



**STATE OF FLORIDA
JUDICIAL QUALIFICATIONS
COMMISSION**
Post Office Box 14106
Tallahassee, Florida 32317
Tel: (850) 488-1581
www.floridajqc.com

FOR JQC USE ONLY

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

INSTRUCTIONS: This form is designed to provide the Commission with the information required to make an initial evaluation of your complaint and to begin any necessary inquiry or investigation into your allegations.

Please print or type your information onto this form. Any materials or documents that you provide to the Commission will become part of the Commission's files, and will not be returned or copied to you. The Commission will contact you if additional information or materials are needed.

After you complete this form, please sign and date the certification page, and mail it, along with any attachments, to Post Office Box 14106, Tallahassee, Florida 32317. Please be aware that the Commission cannot accept complaints by fax, email, or telephone. You will receive an acknowledgement letter when the Commission has received your complaint. The Commission meets approximately every six weeks, and reviews complaints on a first-come-first-served basis. You will be notified in writing of the outcome of your complaint, subject to the limits of confidentiality.

IMPORTANT: The Judicial Qualifications Commission has no authority to review, reverse, or modify a judge's decision or order, and cannot intervene in any way in a court case. Similarly, the Commission does not have the authority to remove a judge from your case. Commission staff is not permitted to provide you with any legal advice or opinions.

The Commission has jurisdiction over Justices of the Florida Supreme Court, and Judges of the District Courts of Appeal, County Courts, and Circuit Courts. The Commission does not have jurisdiction over special masters, magistrates, hearing officers (including: traffic hearing officers, worker's compensation hearing officers), administrative law judges, or federal judges.

YOUR CONTACT INFORMATION (Please print legibly):

Name: ADAM JOSHUA MACKER Phone Number: 386-898-4700

Mailing Address: 6338 ROLLING MEADOWS ST.

City, State, Zip Code: EASTVALE, CA 92880

JUDGE'S INFORMATION:

Judge's Name: RANDALL H. ROWE III County: VOLUSIA

Address: 101 NORTH ALABAMA AVE.

City, State, Zip Code: DELAND, FL 32724

CASE INFORMATION

If your complaint involves a court case, please provide the following information.

Case Name: STATE OF FLORIDA V. ADAM MACKER

Case Number (include all letters and numbers): FL 2022-02904-CFDL

County: VOLUSIA

If you were represented by an attorney, please provide their contact information.

Attorney's Name: KEVIN J. PITTS

Address: 4195 N. 17-92

City, State, Zip Code: SANFORD, FL 32733

Phone: 407-268-3688

WITNESS INFORMATION

In this section, provide the names and contact information for any other persons who may have witnessed the improper conduct. (Attach additional sheets if necessary).

1. Name: JORDAN MACKER

Relationship to case: DAUGHTER OF VICTIM

Phone number: 386-500-8549

2. Name: JACOB MACKER

Relationship to case: SON OF VICTIM

Phone: 386-318-4150

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

Attach copies of any relevant documents which you believe support your claim that the judge has engaged in judicial misconduct or has a disability. Please do not staple or bind documents. **Retain the originals or copies of any documents submitted. All submitted materials become property of the Commission and will not be returned.**

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Please provide, in as much detail as possible, the information you believe constitutes judicial misconduct or disability. Include names, dates, places, addresses, and telephone numbers which may assist the Commission. Attach additional pages as necessary.

PLEASE REFER TO ATTACHED..

IN FILING THIS COMPLAINT, I UNDERSTAND THAT FLORIDA LAW REQUIRES THAT COMPLAINTS FILED WITH THE COMMISSION MUST REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL, AND THAT ALL INQUIRIES BEFORE THE COMMISSION ARE CONFIDENTIAL, UNLESS AND UNTIL PROBABLE CAUSE IS DETERMINED AND FORMAL CHARGES ARE FILED.

UNDER THE PENALTY OF PERJURY, I declare that I have read and understand this complaint form, and the above information is true, correct, complete, and submitted of my own free will.

07-03-2026

Date

Adam J. Macker

Complainant's Signature

Please note that the Commission only has authority to investigate allegations of judicial misconduct or permanent disability by persons holding state judicial positions. The Commission has no jurisdiction over, and does not consider complaints against, Federal Judges, magistrates, law enforcement, clerks, court personnel, attorneys, etc.

