEITH LEVENE, ET AL.,

Respondent(s).

MONDAY, JULY 1, 2024

SC2024-0958

Lower Tribunal No(s).:

6D2024-0147;

482018CA010630A001OX

Petitioner's Notice to Invoke Discretionary Jurisdiction, seeking review of the order or opinion issued by the Sixth District Court of Appeal on June 21, 2024, is hereby dismissed. This Court lacks jurisdiction to review an unelaborated decision from a district court of appeal that is issued without opinion or explanation or that merely cites to an authority that is not a case pending review in, or reversed or quashed by, this Court. *See Wheeler v. State*, 296 So. 3d 895 (Fla. 2020);

App.4a

Wells v. State, 132 So. 3d 1110 (Fla. 2014); *Jackson v. State*, 926 So. 2d 1262 (Fla. 2006); *Gandy v. State*, 846 So. 2d 1141 (Fla. 2003); *Stallworth v. Moore*, 827 So. 2d 974 (Fla. 2002); *Harrison v. Hyster Co.*, 515 So. 2d 1279 (Fla. 1987); *Dodi Publ'g Co. v. Editorial Am. S.A.*, 385 So. 2d 1369 (Fla. 1980); *Jenkins v. State*, 385 So. 2d 1356 (Fla. 1980).

No motion for rehearing or reinstatement will be entertained by the Court.

A True Copy

Test:

/s/ John A. Tomasino
Clerk, Supreme Court

Case No.: SC2024-0958 7/1/2024

TD

Served:

KATHLEEN MARIA BONCZYK
6DCA CLERK
ORANGE CLERK
LONDON LEE OTT
HON. BRIAN S. SANDOR
RICHARD CHARLES WOLFE

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE,
DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE
STATE OF FLORIDA SIXTH DISTRICT
(JUNE 21, 2024)**

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

KATHLEEN M. BONCYZK, ESQ.,

Appellant(s),

v.

**JOHN WARDLE, RICHARD ENGLAND,
MARTIN GLOVER, JULIAN KEITH LEVENE,
CADIZ MUSIC AND DIGITAL LTD.,
JEAN MARIE CARROLL,**

Appellee(s),

KATHLEEN M. BONCYZK, ESQ.

Appellant(s),

v.

**JULIAN KEITH LEVENE, JOHN WARDLE,
RICHARD ENGLAND, CADIZ MUSIC
AND DIGITAL LTD, MARTIN GLOVER
AND JEAN MARIE CARROLL,**

Appellee(s).

****NOT CONSOLIDATED****

CASE NO.: 6D2024-0147

CASE NO.: 6D2024-0641

L.T. NO.: 2018-CA-010630-0

Before: NARDELLA, WOZNIAK,
and SMITH, JJ, Judges.

BY ORDER OF THE COURT:

The motions to consolidate in 6D24-147 and 6D24-641 are denied.

The motion to strike the response to the request to consolidate in 6D24-147 is denied. That portion of the response in 6D24-147 containing a motion to bar the appellant/petitioner from self-representation in her cases is deferred to the merits panel.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the original court order.

/s/ Stacey Pectol
Clerk

6D2024-0147 June 21, 2024

cc:

KATHLEEN M. BONCYZK, ESQ.
RICHARD WOLFE, ESQ.
TIFFANY RUSSELL, CLERK

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO STRIKE AND
FOR SANCTIONS, CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR ORANGE COUNTY FLORIDA
(JANUARY 17, 2024)**

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR ORANGE COUNTY FLORIDA**

KATHLEEN M. BONCZYK,

Plaintiff,

v.

**JULIAN KEITH LEVENE, MARTIN GLOVER,
JOHN WARDLE, JEAN MARIE CARROLL,
RICHARD ENGLAND and CADIZ MUSIC
AND DIGITAL LTD,**

Defendants.

Case No. 2018-CA-010630-O

**Before: Brian S. SANDOR,
Circuit Judge.**

ORDER

This matter having come before the court on January 17, 2024, on Plaintiff's Kathleen M. Bonczyk's Motion to Strike and for Sanctions concerning ongoing abuse and harassment and for referral of Richard C. Wolfe, Esq. to the Florida Bar and to the Orange County

Sheriff's, and the Court having heard arguments of counsel and being otherwise advised in the premise, it is hereby:

ORDERED and ADJUDGED

1. The Court finds that Kathleen Bonczyk Motion dated January 3, 2024, is hereby **DENIED**. The Court finds the case is closed as to its merits of the underlying cause of action, however that in no way prohibits the Defendants' attempts to conduct post judgment discovery or collection on the final judgment entered in its favor in this case.
2. The Court, *sua sponte* and on its own motion, orders Ms. Bonczyk to fully and completely file and serve upon Judgment Creditors, within 45 days from the date of this order (with a copy to the Court) a Form 1.977 (with attachments). If Plaintiff believes a proper form has already been provided, she may re-serve the form to Defendant.

Done and Ordered in Chambers at Orange County, Florida this 17th day of January 2024.

/s/ Honorable Brian S. Sandor

Copies provided to all parties

**ORDER, CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,
IN AND FOR ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA
(FEBRUARY 27, 2024)**

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE NINTH
JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, IN AND FOR ORANGE
COUNTY, FLORIDA**

KATHLEEN M BONCZYK,

Plaintiff,

v.

**JULIAN KEITH LEVENE, MARTIN GLOVER,
JOHN WARDLE, RICHARD ENGLAND, CADIZ
MUSIC AND DIGITAL LTD, JEAN MARIE
CARROLL, JEAN MARIE CARROLL,**

Defendant.

CASE NUMBER: 2018-CA-010630-O DIVISION 48

**Before: Brian S. SANDOR,
Circuit Judge.**

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
ENTRY OF ORDERS AND PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF
“COMMON INTEREST” OR “COMMON
DEFENSE” AGREEMENT**

**THIS CAUSE, having come before the Court
upon the Plaintiff Motion for Entry of Orders, filed**

02/27/2024 (“the Motion”), and the Court having reviewed the Motion and the Court File and being otherwise duly advised in the premises:

It is hereby ORDERED and ADJUDGED,

The Plaintiff's Motions are **DENIED** as *res judicata* based on the Court's numerous orders addressing the identical or nearly identical issues raised again by Plaintiff. The Court has repeatedly addressed the same motions and arguments from Plaintiff over the past two months. For clarification, the Court will re-address and plainly state its rulings and findings once again.

All outstanding motions filed by either party concerning the merits of the underlying cause of action leading to the entry of the final judgment in this case are **DENIED** as moot based on Judge Chiu's prior order.

All outstanding motions filed by either party concerning the enforcement of post judgment collection, including post judgment discovery, and compliance with Florida's F.A.C.T. information sheet remain open and viable. Post judgment recovery is a separate and distinct legal matter apart from the underlying cause of action. These motions and this type of discovery is not subject to Judge Chiu's prior order. The Court has repeated this numerous times in hearings and in its written orders. The Plaintiff is not relieved of the judgment entered in this case by way of Judge Chiu's prior order.

The Court denies Plaintiff's Motion seeking documents related to the representation of the parties and Mr. Wolfe as not relevant to any remaining issue before the Court. The Court has no reason to believe Mr.

App.11a

Wolfe does not represent the judgment creditors and this information does not tend to prove or disprove any element of any remaining issue and therefore is irrelevant.

The Court lastly, cautions the Plaintiff that continued tactics of filing, re-filing and setting matters for hearings on issues previously ruled on may lead to sanctions by this Court in the form of striking motions or pleadings, monetary sanctions, or even contempt of court.

DONE AND ORDERED in Orlando, Orange County, Florida this 27th day of February 2024.

/s/ Brian S. Sandor
Circuit Judge