

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,

IN AND FOR VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO.: 2026 12586 C1C1

MICHAEL LYRAS,

Petitioner,

v.

CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH, FLORIDA, and

THE DAYTONA BEACH POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Respondents.

FILED
2026 JUL 10 PM 3:02
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT
& CITY COURT VOLUSIA COUNTY, FL.
CC 32

_____/

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS PURSUANT TO FLORIDA CHAPTER 119

Petitioner, MICHAEL LYRAS, respectfully petitions this Court for the issuance of an Alternative Writ of Mandamus directed to Respondents, CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH, FLORIDA, and the DAYTONA BEACH POLICE DEPARTMENT, and in support thereof states:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This is a civil action to enforce the Petitioner's non-discretionary, ministerial right to inspect and copy public records pursuant to Chapter 119 of the Florida Statutes and Article I, Section 24 of the Florida Constitution.
2. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Florida Statute § 119.11 and Article V, Section 5(b) of the Florida Constitution.

3. Venue is proper in Volusia County, Florida, as the named municipal agencies are situated, maintain the requested public records, and executed the statutory withholdings within this judicial circuit.

PARTIES

4. Petitioner Michael Lyras is a resident of Volusia County, Florida, and is a member of the public entitled to inspect and copy public records under Florida Statute § 119.01(1).
5. Respondent City of Daytona Beach is a political subdivision of the State of Florida and a public agency under Florida Statute § 119.011(2), maintaining administrative custody of municipal records.
6. Respondent Daytona Beach Police Department ("DBPD") is a municipal law enforcement agency within the City of Daytona Beach and an agency subject to the mandatory disclosure provisions of Chapter 119, Florida Statutes.

MINISTERIAL PUBLIC RECORDS FRAMEWORK

7. Under Florida law, a public records mandamus action cannot litigate claims of police misconduct, bad insurance advice, rude behavior, or investigate the underlying traffic crash. It is strictly limited to enforcing the non-discretionary, ministerial duty to produce public records.
8. Respondents have a non-discretionary, ministerial duty under Florida Statute § 119.07(1) to permit the inspection and copying of public records, including unredacted shift rosters, desk logs, agency surveillance video, internal affairs tracking files, and electronic server data.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The Public Records Request and Statutory Hardship Assertion

9. On May 13, 2026, Petitioner submitted comprehensive public records requests pursuant to Chapter 119 via Respondents' official portals (Exhibits B, C, D).

10. The requests explicitly sought closed Internal Affairs investigative files, supervisor intake recordings, precinct lobby and parking lot surveillance video from April 4, 2025, and internal agency email/server logs necessary to identify a plainclothes employee who interacted with Petitioner on April 4, 2025. To ensure notice, Petitioner executed multiple follow-up phone calls to the direct office line of Lieutenant Jemma Chirillo, specifically logging an outgoing call on Friday, May 16, 2025, at approximately 3:21 PM (1 min 11 sec), two sequential outgoing calls on Monday, May 19, 2025, at approximately 11:18 AM (13 sec and 2 min 33 sec), and a final outgoing call on Tuesday, May 20, 2025, at approximately 1:45 PM (50 sec). Additionally, an extended telephonic consultation on Monday, May 19, 2025, resulted in a live 13-minute conversation with internal staff where Petitioner was explicitly assured that an employee named "Roman" would execute a prompt return call; however, no such callback was ever received. Respondents completely ignored both the electronic portal submittals and these logged telephonic contact attempts.
11. Pursuant to Florida Statute § 119.07(4), Petitioner asserted a permanent disability financial hardship, requested a formal fee waiver, placed a strict \$25.00 pause cap on clerical work, and demanded a mandatory written, itemized Good Faith Estimate before extensive labor costs were incurred.

