

Law Offices of Paul Morris, P.A.
9350 S. Dixie Highway
Suite 1450
Miami, FL 33156
(305) 670-1441
(305) 670-2202 (fax)
paulappeal@gmail.com
www.paulmorrislaw.com

December 10, 2015

Office of the Clerk
Supreme Court of Florida
500 South Duval Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1925

Re: Epstein/Petitioner v. Edwards/Respondent
SC15-
4D14-2282

Dear Sir or Madam:

Enclosed for filing please find the petitioner's check for the filing fee of \$300.00 and a file stamped copy of the notice to invoke.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

PAUL MORRIS
Counsel for Petitioner Jeffrey Epstein

PM/pah
enc.

FILED

JOHN A. TOMASINO

DEC 14 2015

CLERK, SUPREME COURT

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA
FOURTH DISTRICT

CASE NO. 4D14-2282

BRADLEY J. EDWARDS,

Appellant,

v.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Appellee.

NOTICE TO INVOKE DISCRETIONARY JURISDICTION

NOTICE IS GIVEN that the appellee, Jeffrey Epstein, invokes the discretionary jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Florida to review the decision of this Court rendered November 12, 2015. The decision is within the discretionary jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Florida because it expressly and directly conflicts with a decision of another district court of appeal or the supreme court on the same question of law and certifies conflict with *Wolfe v. Foreman*, 128 So. 3d 67 (Fla. 3d DCA 2013).

Respectfully submitted,

LAW OFFICES OF PAUL MORRIS, P.A.
9350 S. Dixie Highway
Suite 1450
Miami, FL 33156
Florida Bar No. 193769
Tel. (305) 670-1441

RECEIVED, 12/10/2015 10:04 AM, Clerk, Fourth District Court of Appeal

Fax (305) 670-2202
paulappeal@gmail.com
paul@paulmorrislaw.com

s/ Paul Morris
PAUL MORRIS
Counsel for Appellee

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 10th day of December, 2015, a copy of the foregoing was emailed to those on the list below.

s/ Paul Morris

SERVICE LIST:

William B. King
Searcy Denny Scarola Barnhart
& Shipley, P.A.
2139 Palm Beach Lakes Blvd.
West Palm Beach, FL 33409
wbk@searcylaw.com

Philip M. Burlington
Burlington & Rockenbach, P.A.
Courthouse Commons/Suite 350
444 W. Railroad Avenue
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
pmb@FLAppellateLaw.com
kbt@FLAppellateLaw.com

Tonja Haddad Coleman
Tonja Haddad Coleman, P.A.
5315 SE 7th Street
Suite 301

Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
tonja@tonjahaddad.com
jayme@tonjahaddad.com

Bradley J. Edwards
Farmer, Jaffe, Weissing, Edwards,
Fistos & Lehrman, P.L.
425 N. Andrews Ave., Ste. 2
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301
brad@pathtojustice.com

Fred Haddad
Fred Haddad, P.A.
1 Financial Plaza, Ste. 2612
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301
haddadfm@aol.com

Mark Nurik
Law Offices of Mark S. Nurik
1 E. Broward Blvd., Ste. 700
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301
marc@nuriklaw.com

Jack Goldberger
Atterbury, Goldberger & Weiss, P.A.
250 S. Australian Ave., Ste. 1400
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
jgoldberger@agwpa.com

W. Chester Brewer, Jr.
W. Chester Brewer, Jr., P.A.
250 S. Australian Ave., Suite 1400
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
wcbllaw@aol.com
wcbdiane@yahoo.com

DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA
FOURTH DISTRICT

BRADLEY J. EDWARDS,
Appellant,

v.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN and SCOTT ROTHSTEIN,
Appellees.

No. 4D14-2282

[November 12, 2015]

Appeal from the Circuit Court for the Fifteenth Judicial Circuit, Palm Beach County; Donald W. Hafele, Judge; L.T. Case No. 502009CA040800XXXXMB.

Philip M. Burlington of Burlington & Rockenbach, P.A., and William B. King of Searcy Denney Scarola Barnhart & Shipley, P.A., West Palm Beach, for appellant.

Paul Morris of The Law Offices of Paul Morris, P.A., Miami, and Tonja Haddad Coleman of Tonja Haddad, PA, Fort Lauderdale, for appellee Jeffrey Epstein.

WARNER, J.

Appellant challenges a summary judgment holding that his malicious prosecution claim against appellee Epstein was barred by the litigation privilege. The trial court granted summary judgment based upon *Wolfe v. Foreman*, 128 So. 3d 67 (Fla. 3d DCA 2013), which had decided this issue just before the motion for summary judgment was heard.¹ However, after the trial court ruled, our court held to the contrary in *Fischer v. Debrincat*, 169 So. 3d 1204, 1209 (Fla. 4th DCA 2015), and certified conflict with *Wolfe* to the supreme court. See also *Rivernider v. Meyer*, 174 So. 3d 602, 604 (Fla. 4th DCA 2015) (same). As the issue is the same in this case, we hold that the litigation privilege does not bar a malicious prosecution

¹ The trial court properly relied on *Wolfe* at the time, because that case was binding upon the trial court in the absence of interdistrict conflict. See *Pardo v. State*, 596 So. 2d 665, 666 (Fla. 1992).

cause of action where all the elements of malicious prosecution are present.

Epstein suggests that this case could be decided on a tipsy coachman analysis, as he alleges that all the elements of the cause of action were not present. However, the trial court specifically found that material issues of fact remained as to the elements of the claim. Based upon the facts presented and the inferences which may be drawn from those facts, we will not disturb the trial court's evaluation.

Just as in *Fischer* and *Rivernider*, we certify that this opinion conflicts with *Wolfe*.

Reversed and remanded for further proceedings.

TAYLOR and FORST, JJ., concur.

* * *

Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing.