

THE HANSON LITIGATION CASES — Open Letter

To the leadership of the Florida courts and the Office of the Attorney General — and to the public they serve

TO:

- The Honorable Shawn Crane, Chief Judge, Sixth Judicial Circuit of Florida (served via the Public Information Office; no published direct email)
- **Public Information Office**, Sixth Judicial Circuit — pio@jud6.org
- cc: **Jennifer A. Parker**, Trial Court Administrator — courts@jud6.org

Copies, for your information and response:

- Thirteenth Judicial Circuit — Public Information Office (james.moore@fljud13.org) and Court Administration (publicinfo@fljud13.org); the Honorable Christopher C. Sabella, Chief Judge
- Second Judicial Circuit (Leon County) — the Honorable Francis J. Allman, Chief Judge; Elizabeth Garber, Trial Court Administrator (GarberE@leoncountyfl.gov); Court Media Office (CourtMediaRequest@leoncountyfl.gov)
- The Honorable Angela C. Dempsey, Second Judicial Circuit — via Judicial Assistant Kerri L. Owens (OwensK@leoncountyfl.gov)
- Office of the Florida Attorney General — Civil Litigation Division (oag.civil.eserve@myfloridalegal.com) and Communications Office (Press@MyFloridaLegal.com)

FROM: Christopher Hanson, Esq. (Fla. Bar No. 44094), Self-Represented Petitioner

RE: The Hanson Litigation Cases — a documented, two-tiered application of Florida's public-records law across the Sixth, Thirteenth, and Second Circuits, the Office of the Attorney General, and the University of Florida; see **Hanson v. Thirteenth Judicial Circuit, No. 25-CA-010255**, and related matters

DATE: June 8, 2026

I. The Perfect Case for Accountability:

The Hanson litigation arises from a single issue. In Case No. 24-DR-001150, Christopher Hanson requested basic discovery he was plainly entitled to under the law, and the defendants — aided by a growing list of complicit judges — have obstructed it, unlawfully and with no good-faith basis. Hanson has waived attorney-client privilege across every related matter, so that nothing stands between the public and the full truth. What follows documents the obstruction of that one simple right, and what happens when oversight and the good-faith pursuit of justice break down inside the Florida Judicial system.

Christopher Hanson is a Florida lawyer of nineteen years. He has remained vocal about judicial bias and corruption for nearly two years, even after one of the judges named here — Judge Kelly Ayers — submitted a Florida Bar

complaint against him to the Bar's intake office on November 24, 2025. Neither Judge Ayers nor the Bar has identified any false statement despite months of questions from Hanson. Publicly accusing sitting judges and the Florida Bar of abandoning their duties is not something a lawyer does without cost to himself. Yet, Hanson's Bar record remains clear of any discipline or suggestion of dishonesty or misconduct.

What follows is an open, public, and fully sourced account of how two judges of the Sixth Circuit — the Honorable Evan G. Frayman and the Honorable Sherwood S. Coleman — specially assigned to a mandamus case against the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit, have shielded that circuit from the most basic command of the Florida Constitution: that the people may inspect the records of their own courts. It also documents how the Florida Bar and courts across the Thirteenth, Sixth, and Second Circuits have repeatedly chosen the protection of insiders over the truth and their duties as state officers.

Hanson has brought these concerns to the Florida Bar, the Judicial Qualifications Commission, and members of Florida's executive and legislative branches alike. The Bar has engaged in similar misconduct to that alleged within the Thirteenth and Sixth Circuits — intentional avoidance of facts and law to protect insiders. That misconduct has since grown into efforts to cover up the original obstruction and concealment. The same pattern of insiders avoiding accountability now reaches beyond the courthouse: Hanson has even had to sue the [University of Florida](#) — home to its Brechner Institute, an institute dedicated to freedom of information — for public records about how this very story has been handled (see Section XI).

