## IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA FIFTH DISTRICT JULY TERM 2013

NOT FINAL UNTIL TIME EXPIRES TO FILE MOTION FOR REHEARING AND DISPOSITION THEREOF IF FILED

SCOTT KATZMAN, M.D. AND ADVANCED ORTHOPAEDICS, P.A.,

Petitioners,

v. Case No. 5D12-4816

WINN-DIXIE STORES, INC. AND MICHELE GOULD,

Respondents.

Opinion filed July 26, 2013

Petition for Certiorari Review of Order from the Circuit Court for Sumter County, Michelle Morley, Judge.

Kimberly P. Simoes and Mario B. Simoes, of The Simoes Law Group, P.A., DeLand, for Petitioners.

Jennings L. Hurt, III and Richard S. Womble, of Rissman, Barrett, Hurt, Donahue & McLain, P.A., Orlando, for Respondent Winn-Dixie Stores. Inc.

No Appearance for Respondent Michele Gould.

EVANDER, J.

Petitioners seek certiorari review of the trial court's denial of their motion for protective order from a subpoena duces tecum without deposition. We conclude that the trial court did not depart from the essential requirements of law in requiring

Petitioners to produce the documents at issue.<sup>1</sup> See Katzman v. Rediron Fabrication, Inc., 76 So. 3d 1060 (Fla. 4th DCA 2011); Columbia Hosp. (Palm Beaches) Ltd. P'ship v. Hasson, 33 So. 3d 148 (Fla. 4th DCA 2010).

However, to the extent the trial court failed to take appropriate measures to protect Petitioners from the dissemination of the documents (and/or confidential information contained therein), Petitioners are entitled to certiorari relief. A protective order or confidentiality agreement should be in place prior to release of the documents. *Laser Spine Inst., LLC v. Makanast*, 69 So. 3d 1045 (Fla. 2d DCA 2011).

PETITION GRANTED, in part; DENIED, in part; and REMANDED.

LAWSON and COHEN, JJ., concur.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>We interpret the trial court's order to limit Petitioners' obligation to produce those documents requested in paragraphs five and six of the subpoena to the three-year period immediately preceding the date of the filing of the subpoena.