

APPENDIX

1a

Appendix A

USCA11 Case: 24-12752 Doc. 71-1, 12/23/25

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 24-12752
Non-Argument Calendar

CARLOS A. ALONSO CANO,
as next friend of his minor daughter
Jany Leidy Alonso Morejon,

FE MOREJON FERNANDEZ,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

ANGIE A. MOREJON,

KATY A. MOREJON,

Plaintiffs,

JANY L. ALONSO

Interested Party-Appellant,

versus

245 C&C, LLC,
CFH GROUP, LLC,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appendix A

2

Opinion of the Court

24-12752

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 1:19-cv-21826-JAL

Before LUCK, LAGOA, and WILSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Plaintiffs-Appellants Carlos Alonso Cano, his wife, Fe Morejon Fernandez, and their daughter, Jany Alonso Morejon (collectively, Appellants),¹ appeal the district court's order granting their trial counsel's, Michael Dunlavy, motion to withdraw from representing them on appeal. In response, Defendants-Appellees 245 C&C, LLC and CFH Group, LLC contend that Appellants lack standing to bring this claim, and alternatively, that the issue is meritless. We conclude that Appellants do have standing but nevertheless affirm the district court's order.

We review de novo questions of appellate standing. *Kimberly Regenesis, LLC v. Lee Cnty.*, 64 F.4th 1253, 1258 (11th Cir. 2023) (per curiam). To establish appellate standing, a litigant must prove that he has suffered a concrete and particularized injury that is fairly traceable to the challenged conduct, and is likely to be redressed by a favorable judicial decision." *Id.* at 1259. In the appellate standing context,

¹ Angie Morejon and Katy Morejon, while plaintiffs below, are not parties in the present appeal.

Appendix A

24-12752

Opinion of the Court

3

“the primary meaning of the injury requirement is adverseness: Only a litigant who is aggrieved by the judgment or order may appeal.” *United States v. Amodeo*, 916 F.3d 967, 971 (11th Cir. 2019) (quotation marks omitted). A party appealing an adverse judgment against them “is enough to establish appellate standing.” *Corley v. Long-Lewis, Inc.*, 965 F.3d 1222, 1234 (11th Cir. 2020). Insofar as redressability, the party must show that “a favorable decision from this Court would redress [their] alleged injury.” *Rivers v. Guerrero*, 605 U.S. 443, 451 (2025).

We review a district court’s decision to allow an attorney to withdraw from representing a party for an abuse of discretion. *In re Kellogg*, 197 F.3d 1116, 1119 (11th Cir. 1999). A district court abuses its discretion when it “applies an incorrect legal standard, fails to follow the appropriate procedures when making the relevant determination, or makes findings of fact that are clearly erroneous.” *Consumer Fin. Prot. Bureau v. Brown*, 69 F.4th 1321, 1329 (11th Cir. 2023). Under Florida Bar Rule 4-1.16, an attorney must withdraw from representing a client if representing the client “will result in violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct or law.” R. Regulating Fla. Bar 4-1.16(a)(1). (11th Cir. 2023). Under Florida Bar Rule 4-1.16, an attorney must withdraw from representing a client if representing the client “will result in violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct or law.” R. Regulating Fla. Bar 4-1.16(a)(1).

Appendix A

4

Opinion of the Court

24-12752

Here, Appellants have standing to challenge the district court's order, which was averse to them and may be redressed by a favorable decision from this court. But there is no evidence in the record showing that the district court applied an incorrect legal standard, failed to follow appropriate procedures, or made a clearly erroneous finding of fact. In his motion to withdraw, Dunlavy contended that continuing to represent Appellants would result in a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct or law, which requires Dunlavy to withdraw his representation under Florida rules.² Further, Dunlavy's withdrawal did not materially and adversely affect Appellants' case; Appellants timely filed their pro se notices of appeal and successfully filed briefs and motions before this court.

Thus, the district court did not abuse its discretion in allowing Dunlavy to withdraw from appellate representation.

AFFIRMED.