Hanson consistently documented the relevant misconduct of each accused party — the opposing litigant and her counsel, Scott Davis, the Thirteenth Circuit's judicial and administrative officials, and the Florida Bar — and asked any of them to identify a single statement that was untrue. None ever has. Under Florida law that silence is itself evidence: a party's failure to deny a written assertion it would naturally deny if false is an adoptive admission of its truth. § 90.803(18)(b), Fla. Stat.; *Sullivan v. McMillan*, 26 Fla. 543, 8 So. 450 (1890); *Globe v. State*, 877 So. 2d 663 (Fla. 2004); see [Request for Judicial Notice \(1150 Doc 303\)](#) § III. So when Hanson describes what these courts and lawyers have done, he is stating facts the accused have had every opportunity, and every incentive, to deny — and have let stand. The detailed written account Hanson served on each of them on November 26, 2025 remains public and undisputed to this day.

II. The Matter of Great Public Importance:

Florida judges are responsible for their duties under the constitution, not “immune” from them as the Florida Attorney General argues for the defendant judges in the present case. The Thirteenth Circuit is withholding records that would further document misconduct by its own judges. A citizen sued to obtain them. Two judges have each found that the citizen stated a “prima facie” or legally sufficient case for those records. Yet, more than seven months after the petition was filed, no writ compelling production has ever been entered.

The defendants have never even specifically identified the records they are withholding or the legal basis for withholding them. The Attorney General — representing the very court Hanson asked their office to investigate over a year ago — now argues that the records case should be paused so that the underlying family-law case (the one marred by the misconduct the records would further expose) can proceed first.

The Attorney General is arguing that the public records proceedings that the rules require to be expedited should instead be paused — because the records sought would expose another circuit court's misconduct. Hanson requires access to those records for his defense in the underlying case. Nonetheless, the Attorney General's office is

arguing that the family law proceedings should go forward before the public records, depriving Hanson of evidence so that the Attorney General can later present its "judicial immunity" argument to the Sixth Circuit judges. All of this is readily available on the docket. What follows shows it, step by step.

III. Sixth Circuit Involvement

In 2025 Hanson submitted public-records requests to the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit seeking communications and a courtroom video bearing on judicial misconduct in his family-law case, 24-DR-001150. The Circuit's administrator **confirmed responsive records existed**, produced a partial, document-dumped response, and then went silent on the specific items that mattered — including the **April 4, 2025 hearing video** that Judge Kelly Ayers had offered, on the record, to retrieve, and then refused to retrieve hours later.

When the informal channels were exhausted, Hanson filed a [Petition for Writ of Mandamus \(Doc 3\)](#) on October 14, 2025, and an [Amended Verified Petition \(Doc 12\)](#) on November 13, 2025, under **Article I, § 24 of the Florida Constitution** and **Florida Rule of Judicial Administration 2.420** — the constitutional guarantee of public access to judicial records. Because he had sued the Thirteenth Circuit's own judges, the case was assigned out of circuit to **Sixth Circuit** judges sitting by Supreme Court designation. The Thirteenth Circuit has refused to transfer the underlying family law case despite multiple requests and appeals.

IV. Two prima facie findings — and a writ that never comes

The Rules of procedure for a records mandamus are to be **expedited** (Rule 2.420(l); § 119.11(1) requires an "immediate hearing"). Here is what actually happened:

- **January 13, 2026** — Judge Frayman found Hanson had stated a prima facie case and issued an [Alternative Writ \(Doc 47\)](#).
- **February 17, 2026** — Judge Coleman, after taking over, independently found a prima facie case and issued a [second Alternative Writ \(Doc 62\)](#).

Two judges. Two findings that the law entitled Hanson to the records sought absent the defendants proving some affirmative defense. While they had to make those findings based on the facts, the Judges found ways to delay production that continue to this day. Defendants have failed to even plead what could be considered a basis for an exemption.

V. The pattern: successive sua sponte acts that did the work of the defendants and their lawyers at the Florida Attorney General's office

The Supreme Court of the United States has a name for a court abandoning its role as a neutral arbiter and supplying arguments the parties did not make: a violation of the party-presentation principle. *United States v. Sineneng-Smith*, 590 U.S. 371 (2020). Judge Frayman and then after his disqualification, Coleman, twice in succession, stepped into the defendants' shoes to advocate for the Thirteenth Circuit Judicial defendants, even beyond the Florida Attorney General's active representation.