The Agency Delays and Constructive Denial of Public Records

12. Respondents executed separate, unlawful processing methods that constitute a constructive denial of public records under Chapter 119 of the Florida Statutes. Specifically, Respondent City Hall prematurely closed request #PRR-2026-1302 on May 15, 2026—just two days after submission—by dumping unreadable, locked database index structures extracted from server file "Exchange.001.pst" that outside browsers cannot open, while Respondent Daytona Beach Police Department actively delayed the production of internal tracking files and surveillance data for 30 days prior to its partial portal data dump, with both public agencies completely failing to provide readable statutory productions or itemized Good Faith Estimates within a reasonable time frame.
13. The locked server file extraction from "Exchange.001.pst" captured internal routing logs for Tickets #19006969 and #21526012, alongside the file "Complaint Dismissal Lyras

2025-068 11-4-25.pdf". Following this encrypted data dump, Respondents' staff flatly asserted that the City had fulfilled its obligations and would not produce the underlying raw text files.

The Hand-Delivery Notice and Premature Electronic Portal Closure

14. On June 16, 2026, Petitioner sent a formal Statutory Inquiry to City Clerk Letitia LaMagna flagging the ongoing non-compliance (Exhibit E).
15. On June 25, 2026, Petitioner physically hand-delivered a 5-day Statutory Warning Notice to City Hall and DBPD records personnel (Exhibit F).
16. Following delivery of the statutory warning notice, Respondents executed an abrupt backend portal data dump at approximately 4:52 PM and subsequently issued an automated system notification marking Request PD-2026-3124 as "Completed" on the JustFOIA tracking platform.
17. Despite marking the tracking thread "Completed" inside the portal registry, the face of the DBPD notification email (Exhibit G) explicitly states: "when the axon from Sgt. Catalano has been completed it will be attached to your request." This statement constitutes a written admission of an active, ongoing withholding of public records in open violation of Florida Statute § 119.07(1).

Bad-Faith Evading and Unlawful Statutory Redactions

18. On June 29, 2026, Respondents executed a reactive backend upload of a 584.61 MB video file titled
_Extraction_1_1_Axon_Body_4_Video_2025-10-21_1046_D01A6468V.mp4 (Exhibit H), capturing a supervisor call from October 21, 2025.
19. Respondents utilized this backend upload as a substitute to satisfy the tracking portal while actively suppressing the explicitly requested April 4, 2025 precinct lobby surveillance video capturing the identity of the plainclothes officer and the front desk intake logs.
20. On June 25, 2026, Respondent produced a 6-page Florida Traffic Crash Report under HSMV Crash Report Number 26929358 (Exhibit I). The face of this public record

establishes an extensive delay between the crash date of April 4, 2025, and the official report date of June 23, 2025. Page 4 confirms that Detective Henry T. Fulcher II omitted citizen-provided video evidence from the investigative file.

21. On May 26, 2026, and June 25, 2026, Respondents uploaded CAD Incident Log P250941491-Redacted.pdf to the JustFOIA registry (Exhibit J). Respondents delivered these public records in heavily redacted system formats, blacking out entire text blocks under an overbroad citation of the 911 caller restrictions in F.S. § 365.171(12) to suppress substantive dispatch tracking logs.

The Production of Falsified and Suppressed Internal Investigation Records

22. On June 25, 2026, Respondent produced an internal database schedule under file registry filename 2e4621d7-ac0a-4bb7-8f4e-63c650734e5f(1).png (Exhibit K). This calendar documents that Detective Fulcher was fully active during the weeks of June 2025, establishing an unjustified delay in executing the electronic system entry for Petitioner's traffic crash report until Monday, June 23, 2025.
23. On June 25, 2026, Respondent produced a 3-page internal record titled Citizen's Complaint Form (Exhibit L). Page 3 contains the official typed and handwritten Supervisory Review blocks. The typed intake block confirms that Lieutenant Raymond Walden assumed administrative custody of the file on October 21, 2025, but left the time field completely blank.
24. The document reveals that the department weaponized the internal affairs intake process as an administrative shield to protect the anonymous employee's identity, completely omitting any record of the plainclothes detective's identity. Lieutenant Walden subsequently executed an administrative deflection by leaving the time field blank to walk out of the building for a lunch period at approximately 10:51 AM, directing Petitioner to submit the materials to Officer Tatiani so as not to wait. Officer Tatiani summarily swore the Petitioner in but an official administrative receipt was never received.
25. The handwritten disposition block on Page 3, signed manually by Captain Trisha Jones, contains an explicit, written admission of the legal misrepresentation utilized by the department to suppress the public records. Captain Jones states verbatim: "Complainant

