

COERCIVE ACTIONS

Repetitive, Coercive Communications and Misrepresentation of Legal Requirements**

Your persistent attempts to coerce me into a phone call, despite my clear, written request for all communications to remain in writing, constitute a pattern of harassment—especially given your self-declared status as a “corporate attorney” and the intimidation factor introduced by your “luther2law” email address. Florida’s landlord-tenant statutes do not compel me to engage in phone discussions to resolve disputes or address your claims. Yet you continued to push for verbal contact, misrepresenting that the law requires such a step.

Timeline of Intensive Harassment on October 29, 2024:

Over the course of approximately six hours, you escalated your pressure tactics, placing repeated phone calls and leaving multiple voicemails, each attempt separated by roughly two-hour intervals. After ignoring my standing request for written correspondence, you made two phone calls followed by two voicemails, all within a short timeframe. When I did not respond, you followed up with a text message, again approximately two hours later, thereby punctuating the day with a relentless cycle of unsolicited outreach.

Quoted Text Message Written by Luther Rollins, Landlord:

After these repeated phone contacts and voicemails, you sent me the following text message on October 29, 2024:

“Hi Stephen, I called you a couple times today to discuss the Tenant Response & Dispute you sent to me which I recently received. I hope we could talk (and I believe we are both supposed to) try to resolve amicably. I am available most days this week 9:00am-ish till about 10pm.”

In this message, you again attempt to frame the resolution process as something that supposedly mandates a phone call, stating “I believe we are both supposed to” engage in a verbal discussion. This is categorically untrue. Fla. Stat. §§83.49 and 83.51, which govern security deposits and habitability, as well as §§715.10–715.111, which outline procedures for handling personal property, impose no requirement for phone calls, verbal negotiations, or live discussions. Your claim that “we are both supposed to” have a phone call severely

misrepresents the law and seeks to corner me into a scenario where I would be at a disadvantage—"outmatched by a declared lawyer"—contrary to the transparency and fairness that the statutes intend.

Impact and Legal Implications:

The repeated calls, voicemails, and now this text message—each separated by roughly two-hour intervals—display a calculated effort to erode my stance on written communication and push me into a verbally intimidating interaction. This calculated timing and insistence on a method never required by statute is a form of harassment. Your decision to leverage your attorney status, along with an email moniker implying legal expertise, only intensifies the coercive atmosphere.

Conclusion:

These actions—excessive calling, repeated voicemails, and sending a misleading text message after a series of two-hour interval attempts—violate the principle of written, verifiable communication that Florida law heavily favors and I explicitly requested. By misrepresenting legal requirements and attempting to pressure me into a "phone call" that statutes do not mandate, you have crossed into harassment and bad-faith intimidation. This coercive behavior will not force me to abandon my legal rights or documented communication channels. Instead, it further solidifies my resolve to seek remedies permitted by Florida law, should you continue to flout statutory directives and proper dispute resolution procedures.