² Dunlavy also contended multiple reasons that are all valid for permissive withdrawal under Florida rules, including that Appellants took actions he considered imprudent and failed to substantially fulfill their obligations to him after being given a reasonable warning, and if Dunlavy continued to represent Appellants, it would place a significant financial burden on him. See R. Regulating Fla. Bar 4-1.16(b)(1)-(4).

5a

Appendix B

USCA11 Case: 24-12752 Doc. 77, 02/05/26

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 24-12752

CARLOS A. ALONSO CANO,
as next friend of his minor daughter
Jany Leidy Alonso Morejon,

FE MOREJON FERNANDEZ,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

ANGIE A. MOREJON,

KATY A. MOREJON,

Plaintiffs,

JANY L. ALONSO

Interested Party-Appellant,

versus

245 C&C, LLC,
CFH GROUP, LLC,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 1:19-cv-21826-JAL

6a

Appendix B

2

Order of the Court

24-12752

ORDER:

Appellants' motion for additional time to file their petition for rehearing is GRANTED IN PART. Appellants have 14 days from the date of this order to file their petition.

DAVID J. SMITH
Clerk of the United States Court of
Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit

ENTERED FOR THE COURT - BY DIRECTION

Appendix C

USCA11 Case: 24-12752 Doc. 83-2, 03/25/26

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 24-12752

CARLOS A. ALONSO CANO,
as next friend of his minor daughter
Jany Leidy Alonso Morejon,

FE MOREJON FERNANDEZ,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

ANGIE A. MOREJON,

KATY A. MOREJON,

Plaintiffs,

JANY L. ALONSO

Interested Party-Appellant,

versus

245 C&C, LLC,
CFH GROUP, LLC,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 1:19-cv-21826-JAL

Appendix C

2

Order of the Court

24-12752

ON PETITION FOR REHEARING AND PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC

Before LUCK, LAGOA, and WILSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

The Petition for Rehearing En Banc is DENIED, no judge in regular active service on the Court having requested that the Court be polled on rehearing en banc. FRAP 40. The Petition for Panel Rehearing also is DENIED. FRAP 40.

Appendix D

FLSD, Case 1:19-cv-21826-JAL, DE 727, 10/12/23

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
Case No. 19-21826-cv-JAL**

CARLOS A. ALONSO CANO, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

245 C & C, LLC and
CFH GROUP, LLC.,

Defendants.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

THIS CAUSE is before the Court upon the Motion to Withdraw as Counsel for Plaintiffs (ECF No. 719), filed by Michael D. Dunlavy ("Movant"). Defendants 245 C and C, LLC and CFH Group LLC filed a response in opposition to the Motion. (ECF No. 723). No reply was filed and the time to do so has passed. The matter was referred to the undersigned by the Honorable Joan A. Lenard, United States District Judge, for a Report and Recommendation regarding the Motion to Withdraw. (ECF No. 724). Having reviewed the Motion, Response, the record as a whole, and being otherwise fully advised, the undersigned **RECOMMENDS** that the Motion to Withdraw be **DENIED**, without prejudice.

*Appendix D***I. DISCUSSION**

In his Motion, Movant seeks leave of this Court to withdraw as counsel of record for Plaintiffs, representing that Plaintiffs wish to proceed pro se or to obtain alternate trial counsel. Movant asserts that he is unable to continue to adequately represent Plaintiffs.

The Local Rules of the Southern District of Florida provide that “no attorney shall withdraw the attorney’s appearance in any action or proceeding except by leave of Court after notice served on the attorney’s client and opposing counsel.” S.D. Fla. L.R. 11.1(d)(3)(A). It is within a district court’s discretion to permit or deny a motion to withdraw as counsel. See *Patnaude v. Sears Pest Control, Inc.*, No. 08-61980-CIV, 2009 WL 10667065, at *2 (S.D. Fla. May 13, 2009); *Reagan v. Title Max of Ala., Inc.*, No. 5:09-cv-91/RS-MD, 2010 WL 11530503, at *1 (N.D. Fla. Apr. 15, 2010) (citing *Baker v. Coto*, 154 F. App’x 854, 858 (11th Cir. 2005)). “Before granting an attorney’s motion to withdraw, however, ‘it is incumbent on the court to assure that the prosecution of the lawsuit before it is not disrupted by the withdrawal of counsel, and that the withdrawal of counsel is for good cause.’” *Patnaude*, 2009 WL 10667065, at *2 (quoting *Mekdeci v. Merrell Nat’l Lab’ys*, 711 F.2d 1510, 1521–22 (11th Cir. 1983)).