not satisfied that state law does not allow us to make an arrest on hit & run, fulcher could not even verify it occurred. Complaint is unfounded & recommend to close."

26. Respondents have failed to produce clean, unredacted, and readable copies of the underlying personnel shift rosters, desk logs, lobby surveillance logs, the citizen-secured video obtained from Dr. Doris Antos's Chiropractic office—who owns the commercial building that LabCorp rents from her—and unencrypted server files extracted from "Exchange.001.pst" necessary to identify the employee.
27. Pursuant to Florida Statute § 119.11, the Petitioner formally demands this Court conduct an immediate In-Camera Inspection of all redacted, locked, and withheld administrative, CAD dispatch, internal investigation, and audio files to strip away unauthorized censorship.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Petitioner, MICHAEL LYRAS, respectfully requests that this Court issue an immediate Alternative Writ of Mandamus commanding the Respondents to appear before this Court and show cause why a Peremptory Writ should not issue, and enter a Final Judgment against the Respondents that:

- A. Compels the Respondents to immediately produce clean, unredacted, and readable copies of all withheld records, including the unredacted personnel shift rosters and desk logs for April 4, 2025, the precinct lobby/parking lot surveillance video from April 4, 2025, and all raw text, internal routing logs, and server data extracted from 'Exchange.001.pst';
- B. Conducts an immediate In-Camera Inspection of all redacted CAD dispatch logs, internal investigation logs (Track 1 and Track 2), and locked server backup fields to verify that no valid statutory exemptions apply; and
- C. Assesses all taxable court costs, operational litigation expenses, and reasonable civil fees against the Respondents pursuant to the mandatory fee-shifting provisions of Florida Statute § 119.12.

VERIFICATION

STATE OF FLORIDA

COUNTY OF VOLUSIA

Under penalties of perjury, I declare that I have read the foregoing Petition for Writ of Mandamus and that the facts stated in it are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

MICHAEL LYRAS, Petitioner Pro Se

michaellyras2@gmail.com | (856) 313-8467

Date: July 6, 2026

EXHIBIT D: SWORN AFFIDAVIT OF MICHAEL LYRAS

STATE OF FLORIDA

COUNTY OF VOLUSIA

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, personally appeared Michael Lyras, who, being first daily sworn, deposes and states under penalty of perjury:

1. My name is Michael Lyras. I am over eighteen years of age, a resident of Volusia County, Florida, and am competent to testify to the facts set forth in this affidavit based upon my personal, firsthand knowledge.
2. This affidavit is submitted as evidentiary support for the attached Petition for Writ of Mandamus pursuant to Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, and details the timeline of events surrounding the public records withholdings executed by the City of Daytona Beach and the Daytona Beach Police Department.

