

Fulford, Millie

From: Stillman, Kerrie
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 5:09 PM
To: Robert Burns
Cc: Zuilkowski, Steven; Fulford, Millie; Stillman, Kerrie
Subject: RE: Notice of Constructive Failure to Refer Indicated Criminal Conduct Ref Randy Fine Under Fla. Stat. § 112.324(9); Demand for Immediate Action — Complaint Nos. 22-079, 24-037, 24-134, 24-135

Mr. Burns,

In response to your recent email, the Commission's reply is *limited to only public records and information therein*. The Commission is required to provide public records in accordance with Florida's public records law, but the public records law does not require the Commission to respond to questions about its public records. However, as is the Commission's practice, I will provide you with procedural information about public records.

Item 1. - Complaint No. 22-079, In re RANDALL FINE is a matter of public record and currently pending dismissal of certain allegations and is on the Commission's agenda for consideration at its meeting on August 28, 2026. After that consideration, the matter will be in the hands of the Commission Advocate and the Respondent's legal counsel to determine whether a stipulated settlement agreement can be reached, or whether a public hearing will be held before DOAH. The Commission has made no referrals to any other agency regarding this complaint.

Item 2. - Section 112.324(9), F.S. provides:

(9) In addition to reporting its findings to the proper disciplinary body or official, the commission shall report these findings to the state attorney or any other appropriate official or agency having authority to initiate prosecution when violation of criminal law is indicated.

We found no responsive public record(s) regarding a legal interpretation of this statute. However, a reading of the statute makes clear that the statute may only be applied after findings have been made, and the Commission has not made any findings in Complaint No. 22-079. Findings are made when the Commission takes final action on a complaint.

Item 3 - Rule 34-5.006, F.A.C. states:

34-5.006 Probable Cause Determination.

(1) Notification of Completion of Investigation. When the investigator's report is completed, the Executive Director shall notify the respondent that the report is completed and shall send to the respondent a copy of the investigator's report and a copy of the Executive Director's order to investigate. The investigatory report must be transmitted to the alleged violator no later than 5 days after completion of the report. The investigatory file and main complaint file shall be open for inspection by the respondent and the respondent's counsel at that time, and copies may be obtained at no more than cost.

(2) Time to Review Report. The respondent shall be given not less than 14 days from the date of mailing of the investigator's report, within which time to file with the Commission a written response to the investigator's report. This time period may be shortened with the consent of the respondent, or without the consent of the respondent when the passage of time could reasonably be expected to render moot the ultimate disposition of the matter by the Commission so long as reasonable notice under the circumstances is given.

(3) Advocate's Recommendation. The investigatory report must be transmitted to the counsel representing the Commission (the Advocate) no later than 5 days after completion of the report. The Advocate shall review the investigator's report and make a written recommendation to the Commission for disposition of the complaint no later than 15 days after he or she receives the completed investigatory report. The Advocate's shall review the investigator's report and shall make a written recommendation to the Commission for the disposition of the complaint must include a statement of what charges shall be at issue at the probable cause hearing. A copy of the recommendation must be transmitted shall be furnished to the respondent no later than 5 days after its completion. The respondent shall be given 14 days from the date of mailing of the Advocate's recommendation to file with the Commission a written response to the recommendation. This time period may be shortened with the consent of the respondent, or without the consent of the respondent when the passage of time could reasonably be expected to render moot the ultimate disposition of the matter by the Commission, so long as the recommendation is furnished to the respondent within a reasonable period of time under the circumstances.

(4) Notice of Probable Cause Hearing and Right to Attend. Upon receipt of the Advocate's recommendation, the Commission shall schedule a probable cause hearing for the next Commission meeting for which notice requirements can be met. The respondent, the complainant(s), their counsel, and the Advocate shall be permitted to attend the hearing at which the probable cause determination is made. Notice of the probable cause hearing shall be sent to the respondent, complainant(s), and Advocate at least 14 days before the hearing. This time period may be shortened with the consent of the respondent, or without the consent of the respondent when the passage of time could reasonably be expected to render moot the ultimate disposition of the matter by the Commission, so long as the notice is furnished within a reasonable period of time under the circumstances.

