

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

TARON JACQUETT,
Petitioner,

v.

ESTEFANIA JACQUETT,
Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Taron Jacquett
Petitioner, Pro Se
5415 Avebury Lane
Saint Cloud, FL 34771
Tel. 214-498-2212
Tjacquett03@gmail.com

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment are violated when a State's appellate structure forecloses all meaningful review of preserved federal constitutional claims through the combined use of unexplained Per Curiam affirmances and transcript requirements that indigent litigants cannot satisfy.
2. Whether conditioning appellate review on a litigant's ability to purchase transcripts—where facial legal and constitutional errors were preserved by timely trial-court motions—constitutes wealth-based discrimination barred by *Griffin v. Illinois*, 351 U.S. 12 (1956), *Mayer v. City of Chicago*, 404 U.S. 189 (1971), and *M.L.B. v. S.L.J.*, 519 U.S. 102 (1996).
3. Whether substantive and procedural due process are violated when a state trial court deprives a fit parent of all parenting time while suppressing material child-safety evidence, denying a continuance during an active child-abuse investigation, ignoring a controlling oral pronouncement restoring parenting time, and enforcing a conflicting written order drafted by opposing counsel.
4. Whether the Fourteenth Amendment is violated when a state court enforces incarceration and coercive financial sanctions for alleged noncompliance with family-court orders without notice of possible incarceration, without counsel for an indigent litigant, without findings of present ability to pay as required by *Turner v. Rogers*, 564 U.S. 431 (2011), and while relying on knowingly false or unchallenged financial affidavits.
5. Whether a State violates the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses when fraud on the court—through false financial affidavits, fabricated agreements, and material misrepresentations—is compounded by judicial enforcement of fraud-tainted orders and by appellate practices that insulate those orders from any merits review, including review by the State's court of last resort.

LIST OF PARTIES

Petitioner Taron Jacquett was the appellant in the Sixth District Court of Appeal of Florida and the petitioner in the Supreme Court of Florida.

Respondent Estefania Jacquett was the appellee below.

State actors whose conduct is implicated include officials of the Ninth Judicial Circuit Court for Osceola County, Florida, and associated child-welfare and law-enforcement entities.

RELATED CASES

- Sixth District Court of Appeal of Florida, Case No. 6D2024-2519
- Supreme Court of Florida, Case No. SC2025-1735

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED i
LIST OF PARTIES ii
RELATED CASES ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iv
OPINIONS BELOW 1
JURISDICTION 1
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED 1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT 3
 I. The State’s Appellate Structure Denies Meaningful Review of Preserved Federal
 Constitutional Claims 3
 II. Unexplained Per Curiam Affirmances Compound Wealth-Based Discrimination
 and Foreclose Review 3
 III. Deprivation of Fundamental Parental Rights Without Due Process Warrants
 Review 3
 IV. Coercive Enforcement Without Required Safeguards Violates the Fourteenth
 Amendment 4
CONCLUSION 4
INDEX TO APPENDICES 5

INDEX TO APPENDICES

Appendix A Decision of the Sixth District Court of Appeal of Florida
(Per Curiam Affirmance) 1a
Appendix B Order of the Supreme Court of Florida
Denying Discretionary Review (Nov. 17, 2025) 3a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Santosky v. Kramer, 455 U.S. 745 (1982).....	3
Bearden v. Georgia, 461 U.S. 660, 672–73 (1983)	4
Evitts v. Lucey, 469 U.S. 387 (1985).....	3
Griffin v. Illinois, 351 U.S. 12 (1956)	i, 3
Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co., 455 U.S. 422 (1982)	3
M.L.B. v. S.L.J., 519 U.S. 102 (1996).....	i, 3
Mayer v. City of Chicago, 404 U.S. 189 (1971).....	i, 3
Ortwein v. Schwab, 410 U.S. 656, 659 (1973).....	3
Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000).....	3
Turner v. Rogers, 564 U.S. 431 (2011).....	i, 4

STATUTES AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

U.S. Const. amend. XIV	1, 3, 4
28 U.S.C. § 1257(a)	1

RULES

Supreme Court Rule 10	3
Supreme Court Rule 13	1
Supreme Court Rule 14.1(i)	i
Supreme Court Rule 39	i

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

The judgment of the Sixth District Court of Appeal of Florida was entered on October 24, 2025. The court issued an unexplained per curiam affirmance without a written opinion. (App. A).