First, Movant has failed to demonstrate good cause for withdrawal. The Motion merely states that Movant is unable to continue to adequately represent Plaintiffs, but fails to proffer any

Appendix D

additional information. See *Innovative Genetics, LLC v. Flavocure Biotech, LLC*, No. 21-21457-CV, 2023 WL 2991896, at *1 (S.D. Fla. Mar. 10, 2023) (“Plaintiff’s Counsel state that ‘irreconcilable differences’ arose between them and Plaintiff without providing any additional details. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Counsel have failed to demonstrate good cause for their requested withdrawal.”).

Second, Carlos A. Alonso Cano (“Carlos”) and Fé Morejón Fernandez (“Fé”) are the only Plaintiffs that can proceed pro se in this case. Plaintiffs in this action include Carlos who brought this action individually and as a guardian for his son, Angie Alonso Morejón (“Angie”), and as next friend of his minor daughters, Katy Alonso Morejón (“Katy”) and Jany Leidy Alonso Morejón (“Jany”), and Fé individually. The District Court, on January 23, 2023, ordered Plaintiffs to retain counsel for Angie, Katy, and Jany or have one of their claims be dismissed because a non-attorney parent may not represent a child or ward in an action in the child’s name. (ECF No. 575); see *Alonso v. Alonso*, No. 18-23668-CIV, 2020 WL 13538521, at *3 (S.D. Fla. July 10, 2020); *Devine v. Indian River Cnty. Sch. Bd.*, 121 F.3d 576, 582 (11th Cir. 1997) (“[P]arents who are not attorneys may not bring a pro se action on their child’s behalf.”); *Dingler v. Georgia*, 725 F. App’x 923, 926 (11th Cir. 2018) (“[W]e note that we consider only Plaintiff’s claims raised on his own behalf because a non-attorney pro se litigant cannot bring any action on behalf of his or her child.”). Here, if Movant were to withdraw from representing

Appendix D

Plaintiffs in the above-captioned case, it would leave Plaintiffs Angie, Katy, and Jany without counsel. Instead, Movant should only be permitted to withdraw as counsel once suitable replacement counsel is found. Movant is an officer of the Court and is this Court's means of communication with Plaintiffs.

Third, as Defendants note in their Response, there is substantial prejudice to Defendants in permitting Movant to withdraw at this posture. There are currently three pending post-trial motions that Plaintiffs have yet to respond to. The Responses to these Motions would likely be delayed based on the necessity of Plaintiffs securing new counsel for Angie, Katy, and Jany if Movant is permitted to withdraw at this posture. Thus, the prosecution of the lawsuit would be disrupted by the withdrawal of counsel at this posture in the case.

II. RECOMMENDATION

For the foregoing reasons, the undersigned respectfully **RECOMMENDS** that the Motion to Withdraw as Counsel for Plaintiffs (ECF No. 719) be **DENIED**, **without prejudice**.

A party shall serve and file written objections, if any, to this Report and Recommendations with the Honorable Joan A. Lenard, United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, within **FOURTEEN (14) DAYS** of being served with a copy of this Report and Recommendations. Failure to timely file objections will bar a de novo determination by the District Judge of anything in

Appendix D

this recommendation and shall constitute a waiver of a party's "right to challenge on appeal the district court's order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions." 11th Cir. R. 3-1 (2016); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); see also *Harrigan v. Metro-Dade Police Dep't Station # 4*, 977 F.3d 1185, 1191–92 (11th Cir. 2020).

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED in Chambers at Miami, Florida this 12th day of October, 2023.

