

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA

Case No.: 2026 - 12197 CICI

JODIA JOHANNA STEFANO,

Petitioner,

v.

CITY OF ORMOND BEACH, FLORIDA, an agency/municipal corporation;

ORMOND BEACH POLICE DEPARTMENT, an agency of the City of Ormond Beach;

SUSAN CARROLL DAUDERIS, in her official capacity as City Clerk and Records Custodian for the City of Ormond Beach; and

CHRISTOPHER ROOS, in his official capacity as Captain of Support Services and Records Custodian for the Ormond Beach Police Department,

Respondents.

**(I) AMENDED EMERGENCY PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS; (II)
STATUTORY COMPLAINT FOR ENFORCEMENT OF FLORIDA'S PUBLIC
RECORDS ACT (CHAPTER 119)**

Note; the initial petition is amended to collapse individuals previously named as respondents into either two entity named, and to clarify the distinctions between the actions explicit to the City of Ormond Beach and those explicit to the Ormond Beach Police Department, and adds a complaint for enforcement (chapter 119). Additionally, the counts are clearly established in this amended filing.

Petition incorporates, for reference, pages 9 - 407 of the initial petition—record.

Petitioner, Jodia Johanna Stefano, seeks an emergency writ of mandamus compelling Respondents to comply with their non-discretionary duties under

Article I, Section 24(a) of the Florida Constitution and Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, and states:

1. EMERGENCY NATURE OF RELIEF REQUESTED

This matter is an emergency.

Petitioner has been forced to proceed through multiple civil matters, and is currently facing ongoing legal proceedings, including criminal exposure, without access to public records that were requested, preserved, and necessary to defend against allegations and protect Petitioner's rights.

Respondents' actions have:

- Prevented Petitioner from accessing exculpatory evidence
- Forced Petitioner to proceed through litigation without necessary records
- Resulted in ongoing harm, including reputational, legal, and procedural harm
- Created a continuing inability for Petitioner to defend against allegations arising from the same events reflected in the requested records

Petitioner does not have the ability to obtain these records through subpoena or discovery mechanisms in a timely or effective manner because:

- Public records access is independent of litigation
- Respondents have refused to identify what records exist
- Respondents have refused inspection
- Respondents have removed or deleted records after preservation

Without a court order compelling immediate inspection and accounting, Petitioner will continue to suffer irreparable harm.

2. CLEAR LEGAL DUTY

Under Article I, Section 24(a), Florida Constitution, and §119.07(1)(a), Fla.

Stat., Respondents have a mandatory duty to:

- Permit inspection of public records promptly
- Produce records in the form maintained
- Identify responsive records
- Provide written statutory exemptions when withholding records
- Preserve records once on notice of their relevance

These duties are non-discretionary.

3. CONTINUOUS FAILURE TO LAWFULLY PRODUCE RECORDS

a. From 2024 through 2026, Petitioner made numerous lawful public records

requests to Ormond Beach Police Department for:

- Body-worn camera (BWC) footage
- Dispatch (CAD) records
- Incident reports
- Officer communications
- Metadata, audit logs, and Action History

Respondents have never lawfully produced records.

Instead, Respondents:

- Marked requests “complete” without producing records

- Provided partial, inconsistent, or unidentified materials
- Failed to identify what records correspond to which requests
- Required payment without identifying the records being provided
- Provided inaccessible, incomplete, or empty files
- Ignored follow-up requests
- Failed to provide lawful written exemptions

Partial, unidentifiable, or inaccessible production is not lawful production.

- b. Respondent, City of Ormond Beach, under the designation of City Clerk - records Custodian, refused to release a recording of the magistrate hearing in June 2025.

A secretary finally did that.

City of Ormond Beach also refused to submit to the records request regarding public funding paid to Abraham McKinnon, esq, and requests for records of information surrounding his involvement in litigation matters.

Continuous requests from JUNE 2025- October 2025 to the City of Ormond Beach for:

- Clarification of records requests
- Unverified records requests
- Incomplete records requests

were heavily avoided. When they were responded to, Taylor Lochert, the designee by the Clerk to be responsive to JUSTFOIA requests gave boiler plate,

copy/paste type of answers, never produced, never clarified, and stopped responding.

Petitioner made MULTIPLE phone calls to the City of Ormond Beach to speak with the City Manager, never being routed to her. Then to the City Clerk, also never being routed to her.

She spoke primarily to persons who were said to be secretaries (3 females) and somebody who may be an administrative assistant, named "Jessica."

Petitioner made her phone calls from 386.293.4333 and was told there was a call log— where the calls, how they were responded to, by whom they were responded to, and if they were routed was kept.

Petitioner was told that her voicemails were also kept for at least 2 years.