Violation One — Judge Frayman (January 2026)

In the very order finding a prima facie case, Judge Frayman, **on his own initiative and on a theory no defendant had raised**, carved the case down: he held the court lacked jurisdiction over the administrative-records claims against the individual judges (Sabella, Ayers, Felix) and dismissed the declaratory-relief count. The defendants had not

moved for either. In the companion [Case Management Conference Order \(Doc 48\)](#), he recited that he "**declined to hear argument or any attempt to further 'establish a record.'**"

At the hearing itself Judge Frayman told Hanson, "you're going to listen to me or I'm going to mute you," and then muted Hanson. ([1/13/26 Transcript, Doc 51, Tr. 17, 20](#)) Judge Frayman was so frustrated to the point of muting Hanson's attempt to create a record — specifically because he knew everything Hanson stated during the hearing and in his filings was true. Judge Frayman crafted his orders in a manner that gave Defendants an extra 20 days and an additional opportunity to plead an exemption, while striking claims on his own initiative and coaching Defendants and their counsel on future strategy.

When Hanson moved to vacate that order, Judge Frayman [granted his own disqualification \(Doc 50\)](#) — but refused to rule on the request to vacate his rulings. His delay/defense-friendly orders survived, and the judge who entered them was gone before anyone could test them.

[Violation Two — Judge Coleman \(February–current\)](#)

Judge Coleman took the case over and [vacated Judge Frayman's writ in its entirety \(Doc 61\)](#) — which, as Hanson pointed out on the record, handed the defendants another fresh response window and opportunity (Judge Frayman had already reset the clock as he ignored defendants' initial 20 days after service and the response filed at that time). Judge Coleman acknowledged his warning in a footnote and proceeded anyway. The cumulative effect was to extend the defendants' response runway to roughly five months past the initial twenty-day ceiling that expired on January 8, 2026. Defendants filed their first response to the writ on that same date, with at least four formal pleadings filed since, all failing to even plead a potential exemption to the public access Hanson seeks.

Then:

- Judge Coleman [denied the peremptory writ \(Doc 73\)](#) because, he said, Hanson had "not demonstrated a legal basis for the Court to deviate from... Rule 1.630" — a rationale no defendant argued, and one that inverts the rule (once the alternative writ issues and the return raises no fact dispute, the peremptory writ is what is supposed to follow).
- He [stayed all discovery except requests for admission \(Doc 80\)](#) and deferred any privilege log until "ten (10) days prior to the final hearing" — meaning the defendants need not identify a single withheld record until the eve of trial. There is no basis for such a mechanism which seems to be intentionally setting up a trial by ambush in favor of defendants.
- He [recharacterized Hanson's motions as "improperly titled... summary disposition under Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.510" \(Doc 81\)](#) and set the defendants' deadline at "no later than 40 days after service."
- Judge Coleman continues to ignore the fact that Hanson doesn't need a motion or anything else to elicit the entry of the peremptory writ that would actually require public access. Judge Coleman is simply ignoring his duties under Rule 1.140.
- Further, Judge Coleman is aware of the underlying family law proceedings being rushed through before the "expedited" mandamus proceedings can allow public access to the critical evidence necessary for a fair determination.

Two specially-assigned judges. Two prima facie findings. **Zero merits rulings. No peremptory/mandatory writ. Three resets of the defendants' clock and beyond.** Every procedural move ran in one direction.

VI. The defense that should alarm every citizen of Tampa Bay: "judicial immunity" from mandatory constitutional duties

Here is the Thirteenth Circuit's primary defense, in its own counsel's words at the [April 13, 2026 hearing](#): the court's communications are "**protected by judicial immunity**," and his requests are "**not a basis for overcoming judicial immunity**." (Tr. 20) The same theory runs through the defendants' written returns — the [1st return \(Doc 40\)](#) and the [2nd return \(Doc 65\)](#) — neither of which identifies the withheld records nor a valid Rule 2.420 exemption.

Hanson said it plainly on the record: "Where is there any authority that immunity has any place in the analysis of responding to public records? I'm not seeking damages. I'm seeking access to information, which is a basic constitutional right in Florida." (Tr. 22) The Attorney General is asserting a defense that belongs to suits for damages — not to a mandamus action seeking access to records. Judicial immunity shields judges from personal liability in damages; it does not bar prospective relief compelling compliance with the law. See *Pulliam v. Allen*, 466 U.S. 522 (1984). That the defense is even raised here is troubling, as it runs directly contrary to what judges swear to uphold.

