A bill to be entitled

An act for the relief of Brian Pitts; directing the Division of Administrative Hearings to appoint an administrative law judge to determine a basis for equitable relief for the purpose of compensating Mr. Pitts for any wrongful act or omission by the State of Florida or officials thereof; requiring a report to the Legislature; authorizing compensation upon a determination by the administrative law judge; providing an appropriation to compensate Mr. Pitts for injuries and damages sustained; providing a limitation on the payment of fees and costs; directing that certain court orders and judgments be declared null and void; authorizing Mr. Pitts to practice law under certain circumstances; authorizing the President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Governor to sever portions of this act under certain circumstances; providing an effective date.

1920

21

22

23

24

25

26

18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1617

WHEREAS, this state has clearly recognized the practice of law by lay persons since at least 1980 as declared in The Florida Bar v. Moses, 380 So. 2d 412, 416-418 (Fla. 1980) and The Florida Bar re Advisory Opinion on Nonlawyer Representation in Securities Arbitration, 696 So. 2d 1178, 1180-1181, 1183-1184 (Fla. 1997), the Legislature and judiciary having concurrent jurisdiction to regulate such, and

Page 1 of 14

WHEREAS, Mr. Pitts has exercised this privilege since 2001 in Pinellas County, and his practice was later confirmed by the Florida Supreme Court in case number SC02-247, in a final order dated November 6, 2003, at clause (1) declaring "unless otherwise authorized by Florida Statutes, court rule, case law, administrative rule, or the rules regulating The Florida Bar," and

WHEREAS, since the inception of Mr. Pitts' practice, the Second District Court of Appeal, the Sixth Judicial Circuit of Florida serving Pasco and Pinellas Counties, the State Attorney's Office for the Sixth Judicial Circuit of Florida, and The Florida Bar have, without good cause, continued to deprive Mr. Pitts of the privilege of practicing law as prescribed by the Legislature and Florida Supreme Court, subjecting him to civil and criminal proceedings and penalties on an ongoing basis, and

WHEREAS, the Florida Supreme Court, by virtue of the broad, general, yet ambiguous language of its 2003 final order in case number SC02-247, has subjected Mr. Pitts to entrapment and has failed to exercise its constitutional duty despite many requests by Mr. Pitts to clarify or amend the final order or to promulgate court rules through The Florida Bar following original proceedings brought or suggested by Mr. Pitts to correct the matter, and

WHEREAS, this course of misconduct has been ongoing from 2001 to 2012, and such action has resulted in wrongful and

Page 2 of 14

unlawful incarcerations of Mr. Pitts in the Pinellas County jail for a total of nearly 1 year, and

WHEREAS, the purpose of this course of misconduct was to retaliate against Mr. Pitts for not being a member of the bar despite being lawfully otherwise authorized to represent third persons he assisted in legitimate legal matters and, by way of his detainment, to thwart his pending pro se actions for relief directed to or from criminal cases SC02-247, SC06-1279, CRCAB-65835CFANO, CRCAB-90407CFANO, CRC07-12964CFANO, CTC07-03965MMANO, CTC03-01885MMANO, CTC03-01887MMANO, and CTC03-09855MMANO, and

WHEREAS, appearing pro se in many of his cases, Mr. Pitts was complimented by several judges of the Sixth Judicial Circuit for his exceptional degree of technical performance and competence that would be expected of any trained and experienced member of The Florida Bar, yet he was informed by express or implied communication that he would not receive the relief requested in any given proceeding unless represented by a member of The Florida Bar, and

WHEREAS, though appearing pro se in said cases and other actions seeking relief from collusion, Mr. Pitts was at times represented by appointed counsel; however, such proceedings proved to be futile and illusory, and the courts failed to abide by binding precedent and stare decisis, where applicable, as well as Florida Rules of Court, as evidenced by the series of filings in each case by Mr. Pitts, or his court-appointed

Page 3 of 14

counsel, hence depriving Mr. Pitts of procedural and substantive due process, equal protection of the law, self-representation, and representation by counsel under the United States Constitution, and