The Incident and the Initial Precinct Front Desk Non-Consensual ID Detention

3. On April 4, 2025, I was involved in a traffic collision entirely within the private parking lot of the LabCorp medical building located in Daytona Beach, Florida. The other driver fled the scene immediately. Because the perpetrator fled, there was no active scene left for law enforcement to process when I returned to the parking lot. It was simply myself standing alone next to my damaged vehicle with the perpetrator completely gone in a small tightly packed parking lot.
4. On April 4, 2025, at approximately 14:51:15, I arrived at the Daytona Beach Police Department precinct lobby to execute a face-to-face report of the hit-and-run traffic crash. Front desk operator Craig Petty (ID D50793) took physical possession of my identification card and actively denied basic services, forcing me to wait outside at the front glass door for a non-consensual duration while executing a mandatory background search for criminal warrants. At approximately 14:54:40, the terminal check logged "LYRAS NEG/VALID" and concluded. This precise three-minute window constitutes an active, unlawful investigative detention of a crime victim, completely devoid of reasonable suspicion.
5. Immediately following this interaction, an unidentified plainclothes detective emerged from the back office areas, confronted me in the precinct lobby, and walked me out to the exterior parking lot to view my vehicle. While examining the vehicle, the detective displayed clear annoyance, minimized over \$1,000 in property damage as a mere "\$200," and actively advised me to leave the station without filing an official traffic crash report, and by proxy, preventing an insurance claim. I subsequently filed an internal complaint regarding this specific misconduct.

The Suppression of the Internal Investigation Tracks

6. The Daytona Beach Police Department generated two separate, internal investigation tracks to look into the matter. Track 1 (IA Case 2025-068) was originally directed online and via phone to Lieutenant Jemma Chirillo's Internal Affairs office between April and June 2025, where it was completely ignored. Following my in-person precinct filing on October 21, 2025, the track was processed as a telephone intake by Sgt. Stephen Castellano, and subsequently reviewed by Captain Trisha Jones, who omitted her name from the final text and generated a formal "unfounded" closeout letter signed by Police

Chief Jakari Young on November 4, 2025 (Exhibit A). Track 2 was opened in good faith by Lieutenant Dave DiNardi—who took over the division position following Lieutenant Chirillo's department promotion—in March 2026, but later surreptitiously closed out by Captain Conde without any mandatory notification or closure letter being sent to me.

7. Prior to the supervisor call detailed below, I attempted to report the misconduct surrounding the hit-and-run incident online directly to Lt. Chirillo's Internal Affairs office on two separate occasions months prior. To ensure notice, I executed multiple follow-up phone calls to her direct office line, specifically logging an outgoing call on Friday, May 16, 2025, at approximately 3:21 PM (1 min 11 sec), two sequential outgoing calls on Monday, May 19, 2025, at approximately 11:18 AM (13 sec and 2 min 33 sec), and a final outgoing call on Tuesday, May 20, 2025, at approximately 1:45 PM (50 sec). Additionally, an extended telephonic consultation on Monday, May 19, 2025, resulted in a live 13-minute conversation with internal staff where I was explicitly assured that an employee named "Roman" would execute a prompt return call; however, no such callback was ever received. Her office completely ignored both the electronic portal submittals and these logged telephonic contact attempts, failing to issue any administrative reply.

The October 21, 2025 Supervisor Recording and Fabricated Legal Standards

8. On October 21, 2025, I initiated a 38-minute telephone call with Respondent's supervisor, Sgt. Stephen Castellano, explicitly securing his advance permission to record the interaction. During the latter 17-minute and 39-second recorded segment of this call, Sgt. Castellano explicitly authenticated the department's structural failures, actively agreeing with me regarding the highly irregular 7-week non-communication window and the administrative issues surrounding Detective Fulcher and Lieutenant Osterman's conflicting municipal staffing timelines.
9. Crucially, Sgt. Castellano is captured on this recording following a temporary line disconnection explicitly requesting that I "go on" with the call, at which point the conversation re-anchored directly onto the legal standard regarding arrest criteria originally authored by Detective Henry T. Fulcher II and subsequently backed by Lieutenant Osterman: claiming that criminal hit-and-run charges under Florida law were

completely barred simply because I drove directly to the precinct to file a face-to-face report rather than waiting at the scene of the incident.

