Devo Seereeram, Ph.D., P.E.
5500 Alhambra Drive · Orlando, Florida 32808 · (407) 290-2371 · devo@devoeng.com

September 17, 2026 *By Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested*

Florida Judicial Qualifications Commission
Attention: Alexander J. Williams, Executive Director, and Jon Bielby, General Counsel
Post Office Box 14106
Tallahassee, Florida 32317

Re: Diana M. Tennis: complaint on two matters not previously before the Commission
Related: Docket No. 24-714; JQC Nos. 2024-714 and 2024-767; Supreme Court Case No. SC2025-1438

Dear Mr. Williams and Mr. Bielby:

I am the complainant in Docket No. 24-714. Judge Tennis left the bench on September 4, 2026. Enclosed is a signed complaint form on two matters that were not part of my original complaint, with the records supporting each.

Exhibit 1 concerns Diana M Tennis LLC. On June 16, 2026, while Judge Tennis was sitting and Case No. SC2025-1438 was pending before the Supreme Court, Electronic Articles of Organization for Diana M Tennis LLC were filed with the Division of Corporations. Article IV names Diana M Tennis, title "MGR," as the person authorized to manage the company. Eleven days after her last day, her Florida Bar profile listed that company as her firm, firm size one, firm position "Private Law Practice," and her section as Family Law, the division she had presided over. The memorandum sets out the records and quotes Canons 5D(3), 5D(1) and 5A.

Exhibit 2 concerns the motion to seal in my dissolution case. On August 12, 2024, I filed a motion asking Judge Tennis to disqualify herself, which placed the record of her political contributions in the public court file. Two hours and forty-five minutes later, opposing counsel moved to seal that filing "for the protection of the judicial branch." The next morning Judge Tennis entered one order: the motion to seal was "RESERVED FOR TRIAL," and my motion for reconsideration was "DENIED." Two days later she granted disqualification and the case was reassigned, so the reserved motion was never reached. The motions and the orders are attached.

Both exhibits are limited to the records and leave the conclusions to the Commission. The Commission has jurisdiction over allegations of misconduct before or during service where the complaint is made no later than one year following service. Art. V, § 12(a)(1), Fla. Const. If this file, or any part of it, goes to the Supreme Court or to The Florida Bar, I ask that these two matters go with it.

I would appreciate written confirmation that the complaint and enclosures were received, as the Commission provided on August 26, 2024.

Respectfully,

Devo Seereeram, Ph.D., P.E.

Enclosures: 62 pages, numbered at the lower right of each page, with an index at page 1
Complaint Against a Judge, signed September 17, 2026 (pages 2 to 5)
Exhibit 1. Memorandum on Diana M Tennis LLC, with Attachments A through E (pages 6 to 26)
Exhibit 2. Supplement on the motion to seal, with Exhibits A through E (pages 27 to 62)
cc: Warren W. Lindsey, Esq., Lindsey, Ferry & Parker, P.A., counsel for Judge Tennis, with enclosures

JQC DOCKET NO. 24-714

Index of Enclosures

Enclosures to the letter of September 17, 2026 from Devo Seereeram, Ph.D., P.E.

The enclosures are numbered consecutively at the lower right of each page, 1 to 62. Page numbers that appear within the court filings and other source documents are their own and were left as they are.

ENCLOSURE	PAGES
COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE, signed September 17, 2026	**2 to 5**
EXHIBIT 1. Diana M Tennis LLC	**6 to 26**
Memorandum	7 to 11
Attachment A. Electronic Articles of Organization, June 16, 2026	12 to 14
Attachment B. Order of the Supreme Court of Florida, June 25, 2026	15 to 17
Attachment C. Order of the Supreme Court of Florida, July 2, 2026	18 to 20
Attachment D. Notice to Court, July 31, 2026	21 to 23
Attachment E. The Florida Bar Member Profile, September 15, 2026	24 to 26
EXHIBIT 2. The Motion to Seal and the Order of August 13, 2024	**27 to 62**
Supplement to Complaint	28 to 30
Exhibit A. Final Motion for Reconsideration of Recusal of Judge Diana Tennis, August 12, 2024	31 to 49
Exhibit B. Motion to Seal Husband's Final Motion to Recuse Judge, August 12, 2024	50 to 54
Exhibit C. Order on Outstanding Pleadings, August 13, 2024	55 to 57
Exhibit D. Amended Order on Motion for Reconsideration Filed 8/12/2024, August 15, 2024	58 to 60
Exhibit E. Order of Reassignment for Unified Family Court (UFC), August 15, 2024	61 to 62

STATE OF FLORIDA
JUDICIAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMISSION
Post Office Box 14106
Tallahassee, Florida 32317
Tel: (850) 488-1581
www.floridajqc.com

FOR JQC USE ONLY

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

INSTRUCTIONS: This form is designed to provide the Commission with the information required to make an initial evaluation of your complaint and to begin any necessary inquiry or investigation into your allegations.

Please print or type your information onto this form. Any materials or documents that you provide to the Commission will become part of the Commission's files, and will not be returned or copied to you. The Commission will contact you if additional information or materials are needed.

After you complete this form, please sign and date the certification page, and mail it, along with any attachments, to Post Office Box 14106, Tallahassee, Florida 32317. Please be aware that the Commission cannot accept complaints by fax, email, or telephone. You will receive an acknowledgement letter when the Commission has received your complaint. The Commission meets approximately every six weeks, and reviews complaints on a first-come-first-served basis. You will be notified in writing of the outcome of your complaint, subject to the limits of confidentiality.

IMPORTANT: **The Judicial Qualifications Commission has no authority to review, reverse, or modify a judge's decision or order, and cannot intervene in any way in a court case.** Similarly, the Commission does not have the authority to remove a judge from your case. Commission staff is not permitted to provide you with any legal advice or opinions.

The Commission has jurisdiction over Justices of the Florida Supreme Court, and Judges of the District Courts of Appeal, County Courts, and Circuit Courts. The Commission does not have jurisdiction over special masters, magistrates, hearing officers (including: traffic hearing officers, worker's compensation hearing officers), administrative law judges, or federal judges.

YOUR CONTACT INFORMATION (Please print legibly)**:**

Name: Devanand (Devo) Seereeram, Ph.D., P.E. Phone Number: (407) 290-2371

Mailing Address: 5500 Alhambra Drive

City, State, Zip Code: Orlando, Florida 32808

JUDGE'S INFORMATION:

Judge's Name: Diana M. Tennis County: Orange

Address: P.O. Box 560523 (resigned from the bench September 4, 2026)

City, State, Zip Code: Orlando, Florida 32856

CASE INFORMATION

If your complaint involves a court case, please provide the following information.

Case Name: Seereeram v. Saith (Exhibit 2 only)

Case Number (include all letters and numbers): 2023-DR-004193-O

County: Orange

If you were represented by an attorney, please provide their contact information.

Attorney's Name: None - self-represented

Address: _____

City, State, Zip Code: _____

Phone: _____

WITNESS INFORMATION

In this section, provide the names and contact information for any other persons who may have witnessed the improper conduct. (Attach additional sheets if necessary).

1. Name: Hon. Lisa T. Munyon, Chief Judge

   Relationship to case: Ninth Judicial Circuit

   Phone number: (407) 836-2470

2. Name: _____

   Relationship to case: _____

   Phone: _____

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

Attach copies of any relevant documents which you believe support your claim that the judge has engaged in judicial misconduct or has a disability. Please do not staple or bind documents. **Retain the originals or copies of any documents submitted. All submitted materials become property of the Commission and will not be returned**.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Please provide, in as much detail as possible, the information you believe constitutes judicial misconduct or disability. Include names, dates, places, addresses, and telephone numbers which may assist the Commission. Attach additional pages as necessary.

I am the complainant in JQC Docket No. 24-714. This complaint concerns two matters that were not part of that complaint. Both are documented by the records enclosed with my transmittal letter of September 17, 2026, which accompanies this form.

1. BUSINESS FORMED WHILE SHE WAS ON THE BENCH. On June 16, 2026, while Judge Tennis was a sitting circuit judge and Supreme Court Case No. SC2025-1438 was pending, Electronic Articles of Organization for Diana M Tennis LLC were filed with the Florida Division of Corporations, Document No. L26000331341. Article IV names Diana M Tennis, title "MGR," as the person authorized to manage the company, and the articles carry the electronic signature "DIANA TENNIS." Article II gives the company's principal office as 815 N Magnolia Ave, 300, Orlando, which is the published address of a shared-office facility operated by IWORKSPACES, LLC; the state record lists two members of The Florida Bar as its managers, one of them the managing partner of a family law firm in the same building. On September 15, 2026, eleven days after her last day on the bench, her Florida Bar member profile listed Diana M Tennis LLC as her firm, firm size 1, firm position "Private Law Practice," and her section as Family Law. Judge Tennis presided over family law in the Ninth Judicial Circuit. Canons 5D(3), 5D(1) and 5A may apply. The records are Exhibit 1, Attachments A through E.

2. THE ORDER OF AUGUST 13, 2024. On August 12, 2024 at 9:48 a.m., in my dissolution case, Seereeram v. Saith, No. 2023-DR-004193-O, I filed pro se a motion asking Judge Tennis to disqualify herself, which placed the record of her political contributions in the public court file (Filing No. 204482114). Two hours and forty-five minutes later, counsel for the opposing party moved to seal that filing to "prevent public access and for the protection of the judicial branch" (Filing No. 204508525). At 10:53 a.m. the next morning, Judge Tennis entered one order in chambers, with no hearing noticed or held: "The Motion to Seal filed 8/12/2024 is RESERVED FOR TRIAL. The Motion for Reconsideration filed 8/12/2024 is DENIED." (Filing No. 204590429.) On August 15, 2024 at 12:23 p.m. she granted disqualification, and at 12:28 p.m. the case was reassigned to another division, so the reserved motion was never reached. Canons 1, 2A and 3E(1) may apply. The records are Exhibit 2, Exhibits A through E.

Judge Tennis left the bench on September 4, 2026. This complaint is made within one year following her service. Art. V, sec. 12(a)(1), Fla. Const.

IN FILING THIS COMPLAINT, I UNDERSTAND THAT FLORIDA LAW REQUIRES THAT COMPLAINTS FILED WITH THE COMMISSION MUST REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL, AND THAT ALL INQUIRIES BEFORE THE COMMISSION ARE CONFIDENTIAL, UNLESS AND UNTIL PROBABLE CAUSE IS DETERMINED AND FORMAL CHARGES ARE FILED.

