

NOT FINAL UNTIL TIME EXPIRES
TO FILE REHEARING MOTION
AND, IF FILED, DISPOSED OF.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
OF FLORIDA
THIRD DISTRICT
JANUARY TERM, A.D. 2004

RITA TEMPLER and PAUL TEMPLER, **

Appellants, **

vs. **

CASE NO. 3D03-42

N. RALPH FRANKEL, M.D. and **
TENET HEALTHCARE CORPORATION, **
d/b/a TENET PHYSICIANS **
SERVICES, a foreign **
corporation, **

LOWER
TRIBUNAL NO. 01-6434

Appellees. **

Opinion filed May 26, 2004.

An Appeal from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County,
Jennifer D. Bailey, Judge.

Ratzan & Alters; Angelo, Barry & Boldt and Kimberly L. Boldt,
for appellants.

Wicker, Smith, O'Hara, McCoy, Graham & Ford and Shelley H.
Leinicke for appellee, N. Ralph Frankel, M.D.; Parenti, Falk,
Waas, Hernandez & Cortina and Gail Leverett Parenti, for appellee,
Tenet Healthcare Corporation, d/b/a Tenet Physicians Services.

Before SCHWARTZ, C.J., SHEVIN and WELLS, JJ.

SHEVIN, Judge.

We affirm the final judgment. We hold that the court did
not abuse its discretion in excluding the proffered documents.

The trial court has broad discretion in determining the admissibility of evidence. Hendry v. Zelaya, 841 So. 2d 572 (Fla. 3d DCA 2003). The plaintiffs' expert testified as to the same matter the documents would have illustrated: the standard of care the defendant-physician should have exercised, and how the patient's care should have been coordinated. Therefore, the exclusion was not an abuse of discretion. See Parker v. State, 29 Fla. L. Weekly S27 (Fla. Jan. 22, 2004) (exclusion of letters to attorney not abuse of discretion where attorney testified to same facts contained in letters). We also hold that the trial court did not err in limiting the scope of the expert's testimony. Castillo v. E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co., 854 So. 2d 1264 (Fla. 2003).

Affirmed.