

THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA

Edward Fidelman v. Adonis Dominguez

Fidelman · No. 3D25-1057 · Decided February 18, 2026

SUMMARY

The Third District Court of Appeal of Florida affirmed a Miami-Dade County Court judgment in an appeal brought by Edward Fidelman against Adonis Dominguez. Citing *Applegate v. Barnett Bank of Tallahassee*, the court explained that the appellant bears the burden of demonstrating error and that an inadequate record prevents review of underlying factual issues.

OPINION

Edward Fidelman v. Adonis Dominguez

PER CURIAM.

Third District Court of Appeal State of Florida Opinion filed February 18, 2026. Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing. No. 3D25-1057 Lower Tribunal No. 24-228541-SP-23 Edward Fidelman, Appellant, vs. Adonis Dominguez, Appellee. An Appeal from the County Court for Miami-Dade County, Michaelle Gonzalez-Paulson, Judge. Edward Fidelman, in proper person. Adonis Dominguez, in proper person. Before FERNANDEZ, LOGUE and BOKOR, JJ. PER CURIAM. Affirmed. See *Applegate v. Barnett Bank of Tallahassee*, 377 So. 2d 1150, 1152 (Fla. 1979) (“In appellate proceedings the decision of a trial court has the presumption of correctness and the burden is on the appellant to demonstrate error. . . . When there are issues of fact the appellant necessarily asks the reviewing court to draw conclusions about the evidence. 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 or by an alternative theory. Without knowing the factual context, neither can an appellate court reasonably conclude that the trial judge so misconceived the law as to require reversal.”). 2