

APPENDIX

to Petition for Writ of CERTIORARI

José Yeyille v. The Florida Bar

NO. _____

**APPENDIX
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**APPENDIX A: *Florida Bar v. Yeyille*, SC2024-0235 (October 24, 2025)
.....1a**

APPENDIX B: *Florida Bar v. Yeyille*, 2024 WL 4903524, No. SC2024-0235. (Fla. Nov. 27, 2024).....3a

**APPENDIX C: *Florida Bar v. Yeyille*, SC2024-0235 (May 21, 2024).
.....5a**

**APPENDIX D: *José Yeyille v. Dinah Stein, et al.*, 3D24-418.
(3rd DCA April 4, 2024).6a**

**APPENDIX E: *José Yeyille v. Justin Speigel*, 3D23-2147
(3rd DCA April 4, 2024).....8a**

**APPENDIX F: *José Yeyille v. Glenn Falk, et al.*, 3D23-0926
(3rd DCA Aug. 25, 2023).....10a**

**APPENDIX G: *Yeyille v. Speigel*, 373 So. 3d 1238 (Fla. 3d DCA,
June 14, 2023).....11a**

Supreme Court of Florida

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2025

The Florida Bar,
Complainant(s)
v.

SC2024-0235
Lower Tribunal No(s):
2023-70,492 (11I)

Jose L. Yeyille,
Respondent(s)

Previously, we suspended Yeyille from the practice of law in Florida for 91 days for violating multiple Rules Regulating The Florida Bar. *See Fla. Bar v. Yeyille*, 2024 WL 4903524, No. SC2024-0235 (Fla. Nov. 27, 2024). Yeyille motioned the Court for rehearing, filing a lengthy appendix with his motion that contained obscene and vulgar imagery. The Court ordered Yeyille on May 14, 2025, to show cause why the motion and accompanying appendix should not be stricken as frivolous under Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.410 (Sanctions), and why he should not be barred from filing any paper with the Court pro se in Bar disciplinary cases.

Yeyille filed a response to the show cause order in which he insisted that “[t]here is nothing in the 213 pages submitted to this Court in [his] Motion for Rehearing and APPENDIX that could possibly qualify as ‘obscene’, ‘vulgar’, or ‘vexatious’, or ‘in bad faith.’” We find that Yeyille has failed to show cause why sanctions are not warranted in this case.

This Court has sanctioned “pro se respondents who have abused the judicial process and otherwise misused this Court’s limited judicial resources by filing frivolous, nonmeritorious, or otherwise inappropriate filings.” *Fla. Bar v. Petrano*, 153 So. 3d 894, 895 (Fla. 2014). Such sanctions have included being “barred from further filings in this Court unless their pleadings, motions, or other requests for relief were filed under the signature of a member

APPENDIX A (19)

CASE NO.: SC2024-0235

Page Two

of The Florida Bar in good standing other than the respondents.”
Id. at 895-96. Accordingly, Yeyille’s motion for rehearing and the accompanying appendix filed with this Court on December 2, 2024, is stricken as frivolous and filed in bad faith. Further, the Clerk of this Court is directed to reject any paper filed by Yeyille in a Bar discipline case that is not signed by another member in good standing of The Florida Bar. See R. Regulating Fla. Bar 3-7.17.

MUÑIZ, C.J., and CANADY, LABARGA, COURIEL, GROSSHANS, FRANCIS, and SASSO, JJ., concur.

A True Copy


Test:

~~SC2024-0235~~ 10/24/2025

John A. Tomasino

Clerk Supreme Court

SC2024-0235 10/24/2025



AS

Served:

WILLIAM WONIL CHUNG
HON. CARLOS GUZMAN
PATRICIA ANN TORO SAVITZ
JOSE L. YEYILLE

2a

Supreme Court of Florida

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 2024

The Florida Bar,
Complainant(s)
v.