UNDER THE PENALTY OF PERJURY, I declare that I have read and understand this complaint form, and the above information is true, correct, complete, and submitted of my own free will.

September 17, 2026

Date

Complainant's Signature

Please note that the Commission only has authority to investigate allegations of judicial misconduct or permanent disability by persons holding state judicial positions. The Commission has no jurisdiction over, and does not consider complaints against, Federal Judges, magistrates, law enforcement, clerks, court personnel, attorneys, etc.

The Commission does not act as an appellate court and cannot review, reverse or modify a decision or ruling made by a judge in the course of a court proceeding.

Please return the completed complaint form by regular US Mail, and direct all future communications, to:

Florida Judicial Qualifications Commission
Post Office Box 14106
Tallahassee, Florida 32317

ENCLOSURE TO LETTER OF SEPTEMBER 17, 2026
JQC DOCKET NO. 24-714

EXHIBIT

1

Diana M Tennis LLC

Memorandum with Attachments A through E

21 pages including this cover

Inquiry Concerning a Judge, Diana M. Tennis
JQC Nos. 2024-714 and 2024-767 · Supreme Court Case No. SC2025-1438

MEMORANDUM

Diana M Tennis LLC

A company formed on June 16, 2026, while Judge Tennis was on the bench

To: Florida Judicial Qualifications Commission

From: Devo Seereeram, Ph.D., P.E., complainant in Docket No. 24-714

Date: September 17, 2026

Re: Diana M. Tennis, Circuit Judge, Ninth Judicial Circuit (resigned September 2026). JQC Nos. 2024-714 and 2024-767; Supreme Court Case No. SC2025-1438.

1. Purpose

This memorandum collects the public records showing that Diana M Tennis LLC was formed on June 16, 2026, while Judge Tennis was a sitting circuit judge, with Judge Tennis named as its manager. It sets out what the records show and quotes the provisions of Canon 5 that may apply.

Attachments A through E are reproduced without change. Web sources are listed in Section 6 with their addresses.

2. Chronology from the records

Date	Record	Source
June 7, 2026	The .com registry record for the domain dianatennisresolutions.com shows a creation date of June 7, 2026, and Cloudflare, Inc. as registrar. The registry record does not name the registrant.	S1
June 16, 2026	Electronic Articles of Organization for Diana M Tennis LLC were filed with the Florida Division of Corporations (Document No. L26000331341), effective the same day. **Article IV names Diana M Tennis, title "MGR," P.O. Box 560523, Orlando, as the person authorized to manage the company.** Article II gives the principal office and mailing address as 815 N Magnolia Ave, 300, Orlando. Article III names Northwestern Registered Agent LLC of St. Petersburg as registered agent. The articles carry the electronic signature "DIANA TENNIS."	Att. A
June 25, 2026	In Case No. SC2025-1438, the Supreme Court rejected the parties' stipulation and stated that, in addition to the agreed public reprimand, it "would impose a fine."	Att. B
July 2, 2026	The Court vacated its June 25 order, again rejected the stipulation, and stated that, in addition to the agreed public reprimand, it "would impose a suspension and fine."	Att. C

Date	Record	Source
July 31, 2026	The Commission and Judge Tennis filed a joint Notice to Court stating that no agreement on the sanction had been reached and that "the matter will now return to the Commission." The certificate of service lists her as "Hon. Diana Tennis" at the "Orange County Courthouse."	Att. D
Sept. 4, 2026	Judge Tennis's last day on the bench. Central Florida Public Media reported on September 8 that a representative of the Ninth Circuit "confirmed by email that Friday was her last day."	S2
Sept. 15, 2026	The Florida Bar member profile for Diana Michelle Tennis (Bar No. 966703) showed: "Member of the Judiciary"; Judicial Position, Circuit Court; **Firm, Diana M Tennis LLC; Firm Size, 1; Firm Position, Private Law Practice; Sections, Family Law**; mail address P.O. Box 560523, Orlando; email diana@dianatennisresolutions.com; firm website www.dianatennisresolutions.com.	Att. E
Sept. 17, 2026	A public DNS lookup for dianatennisresolutions.com returns no address record, so the website listed on the Bar profile does not resolve.	S3

3. What the records show

Timing. The company was formed 80 days before Judge Tennis's last day on the bench, and Article IV names her as its manager. The domain later used for the company's website and email was created nine days before the company was formed. During this period the disciplinary case was open, and the July 31 notice still listed Judge Tennis at the Orange County Courthouse.

Nature of the business. By September 15, 2026, eleven days after her last day, the Bar profile gave Diana M Tennis LLC as her firm, a firm size of one, a firm position of "Private Law Practice," and her section as Family Law. The post office box on the Bar profile is the same one given for the manager in Article IV. Judge Tennis presided over family law in the Ninth Circuit.

The records do not state what services the business offers, and they do not show what the company did, if anything, between June 16 and September 4, 2026.

4. The Suite 300 address

The articles give 815 N Magnolia Ave, 300, Orlando, as both the principal office and the mailing address of the company. The second address line reads "300" without the word "Suite," and the ZIP code is 32802; I read "300" as the suite number. The Bar profile gives a post office box instead.

Suite 300 at 815 North Magnolia Avenue, ZIP code 32803, is the published address of iWorkspaces Orlando, which offers virtual business addresses, mail handling, a receptionist, and meeting rooms rented by the hour [S4, S5]. Its website lists a Standard Plan at $99 per month and, for members, a standard meeting room at $20 per hour [S4]. These are published prices, not evidence of what Judge Tennis

or her company purchased. The website describes the facility as "a community of lawyers and professionals" [S6].

The facility is operated by IWORKSPACES, LLC (Document No. L22000091744). The Division of Corporations lists Conti Moore and Andre Young as its managers and The Young Law Firm of Florida LLC as its registered agent; its 2026 annual report was filed on February 27, 2026 [S7]. The iWorkspaces website carries a statement from the owners signed "Conti Moore Smith & Andre T. Young" [S6]. Both names match Florida lawyers with offices in the same building:

Lawyer	Role at iWorkspaces	Practice
Conti J Moore Florida Bar No. 74892	The state record lists "Moore, Conti" as a manager. The website names "Conti Moore Smith" as an owner.	Managing Partner, Conti Moore Law Divorce Lawyers, PLLC, 815 N Magnolia Ave, Suite 100. Family Law Section. The firm handles divorce, child custody, child support and related family matters [S8, S9].
André Tylor Young Florida Bar No. 58030	The state record lists "Young, Andre" as a manager. The website names "Andre T. Young" as an owner.	Managing Partner, The Young Law Firm of Florida, 815 N Magnolia Ave, Suite 200. Business and real estate, probate, and wills, trusts and estates [S10, S11].

Two other law practices publish Suite 300 as their own office address: Artemis Family Law Group PLLC (Teris J. Deitsch and Paul Shafranski), whose practice areas include collaborative divorce, mediation, and contested and uncontested divorce [S12]; and Alcalde Legal (Stephanie N. Alcalde), family law and immigration law [S13].

These are examples, not a roster of everyone who uses the address, and a shared business address does not by itself show a relationship among the people who use it. The records do not show when any of these practices began using Suite 300, or whether Judge Tennis or her company has an agreement with iWorkspaces or has paid it anything.

5. Provisions of Canon 5 that may apply

Canon 5 of the Florida Code of Judicial Conduct is titled "A Judge Shall Regulate Extrajudicial Activities to Minimize the Risk of Conflict With Judicial Duties." The provisions below are quoted from the Code [S14].

Canon 5D(3)

> "A judge shall not serve as an officer, director, manager, general partner, advisor or employee of any business entity except that a judge may, subject to the requirements of this Code, manage and participate in: (a) a business closely held by the judge or members of the judge's family, or (b) a business entity primarily engaged in investment of the financial resources of the judge or members of the judge's family."

Article IV of the articles names Judge Tennis as the manager of the company from June 16, 2026, while she held judicial office. The Bar profile identifies the company as a private law practice in the Family Law Section, not as a family or investment business.

Canon 5D(1)

> "A judge shall not engage in financial and business dealings that (a) may reasonably be perceived to exploit the judge's judicial position, or (b) involve the judge in frequent transactions or continuing business relationships with those lawyers or other persons likely to come before the court on which the judge serves."

The company was named for the judge, and its address on the state filing is a facility operated by two members of the Bar, one of them the managing partner of a family law firm in the same building. Whether any dealings took place before September 4, 2026 is not shown by these records.

Canon 5A

> "A judge shall conduct all of the judge's extra-judicial activities so that they do not: (1) cast reasonable doubt on the judge's capacity to act impartially as a judge; (2) undermine the judge's independence, integrity, or impartiality; (3) demean the judicial office; (4) interfere with the proper performance of judicial duties; (5) lead to frequent disqualification of the judge; or (6) appear to a reasonable person to be coercive."

This is the general standard for the activity described in Sections 2 through 4.

6. Records that would answer the open questions

- The complete Division of Corporations file for Diana M Tennis LLC, including any amendments.
- The official record of the date Judge Tennis's judicial service ended.
- The dates on which the practice became public: the registrant and hosting records for dianatennisresolutions.com, the date the website first went live, and The Florida Bar's change history for the profile entries listing the company, the private practice designation, the email address and the website.
- Any agreement, invoices, payments or room bookings between Judge Tennis or her company and IWORKSPACES, LLC for June through September 2026.

7. Sources

Attachments (reproduced in full behind this memorandum)

Att. A Electronic Articles of Organization, Diana M Tennis LLC, Florida Division of Corporations, Document No. L26000331341, filed June 16, 2026.

Att. B Order, Supreme Court of Florida, Case No. SC2025-1438, June 25, 2026.

Att. C Order, Supreme Court of Florida, Case No. SC2025-1438, July 2, 2026.

Att. D Notice to Court, Case No. SC2025-1438, Filing No. 253725376, July 31, 2026.

Att. E The Florida Bar, member profile of Diana Michelle Tennis, Bar No. 966703, printed September 15, 2026.