(5) Scope of Probable Cause Determination. The probable cause determination is the conclusion of the preliminary investigation. The respondent and the Advocate shall be permitted to make brief oral statements in the nature of oral argument to the Commission, based on the investigator's report, before the probable cause determination. The Commission's determination shall be based upon the investigator's report, the Advocate's recommendation, the complaint, and staff recommendations, as well as any written statements submitted by the respondent and any oral statements made at the hearing. No testimony or other evidence will be accepted at the hearing.

(6) Probable Cause Determination. At its meeting to determine probable cause, the Commission may continue its determination to allow further investigation; may order the issuance of a public report of its investigation if it finds no

probable cause to believe that a violation of the Code of Ethics or other breach of public trust has occurred, concluding the matter before it; may order a final, public hearing of the complaint if it finds probable cause to believe that a violation of the Code of Ethics or other breach of public trust has occurred; or may take such other action as it deems necessary to resolve the complaint, consistent with due process of law. In making its determination, the Commission may consider:

- (a) The sufficiency of the evidence against the respondent, as contained in the investigator's report;
 - (b) The admissions and other stipulations of the respondent, if any;
 - (c) The nature and circumstances of the respondent's actions;
 - (d) The expense of further proceedings; and
 - (e) Such other factors as it deems material to its decision. If the Commission orders a public hearing of the complaint, the Commission shall determine what charges shall be at issue for the hearing.
- (7) Finding of Probable Cause. If the Commission finds probable cause to believe a breach of the public trust has been committed, it must transmit a copy of the order finding probable cause to the complainant and the alleged violator no later than 5 days after the date of the probable cause determination.
- (a) Upon request submitted to the Commission in writing, any person whom the Commission finds probable cause to believe has committed a violation is entitled to a public hearing and may elect to have the formal administrative hearing conducted by an administrative law judge in the Division of Administrative Hearings.
 - (b) If the person does not elect to have a formal administrative hearing by an administrative law judge, the person is entitled to have an informal hearing conducted before the Commission.
 - (c) Such person is deemed to have waived the right to a formal or informal public hearing if the request is not received within 14 days of the mailing date of the probable cause notification.
 - (d) If the Commission conducts an informal hearing, it must be held no later than 75 days after the date of the probable cause determination.
 - (e) If the Commission refers a case to the Division of Administrative Hearings for a formal hearing and subsequently requests that the case be relinquished back to the Commission, or if the administrative law judge assigned to the case relinquishes jurisdiction back to the Commission before a recommended order is entered, the Commission must schedule the case for additional action at the next Commission meeting for which notice requirements can be met. At that Commission meeting, the Commission must complete final action on such case.

Rulemaking Authority 112.322(9) FS. Law Implemented Art. II, Section 8(f), (h), Fla. Const., 112.322, 112.324 FS. History—New 4-7-77, Amended 9-21-77, 7-13-80, 2-21-83, 11-14-85, Formerly 34-5.06, Amended 2-19-91, 7-7-91, 7-5-92, 7-28-98, 9-4-12, 1-9-25.

The Commission has followed all applicable Rules related to complaint proceedings.

Item 4. — The Commission has no responsive public records to your request for, "A written explanation of why the June 5, 2026 and July 24, 2026 Commission meetings were not used to agendize the Fine probable cause hearings."

Regarding the **Item 5** public records request regarding s. 112.324(9), F.S., the Commission has no responsive records.

I understand your concern and frustration regarding continuance requests by Respondent's counsel that have been granted by the Commission. As I previously indicated in our phone conversation and via email, this office has been working diligently to schedule his complaint for consideration by the Commission. It is scheduled for the August 28th meeting.