The Commission does not act as an appellate court and cannot review, reverse or modify a decision or ruling made by a judge in the course of a court proceeding.

Please return the completed complaint form by regular US Mail, and direct all future communications, to:

Florida Judicial Qualifications Commission
Post Office Box 14106
Tallahassee, Florida 32317

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This complaint respectfully requests that the Florida Judicial Qualifications Commission conduct a formal investigation into the conduct of the Honorable Randall H. Rowe III arising from judicial actions taken in Volusia County, Florida, including the signing of a warrant for organized scheme to defraud on or about December 27, 2022, and later events involving Ishmael “Izzy” Acevedo in March 2023.

This complaint is not submitted for the purpose of asking the Commission to reverse a judicial ruling, modify a criminal case, or act as an appellate court. The Commission’s public guidance explains that it does not review, reverse, or modify judicial rulings and cannot intervene in an active case. Its authority concerns judicial misconduct and judicial ethics.

The purpose of this complaint is to request an ethics-based investigation into whether Judge Rowe’s conduct, when viewed together with the documented chronology, complied with the duties imposed upon Florida judges to preserve integrity, independence, impartiality, and public confidence of the judiciary. The Florida Code of Judicial Conduct requires judges to uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary, avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety, and perform judicial duties impartially and diligently.

The complainant, Adam Joshua Macker, alleges that Judge Rowe’s actions must be reviewed in the context of a broader documented chronology involving public court-record irregularities, alleged financial fraud involving the Clerk’s Office and related entities, law-enforcement misconduct, retaliatory criminal process, and judicial actions taken shortly after the complainant began identifying and reporting those issues.

Specifically, the complainant alleges that during the final week of December 2022, he uncovered documented evidence of fraud and irregularities executed through public court records and the Clerk’s Office. He then shared those findings with his father, Richard Macker. Approximately five days later, on December 27, 2022, Judge Randall H. Rowe III signed a warrant for organized scheme to defraud against the complainant in connection with a company that, according to the complainant, had closed approximately three years earlier upon the arrival of the COVID-19 pandemic. Prior materials in the complainant’s federal filings state that he discovered alleged fraud on Clerk.org around December 15, 2022, shared those findings with Richard Macker around December 22, 2022, and that Judge Rowe signed the scheme-to-defraud warrant on December 27, 2022.

The complainant alleges that the company at issue, Community Outreach, publicly advocated for child safety and distributed safety-related materials through schools, fire departments, and participating organizations. The complainant further alleges that the State had only three official complaints despite approximately five years in business and thousands of clients, and that the charging theory failed to fairly account for the company’s public-safety mission, business model, participating organizations, and documentary proof of legitimate operations.

The second major issue concerns Ishmael “Izzy” Acevedo. The complainant alleges that on or about March 16 or March 17, 2023, he wrote a letter to Judge Rowe explaining that he did not wish to press charges against Mr. Acevedo regarding a stolen motorcycle, because Mr. Acevedo was a longtime friend and the complainant no longer wished to pursue that matter criminally. According to the complainant’s prior filings, after that letter was delivered, Judge Rowe released Mr. Acevedo from custody but required

him to sign a restraining order against the complainant, despite the complainant's position that there was no lawful basis for such an order.

The complainant further alleges that Mr. Acevedo later died while that restraining order remained in effect. The complainant believes the circumstances surrounding Mr. Acevedo's death are deeply suspicious and may be connected to the broader pattern of misconduct described in this complaint. The complainant recognizes that the Commission is not a homicide-investigating agency and does not ask the Commission to determine the cause or manner of Mr. Acevedo's death. However, the complainant respectfully submits that the circumstances surrounding the restraining order, the timing of Judge Rowe's actions, and the subsequent death of Mr. Acevedo heighten the need for independent review.

The complainant further alleges that Judge Rowe's conduct is connected in time and context to the conduct of Judge Dawn D. Nichols and other public officials involved in proceedings against him. The complainant does not ask the Commission to accept the existence of a broader racketeering operation merely because he alleges it. Instead, he respectfully asks the Commission to independently review the chronology, public records, court filings, Internal Affairs complaints, fax transmissions, court dockets, and related documentation available at **VolusiaTruth.com**.