Web sources (reviewed September 15 to 17, 2026)

S1 Verisign .com registry record (RDAP) for dianatennisresolutions.com: creation date June 7, 2026, 20:33:08 UTC; registrar Cloudflare, Inc. The same record can be viewed at lookup.icann.org.
https://rdap.verisign.com/com/v1/domain/dianatennisresolutions.com

S2 Central Florida Public Media, "Central Florida judge steps down amid political donation misconduct," by Sam Stockbridge, September 8, 2026.
https://www.cfpublic.org/politics/2026-09-08/diana-tennis-misconduct-resignation

S3 Public DNS lookup for dianatennisresolutions.com (address record), September 17, 2026: no address record returned.
https://dns.google/resolve?name=dianatennisresolutions.com&type=A

S4 iWorkspaces Orlando, "Our Facility" (address, reception and mail services, meeting rooms, plan prices).
https://iworkspacesorlando.com/our-facility/

S5 iWorkspaces Orlando, "Virtual Office Space."
https://iworkspacesorlando.com/virtual-office-space-orlando/

S6 iWorkspaces Orlando, home page (owners' statement; description of the community).
https://iworkspacesorlando.com/

S7 Florida Division of Corporations, IWORKSPACES, LLC, Document No. L22000091744 (filed February 9, 2022; status active), including the 2026 annual report filed February 27, 2026. Search by document number at search.sunbiz.org.

S8 The Florida Bar, member profile of Conti J Moore, Bar No. 74892.
https://www.floridabar.org/mybarprofile/74892

S9 Conti Moore Law, Orlando office page.
https://www.contimoorelaw.com/contact-us/orlando-family-law-office/

S10 The Florida Bar, member profile of André Tylor Young, Bar No. 58030.
https://www.floridabar.org/mybarprofile/58030

S11 The Young Law Firm of Florida, LLC, "About Us" and "Contact Us" pages.
https://younglawfl.com/about-us/

S12 Artemis Family Law Group PLLC, firm website.
https://artemisfamilylaw.com/

S13 Alcalde Legal, firm website.
https://www.alcaldelegal.com/

S14 Florida Code of Judicial Conduct, Canon 5, Florida Supreme Court website.
https://supremecourt.flcourts.gov/resources/jeac/Code-of-Judicial-Conduct/Canon-5

Submitted by **Devo Seereeram, Ph.D., P.E.**
5500 Alhambra Drive, Orlando, Florida 32808 · (407) 290-2371 · devo@devoeng.com

EXHIBIT 1

JQC DOCKET NO. 24-714

ATTACHMENT



Electronic Articles of Organization

Diana M Tennis LLC

Florida Division of Corporations, Document No. L26000331341

Filed June 16, 2026

2 pages, reproduced without change

Inquiry Concerning a Judge, Diana M. Tennis

JQC Nos. 2024-714 and 2024-767 · Supreme Court Case No. SC2025-1438

Electronic Articles of Organization
For
Florida Limited Liability Company

L26000331341
FILED 8:00 AM
June 16, 2026
Sec. Of State
mkanderson

Article I

The name of the Limited Liability Company is:

DIANA M TENNIS LLC

Article II

The street address of the principal office of the Limited Liability Company is:

815 N MAGNOLIA AVE
300
ORLANDO, FL. UN 32802

The mailing address of the Limited Liability Company is:

815 N MAGNOLIA AVE
300
ORLANDO, FL. UN 32802

Article III

The name and Florida street address of the registered agent is:

NORTHWESTERN REGISTERED AGENT LLC
7901 4TH ST N
300
ST. PETERSBURG, FL. 33702

Having been named as registered agent and to accept service of process for the above stated limited liability company at the place designated in this certificate, I hereby accept the appointment as registered agent and agree to act in this capacity. I further agree to comply with the provisions of all statutes relating to the proper and complete performance of my duties, and I am familiar with and accept the obligations of my position as registered agent.

Registered Agent Signature: TAYLOR NEWMAN

Article IV

L26000331341
FILED 8:00 AM
June 16, 2026
Sec. Of State
mkanderson

The name and address of person(s) authorized to manage LLC:

Title: MGR
DIANA M TENNIS
P.0. BOX 560523
ORLANDO, FL. 32856 UN

Article V

The effective date for this Limited Liability Company shall be:

06/16/2026

Signature of member or an authorized representative

Electronic Signature: DIANA TENNIS

I am the member or authorized representative submitting these Articles of Organization and affirm that the facts stated herein are true. I am aware that false information submitted in a document to the Department of State constitutes a third degree felony as provided for in s.817.155, F.S. I understand the requirement to file an annual report between January 1st and May 1st in the calendar year following formation of the LLC and every year thereafter to maintain "active" status.

EXHIBIT 1

JQC DOCKET NO. 24-714

ATTACHMENT

B

Order of the Supreme Court of Florida

Inquiry Concerning a Judge, Case No. SC2025-1438

June 25, 2026

2 pages, reproduced without change

Inquiry Concerning a Judge, Diana M. Tennis

JQC Nos. 2024-714 and 2024-767 · Supreme Court Case No. SC2025-1438

Supreme Court of Florida

THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 2026

Inquiry Concerning a Judge
JQC Nos. 2024-714, 2024-
767 re: Diana M. Tennis

SC2025-143

Upon consideration of the Judicial Qualifications Commission's Findings and Recommendations of Discipline and the parties' Stipulation, the Court rejects the Stipulation and disapproves the proposed sanction. In addition to the public reprimand agreed to in the Stipulation, the Court would impose a fine. Should the parties agree to the imposition of a fine in addition to a public reprimand, a revised Findings and Recommendations of Discipline and revised Stipulation should be filed with the Court within 30 days of the date of this order.

If the parties do not agree to these terms, the parties must inform the Court within 30 days that they have not reached an agreement. In that event, this case will be returned for a hearing before the Judicial Qualifications Commission.

MUÑIZ, C.J., and LABARGA, COURIEL, GROSSHANS, FRANCIS, and SASSO, JJ., concur.
TANENBAUM, J., dissents.

A True Copy
Test:

SC2025-1438 6/25/2026

John A. Tomasino
Clerk, Supreme Court

SC2025-1438 6/25/2026

VACATED

DL

Served:
Hugh Richard Brown
Gregory William Coleman
Warren William Lindsey
Hon. Lisa T. Munyon
Blan LeVasseur Teagle
Alexander John Williams

VACATED

EXHIBIT 1

JQC DOCKET NO. 24-714

ATTACHMENT

C

Order of the Supreme Court of Florida

Inquiry Concerning a Judge, Case No. SC2025-1438

July 2, 2026

2 pages, reproduced without change

Inquiry Concerning a Judge, Diana M. Tennis

JQC Nos. 2024-714 and 2024-767 · Supreme Court Case No. SC2025-1438

Supreme Court of Florida

THURSDAY, JULY 2, 2026

Inquiry Concerning a Judge
JQC Nos. 2024-714, 2024-767 re: Diana M. Tennis

SC2025-1438

The order of this Court issued June 25, 2026, is hereby vacated.

Upon consideration of the Judicial Qualifications Commission's Findings and Recommendations of Discipline and the parties' Stipulation, the Court rejects the Stipulation and disapproves the proposed sanction. In addition to the public reprimand agreed to in the Stipulation, the Court would impose a suspension and fine. Should the parties agree to the imposition of a suspension and fine in addition to a public reprimand, a revised Findings and Recommendations of Discipline and revised Stipulation should be filed with the Court within 30 days of the date of this order.

If the parties do not agree to these terms, the parties must inform the Court within 30 days of the date of this order that they have not reached an agreement. In that event, this case will be returned for a hearing before the Judicial Qualifications Commission.

COURIEL, C.J., and LABARGA, MUÑIZ, GROSSHANS, FRANCIS, and SASSO, JJ., concur.
TANENBAUM, J., dissents.

A True Copy
Test:

SC2025-1438 7/2/2026

John A. Tomasino
Clerk, Supreme Court

SC2025-1438 7/2/2026

DL

Served:
HUGH RICHARD BROWN
GREGORY WILLIAM COLEMAN
WARREN WILLIAM LINDSEY
HON. LISA T. MUNYON
BLAN LEVASSEUR TEAGLE
ALEXANDER JOHN WILLIAMS

EXHIBIT 1

JQC DOCKET NO. 24-714

ATTACHMENT

D

Notice to Court

Inquiry Concerning a Judge, Case No. SC2025-1438

Filing No. 253725376

July 31, 2026

2 pages, reproduced without change

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

INQUIRY CONCERNING A JUDGE, THE HONORABLE DIANA TENNIS
JQC NO. 2024-714 & 2024-767
_____ /

SC 25-1438

NOTICE TO COURT

The Judicial Qualifications Commission ("Commission") and Respondent Judge Diana Tennis, by and through the undersigned counsel, provide this notice to the Court, pursuant to the Court's order dated July 2, 2026, that an agreement as to the appropriate sanction has not been reached and the matter will now return to the Commission.

Respectfully submitted this 31st day of July, 2026.

THE FLORIDA JUDICIAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMISSION

By:_____
Jon Bielby
GENERAL COUNSEL
Florida Bar No. 1020684
PO Box 14106
Tallahassee, FL 32317
(850) 488-1581
jbielby@floridajqc.com

&

By: s/ Warren W. Lindsey
Warren W. Lindsey
Florida Bar No. 299111
warren@warrenlindseylaw.com
(407) 644-4044
Lindsey, Ferry & Parker, P.A.
PO Box 505
Winter Park, FL 32790-0505
COUNSEL FOR JUDGE TENNIS

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Notice to the Court has been furnished by electronic service this 31st day of July, 2026 to:

Hon. Diana Tennis
Orange County Courthouse
425 N. Orange Avenue
Orlando, Florida 32801

C/o Warren Lindsey, Esq.
Lindsey, Ferry & Parker, P.A.
Counsel for Judge Diana Tennis

_____

Jon Bielby
GENERAL COUNSEL

EXHIBIT 1

JQC DOCKET NO. 24-714

ATTACHMENT

E

The Florida Bar Member Profile

Diana Michelle Tennis, Bar No. 966703

Printed September 15, 2026

2 pages, reproduced without change

Inquiry Concerning a Judge, Diana M. Tennis

JQC Nos. 2024-714 and 2024-767 · Supreme Court Case No. SC2025-1438

MEMBER PROFILE

Diana Michelle Tennis

Member of the Judiciary



Bar Number:	966703
Mail Address:	Diana M Tennis LLC Po Box 560523 2860 Orlando, FL 32856 Office: **321-321-4551**
Email:	**diana@dianatennisresolutions.com**
Personal Bar URL:	https://www.floridabar.org/mybarprofile/966703
vCard:	
County:	Orange
Circuit:	09
Admitted:	11/20/1992
Judicial Position:	Circuit Court
10-Year Discipline History:	None
Law School:	University of Florida, Fredric G. Levin College of Law, 1992
Sections:	Family Law
Firm:	Diana M Tennis LLC
Firm Size:	1
Firm Position:	Private Law Practice
Firm Website:	**https://www.dianatennisresolutions.com**

The Find a Lawyer directory is provided as a public service. The Florida Bar maintains limited basic information about lawyers licensed to practice in the state (e.g., name, address, year of birth, gender, law schools attended, admission year). However, The Florida Bar allows individual attorneys the opportunity to add personal and professional information to the directory. The lawyer is solely responsible for reviewing and updating any additional information in the directory. The lawyer's added information is not reviewed by The Bar for accuracy and The Bar makes no warranty of any kind, express or implied. The Florida Bar, its Board of Governors, employees, and agents are not responsible for the accuracy of that additional information. Publication of lawyers' contact information in this listing does not mean the lawyers have agreed to receive unsolicited communications in any form. Unauthorized use of this data may result in civil or criminal penalties. The Find a Lawyer directory is not a lawyer referral service.