SC2024-0235
Lower Tribunal No(s).:
2023-70,492 (11I)

Jose L. Yeyille,
Respondent(s)

Respondent's "Motion to Dismiss the Report of "Referee" with Prejudice for: Lack of Jurisdiction. VLTRA·VIREs. Diane Hensley—Loper Bright Enterprises Revolution. Violations of Citizen José Rights to Free Speech, Free Association, to Petition the Government for a Redress of Grievances (Amendment I, U.S. Const.). Violations of Rights to Property and Liberty, A Fair Trial, Due Process, Equal Protection of the Laws (Amendment XIV, U.S. Const.). Absolute Litigation Privilege. Motion to Dismiss and Actual Compensatory Damages Pursuant to Florida Statute § 768.295(4)" is stricken.

Respondent's "Emergency Petition(s) for Writ of Mandavs, [sic] and/or Prohibition, and/or, in the Alternative, Petition for All Writs to Command the Referee and the Florida Bar to Hire and Appoint Attorney(s) to Represent Indigent Respondent for his Inquisition for Libel Against the Government—the Judiciary of the State of Florida" is denied as moot.

The uncontested report of the referee is approved, and Respondent is suspended from the practice of law for 91 days, effective 30 days from the date of this order so that Respondent can close out his practice and protect the interests of existing clients. If Respondent notifies this Court in writing that he is no longer practicing and does not need the 30 days to protect existing clients, this Court will enter an order making the suspension effective immediately. Respondent shall fully comply with Rule Regulating The Florida Bar 3-5.1(h). Respondent shall also fully comply with Rule Regulating The Florida Bar 3-6.1, if applicable. In addition, Respondent shall accept no new business from the date this order

APPENDIX B (3a)

CASE NO.: SC2024-0235

Page Two

is filed until he is reinstated. Respondent is further directed to comply with all other terms and conditions of the report.

Judgment is entered for The Florida Bar, 651 East Jefferson Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2300, for recovery of costs from Jose L. Yeyille in the amount of \$2,286.52, for which sum let execution issue.

Not final until time expires to file motion for rehearing, and if filed, determined. The filing of a motion for rehearing shall not alter the effective date of this suspension.

MUÑIZ, C.J., and CANADY, LABARGA, COURIEL, GROSSHANS, FRANCIS, and SASSO, JJ., concur.

A True Copy

Test:

SC2024-0235 11/27/2024

John A. Tomasino

Clerk, Supreme Court

SC2024-0235 11/27/2024



CA

Served:

WILLIAM WONIL CHUNG
HON. CARLOS GUZMAN
PATRICIA ANN TORO SAVITZ
JOSE L. YEYILLE

4a

Supreme Court of Florida

TUESDAY, MAY 21, 2024

The Florida Bar,
Complainant(s)
v.

SC2024-0235
Lower Tribunal No(s):
2023-70,492 (11I)

Jose L. Yeyille,
Respondent(s)


Respondent's "Emergency Petition for Writ of Prohibition, and/or, in the Alternative, Petition for All Writs. Motion to Stay Inquisition Against Citizen José While this Court Fixes to Deliberate its Order on This/These Petition(s)" is hereby denied. No rehearing will be entertained by this Court.

MUÑIZ, C.J., and CANADY, LABARGA, COURIEL, GROSSHANS, FRANCIS, and SASSO, JJ., concur.

A True Copy
Test:

SC2024-0235 5/21/2024

John A. Tomasino
Clerk, Supreme Court
SC2024-0235 5/21/2024



CA
Served:
WILLIAM WONIL CHUNG
HON. CARLOS GUZMAN
PATRICIA ANN TORO SAVITZ
JOSE L. YEYILLE

APPENDIX C (5a)

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
APPEAL
OF FLORIDA
THIRD DISTRICT

April 3, 2024

Jose L Yeyille,

3D2024-0418

Appellant(s),

Trial Court Case No. 23-14632-CA

v.

Dinah Stein, etc., et al.,

Appellee(s).


We deny Appellee Dinah Stein, Esquire's Motion to Dismiss the Appeal. This Court's Order barring Appellant, Jose Yeyille, from further pro se filings in this Court, Yeyille v. Spiegel, 373 So. 3d 1238 (Fla. 3d DCA 2023), did not prevent this Court's clerk from accepting filings from Mr. Yeyille in his capacity as an attorney representing a client, even if that client happens to be Mr. Yeyille. This ruling is consistent with an August 21, 2023, similar ruling by another panel of this Court. (See Yeyille v. Falk, 3D23-926).

SCALES, LINDSEY and MILLER, JJ., concur.

