

#### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 79-837

JUN 1 1992
CLERK, SUPREME COURT.
By
Chief Deputy Clerk

W.R. GRACE & CO. - CONN., OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLAS CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants-Petitioners,

vs .

GARLAND P. PARLIER and MARIE W. PARLIER, his Wife,

Plaintiffs-Respondents.

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW OF A DECISION OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA, FIFTH DISTRICT

JURISDICTIONAL BRIEF OF PETITIONER OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLAS CORPORATION

James E. Tribble
Florida Bar No. 082614
BLACKWELL & WALKER, P.A.
2400 AmeriFirst Building
One Southeast Third Avenue
Miami, Florida 33131
Telephone: (305) 995-5593
Attorneys for Owens-Corning
Fiberglas Corporation

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Ŧ	AGE
STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS			1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	•		2
ARGUMENT	• 1		2
THE DECISION BELOW IS IN EXPRESS AND DIRECT CONFLICTION OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL, DISTRICT IN BERDEAUX, THEREBY VESTING THIS COUR	TH	IIRD	
JURISDICTION			2
CONCLUSION .,			4
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE			4

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>CASES</u> :	PAGE
Berdeaux v. Eagle-Picher Industries, Inc., 575 So. 2d 295 (Fla. 3d DCA 1990)	2, 3
Childers v. Hoffmann-LaRoche, 540 So. 2d 102 (Fla. 1989)	. 3
Hamman v. <u>Worling</u> , 549 So. 2d 188 (Fla. 1989)	. 3
Hill v. <u>Hammerman</u> , 583 So. 2d 368 (Fla. 4th DCA 1991)	. 2
Jollie v. State, 405 So. 2d 418 (Fla. 1981)	. 3
<pre>King v. Pearlstein,      592 So. 2d 1176 (Fla. 2d DCA 1992)</pre>	1-3
Parlier v. Eagle-Picher Industries, Inc., 17 FLW D701 (Fla. 5th DCA March 13, 1992)	. 1
Partin v. Flagler Hospital, Inc., 581 So. 2d 240 (Fla. 5th DCA 1991)	1-3
State v. Loftin, 534 So. 2d 1148 (Fla. 1988)	. 3
OTHERS =	
Florida Constitution, article V, section 3(b)(3)	. 3
Florida Rules of Civil Procedure 1.070(j)	L <b>,</b> 2

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

This brief on jurisdiction is filed on behalf of petitioner Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation ("OCF"), one of several defendants in eleven personal injury actions brought in the Circuit Court for Orange County, Florida and one of several appellees in the ensuing consolidated appeals by plaintiffs to the District Court of Appeal of Florida, Fifth District. That appeal resulted in the decision which is the subject of these discretionary proceedings, reported as <a href="Parlier v. Eagle-Picher Industries, Inc.">Parlier V. Eagle-Picher Industries, Inc.</a>, 17 FLW D701 (Fla. 5th DCA March 13, 1992). A copy of the <a href="Parlier decision">Parlier decision appears in the appendix to this brief. (A. 1-2). OCF filed a timely joinder in the notice filed by co-petitioner W.R. Grace & Co. - Conn. ("W.R. Grace") invoking the discretionary jurisdiction of this Court.

The facts pertinent to this Court's discretionary conflict jurisdiction appear from the face of the district court's opinion, as follows: The opinion recites that although plaintiffs-appellants filed actions in 1987 alleging asbestos-related injuries, they did not effect service of their complaints either "within 120 days from the filings nor within 120 days from the effective date of Florida Rules of Civil Procedure 1.070(j)." The trial court applied the rule and dismissed the complaints, "since appellants had failed to show good cause for their non-compliance with the 120-day rule . . . " The District Court of Appeal reversed the dismissals on authority of its decision in Partin v. Flagler Hospital, Inc., 581 So. 2d 240 (Fla. 5th DCA 1991) and the decision of the District Court of Appeal, Second District in King

v. Pearlstein, 592 So. 2d 1176 (Fla. 2d DCA 1992). (A. 2). The significance of the district court's citation of <u>Partin</u> and <u>King</u> and the consequent direct conflict created thereby will be discussed in the argument portion of this brief.