Petitioner's email communication and JUSTFoia requests were sent by sina.journey@gmail.com and jodiajohannastefano@gmail.com.

4. UNLAWFUL DENIAL OF INSPECTION - OBPD

Petitioner repeatedly demanded inspection from OBPD.

Respondents refused to:

- Schedule inspection
- Allow in-person review
- Provide access to records previously available

Captain Christopher Roos explicitly refused inspection and would not permit Petitioner to review records in person.

5. AXON ACCESS, PRESERVATION, AND RELIANCE - OBPD

The BWC recordings were accessed through Axon accounts linked to:

- sina.journey@gmail.com
- jodiajohannastefano@gmail.com

Respondents manually preserved and unscheduled the recordings for deletion after disputes.

Petitioner verified preservation and relied on that status while awaiting lawful production, metadata, and audit logs.

6. JUNE–JULY 2025 – REMOVAL OF BWC AND INJUNCTION MANUFACTURING - OBPD and City of Ormond Beach

In June 2025, Petitioner discovered missing recordings.

Petitioner immediately called to the Ormond Beach Police Department directly and spoke with the records staff, first Ms. Sandy, and then Ms. Kathy (deceased). Ms. Kathy routed the communication to Captain Roos.

Petitioner also emailed Captain Roos. Captain Roos responded via email that the BWC was not preserved, he did not know how to do it, and that they deleted automatically.

After back and forth, Roos determined he could restore the videos that had been deleted (3) of them because they were still stored 7 days after deletion.

However, when Roos confirmed that they had been restored, only 2 were restored, and more had been deleted.

There was a lot of argument back and forth.

Petitioner clearly told Roos that she depended on the storage on AXON and her demand for preservation.

Petitioner told Roos that she must have the videos placed on a flashdrive — as she had been told she could have— because the files were too big to download or whatever problem, but she needed them produced on rflashdrive – which is what she had asked for months, since before production.

It was at that time that Roos assured that all BWC had been preserved.

Petitioner noticed that the “scheduled deletion” read “unscheduled” whereas before it showed a date 90 days from upload.

She relied on this preservation.

In or around 16–17 July 2025, Respondents Ormond Beach Police Department (OBPD) manually removed or deleted BWC recordings that directly contradicted allegations later used against Petitioner.

On or about the following day, after those recordings were no longer accessible, Michael Regan filed a stalking injunction.

On 06 August 2025 Petitioner was seeking public records that were prepared for her and noticed to her were available to be picked up.

She had a neighborly chat with Ms. Sandy from the records division for 44 minutes and turned to leave when she was confronted by CSO Champion.

Afterwards, she was surrounded by at least 4 officers, and up to 6 officers, including Captain Donald Smith where she was told that “since you decided to sue the whole city, we are not helping you here.”

Petitioner had no idea, but Captain Donald Smith had falsely radio'd into dispatch for a level 1 priority 2 emergency response for a "disorderly" in the lobby.

One year later, Petitioner is still enduring the prosecution that has no probable cause — still — never articulated, told to not have it, refused hearings, etc. and has been unable to seek records (and public safety services) from Ormond Beach Police due to threats, intimidation, refusal to follow up with calls for service, callbacks, and emails.

Furthermore, on 06 August 2026, Petitioner was told "go to city legal" "we were told not to talk to you."

Despite that Petitioner asked multiple times from the City of Ormond Beach for records to prove that there was an official memorandum directing OBPD to refuse Petitioner services — in which case this unlawful action would be documented and could be reviewed, challenged, and litigated, City has refused to provide that.

That evening of 06 August 2025, Petitioner was ambushed in a wholly coordinated and manufactured arrest over a violation of the injunction already. Petitioner shall not litigate that here.

Petitioner was threatened again, with Lt. Garner telling her "you went too far," and Ofc Garcia saying that lawful service, responsive pleadings to the injunction were "bothering" and telling her to "leave him alone."

That officer would go on to manufacture MULTIPLE “violations” , carry out unlawful arrests, pursuits, targeting and surveillance, all the while Petitioner was prohibited by OBPD to make sworn statements as a victim before any escalation. This is important — because any effort Petitioner made to seek out the records she needed became a risk, and the department’s avoidance and refusal to produce — a criminal offense officers are not offered immunity from — was intimidation in itself.

On 07 August 2025, Petitioner stated in court that the injunction could not be reconciled with existing evidence. She told the Judge she was in duress. She told the judge she could not plead. That she was too confused on where the Respondent was getting his confidence from.

That day, Petitioner realized that she had not audited her Axon accounts since she had seen the BWCs were preserved.

Petitioner audited Axon and discovered the recordings from 15 March 2025 event had been deleted.

Additionally, several other records requests, to include one from 24 JULY 2025, which was responded to by OBPD, remained entirely incomplete, and follow up requests have been refused.