Sincerely,

KERRIE STILLMAN
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
FLORIDA COMMISSION ON ETHICS

From: Robert Burns <rwburns3rd@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2026 5:51 PM

To: Stillman, Kerrie <STILLMAN.KERRIE@leg.state.fl.us>; jphilipson@gunster.com; Press@myfloridalegal.com

Cc: Fulford, Millie <FULFORD.MILLIE@leg.state.fl.us>; JOSEPH OGLESBY <oglesby.joe@gmail.com>; Zuilkowski, Steven <ZUILKOWSKI.STEVEN@leg.state.fl.us>; don.gaetz@flsenate.gov; Matt Reed <mreed@sa18.org>; Office of Senator Burgess <BURGESS.DANNY.WEB@flsenate.gov>; media@eog.myflorida.com; wscheiner@sa18.org

Subject: Notice of Constructive Failure to Refer Indicated Criminal Conduct Ref Randy Fine Under Fla. Stat. § 112.324(9); Demand for Immediate Action — Complaint Nos. 22-079, 24-037, 24-134, 24-135

Dear Ms. Stillman, Chair Philipson, and Attorney General Uthmeier:

I write in my capacity as the sworn complainant in Florida Commission on Ethics Complaint Nos. 24-037, 24-134, and 24-135 (consolidated, *In re Randall Fine*), and as an interested party with respect to Complaint No. 22-079 (the parallel Jenkins complaint against the same Respondent, in which the Commission found probable cause on April 21, 2023). This is at least my third written communication on the subject of the delays in these proceedings, following my correspondence of September 24, 2025, and February 4, 2026. Neither prior communication has produced any substantive response, and each subsequent month has narrowed the universe of conduct that remains available for criminal prosecution.

This letter is to place each of you on formal notice of what the record now establishes, to identify the legal provisions implicated by your respective offices' conduct, and to demand a response within fourteen (14) days.

I. The Statutory Architecture

Florida Statute § 112.324(9) provides, in operative language:

"In addition to reporting its findings to the proper disciplinary body or official, **the commission shall report these findings to the state attorney or any other appropriate official or agency having authority to initiate prosecution when violation of criminal law is indicated.**"

The Florida Legislature chose the word "shall." Florida courts have consistently held that the use of "shall" in a statutory directive is mandatory, not discretionary. See, e.g., *S.R. v. State*, 346 So. 2d 1018, 1019 (Fla. 1977). The Commission is not vested with discretion to decline a § 112.324(9) referral when criminal conduct is indicated. The obligation is affirmative.

The same statute requires, under § 112.324(3), that the Commission act "promptly" on complaints. The Commission's procedural rules, Rules 34-5.004 and 34-5.006 of the Florida Administrative Code, similarly require investigations to commence within 30 days, investigative reports to be completed within 150 days, and probable cause hearings to be scheduled at the next available executive session.

Rule 34-5.006 further provides and I have noted this in each of my prior letters, neither of which has received a substantive response on the point that probable cause hearings may proceed without the Respondent personally present, provided counsel appears.

The integrated effect of these provisions is plain. The Commission is required to act promptly on legally sufficient complaints, to make findings, and to refer findings indicating criminal conduct to the appropriate prosecutorial authority. This statutory chain exists for a reason: the criminal statute of limitations under § 775.15 runs continuously from the date of the underlying conduct, regardless of administrative pace. If the Commission delays its findings past the criminal limitations period, the § 112.324(9) referral obligation matures only after criminal accountability is no longer possible. The statutory bridge between administrative and criminal enforcement collapses.

II. The Documented Conduct of the Florida Commission on Ethics

The record now establishes the following facts. Each is supported by Commission records, public records request productions, or correspondence already in my possession and the Commission's possession.

