

DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA
SECOND DISTRICT

In the Interest of A.K., a child.

O.K.,

Appellant,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES,

Appellee.

No. 2D22-1608

December 28, 2022

Appeal from the Circuit Court for Pinellas County; James V. Pierce,
Judge.

Ita M. Neymotin, Regional Counsel, Fort Myers, and David C. Chafin,
Assistant Regional Counsel, Clearwater, for Appellant.

Bruce Bartlett, State Attorney, and Leslie M. Layne, Assistant State
Attorney, Sixth Judicial Circuit of Florida, Clearwater, for Appellee.

PER CURIAM.

O.K. (the Father) appeals the trial court's April 18, 2022, Amended Order on Permanency Judicial Review, Order on Father's Motion for Reunification and Order Releasing Supervision and Relinquishing Jurisdiction. Because the Father did not preserve the issues raised in his briefs by filing a motion for rehearing, we affirm the trial court's April

18, 2022, order. *See A.M. v. Dep't of Child. & Fams.*, 118 So. 3d 998, 999 (Fla. 1st DCA 2013) ("[I]f statutory deficiencies existed in the trial court's order, [a]ppellant needed to preserve these issues 'by a motion for rehearing or . . . [by otherwise bringing] the claimed deficiency to the attention of the trial court at a point when it could have been corrected.' " (third alteration in original) (quoting *D.T. v. Dep't of Child. & Fams.*, 54 So. 3d 632, 622 (Fla. 1st DCA 2011))).

The Father also raises in this appeal issues related to the trial court's July 6, 2022, Order Denying Father's Motion to Compel Child's Return to Florida and Motion for Rehearing (July 6, 2022, Order). Because the July 6, 2022, Order was subject to appeal in case number 2D22-2263, which was dismissed by this court, we reject the Father's arguments related to that order. *See Clearwater Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n. v. Sampson*, 336 So. 2d 78, 79 (Fla. 1976) (holding that orders rendered after judgment that adjudicates rights that were not adjudicated in the original final judgment are separate final and distinct orders that require their own appeal); *see also M.C.G. v. Hillsborough Cnty. Sch. Bd.*, 927 So. 2d 224, 228 (Fla. 2d DCA 2006) (affirming a final agency order "[b]ased on the determination made in the appellants' case that we previously considered"); *Friends of the Everglades, Inc. v. City of Miami*, 485 So. 2d 856, 856 (Fla. 1st DCA 1986) (affirming final order where the issues raised in the current appeal had already been decided by the appellate court in two prior appeals).

Affirmed.

LaROSE, KHOUZAM, and SMITH, JJ., Concur.

Opinion subject to revision prior to official publication.