

THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA

Diana Blakeslee v. Quermin Madrigal

No. 3D24-2301 · No. 3D24-2301 · Decided December 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The Third District Court of Appeal of Florida affirmed an order permitting Quermin Madrigal to relocate the minor child from Tavernier, Florida, to Cape Coral, Florida. The court held that the trial court did not abuse its discretion because its findings under section 61.13001(7), Florida Statutes, were supported by competent, substantial evidence.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Third District Court of Appeal of Florida
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per Curiam; Emas; Fernandez; Gooden
JURISDICTION	Florida Third District Court of Appeal
DECIDED	December 3, 2025
DOCKET	3D24-2301
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from an order of the circuit court granting a petition to relocate the minor child from Tavernier, Florida, to Cape Coral, Florida.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	An order on a petition for relocation is reviewed for abuse of discretion; the appellate court considers whether competent, substantial evidence supports the trial court's findings under section 61.13001(7), Florida Statutes.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published opinion
PARTIES	Diana Blakeslee v. Quermin Madrigal

TOPICS

- relocation
- child custody
- standard of review
- appellate procedure
- family law procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Family law
- Appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court abused its discretion in granting the petition to relocate the minor child from Tavernier, Florida, to Cape Coral, Florida.
2. Whether competent, substantial evidence supported the trial court's findings under section 61.13001(7), Florida Statutes.

HOLDINGS

1. The trial court did not abuse its discretion in granting Madrigal's request to relocate the minor child because its findings were supported by competent, substantial evidence.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“An order on a petition for relocation is reviewed for an abuse of discretion, and the appellate court considers whether competent, substantial evidence supports the court’s findings under section 61.13001(7), Florida Statutes.” (at 2)

“To hold otherwise would require us to reweigh evidence and substitute our judgment and findings for those of the trial court. This we cannot do.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The trial court granted Quermin Madrigal's request to relocate the minor child from Tavernier, Florida, to Cape Coral, Florida. It found that relocation was in the child's best interests and made findings addressing the factors in section 61.13001(7)(a)-(k), including credibility findings concerning the parties.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Miami-Dade County Circuit Court granted Quermin Madrigal's request to relocate the minor child and found that relocation was in the child's best interests. Diana Blakeslee appealed, and the Third District Court of Appeal affirmed the order in all respects.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Ness v. Martinez, 249 So. 3d 754, 757 (Fla. 1st DCA 2018)
- Greenwood v. Greenwood, No. 3D24-1585, 2025 WL 2656234, at *1 (Fla. 3d DCA Sept. 17, 2025)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

Third District Court of Appeal State of Florida Opinion filed December 3, 2025. Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing. _____ No. 3D24-2301 Lower Tribunal No. 15-15812-FC-04 _____ Diana Blakeslee, Appellant, vs. Quermin

Madrigal, Appellee. An Appeal from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County, Christina Marie DiRaimondo, Judge.

Marro Law, P.A., and Meaghan K. Marro (Plantation), for appellant. Law Office of Elena Vigil-Farinas, P.A., and Elena Vigil-Farinas (Tavernier), for appellee. Before EMAS, FERNANDEZ and GOODEN, JJ. PER CURIAM. Appellant Diana Blakeslee challenges the trial court's order granting Appellee Quermin Madrigal's request to relocate the minor child from Tavernier, Florida, to Cape Coral, Florida.

The trial court found that relocation was in the best interests of the child. In doing so, it made numerous findings of fact which tracked the relocation statute, including credibility findings of the parties. § 61.13001(7)(a)–(k), Fla. Stat. (2024).

We affirm the order in all respects. See *Ness v. Martinez*, 249 So. 3d 754, 757 (Fla. 1st DCA 2018) (“An order on a petition for relocation is reviewed for an abuse of discretion, and the appellate court considers whether competent, substantial evidence supports the court's findings under section 61.13001(7), Florida Statutes.”); *Greenwood v. Greenwood*, No. 3D24-1585, 2025 WL 2656234, at *1 (Fla.

3d DCA Sept. 17, 2025) (“But the trial court simply did not abuse its discretion. Instead, it properly exercised that discretion. Its findings were supported by competent, substantial evidence. This evidence was ‘reasonable and logical.’ To hold otherwise would require us to reweigh evidence and substitute our judgment and findings for those of the trial court.

This we cannot do.”) (internal citations omitted). Affirmed. 2