Nevertheless, here is the Attorney General's argument from Docket 65, page 5, defendants' *RESPONSE TO AMENDED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND INCORPORATED MEMORANDUM OF LAW AS PER THE ALTERNATIVE WRIT IN MANDAMUS ENTERED ON FEBRUARY 17, 2026*:

"For the records to which the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit is the custodian of records, Judicial immunity would apply to many of the requested records. Judicial immunity "embraces persons who exercise a judicial or quasi-judicial function; and the immunity rests on the sound public policy that a strict guarantee of immunity is necessary to preserve the effectiveness and impartiality of judicial and quasi-judicial offices." *Office of State Attorney, Fourth Judicial Circuit of Florida v. Parrotino*, 628 So. 2d 1097, 1098 (Fla. 1993)."

The Thirteenth Circuit's lead defense is, functionally, that the people's courts answer to no one for what they hide. Worse, the Sixth Circuit has entertained that defense as legitimate — for seven months, across at least three unlawful response-window resets and chances to plead and support an exemption. They have offered nothing to support the security label they assigned — not even an affidavit — and have used judicial immunity to avoid identifying what they are concealing.

VII. The Sixth Circuit's inversion of constitutional priorities: deferring transparency so the retaliation can finish

In moving to stay discovery, the Attorney General argued that the records case should wait so the **underlying family-law case can move forward first**. As Hanson told Judge Coleman: "**their argument seems to be, 'You have to deal with the underlying proceedings with all the corruption that the judge introduced and maybe we'll give you the records later.'**" (Tr. 26)

Understand what that means. The records Hanson seeks would further document the misconduct that has caused such unnecessarily difficult periods for his two young children (ages 8 and 6) and himself. The State's position is that he must absorb the consequences of that misconduct before he is allowed to see more definitive proof of it. That is transparency deferred precisely so that it cannot matter. In public-records law, delay is denial.

Hanson asked the court, repeatedly, for any reason for the continuing delays: "**give me a basis in law, fact, or anything that motivates its... decision to postpone mandamus other than protecting insider judges across the**

Howard Frankland." (Tr. 43) No such basis was given. When the court suggested Hanson had "not been correct on the law," he asked when. The answer was, "**you could probably go back and read over my orders and find those.**" (Tr. 30) Despite multiple requests, Judge Coleman has never offered support for this statement.

The only explanation consistent with the record is the one no one will say aloud: the records will embarrass the Thirteenth Circuit, and so the Sixth Circuit refuses to enforce the law against it. Judge Coleman is opting instead to assist in concealing them, while the Thirteenth Circuit forces a guardian ad litem, unsupported by any evidence, onto two happy, healthy children. That GAL proceeding has been the Thirteenth Circuit's focus for a year and a half, even as it delayed the simple discovery issue at the heart of all this.

VIII. How the Sixth Circuit's delay powers the Thirteenth Circuit's retaliation

The records case and the family case are inextricably linked as judicial bias and misconduct have complicated a simple discovery matter into years of delay and conflict solely because the Judges act as though the law doesn't apply to them. The Sixth Circuit's continuing to delay mandamus enables the retaliation in the Thirteenth Circuit.

