

Appendix

TOC Title	Running Footer Page(s)
Florida Supreme Court acceptance of writ of mandamus	A-1
Third DCA Opinion for Rehearing	A-2
Third DCA Opinion Affirming Judgment	A-3
Third DCA's Order on Supplementation (later)	A-5
Third DCA's Order (earlier)	A-6
Lower Tribunal Clerk's Notice of Missing Transcript	A-7
Florida Supreme Court Denial of Review (<i>final denial</i>)	A-9
Evidence of Attempted Record Access	A-10
Affidavit under 28 U.S.C. § 1746	A-21
Judicial Misconduct Exhibit	A-23
Judicial Misconduct Exhibit	A-28
Related Federal Precedents & Citations	A-34

APPENDIX G

Supreme Court of Florida

TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 2025,

Kerlee Jilla, SC2025-0069

Petitioner(s)

v.

Luzabelle Lucas-Jilla,

Respondent(s)

SC2025-0069

Lower Tribunal No(s).:

3D2023-1263;

132018DR023458A00104

The petition for a writ of mandamus is hereby dismissed. See *Matheus v. Crews*, 132 So. 3d 776 (Fla. 2014). Any motions or other requests for relief are hereby denied. No motion for rehearing or reinstatement will be considered by this Court.

CANADY, LABARGA, COURIEL, GROSSHANS, and FRANCIS, JJ., concur.

A True Copy Test:

SC2025-0069 4/22/2025

KS

Served:

BRUCE ANDREW ARRICK

3DCA CLERK

MIAMI-DADE CLERK

JOHN ELIAS

KERLEE JILLA

APPENDIX A

Supreme Court of Florida
THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 2025

Kerlee Jilla,
Petitioner(s)

v.

Luzabelle Lucas-Jilla,
Respondent(s)

/

SC2025-0069
Lower Tribunal No(s).:
3D2023-1263;
132018DR023458A00104

The jurisdiction of this Court was invoked by the filing of a Petition for Writ of Mandamus; however, said petition was not accompanied by the \$300.00 filing fee or a proper motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis as required by Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.100(b). The filing fee is due and payable at the time of filing the petition. Petitioner is allowed to and including February 17, 2025, in which to submit the filing fee or a proper motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis that complies with sections 57.081 and 57.082, Florida Statutes. The petition will not be submitted to the Court until receipt of the above. Failure to submit the filing fee or the above referenced document to this Court could result in the imposition of sanctions, including dismissal of the petition. Please understand that once this case is dismissed, it is not subject to reinstatement.

A True Copy
Test: SC2025-0069 1/16/2025

APPENDIX B

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
APPEAL OF FLORIDA THIRD DISTRICT

January 7, 2025,
Kerlee Jilla,
Appellant(s),
v.
Luzabelle Lucas-Jilla,
Appellee(s).

Trial Court Case No. 18-23458
3D2023-1263

Upon consideration, pro se Appellant's Motion for
Rehearing is hereby denied.
MILLER, GORDO and BOKOR, JJ., concur.
A True Copy
ATTEST

3D2023-1263 1/8/25]
Mercedes M. Prieto, Clerk
District Court of Appeal
Third District

APPENDIX C

Third District Court of Appeal
State of Florida

Opinion filed December 4, 2024.

Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for
rehearing.

No. 3D23-1263
Lower Tribunal No. 18-23458

Kerlee Jilla,
Appellant,
vs.

Luzabelle Lucas-Jilla,
Appellee.

An Appeal from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade
County, Stacy D.
Glick, Judge.

Kerlee Jilla, in proper person.

Law Office of John Elias, and John Elias (Pembroke
Pines), for appellee.

Before MILLER, GORDO and BOKOR, JJ.
PER CURIAM.

Affirmed. See *Williams v. Jessica L. Kerr, P.A.*, 271 So. 3d 82, 83 (Fla. 3d DCA 2019) (“It is well established that the party seeking appellate review has the burden of providing the court with an adequate record of the proceedings in the lower tribunal.” (quotation omitted)); *Applegate v. Barnett Bank of Tallahassee*, 377 So. 2d 1150, 1152 (Fla. 1979) (“Without a [complete] record of the trial proceedings, the appellate court can not properly resolve the underlying factual issues so as to conclude that the trial court’s judgment is not supported by the evidence or by an alternative theory. Without knowing the factual context, neither can an appellate court reasonably conclude that the trial judge so misconceived the law as to require reversal.”); *Taylor v. Bateman*, 927 So. 2d 1024, 1026 (Fla. 4th DCA 2006) (“Such record omissions are fatal to an appeal.”).