A True Copy
ATTEST

APPENDIX D (6a)

3D2024-0018 4/8/24 Prieto
Mercedes M. Prieto, Clerk
District Court of Appeal
Third District



CC: Forrest Lee Andrews, Jr.
Miami-Dade Clerk
Rolando Andres Diaz
Stephanie Pidermann
Natalia Pinzon Martinez
Dinah Stein
Conrad Christian Witte
Jose L Yeyille

TS

7a

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
APPEAL
OF FLORIDA
THIRD DISTRICT

April 3, 2024

Jose Yeyille,

3D2023-2147

Appellant(s),

Trial Court Case No. 23-14782

v.

Justin Cole Speigel, M.D.,

Appellee(s).

Appellant's Response to Appellee's Amended/Corrected Motion to Dismiss Appeal is noted.


Upon consideration of Appellee's Amended/Corrected Motion to Dismiss Appeal, as it appears Jose Yeyille, Esquire, is currently a lawyer in good standing with The Florida Bar, we deny the Motion to Dismiss.

SCALES, LINDSEY and MILLER, JJ., concur.

A True Copy
ATTEST

APPENDIX E (8a)

~~3D2022-2147~~ *4/8/23 Prieto*
Mercedes M. Prieto, Clerk
District Court of Appeal
Third District



CC: Rolando Andres Diaz
Jose L. Yeyille

TS

9a

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
OF FLORIDA
THIRD DISTRICT
AUGUST 25, 2023


JOSE YEYILLE,
Appellant(s)/Petitioner(s),
vs.
GLENN FALK, ESQ., etc., et al.,
Appellee(s)/Respondent(s),

CASE NO.: 3D23-0926

L.T. NO.: 23-14635

Upon consideration of Appellees' Motion to Dismiss the Appeal or, Alternatively, to Strike the Initial Brief, the Motion to Dismiss is hereby denied. See this Court's Order of August 21, 2023. Pro se Appellant's Initial Brief, filed on August 21, 2023, is filed by Jose Yeyille, Esquire, as a member of the Florida Bar.

FERNANDEZ, MILLER and LOBREE, JJ., concur.



cc: Jose Yeyille

Glenn P. Falk

Jessica M. Hernandez

ts

APPENDIX F (10a)

Third District Court of Appeal

State of Florida

Opinion filed June 14, 2023.
Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing.

Nos. 3D22-624, 3D22-625
Lower Tribunal No. 21-24767

José Yeyille,
Appellant,

vs.

Justin Cole Speigel, M.D.,
Appellee.

Appeals from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County, Valerie R. Manno Schurr, Judge.

José Yeyille, in proper person.

Diaz Law Group, and Rolando A. Diaz; Hicks, Porter, Ebenfeld & Stein, P.A., Dinah S. Stein and Aneta McCleary, for appellee.

Before FERNANDEZ, C.J., and HENDON and GORDO, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

APPENDIX G (11a)

ON ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

On May 3, 2023, upon motion of appellee Justin Cole Spiegel, M.D., this Court issued an order to show cause directing José Yeyille to demonstrate why he should not be barred from further pro se appeals for filing a repetitious and frivolous motion for rehearing that impugns and disparages the judges of this Court and a judge of the circuit court. Having considered Mr. Yeyille's response, we find that Mr. Yeyille has failed to show good cause why he should not be barred from further pro se filings.

Specifically, this Court finds Mr. Yeyille violated Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.330(a)(2)(A), by filing a repetitious and frivolous motion for rehearing that merely reasserted previously disposed of arguments. In his motion for rehearing Mr. Yeyille failed to show—or even state with particularity—how this Court's per curiam affirmance conflicted with prior precedent or violated any of his constitutional rights. Florida law has long held that a motion for rehearing is not “an open invitation for an unhappy litigant or attorney to reargue the same points previously presented, or to discuss the bottomless depth of the displeasure that one might feel toward this judicial body as a result of having unsuccessfully sought appellate relief.” Ayala v. Gonzalez, 984 So. 2d 523, 526 (Fla. 5th DCA 2008); see also Jedak Corp. v. Seabreeze Off. Assocs., LLC, 248 So. 3d

242, 244 n.1 (Fla. 5th DCA 2018) (denying a motion for rehearing where “the motion expressed disagreement with the opinion, [but] failed to identify any ambiguity necessitating clarification”).

Under Florida law, “a citizen . . . abuses the right to pro se access by filing repetitious and frivolous pleadings, thereby diminishing the ability of the courts to devote their finite resources to the consideration of legitimate claims.” State v. Spencer, 751 So. 2d 47, 48 (Fla. 1999). The Florida Supreme Court has held that to ensure every citizen’s access to courts, a court may prevent “abusive litigants from continuously filing frivolous petitions, thus enabling the Court to devote its finite resources to those who have not abused the system.” Rivera v. State, 728 So. 2d 1165, 1166 (Fla. 1998).

The Court further finds Mr. Yeyille violated Rule 4-8.2(a), Rules Regulating the Florida Bar, by impugning the qualifications or integrity of the judges of this Court and of the trial court. Rule 4-8.2(a) states, in relevant part, that a “lawyer shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge.” When determining whether the rule was violated, the question is not whether the statement is false, but whether

Mr. Yeyille had an objectively reasonable factual basis for making the statement. See The Florida Bar v. Ray, 797 So. 2d 556, 558–59 (Fla. 2001).

Mr. Yeyille's response to the show cause order proffers no objectively reasonable factual basis for his statements. Rather than address the show cause order, Mr. Yeyille utilizes his response to further impugn the Judges of this Court, stating:

1. "[A]ppellate judges in the state of Florida cannot complain about their vaunted integrity because, thanks to the political process which allows large law firms to choose, buy, and own them, they do not have any."
2. "Significantly, those law firms Greenberg Traurig P.A. and Akerman LLP own the judges of the Third District Court of Appeal."
3. "Hitherto I have most proficiently provided evidence, and proven, that the judges of the judiciary of the state of Florida, from the district courts of appeals, especially the Third District Court of Appeal, to the justices of the Florida Supreme Court, are racists and elitists who deliberately issue PER•CURIAM affirmances, in the vast majority of cases that they decide, to indigents, and indigent PRO•SE Black and Hispanic parties which, in turn, preclude appeals and petitions for writs to the Florida Supreme Court."

(14a)

4. "For now, and regarding this case only, I am confident to allege, based on public information, that the Third District Court of Appeal, is a criminal enterprise. Its judges are owned by Greenberg Traurig PA, and associate law firms including Akerman LLP, the Florida State Attorney's Office, and the local and state's governments."
5. "But none are more brazen than the current Chief Judge of the Third District Court of Appeal, Ivan Fernandez, whose mere presence is an affront to the judiciary and the people of Florida, and his actions an endless travesty of justice."

The fact that Mr. Yeyille is acting in a pro se capacity does not insulate him from the consequences of his actions. "On a proper showing, an attorney may be barred from self-representation." Sibley v. Sibley, 885 So. 2d 980, 986 (Fla. 3d DCA 2004); see also Slizyk v. Smilack, 734 So. 2d 1166, 1167 (Fla. 5th DCA 1999) ("This court has inherent power to prevent abuse of court procedure by inter alia prohibiting [any] pro se parties from appearing without the assistance of counsel."). Even non-attorney pro se individuals may be sanctioned for repeatedly filing motions that include personal attacks on judges, that are "abusive," "malicious," "insulting," and demeaning to the judiciary. Martin v. State, 747 So. 2d 386, 389 (Fla. 2000). At no point in his response does Mr. Yeyille acknowledge his responsibility as a member of

the Florida Bar, make any statements of remorse, admit the wrongfulness of his actions or assert any other mitigating circumstances for this Court to consider and weigh in determining the appropriate sanctions to be imposed.

This Court, therefore, pursuant to Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.410(a), imposes the following sanctions upon José Yeyille for violations Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.330 and Rule 4-8.2(a) of the Rules Regulating the Florida Bar:

1. We direct the Clerk of the Third District Court of Appeal to reject any further pro se filings submitted by José Yeyille, unless such filing has been reviewed and signed by a member of The Florida Bar in good standing.
2. We formally refer this matter to the Florida Bar for appropriate disciplinary proceedings against José Yeyille, Esquire.

It is so ordered.

16a