1. The complaints have been pending more than 500 days. Complaint Nos. 24-037, 24-134, and 24-135 were filed in 2024. The probable cause hearings on those complaints were originally scheduled for January 6, 2025, and have been continued repeatedly — to March 7, 2025; April 2025 (cancelled for lack of quorum); June 6, 2025; September 12, 2025 (declined by Respondent on a "travel day" basis); October 24, 2025 (same); November 12-14, 2025 (declined on the basis of a Congressional Delegation trip); December 5, 2025 (declined as an "official travel day"); January 23, 2026 (not agendized); March 6, 2026 (continued on the basis of a single congressional session day); and finally August 28, 2026.

2. The continuances were granted on grounds without statutory foundation. Florida Statute § 11.111 provides a legislative continuance for members of the Florida Legislature during legislative session and for 15 days before and after. It does not provide a continuance for: congressional travel days; Congressional Delegation trips to South America; conferences of the American Legislative Exchange Council in Denver; single Friday session days that bear no relationship to a Friday Commission meeting one week earlier or later; or any of the other grounds invoked by Respondent's counsel and accepted by the Commission. The U.S. Constitution's Speech and Debate Clause, Article I, Section 6, similarly provides no foundation for these continuances; it protects members of Congress from civil arrest during session, not from state administrative proceedings in which counsel can appear on their behalf.

3. Rule 34-5.006 has been disregarded entirely. I have raised this point in writing on September 24, 2025, and February 4, 2026. The Commission has never responded to it. The rule expressly permits the

proceeding to go forward without Respondent personally present so long as counsel appears. Respondent's counsel, Richard E. Coates, has been continuously available throughout every continuance period. There is no basis in the Commission's own rules for the cumulative two-plus years of delay.

4. The Commission's Executive Director coordinated scheduling with Respondent's counsel in a manner that produced a hearing date conveniently after a contested federal primary. Records produced by the Commission show Executive Director Stillman writing to Respondent's counsel on October 1, 2025: *"Understanding Congressman Fine's official duties and the associated scheduling challenges, as well as the Commission's obligation to consider [his cases], we would like to schedule his cases for consideration during the August 2026 Congressional break. For scheduling purposes, please let me know by October 17 which Friday in August 2026 will work for you and Congressman Fine."* The Respondent's preferred date — August 28, 2026 — was then selected. That date is ten (10) days after the August 18, 2026 Republican primary in which Respondent is a contested candidate.

5. The Commission skipped three regularly scheduled meetings between the April 6, 2026 hearing notice and the August primary. The Commission's published 2026 meeting calendar shows scheduled meetings on April 24, 2026 (subsequently cancelled), June 5, 2026, and July 24, 2026. None of those dates was used to agendize the Fine matters. The Commission has provided no public explanation for why those dates were rejected in favor of a date after the primary.

6. No member of the Commission that found probable cause against Respondent on April 21, 2023, remains on the Commission today. The 7-1 vote was taken by Chair Glenton Gilzean, Vice Chair Don Gaetz, and Commissioners Anchors, Cervone, Grant, Meggs, Moore, Newton, and Waldman. Not one of those individuals is on the current Commission. The body that will now decide whether to dismiss portions of the very findings made in 2023 has no institutional memory of the evidence underlying those findings.

III. The Consequence: Criminal Statutes of Limitations Have Expired or Are Expiring

The conduct alleged in my complaints, if proven, constitutes violations of multiple criminal statutes. The Commission's process found the complaints legally sufficient meaning the allegations, taken as true, state cognizable violations of Florida law. Among the criminal statutes implicated:

A. Florida Statute § 106.19(1)(d) — willful misuse of campaign funds in violation of § 106.11(4) — a **first-degree misdemeanor**, punishable by up to one year imprisonment and a \$1,000 fine, plus a civil penalty equal to three times the amount of the illegal expenditure. **2-year statute of limitations under § 775.15(2)(c).**

This statute is implicated by the allegations in Complaint No. 24-037 regarding \$20,000 in payments from the political committee "Friends of Randy Fine" to the Law Firm of Alan Landman for personal legal representation in a third-party criminal-case deposition unrelated to Respondent's official duties. The two operative payments were recorded on **November 28, 2023** (\$10,000) and **January 8, 2024** (\$10,000). The corresponding base statutes of limitations expired on **November 28, 2025** and **January 8, 2026**, respectively.