# **SUMMARY** OF ARGUMENT

Based on the facts stated in the decision below and the Court's citation of <u>Partin</u> and <u>King</u>, there is an express and direct conflict with the decision of the District Court of Appeal, Third District in <u>Berdeaux v. Eagle-Picher Industries. Inc.</u>, **575** So. 2d **295** (Fla. 3d DCA 1990). Because this Court has accepted conflict jurisdiction to review <u>King</u>, based an a direct conflict with <u>Berdeaux</u>, it should also accept jurisdiction in the present case.

#### **ARGUMENT**

THE DECISION BELOW IS IN EXPRESS AND DIRECT CONFLICT WITH THE DECISIONS OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL, THIRD DISTRICT IN BERDEAUX, THEREBY VESTING THIS COURT WITH JURISDICTION.

To avoid repetition, OCF will adopt the argument appearing at pages 3-8 of the Jurisdictional Brief of the co-petitioner W.R. Grace, including that pertaining to the direct conflict with <u>Hill v. Hammerman</u>, 583 So. 2d 368 (Fla. 4th DCA 1991). In addition, however, OCF submits the following brief arguments and citations to authorities bearing on the jurisdictional conflict with Berdeaux.

The <u>Partin</u> decision cited by the District Court of Appeal, Fifth District as authority for its reversal in the instant case confirms **beyond** question the existence of a conflict with <u>Berdeaux</u>.

<u>Partin</u> expressly recognized that its conclusion that Rule 1.070(j) is not applicable to cases filed prior to its effective date of

January 1, 1989, conflicts with the Third District's decision in Berdeaux. Partin, 581 So. 2d at 242. Moreover, the decision of the District Court of Appeal, Second District in King, also cited as authority for the Fifth District's reversal, followed Partin but "acknowledge(d) that there is a difference of opinion between the various districts as to whether the rule is to apply to cases filed before January 1, 1989, and pending on that date." King, 592 So. 2d at 1178.

Most importantly, the Second District's decision in **King** is now pending before this Court in Case Nos. **79,529** and **79,530**. We have been informed that this Court entered an order on May **28,** 1992 accepting jurisdiction to review <u>King</u> based on conflict with <u>Berdeaux</u>. This Court has repeatedly recognized and accepted conflict jurisdiction under closely analogous circumstances. As stated in <u>State v. Loftin</u>, **534 So.** 2d 1148, 1149 (Fla. 1988):

In <u>Jollie v. State</u>, **405 So.** 2d **418** (Fla. **1981)**, we held that a per curiam decision without opinion of a district court of appeal which cites as controlling authority a decision that is pending review in this Court constitutes prima facie express conflict for purposes of iurisdiction. Thus we have jurisdiction pursuant to article V, section 3(b)(3), Florida Constitution.

[Emphasis added]. <u>See also Hamman v. Worling</u>, **549 So**. 2d **188** (Fla. 1989) and <u>Childers v. Hoffmann-LaRoche</u>, **540** So. **2d 102** (Fla. **1989)**, wherein this Court followed <u>Jollie</u> and exercised its conflict jurisdiction to review "per curiam affirmed" decisions which **cited** cases over which this Court later accepted conflict jurisdiction.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing reasons and authorities, jurisdictional conflict exists. Accordingly, this Court should enter an order accepting jurisdiction and ordering briefs on the merits.

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

WE HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing Brief on Jurisdiction was mailed this 29th day of May, 1992 to all counsel on the attached service list.

BLACKWELL & WALKER, P.A. Attorneys for OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLAS CORPORATION

Bv:

SAMES E. TRIBBLE

Florida Bar No. 082614 2400 AmeriFirst Building One Southeast Third Avenue

Miami, Florida 33131

Telephone: (305) 995-5593

H:\106\0204.JET

•			•
•			
•			
•			
•			
•			
•			
•			
•			
•			
•			

# IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA FIFTH DISTRICT JANUARY TERM 1992

NOT FINAL UNTIL THE TIME EXPIRES TO FILE REHEARING MOTION, AND, IF FILED, DISPOSED OF.

GARLAND P. PARLIER, et ux, et al.,

Appel lants,

٧.

8

CASE NO. 91-18, 91-19, 91-20, 91-22, 91-23, 91-24, 91-25, 91-26, 91-27, 91-28, 91-30

EAGLE-PICHER INDUSTRIES, INC., et al., Appellees.

Opinion filed March 13, 1992

Appeal from the Circuit Court for Orange County, W. Rogers Turner, Judge.

Patrice A. Talisman and David B. Pakula, of Robles & Gonzales, Miami, and Daniels & Talisman, P.A., Miami, for Appellants.

