

## Interpersonal Violence Injunctions (DV, SV, Dating, Repeat, Stalking) Case Law

### ***Florida Supreme Court***

No new opinions for this reporting period.

### ***First District Court of Appeal***

No new opinions for this reporting period.

### ***Second District Court of Appeal***

Givens v. Holmes, \_\_ So. 3d \_\_, 2018 WL 1177296 (Fla. 2d DCA 2018). [STALKING INJUNCTION AFFIRMED IN PART; REVERSED IN PART; AND REMANDED](#). A neighbor appealed after a stalking injunction was issued against him. The appellate court affirmed that the injunction was supported by competent, substantial evidence. However, the court reversed the portion of the final judgment that forbid the respondent from coming within 500 feet of the petitioner's home since that prohibited the respondent from accessing and using his property. The court also noted that the trial court ended the hearing without articulating the terms of the injunction, and therefore the respondent was unaware of the 500 foot provision and did not have an opportunity to object. Because the final judgment was broader than necessary to protect the petitioner, the appellate court reversed and remanded with instructions to more narrowly tailor the buffer-zone provision of the injunction.

[https://edca.2dca.org/DCADocs/2017/0444/170444\\_114\\_03072018\\_08292868\\_i.pdf](https://edca.2dca.org/DCADocs/2017/0444/170444_114_03072018_08292868_i.pdf) (March 7, 2018)

### ***Third District Court of Appeal***

Zarudny v. Zarudny, \_\_ So. 3d \_\_, 2018 WL 1513344 (Fla. 3d DCA 2018). [DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INJUNCTION AFFIRMED](#). An injunction for protection against domestic violence was entered against the husband due to physical violence, and he appealed, claiming that the injunction was not based on competent, substantial evidence. After a review of the evidence and testimony, the appellate court affirmed the injunction, stating that the evidence of angry and abusive conduct, which occurred at times in front of the minor child, as well as evidence of prior violence, was sufficient. The appellate court also noted that the trial court correctly considered the factors set forth in section 61.13(3)(a)-(t), F.S., in determining that the wife should temporarily have 100 percent time-sharing responsibility for the child.

<http://www.3dca.flcourts.org/Opinions/3D17-0451.pdf> (March 28, 2018)

### ***Fourth District Court of Appeal***

No new opinions for this reporting period.

### ***Fifth District Court of Appeal***

No new opinions for this reporting period.