II. JURISDICTION AND SCOPE OF COMPLAINT

The Florida Judicial Qualifications Commission has jurisdiction over allegations of judicial misconduct involving Florida circuit judges. The Commission's public complaint materials confirm that it has jurisdiction over Florida Supreme Court justices, District Court of Appeal judges, circuit judges, and county judges.

This complaint concerns Judge Randall H. Rowe III in his capacity as a circuit judge in the Seventh Judicial Circuit.

The complainant does not request that the Commission:

1. reverse any order;
2. vacate any warrant;
3. intervene in any pending case;
4. determine criminal guilt or innocence;
5. decide whether a prosecutor, law-enforcement officer, clerk, attorney, or private person committed a crime; or
6. determine the cause of Ishmael Acevedo's death.

Instead, the complainant requests that the Commission determine whether Judge Rowe's conduct, as reflected in the chronology and supporting records, complied with the ethical obligations imposed upon Florida judges.

The complainant respectfully submits that this matter raises serious concerns regarding:

1. the appearance of impartiality;
2. the timing and basis for judicial action;
3. whether judicial authority was used in a manner that appears retaliatory or irregular;
4. whether the judge acted with appropriate care before authorizing serious criminal process;
5. whether the restraining order involving Mr. Acevedo was supported by a lawful and transparent basis; and
6. whether further investigation is warranted under the Florida Code of Judicial Conduct.

III. AVAILABILITY OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

The factual chronology described in this complaint is supported by public records, court filings, Internal Affairs complaints, correspondence, public docket materials, and related documents.

Rather than attaching hundreds of pages of hardcopy exhibits, the complainant has organized the supporting documentation in a public evidence repository:

VolusiaTruth.com

The complainant respectfully requests that investigators review the relevant sections of the website, including:

Category	Description	Website Location
Court-record irregularities	Public records and alleged Clerk's Office irregularities	Court Fraud / Clerk Records section
Community Outreach materials	Information concerning the child-safety business model, safety-board materials, and participating organizations	Community Outreach / Business Records section
Judge Rowe materials	Documents relating to the December 27, 2022 warrant and March 2023 Acevedo matter	Judge Randall H. Rowe III section
Internal Affairs complaints	Complaints submitted to the Volusia Sheriff's Office	Official Complaint page
Federal filings	Related filings from Macker v. Macker et al., M.D. Fla. Case No. 6:23-cv-01963-JSS-DCI, now on appeal in the Eleventh Circuit	Federal Case / Eleventh Circuit section
Acevedo / motorcycle documentation	Letter, motorcycle documents, and law-enforcement chronology	Acevedo / Motorcycle section

Category	Description	Website Location
Judge Nichols materials	Related chronology involving Judge Nichols and competency proceedings	Judge Dawn Nichols section

The complainant respectfully submits that the website functions as an evidence index and repository, not as a substitute for certified records. Certified copies, transcripts, court documents, and additional records can be provided upon request.

IV. CHRONOLOGICAL STATEMENT OF FACTS

A. Discovery of Alleged Court-Record Fraud

In December 2022, the complainant began independently reviewing public records available through Clerk.org and related court-record sources. According to the complainant, he discovered what appeared to be a repetitive pattern involving older court financial obligations, payments, satisfactions, judgments, and driver-license consequences.

The complainant alleges that the records showed a pattern where cases that had been paid or satisfied later appeared to generate additional collection activity, satisfactions, or other irregular docket activity. Prior filings describe the complainant's position that Perdue, Brandon, Fielder, Collins & Mott, LLP worked in conjunction with the Volusia Clerk's Office to force duplicate payments for driver-license reinstatement and then satisfy judgments from unrelated or previously satisfied cases.

The complainant further alleges that these irregularities were not limited to his own name and that he identified additional examples involving other citizens.

B. Disclosure to Richard Macker

On or about December 22, 2022, the complainant shared his findings regarding the alleged Clerk's Office fraud with his father, Richard Macker. The complainant alleges that Richard Macker has concerning associations and that, based on the complainant's personal knowledge and history, Richard Macker had motive to assist or participate in efforts to harm the complainant.

Because those allegations involve non-judicial actors, the complainant does not ask the Commission to make findings regarding Richard Macker's alleged affiliations or role. However, the complainant includes this fact because the timing is central: the complainant alleges that he shared his findings with Richard Macker, and approximately five days later, Judge Rowe signed the warrant that is the subject of this complaint.

