

Third District Court of Appeal

State of Florida

Opinion filed April 24, 2019.
Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing.

No. 3D18-2208
Lower Tribunal No. 18-2141

Ingrid Filomia,
Appellant,

vs.

**Celebrity Cruises Inc. and Reemployment Assistance Appeals
Commission,**
Appellees.

An Administrative appeal from the Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission.

Ingrid Filomia, in proper person.

Amanda L. Neff (Tallahassee), Deputy General Counsel & Chief Appellate Attorney, for appellee Reemployment Assistance Appeals Commission.

Before EMAS, C.J., and SALTER, and MILLER, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Although we are sympathetic to appellant’s personal tragedy, it is well-settled that “in appellate proceedings . . . the burden is on the appellant to demonstrate error,” thus, we affirm.¹ Applegate v. Barnett Bank of Tallahassee, 377 So. 2d 1150, 1152 (Fla. 1979); see Steele v. Fla. Unemployment Appeals Comm’n, 596 So. 2d 1190, 1192 (Fla. 1st DCA 1992) (“The burden of properly presenting a case to this court for review must therefore remain squarely upon the litigant, whether represented by counsel or not.”); see also J.A.B. Enters. v. Gibbons, 596 So. 2d 1247, 1250 (Fla. 4th DCA 1992) (“[A]n issue not raised in an initial brief is deemed abandoned.”) (citations omitted).

Affirmed.

¹ “In Florida, pro se litigants are bound by the same rules that apply to counsel.” Stueber v. Gallagher, 812 So. 2d 454, 457 (Fla. 5th DCA 2002) (citing Kohn v. City of Miami Beach, 611 So. 2d 538 (Fla. 3d DCA 1992)).