EXHIBIT

2

The Motion to Seal and the Order of August 13, 2024

Supplement to Complaint with Exhibits A through E

36 pages including this cover

Inquiry Concerning a Judge, Diana M. Tennis
JQC Nos. 2024-714 and 2024-767 · Supreme Court Case No. SC2025-1438

SUPPLEMENT TO COMPLAINT · DOCKET NO. 24-714

The Motion to Seal and the Order of August 13, 2024

Seereeram v. Saith, Case No. 2023-DR-004193-O, Ninth Judicial Circuit, Orange County

To: Florida Judicial Qualifications Commission

From: Devo Seereeram, Ph.D., P.E., complainant in Docket No. 24-714

Date: September 17, 2026

Re: Diana M. Tennis, Circuit Judge, Ninth Judicial Circuit (resigned September 2026). JQC Nos. 2024-714 and 2024-767; Supreme Court Case No. SC2025-1438.

1. Purpose

On August 12, 2024, opposing counsel in my dissolution case moved to seal the filing in which I had placed Judge Tennis's political contributions in the public court file. The next morning Judge Tennis ruled on that motion, reserving it for trial, in the same order in which she denied my motion for reconsideration of her disqualification. Neither the motion nor the order was part of my complaint in Docket No. 24-714, which dealt only with the contributions. This supplement puts them in the Commission's file. The filings and orders are attached as Exhibits A through E, as they appear on the Florida Courts E-Filing Portal; filing numbers and times are from the portal stamp at the top of each document.

2. Sequence of filings

Date and time	Filing No.	Event	Exhibit
Aug. 12, 2024 9:48 a.m.	204482114	I filed, pro se, a "Final Motion for Reconsideration of Recusal of Judge Diana Tennis ... Including Motion for Recusal Due to Canon 7 Violations." Pages 13 and 14 list 31 political contributions made in Judge Tennis's name between August 9 and November 16, 2020, 28 of them listing "State of Florida/Judge," and quote Canon 7.	A
Aug. 12, 2024 12:33 p.m.	204508525	Two hours and forty-five minutes later, counsel for the opposing party, Hal Roen, Esq. (Florida Bar No. 164797), filed a "Motion to Seal Husband's Final Motion to Recuse Judge Filed August 12, 2024."	B
Aug. 13, 2024 10:53 a.m.	204590429	Judge Tennis entered an "Order on Outstanding Pleadings" in chambers. It reserved the motion to seal for trial and denied my motion for reconsideration.	C
Aug. 15, 2024 morning		I delivered a letter about the contributions to Chief Judge Lisa T. Munyon. (Previously furnished to the Commission; not reproduced here.)	

Date and time	Filing No.	Event	Exhibit
Aug. 15, 2024 12:23 p.m.	204794462	Judge Tennis entered an "Amended Order on Motion for Reconsideration Filed 8/12/2024" reading: "The Motion for Reconsideration is GRANTED. The Motion for Disqualification is GRANTED. This case will be re-assigned."	D
Aug. 15, 2024 12:28 p.m.	204795117	An "Order of Reassignment for Unified Family Court (UFC)," signed "Diana M. Tennis" over the title "Administrative Judge," moved the case from Judge Tennis (Division 38) to Judge Michael Deen (Division 31).	E

A fuller search of Federal Election Commission records, which I furnished to the Commission later that month, showed 913 contributions totaling $29,154.76 between January 26, 2017, and January 31, 2021. The Commission's Findings and Recommendations of Discipline, filed in the Supreme Court on September 16, 2025, report more than 900 contributions totaling approximately $29,154.76.

3. The motion to seal (Exhibit B)

The motion asked that my filing be sealed so as to "prevent public access and for the protection of the judicial branch pursuant to the Rules of Judicial Administration 2.420 (c) (and all its subsections)." The footer on pages 2 through 4 of the motion reads "Motion to Protect Judiciary and to Seal Husband's Final Motion filed August 12."

The grounds stated in paragraphs 7 through 9 are that the filing was "irrelevant, disrespectful," an "unnecessary, unwarranted and shameless diatribe," and "a document full of irrelevant and mean-spirited allegations that attack one of our basic foundations of this society – the judiciary." The motion asked for an order "to protect the judiciary and the public by denying access to the Husband's Final Motion to Recuse."

The motion does not say which part of Rule 2.420(c) it relies on, does not cite a statute, and does not contain a certification that it is made in good faith and supported by a sound factual and legal basis.

4. The order of August 13, 2024 (Exhibit C)

The order states that the matter came "for consideration in Chambers" on "the pleadings and the court file." No hearing was noticed or held on either motion. The rulings read in full:

> "The Motion to Seal filed 8/12/2024 is RESERVED FOR TRIAL.
>
> The Motion for Reconsideration filed 8/12/2024 is DENIED."

The subject of the motion Judge Tennis reserved was the record of her own political contributions, and the motion she denied in the same instrument was my request that she step aside from the case containing that record. Two days later she granted disqualification and the case was reassigned to another division, so the reserved motion was never reached.

5. Rule 2.420

Motions to make trial court records confidential in noncriminal cases are governed by Rule 2.420(e), Florida Rules of General Practice and Judicial Administration, titled "Request to Determine Confidentiality of Trial Court Records in Noncriminal Cases." Two of its provisions are relevant here. The quotations are from the rule as amended in 2023 (Supreme Court Case No. SC2023-0014).

- Information that is the subject of such a motion "must be treated as confidential by the clerk pending the court's ruling on the motion."
- Unless the motion represents that all parties agree to the relief, "the court must, as soon as practicable but no later than 30 days after the filing of a motion under this subdivision, hold a hearing before ruling on the motion."

The August 13 order deferred the ruling to trial and set no hearing. How the clerk treated Filing #204482114 during that period, and for how long, will appear on the docket.

6. Provisions of the Code that may apply

> Canon 1: "A judge should participate in establishing, maintaining, and enforcing high standards of conduct, and shall personally observe those standards so that the integrity and independence of the judiciary may be preserved."
>
> Canon 2A: "A judge shall respect and comply with the law and shall act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary."
>
> Canon 3E(1): "A judge shall disqualify himself or herself in a proceeding in which the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned ..."

I submit the record so that the Commission can consider whether the order of August 13, 2024 was consistent with these provisions. That order acted on a motion to seal a filing about the judge's own conduct and, in the same instrument, denied reconsideration of her disqualification.

The Notice of Formal Charges, the Stipulation, and the Findings and Recommendations of Discipline, all filed in Case No. SC2025-1438 on September 16, 2025, address the contributions. They do not mention the motion to seal or the order of August 13, 2024.

7. Timing of this submission

I did not raise the motion to seal with the Commission in 2024. My letter to the Chief Judge and my complaint to the Commission dealt only with the contributions. I am submitting this record now so that the Commission's file is complete.

Submitted by **Devo Seereeram, Ph.D., P.E.**
5500 Alhambra Drive, Orlando, Florida 32808 · (407) 290-2371 · devo@devoeng.com

EXHIBIT 2

JQC DOCKET NO. 24-714

EXHIBIT



Final Motion for Reconsideration of Recusal of Judge Diana Tennis

Seereeram v. Saith, Case No. 2023-DR-004193-O

Filing No. 204482114

August 12, 2024

18 pages, reproduced without change

Inquiry Concerning a Judge, Diana M. Tennis

JQC Nos. 2024-714 and 2024-767 · Supreme Court Case No. SC2025-1438

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO. 2023-DR-004193-O

DEVANAND SEEREERAM,
COUNTER-RESPONDENT/PETITIONER,

V.

CHARMAINE SAITH,
COUNTER-PETITIONER/RESPONDENT.

FINAL MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF RECUSAL OF JUDGE DIANA TENNIS WITH ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION ADDRESSING THE "LEGAL INSUFFICIENCY" OF PREVIOUS MOTIONS, INCLUDING MOTION FOR RECUSAL DUE TO CANON 7 VIOLATIONS

INTRODUCTION ADDENDUM

This motion for reconsideration supplements the previous motions for recusal submitted in this case. The additional evidence and arguments presented are intended to reinforce and expand upon the substantial concerns previously raised, rather than to stand alone. This motion builds upon the primary documents submitted, addressing issues of bias, procedural errors, and conflicts of interest that, when considered cumulatively, strongly warrant Judge Tennis's recusal from this case.

PURPOSE OF THE MOTION

This motion is filed due to the denial of previous recusal motions, which were deemed "legally insufficient." The purpose is to provide additional context and documentation to substantiate the claim of bias and other concerns about Judge Tennis's ability to preside fairly over the case.

BACKGROUND

This section provides the background of the case, outlining the petitioner's reasons for seeking the recusal of Judge Diana M. Tennis. It also clarifies the relationship (or lack thereof) between the petitioner and Judge Tennis, emphasizing that the concerns raised are rooted in publicly available records and judicial decisions. The analysis presented here is not intended as a personal attack but as a legitimate and well-founded concern about the fairness and impartiality of the proceedings in this matter. The petitioner seeks to ensure that the trial is conducted in a manner that upholds the principles of justice and impartiality, free from any potential bias or conflict of interest.