10. During the unrecorded first half of this live telephone consultation, Sgt. Castellano offered to look up the relevant hit-and-run statutory frameworks online alongside me; I pulled up the statutory language first, informed the supervisor that the department's restrictive claims were legally incorrect, and directly challenged his initial stance. Following this legal research race, Sgt. Castellano began reading verbatim from Florida Statute § 316.645 regarding an officer's authority to arrest "at the scene of the accident," further referencing provisions from Florida Chapters 320 and 322 alongside general limitations surrounding non-view misdemeanor arrests versus felony warrant thresholds to claim that an arrest could not be effectuated, despite the fact that the criminal perpetrator was never located, identified, or actively sought by the department.
11. At approximately the 21-minute mark, Sgt. Castellano stated that he would not tell me not to file a complaint, at which point I explicitly clarified that I wanted to execute a formal misconduct complaint against that specific plainclothes officer, but was completely prevented from doing so because the agency refused to disclose his identity. Sgt. Castellano supportively instructed me to write down the interaction details directly on the citizen's complaint form and describe the anonymous employee as best I could, explicitly stating matter-of-factly, "we will figure it out," emphasizing that there was no logical way the department would be unable to infer the detective's identity.
12. Concluding the consultation at approximately the 38-minute mark, I explicitly requested actionable guidance on how to move forward to ensure a procedural resolution; Sgt. Castellano repeated his mandate to remain physically on-scene and confirmed on the recording that he was contacting Lieutenant Walden ahead of time to alert him to my arrival so the physical complaint narrative could be submitted. I explicitly established that the purpose of bringing the written form to the precinct was specifically to enable the agency to identify the detective from his physical description, yet Lieutenant Walden subsequently executed an administrative deflection by stating he was leaving for a lunch period, leaving the time field blank, and directing me to step away over to Officer Tatiani's window to turn in the paperwork so I would not have to wait. Officer Tatiani summarily swore me in on the document but I never received an official administrative

receipt or filing copy, leaving no record of the transaction. Lieutenant Walden subsequently compiled an official investigative conclusion despite having never interviewed me or examined the underlying evidence.

13. I further explained to Sgt. Castellano that the hours-long gap on the face of the official crash report was the result of myself returning to a previous stop at New Seasons to inspect their video logs—ruling out an interaction with a pedestrian who had approached me directly on foot for currency—before reporting the collision at the precinct.
14. At approximately the 31-minute mark, Sgt. Castellano repeated the assertion that I should have remained at the scene, at which point I detailed the exact reporting timeline: that immediately upon inspecting the New Seasons video and confirming that the impact actually occurred entirely within the private LabCorp medical building parking lot, I returned home and placed an emergency call to the police database; that despite contacting Daytona Beach dispatch to request guidance, response units from the Holly Hill Police Department were erroneously sent to my residence; and that Holly Hill responding personnel explicitly informed me that because the accident location sat inside Daytona Beach jurisdiction, and because the fleeing perpetrator had left behind no active scene to secure, I was legally required to travel directly to the Daytona Beach precinct front desk in person to execute the criminal filing. I further detailed that Detective Fulcher offered the excuse that the multi-week delay occurred simply because he "lost" my phone number, despite my contact information being logged in live dispatch text logs from day one.
15. At approximately the 28-minute mark, Sgt. Castellano explicitly acknowledged that leaving the scene of a crash constitutes a statutory exception to warrantless arrest restrictions, but repeatedly claimed that enforcement remained barred due to the exact wording regarding an officer's presence "at the scene." I directly exposed the logical fallacy of this administrative position on the recording, challenging the supervisor that if such a standard were the law, a fleeing perpetrator would have no incentive to stay, and asking why any citizen would ever remain at a crash scene if leaving legally barred them from being criminally charged. I explicitly noted on the recording that establishing such a precedent "opens a whole cascade of potential events." Caught in this contradiction, Sgt.

Castellano retracted his initial stance, stating, "Oh no, that's not what I meant," yet continued to cite local judicial warrant limitations to shift administrative fault onto me.

