

FLORIDA FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL

Fred Jay Campbell v. Erica Schulze Ising

No. 1D2024-1698, Florida First District Court of Appeal (December 23, 2025)

SUMMARY

The Florida First District Court of Appeal affirmed an injunction for protection against stalking issued in favor of Erica Schulze Ising against Fred Jay Campbell. Judge Winokur dissented, concluding that the evidence did not establish harassment causing substantial emotional distress under section 784.0485, Florida Statutes.

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL STATE OF FLORIDA
No. 1D2024-1698

FRED JAY CAMPBELL, Appellant, v. ERICA SCHULZE ISING, Appellee.

On appeal from the Circuit Court for Escambia County. John Miller, Judge. December 23, 2025 PER CURIAM. AFFIRMED. OSTERHAUS, C.J., and LONG, J., concur; WINOKUR, J., dissents with opinion. Not final until disposition of any timely and authorized motion under Fla. R. App.

P. 9.330 or 9.331. WINOKUR, J., dissenting. The evidence in this case was not sufficient to show that Campbell willfully, maliciously, and repeatedly harassed Ising to support an injunction for protection against stalking pursuant to section 784.0485, Florida Statutes. “Harass” means “to engage in a course of conduct directed at a specific person which causes substantial emotional distress to that person and serves no legitimate purpose.” § 784.048(1)(a), Fla. Stat. Even if we view the evidence in the light most favorable to Ising, the evidence did not support a finding that Campbell’s conduct was sufficient to cause “substantial emotional distress” under the reasonable-person standard we must apply.

See *Bouters v. State*, 659 So. 2d 235, 238 (Fla. 1995) (holding that an objective, reasonable-person standard applies to the phrase “substantial emotional distress”). For this reason, we should reverse. Jason Cromey of Cromey Law, P.A., Pensacola, for Appellant. Erica Schulze Ising, pro se, Appellee. 2