PATHWAY TO BECOMING A DIVORCE JUDGE IN FLORIDA

Background

In Florida, most circuit court judges, including those handling family law and divorce cases, are elected by voters in nonpartisan elections. Judges serve six-year terms and must run for re-election if they wish to continue serving. When a vacancy occurs between elections due to retirement, resignation, or other reasons, the governor can appoint a judge to fill the vacancy until the next election. The appointee may also run in the next election to retain the seat.

The Judicial Nominating Commission (JNC) plays a crucial role in this process, vetting candidates and forwarding a shortlist to the governor for appointment. While this process ensures that candidates meet certain qualifications, it does not always guarantee that the broader electorate will be familiar with the appointed judge.

Moreover, Orlando's population has seen explosive growth since the mid-1980s, attracting many new residents who may not have long-term familiarity with local candidates. This demographic shift can result in voters making decisions without a deep understanding of the judicial candidates, further complicating the election of judges who hold significant authority in family and civil matters. As newer residents become a larger portion of the electorate, the influence of long-time residents—who may have deeper insights into the candidates—is diluted, leading to less informed voting decisions.

While Florida's system aims to balance merit-based selection with democratic accountability, these factors can lead to situations where judges, like Judge Tennis, hold significant power without broad public endorsement or recognition. This context is critical when considering the specific concerns raised about Judge Tennis's conduct and decision-making in this case.

Judges in the 9th Judicial Circuit Divorce Division:

Appointed Judges (by Governors):

- Michael Deen - Appointed by Governor Ron DeSantis
- Elizabeth Gibson - Appointed by Governor Ron DeSantis
- Craig A. McCarthy - Appointed by Governor Ron DeSantis

Elected Judges:

- Diana M. Tennis - Elected
- Elaine A. Barbour - Elected
- Mikaela Nix-Walker - Elected

Comparing to Other States:

In many other states, judges are elected in nonpartisan or partisan elections similar to Florida's process. However, some states use a merit-based selection system where a judicial nominating commission vets candidates, and the governor appoints a judge from the commission's recommendations. Judges may then face retention elections where voters decide whether to keep the judge in office.

The Missouri Plan is widely regarded as one of the most merit-based judicial selection systems. It focuses on selecting judges based on qualifications, experience, and ability rather than political affiliations or popular vote. Judges must undergo retention elections, where voters decide if they should continue serving, but these elections do not involve running against another candidate.

In contrast, Texas's system of partisan elections for judges is often criticized for being the least merit-based. Judges are elected based on their political party affiliation, and campaigns often involve significant fundraising, raising concerns about the influence of money and politics in judicial decisions. Judges must campaign and be re-elected, potentially pressuring them to align decisions with political supporters rather than purely legal merits.

2014 ELECTION RESULTS AND FINANCING

Judge Diana M. Tennis won her primary election on August 26, 2014 (Circuit 9 Group 32) with the following vote counts and percentages:

Vote Counts

- Diana Tennis: Orange County: 51,722 + Osceola County: 8,973 = 60,695 (43.91%)
- Patricia Strowbridge: Orange County: 47,418 + Osceola County: 10,360 = 57,778 (41.81%)
- No Selection (Undervotes): Orange County: 17,652 + Osceola County: 2,058 = 19,710 (14.27%)

Total Registered Voters for 2014:

- Orange County: 715,403
- Osceola County: 164,241
- Total: 879,644

Actual Representation Percentages:

- Diana Tennis: 6.90%
- Patricia Strowbridge: 6.57%
- No Selection (Undervotes): 2.24%

Judge Diana M. Tennis won her primary election on August 26, 2014, with support from 6.9% of the registered voter population in Orange County. This allowed her to assume significant authority over deeply personal and critical decisions affecting the lives and families of Orange County citizens—an authority that often surpasses even that of law enforcement. This level of authority is

particularly striking when compared to the overwhelming support Sheriff John Mina received in his 2020 election, where he garnered 95% of the vote.

It is essential to recognize that, as an elected judge, Judge Tennis has been granted legitimate legal authority by the electoral process. The comparison with Sheriff Mina's broader support is not intended to undermine her position or the legal system, but rather to highlight the importance of public trust and support when wielding such extensive judicial power.

This contrast becomes even more significant considering that the same governmental arm responsible for enforcing laws and issuing DUIs—such as the one Judge Tennis received—now operates under her judicial authority. While the legal system rightfully grants her the power to make decisions that can fundamentally alter the lives of those in her jurisdiction, particularly in matters of family and household, it is crucial to ensure that this power is exercised with broad public trust and accountability.

Campaign Contributions:

- Patricia Strowbridge raised $267,758.69 (Self-Funding: $226,600) with 51 unique contributors.
- Diana Tennis raised $190,271.41 (Self-Funding: $76,000) with 206 unique contributors.

Salary Information:

- Both Diana Tennis and Patricia Strowbridge have a current salary of $196,898.04. Governor Rick Scott appointed Strowbridge to the court on March 25, 2015, due to a retirement shortly after Diana Tennis started on January 5, 2015. Despite the significant time and money invested in campaigning, the efforts were ultimately unnecessary, as both candidates ended up on the bench. The Governor's appointment of the second candidate after the election demonstrated his implicit endorsement. Furthermore, the high costs of the campaigns were disproportionate to the annual salaries of the positions, raising questions about the value and necessity of the expenditure given the eventual outcome.

Endorsements:

- Diana Tennis's campaign included 296 endorsements (0.034% of the total registered voters) with the vast majority from attorneys in family law within her legal circle, but none from the general population.

JUDICIAL ANALYTICS

Caseload and Case Length

- Active Cases: Judge Tennis currently manages 1,370 active cases, which is 35.24% more than the average judge in her county. This significantly higher workload suggests that she is handling a large volume of cases at any given time, potentially leading to strain on her decision-making processes.
- Average Case Length: The average case in Judge Tennis's court remains pending for 746 days, which is 48.61% longer than the county average of 502 days. The extended case duration indicates possible inefficiencies or complexities in managing cases, potentially leading to frustrations among litigants and contributing to procedural errors.

Motion Grant Rates and Judicial Tendencies

Overall Grant Rate

Judge Tennis's overall motion grant rate is 59.65%, which is 8.61% higher than the county average of 54.92%. This suggests that she is slightly more inclined to grant motions compared to her peers, reflecting a judicial philosophy that may prioritize resolving issues through motions.

Detailed Motion Grant Rates

Motion for Reconsideration or Rehearing:
Grant Rate for All Cases: 17.5%
Comparison to County Average: 1.5% higher than the county's average grant rate of 16%.
Grant Rate for Plaintiffs (Petitioners): 10%
Grant Rate for Defendants (Respondents): 15.86%
Difference: The grant rate for Plaintiffs (Petitioners) is 36.95% lower than for Defendants (Respondents), suggesting potential bias or stricter scrutiny towards plaintiffs.

Motion for Temporary Restraining Order:
Grant Rate for All Cases: 82.86%
Comparison to County Average: 28.21% higher than the county's average grant rate of 64.63%.

Motion to Approve or Confirm Settlement:
Grant Rate for All Cases: 90%
Comparison to County Average: Equal to the county's average grant rate of 90%.

Motion to Be Relieved or Withdraw as Counsel:

Grant Rate for All Cases: 89.27%

Comparison to County Average: 0.52% higher than the county's average grant rate of 88.81%.

Motion to Dismiss:

Grant Rate for All Cases: 85.43%

Comparison to County Average: 21.11% higher than the county's average grant rate of 70.54%.

Motion to Strike Initial Pleading:

Grant Rate for All Cases: 63.64%

Comparison to County Average: 30.12% higher than the county's average grant rate of 48.91%.

Request for Judgment:

Grant Rate for All Cases: 89.34%

Comparison to County Average: 1.22% higher than the county's average grant rate of 88.26%.

Summary

- Plaintiff vs. Defendant Bias: The most significant discrepancy is in the Motion for Reconsideration or Rehearing, where the grant rate for Plaintiffs (Petitioners) is 36.95% lower than for Defendants (Respondents). This suggests a potential bias or stricter scrutiny towards plaintiffs. Notably, in this particular case, the grant rate for the petitioner (myself) stands at 0%, further highlighting a pattern of unfavorable rulings against plaintiffs.
- Overall Trends: Judge Tennis tends to have higher-than-average grant rates across most motion types, indicating a propensity to grant motions more often than her peers. However, motions filed by plaintiffs generally appear to face more challenges compared to those filed by defendants, particularly in reconsideration and rehearing motions.

APPELLATE RECORD AND REVERSALS

This section provides a non-exhaustive list of appellate cases (5th and 6th DCA) involving Judge Diana Tennis, highlighting patterns of judicial misconduct, bias, and procedural errors. The cases are categorized by their severity:

Most Egregious Cases:

Case: 5D18-2501 (Cynthia Torres v. Juan O. Gomez)
Outcome: Writ of Prohibition Granted
Date: September 14, 2018
Prevailing Attorney: Kyle D. Macomber
Summary: Judge Tennis was disqualified from the case due to perceived bias, undermining her role as an impartial arbiter. The writ was granted because the court found that the facts alleged were legally sufficient to cause a reasonable fear of not receiving a fair trial.

Case: 5D18-3354 (Erika Schwarz Wright v. John R. Wright)
Outcome: Writ of Prohibition Granted
Date: December 6, 2018
Prevailing Attorney: Shannon McLin Carlyle (The Carlyle Appellate Law Firm)
Summary: The DCA granted the writ after Judge Tennis made comments suggesting strategic advice to one party, raising concerns about bias. This led to serious questions about her impartiality in the case.

Case: 5D20-1667 (Juliette Nieves v. Christopher Guthrie)
Outcome: Writ of Prohibition Granted
Date: August 28, 2020
Prevailing Attorney: Scott E. Siverson
Summary: Judge Tennis was removed from the case due to a well-founded fear of bias. The DCA found that the petitioner's concern about not receiving a fair trial under Judge Tennis was legally sufficient to justify disqualification.

Case: 6D23-2180 (Timothy Temple v. Cheri Melchione)
Outcome: Writ of Prohibition Granted
Date: July 28, 2023
Prevailing Attorney: Hal Roen
Summary: The DCA found that Judge Tennis overstepped her jurisdiction, preventing her from taking further action on the child support claim. This decision highlighted significant judicial overreach on her part.

