

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
FIRST DISTRICT, STATE OF FLORIDA

BRIAN LOWRY,

CASE NO. 1D07-0141

Appellant,

v.

CENTRAL LEASING
MANAGEMENT, INC., and ZURICH
NORTH AMERICA,

Appellees.

Opinion filed July 15, 2008.

An appeal from an order of the Judge of Compensation Claims.
Paul T. Terlizzese, Judge.

Wendy S. Loquasto, of Fox & Loquasto, P.A., Tallahassee; and Susan W. Fox, of Fox
& Loquasto, Tampa, for Appellant.

Kimberly A. Hill and Hinda Klein, of Conroy, Simberg, Ganon, Krevans, Abel,
Lurvey, Morrow & Schefer, P.A., Hollywood, for Appellees.

OPINION ON MOTION FOR REHEARING, CLARIFICATION AND
CERTIFICATION; MOTION FOR REHEARING EN BANC; AND
ALTERNATIVE MOTION TO STAY MANDATE

BROWNING, C.J.

Appellant's motions for rehearing, clarification, or rehearing en banc and

alternative motion to stay mandate are DENIED. However, pursuant to Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.030(a)(2)(A)(v), we GRANT the motion for certification and certify to the Supreme Court of Florida the following as a question of great public importance:

DO THE AMENDED PROVISIONS OF SECTION 440.34(1), FLORIDA STATUTES (2003), CLEARLY AND UNAMBIGUOUSLY ESTABLISH THE PERCENTAGE FEE FORMULA PROVIDED THEREIN AS THE SOLE STANDARD FOR DETERMINING THE REASONABLENESS OF AN ATTORNEY'S FEE TO BE AWARDED A CLAIMANT?

VAN NORTWICK and ROBERTS, JJ., CONCUR.