

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 Jacquet
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