

SIXTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA

William Thomas Ficka, III v. Karla Lynn Brown, f/k/a Karla Lynn Ficka

Ficka · No. 6D2023-4157 · Decided March 27, 2026

SUMMARY

In this dissolution-of-marriage appeal, the Florida Sixth District Court of Appeal held that the trial court’s valuation of the parties’ marital furniture was not supported by competent, substantial evidence. The court reversed that portion of the final judgment, remanded for adjustment of the equitable distribution, and affirmed the judgment in all other respects.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Sixth District Court of Appeal of Florida
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Mize, J.; Nardella, J.; Wozniak, J.
JURISDICTION	Florida Sixth District Court of Appeal
DECIDED	March 27, 2026
DOCKET	6D2023-4157
DISPOSITION	reversed_and_remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Both parties appealed the trial court's final judgment of dissolution of marriage; the appellee/cross-appellant challenged the valuation of the parties' marital furniture.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The opinion applies the requirement that an asset valuation be supported by competent, substantial evidence.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	William Thomas Ficka, III v. Karla Lynn Brown, f/k/a Karla Lynn Ficka

TOPICS

- dissolution of marriage
- equitable distribution
- evidence
- appellate procedure
- standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

- family law
- dissolution of marriage
- equitable distribution
- appellate procedure
- evidence

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court's valuation of the parties' marital furniture was supported by competent, substantial evidence.
2. Whether the equitable distribution of the parties' marital estate must be adjusted after reversal of the furniture valuation.

HOLDINGS

1. The trial court's valuation of the marital furniture was not supported by competent, substantial evidence.
2. The portion of the final judgment concerning the valuation of the marital furniture was reversed, and the case was remanded with instructions to adjust the equitable distribution of the marital estate accordingly.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“the valuation of an asset must be based on competent, substantial evidence.” (at 1)

“Therefore, we reverse the portion of the final judgment pertaining to the valuation of the marital furniture, and remand with instructions to adjust the equitable distribution of the parties’ marital estate accordingly.”
(at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties were involved in a dissolution of marriage proceeding involving equitable distribution of their marital estate. The trial court valued the parties' marital furniture, but the appellate court concluded that the valuation was not supported by competent, substantial evidence.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Circuit Court for Orange County entered a final judgment of dissolution of marriage. Both parties appealed, and the Sixth District Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment in all respects except the valuation of the marital furniture, which it reversed and remanded for adjustment of the equitable distribution.

DISPOSITION

reversed_and_remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Reverse the portion of the final judgment pertaining to the valuation of the marital furniture and adjust the equitable distribution of the parties' marital estate accordingly. The trial court may determine whether an additional evidentiary hearing is required. The final judgment is affirmed in all other respects.

CASES CITED

- Reese v. Reese, 363 So. 3d 1202, 1208 (Fla. 6th DCA 2023)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

SIXTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL STATE OF FLORIDA
_____ Case No. 6D2023-4157 Lower Tribunal No. 2022-DR-
002424 _____ WILLIAM THOMAS FICKA, III, Appellant/Cross-
Appellee, v. KARLA LYNN BROWN, f/k/a KARLA LYNN FICKA, Appellee/Cross-Appellant.
_____ Appeal from the Circuit Court for Orange County.

Eric H. DuBois, Judge. March 27, 2026 MIZE, J. In this dissolution of marriage case, both parties appeal the trial court's final judgment of dissolution. Each party argues that the trial court committed a number of errors, but we find only one. Appellee/Cross-Appellant Karla Lynn Brown argues that the trial court's valuation of the parties' marital furniture was not supported by competent, substantial evidence.

See *Reese v. Reese*, 363 So. 3d 1202, 1208 (Fla. 6th DCA 2023) (“[T]he valuation of an asset must be based on competent, substantial evidence.” (citing § 61.075(3), Fla. Stat. (2018))). Having reviewed the record, we agree with her.

Therefore, we reverse the portion of the final judgment pertaining to the valuation of the marital furniture, and remand with instructions to adjust the equitable distribution of the parties' marital estate accordingly.

On remand, the trial court may determine whether it requires an additional evidentiary hearing to comply with this opinion. In all other respects, the final judgment is affirmed. AFFIRMED in part; REVERSED in part; and REMANDED with instructions. NARDELLA and WOZNIAK, JJ., concur. Nikie Popovich, of Popovich Law Firm, P.A., Orlando, for Appellant/Cross-Appellee.

Christian D. Smed, of Christian D. Smed, P.A., Winter Park, for Appellee/Cross-Appellant. NOT FINAL UNTIL TIME EXPIRES TO FILE MOTION FOR REHEARING AND DISPOSITION THEREOF IF TIMELY FILED 2