The Supreme Court of Florida denied discretionary review on November 17, 2025. (App. B).

JURISDICTION

The Supreme Court of Florida denied discretionary review on November 17, 2025. That order constitutes the final judgment of the highest court of a State in which a decision could be had. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a). The petition is timely.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This case arises from family-court proceedings in which Petitioner, a fit parent, was deprived of all parenting time and subjected to coercive enforcement measures without the procedural safeguards required by the Fourteenth Amendment.

During the underlying proceedings, the trial court denied Petitioner a continuance despite an active child-abuse investigation involving Child Protection Team professionals, the Department of Children and Families, and law enforcement. Material medical and forensic evidence relating to the minor children's safety was suppressed. At a subsequent hearing, the trial court orally pronounced that Petitioner's parenting time would be restored upon completion of a mental-health evaluation. Petitioner completed the evaluation and filed it with the court. Nonetheless, the trial court ignored the oral pronouncement and enforced a written order drafted by opposing counsel that materially conflicted with the court's own oral ruling.

The trial court further enforced financial obligations and coercive sanctions based on disputed financial affidavits, without allowing impeachment of those affidavits, and without providing notice of potential incarceration, counsel for an indigent litigant, or findings regarding Petitioner's present ability to pay.

Petitioner timely raised and preserved constitutional objections through trial-court motions, including objections based on due process, access to courts, and the enforcement of orders entered in violation of constitutional safeguards. Petitioner appealed. The Sixth District Court of Appeal affirmed without opinion. Because the affirmance was unexplained, the Supreme Court of Florida lacked jurisdiction to review the constitutional issues and denied discretionary review.

As a result, no state appellate court has reviewed the merits of Petitioner's preserved federal constitutional claims.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

I. The State's Appellate Structure Denies Meaningful Review of Preserved Federal Constitutional Claims

This Court has long held that a State may not condition appellate review on a litigant's ability to pay. *Griffin v. Illinois*, 351 U.S. 12 (1956); *Mayer v. City of Chicago*, 404 U.S. 189 (1971). Where fundamental rights are at stake, appellate access must be meaningful and not dependent on wealth. *M.L.B. v. S.L.J.*, 519 U.S. 102 (1996).

This Court has distinguished cases involving purely economic interests from those implicating fundamental rights, emphasizing that heightened procedural protections apply where family integrity and parental rights are involved. *Ortwein v. Schwab*, 410 U.S. 656, 659 (1973); *M.L.B.*, 519 U.S. at 121–22.

Here, Petitioner preserved facial constitutional errors through timely trial-court motions. Nonetheless, appellate review was foreclosed solely because Petitioner could not purchase transcripts, resulting in a complete denial of meaningful review.

II. Unexplained Per Curiam Affirmances Compound Wealth-Based Discrimination and Foreclose Review

Meaningful appellate review is a component of due process. *Evitts v. Lucey*, 469 U.S. 387 (1985). When a State's procedures operate to extinguish claims through structural barriers, due process is violated. *Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co.*, 455 U.S. 422 (1982).

The unexplained per curiam affirmance in this case insulated serious constitutional violations from review and prevented the State's court of last resort from exercising jurisdiction. The resulting disparity in access to review based on indigency warrants this Court's intervention.

III. Deprivation of Fundamental Parental Rights Without Due Process Warrants Review

Parental rights are fundamental liberty interests protected by the Fourteenth Amendment. *Santosky v. Kramer*, 455 U.S. 745 (1982); *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57 (2000).

The enforcement of orders depriving a fit parent of all parenting time—while suppressing child-safety evidence and ignoring a controlling oral pronouncement—raises serious due-process concerns that have never been addressed on the merits by any appellate court.

IV. Coercive Enforcement Without Required Safeguards Violates the Fourteenth Amendment

The Fourteenth Amendment forbids the State from imposing coercive sanctions based on nonpayment without first determining whether the failure to pay was willful and whether adequate procedural safeguards were provided. *Bearden v. Georgia*, 461 U.S. 660, 672–73 (1983). In civil contempt proceedings involving family-court obligations, the Constitution requires notice, the opportunity to be heard, and findings regarding ability to pay. *Turner v. Rogers*, 564 U.S. 431 (2011).

Those safeguards were absent here, compounding the denial of due process.