16. This recording further documents me notifying Sgt. Castellano that I had been in direct contact with the Florida Highway Patrol (FHP) and the State Attorney's Office regarding these conflicting statements. Specifically, I detailed that FHP command personnel informed me that their strict 10-day operational intervention window had already expired due to DBPD's initial multi-week mandate to wait for a callback, meaning the local agency's delay effectively stripped me of state-level investigative options. I further detailed that a Lead Investigator for the State Attorney's Office explicitly confirmed that the legal thresholds and statutory standards fed to me by Detective Fulcher and Lieutenant Osterman were entirely incorrect under Florida law.
17. Sgt. Castellano listened with professional care, noting that while the department attempts to secure misdemeanor warrants, local judges routinely decline to issue them for misdemeanor offenses. At approximately the 33-minute mark, Sgt. Castellano attempted to further minimize the lack of criminal investigation by contrasting the department's interactions with cooperative corporate entities like Walmart against the fact that LabCorp personnel had stonewalled inquiries, implying that a private business's initial non-cooperation legally insulated a fleeing perpetrator from criminal charges. Sgt. Castellano further acknowledged the existence of the citizen-secured video obtained from Dr. Doris Antos's Chiropractic office—who owns the commercial building that LabCorp rents from her—which explicitly tracks the fleeing truck toward the intersection of Health Boulevard and Clyde Morris Boulevard, establishing that the department possessed knowledge of active evidentiary leads but willfully chose to let the municipal camera data retention loops expire.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

MICHAEL LYRAS, Affiant

STATE OF FLORIDA

COUNTY OF VOLUSIA

Sworn to (or affirmed) and subscribed before me by means of physical presence or online notarization, this ____ day of July, 2026, by Michael Lyras, who is personally known to me or has produced an identification card as identification.

Notary Public, State of Florida

My Commission Expires:

FINAL STATUTORY NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANCE & EVIDENCE PRESERVATION DEMAND

DELIVERY METHOD: HAND-DELIVERED IN PERSON

DATE OF DELIVERY: June 25, 2026

TO:

- **Deric Feacher**, City Manager, City of Daytona Beach
- **Letitia LaMagna**, City Clerk, City of Daytona Beach
- **Angel Ndichu**, Assistant City Attorney, City of Daytona Beach
- **Records Division**, Daytona Beach Police Department

REFERENCE TRACKING IDENTIFIERS:

- **Master City Request:** PRR-2026-1302 | **Security Key:** F0D2269D
 - **Police Department Request:** PD-2026-3124 | **Security Key:** EBD36FBC
 - **Associated Investigative File:** Closed IA Case # 250004939 (Sgt. Castellano Interview / Precinct Surveillance)
-

NOTICE OF CHAPTER 119 VIOLATION AND DEMAND FOR ESTIMATE

Dear Mr. Feacher, Ms. LaMagna, and Ms. Ndichu:

This serves as formal, final notice under Florida Statute Chapter 119 that the City of Daytona Beach and the Daytona Beach Police Department are in ongoing, active violation of their statutory obligations.

On May 13, 2026, I submitted a comprehensive public records demand. On May 26, 2026, the City split this filing into two separate administrative files (PRR-2026-1302 and PD-2026-3124). As of today, forty-two (42) calendar days have elapsed since my initial filing. Because the records sought belong to a finalized, closed Internal Affairs investigation, they are a matter of public record. This extensive delay constitutes an unlawful refusal and constructive denial under Florida law.

Please take notice of the following legal mandates:

1. **Failure to Provide Good Faith Estimate:** Both requests were filed with an explicit, statutory cost-containment ceiling of \$25.00 and a demand for an itemized Good Faith Estimate under *F.S. 119.07(4)* before extensive clerical or IT service fees are accrued. The City's failure to provide this estimate has unlawfully stalled production.

2. **Evidence Preservation Mandate:** This document serves as a strict demand to preserve all native electronic files, precinct facility surveillance footage from April 4, 2025, audio recordings, and related metadata. Any destruction, purging, or overwriting of these records while this request is pending constitutes a criminal misdemeanor under *F.S. 119.10*.
3. **Intent to File Pro Se Mandamus:** If the City fails to provide an itemized Good Faith Estimate or a definitive production schedule within five (5) business days of this hand-delivered notice, I will file a *Pro Se* Petition for Writ of Mandamus in the Seventh Judicial Circuit Court.

