

SIXTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA

Steven Sanzaro v. Katherine Grace Crowe

Sanzaro v. Crowe · No. 6D2023-1796 · Decided March 21, 2025

SUMMARY

The Sixth District Court of Appeal of Florida affirmed a final judgment of injunction for protection against stalking and rejected three appellate challenges. The court specifically held that the trial court did not abuse its discretion by denying the indigent, nonresident appellant’s request to appear telephonically at the final evidentiary hearing; an associate judge concurred in part and dissented in part on that issue.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Sixth District Court of Appeal of Florida
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per Curiam; White, J.; Brownlee, J.; Lambert, B.D., Associate Judge
JURISDICTION	Florida Sixth District Court of Appeal
DECIDED	March 21, 2025
DOCKET	6D2023-1796
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from a final judgment granting an injunction for protection against stalking. The appellant challenged three issues, including the denial of his request to appear telephonically at the final evidentiary hearing.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Abuse of discretion
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published opinion
PARTIES	Steven Sanzaro v. Katherine Grace Crowe

TOPICS

- injunctions
- appellate procedure
- standard of review
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- appellate procedure
- injunctions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court abused its discretion by denying Sanzaro's request to appear telephonically at the final evidentiary hearing on Crowe's petition for an injunction for protection against stalking.
2. Whether the trial court otherwise erred on the two additional issues raised by Sanzaro on appeal.

HOLDINGS

1. The trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying Sanzaro's request to appear telephonically at the final evidentiary hearing because the record did not show that the ruling was arbitrary, fanciful, unreasonable, or one that no reasonable judge could have made.
2. The court affirmed the trial court's ruling as to all three issues raised by Sanzaro.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“discretion ‘is abused when the judicial action is arbitrary, fanciful, or unreasonable, which is another way of saying that discretion is abused only where no reasonable man would take the view adopted by the trial court.’”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Katherine Grace Crowe filed a petition for an injunction for protection against stalking. Steven Sanzaro requested permission to appear telephonically at the final evidentiary hearing, but the trial court denied the request and entered a final injunction. On appeal, Sanzaro challenged that denial and two additional issues; the majority concluded that the record did not demonstrate an abuse of discretion.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Crowe petitioned for an injunction for protection against stalking in the Circuit Court for Lee County. The trial court entered a final judgment of injunction and denied Sanzaro's request to appear telephonically at the final evidentiary hearing. Sanzaro appealed, and the Sixth District Court of Appeal affirmed on all three issues addressed on appeal.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. State, 397 So. 3d 626, 639 (Fla. 2024)
- Canakaris v. Canakaris, 382 So. 2d 1197, 1203 (Fla. 1980)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

SIXTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL STATE OF FLORIDA
_____ Case No. 6D2023-1796 Lower Tribunal No. 22-035515DR C

____ STEVEN SANZARO, Appellant, v. KATHERINE GRACE CROWE, Appellee. _____ Appeal from the Circuit Court for Lee County. John S. Carlin, Judge. March 21, 2025 PER CURIAM. Steven Sanzaro challenges the trial court’s final judgment of injunction for protection against stalking and raises three issues on appeal.

We affirm as to all three, but we find one issue merits comment. As his first issue, Sanzaro argues the trial court erred in denying his request to appear telephonically at the final evidentiary hearing on Appellee Katherine Grace Crowe’s petition for injunction for protection against stalking.

We find Sanzaro’s argument for reversal on this point fails under the applicable abuse of discretion standard. On this record, we cannot say that “no reasonable man would take the view adopted by the trial court” or that the trial court’s action was “arbitrary, fanciful, or unreasonable.” See *Johnson v. State*, 397 So. 3d 626, 639 (Fla. 2024) (“[D]iscretion ‘is abused when the judicial action is arbitrary, fanciful, or unreasonable, which is another way of saying that discretion is abused only where no reasonable man would take the view adopted by the trial court.’” (quoting *Canakaris v. Canakaris*, 382 So.

2d 1197, 1203 (Fla. 1980))). Accordingly, we affirm. AFFIRMED. WHITE and BROWNLEE, JJ., concur. LAMBERT, B.D., Associate Judge, concurs in part, and dissents in part, with opinion.

____ NOT FINAL UNTIL TIME EXPIRES TO FILE MOTION FOR REHEARING AND DISPOSITION THEREOF IF TIMELY FILED _____ LAMBERT, B.D., Associate Judge, concurring, in part, and dissenting, in part.

I concur with the majority opinion’s affirmance on two of the three issues raised by Appellant for reversal. However, under the circumstances of the case, because I believe that the trial judge abused his discretion in denying the indigent, non-resident Appellant’s motion to appear telephonically at the final hearing, I would reverse the final judgment of injunction for protection against stalking and 2 remand for further proceedings.¹ Accordingly, I respectfully dissent as to the majority’s affirmance on the first issue raised by Appellant in this appeal.

____ Steven Sanzaro, Las Vegas, Nevada, pro se.

Katherine Grace Crowe, Bonita Springs, pro se. 1 To be clear, I take no position on the merits of either Appellee’s petition for the injunction or Appellant’s defense to the petition. 3