



CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION
MOTION PRACTICE IN FLORIDA APPELLATE COURTS
(ALL-IN-ONE DOCUMENT)

Stetson Law Review
Law Reviews Pertinent to Civil Rights Litigation

UNOFFICIAL REPLICA

{Published On: 10/22/2002}

E: TextBook.Discrimination@outlook.com
W: www.TextBookDiscrimination.com

visit TBD's [website](#) for the most up-to-date information

TABLE OF CONTENTS | STETSON LAW REVIEW | CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION

#	Item	Title	Page
1	4.A.00	Conclusion	4
-	n/a	Appendix	5



LAW REVIEWS
PERTINENT TO CIVIL RIGHTS LITIGATION
STETSON LAW REVIEW

TITLE: Motion Practice in Florida Appellate Courts

AUTHOR: Hon. Philip J. Padovano, J.D.*

BODY: Stetson University College of Law

ISSUE: Issue 2, Volume 32, Article 4

YEAR: 2002

CHAPTER: 4 CONCLUSION

* © 2003, Hon. Philip J. Padovano. All rights reserved. Judge, Florida First District Court of Appeal. B.S., Florida State University, 1969; J.D., Stetson University College of Law, 1973.



§4.A.00 | CONCLUSION

Motion practice in appellate courts requires a different approach from that customarily taken in trial courts. There are fewer case-management issues on appeal, there are rarely facts to determine, and usually there is no need to test the viability of an argument before it is presented to the court. Most of the advocacy is contained in the briefs, and it is necessarily limited to matters of record. Because motion practice serves a more limited purpose on review, appellate lawyers should be selective in filing motions in an appellate court. The opportunity to present an issue by motion should not be viewed as a routine step in the appellate process, but rather as a chance to resolve a matter that will not be addressed when the court considers the merits of the case.

Nevertheless, a party may need to file a motion in an appellate court to resolve a procedural problem or to obtain relief on issues not addressed in the briefs. The most common issues arising before the case is considered on the merits relate to the enforcement of the order in question; that is, whether it should be stayed pending the outcome of the case in the appellate court, and whether the appellate court has jurisdiction. After the case has been decided, it may be necessary to file a motion for rehearing, a motion for certification, or a motion for clarification. In more limited circumstances, a party properly may file a motion for rehearing en banc. As with other motions in appellate courts, these motions should be filed only when necessary, and not as a matter of course.

(Stetson Law Review © 2002 // Volume 32, Issue 2, Article 4 // Phillip J. Padovano)

APPENDIX



COPYRIGHT NOTICE

TextBookDiscrimination.com is not the author of this law review. Instead, TextBookDiscrimination.com merely re-printed and reformatted it for easier use.

ORIGINAL SOURCE

<u>#</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Link</u>
1	Stetson Review	https://www2.stetson.edu/law-review/

INTERACTIVE VERSION

<u>#</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Link</u>
1	Web	TextBookDiscrimination.com/Handbooks/LawReviews/Appeal/Stetson/C04

CONTACT INFORMATION

E: TextBook.Discrimination@outlook.com

W: www.TextBookDiscrimination.com

Congratulations! You're now ***booked up*** on this law review on Litigating an Appeal!