79

80

81

82

8384

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

9899

100

101

102

103

104

WHEREAS, the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office wrongfully incarcerated Mr. Pitts in the Pinellas County jail during the time periods of January 2003 through April 2004 and March 22, 2010, through July 4, 2010, and by refusing him administrative alternative sentencing without cause, and by subjecting him to living conditions and circumstances in violation of Florida Model Jail Standards (2.15)(c), (9.08), (9.06)(b), (5.08)(a) and (c)(1)-(8), (12.03)(d)-(g) and (i), (12.06), (5.08)(j), (10.01), (6.02), (11.12), (11.16), Appendix A, (4.12), (4.13), (4.15), and (9.10) and in violation of ss. 951.03 and 951.033(3), Florida Statutes, and by extending his sentence an additional 40 and 10 days of detention over the ordered sentences in violation of Inmate Handbook XI. A., Florida Model Jail Standard (4.16), and ss. 951.21(1) and 921.16(1), Florida Statutes, thereby subjecting him to cruel and unusual punishment, subjecting him to false imprisonment, and denying him due process and equal protection of the law. See Miller v. Carson, 599 F.2d 742 (5th Cir. 1979); Miller v. Carson, 563 F.2d 757 (5th Cir. 1977); Miller v. Carson, 563 F.2d 741 (5th Cir. 1977); Miller v. Carson, 401 F. Supp. 835 (M.D. Fla. 1975); Miller v. Carson, 392 F. Supp. 515 (M.D. Fla. 1975); Solomos v. Jenne, 776 So. 2d 953 (Fla. 4th DCA 2000); Douthit v. Jones, 619 F.2d 527 (5th Cir.

Page 4 of 14

105 | 1980), and

WHEREAS, such misconduct is a clear abuse of judicial, executive, and administrative authority as to the state court system and local government, including the State Attorney's Office for the Sixth Judicial Circuit of Florida and the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office, and

WHEREAS, Mr. Pitts' good name and reputation have been damaged, he has been deprived of due process, the ability to conduct a lawful business, freedom of speech, property, liberty, and equal protection of the law, he has not benefited from constitutional protections against unlawful trusts by public officers and employees (oath of office) and double jeopardy as to criminal proceedings and sanctions, he has suffered mental anguish and emotional distress as the result of the intentional misconduct and gross negligence of the courts, the State Attorney's Office for the Sixth Judicial Circuit of Florida, The Florida Bar, and the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office relating to his practice of law as a non-lawyer in this state, and, further, there is no state-action exception to federal antitust laws (Sherman Act), which were violated in the subject cases, and

WHEREAS, Mr. Pitts has suffered, and continues to suffer, significant monetary damage by virtue of lost income, property, and time, expenses, fees, fines, costs, and restitution resulting from the civil and criminal proceedings relating to his alleged unauthorized or unlicensed practice of law, and

Page 5 of 14

WHEREAS, Mr. Pitts, on many occasions, appears before the Legislature to instruct, advise, inform, and advocate for or against proposed legislation covering a broad spectrum of topics and subject matter in fact and law with an exceptional degree of technical performance and competence that would be expected of any trained and experienced member of The Florida Bar, and

WHEREAS, the Legislature recognizes that no system of justice is impervious to human error, and

WHEREAS, the Legislature acknowledges that the state's system of justice sometimes yields imperfect results that may have tragic consequences, and

WHEREAS, this claim is based on a moral and legal obligation of the Legislature to acknowledge its own acts and inherent authority to correct a wrong where normal or other state authority, remedy, or resolution has been intentionally avoided, deprived, or denied in an arbitrary and capricious manner, resulting in a manifest injustice or disregard for the law, and

WHEREAS, this is in accord with rulings of the courts concerning legislative claim bills as expressed in *Circuit Court of Twelfth Judicial Circuit v. Dep't of Natural Res.*, 339 So. 2d 1113, 1116-1117 (Fla. 1976), in which the court held that one may seek a claim bill through the Legislature, for "[a]bsent legislation waiving the state's sovereign immunity . . . this Court cannot authorize relief through the judicial process"; *Gerard v. Dep't of Transp.*, 472 So. 2d 1170, 1172 (Fla. 1985),

Page 6 of 14

in which the court stated, "we agree with the Department of Transportation's assertion that a judgment in this case was not a prerequisite to Gerard's filing a claims bill in the legislature," and the First District Court of Appeal in Jetton v. Jacksonville Elec. Auth., 399 So. 2d 396, 397 (Fla. 1st DCA 1981), stated that although the Legislature has placed limits on recovery, "claimants remain free to seek legislative relief bills, as they did during days of complete sovereign immunity," and Dickinson v. Bradley, 298 So. 2d 352, 354 (Fla. 1974), held that "any claim bill is restricted to less than the general public and its purpose is to discharge the state's moral obligation to any individual or other entity whom or which the legislature recognizes as being entitled to such . . . The Legislature may enact a claim bill for what would be a tort if a private party was involved just as effectively as for what would constitute a contractual debt," and