S: *Lauren F. Louis*

LAUREN F. LOUIS
United States Magistrate Judge

Appendix E

FLSD, Case 1:19-cv-21826-JAL, DE 745, 11/07/23

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
CASE NO. 19-21826-CIV-LENARD/LOUIS**

CARLOS A. ALONSO CANO, individually
and as guardian for his son, ANGIE ALONSO
MOREJON, KATY ALONSO MOREJON,
JANY LEIDY ALONSO MOREJON, and
FE MOREJON FERNANDEZ, individually,

Plaintiffs,

v.

245 C & C, LLC and CFH GROUP, LLC.,

Defendants.

**OMNIBUS ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS (D.E. 727)**

THIS CAUSE is before the Court on the Report of Magistrate Judge Lauren F. Louis ("Report," D.E. 727), recommending the Court deny the Motion to Withdraw as Counsel for Plaintiffs Carlos A. Alonso Cano ("Carlos"), Fé Morejón Fernandez ("Fé"), Jany Leidy Alonso Morejón ("Jany"), Katy Alonso Morejón ("Katy"), and Angie Alonso Morejón ("Angie") ("Motion," D.E. 719), filed by Michael D. Dunlavy ("Movant") on September 29, 2023. Also before the Court is Plaintiffs' Renewed Request for Additional Findings of Fact (D.E. 736) and Renewed Motion for New Trial (D.E. 737) filed by Movant on October 25, 2023, on behalf of Katy and Angie.

Appendix E

Movant has filed Objections to the Report. ("Objections," D.E. 739.) The Defendants have not filed Objections and the time to do so has passed.¹ In brief, the Magistrate Judge's Report finds that Plaintiffs Angie, Katy, and Jany are unable to proceed pro se,² and that retaining suitable replacement counsel at this posture in the case will result in a disruption in the proceedings and prejudice to the Plaintiffs and Defendants.³ After an independent review of the Report and record, the Court adopts the Report, overrules the Objections, and makes the following additional findings.

First, Movant does not dispute the Magistrate Judge's determination that new counsel would need to be secured for Angie and the minor children if he were permitted to withdraw.⁴ As discussed, there are several pending post-trial motions and substitution of counsel would result in substantial delays and prejudice to the parties.

¹ The Court notes that Defendants previously filed a response in opposition to the Motion. ("Defendants' Response," D.E. 723.)

² The Report explains that Carlos and Fé are the only Plaintiffs that can proceed pro se in this case. (R. & R. at 2.) This is because Carlos brought this action individually and as guardian for his son Angie and as next friend of his minor daughters Katy and Jany; however, a non-attorney pro se litigant cannot bring an action on behalf of his or her minor child or ward. (See *id.* at 2-3.)

³ The Defendants have the following three motions pending before the Court: Defendants' Verified Motion for Award of Attorney's Fees and for Entry of Judgment (D.E. 697), Defendants' Verified Motion for Entry of Judgment for Non-Taxable Costs (D.E. 698), and Defendants' Verified Combined Motion Out of Time for an Order Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 10(b)(3)(C) to Require Appellants to Prepare, Pay For and File All Portions of the Trial Transcript (D.E. 713.)

⁴ Movant states that, without his knowledge or assistance, Carlos filed a pro se Notice of Appeal (D.E. 683.) The Notice of Appeal is signed by Carlos, Fé, and Jany. (Obj.'s at 4-5.) In other words, Angie and Katy are not parties to the appeal. Movant argues that Carlos's unilateral action amounts to a refusal "to abide by the terms of an agreement relating to the representation[.]" (*Id.* at 6.)

Appendix E

Second, Movant wholly fails to explain why he delayed in filing his Motion. The parties agree that Defendants had no objection to Movant's post-trial withdrawal on July 20, 2023—just four days after entry of final judgment. (See Obj.'s at 5, Defendants' Resp. at 1.) However, Movant did not file the Motion with the Court. Movant instead continued filing other motions on the Plaintiffs' behalf. On September 11, 2023, Movant filed Plaintiffs' Corrected Motion for New Trial (D.E. 695.) On October 25, 2023, Movant filed Plaintiffs' Response to Defendants' Motion for Fees and Costs. (D.E. 738.) On the same date, Movant—on behalf of Katy and Angie—filed Plaintiffs' Renewed Request for Additional Findings of Fact (D.E. 736) and Plaintiffs' Renewed Motion for New Trial (D.E. 737.)⁵ On this record, the Court finds that Movant's September 29, 2023 Motion comes too late. The prosecution of the lawsuit will be disrupted, and substantial prejudice to the parties will result, if withdrawal is permitted at this posture.

