IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, OFFICE OF MEDICAL MARIJUANA USE, ET AL.,

Case No. SC19-1464 DCA Case No. 1D18-4471 L.T. Case No. 2017-CA-2549

Petitioners,

v.

FLORIGROWN, LLC, a Florida Limited Liability Company, and VOICE OF FREEDOM, INC., d/b/a FLORIGROWN,

Respondents.

RESPONDENTS' ANSWER BRIEF

KATHERINE E. GIDDINGS, BCS (949396) katherine.giddings@akerman.com elisa.miller@akerman.com myndi.qualls@akerman.com Akerman LLP 106 East College Avenue, Suite 1200 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 Telephone: (850) 224-9634 Telecopier: (850) 222-0103 JONATHAN S. ROBBINS (989428) jonathan.robbins@akerman.com nancy.alessi@akerman.com
Akerman LLP
Las Olas Centre II, Suite 1600
350 East Las Olas Boulevard
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
Telephone: (954) 463-2700
Telecopier: (954) 463-2224

ARI H. GERSTIN (0839671) ari.gerstin@akerman.com marylin.herrera@akerman.com Akerman LLP Three Brickell City Centre 98 Southeast Seventh St., Ste. 1100 Miami, FL 33131 Telephone: (305) 374-5600 Telecopier: (305) 374-5095

Attorneys for Respondents



TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
TABLE C	F AU	THORITIES iii
INTROD	UCTIO	ON1
STATEM	ENT (OF THE CASE AND FACTS4
SUMMA	RY OF	THE ARGUMENT21
STANDA	RD O	F REVIEW24
ARGUMI	ENT	
I.		RIGROWN ESTABLISHED A SUBSTANTIAL ELIHOOD OF SUCCESS ON THE MERITS
	A.	The Statute Materially Alters, Restricts, and Contradicts The Amendment's Definition Of An MMTC
	B.	Nothing In The Record Or The Law Supports The Arbitrary And Artificial Caps Imposed By The Statute
	C.	The Statutory Requirement For Vertical Integration Of MMTCs Violates The Amendment
	D.	The Statute Improperly Grants Special Advantages, Benefits, And Privileges That Only Apply To Particular Entities
II.		RIGROWN MET THE REMAINING INJUNCTION FERIA
	A.	The Trial Court and First District Properly Recognized The Existence Of Irreparable Harm And Lack Of Adequate Remedy As A Matter Of Fact And Law
	B.	The Public Interest Factors Support The Injunction



III.	THE INJUNCTION IS CONSISTENT WITH THE	
	AMENDMENT'S PLAIN LANGUAGE AND HAS NO	
	BEARING ON THE DEPARTMENT'S REGULATION OF	
	MMTCS	47
IV.	THE INJUNCTION ORDERS MAKE THE REQUISITE	
	FACTUAL FINDINGS TO SUPPORT THE INJUNCTION	
	CRITERIA	49
CONCLU	JSION	50
CERTIFIC	CATE OF SERVICE52	2, 53
CFRTIFIC	CATE OF FONT COMPLIANCE	53



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases
Aaoep USA, Inc. v. Pex German OE Parts, LLC, 202 So. 3d 470
(Fla. 1st DCA 2016)
Adv. Op. to the Atty. Gen. re Use of Marijuana for Debilitating Med.
Conditions, 181 So. 3d 471 (Fla. 2015)
Atwater v. Kortum, 95 So. 3d 85 (Fla. 2012)
Baker v. Buckeye Cellulose Corp., 856 F.2d 167 (11th Cir. 1988) 44
Browning v. Fla. Hometown Democracy, Inc., PAC, 29 So. 3d 1053
(Fla. 2010)
Bush v. Holmes, 919 So. 2d 392 (Fla. 2006)
Capraro v. Lanier Bus. Prods. Inc., 466 So. 2d 212 (Fla. 1985)
Citizens for Strong Sch., Inc. v. Fla. St. Bd. of Educ., 262 So. 3d 127
(Fla. 2019)
Crist v. Fla. Ass'n of Criminal Def. Lawyers, Inc., 978 So. 2d 134 (Fla. 2008) 24
Dep't of Envtl. Prot. v. Millender, 666 So. 2d 882 (Fla. 1996)
Eskind v. City of Vero Beach, 159 So. 2d 209 (Fla. 1963)
Fla. Dep't of Health v. Florigrown, LLC, So. 3d, 2019 WL 2943329
(Fla. 1st DCA July 9, 2019)passin



Fla. Dep't of Health v. Florigrown, LLC, So. 3d, 2019 WL 4019919	
(Fla. 1st DCA Aug. 27, 2019)	. 21
Fla. Hosp. Waterman, Inc. v. Buster, 984 So. 2d 478 (Fla. 2008)	. 25
Fla. House of Representatives v. Florigrown, LLC, 278 So. 3d 935	
(Fla. 1st DCA 2019)	. 19
Gainesville Woman Care, LLC v. State, 210 So. 3d 1243 (Fla. 2017)	. 44
Garcia v. Andonie, 101 So. 3d 339 (Fla. 2012)	. 29
Holley v. Adams, 238 So. 2d 401 (Fla. 1970)	. 25
Maryland v. King, 567 U.S. 1301 (2012)	, 47
New Motor Vehicle Bd. of Cal. v. Orrin W. Fox Co., 434 U.S. 1345	
(1977)43	, 47
Manatee Cty. v. 1187 Upper James of Fla., LLC, 104 So. 3d 1118	
(Fla. 2d DCA 2012)	. 43
Notami Hosp. of Fla., Inc. v. Bowen, 927 So. 2d 139 (Fla. 1st DCA 2006)	. 38
Ralicki v. 998 SW 144 Court Rd., LLC, 254 So. 3d 1155 (Fla. 5th DCA 2018)	. 50
Ruppel v. Gulf Winds Apts, Inc., 508 So. 2d 534 (Fla. 2d DCA 1987)	. 49
Sparkman v. State ex rel. Scott, 58 So. 2d 431 (Fla. 1952)	. 29
S & J Transp., Inc. v. Gordon, 176 So. 2d 69 (Fla. 1965)	. 29
Sun Ins. Office, Ltd. v. Clay, 133 So. 2d 735 (Fla. 1961)	. 25
The Fla. Bar v. Siblev. 995 So. 2d 346 (Fla. 2008)	. 28



DOCKET

Explore Litigation Insights



Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time** alerts and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.