- **A defendant judge the records would expose is the same judge running the family case.** Judge Matthew Felix is a named defendant in the mandamus (25-CA-010255) and simultaneously presides over Hanson's family case (24-DR-001150). Hanson placed this squarely before him in a [Notice of Invocation of Constitutional Rights \(1150 Doc 290\)](#) demanding written findings on the structural conflict under *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868 (2009), and filed further evidence of that conflict and the impossibility of a fair process ([1150 Doc 294](#)). Felix proceeded anyway refusing to transfer the case or make findings of fact.
- **The evidence is held hostage on both ends.** The April 4, 2025 video — the recording Judge Ayers offered on the record and then refused to retrieve — is one of the exact records the Sixth Circuit refuses to compel in the mandamus, and the exact record the family court refuses to review even after Hanson moved it directly to watch the video and report on Judge Ayers's conduct ([1150 Doc 280](#); [Doc 304](#)). Concealed by one circuit, ignored by the other; the misconduct never surfaces.
- **Judicial notice was put before the family court — and brushed past.** In a [Request for Judicial Notice \(1150 Doc 303\)](#), Hanson asked the family court to formally notice that two Sixth Circuit judges had found a prima facie right to these records and that a protective order now stays their discovery. The court pressed forward on the clearly retaliatory guardian-ad-litem issue, ignoring the obvious conflicts and evidence of bias.
- **A closed loop of mutual protection.** Because the Sixth Circuit will not enter the writ, the records that would prove the misconduct stay buried — which is precisely what lets the Thirteenth Circuit ram through a retaliatory guardian-ad-litem proceeding against two happy, healthy children before that proof can be seen. At the [April 17, 2026 hearing](#), Judge Felix declined to make findings on the structural conflict and advanced the GAL while the video sat concealed. Pressed repeatedly for written findings on the structural conflict, Judge Felix stated on the record: "I can make the ruling without findings of facts, and if the Second DCA says I need to find facts, then I'll do so." (April 17, 2026 Tr. p. 181; see 1150 Doc 303.) He deferred instead to his earlier order denying disqualification — an order that itself made no findings of fact.
- Judge Felix still refuses to review that April 4, 2025 video on the same guardian ad litem issue, which got Judge Ayers disqualified. Judges in both Circuits simply ignore the evidence that demonstrates insider misconduct, leaving the aggrieved litigants to absorb the consequences.

Put plainly: the Sixth Circuit's "delay" is not neutral inertia. It is the cover under which the Thirteenth Circuit completes retaliatory litigation that baselessly and directly impacts the welfare of children.

IX. The record is now ripe — the only lawful step left is the writ

The vehicle for that relief is already before the Court. On April 15, 2026, Hanson filed his [Motion for Sanctions and Entry of Peremptory Writ of Mandamus \(Doc 78\)](#). Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.630(e), incorporating Rule 1.140, requires that the legal sufficiency of the defendants' return be decided before any trial. Two judges have issued operative alternative writs; yet the defendants "offered no sworn evidence," and "by substituting a conclusory label for a factual return," have "effectively refused to respond." Having "filed a legally insufficient return to the Alternative Writ," and produced no particularized privilege log — which waives the asserted privilege — the defendants have "waived any claimed exemption as a matter of law." On that record the only lawful step is entry of the peremptory writ. Because that result would embarrass the Thirteenth Circuit, the Sixth Circuit continues to stall, setting another hearing where the sole issue is delay.

Then, on June 2, 2026 — after the Attorney General again insisted Hanson complete some unspecified "step" to obtain the video — Hanson wrote to the Court and counsel directly. His [June 2, 2026 email](#) states it in one line: **"The case is ripe for entry of the writ."** There remains **"no evidence whatsoever to support the security label... Not even an affidavit."** And the defendants themselves placed Judge Ayers's own words on the litigation record — **"I will go get the camera footage and do it because I have not rolled my eyes at you"** — a party-opponent admission (§ 90.803(18), Fla. Stat.) that destroys the very predicate of their exemption theory.

The harm is not abstract: Hanson remains under retaliation from Defendant Judge Felix, who "continues to show open and obvious bias... while refusing to even look at the video of the 4-4-25 GAL hearing." Beyond that, Ayers's Bar complaint remains pending and the video will further demonstrate the veracity of all of Hanson's statements and the bad-faith nature of Ayers's Bar complaint against him.

Taken together, these two filings make the conclusion inescapable: no disputed facts, no valid exemption, no privilege log, a facially insufficient return — which the rules require be decided **before** any trial. **The only action consistent with the Constitution, the rules, and this record is entry of the peremptory writ.** Every additional hearing, reset, and "clarification" is one more day the records stay hidden while the retaliation against his family proceeds.

