

THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA

Leticia Lopez v. Pedro Fernandez

No. 3D25-486 (Fla. 3d DCA July 23, 2025) · No. 3D25-486 · Decided July 23, 2025

OPINION

Leticia Lopez v. Pedro Fernandez

PER CURIAM.

Third District Court of Appeal State of Florida Opinion filed July 23, 2025. Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing. _____ No. 3D25-486 Lower Tribunal No. 19-13547-FC-04 _____ Leticia Lopez, Appellant, vs. Pedro Fernandez, Appellee. An Appeal from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County, Stacy D. Glick, Judge. Leticia Lopez, in proper person. Craig E. Weissberg, P.A., and Craig E. Weissberg, for appellee. Before FERNANDEZ, GORDO and LOBREE, JJ. PER CURIAM. Leticia Lopez, the mother, appeals from a final order granting a permanent injunction sought by the father Pedro Fernandez, for protection of their minor child. We have jurisdiction. See Art. V, § 4(b)(1), Fla. Const.; Fla. R. App. P. 9.130(a)(3)(B). We affirm. No transcripts were provided nor was any statement of the evidence or proceedings prepared pursuant to Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.200(b)(4), (5). Without an adequate record, we are limited to a review of the order entered by the lower court. See *Applegate v. Barnett Bank of Tallahassee*, 377 So. 2d 1150, 1152 (Fla. 1979) (“In appellate proceedings the decision of a trial court has the presumption of correctness and the burden is on the appellant to demonstrate error. . . . 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.”). The trial court’s findings were predicated upon the best interests of the child. Finding no legal error apparent on the face of the order, we affirm. See *Saenz v. Diaz*, 50 Fla. L. Weekly D1379, D1380 (Fla. 3d DCA June 25, 2025); *Sheikh v. Mughal-Sheikh*, 114 So. 3d 212, 213 (Fla. 5th DCA 2012). Affirmed. 2