C. December 27, 2022 Warrant Signed by Judge Rowe

On or about December 27, 2022, Judge Randall H. Rowe III signed a warrant for organized scheme to defraud against the complainant.

The complainant alleges that this warrant was egregious and unsupported by a fair review of the underlying facts. According to the complainant, the warrant concerned Community Outreach, a company that had closed approximately three years earlier around the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The complainant alleges that Community Outreach was not a fraudulent enterprise. Rather, he contends that Community Outreach publicly advocated for child safety, distributed public-safety materials, and operated through relationships with schools, fire departments, and participating organizations.

The complainant further alleges that:

1. Community Outreach operated for approximately five years;
2. the company served thousands of clients;
3. the State had only three official complaints;
4. the business publicly advocated for child safety;
5. the business model involved safety materials and sponsorship advertising;
6. the company closed in March 2020 when the coronavirus pandemic began;
7. the warrant was signed years after the company closed; and
8. the timing of the warrant followed shortly after the complainant discovered and shared evidence of alleged fraud involving public court records.

Prior materials in the complainant's federal filings describe the December 27, 2022 warrant as a "scheme to defraud" warrant involving a company closed three years prior and state that it was signed shortly after the complainant began speaking publicly about alleged corruption in Volusia County.

The complainant respectfully submits that the timing and circumstances of the warrant create an appearance that judicial process may have been used to retaliate against him after he discovered and began discussing alleged public-record fraud.

The complainant does not ask the Commission to determine his criminal guilt or innocence. Rather, he asks the Commission to investigate whether Judge Rowe fulfilled his ethical obligations before authorizing such serious criminal process, and whether the warrant was issued under circumstances that create an appearance of impropriety, bias, or misuse of judicial authority.

D. January 4, 2023 Arrest Outside the FBI Field Office

On January 4, 2023, the complainant traveled to the FBI office in Maitland, Florida, to report alleged financial crimes and public-record irregularities. According to the complainant's prior filings, he was arrested outside the FBI field office based on the warrant signed by Judge Rowe. The complainant alleges that the arresting officer was provided false information suggesting that the complainant had traveled to the FBI office to turn himself in, when the complainant contends he was there to report alleged fraud.

This event is relevant because it shows the practical effect of the warrant signed by Judge Rowe: the complainant was arrested while attempting to report alleged fraud to federal authorities.

E. March 2023 Letter Regarding Ishmael “Izzy” Acevedo

On or about March 16 or March 17, 2023, the complainant delivered or sent a letter to Judge Rowe explaining that he did not wish to pursue charges against Ishmael “Izzy” Acevedo concerning the complainant’s motorcycle.

The complainant states that Mr. Acevedo was a longtime friend and that the motorcycle issue had been misunderstood or was no longer something the complainant wished to pursue criminally.

The complainant alleges that instead of simply acknowledging the complainant’s position or allowing the matter to proceed transparently, Judge Rowe released Mr. Acevedo from custody while requiring him to sign a restraining order against the complainant.

Prior filings state that on March 16, 2023, the complainant delivered a letter to Judge Rowe electing not to pursue charges against Mr. Acevedo regarding the motorcycle, and that Judge Rowe released Mr. Acevedo from custody while forcing Mr. Acevedo to sign a restraining order against the complainant.

The complainant alleges that there was no lawful or factual basis for such a restraining order, especially because he was the alleged victim of the motorcycle-related matter and had specifically written to the judge indicating he did not wish to pursue charges.

F. Return of the Motorcycle and Subsequent Events

On or about March 19, 2023, Mr. Acevedo allegedly retrieved the complainant’s motorcycle and returned it to the complainant’s residence. According to the complainant, Mr. Acevedo also alerted authorities to withdraw the BOLO related to the motorcycle.

The complainant alleges that law enforcement nevertheless arrived at his residence, refused to withdraw the BOLO, attempted to engage with him despite his refusal, impounded the motorcycle, and arrested Mr. Acevedo for dealing in stolen property.

The complainant alleges that these events further demonstrate that the restraining order and related judicial actions were not isolated, but part of a broader pattern in which court process and law enforcement were used in a way that disadvantaged the complainant and those connected to him.

G. Death of Ishmael Acevedo

The complainant states that Ishmael Acevedo later died while the restraining order involving the complainant remained in effect.

