

Chief Deputy Clerk

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

MOBIL OIL CORPORATION,

Petitioner,

CASE NO.: 80,310

vs.

JEREMY BRANSFORD,

Respondent.

ON DISCRETIONARY REVIEW FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL FOURTH DISTRICT OF FLORIDA CASE NO.: 91-2147

JURISDICTIONAL BRIEF OF JEREMY BRANSFORD, RESPONDENT

MARK R. McCOLLEM, ESQUIRE FLORIDA BAR NO.: 370606 CHIDNESE & McCOLLEM Attorneys for Respondent 201 Southeast 12th Street Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33316 (305) 462-8484

September 22nd, 1992

CHIDNESE & McCollem

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

i.	Table of Contents	
ii.	Table of Citations	
I.	Brief Statement of the Facts and Procedural History	1
II.	Summary of Argument	1
III.	Argument	1,2
IV.	Conclusion	3
v.	Certificate of Service	4

CHIDNESE & MCCOLLEM

i.

# TABLE OF CITATIONS

## Page

Orlando 1	Executi	ve I	<u>Park v</u>	. Rol	obins	<u>s</u> ,							
433	So.2d	491	(Fla.	1983	3)	• •	•	• •	•	-		•	1,2
Sydenham	v. Sar	ntiag	jo,										
392	So.2d	357	(Fla.	4 th	DCA	1981	.)	•	٠	•	•	•	1,2

CHIDNESE & MCCOLLEM

ii.

#### I. BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

For purposes of this Appeal, the Respondent, JEREMY BRANFORD, (hereinafter "BRANSFORD"), accepts the Petitioner MOBIL OIL CORPORATION'S (hereinafter "MOBIL"), Statement of the Facts and Procedural History as contained in its Jurisdictional Brief. BRANSFORD would point out to this Court, however, that the cover page of MOBILE's brief indicates that this is a discretionary review from the Third District Court of Appeal when in fact the underlying decision came from the Fourth District Court of Appeal.

#### **II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

BRANSFORD argues that there is no express and direct conflict with a decision of this Honorable Court or that of another District Court of Appeal in the state of Florida by virtue of the Fourth District Court's decision in this matter. As a result, BRANSFORD claims that there is no basis for invocation of this Honorable Court's constitutional powers to accept jurisdiction in this matter.

#### III. ARGUMENT

BRANSFORD responds to MOBIL's jurisdictional argument by pointing out that this Court did not approve <u>Sydenham v.</u> <u>Santiago</u>, 392 So.2d 357 (Fla. 4th DCA 1981) by virtue of the decision rendered in <u>Orlando Executive Park v. Robbins</u>, 433 So.2d

> 1 CHIDNESE & MCCOLLEM ATTORNEYS AT LAW

491 (Fla. 1983); it merely refused to extend the language of <u>Sydenham</u> to <u>Robbins</u> consistent with that Petitioner's attempt to create conflict jurisdiction. To argue that <u>Robbins</u> stands for the proposition that there can never be an apparent agency claim made against an oil company in the state of Florida represents a dangerous expansion of that decision. In fact, this Court in <u>Robbins</u> approved the application of apparent agency claims provided that the three step test enunciated therein has been met.

Any potential conflict between <u>Sydenham</u> and this case was discussed by the Fourth District at page 2 of its decision in this matter. We do not have a <u>Sydenham</u> situation in the case <u>Sub</u> <u>Judice</u> because MOBIL owned the property where the attack occurred. As explained by the Fourth District, that single distinction eliminates any conflict between this case and <u>Sydenham</u>.

### IV. CONCLUSION

**BRANSFORD** respectfully submits to this Court that there is no express and direct conflict from the opinion rendered by the Fourth District Court of Appeal and an opinion rendered by this Court or any other District Court of Appeal on the issues contained in this Appeal.

### Respectfully submitted,

CHIDNESE & McCOLLEM
Attorneys for Respondent
201 Southeast 12th Street
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33316
(305) 462-8484
By:
MARK R. MCCOLLEM

MRM/kp

#### V. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

WE HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished by U.S. Mail this 22nd day of September, 1992, to: ROGER S. KOBERT, ESQUIRE, Capital Bank Bldg., Suite 1780, 1221 Brickell Ave., Miami, Florida 33131, and RICHARD B. ADAMS, Esquire, Concord Bldg., 66 West Flagler Street, Miami, Florida 33130.

CHIDNESE & McCOLLEM
Attorneys for Respondent
201 Southeast 12th Street
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33316
(305) 462-8484
By:
MARK R. McCOLLEM
Florida Bar No.: 370606

MRM/kp