⁵ These two motions repeat the arguments made in Plaintiffs' Corrected Motion for New Trial (D.E. 695) which was dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction on September 13, 2023. (See D.E. 696 at 4–5 (“In their Motion for New Trial, Plaintiffs challenge the Court's Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law (D.E. 678.) As such, the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction to decide the Motion for New Trial as it involves ‘aspects of the case involved in the appeal.’”).) The Court finds that these two motions likewise involve aspects of the case involved in the appeal, even though Katy and Angie are not parties to the appeal. As such, these two motions are due to be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

Appendix E

Finally, the Court notes that Movant filed a Supplemental Notice of Permanent Appearance of Counsel (D.E. 581) on February 10, 2023. Therein, Movant agreed “to represent the plaintiffs for trial, all proceedings in the district court, and on appeal.” (Id.) The Court will hold Movant to his agreement.⁶ It appears that Movant has unilaterally withdrawn from the representation of Carlos, Fé, and Jany based on his recent motions, filed solely on behalf of Katy and Angie. This is not permitted. See Local Rule 11.1(d)(3).

In conclusion, the Court holds Movant to his agreement and mandates that he continue representing all plaintiffs in all proceedings in the district court.⁷

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that:

1. The Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (D.E. 727) is **ADOPTED**;
2. Movant’s Motion to Withdraw as Counsel for Plaintiffs (D.E. 719) is **DENIED**;
3. Plaintiffs’ pro se Notice of Opposition to Movant’s Motion to Withdraw (D.E. 742) is **DENIED** as moot; and alternatively, **STRICKEN** as an unauthorized *pro se* filing;


⁶ The Eleventh Circuit retains jurisdiction over the appeal. If Carlos has failed to abide by the terms of the attorney-client agreement by filing a pro se notice of appeal, then Movant must take appropriate action in the Eleventh Circuit.

⁷ Again, the proceedings on appeal are the matter for the Eleventh Circuit. The Court will note that it has no information regarding Jany’s current age or eligibility to proceed *pro se*.

Appendix E

4. Plaintiffs, Katy and Angie's Renewed Request for Additional Findings of Fact (D.E. 736) and Renewed Motion for New Trial (D.E. 737) are **DISMISSED** for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers at Miami, Florida this 7th day of November, 2023.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Joan A. Lenard", is written over a horizontal line.

Joan A. Lenard. United States District Judge

FLSD, Case 1:19-cv-21826-JAL, **DE 816**, 08/16/24

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
CASE NO. 19-21826-CIV-LENARD/LOUIS**

CARLOS A. ALONSO CANO, individually
and as guardian for his son, ANGIE ALONSO
MOREJON, KATY ALONSO MOREJON,
JANY LEIDY ALONSO MOREJON and
FE MOREJON FERNANDEZ individually,

Plaintiffs,

v.

245 C & C, LLC and CFH GROUP, LLC.,

Defendants.

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION
TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL**

THIS CAUSE is before the Court on attorney Michael D. Dunlavy's
("Movant") Motion for Reconsideration¹ or Alternatively Renewed Post-Trial Motion
to Withdraw as Counsel ("Motion," D.E. 794) filed July 8, 2024. Therein, Movant
requests to withdraw as counsel for the above-captioned Plaintiffs.

¹ The Court previously denied Movant's request to withdraw as counsel. (D.E. 745 at 4.)

Appendix F

Defendants filed a Response (“Response,” D.E. 801) on July 16, 2024. Movant did not file a Reply and the time to do so has passed. Upon review of the Motion, Response, and the record, the Court finds as follows:

I. Brief Background

Movant represented the above-captioned Plaintiffs at a bench trial held over ten days in June 2023. (See D.E.’s 641–668.) On July 20, 2023, the Court issued its Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law (D.E. 678) and entered Final Judgment (D.E. 679)² in favor of Defendants and against Plaintiffs. An appeal followed, which remains pending in the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. (Court of Appeals Docket Nos. 23-12413, 23-13392.)