WHEREAS, the Legislature intends that any compensation made pursuant to this act be the sole compensation provided by the state for any and all present and future claims arising out of the facts presented in this act, NOW, THEREFORE,

177178

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166167

168

169170

171

172

173

174

175

176

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

179180

181

182

Section 1. The facts stated in the preamble to this act are found and declared to be true, and all judicial and administrative remedies were exhausted as of March 12, 2010, and

Page 7 of 14

July 4, 2010, respectively.

Section 2. The Division of Administrative Hearings shall appoint an administrative law judge or special master to conduct a hearing and determine a basis for equitable relief for the purpose of compensating Mr. Pitts for any wrongful act or omission of the State of Florida, the State Attorney's Office for the Sixth Judicial Circuit of Florida, or the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office in proportion to what occurred in the investigations, the civil and criminal proceedings relating to Mr. Pitts' alleged unlicensed or unauthorized practice of law, and his incarcerations totaling nearly 12 months from 2001 to 2012, if not longer.

Section 3. (1) The administrative law judge or special master shall determine by a preponderance of the evidence whether the State of Florida, the State Attorney's Office for the Sixth Judicial Circuit of Florida, or the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office committed a wrongful act or omission and whether a basis for equitable relief exists, and if it so finds, the administrative law judge or special master shall award Mr. Pitts an amount of up to \$7 million, but not less than \$1 million, to be paid proportionately by the parties that wronged him and to be paid in lump sum or in payments over a period of no more than 10 years.

(2) The administrative law judge or special master shall report his or her determination to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives by July 1, 2014.

Page 8 of 14

The Chief Financial Officer is directed to draw a warrant in satisfaction of the relief awarded by the administrative law judge, special master, or Legislature as provided in this act, and to pay the warrant out of the Administrative Trust Fund or State Courts Revenue Trust Fund within the state courts system and the State Attorneys Revenue Trust Fund to Brian Pitts.

Pinellas County is directed to and shall pay the warrant out of its general revenue fund or by other means it has provided for to pay valid claims against the local government as pertains to the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office and as to its share of the total award to Mr. Pitts.

- compensation for all present and future claims arising out of the factual situation described in this act which resulted in unlawful or unconstitutional acts committed against Mr. Pitts in connection with allegations, judgments, and convictions of the unlicensed or unauthorized practice of law and his incarcerations totaling nearly 12 months, if not longer, from 2001 through 2012. The total amount paid for attorney fees, lobbying fees, costs, and other similar expenses relating to this claim may not exceed 25 percent of the amount awarded under this act.
- (4) All final orders, judgments, decrees, and convictions, and orders or liens pertaining to fees, fines, costs, and restitution, rendered in cases SC06-1279, SC09-195, SC09-2243, and SC02-247, CRCAB-90407CFANO, CRCAB-65835CFANO, CRCO7-

Page 9 of 14

235	12964CFANO, CTC07-03965MMANO, CTC03-09855MMANO, CTC03-									
236	01885MMANO, and CTC03-01887MMANO, wherein Mr. Pitts is the									
237	respondent or defendant with any appellate reviews resulting									
238	therefrom, are null and void and are annulled by this act by									
239	virtue of the doctrine of separation of powers because the									
240	courts failed to recognize the Legislature's lawful and valid									
241	enactments and its own lawful and valid case precedent and rules									
242	or orders, authorizing lay representation as expressed in The									
243	Florida Bar v. Moses, 380 So. 2d 412, 416-418 (Fla. 1980); by									
244	virtue of inherent authority of this Legislature as expressed in									
245	Florida House of Representatives v. Crist, 999 So. 2d 601, 611									
246	(Fla. 2008), Trianon Park Condo. Ass'n v. City of Hialeah, 468									
247	So. 2d 912, 918, 919 (Fla. 1985); and by virtue of checks and									
248	balances exercised by this Legislature as expressed in State Ex									
249	Rel. Young v. Duval County, 79 So. 692, 697 (Fla. 1918), in									
250	which the court found, "A clear violation of the constitutional									
251	provisions dividing the powers of government into departments									
252	should be checked and remedied." As the court found in State v.									
253	City of Stuart, 120 So. 335, 346 (Fla. 1929), "[t]he general									
254	rule is that the Legislature is supreme in the legislative									
255	field, which is the most powerful branch of government, so long									
256	as it does not violate any of the provisions of the organic law.									
257	There is to our minds no justifiable exception of any class of									
258	legislation from this all-pervasive and fundamental principle."									
259	Also, by virtue of the cases involving Mr. Pitts, the courts									
260	failed to comply with the mandates of s. 20.02(1), Florida									