Case: 5D20-2350 (Jonathan Hernandez Velez v. Gloritza Lafontaine)
Outcome: Reversed and Remanded
Date: December 18, 2020
Prevailing Attorney: Christie L. Mitchell
Summary: The DCA reversed Judge Tennis's ruling due to significant procedural issues, particularly concerning the father's due process rights. The case was remanded for further proceedings to correct these issues.

Moderately Egregious Cases:

Case: 5D16-4270 (Harvey Lovejoy v. Delilah Dee Poole)
Outcome: Reversed and Remanded
Date: August 25, 2017
Prevailing Attorney: Matthew T. Wilson
Summary: The DCA reversed Judge Tennis's denial of a motion to enforce child support arrearages without a hearing, citing a significant procedural error. The case was remanded for further proceedings.

Case: 5D19-2354 (Bradley T. Pace v. Sharese M. Pace)
Outcome: Affirmed in Part, Reversed in Part
Date: January 24, 2020
Prevailing Attorney: Gary S. Israel
Summary: The DCA reversed contempt orders related to financial matters, finding that Judge Tennis improperly handled the appellant's financial situation. The case was sent back for reconsideration in light of the correct financial evidence.

Case: 5D19-2218 (Heidi Ziegler v. Hartmut Ziegler)
Outcome: Affirmed in Part, Reversed in Part
Date: January 3, 2020
Prevailing Attorney: Kyle D. Macomber
Summary: The DCA reversed the award of attorney's fees due to improper justification under the statutory provision, reflecting concerns about the fairness of the financial burden imposed by Judge Tennis.

Case: 5D18-609 (Kevin Carter v. Deborah Hart)
Outcome: Affirmed in Part, Reversed in Part
Date: September 21, 2018
Prevailing Attorney: Erin E. Morse
Summary: The DCA reversed the purge amount set for civil contempt, finding that Judge Tennis relied on incorrect evidence. The case was remanded to reassess the financial obligations based on accurate information.

Case: 5D21-1774 (Arnold Gene Graham v. Alexandra Jean Graham and Joshua Denny)
Outcome: Reversed with instructions to vacate the lower court's orders and reinstate the March 2, 2020, final order of dismissal.
Date: February 4, 2022
Prevailing Attorney: Scott E. Siverson
Summary: The appellate court found that Judge Tennis acted without jurisdiction by entering orders after the case had been dismissed in its entirety. The court ruled that once the case was dismissed, it constituted a final judgment, and without a timely motion for rehearing, the trial court lost its jurisdiction. This led to the reversal of Judge Tennis's orders, further highlighting a significant procedural error.

Case: 5D20-536 (Rajeev Gupta v. Shaily Gupta)
Outcome: Affirmed in part, Reversed in part, Dismissed in part, and Remanded with instructions.
Date: October 1, 2021
Prevailing Attorney: Richard P. Spence
Summary: The appellate court found several errors in Judge Tennis's rulings regarding the distribution of assets and the calculation of the Former Husband's income. Specifically, the court reversed the imputation of in-kind income due to a lack of competent, substantial evidence and identified errors in the valuation of certain assets and liabilities. The case was remanded for further proceedings to correct these issues, underscoring significant procedural and evidentiary oversights.

Case: 6D23-1141/6D23-1146 (Syed Imran Ali v. Salsabeel A. Khan)
Outcome: Affirmed in part; Reversed and Remanded in part.
Date: September 1, 2023
Prevailing Attorney: John N. Bogdanoff (for the appellant)
Summary: The appellate court affirmed Judge Tennis's decisions on denying supplemental petitions for modification of alimony, child support, and timesharing, finding them supported by substantial evidence. However, the court reversed her ruling on awarding attorney's fees to Khan, stating that Judge Tennis failed to properly consider the financial resources of both parties as required under Florida law. The case was remanded for reconsideration of the attorney's fees, highlighting a significant oversight in her judicial process.

Less Severe Cases:

5D17-1709 (David D. Holloway v. Johna Holloway)
Outcome: Affirmed in Part, Reversed in Part
Date: October 27, 2017
Prevailing Attorney: Kevin M. Wells
Summary: The DCA reversed the award of attorney's fees due to the financial positions of both parties being similar, indicating that the award was unjustified. The case was remanded for further proceedings consistent with this finding.

5D17-1717 (Bryant Woelk v. Vickie Woelk)
Outcome: Affirmed in Part, Reversed in Part, and Remanded
Date: September 29, 2017
Prevailing Attorney: Dennis J. Wall
Summary: The DCA required clearer findings on alimony and child support, reversing part of the financial rulings due to lack of clarity. The case was remanded for additional fact-finding and proper documentation.

6D23-1415 (Louis Roman Orosco v. Miguel A. Rodriguez and Brittany Nicole Diehl)
Outcome: Reversed
Date: April 14, 2023
Prevailing Attorney: Andrew T. Windle
Summary: The DCA reversed Judge Tennis's ruling, determining that a non-biological father did not have standing to challenge the presumption of legitimacy. This case primarily involved a legal interpretation rather than procedural or bias issues.

SPECIFIC CONCERNS

Impact of High Caseload and Lengthy Case Durations

- Judicial Performance Under Strain: The significant volume of cases and extended case durations on Judge Tennis's docket appear to correlate with an increased incidence of procedural shortcuts and errors. As evidenced by multiple appellate reversals, the strain of managing a high caseload may contribute to decisions that lack the necessary thoroughness or fairness. This strain likely exacerbates the already evident issues with bias and procedural mishandling, further undermining confidence in her rulings.

- Potential Bias and Fairness: The observed low grant rate for motions, particularly those filed by petitioners like Devanand Seereeram, reflects a potential bias or a tendency to scrutinize plaintiff filings more strictly. This issue is compounded by the complexity of her docket, where overburdening could lead to rushed judgments and a perceived lack of impartiality. Specifically, Devanand Seereeram's grant rate of 0.0% starkly illustrates this concern, raising serious questions about the fairness of the proceedings under Judge Tennis.

DOING ATTORNEY WORK WHILE SERVING AS A JUDGE

Case Background: The document titled "Release and Satisfaction of Attorney's Charging Lien" was filed by Diana M. Tennis on February 22, 2021. This document shows that Judge Tennis, while serving as a judge, was finalizing a financial matter related to a case from her time in private practice.

Filing as a Judge: Despite having withdrawn from the case years earlier, Diana Tennis filed the satisfaction of the lien in 2021 while serving as a judge in the same court where the original case was handled.

Potential Conflict of Interest: The fact that Judge Tennis was involved in finalizing financial matters related to a case from her time as an attorney while serving as a judge in the same jurisdiction could raise concerns about potential conflicts of interest or ethical issues. This is particularly relevant if she had any ongoing involvement in cases with similar parties or legal issues.

CONCERNS ABOUT FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND ETHICAL INTEGRITY

Does Not Pay Bills - College

May 1, 1990: Arrest date for a worthless check (<$150) in Gainesville.
October 5, 1990: Charges filed for the worthless check.
October 26, 1990: Booked in jail on the worthless check charge.
November 15, 1991: Nolle Prosequi on the bad check; leaves school shortly after.

Does Not Pay Bills - Private Practice

Tax Liens Issued Against Law Office of Diana M. Tennis:
- Lien #1: August 27, 2002; $195.00; February 3, 2003; Lien Number: 02-53876
- Lien #2: December 14, 2002; $241.21; February 24, 2003; Lien Number: 02-97557
- Lien #3: January 9, 2003; $216.24; February 24, 2003; Lien Number: 02-97557
- Lien #4: February 8, 2003; $241.21; February 24, 2003; Lien Number: 02-97557

Bad Debt in Business

Case: R.H. Donnelley Publishing & Advertising Inc. v. Diana M. Tennis
Date: July 16, 2004
Issue: Settlement agreement requiring Diana Tennis to pay $15,466.63 for unpaid advertising debt.

Case: Reed Elsevier Inc. d/b/a Martindale-Hubbell v. Law Office of Diana M. Tennis P.A.
Date: April 25, 2005
Issue: A stipulation for payments was reached for an outstanding debt of $6,709.88 owed to Martindale-Hubbell. The agreement required monthly payments until the debt was fully satisfied.

These financial obligations and legal issues from her time in private practice reflect potential financial mismanagement, relevant to assessing her current judicial conduct.

Financial Mismanagement and Decision-Making

Judge Tennis's documented history of financial mismanagement, including unpaid debts, tax liens, and aggressive collection tactics against her former clients, raises significant concerns about her ability to impartially and effectively manage financial bifurcation in divorce cases. Given her own struggles with managing personal and professional finances, it is questionable whether she is equipped to fairly and competently decide how others should allocate their financial resources during a divorce. This issue is especially troubling in cases where financial decisions have long-lasting impacts on the parties involved.

DUI Incident Legal Proceedings and Exploitation of Legal Strategies

Incident Details:
Date: December 2, 2001 (Arrest); January 14, 2003 (Writ Denial); March 2004 (Case Dismissal)
Issue: Arrested for DUI with a breath alcohol content of .185 and .182. Despite the strong evidence against her, Judge Tennis successfully had the DUI charges dismissed in March 2004 on a technicality related to breathalyzer equipment and procedural errors.

Exploitation of DUI Appeal Strategy for Personal Gain:
Judge Tennis has since leveraged this legal victory by applying similar strategies to defend others in her circle, focusing on exploiting procedural technicalities rather than addressing the substantive justice of each case. This pattern raises significant concerns about her broader judicial philosophy, suggesting a preference for procedural maneuvering over the fair and equitable application of the law. Such an approach, when employed by a judge, could undermine public confidence in her ability to deliver impartial and just decisions, particularly in cases where the stakes are high and the outcomes deeply impact the lives of those involved.

Pattern of Traffic Violations and Legal Infractions

Judge Tennis has a documented history of multiple traffic violations, including a ticket as recently as 2020. This ongoing pattern of legal infractions raises significant concerns about her respect for the rule of law, which is particularly troubling for someone in a judicial role responsible for upholding these very standards. Such repeated offenses suggest a casual attitude toward legal compliance, which could reflect poorly on her ability to impartially enforce the law and maintain the high ethical standards expected of a judge.