X. The same pattern at the Florida Bar and the Second Circuit Court

This is not the only institution that has chosen the insider over the facts, law, and justice. When Hanson complained to the Florida Bar about the opposing attorney's conduct (RFA No. 25-6861), the Bar represented a serious, multi-level review — a "Senior Staff Attorney investigation" and additional reviews with the "Director of Intake," and the "Chair of Grievance Committee 13A" (Schuyler letter, 9/24/25; Gangi letter, 9/23/25). Hanson's own correspondence pressing the Bar for answers documents the stonewalling that followed — see his [October 10, 2025 email](#), his [December 1, 2025 email to Deputy General Counsel Courtemanche](#), and his [April 17, 2026 email](#). Months later, in its own court filing, the Bar admitted that it "did not act on his complaint and so did not share it with or request a response from Mr. Davis." (1150 Doc 309, ¶15.)

Both cannot be true. The Bar either conducted the investigation and subsequent review it described — or it misrepresented its process to conceal embarrassing information about its handling of the Davis complaint.

That same pattern — distraction and delay deployed to avoid acting on a meritorious complaint about a powerful insider — runs through the related litigation. The Second Judicial Circuit, under Judge Angela C. Dempsey, was even more aggressive in preventing Hanson from making a record in the [public-records case against the Florida Bar](#) (No.

2025-CA-002469). Hanson submits there was no good-faith basis for the grounds on which Judge Dempsey dismissed that petition; it was simply a case in which the court would not allow the constitutional path to public-records access to proceed. Hanson is now pursuing the appeal in Tallahassee’s First District Court of Appeal (No. 1D2026-0728), where his [Initial Brief on the Merits](#) sets out the Bar’s conduct in detail.

XI. The same pattern reaches the press — the University of Florida and its Brechner Institute

The pattern is not confined to the courts. One of the matters Hanson is now litigating involves the University of Florida — home to the Brechner Institute, whose stated mission is to defend Florida’s public-records laws. On June 4, 2026, Hanson filed a [Verified Petition for Writ of Mandamus](#) against the University of Florida Board of Trustees and its records custodian in the Circuit Court of the Eighth Judicial Circuit, Alachua County (E-Filing No. 249635041), to compel compliance with Chapter 119 and Article I, Section 24. The University acknowledged that it had located responsive records, then declared the request “complete” while producing little more than Hanson’s own correspondence back to him — and withholding the rest.

Hanson sought those records out of a concrete concern: that the press had begun to go quiet on this story. In February 2025, Tony Marrero of the Tampa Bay Times engaged with the story and conferred with the paper’s courts reporter, Dan Sullivan, before declining to attend a February 2025 hearing, citing the paper’s “staffing and story load”; Hanson says the Times never responded even as he updated the reporter while the story grew more newsworthy. He has since pressed the same suppression concern with the Miami Herald’s Brittany Wallman, documenting a repeated pattern of initial interest followed by unexplained retreat. Notably, by the Brechner Institute’s own published account of its funding, the Tampa Bay Times is among the donors whose endowments support the Institute. The institution that exists to enforce the principle that “delay is denial” now relies on the very delay and obfuscation of a lawful public records request from Hanson.

Hanson does not assert a conclusion he cannot support; he alleges a pattern and asks that it be examined. But the convergence — a newspaper that helps fund Florida’s marquee freedom-of-information institute going quiet on a corruption story, and that university’s insistence on keeping its distance from the story before refusing to fully answer a lawful records request about these very events — raises whether the protection of insiders documented throughout this letter reaches beyond the courthouse, into the newsroom.

XII. Questions the responsible institutions must answer

This letter does not ask any tribunal to decide Hanson’s case. It asks the institutions responsible — first among them the Office of the Attorney General and the Sixth Judicial Circuit — to answer, publicly, the questions this record raises. They are not rhetorical:

1. Judicial immunity is a doctrine that shields judges from personal liability in damages. It has never been a basis for a records custodian to withhold public records, or for a court to refuse a writ compelling their production. See *Pulliam v. Allen*, 466 U.S. 522 (1984). By what authority does the Office of the Attorney General assert “judicial immunity” to defeat a citizen’s constitutional right of access — and by what authority has the Sixth Circuit entertained that defense for more than five months past the defendants’ own deadline to respond to the writ, without once requiring the custodian to identify a single record it is withholding or the exemption it claims?

