

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

In the  
United States Court of Appeals  
For the Eleventh Circuit

---

No. 22-10780

Non-Argument Calendar

---

WL ALLIANCE LLC,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

*versus*

PRECISION TESTING GROUP INC.,  
GLENN STUCKEY,

Defendants-Appellants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Florida  
D.C. Docket No. 3:19-cv-04459-RV-HTC

---

Before WILSON, JORDAN, and BRANCH, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

This case involves a partnership dispute between Plaintiff-Appellee WL Alliance and Defendants-Appellants Precision Testing Group, Inc. and Glenn Stuckey (collectively, the defendants). After a jury trial on WL Alliance's claims for wrongful disassociation and breach of partnership agreement, the defendants were found liable for an aggregate \$3.3 million in damages. The defendants appeal, arguing that the damage award included damages for lost future profits that were not "reasonably certain," and that the damage awards were not supported by the evidence because there was no accounting.

After careful review, we conclude the damage awards were in accord with Florida law. Accordingly, we **AFFIRM**.

### I.

We assume the parties are familiar with the factual history of this case and summarize only the relevant points. WL Alliance and the defendants partnered to provide specialized technicians to the energy utility company First Energy. Under their business arrangement the defendants formally contracted with First Energy to provide the technicians and received payments from First Energy. WL Alliance was responsible for actually recruiting the technicians and for managing their payroll. The partners intended to split profits fifty-fifty and settled up their accounts on a quarterly basis.

22-10780

Opinion of the Court

3

After a disagreement about the amounts being remitted from the defendants to WL Alliance, the partnership was terminated. Stuckey, the owner and principal of Precision Testing, terminated the contract between Precision Testing and First Energy. This contract contained an at-will termination clause. Stuckey then caused another entity he owned, JJI Consulting, to enter into a similar contract with First Energy. The effect was to cut WL Alliance out of the business arrangement with First Energy.

WL Alliance sued, alleging that the defendants and WL Alliance were partners on the First Energy contract, and that Stuckey's actions constituted a wrongful disassociation from the partnership (Count 1) and a breach of the partnership agreement (Count 3). WL Alliance also requested an equitable accounting of the partnership accounts (Count 2). The defendants did not counterclaim for a reciprocal accounting. Pre-trial, the parties stipulated that Count 2 would be tried to the bench after the jury verdict, "if necessary."

At trial the jury heard testimony regarding the course of the parties' business, and the prospect that the business with First Energy would continue for several more years. The jury also heard expert testimony from both sides on the valuation of the business. WL Alliance's expert provided a present value calculation of the partnership at the time of the disassociation. The defendants' expert reviewed WL Alliance's calculation but did not provide his own independent valuation.

Pre-verdict, the defendants moved for judgment as a matter of law under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 50(a), arguing that

there was insufficient evidence to support the future damages. Specifically, they argued that, because the contract with First Energy was terminable at-will, damages based on that contract were too speculative as a matter of Florida law. The district court denied this motion. The jury found that a partnership did exist and awarded \$1.7 million in past damages, and \$1.6 million in future damages against the defendants.

Post-verdict, WL Alliance moved the court to enter judgment on counts 1 and 3 for the money damages, and to moot count 2's request for an equitable accounting. WL Alliance noted that it had achieved its goals of discovering what it was owed under the partnership through the discovery process and no longer needed an equitable accounting. The defendants objected, arguing that an accounting was required under Florida law and sought to: (1) amend their answer to add a reciprocal accounting counterclaim to conform to the trial pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(b)(2), and (2) stay entry of judgment pending a bench trial on the accounting counts. The district court denied this motion, noting that an accounting was not required under Florida law and therefore WL Alliance's request for an accounting was moot. Further, the court enforced its pre-trial scheduling order and refused to allow the late amendment of the defendants' answer.

Finally, the defendants filed a renewed motion for judgment as a matter of law under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 50(b), reiterating their arguments that an accounting was required and that the future damages were too speculative. The district court denied

22-10780

Opinion of the Court

5

this motion, holding that the accounting argument was waived because it was not presented in the Rule 50(a) motion and was unsupported by the record. The district court further held that the evidence was sufficient to support the award of future damages.

## II.

We review the denial of motions for judgment as a matter of law *de novo* and apply the same standard as the district court. *Collado v. United Parcel Serv., Co.*, 419 F.3d 1143, 1149 (11th Cir. 2005). Judgment as a matter of law is only warranted where, taking all evidence in favor of the non-movant, no reasonable jury could have reached a verdict for the non-movant. *Id.*

This is a diversity action, and both parties agree that Florida substantive law governs this appeal. *See Erie R.R. v. Tompkins*, 304 U.S. 64, 78 (1938).

## III.

### A.

We begin with the defendants' argument that there was insufficient evidence to support the award of future damages. We have previously held that Florida law requires future damages to be proved with "reasonable certainty." *Nebula Glass Int'l, Inc. v. Reichold, Inc.*, 454 F.3d 1203, 1212 (11th Cir. 2006) (citing *Auto-Owners Ins. Co. v. Tompkins*, 651 So.2d 89, 90–91 (Fla. 1995)). Florida law distinguishes between proving the causation of damages and proving the amount of damages. The plaintiff must prove with reasonable certainty that their lost profits were caused by the

# 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.