7. 07 AUGUST 2025 – DEMAND

Petitioner demanded restoration, identification, and audit logs from:

- OBPD
- City of Ormond Beach

- City Attorney Randy Hayes

No substantive response was provided.

After calling and pleading with the secretaries and staff, City Attorney Randall Hayes integrated what Captain Donald Smith taunted to Petitioner before her arrest on 06 August 2025, stating “there is a fundamental difference of opinion ... you decided to sue the city” and explaining they had nothing to give to her.

8. OCTOBER- (on or around) 14 November 2025 – COMPLETE DELETION

Between October and 14 November 2025, Respondents manually removed preserved recordings.

On 14 November 2025, Petitioner discovered that more than twenty-three (23) BWC recordings were no longer accessible.

Because they had been preserved, this required manual deletion.

She had watched a few videos get deleted, she argued for them to be restored, but was ignored.

She continued to depend on the videos that were unscheduled for deletion and the preservation demands and obligations that OBPD and City of Ormond Beach had in response to the known litigations that were taking place.

9. NOVEMBER 2025 – REFUSAL AND NONRESPONSE

Petitioner repeatedly demanded:

- Where the recordings were
- Whether they were deleted
- Access and inspection

- Audit logs and metadata

Respondent Christopher Roos:

- Told Petitioner to submit additional requests
- Refused to provide records
- Refused to provide inspection
- Refused to provide accounting

Captain Christopher Roos told Petitioner on a recorded call, that “she will *never* be allowed to inspect records,” and that the reason was because Roos “will never have her sit next to her in his office to inspect them.”

The City of Ormond Beach, including the City Attorney, was on notice and failed to correct the violations.

10. 20-21 NOVEMBER 2025 – NOTICE AND ARREST - OBPD

On late night, 20 November, early morning 21 November 2025, Petitioner notified the court where she had a hearing for a case against the OBPD of imminent arrest activity, pleading the morning of a circuit civil court for an emergency stay so she did not have to appear — she was forced to appear in her pajamas.

On 21 November 2025, Petitioner was unlawfully targeted, surveilled, pursued in her vehicle, stopped in traffic, arrested, and unlawfully had her dog and vehicle seized, and unlawfully was placed into jail.

That arrest was supposed to be an individual event, but Petitioner learned that during the morning time, Officer Jake Sesemann and other officers went to the Ormond Beach/ Lydecker YMCA and Manufactured a crime against her with

Michael T. Regan and YMCA management staff — defendants in preexisting litigation.

Petitioner requested all related records for both the a.m event at YMCA and p.m. event.

Respondents refused to provide BWC footage, records, names.

The only records that Petitioner finally was able to get were CAD reports that were provided by Ms.Kathy.

11. FAILURE TO ACCOUNT - OBPD and City of Ormond Beach

Respondents have never:

- **Identified all responsive records for any meaningful public records request**

- Explained what was deleted

- Provided audit logs

- Provided a complete accounting

Petitioner does not know where the records are that were deleted, and she does not know where the records are that were never provided and were ignored.

12. CONTINUING HARM:

Respondents' actions have caused ongoing harm, including:

- Inability to defend against allegations

- Loss of access to exculpatory evidence

- Forced litigation without records

- Ongoing legal exposure

- irreparable harm
- pain and suffering

13. NO ADEQUATE REMEDY

Petitioner has no adequate remedy at law.

Mandamus is required and records enforcement actions are required.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner requests:

- A. Immediate inspection of all records;
- B. Immediate production;
- C. Full accounting of all records;
- D. Identification of deletions and responsible parties;
- E. Production of all audit logs and metadata;
- F. Expedited hearing and oral argument;
- G. Any further relief deemed just and proper.

COUNT II: STATUTORY CHAPTER 119 ENFORCEMENT COMPLAINT AGAINST RESPONDENT SUSAN CARROLL DAUDERIS, IN HER OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS CITY CLERK AND RECORDS CUSTODIAN

- 14. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference all factual allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 13 of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.
- 15. This is an independent statutory action to enforce the mandatory, non-discretionary provisions of Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, Florida's Public Records Act.

16. Respondent, Susan Carroll Dauderis, is the City Clerk and the officially designated statutory Records Custodian for the City of Ormond Beach under Section 119.12, Florida Statutes. She is sued in her official capacity.
17. Respondent Dauderis has violated Section 119.07(1)(a), Florida Statutes, by failing to provide prompt, complete access to general municipal public records requested by Petitioner, and by failing to oversee and ensure citywide compliance after receiving repeated notice.
18. Pursuant to Section 119.11(1), Florida Statutes, "Whenever an action is filed to enforce the provisions of this chapter, the court shall set an immediate hearing, giving the case priority over other pending cases." This statutory mandate requires this Court to bypass standard trial calendars and advance Count II immediately.
19. Pursuant to Section 119.12, Florida Statutes, Petitioner is entitled to an award of all reasonable enforcement costs, including attorney-fee equivalent compensation and operational litigation costs, against the Custodian's office for the unlawful refusal of public records.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court enter an Order tracking Count II for an **IMMEDIATE ENFORCEMENT HEARING** under Section 119.11(1), commanding Respondent Susan Carroll Dauderis to immediately produce the requested municipal records for inspection, and awarding enforcement costs under Section 119.12.

