

FLORIDA THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL

Monica Alice Ullrich v. Federal Mortgage Lending, LLC, Etc.

No. 3D25-1474 · No. 3D25-1474 · Decided January 21, 2026

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

Third District Court of Appeal State of Florida Opinion filed January 21, 2026. Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing. _____ No. 3D25-1474 Lower Tribunal No. 24-21227-CA-01 _____ Monica Alice Ullrich, Appellant, vs. Federal Mortgage Lending, LLC, etc., Appellee. An Appeal from a non-final order from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County, Vivianne del Rio, Judge.

The Tome Law Firm, P.A., and Jay R. Tome (Davie), for appellant. No Appearance, for appellee. Before SCALES, C.J., and EMAS and LINDSEY, JJ. PER CURIAM. Appellant Monica Alice Ullrich challenges a July 1, 2025 non-final order that denied her April 16, 2025 motion that sought both to (i) quash service of process, and (ii) reconsider an earlier interlocutory order that denied Appellant's February 27, 2025 motion to vacate a January 28, 2025 judicial default.

We have jurisdiction to review only that portion of the challenged order denying Appellant's motion to quash service of process. Fla. R. App. P. 9.130(a)(3)(C)(i).¹ We find no error in the trial court's determination that Appellant waived her improper service claim by not raising the claim at her first opportunity (that is, in her February 27, 2025 motion to vacate default), and affirm that portion of the challenged order denying Appellant's motion to quash service of process.

See *Century-Nat'l Ins. Co. v. Frantz*, 320 So. 3d 929, 930-31 (Fla. 2d DCA 2021) (holding that a party asserting defective service of process must challenge personal jurisdiction in the initial motion); *Consol. Aluminum Corp. v. Weinroth*, 422 So. 2d 330, 331 (Fla. 5th DCA 1982); Fla. 1 That portion of the challenged July 1, 2025 non-final order denying reconsideration of an earlier interlocutory order denying Appellant's motion to vacate the judicial default is not appealable under rule 9.130's schedule of appealable non-final orders, and therefore, is subject to dismissal for lack of jurisdiction.

See, e.g., *Valledor Co. v. Decky*, 338 So. 3d 956, 958 (Fla. 3d DCA 2022). 2 R. Civ. P. 1.140(b), (h). The remainder of the appeal is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. Affirmed in part, dismissed in part. 3