

SIXTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA

The Academy of Ability, Inc. and William Harris v. Kareana V. McCloud, as Guardian of the Person and Property of T.B., an Incapacitated Person

Academy of Ability · No. 6D2024-1498 · Decided August 1, 2025

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

SIXTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL STATE OF FLORIDA
_____ Case No. 6D2024-1498 Lower Tribunal No. 2020-CA-6655
_____ IN RE: Guardianship of T.B., an incapacitated person. THE
ACADEMY OF ABILITY, INC. and WILLIAM HARRIS, Appellants/Cross-Appellees, v.
KAREANA V. MCCLOUD, as guardian of the person and property of T.B., an incapacitated
person, Appellee/Cross-Appellant. _____ Appeal pursuant to Fla. R.
App.

P. 9.130 from the Circuit Court for Orange County. Brian S. Sandor, Judge. August 1, 2025
NARDELLA, J. This appeal stems from the trial court’s ruling on the motion to tax costs of The
Academy of Ability, Inc. and William Harris (“Defendants”) following the voluntary dismissal of
the case by Kareana V. McCloud, as guardian of the person and property of T.B. (“Plaintiff”).

1 The parties each raise one issue on appeal, both of which we find unavailing. First, with respect
to Defendants’ argument 1 The claims in this case related solely to T.B., who is an incapacitated
person. challenging the trial court’s rejection of costs associated with treating and expert
witnesses, we find they failed to challenge each of the reasons supporting that finding in their
initial brief, thus, allowing the trial court’s ruling to stand on the unchallenged reason.

See Davis v. State, 153 So. 3d 399, 401 (Fla. 1st DCA 2014) (“An appellant who presents no
argument as to why a trial court’s ruling is incorrect on an issue has abandoned the issue—
essentially conceded that denial was correct.” (quoting Prince v. State, 40 So. 3d 11, 13 (Fla. 4th
DCA 2010))). 2 Second, with respect to Plaintiff’s argument that the trial court erred by holding
Ms. McCloud personally liable for the costs, we find the order on costs does no such thing.

Rather, the order expressly recognizes that the guardian, Ms. McCloud, is not personally liable for
the costs. For these reasons, we affirm the trial court’s ultimate ruling on Defendants’ motion to
tax costs against Plaintiff. AFFIRMED. TRAVER, C.J., and WHITE, J., concur. Jason M.
Azzarone, Thomas Saieva, and Lesley Stine, of La Cava Jacobson & Goodies, P.A., Tampa, for
Appellants/Cross-Appellees.

Ryan Christopher Rodems, of Morgan & Morgan, P.A., Orlando, for Appellee/Cross-Appellant. NOT FINAL UNTIL TIME EXPIRES TO FILE MOTION FOR REHEARING AND DISPOSITION THEREOF IF TIMELY FILED 2 While Defendants addressed both reasons in their reply brief, these arguments came too late. E.g., *Hoskins v. State*, 75 So. 3d 250, 257 (Fla. 2011); *Askar v. Abo*, 411 So.

3d 449 (Fla. 6th DCA 2024). 2

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/florida-sixth-district-court-of-appeal-sixth-district-court-of-appeal-of-florida/2025/the-academy-of-ability-inc-and-william-harris-v-kareana-v-in66zog0>