Both expired before the Commission sent its April 6, 2026 notice scheduling the probable cause hearing. Both expired before any § 112.324(9) referral could have been triggered by a Commission finding.

B. Florida Statute § 837.02 — perjury in an official proceeding — a **third-degree felony**, punishable by up to five years imprisonment and a \$5,000 fine. **3-year statute of limitations under § 775.15(2)(b).**

This statute is implicated by the false sworn statements alleged in Complaint Nos. 24-134 and 24-135 regarding Respondent's Form 6 financial disclosures, including but not limited to the reported \$329,707 in income from Jayvid Holdings, LLC — an entity administratively dissolved in 2017 — claimed on the Form 6 filed in 2024 for tax year 2023.

C. Florida Statute § 838.022 — official misconduct — a **third-degree felony**, punishable by up to five years imprisonment, a \$5,000 fine, and forfeiture of pension benefits under § 112.3173. **3-year statute of limitations under § 775.15(2)(b), extended under § 775.15(12)(b) for misconduct by a public officer.**

This statute is implicated by the same Form 6 allegations, on the theory that knowingly filing a false sworn official document while a public officer constitutes the falsification of an official record for personal benefit.

The most recent Form 6 filed in 2024 remains within both the base 3-year SOL and the public-officer extension. The earlier filings remain potentially reachable only through the public-officer extension under § 775.15(12)(b), and only as long as Respondent remains in public office. The window is open but not indefinite.

IV. The Failures Specifically Identified

A. The Florida Commission on Ethics.

The Commission has had constructive knowledge of the conduct alleged in these complaints since their filing in 2024. The Commission's investigative staff includes attorneys familiar with the Florida criminal code. The Commission's Advocate is, by statute, supplied by the Office of the Attorney General, the very office whose criminal divisions prosecute violations of §§ 106.19, 837.02, and 838.022. The Commission cannot credibly claim it was unaware that the allegations in my complaints implicated criminal statutes with running limitations periods.

The Commission's § 112.324(3) obligation to act "promptly" was breached in this matter long ago. The Commission's Rule 34-5.006 authority to proceed in the Respondent's absence was disregarded for two years without explanation. The Commission's Executive Director coordinated a hearing date with Respondent's counsel that, by design or by effect, was scheduled after the criminal limitations period had expired on at least one set of allegations.

It is not possible to read the documentary record and conclude that these were ordinary scheduling decisions made in good faith. The pattern is too consistent, the legal justifications offered for the continuances too creative and unsupported, and the eventual choice of an after-primary hearing date too convenient. At a minimum, the Commission's conduct in this matter raises serious questions about whether the agency itself is meeting the ethical standards it is charged with enforcing.

If the Commission did not refer this matter to a prosecutor before the misdemeanor SOL expired on the Landman expenditures and there is no public indication that any such referral was made then the Commission either failed in its statutory duty to do so or constructed an interpretation of its own statute under which the duty does not arise until findings are made, knowing that delaying findings would defer the duty past the limitations period.

The first explanation is a violation of § 112.324(9). The second is, in functional terms, a workaround of § 112.324(9). I invite the Commission to provide a third explanation if one exists.

B. The Office of the Attorney General.

The Office of the Attorney General has been on the distribution list for substantive correspondence about these delays since at least February 4, 2026. The Attorney General's own Ethics Bureau provides the Commission's Advocates and is therefore familiar with these specific complaints. The Office of the Attorney General has both the statutory authority and the institutional knowledge to act independently in matters concerning state criminal violations by public officers.

