


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 70,407



NOV 20 1987

SUPREME COURT
JUL

ANA SILVIA GOEDMAKERS)
)
 Petitioner,)
)
 vs.)
)
 HARRY GOEDMAKERS,)
)
 Respondent.)

REPLY BRIEF ON THE MERITS
 OF
 PETITIONER, ANA SILVIA GOEDMAKERS

From The Third District Court Of
 Florida

MILLER AND SCHWARTZ, P.A.
 Attorneys for Petitioner
 4040 Sheridan Street
 Post Office Box 7259
 Hollywood, Florida 33081-1259
 (305) 962-2000 or Miami 625-3630

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND OF THE FACTS	1
POINTS ON APPEAL	2
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	3
ARGUMENT:	
<u>POINT I</u>	
BROWARD COUNTY IS THE ONLY PROPER VENUE IN A DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE ACTION WHERE IT IS UNCONTROVERTED THAT BOTH THE HUSBAND AND WIFE RESIDE IN BROWARD COUNTY, WHERE THE CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE ACCRUED IN BROWARD COUNTY (WHERE THE PARTIES LAST COHABITED AS HUSBAND AND WIFE WITH A COMMON INTENT TO REMAIN MARRIED, WHERE THE SEPARATION OF THE PARTIES OCCURRED, AND WHERE THE MARRIAGE BECAME IRRETRIEVABLY BROKEN), AND WHERE THE MARITAL HOME IS LOCATED IN BROWARD COUNTY AND THERE IS NO PROPERTY OF THE PARTIES LOCATED IN ANY OTHER COUNTY.	4
ARGUMENT:	
<u>POINT II</u>	
THE BUSINESS AND ASSETS OF A NON-PARTY CORPORATION ARE NOT "PROPERTY IN LITIGATION" FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING PROPER VENUE IN A DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE ACTION SIMPLY BECAUSE THE HUSBAND AND/OR WIFE MAY OWN STOCK IN THAT CORPORATION.	5
CONCLUSION	6
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	7

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND OF THE FACTS

Petitioner adheres to the Statement Of The Case And Of The Facts set forth in her Initial Brief On The Merits.

The parties will again be referred to by their designation in the trial court below; that is, Petitioner will be called "Wife," and Respondent will be called "Husband."

All emphasis is the writer's unless otherwise indicated.

POINTS ON APPEAL

POINT I

BROWARD COUNTY IS THE ONLY PROPER VENUE IN A DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE ACTION WHERE IT IS UNCONTROVERTED THAT BOTH THE HUSBAND AND WIFE RESIDE IN BROWARD COUNTY, WHERE THE CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE ACCRUED IN BROWARD COUNTY (WHERE THE PARTIES LAST COHABITED AS HUSBAND AND WIFE WITH A COMMON INTENT TO REMAIN MARRIED, WHERE THE SEPARATION OF THE PARTIES OCCURRED, AND WHERE THE MARRIAGE BECAME IRRETRIEVABLY BROKEN), AND WHERE THE MARITAL HOME IS LOCATED IN BROWARD COUNTY AND THERE IS NO PROPERTY OF THE PARTIES LOCATED IN ANY OTHER COUNTY.

POINT II

THE BUSINESS AND ASSETS OF A NON-PARTY CORPORATION ARE NOT "PROPERTY IN LITIGATION" FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING PROPER VENUE IN A DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE ACTION SIMPLY BECAUSE THE HUSBAND AND/OR WIFE MAY OWN STOCK IN THAT CORPORATION.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

THE HUSBAND'S BRIEF ON THE MERITS FAILS TO SET FORTH ANY PLAUSIBLE OR PERSUASIVE EXPLANATION AS TO HOW THE "THRIVING BUSINESS" OF A NON-PARTY CORPORATION CAN BE CONSIDERED "PROPERTY IN LITIGATION" FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING VENUE.

THE HUSBAND'S BRIEF ON THE MERITS FAILS TO SET FORTH ANY PLAUSIBLE OR PERSUASIVE EXPLANATION AS TO HOW THE CORPORATE VEIL OF A NON-PARTY CORPORATION CAN BE PIERCED WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW.

ARGUMENT

POINT I

BROWARD COUNTY IS THE ONLY PROPER VENUE IN A DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE ACTION WHERE IT IS UNCONTROVERTED THAT BOTH THE HUSBAND AND WIFE RESIDE IN BROWARD COUNTY, WHERE THE CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE ACCRUED IN BROWARD COUNTY (WHERE THE PARTIES LAST COHABITED AS HUSBAND AND WIFE WITH A COMMON INTENT TO REMAIN MARRIED, WHERE THE SEPARATION OF THE PARTIES OCCURRED, AND WHERE THE MARRIAGE BECAME IRRETRIEVABLY BROKEN), AND WHERE THE MARITAL HOME IS LOCATED IN BROWARD COUNTY AND THERE IS NO PROPERTY OF THE PARTIES LOCATED IN ANY OTHER COUNTY.

THE HUSBAND'S BRIEF ON THE MERITS FAILS TO SET FORTH ANY PLAUSIBLE OR PERSUASIVE EXPLANATION AS TO HOW THE "THRIVING BUSINESS" OF A NON-PARTY CORPORATION CAN BE CONSIDERED "PROPERTY IN LITIGATION" FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING VENUE.

THE HUSBAND'S BRIEF ON THE MERITS FAILS TO SET FORTH ANY PLAUSIBLE OR PERSUASIVE EXPLANATION AS TO HOW THE CORPORATE VEIL OF A NON-PARTY CORPORATION CAN BE PIERCED WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW.

ARGUMENT

POINT II

THE BUSINESS AND ASSETS OF A NON-PARTY CORPORATION ARE NOT "PROPERTY IN LITIGATION" FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING PROPER VENUE IN A DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE ACTION SIMPLY BECAUSE THE HUSBAND AND/OR WIFE MAY OWN STOCK IN THAT CORPORATION.

THE HUSBAND'S BRIEF ON THE MERITS FAILS TO SET FORTH ANY PLAUSIBLE OR PERSUASIVE EXPLANATION AS TO HOW THE "THRIVING BUSINESS" OF A NON-PARTY CORPORATION CAN BE CONSIDERED "PROPERTY IN LITIGATION" FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING VENUE.

THE HUSBAND'S BRIEF ON THE MERITS FAILS TO SET FORTH ANY PLAUSIBLE OR PERSUASIVE EXPLANATION AS TO HOW THE CORPORATE VEIL OF A NON-PARTY CORPORATION CAN BE PIERCED WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW.


CONCLUSION

Based upon the reasons and authorities set forth in the Initial Brief On The Merits Of Petitioner, Ana Silvia Goedmakers, the decision of the District Court of Appeal, Third District, should be quashed and the cause remanded with directions to reverse the Trial Court's Order with instructions to transfer the action to Broward County.

Respectfully submitted,

MILLER AND SCHWARTZ, P.A.
Attorneys for Petitioner
4040 Sheridan Street
Post Office Box 7259
Hollywood, Florida 33081-1259
(305) 962-2000 or Miami 625-3630

By

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. Matthew Miller", written over a horizontal line.

A. MATTHEW MILLER