2. The Legislature did not make these proceedings ordinary. Section 119.11(1), Florida Statutes, commands that a court “shall set an immediate hearing, giving the case priority over other pending cases,” and Florida Rule of Judicial Administration 2.420(l) prescribes the same expedited mandamus procedure for judicial-branch records. The Florida Supreme Court has held that the only delay the law tolerates is the reasonable time needed to retrieve a record and redact any exempt portion; delay beyond that is itself an unlawful denial of access. *Tribune Co. v. Cannella*, 458 So. 2d 1075 (Fla. 1984). How is seven months of delay — two prima facie findings, no peremptory writ, and three resets of the defendants’ deadline — reconcilable with a duty the law makes immediate and mandatory?
3. The Florida Constitution and binding precedent presume public access. *Barron v. Fla. Freedom Newspapers; Media General Convergence v. Chief Judge of the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit*. Nothing in this case has honored that presumption. Are the citizens of Florida to understand that, where the records would expose the courts themselves, the presumption runs the other way?
4. Hanson has made these allegations publicly for over a year. No one has refuted any of them — publicly or in the litigation — yet the courts continue to operate in precisely the opposite manner from what the facts require. When a litigant credibly alleges that judicial officials are protecting one another rather than discharging their duties, will the judicial branch — and the media — keep suppressing those concerns, or is there a mechanism that still protects the citizen?
5. And to every institution that receives this letter: a judge stated on the record what a courtroom video would show, and offered to retrieve it to disprove that she had rolled her eyes at the litigant — then refused to produce it. Will the courts keep that recording buried and let her avoid any consequence for what it would show? As that judge begins another term — unchecked for a dishonesty on the bench that the very video she offered would expose — what do you say to the public you serve?

XIII. Closing

Some things are simply true or false. The facts of this case are documented well enough that any version other than the one this letter tells is demonstrably a corrupted one. Hanson has been vocal about this from the beginning because the misconduct is so brazen, harmful, and contrary to what the law requires. The Thirteenth Circuit, the Sixth Circuit, the Florida Bar, the Office of the Attorney General, and anyone else who chooses to spend their institutional credibility defending this conduct has a choice. Hanson will continue to state these facts publicly, and to challenge anyone to dispute them — because they are documented, and they are true.

A court system cannot hide from the truth to avoid doing justice — and it cannot fix cases to fit what fellow judges and insider attorneys would prefer.

Respectfully,

Christopher Hanson, Esq.

Florida Bar No. 44094

cahanson77@yahoo.com

727-409-5738

APPENDIX — Record index (every document, one click)

Petition [Doc 3](#) · Amended Petition [Doc 12](#) · Motion for Immediate Writ [Doc 37](#) · Defendants' 1st return [Doc 40](#) · Frayman Alternative Writ [Doc 47](#) · Frayman CMC Order [Doc 48](#) · Motion to Vacate [Doc 49](#) · Frayman self-DQ order [Doc 50](#) · 1/13/26 Transcript [Doc 51](#) · Motion for Immediate Relief [Doc 52](#) · Motion for Rehearing [Doc 60](#) · Coleman vacatur order [Doc 61](#) · Coleman 2nd Alternative Writ [Doc 62](#) · Clerk's return [Doc 63](#) · Order on 2/16 motion [Doc 64](#) · Defendants' 2nd return [Doc 65](#) · 2/6/26 Transcript [Doc 66](#) · Motion for Protective Order [Doc 72](#) · Order denying peremptory writ [Doc 73](#) · Motion for Summary Final Order [Doc 79](#) · Order staying discovery [Doc 80](#) · Order re hearing dates / 1.510 [Doc 81](#) · 4/13/26 Transcript (Coleman) [link](#) · Leon Bar-Mandamus Petition [link](#) · Motion for Sanctions & Entry of Peremptory Writ (Doc 78, 4/15/26) [link](#) · 6/2/26 email to the Sixth Circuit [link](#) · Notice of Invocation of Constitutional Rights (1150 Doc 290) [link](#) · Request for Judicial Notice (1150 Doc 303) [link](#) · Motion for Judicial Review of 4/4/25 Video (1150 Doc 280) [link](#) · Motion for Judicial Review, Part 2 (1150 Doc 304) [link](#) · Additional Evidence of Structural Conflict (1150 Doc 294) [link](#) · 4/17/26 Hearing Transcript (1150) [link](#) · UF / Brechner Mandamus Petition (8th Cir., filed 6/4/2026) [link](#)