

FLORIDA THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL

Hector Izquierdo v. Marine Iglesias

No. 3D25-0017 (Fla. 3d DCA Feb. 11, 2026) · No. No. 3D25-0017 · Decided February 11, 2026

SUMMARY

The Third District Court of Appeal of Florida affirmed most aspects of a final judgment of paternity establishing a parenting plan, timesharing schedule, and child support. The court reversed and remanded for correction of the judgment's failure to describe parent-child communication methods and for recalculation of child support based on the guidelines worksheet and timesharing allocation.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Florida Third District Court of Appeal
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Miller, J.; Fernandez, J.; Lobree, J.
JURISDICTION	Florida Third District Court of Appeal
DECIDED	February 11, 2026
DOCKET	No. 3D25-0017
DISPOSITION	reversed_and_remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Father appealed from a final judgment of paternity establishing a parenting plan and timesharing schedule and awarding child support.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Not expressly stated; the court summarily affirmed most issues and reviewed the conceded statutory deficiency and the child-support calculation for reversible error.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	Hector Izquierdo v. Marine Iglesias

TOPICS

- paternity
- child support
- family law procedure
- appellate procedure
- child custody

PRACTICE AREAS

- family law
- paternity
- child support
- appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the final judgment of paternity complied with the statutory requirement to describe the methods and technologies the parents would use to communicate with the child.
2. Whether the child-support award was reversible because it conflicted with the monthly net income reflected on the attached child-support guidelines worksheet and the parties' awarded timesharing percentages.
3. Whether the remaining issues raised by the father warranted reversal.

HOLDINGS

1. The final judgment impermissibly failed to describe the methods and technologies the parents would use to communicate with the child, as required by section 61.13(2)(b)(4), Florida Statutes (2024).
2. The child-support award could not stand because it contravened the monthly net income reflected on the child-support guidelines worksheet attached to the judgment and was inconsistent with the percentage of timesharing awarded to the parties.
3. The remaining issues did not warrant reversal, and the judgment was summarily affirmed in all other respects.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Describe . . . the methods and technologies that the parents will use to communicate with the child.” (at 2)

“We summarily affirm in all other respects, save the support calculation because it contravenes the monthly net income reflected on the child support guidelines worksheet attached to the judgment and is inconsistent with the percentage of timesharing awarded to the respective parties.” (at 2)

“Affirmed in part; reversed in part; remanded.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The father and mother were parties to a paternity proceeding involving a child. The trial court entered a final judgment establishing a parenting plan and timesharing schedule, with the father's timesharing amounting to 27%, and awarded child support. The child-support award conflicted with the monthly net income shown on the attached guidelines worksheet and with the percentage of timesharing awarded to the parties.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County entered a final judgment of paternity establishing a parenting plan and timesharing schedule and awarding child support. On appeal, the mother conceded that the judgment failed to describe the methods and technologies the parents would use to communicate with the child. The Third District Court of Appeal summarily affirmed in all other respects, reversed the judgment as to the communication requirement and child-support calculation, and remanded for those limited issues.

DISPOSITION

reversed_and_remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Reverse and remand only for correction of the parenting judgment to describe the methods and technologies the parents will use to communicate with the child, and for correction of the child-support calculation so that it conforms to the monthly net income reflected on the guidelines worksheet and the awarded timesharing percentage. Affirmed in all other respects.

CASES CITED

- Campbell v. Jara, 392 So. 3d 1104, 1106 (Fla. 2d DCA 2024)
- Skelly v. Skelly, 300 So. 3d 342, 345 (Fla. 5th DCA 2020)
- Applegate v. Barnett Bank of Tallahassee, 377 So. 2d 1150, 1152 (Fla. 1979)

OPINION

Hector Izquierdo v. Marine Iglesias

PER CURIAM.

Third District Court of Appeal State of Florida Opinion filed February 11, 2026. Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing. _____ No. 3D25-0017 Lower Tribunal No. 22-23182-FC-04 _____ Hector Izquierdo, Appellant, vs. Marine Iglesias, Appellee. An Appeal from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County, Ivonne Cuesta, Judge. Puzo Law, and Leslie Puzo (Hollywood), for appellant. Cristobal D. Padron & Associates, P.A., and Cristobal D. Padron, for appellee. Before FERNANDEZ, MILLER, and LOBREE, JJ. MILLER, J. Appellant, Hector Izquierdo, the father, appeals from a final judgment of paternity establishing a parenting plan and timesharing schedule and awarding child support. We have jurisdiction. See Fla. R. App. P. 9.030(b)(1)(A). The father raises a myriad of issues on appeal. Appellee, Marine Iglesias, the mother, commendably concedes the judgment impermissibly fails to “[d]escribe . . . the methods and technologies that the parents will use to communicate with the child.” See § 61.13(2)(b)(4), Fla. Stat. (2024). We summarily affirm in all other respects, save the support calculation because it contravenes the monthly net income reflected on the child support guidelines worksheet attached to the judgment and is inconsistent with the percentage of timesharing awarded to the respective parties.¹ See Campbell v. Jara, 392 So. 3d 1104, 1106 (Fla. 2d DCA 2024) (reversing “child support award due to mathematical and factual errors”); Skelly v. Skelly, 300 So. 3d 342, 345 (Fla. 5th DCA 2020) (reversing where use of “worksheet is inconsistent with the child support awarded by the court in its final judgment”); see also Applegate v. Barnett Bank of Tallahassee, 377 So. 2d 1150, 1152 (Fla. 1979) (“Without a record of the trial proceedings, the appellate court can not properly resolve the underlying factual issues so as to conclude that the trial court’s judgment is not supported by the evidence 1 The father’s timesharing award equates to 27%. 2 or by an alternative theory.”); Fla. Fam. L. R. P. 12.530(a) (“To preserve for appeal a challenge to the failure of the trial court to make required findings of fact in the final judgment, a

party must raise that issue in a motion for rehearing under this rule.”). Accordingly, we reverse and remand only as to these two discrete issues. Affirmed in part; reversed in part; remanded. 3