The Office of the Attorney General has the authority under Florida law to investigate and prosecute violations of campaign finance law, perjury, official misconduct, and the other statutes implicated by my complaints. The Office of Statewide Prosecution within the Office of the Attorney General is specifically empowered to handle cases of multi-jurisdictional or political significance.

To date, no public action has been taken by the Office of the Attorney General with respect to the criminal allegations in my complaints. No investigation has been publicly announced. No charging decision has been made or communicated. No public statement on the Commission's delays has been offered.

This silence persists notwithstanding the fact that the Office of the Attorney General has been on documented notice of these matters since February 4, 2026, and notwithstanding the fact that Attorney General Uthmeier is himself a candidate on the same August 18, 2026 Republican primary ballot as the Respondent in these complaints.

I do not allege coordination. I observe silence in a context where action would normally be expected, and I note that the silence has now extended past the expiration of one criminal limitations period.

V. Specific Demands

Within fourteen (14) days of receipt of this letter, I respectfully demand the following:

From the Florida Commission on Ethics:

1. A written statement identifying whether any referral has been made to the State Attorney, the Office of the Attorney General, the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, or any other prosecutorial authority pursuant to Florida Statute § 112.324(9), in connection with any of Complaint Nos. 22-079, 24-037, 24-134, or 24-135. If yes, the date of each such referral, the recipient agency, and the disposition. If no, the legal basis for the Commission's conclusion that no referral was required notwithstanding the criminal nature of the conduct alleged.

2. A written explanation of the Commission's interpretation of when the § 112.324(9) referral obligation is triggered at the staff-investigation phase, at the probable cause finding phase, or at the final order phase and the statutory or rule basis for that interpretation.
3. A written explanation of why Rule 34-5.006, F.A.C., has not been applied to permit the probable cause hearings to proceed in Respondent's absence at any point during the past 500 days, notwithstanding the rule's express authorization for such proceedings.
4. A written explanation of why the June 5, 2026 and July 24, 2026 Commission meetings were not used to agendize the Fine probable cause hearings.
5. Production of all internal Commission communications, memoranda, or staff analyses, since January 1, 2024, addressing the application of § 112.324(9) to any of Complaint Nos. 22-079, 24-037, 24-134, or 24-135, or addressing the statute of limitations implications of the delays in these proceedings. *This is a public records request under Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, to the extent any responsive records are not exempt under § 112.324(2).*

From the Office of the Attorney General:

1. A written statement identifying whether the Office of the Attorney General, the Office of Statewide Prosecution, the Ethics Bureau, or any other division within the Office has received any referral, communication, or notification — from the Commission on Ethics, from the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, from any State Attorney, or from any other source — concerning the conduct alleged in Complaint Nos. 22-079, 24-037, 24-134, or 24-135.
2. A written statement identifying whether the Office of the Attorney General has opened any investigation, declined to open any investigation, or made any charging decision with respect to the criminal allegations underlying those complaints.
3. A written statement addressing the Office of the Attorney General's position on the application of the § 775.15(12)(b) public-officer extension to the Form 6 felony allegations in Complaint Nos. 24-134 and 24-135.
4. Production of all communications between the Office of the Attorney General and the Florida Commission on Ethics, since January 1, 2024, concerning Complaint Nos. 22-079, 24-037, 24-134, or 24-135. *This is a public records request under Chapter 119, Florida Statutes.*

VI. Notice of Further Action

Should I not receive a substantive response to the above demands within fourteen (14) days, I intend to pursue every available avenue of escalation, including but not limited to:

- A formal complaint to the Florida Senate Committee on Ethics and Elections, requesting legislative inquiry into the Commission's conduct in this matter;
- A formal complaint to the Florida Bar concerning the conduct of Respondent's counsel, Richard E. Coates, with respect to the pattern of continuance requests filed in these proceedings;
- A petition to the appropriate Florida judicial authority for any writ available to compel performance of the Commission's nondiscretionary statutory duties;
- Publication of this letter and the Commission's response (or non-response) in its entirety;
- A formal records request to every agency with jurisdiction over any of the foregoing, including the Florida Department of Law Enforcement and the State Attorney for the 18th Judicial Circuit, to construct a definitive public record of which agencies received which communications, when, and what was done with them.