Pursuant to *Florida Statute 119.12*, the court shall award all reasonable costs of enforcement, including attorney's fees, if an agency unlawfully refuses to comply. Civil rights counsel will look to the City for full fee-shifting recovery based on this bad-faith delay.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Lyras

(856) 313-8467 | michaellyras2@gmail.com

FOR RECIPIENT AGENCY USE ONLY (ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT)

Received By (Print Name): _____

Agency/Department: _____

Signature or Stamp: _____ Date: //2026 Time: _____ AM/PM

This Copy was for Records Custodian
at the Daylong Beach PD, Vinton Blvd.
DeAndre Dunklin refused acknowledgment of
this notice and refused to sign for my
Copy

FINAL STATUTORY NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANCE & EVIDENCE PRESERVATION DEMAND

DELIVERY METHOD: HAND-DELIVERED IN PERSON

DATE OF DELIVERY: June 25, 2026

TO:

- **Deric Feacher**, City Manager, City of Daytona Beach
- **Letitia LaMagna**, City Clerk, City of Daytona Beach
- **Angel Ndichu**, Assistant City Attorney, City of Daytona Beach
- **Records Division**, Daytona Beach Police Department

REFERENCE TRACKING IDENTIFIERS:

- **Master City Request:** PRR-2026-1302 | **Security Key:** F0D2269D
- **Police Department Request:** PD-2026-3124 | **Security Key:** EBD36FBC
- **Associated Investigative File:** Closed IA Case # 250004939 (Sgt. Castellano Interview / Precinct Surveillance)

NOTICE OF CHAPTER 119 VIOLATION AND DEMAND FOR ESTIMATE

Dear Mr. Feacher, Ms. LaMagna, and Ms. Ndichu:

This serves as formal, final notice under Florida Statute Chapter 119 that the City of Daytona Beach and the Daytona Beach Police Department are in ongoing, active violation of their statutory obligations.

On May 13, 2026, I submitted a comprehensive public records demand. On May 26, 2026, the City split this filing into two separate administrative files (PRR-2026-1302 and PD-2026-3124). As of today, forty-two (42) calendar days have elapsed since my initial filing. Because the records sought belong to a finalized, closed Internal Affairs investigation, they are a matter of public record. This extensive delay constitutes an unlawful refusal and constructive denial under Florida law.

Please take notice of the following legal mandates:

1. **Failure to Provide Good Faith Estimate:** Both requests were filed with an explicit, statutory cost-containment ceiling of \$25.00 and a demand for an itemized Good Faith Estimate under *F.S. 119.07(4)* before extensive clerical or IT service fees are accrued. The City's failure to provide this estimate has unlawfully stalled production.

2. **Evidence Preservation Mandate:** This document serves as a strict demand to preserve all native electronic files, precinct facility surveillance footage from April 4, 2025, audio recordings, and related metadata. Any destruction, purging, or overwriting of these records while this request is pending constitutes a criminal misdemeanor under *F.S. 119.10*.
3. **Intent to File Pro Se Mandamus:** If the City fails to provide an itemized Good Faith Estimate or a definitive production schedule within five (5) business days of this hand-delivered notice, I will file a *Pro Se* Petition for Writ of Mandamus in the Seventh Judicial Circuit Court.

Pursuant to *Florida Statute 119.12*, the court shall award all reasonable costs of enforcement, including attorney's fees, if an agency unlawfully refuses to comply. Civil rights counsel will look to the City for full fee-shifting recovery based on this bad-faith delay.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Lyras

(856) 313-8467 | michaellyras2@gmail.com

FOR RECIPIENT AGENCY USE ONLY (ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT)

Received By (Print Name): J. Morgan

Agency/Department: City Clerk's Office

Signature or Stamp: _____ Date: //2026 Time: 2:05 AM/PM PM

PRR-2026-1302 is completed on 8/26/26