

FIFTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA

David Charles Sussman v. State of Florida

Sussman · No. 5D2024-3343 · Decided August 15, 2025

SUMMARY

The Fifth District Court of Appeal of Florida affirmed an order denying David Charles Sussman's postconviction motions. The court cautioned that further abusive, repetitive, malicious, or frivolous pro se filings arising from the same Volusia County criminal case could result in sanctions, including a bar on pro se filing.

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

FIFTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL STATE OF FLORIDA
_____ Case No. 5D2024-3343 LT Case No. 2001-36686-CFAES
_____ DAVID CHARLES SUSSMAN, Appellant, v. STATE OF
FLORIDA, Appellee. _____ 3.850 Appeal from the Circuit Court
for Volusia County. Elizabeth Ann Blackburn, Judge. David Charles Sussman, Arcadia, pro se.

James Uthmeier, Attorney General, Tallahassee, and Douglas T. Squire, Assistant Attorney General, Daytona Beach, for Appellee. August 15, 2025 PER CURIAM. David Charles Sussman (“Appellant”) pro se appeals an order denying his postconviction motions.

We affirm this order without further discussion. This Court has previously reviewed and ruled upon multiple meritless and duplicative filings of Appellant stemming from this same case. Because it appears that Appellant’s filings are abusive, repetitive, malicious, or frivolous, Appellant is cautioned that any further pro se filings in this Court asserting claims stemming from Volusia County Circuit Court Case No. 2001-36686-CFAES may result in sanctions such as a bar on pro se filing in this Court.

See State v. Spencer, 751 So. 2d 47 (Fla. 1999); Lavender v. State, 6 So. 3d 713, 714 (Fla. 5th DCA 2009). AFFIRMED; APPELLANT CAUTIONED. WALLIS, LAMBERT, and KILBANE, JJ., concur. _____ Not final until disposition of any timely and authorized motion under Fla. R. App. P. 9.330 or 9.331. _____ 2