Movant asserts that withdrawal is justified because he is unable to ethically continue the representation. (Mot. at 2–3.) In its Response, “Defendants take the position that whether [Movant’s] allegations constitute ‘irreconcilable differences’ or other good cause to permit withdrawal is for this Court to determine.” (Resp. at 3 (citing *Mekdeci By & Through Mekdeci v. Merrell Nat. Lab’ys, a Div. of Richardson-Merrell, Inc.*, 711 F.2d 1510, 1521–22 (11th Cir. 1983).)

² The Court assumes the reader’s familiarity with these Orders.

*Appendix F***II. Legal Standards**

The Local Rules of the Southern District of Florida provide that “no attorney shall withdraw the attorney’s appearance in any action or proceeding except by leave of Court after notice served on the attorney’s client and opposing counsel.” S.D. Fla. L.R. 11.1(d)(3)(A). It is within a district court’s discretion to permit or deny a motion to withdraw as counsel. See *Patnaude v. Sears Pest Control, Inc.*, No. 08-61980-CIV, 2009 WL 10667065, at *2 (S.D. Fla. May 13, 2009); *Reagan v. Title Max of Ala., Inc.*, No. 5:09-cv-91/RS-MD, 2010 WL 11530503, at *1 (N.D. Fla. Apr. 15, 2010) (citing *Baker v. Coto*, 154 F. App’x 854, 858 (11th Cir. 2005).) “Before granting an attorney’s motion to withdraw, however, ‘it is incumbent on the court to assure that the prosecution of the lawsuit before it is not disrupted by the withdrawal of counsel, and that the withdrawal of counsel is for good cause.’” *Patnaude*, 2009 WL 10667065, at *2 (quoting *Mekdeci v. Merrell Nat’l Lab’ys*, 711 F.2d 1510, 1521–22 (11th Cir. 1983).) “Irreconcilable differences” may constitute good cause for withdrawal. See, e.g., *Mekdeci*, 711 F.2d at 1521–22.

III. Discussion

As good cause, Movant asserts that Plaintiff Carlos A. Alonso Cano (“Carlos”) has continually defied his counsel and court orders. (Mot. at 2–3.) Movant further asserts that Carlos has continually expressed that he does not need a lawyer. (Id. at

Appendix F

3 n. 1.) Based upon the facts alleged in the Motion, the Court finds that Movant has established “irreconcilable differences” constituting good cause for withdrawal. The Court additionally finds that the prosecution of the lawsuit will not be disrupted by the withdrawal of counsel. Put simply, the district court proceedings terminated with the entry of final judgment on July 20, 2023, and the appeal is a matter for the Eleventh Circuit.³ Based on the foregoing, the Court finds that withdrawal is justified, and the Motion is thus due to be granted.

IV. Conclusion


Accordingly, it is **ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** as follows:

1. Movant, Michael D. Dunlavy’s Motion to Withdraw as Counsel (D.E. 794) is **GRANTED**. The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to terminate attorney Michael D. Dunlavy as counsel for Plaintiffs Carlos A. Alonso Cano, Fé Morejón Fernandez, Jany Leidy Alonso Morejón, Katy Alonso Morejón, and Angie Alonso Morejón.
2. The Clerk is further **DIRECTED** to mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiffs at their address of record: 6700 NW 186 St. Apt. # 121, Hialeah, FL 33015.

³ The minor child Plaintiffs, Katy Alonso Morejón and Angie Alonso Morejón are not parties to the appeal and the post-trial motions before this Court. As such, the Court need not appoint substitute counsel for them at this time.

Appendix F

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers at Miami, Florida this 16th day of
August, 2024.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Joan A. Lenard", is written over a horizontal line. The signature is fluid and extends slightly beyond the line on both sides.

Joan A. Lenard. United States District Judge