The integrity of Florida's ethics enforcement system depends on whether agencies charged with policing public trust can themselves be held to the same standard. The integrity of Florida's criminal justice system depends on whether the Office of the Attorney General will act on documented criminal allegations before the statute of limitations forecloses action regardless of the merits.

The cumulative record of the past two-plus years suggests that neither system, as currently operating, is performing the function its enabling statutes require. I am writing to give each of you the opportunity to demonstrate otherwise.

I look forward to your responses.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Burns III

Complainant, Complaint Nos. 24-037, 24-134, 24-135



Robert William Burns III

July 14, 2025 at 11:53

Re: Ethics complaints 24-134, 24-135

To: Fulford, Millie

I again don't see Randy Fine on the upcoming agenda and haven't received a letter about the hearing or a continuance. I also didn't see him on the agenda for the earlier July meeting as well. Has there been another continuance? If so could you forward me the correspondence for it?

On Feb 14, 2025, at 7:07 AM, Fulford, Millie <FULFORD.MILLIE@leg.state.fl.us> wrote:

<24134 Notice of Legislative Continuance.pdf>

See Fulford, Millie W. Fulford, Millie



Fulford, Millie

July 16, 2025 at 06:50

RE: Ethics complaints 24-134, 24-135

To: Robert William Burns III

Good morning, Mr. Burns.

There has not been another continuance request from the Respondent. I have not been directed to agenda this probable cause hearing for our July 25th meeting date.

As stated in the May 23rd correspondence, you will be notified when this matter is rescheduled.

Thank you.

Millie

Millie W. Fulford
Complaint Coordinator
Florida Commission on Ethics
850-717-0257

See More from Robert William Burns III

Jon M. Philipson

Chair

Joseph Oglesby

Vice Chair

Paul D. Bain

Michael H. Hellman

Laird A. Lile

Jeremy M. Rodgers

Abbey L. Stewart

Linda Stewart



State of Florida
COMMISSION ON ETHICS
P.O. Drawer 15709
Tallahassee, Florida 32317-5709

325 John Knox Road
Building E, Suite 200
Tallahassee, Florida 32303

"A Public Office is a Public Trust"

Kerrie J. Stillman

Executive Director

Steven J. Zuilkowski

Deputy Executive Director/

General Counsel

(850) 488-7864 Phone

(850) 488-3077 (FAX)

www.ethics.state.fl.us

April 6, 2026

Confidential

ROBERT BURNS
1310 RASCAL STREET
PALM BAY, FL 32909

RE: Complaint Nos. 24-037, 24-134, 24-135 (consolidated), In re RANDALL FINE

Dear ROBERT BURNS:

The probable cause hearing in the above-referenced complaint is scheduled for consideration at the August 28, 2026 Commission meeting. The meeting has been scheduled to begin at 10:00 A.M., in the First Floor Conference Room, First District Court of Appeal, 2000 Drayton Drive, Tallahassee, Florida.

Under the Commission rules, the Respondent, the Complainant, and their counsel may attend the hearing to observe the Commission's deliberations. The Respondent and the Commission Advocate will be given ten minutes each to provide statements to the Commission. No witnesses may be called at this hearing and no new evidence may be introduced. The sole purpose of the probable cause hearing is to evaluate the results of the preliminary investigation. If you plan to attend the meeting, please notify our office at least two days prior to the meeting.

Please do not hesitate to contact this office if you have questions concerning this matter.

Sincerely,

Millie W. Fulford
Complaint Coordinator