

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

Case No.: SC19-385

STEVEN YOUNKIN,

Petitioner,

v.

NATHAN BLACKWELDER,

Respondent

_____ /

PETITIONER'S NOTICE OF FILING
SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY

Petitioner STEVEN YOUNKIN, by and through undersigned counsel and pursuant to Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.225, submits as supplemental authority the decision by the Fifth District Court of Appeal in Walsh v. Diaz-Navedo, No. 5D20-1759 (Fla. 5th DCA Jan. 22, 2021), a copy of which is attached. The supplemental authority is pertinent to the certified question of great importance in this petition.

RECEIVED, 01/27/2021 04:33:27 PM, Clerk, Supreme Court

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

WE HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing was served via EPORTAL to: **George H. Anderson, III Esq.**, Dutch.Anderson@newlinlaw.com; Anderson.pleadings@newlinlaw.com; Dan Newlin & Partners, 7335 W Sand Lake Road, Orlando, FL 32819; **Mark A. Nation, Esq.**, and **Paul W. Pritchard, Esq.**, bhirt@nationlaw.com, mnation@nationalw.com, ppritchard@nationlaw.com, The Nation Law Firm, 570 Crown Oak Centre Drive, Longwood, FL 32750; **Amanda E. Wright, Esq.**, OrlandoLegal@Allstate.com, Law Offices of Robert J. Smith, 390 North Orange Avenue, Suite 895, Orlando, FL 32801-1635; **Jason Gonzalez, Esq.**, **Amber Stoner Nunnally, Esq.**, Shutts & Bowen, LLP, 215 S. Monroe St. Suite 804, Tallahassee, FL 32301, jasongonzalez@shutts.com, anunnally@shutts.com; **William W. Large, Esq.**, Florida Justice Reform Institute, 201 S. Monroe St., Tallahassee, FL 32301, william@fljustice.org; **Bryan S. Gowdy, Esq.**, 865 May Street, Jacksonville, FL 32204, bgowdy@appellate-firm.com, filings@appellate-fim.com; **Elaine D. Walter**, Boyd Richards Parker Colonnelli, 100 S.E. 2nd Street, Suite 2600, Miami, FL 33131, ewalter@boydlawgroup.com, **Andrew S. Bolin, Esq.**, **Chizom Okebugwu, Esq.**, Bolin Law Group, 1905 E. 7th Avenue, Tampa, FL 33605, asb@bolin-law.com, cjo@bolin-law.com; **Douglas Eaton, Esq.**, Eaton & Wolk, P.L., 2665 So. Bayshore Drive, Suite 609, Miami, FL 33133, deaton@eatonwolk.com, cgarcia@eatonwolk.com; this 27th day of January, 2021.

BOYD & JENERETTE, PA

/s/ Kansas R. Gooden

KANSAS R. GOODEN

Florida Bar No.: 58707

kgooden@boydjen.com

11767 S. Dixie Hwy, #274

Miami, FL 33156

Tel: (305) 537-1238

GENEVA R. FOUNTAIN

Florida Bar No. 117723

gfontain@boydjen.com

201 North Hogan Street, Suite 400

Jacksonville, Florida 32202

Tel: 904-353-6241

Attorneys for Petitioner Steven Younkin

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA
FIFTH DISTRICT

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

GLEND A. KENT AND SCOTT
GEORGE WALSH,

Petitioners,

v.

Case No. 5D20-1759

LEIDY A. DIAZ-NAVEDO,

Respondent.

Opinion filed January 22, 2021

Petition for Certiorari Review of Order
from the Circuit Court for Orange County,
Chad K. Alvaro, Judge.

Kansas R. Gooden, of Boyd & Jenerette,
P.A., Boca Raton, for Petitioners.

Chad A. Barr, of Law Office of Chad A. Barr,
P.A., Altamonte Springs, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM.

Petitioners, who are defendants in an automobile negligence suit filed below, seek certiorari relief from a discovery order entered by the trial court that essentially compels their counsel and her law firm to disclose the amount of money that the firm has paid to its retained trial experts in this case over the last three years.

In Younkin v. Blackwelder, 44 Fla. L. Weekly D549 (Fla. 5th DCA Feb. 22, 2019), review granted, No. SC19-385, 2019 WL 2180625 (Fla. May 21, 2019),¹ we denied certiorari relief regarding a substantially similar discovery order. We observed there that while the disclosure of this type of financial information was both consistent with our earlier decision in Vazquez v. Martinez, 175 So. 3d 372, 373–74 (Fla. 5th DCA 2015), and furthered the “truth-seeking function and fairness of the trial,” it also appeared to us that the law in this area was not being applied in an even-handed manner to all litigants. Younkin, 44 Fla. L. Weekly at D549 (quoting Springer v. West, 769 So. 2d 1068, 1069 (Fla. 5th DCA 2000)); see also Worley v. Cent. Fla. Young Men’s Christian Ass’n, 228 So. 3d 18, 23 (Fla. 2017) (holding that law firm representing plaintiff in personal injury litigation that refers its clients to specific physician for treatment is not required to disclose extent of its referral or financial relationship with physician because “[f]irst, and most obviously, the law firm is not a party to the litigation”).

Accordingly, consistent with our decision in Younkin, we deny the instant petition.² However, as we did in Younkin, we certify the following question to the Florida Supreme Court as one of great public importance:

WHETHER THE ANALYSIS AND DECISION IN WORLEY SHOULD ALSO APPLY TO PRECLUDE A DEFENSE LAW FIRM THAT IS NOT A PARTY TO THE LITIGATION FROM HAVING TO DISCLOSE ITS FINANCIAL RELATIONSHIP WITH EXPERTS THAT IT RETAINS FOR PURPOSES OF LITIGATION INCLUDING THOSE THAT PERFORM COMPULSORY MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS UNDER FLORIDA RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 1.360?

¹ The Florida Supreme Court entertained oral argument in the case on September 10, 2020. To date, the court has not released its opinion.

² We find no merit in Petitioners’ remaining issue.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI DENIED; QUESTION CERTIFIED.

ORFINGER, EDWARDS and HARRIS, JJ., concur.