

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.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Third District Court of Appeal of Florida
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Fernandez; Logue; Bokor
JURISDICTION	Florida Third District Court of Appeal
DECIDED	February 18, 2026
DOCKET	3D25-1057
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from a judgment of the Miami-Dade County Court.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A trial court decision is presumed correct, and the appellant bears the burden of demonstrating reversible error. Without a record of the trial proceedings, an appellate court cannot properly resolve underlying factual issues or determine whether the trial court's judgment was unsupported by the evidence or rested on a misconceived legal theory.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published
PARTIES	Edward Fidelman v. Adonis Dominguez

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- standard of review
- preservation of error
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- appellate procedure
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the appellate court could determine that the county court committed reversible factual or legal error without a record of the trial proceedings.

HOLDINGS

1. When the appellant does not provide a record sufficient to evaluate the trial court's factual findings or alleged legal error, the appellate court cannot conclude that reversal is warranted and must affirm the trial court's decision.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“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.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion does not describe the underlying dispute or the material facts developed in the county court proceedings. The appeal was resolved on the inability to review the trial proceedings because the necessary record was not provided.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Edward Fidelman appealed a county court judgment in Miami-Dade County. The Third District Court of Appeal affirmed, explaining that the absence of a record of the trial proceedings prevented meaningful review of the underlying factual and legal issues.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Applegate v. Barnett Bank of Tallahassee, 377 So. 2d 1150, 1152 (Fla. 1979)