[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT	FILED
	U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
	ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
No. 09-15846	APRIL 5, 2012
110. 03-13640	JOHN LEY
	CLERK
D. C. Docket No. 05-00334-CV-ORL-31-GJK	
AUTO-OWNERS INSURANCE COMPANY,	
	Plaintiff-Appellee,
versus	
SOUTHEAST FLOATING DOCKS, INC.,	
	Defendant-Appellant.
Appeal from the United States District Court	
for the Middle District of Florida	
(April 5, 2012)	
Before WILSON, PRYOR and ANDERSON, Circuit Judges.	
PER CURIAM:	

The instant appeal involves a fee dispute arising from Auto-Owners' suit against Southeast based on a written indemnity contract. Southeast prevailed, and filed a motion for attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Fla.Stat. §768.79. The district court denied the motion, and Southeast appealed to this court. We certified questions to the Supreme Court of Florida, including the following question:

DOES FLORIDA STATUTE §768.79 APPLY TO CASES THAT

ARE GOVERNED BY THE SUBSTANTIVE LAW OF ANOTHER

JURISDICTION; AND, IF SO, IS THIS STATUTE APPLICABLE

EVEN TO CONTROVERSIES IN WHICH THE PARTIES HAVE

CONTRACTUALLY AGREED TO BE BOUND BY THE

SUBSTANTIVE LAWS OF ANOTHER JURISDICTION?

In the indemnity contract, the parties agreed that the substantive law of Michigan would apply.² The Supreme Court of Florida answered the certified question in the negative, holding that §768.79 is substantive in nature for conflict of laws purposes, that no sufficient public policy concerns override the parties' right to choose the law of a particular forum that governs the substantive portions

Auto-Owners Ins. Co. v. Southeast Floating Docks, Inc., 632 F.3d 1195 (11th Cir. 2011).

The parties stipulated that no comparable statute exists under Michigan law.

of their contract, and thus that §768.79 simply does not apply.³ The Florida Supreme Court also disapproved of <u>BDO Seidman, LLP v. British Car Auctions</u>, <u>Inc.</u>, 802 So.2d 366, 368 (Fla. 4th DCA 2001).

Although the judgment of the district court denying attorney's fees and costs was based upon a different ground, we affirm on the ground articulated by the Supreme Court of Florida.

AFFIRMED.

³ <u>Southeast Floating Docks, Inc. v. Auto-Owners Ins. Co.,</u> So.3d ____, 2012 WL 301029 (Fla. 2012).