Page 10 of 14

Statutes, which states "[t]he judicial branch has the purpose of determining the constitutional propriety of the policies and programs and of adjudicating any conflicts arising from the interpretation or application of the laws."

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

- The clerk of the court for the Florida Supreme Court, as to cases SC06-1279, SC09-195, and SC09-2243, and the clerk of the court for the Sixth Judicial Circuit, as to cases CRCAB-90407CFANO, CRCAB-65835CFANO, CRC07-12964CFANO, CTC07-03965MMANO, CTC03-09855MMANO, CTC03-01885MMANO, and CTC03-01887MMANO, all pertaining to Mr. Pitts, are hereby directed to remove from public and private access all dockets, records, documents, and recorded orders or liens related to those cases and transmit them to the Department of Law Enforcement to fulfill the duties required under section 6 of this act. The Department of Law Enforcement is hereby directed to remove from public and private access all record history and information of a criminal nature concerning Mr. Pitts. This includes, but is not limited to, fingerprints, felon registration, and all other matters concerning the case numbers cited in this subsection. Said records, information, or documents may not be used by or accessed for any purpose by anyone unless access to those records is required by federal authorities or for investigations conducted under section 6 of this act.
- (6) The Department of Law Enforcement is directed to ensure the compliance, execution, and enforcement of subsections (4), (5), and (6) of this section and shall provide protective

Page 11 of 14

services to Mr. Pitts, ensuring his rights, privileges, and safety under sections 4, 5, and 6 of this act.

- Section 4. In accordance with the Florida Supreme Court's final order in case number SC02-247 and the exception contained in clause (1) of that ruling, unless otherwise authorized by Florida Statutes, court rule, case law, administrative rule, or the rules regulating The Florida Bar, thereby authorizing Mr. Pitts to practice law in this state, the Legislature authorizes Mr. Pitts to practice law in this state under the following designations, titles, rules, decisions, or acts in the capacity as a lay counselor or lay representative:
- (1) Chapter 120, Florida Statutes, relating to a qualified representative.
- (2) Chapter 44, Florida Statutes, relating to a designated representative.
- (3) Chapter 709, Florida Statutes, relating to an attorney-in-fact and durable power of attorney, including when coupled with an interest in any personal or property claim, election, right, or interest.
- (4) Decisions or rules of the Florida Supreme Court relating to representation in real property management.
- (5) Decisions or rules of the Florida Supreme Court relating to a non-lawyer using approved forms.
- (6) Decisions or rules of the Florida Supreme Court relating to representation in county or small claims civil proceedings.

Page 12 of 14

(7) Decisions or rules of the Florida Supreme Court relating to third party standing representation.

- (8) Rule 5-15, Rules Relating to Admission to The Florida

 Bar.
- (9) Judicial discretion under the inherent authority doctrine.
- (10) Issues of federal law or any other clearly expressed state or local rule, statute, or law, or court or administrative decision or order under other federal, state, or local law or authority.

Section 5. Any appearance or public testimony given by Mr. Pitts on bills or matters before the Legislature, wherever held or convened throughout this state, does not constitute the practice of law. In all circumstances Mr. Pitts retains the right to represent himself at any time he has valid standing supported by law, or, if he is the subject of civil, administrative, or criminal proceedings, Mr. Pitts retains the right to represent himself without a lawyer in court and in administrative actions or cases.

Section 6. The President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or the Governor may sever in whole or in part any section of this act, excluding this section, which remaining parts shall be in full force and effect upon becoming law. Notwithstanding severance, Brian Pitts shall retain the right or privilege during future legislative sessions to request the relief severed in part or whole by virtue of this section

Page 13 of 14

339	until ful	y reme	edied.								
340	Sect	on 7.	This	act	shall	take	effect	upon	becoming	a	law.

Page 14 of 14