CONCLUSION

This case presents a fundamental breakdown in the operation of a State’s judicial system as applied to preserved federal constitutional claims. Through the combined use of unexplained *Per Curiam* affirmances and transcript-based barriers that indigent litigants cannot satisfy, Florida’s appellate structure foreclosed all meaningful review of Petitioner’s due-process and equal-protection claims. As a result, no state appellate court has ever addressed the merits of serious constitutional violations involving parental rights, access to courts, coercive enforcement, and fraud-tainted judicial orders.

This Court has repeatedly held that States may not condition appellate review on wealth, particularly where fundamental liberty interests are at stake. Yet here, a fit parent has been deprived of all parenting time, subjected to coercive sanctions, and exposed to the threat of incarceration, without the procedural safeguards the Constitution requires—and without any appellate court ever reviewing those claims on the merits.

Absent this Court’s intervention, the constitutional violations presented will remain insulated from review, not only in this case but for other indigent litigants whose federal rights are extinguished by similar structural practices. The petition therefore squarely satisfies the considerations governing certiorari, and review is warranted to vindicate the Fourteenth Amendment’s guarantees of due process, equal protection, and meaningful access to justice.

For these reasons, the petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,



Taron Jacquett
Pro Se Petitioner
5415 Avebury Lane
Saint Cloud, FL 34771
Tel: 214-498-2212
Email: Tjacquett03@gmail.com

INDEX TO APPENDICES

Appendix A Decision of the Sixth District Court of Appeal of Florida
(Per Curiam Affirmance) 1a

Appendix B Order of the Supreme Court of Florida
Denying Discretionary Review (Nov. 17, 2025) 3a

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

Case No. 6D2024-2519
Lower Tribunal No. 2021-DR-003477

TARON JACQUETT,

Appellant,

v.

ESTEFANIA JACQUETT,

Appellee.

Appeal from the Circuit Court for Osceola County.
Christy C. Collins, Judge.

October 24, 2025

PER CURIAM.

AFFIRMED. *See Applegate v. Barnett Bank of Tallahassee*, 377 So. 2d 1150, 1152 (Fla. 1979) (“In appellate proceedings the decision of a trial court has the presumption of correctness and the burden is on the appellant to demonstrate error. . . . The trial court should have been affirmed because the record brought forward by the appellant is inadequate to demonstrate reversible error.”); *Robinson v. Robinson*, 50 Fla. L. Weekly D1997, D1997 (Fla. 6th DCA Sept. 5, 2025) (stating that where error appears for first time on final judgment’s face, party must alert trial court to

error through motion for rehearing or some other appropriate motion to preserve it for appeal); *Julia v. Ramos-Baez*, 395 So. 3d 1121, 1123 (Fla. 6th DCA 2024) (“Without the transcript of the relevant proceeding, an appellate court cannot conduct ‘an examination of the entire case’ to determine whether the trial court actually failed to make the required findings.” (quoting § 59.041, Fla. Stat.)).

TRAVER, C.J., and MIZE and BROWNLEE, JJ., concur.

Taron Jacquett, Saint Cloud, pro se.

Ronda Denise Westfall, of The Westfall Law Firm, P.A., Orlando, for Appellee.

NOT FINAL UNTIL TIME EXPIRES TO FILE MOTION FOR REHEARING
AND DISPOSITION THEREOF IF TIMELY FILED

Supreme Court of Florida

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2025

Taron Jacquett,
Petitioner(s)

v.

Estefania Jacquett,
Respondent(s)

SC2025-1735

Lower Tribunal No(s).:

6D2024-2519;

492021DR003477DCXXXX

This cause having heretofore been submitted to the Court on jurisdictional briefs and portions of the record deemed necessary to reflect jurisdiction under Article V, Section 3(b), Florida Constitution, and the Court having determined that it should decline to accept jurisdiction, it is ordered that the petition for review is denied.

No motion for rehearing will be entertained by the Court. See Fla. R. App. P. 9.330(d)(2).

Petitioner's Verified Emergency Motion to Stay Mandate and Enforcement of Lower-Court Orders Pending Supreme Court Review filed in the above styled cause is hereby denied.

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

A True Copy
Test:

SC2025-1735 11/17/2025

John A. Tomasino

Clerk, Supreme Court

SC2025-1735 11/17/2025



CASE NO.: SC2025-1735

Page Two

KS

Served:

6DCA CLERK

OSCEOLA CLERK

HON. CHRISTY CHANEL COLLINS

TARON JACQUETT

RONDA WESTFALL