Henry W. Jewett, II, of Hannah, Marsee, Beik & Voght, Orlando, for Appellee, Owens-Illinois, Inc.

Ronnie H. Walker, of Ronnie H. Walker, P.A., Orlando, for Appellee, U. S. Mineral Products, Inc.

Jonathan C. Hollingshead and Susan B. Collingwood, of Fisher, Rushmer, Werrenrath, Keiner, Wack & Dickson, P.A., Orlando, for Appellee, W. R. Grace & Co.

Wendy F. Lumish and Amy M. Uber, of Rumberger, Kirk, Caldwell, Cabaniss, Burke & Wechsler, Miami, for Appellee, Foster Wheeler Corporation.

M. Stephen Smith and Marie P. Montefusco, of Rumberger, Kirk, Caldwell, Cabaniss, Burke & Wechsler, Miami, for Appellee, Anchor Packing Company.

James E. Tribble, of Blackwell & Walker, P.A.,

Miami, for Appellee, Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corporation.

Louise H. McMurray, of Louise H. McMurray, P.A., — 27 ? — 77 Miami, and Susan J. Cole, of Blair & Cole, P.A., Coral Gables, for Appellees Pittsburgh Corning Corporation, Fiberboard Corporation and Keene Corporation.

No Appearance for Appellee, Eagle-Picher.

HARRIS, J.

In 1987 appellants in this consolidated action filed suit for damages alleging asbestos related injuries. Service was not effected within 120 days from the filings nor within 120 days from the effective date of Florida Rules of Civil Procedure 1.070(j).

The trial court held that Rule 1.020(j) was applicable to these cases and, since appellants had failed to show good cause for their noncompliance with the 120 day rule, the actions were dismissed with prejudice.

We reverse. Partin v. Flagler Hospital, Inc., 581 So.2d 240 (Fla. 5th DCA 1991). Accord King v. Pearlstein, 17 F.L.W. 269 (Fla. 2d DCA Jan. 15, 1992). REVERSED and REMANDED.

GRIFFIN, J., and POUND, F. R. JR., Associate Judge, concur.

## SERVICE LIST

David B. Pakula, Esq.
Daniels & Talisman, P.A.
Suite 2401, New World Tower
100 N. Biscayne Boulevard
Miami, FL 33132

Robles & Gonzalez
Suite 900
One Bay Front Plaza
100 South Biscayne Blvd.
Miami, FL 33131

Stephen T. Brown, Esq. 501 N.E. First Avenue Miami, FL 33132-1998

Louise H. McMurray, P.A. Suite 226 11430 N. Kendall Drive Miami, FL 33176

Henry Garrard, 111, Esq. Blasingame, Burch 440 College Avenue, N. Athens, GA 30601

Ronnie H. Walker, Esq. P.O. Box 273 Orlando, FL 32802

Robert A. Hannah, Esq. Hannah, Marsee, Beik & Vought Suite 505 225 E. Robinson St. Orlando, FL 32801

Susan J. Cole, Esq. Blaire & Cole, P.A. 2801 Ponce de Leon Blvd. Coral Gables, FL 33134

Brian S, Keif, Esq. 1230 Miami Center 100 Chopin Plaza Miami, FL 33131

Peter Kellog, Esq. 801 Blackstone Bldg. 233 E. Bay Street Jacksonville, FL 32302

L:\WP\EPB\PARLIER\SERVICE.LST

Grey Reddit, Esq.
Inge,. Twitty, et al
First Alabama Bank Bldg.
P.O. BOX 1109
Mobile, AL 36633

Jeffrey Creasman, Esq. Wolpe, Leibowitz, Berger 19 West Flagler Street suite 520 Miami, FL 33130

Jonathon C. Hollingshead, Esq. Suite 1550 20 N. Orange Avenue Orlando, FL 32802-0712

Norwood Wilner, Esq. Zisser Robison Spohrer 44 East Duval Street Jacksonville, FL 32202

Marie Montefusco, Esq.
M. Stephen Smith, Esq.
Rumberger, Kirk, et al
Suite 3100, One Biscayne Tower
2 South Biscayne Boulevard
Miami, FL 33131

Amy M. Uber, Esq.
Wendy Lumish, Esq.
Rumberger, Kirk, et al
Suite 3100, One Biscayne Tower
2 South Biscayne Boulevard
Miami, FL 33131

Blackwell & Walker, P.A.