

# **Third District Court of Appeal**

## **State of Florida**

Opinion filed October 31, 2018.  
Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing.

---

No. 3D17-2473  
Lower Tribunal No. 14-30760

---

**Bruce C. Matheson,**  
Appellant,

vs.

**Miami-Dade County, Florida and  
The Florida International University Board of Trustees,**  
Appellees.

An Appeal from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County, Antonio Marin,  
Judge.

Carlton Fields Jordan Burt, P.A., and Frank G. Burt, and Enrique D. Arana,  
and Todd M. Fuller, and Scott E. Byers, for appellant.

Bilzin Sumberg Baena Price & Axelrod LLP, and Eileen Ball Mehta, for  
Florida International University Board of Trustees; Abigail Price-Williams,  
Miami-Dade County Attorney, and Miguel A. Gonzalez, and Monica Rizo Perez,  
Assistant County Attorneys, for Miami-Dade County, Florida, for appellees.

Before ROTHENBERG, C.J., and SALTER, and LINDSEY, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Affirmed. See County of Volusia v. Detzner, 43 Fla. La. Weekly S 355 (Fla. Sept. 7, 2018) (A ballot title and summary was found not “defective for failing to inform voters of what the Appellants assert is Amendment 10's true chief purpose: to divest county voters of their current constitutional right to decide the structure of their local governments” because the summary “accurately states the effect that Amendment 10's passage would have on county charters and special laws; there is no need to explain ramifications that are implicit in those statements.”); Dep't of State v. Fla. Greyhound Ass'n, 2018 Fla. LEXIS 1593 \* | 2018 WL 4275358 (Fla. Sept. 7, 2018) (“When evaluating whether a proposed amendment’s ballot language is clearly and conclusively defective, a court must look not to subjective criteria espoused by the amendment’s sponsor but to objective criteria inherent in the amendment itself, such as the amendment’s main effect.”).