**COUNT III: STATUTORY CHAPTER 119 ENFORCEMENT COMPLAINT
AGAINST RESPONDENT CAPTAIN CHRISTOPHER ROOS, IN HIS OFFICIAL
CAPACITY AS OBPD RECORDS CUSTODIAN**

20. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference all factual allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 13 of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.
21. Respondent, Captain Christopher Roos, is the Support Services Captain and the designated operational Records Custodian for the Ormond Beach Police Department, holding direct control over law enforcement files, Axon accounts, and body-worn camera footage. He is sued in his official capacity.
22. Respondent Roos has directly violated Section 119.07(1)(a), Florida Statutes, by unlawfully denying physical inspection, withholding raw metadata, and manually deleting or restricting user access to critical body-worn camera videos.
23. Pursuant to Section 119.11(1), Florida Statutes, the court **shall** set an immediate priority hearing on this statutory claim, giving it absolute priority and bypassing the standard October common-law trial calendar.
24. Pursuant to Section 119.12, Florida Statutes, Petitioner is entitled to an award of reasonable enforcement costs and attorney-fee equivalent compensation for Respondent Roos's unlawful statutory violations.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court enter an Order tracking Count III for an **IMMEDIATE ENFORCEMENT HEARING** under Section 119.11(1), commanding Respondent Captain Christopher Roos to immediately restore access to all deleted or restricted videos and metadata for inspection, and awarding statutory costs.

**COUNT IV: STATUTORY CHAPTER 119 ENFORCEMENT COMPLAINT
AGAINST RESPONDENT CITY OF ORMOND BEACH, FLORIDA**

25. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference all factual allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 13 of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.
26. Respondent, City of Ormond Beach, Florida, is a municipal corporation and an "agency" as defined by Section 119.011(2), Florida Statutes, and is bound by the mandates of Chapter 119.
27. The City of Ormond Beach has violated Chapter 119 by permitting its operational divisions to mark requests "complete" without producing records, demanding unauthorized fees, and failing to provide written statutory exemptions, failure to provide clarification, and refusing to verify documents.
28. Pursuant to Section 119.11(1), Florida Statutes, an immediate priority hearing is required to address these systemic agency violations.

29. Pursuant to Section 119.12, Florida Statutes, Petitioner is entitled to an award of reasonable enforcement costs due to the agency's unlawful public records refusal.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court enter an Order tracking Count IV for an **IMMEDIATE ENFORCEMENT HEARING** under Section 119.11(1), commanding the City of Ormond Beach to produce all withheld records, and assessing operational enforcement costs against the agency under Section 119.12, Florida Statutes.

**COUNT V: STATUTORY CHAPTER 119 ENFORCEMENT COMPLAINT
AGAINST RESPONDENT ORMOND BEACH POLICE DEPARTMENT**

30. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference all factual allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 13 of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.
31. Respondent, Ormond Beach Police Department, is an active law enforcement department and an "agency" as defined by Section 119.011(2), Florida Statutes, bound by the mandates of Chapter 119.
32. The Ormond Beach Police Department has violated Chapter 119 by failing to produce public records in the form maintained, withholding critical bodycam evidence, and blocking access to files after being on explicit preservation notice.

33. Pursuant to Section 119.11(1), Florida Statutes, an immediate priority hearing is required to address these law enforcement agency violations.

34. Pursuant to Section 119.12, Florida Statutes, Petitioner is entitled to an award of reasonable enforcement costs due to the police department's unlawful public records refusal.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court enter an Order tracking Count V for an **IMMEDIATE ENFORCEMENT HEARING** under Section 119.11(1), commanding the Ormond Beach Police Department to immediately cease all data deletions or alterations, and assessing all enforcement costs against the department under Section 119.12, Florida Statutes.

VERIFICATION

Under penalties of perjury, I declare that I have read the foregoing Amended Emergency Petition for Writ of Mandamus and Statutory Complaint for Enforcement of Florida's Public Records Act, and that the facts stated in it are true. Dated this 19TH day of July, 2026.

By: /s/ Jodia Johanna Stefano

JODIA JOHARNNA STEFANO

386.293.4333

4 ABROR LAKE PARK; Ormond Beach, FL 32174

jodiajohannastefano@gmail.com