Disguised Political Contributions and Transparency Concerns

According to online election campaign documents, Judge Tennis's net worth as of December 31, 2019, was reported to be $2,661,200. Notably, her campaign treasurer, who is also her husband, made significant contributions (210 discrete donations) to ActBlue or similar, a platform known for supporting Democratic causes. The judge herself made 31 contributions ($1450 total) and here is the detailed list with the exact name she used:

1. Summary of Contributions by Diana Tennis
    Number of Contributions: 31 (28 of them have the word “State of Florida/Judge”
    Date Range: August 9, 2020 - November 16, 2020
    Total Contributed: $4,421
    Organizations:
        ActBlue: 8 contributions, Biden for President: 12 contributions
        DCCC: 3 contributions, Ditch Fund: 8 contributions
        Emily’s List: 3 contributions, Let America Vote PAC: 5 contributions
        The Democratic Coalition: 1 contribution

2. Summary of Contributions by Michael Cybrynski
    Number of Contributions: 210
    Date Range: April 5, 2020 - November 15, 2020
    Total Contributed: $7,871
    Organizations:
        ActBlue: 128 contributions, Biden for President: 48 contributions
        DNC Services Corp/Democratic National Committee: 14 contributions
        DCCC: 5 contributions, Let America Vote PAC: 11 contributions
        Emily's List: 5 contributions, Biden Victory Fund: 2 contributions
        Jaime Harrison for US Senate: 3 contributions,
        Amy McGrath for Senate: 1 contribution

Per Canon 7 of the Florida Code of Judicial Conduct, Judge Diana Tennis has engaged in multiple violations by making 31 contributions to partisan political campaigns, primarily through ActBlue, while listing her judicial title as "DIANA TENNIS (STATE OF FLORIDA/JUDGE)." This is particularly concerning given the recent precedent set in the 2019 case of Judge Ernest Kollra, where the Florida Supreme Court issued a public reprimand for similar violations.

These actions, coupled with the significant volume of contributions made by her husband, Michael Cybrynski, who served as her campaign treasurer and manager, raise serious concerns about the impartiality and integrity of the judicial process. This motion, supported by the detailed analysis of contributions, is being submitted to ensure the preservation of an unbiased judicial system. Additionally, this matter is being referred to the Florida Judicial Qualifications Commission (JQC) for further investigation.

Canon 7: A Judge or Candidate for Judicial Office Shall Refrain From Inappropriate Political Activity

A. All Judges and Candidates

(1) Except as authorized in Sections 7B(2), 7C(2), and 7C(3), a judge or a candidate for election or appointment to judicial office shall not:

(a) act as a leader or hold an office in a political organization;

(b) publicly endorse or publicly oppose another candidate for public office;

(c) make speeches on behalf of a political organization;

(d) attend political party functions; or

(e) solicit funds for, pay an assessment to, or make a contribution to a political organization or candidate, or purchase tickets for political party dinners or other functions.

Aggressive Collection Tactics in Private Practice

Judge Tennis has demonstrated a history of aggressively pursuing payments from clients during her time in private practice, often resorting to filing liens and forcing property sales to recover unpaid fees. These tactics highlight a pattern of behavior that raises ethical concerns, particularly in light of her current role as a judge, where fairness and impartiality are paramount.

Case: James Walk

Details: Judge Tennis represented James Walk in a domestic violence case in March 1995. When Walk was unable to pay the legal fees, Judge Tennis filed a lien on his property. This aggressive collection tactic ultimately led to the forced sale of Walk's property in 1999, allowing her to collect $39,315.55.

Case: Melissa Brindle

Details: Judge Tennis represented Melissa Brindle in a family law matter. When Brindle was unable to pay the legal fees, Judge Tennis similarly filed a lien against Brindle's property. The persistent collection efforts that followed placed significant financial strain on Brindle, who was eventually forced to sell her property to satisfy the debt.

These examples illustrate a pattern of behavior in which Judge Tennis prioritized aggressive financial recovery over the well-being of her clients. This conduct raises questions about her judgment and approach to justice, particularly in her current capacity as a judge overseeing cases that involve financial disputes and vulnerable parties.

Financial Struggles and the Pursuit of Judicial Stability

In a recent interview, Judge Tennis candidly acknowledged that her private legal practice faced significant challenges, ultimately failing due to financial pressures and her lack of business acumen. This financial struggle played a key role in her decision to pursue a judicial role, seeking the stability that comes with a government position. While seeking a stable career is understandable, this context raises questions about her motivations and whether her financial difficulties may influence her decisions on the bench, particularly in cases involving complex financial matters.

Ambition for Media Exposure and Potential Conflicts with Judicial Duties

Media Ambitions:
In Episode 46 of the "Open Ninth" podcast, Judge Tennis openly expressed her interest in becoming a television judge, drawing a comparison to the widely recognized Judge Judy. This ambition for a high-profile media role suggests that her focus may be influenced by opportunities for public exposure, potentially conflicting with her responsibilities to remain an impartial and objective judicial officer.

High-Profile Case Commentary:
Judge Tennis has actively sought media attention through her commentary on several high-profile legal cases, including the globally followed Casey Anthony trial, the Zimmerman case, and other Orlando-based legal dramas. These cases garnered substantial public and media interest, and Judge Tennis used these platforms to elevate her public profile. While such media engagements might be seen as enhancing public understanding of legal issues, they also raise concerns about whether her judicial decisions might be swayed by a desire for further media exposure.

Debate and Resume Highlight:
During her debate with another judicial candidate, Judge Tennis prominently highlighted her media appearances and commentary on these high-profile cases as a significant credential in her resume. She positioned her involvement in these televised trials as a key qualification for her judicial ambitions, further underscoring her desire for public recognition. This emphasis on media presence raises questions about whether her role as a judge is influenced more by the pursuit of public and media opportunities than by a steadfast commitment to impartial justice.

UNEVEN ETHICAL STANDARDS PLAGUE THE PROFESSION

While significant concerns have been raised regarding Judge Tennis's actions and motivations, there remains a beacon of hope within the legal profession. The first attorney my wife approached for her divorce was Andrew Windle, a well-regarded attorney and member of the Central Florida Family Law Inn. After accepting a $10,400 retainer to represent her, Mr. Windle ultimately refused to proceed with the case, recognizing the ethical complexities involved.

Mr. Windle's principled decision to step away stands in stark contrast to the approach taken by my wife's current attorney, who has not demonstrated the same level of professional integrity. This stark comparison highlights the uneven ethical standards within the legal profession and raises further questions about the influences and relationships that could affect impartiality in this case.

POTENTIAL CONFLICTS AND JUDICIAL OVERREACH

In the case 6D23-2180 (Timothy Temple v. Cheri Melchione), the District Court of Appeal (DCA) granted a writ of prohibition on July 28, 2023, determining that Judge Tennis had overstepped her jurisdiction by taking further action on a child support claim. This ruling highlighted significant judicial overreach and could have seriously impacted her professional reputation. The decision serves as a substantial rebuke, calling into question her adherence to judicial boundaries.

While attorney Andrew Windle also succeeded in having the DCA overturn one of Judge Tennis's decisions, his case resulted in a routine correction rather than a substantial challenge to her judicial conduct. In stark contrast, the ruling elicited by Hal Roen—who is now representing my wife—was a more severe reprimand, directly addressing Judge Tennis's overreach and questioning her ability to remain within the limits of her authority. Roen is fully aware of Judge Tennis's history of stepping outside these boundaries, which only intensifies the potential for conflict and bias in the current proceedings.

Given the outcome of this case and the professional implications for Judge Tennis, there is a legitimate concern that she may feel challenged or even threatened by Mr. Roen's involvement in this matter. This potential dynamic raises serious doubts about her ability to remain impartial and fair in overseeing this case.

RECAP OF JUDICIAL CONCERNS

Judge Diana M. Tennis's track record presents significant concerns regarding her ability to serve as an impartial and fair judge in this case. The documented evidence reveals multiple instances of appellate reversals, perceived bias, procedural errors, and questionable financial management, both during her tenure in private practice and in her current judicial role.

The most egregious cases, where writs of prohibition were granted, highlight a troubling pattern of behavior that calls her impartiality into question. The moderately egregious cases reflect consistent procedural errors, particularly in financial matters, which suggest a lack of thoroughness in her judicial approach. Even the less severe cases demonstrate a concerning trend of reversals, indicating ongoing issues with legal interpretation and application.

Further concerns arise from Judge Tennis's high caseload and lengthy case durations, which may contribute to rushed decisions and procedural shortcuts, ultimately leading to unfair outcomes. The low grant rate for motions filed by petitioners, particularly for reconsideration or rehearing, suggests potential bias or an unequal standard of scrutiny applied to different parties.

Additionally, Judge Tennis's history of financial mismanagement, including unpaid debts and aggressive collection tactics against her clients, raises serious questions about her character and integrity. Her involvement in attorney work while serving as a judge presents potential conflicts of interest, especially when finalizing matters related to her private practice while on the bench. Her legal strategy to fight DUI charges, which she has since employed to defend others, further demonstrates a focus on technicalities rather than substantive justice, undermining confidence in her judicial philosophy.

Finally, Judge Tennis's ambition for media exposure and expressed interest in becoming a television judge suggest a desire for public attention that may conflict with her duties as an impartial and serious judicial officer. This pursuit of media prominence could distract from her primary role as a fair and unbiased adjudicator.

Given this substantial body of evidence, there is a well-founded concern that Judge Tennis cannot provide the fair and impartial trial that every litigant deserves. Therefore, the motion for recusal is justified and necessary to ensure that justice is served without bias or the appearance of impropriety.

CONCLUSION ADDENDUM

The concerns and evidence detailed in this motion are intended to supplement and reinforce the arguments presented in the previous filings. When considered alongside the earlier motions for recusal, they collectively paint a comprehensive picture of the substantial and reasonable doubt surrounding Judge Tennis's ability to preside impartially in this matter. Notably, in this case, the petitioner has experienced a 0% grant rate, which further highlights the potential bias and the need for judicial impartiality. It is within this broader context that we respectfully reiterate the request for her recusal, ensuring that the trial proceeds with the fairness and justice that every litigant deserves.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

For the reasons stated above, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court disqualify Judge Diana M. Tennis from presiding over this case due to the substantial concerns regarding her impartiality, procedural conduct, and overall fitness to serve in this matter.

