

THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA

Claudia Umana v. MRG Glazing Contractors, Inc.

No. 3D25-0189 (Fla. 3d DCA May 20, 2026) · No. No. 3D25-0189; Lower Tribunal No. 23-988-CA-01 ·

Decided May 20, 2026

OPINION

Claudia Umana v. MRG Glazing Contractors, Inc.

PER CURIAM.

Third District Court of Appeal State of Florida Opinion filed May 20, 2026. Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing. _____ No. 3D25-0189 Lower Tribunal No. 23-988-CA-01 _____ Claudia Umana, Appellant, vs. MRG Glazing Contractors, Inc., Appellee. An Appeal from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County, Peter R. Lopez, Judge. Patrick J. Thompson (Lake Mary), for appellant. Delgado Vega, PLLC and Daniel R. Vega and John B. Hinz, for appellee. Before FERNANDEZ, LOGUE and LOBREE, JJ. PER CURIAM. Claudia Umana challenges an award of attorney's fees in a final judgment of foreclosure of a construction lien, contending among other things that the amount of fees requested and the use of a contingency fee multiplier is not supported by competent, substantial evidence. "This Court reviews an award of attorney's fees for abuse of discretion. A trial court's determination of whether claims are inextricably intertwined is a question of law reviewed de novo." *Aquastar Holdings LLC v. Avant Design Grp., Inc.*, 421 So. 3d 767, 770 n.3 (Fla. 3d DCA 2025) (quoting *Shelly L. Hall, M.D., P.A. v. White*, 97 So. 3d 907, 909 (Fla. 1st DCA 2012)). Because Umana has not furnished this court with a transcript of the fee hearing, we affirm. See *Val v. Gentera Ctr. for Plastic Surgery, LLC*, 419 So. 3d 793 (Fla. 3d DCA 2025); *Applegate v. Barnett Bank of Tallahassee*, 377 So. 2d 1150, 1152 (Fla. 1979) (burden is on appellant to demonstrate error and "[e]ven when based on erroneous reasoning, a conclusion or decision of a trial court will generally be affirmed if the evidence or an alternative theory supports it"). Affirmed. 2