Respectfully,



Devanand (Devo) Seereeram
Petitioner/Husband, Pro Se
5500 Alhambra Drive
Orlando, FL 32808
(407) 290-2371
devo@devoeng.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing has been furnished via the Clerk of the Court by using Florida Court's E-Filing Portal system which will send notice of electronic filing and complete service of the foregoing as required by Florida Rules of General Practice and Judicial Administration to: Hal Roen, Esq., Attorney for Respondent at hal@halroenlaw.com on August 12, 2024.



Devanand (Devo) Seereeram
Petitioner/Husband, Pro Se
5500 Alhambra Drive
Orlando, FL 32808
(407) 290-2371
devo@devoeng.com

EXHIBIT 2

JQC DOCKET NO. 24-714

EXHIBIT

B

Motion to Seal Husband's Final Motion to Recuse Judge

Seereeram v. Saith, Case No. 2023-DR-004193-O

Filing No. 204508525

August 12, 2024

4 pages, reproduced without change

Inquiry Concerning a Judge, Diana M. Tennis

JQC Nos. 2024-714 and 2024-767 · Supreme Court Case No. SC2025-1438

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO.: 2023-DR-004193-O

IN RE: THE MARRIAGE OF:

DEVANAND SEEREERAM,
Petitioner/Husband,

and

CHARMAINE SAITH,
Respondent/Wife,

CHARMAINE SAITH,
Counter-Petitioner,
vs.

DEVO SEEREERAM, PhD, P.E. LLC. and
SAITH-SEEREERAM FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST,
Counter-Respondents.
_____/

MOTION TO SEAL HUSBAND'S
FINAL MOTION TO RECUSE JUDGE FILED AUGUST 12, 2024

COMES NOW Counsel for Respondent/Wife, HAL ROEN, Esquire, and as an officer of the Court, files this Motion to have the Husband's Final Motion For Reconsideration of Recusal of Judge Diana Tennis With Additional Supporting Documentation Addressing The "Legal Insufficiency" of Previous Motions, Including Motion for Recusal Due to Cannon 7 Violations to be sealed, or so at to prevent public access and for the protection of the judicial branch pursuant to the Rules of Judicial Administration 2.420 (c) (and all its subsections), and for the entry of an

order restricting and keeping from the public from accessing said document. As grounds for said Motion it needs to be shown:

1. Husband, irrespective of having the financial wherewithal, has chosen to represent himself.

2. Husband is a very well-educated individual having been awarded a PhD. degree.

3. Husband has already complained about the below-signed to the Florida Bar. (Before the below-signed was aware of the complaint against him, the Bar dismissed that complaint. Husband has indicated that he has already begun the drafting of another complaint to be filed against the below-signed. (Sadly, there is nothing that the below-signed can do until that complaint is filed).

4. Because Husband does not get his way, because he feels he has been wronged, Husband attacks and will go at any lengths he feels necessary to include Husband has reported his Wife as a domestic terrorist to the FBI resulting in her being arrested, and when that case was closed and did go to his liking, he did it again; Husband unilaterally removed Wife from their trust until this Court ordered him to restore her status in the trust; Husband has attacked Wife's attorney by complaining about him to the Bar; and Husband has now filed numerous motions against this Court; among many other attacks Husband has taken against Wife.

5. In Husband's seeking to have this Trial Judge disqualified, and when that request was denied in that it was and is legally insufficient, now

Husband has filed his renewed motion for the Judge's recusal.

6. Were it not for the protections of filings in legal proceedings to be beyond a person being held responsible for defamation and spewing false and venomous statements, he otherwise would be subjecting himself to a civil suit for damages.

7. On this date, Husband has filed and put into a public record a document full of irrelevant and mean-spirited allegations that attack one of our basic foundations of this society – the judiciary.

8. Husband's displeasure does not permit, nor should it allow this unnecessary, unwarranted and shameless diatribe to be available to anyone who may seek some titillating reading.

9. Husband's filing is irrelevant, disrespectful, and accomplishes nothing more than his displeasure and mere venting. There is no need to have the judicial system lowered to his childish and boorish conduct. No good will come to anyone to allow this pleading to remain available for viewing by anyone who should choose to read it.

WHEREFORE it is sought for an order from this Court be entered to protect the judiciary and the public by denying access to the Husband's Final Motion to Recuse, etc. filed on August 12, 2024. An order sealing same should be entered and access to said Motion should only be allowed upon proper court authority.

/s/Hal Roen
HAL ROEN
HAL ROEN, P.A.
100 Sybelia Lane
Suite 355
Maitland, Florida 32751
(407) 628-1199
Fax: (407) 628-8638
Florida Bar No.: 164797
hal@halroenlaw.com
jessica@halroenlaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was furnished by E-Mail this 12th day of August, 2024 to: DEVANAND SEEREERAM, *pro se*; 4775 Lincoln Avenue, Orlando, 32819; devo@devoeng.com.

/s/Hal Roen
HAL ROEN
HAL ROEN, P.A.
100 Sybelia Lane
Suite 355
Maitland, Florida 32751
(407) 628-1199
Fax: (407) 628-8638
Florida Bar No.: 164797
hal@halroenlaw.com
jessica@halroenlaw.com

EXHIBIT 2

JQC DOCKET NO. 24-714

EXHIBIT



Order on Outstanding Pleadings

Seereeram v. Saith, Case No. 2023-DR-004193-O

Filing No. 204590429

August 13, 2024

2 pages, reproduced without change

Inquiry Concerning a Judge, Diana M. Tennis

JQC Nos. 2024-714 and 2024-767 · Supreme Court Case No. SC2025-1438

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, IN AND
FOR ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO: 2023-DR-004193-O
DIVISION: 38

DEVANAND SEEREERAM,
Petitioner,

-vs-

CHARMAINE SAITH,
Respondent.
_____/

ORDER ON OUTSTANDING PLEADINGS

THIS CAUSE having come for consideration in Chambers and the Court having reviewed the pleadings and the court file:

It is hereby **ORDERED,**

The Motion to Seal filed 8/12/2024 is RESERVED FOR TRIAL.

The Motion for Reconsideration filed 8/12/2024 is DENIED.

DONE AND ORDERED at Orlando, Florida on this 13th day of August, 2024.

Diana M. Tennis

_____
Judge Diana M. Tennis
Circuit Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that this Order was filed with the Clerk of the Court by using the Florida Courts E-Filing Portal System. A copy is being served on all attorney(s) and parties identified on the ePortal Electronic Service List, via Notices of Electronic Filing generated by the ePortal System. This Order has been furnished to parties via their attorney of record, and, if none, then by Regular U.S. Mail to the addresses below on this 13th day of August, 2024.

DEVANAND SEEREERAM, 5500 ALHAMBRA DR, ORLANDO, FL 32808; devo@devoeng.com

CHARMAINE SAITH, via counsel

HARRY L ROEN Esquire Via e-portal

Elizabeth Diaz, Judicial Assistant to Judge Diana Tennis

EXHIBIT 2

JQC DOCKET NO. 24-714

EXHIBIT

D

Amended Order on Motion for Reconsideration Filed 8/12/2024

Seereeram v. Saith, Case No. 2023-DR-004193-O

Filing No. 204794462

August 15, 2024

2 pages, reproduced without change

Inquiry Concerning a Judge, Diana M. Tennis

JQC Nos. 2024-714 and 2024-767 · Supreme Court Case No. SC2025-1438

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, IN AND
FOR ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO: 2023-DR-004193-O
DIVISION: 38

DEVANAND SEEREERAM,
Petitioner,

-vs-

CHARMAINE SAITH,
Respondent.
_____/

AMENDED ORDER ON MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION FILED 8/12/2024

THIS CAUSE having come for consideration in Chambers and the Court having reviewed the pleadings and the court file:

It is hereby **ORDERED,**

The Motion for Reconsideration is GRANTED. The Motion for Disqualification is GRANTED. This case will be re-assigned**.**

DONE AND ORDERED at Orlando, Florida on this 15th day of August, 2024.

Diana M. Tennis

_____
Judge Diana M. Tennis
Circuit Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that this Order was filed with the Clerk of the Court by using the Florida Courts E-Filing Portal System. A copy is being served on all attorney(s) and parties identified on the ePortal Electronic Service List, via Notices of Electronic Filing generated by the ePortal System. This Order has been furnished to parties via their attorney of record, and, if none, then by Regular U.S. Mail to the addresses below on this 15th day of August, 2024.

DEVANAND SEEREERAM, 5500 ALHAMBRA DR, ORLANDO, FL 32808; devo@devoeng.com

CHARMAINE SAITH, via counsel

HARRY L ROEN Esquire, Via e-portal

Elizabeth Diaz, Judicial Assistant to Judge Diana Tennis

EXHIBIT 2

JQC DOCKET NO. 24-714

EXHIBIT

E

Order of Reassignment for Unified Family Court (UFC)

Seereeram v. Saith, Case No. 2023-DR-004193-O

Filing No. 204795117

August 15, 2024

1 page, reproduced without change

Inquiry Concerning a Judge, Diana M. Tennis

JQC Nos. 2024-714 and 2024-767 · Supreme Court Case No. SC2025-1438

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,
IN AND FOR ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NUMBER: 2023-DR-004193-O
DIV 38

DEVANAND SEEREERAM
Petitioner,
and

CHARMAINE SAITH
Respondent.
_____/

ORDER OF REASSIGNMENT FOR UNIFIED FAMILY COURT (UFC)

The above styled case has been reviewed by the court and is appropriate for handling by the Domestic divisions within Family Court. Pursuant to Florida Family Law Rule of Procedure 12.003, to effectuate a Unified Family Court, the Clerk of Court is hereby ordered to reassign this case from the Honorable Diana M. Tennis (Div 38) to the Honorable Michael Deen (Div 31). Any hearings previously scheduled in Div 38 are hereby cancelled and will need to be set in Div 31.

DONE AND ORDERED this 15th day of August, 2024.

Diana M. Tennis

_____
Administrative Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy was delivered to the below parties on this 15th day of August, 2024.

Honorable Diana M. Tennis
Honorable Michael Deen

DEVANAND SEEREERAM, 5500 ALHAMBRA DR, ORLANDO, FL 32808;
devo@devoeng.com

CHARMAINE SAITH, Via Counsel

HARRY L ROEN Esquire, Via e-portal

Elizabeth Diaz, Judicial Assistant to Administrative Judge