The complainant believes Mr. Acevedo’s death was suspicious and may be connected to the broader pattern of misconduct described throughout his public records and complaints.

The complainant acknowledges that the Judicial Qualifications Commission does not investigate homicides and is not being asked to determine the cause of death. However, the complainant respectfully submits that the restraining order imposed under Judge Rowe’s authority is part of the factual chronology and should be reviewed in determining whether Judge Rowe acted appropriately, lawfully, and ethically.

V. BASIS FOR REQUESTED INVESTIGATION

The complainant respectfully submits that the following issues warrant investigation by the Judicial Qualifications Commission.

1. Appearance of Impropriety

A judge must avoid not only actual impropriety, but also the appearance of impropriety. A judge must act in a manner that preserves public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.

The complainant alleges that Judge Rowe's signing of the December 27, 2022, warrant, shortly after the complainant discovered and shared evidence of alleged Clerk's Office fraud, creates a serious appearance problem.

The complainant alleges that the warrant targeted a closed company that publicly advocated for child safety, operated openly, and had very few official complaints compared to the number of clients served.

The complainant respectfully submits that an independent review is necessary to determine whether Judge Rowe's conduct created an appearance that judicial authority was used in response to, or in coordination with, efforts to suppress the complainant's exposure of alleged court-record fraud.

2. Possible Failure to Exercise Proper Judicial Care Before Authorizing Serious Criminal Process

The complainant alleges that the December 27, 2022, warrant was facially questionable because it involved a company that had closed approximately three years earlier, had a public safety-oriented business model, and had only three official complaints despite thousands of clients.

The complainant respectfully requests that the Commission review whether Judge Rowe performed an appropriate judicial function before authorizing the warrant, including whether the judge meaningfully reviewed the factual basis, the timing, the corporate history, the number of complaints, the business records, and the available evidence of legitimate operations.

This complaint does not ask the Commission to determine whether probable cause legally existed in the appellate sense. Rather, it asks whether the judge's conduct in authorizing the warrant raises ethical concerns requiring investigation.

3. Possible Retaliatory Use of Judicial Process

The complainant alleges that the timing of the December 27, 2022 warrant is highly suspicious.

According to the complainant's chronology:

1. he discovered alleged court-record fraud in December 2022;
2. he shared his findings with Richard Macker on or about December 22, 2022;
3. Judge Rowe signed a serious criminal warrant approximately five days later;
4. the warrant involved a company closed years earlier; and
5. the complainant was arrested outside the FBI field office while attempting to report alleged fraud.

The complainant respectfully submits that this timing raises a substantial question as to whether judicial process was used in a retaliatory or improper manner.

4. The Acevedo Restraining Order

The complainant alleges that Judge Rowe required Ishmael Acevedo to sign a restraining order against him even after the complainant wrote to Judge Rowe explaining that he did not wish to pursue charges against Mr. Acevedo.

The complainant respectfully asks the Commission to investigate:

1. what legal basis existed for the restraining order;
2. whether the order was requested by a party, prosecutor, law-enforcement officer, or the court;
3. whether Mr. Acevedo was represented by counsel;
4. whether the complainant was given notice or an opportunity to be heard;
5. whether the order was imposed as a condition of release;
6. whether Judge Rowe had a lawful and ethical basis to impose it; and
7. whether the order served any legitimate judicial purpose.

The complainant alleges that this restraining order was unnecessary, unsupported, and deeply harmful, particularly because Mr. Acevedo later died while the order remained in effect.

5. Connection to Broader Pattern of Judicial and Government Misconduct

The complainant alleges that Judge Rowe's conduct is not isolated. He believes Judge Rowe's actions are connected to a broader pattern involving the Volusia Clerk's Office, Perdue Brandon Fielder Collins & Mott, law-enforcement officers, prosecutors, and Judge Dawn D. Nichols.

The complainant recognizes that the Commission may only discipline judges and cannot adjudicate claims against non-judicial actors. Nevertheless, the complainant respectfully submits that surrounding facts are necessary to understand the context in which Judge Rowe acted.

The complainant therefore requests that the Commission review Judge Rowe's conduct in connection with the larger documented chronology available through **VolusiaTruth.com**, including the Internal Affairs complaints, public court records, fax submissions, federal filings, and related documentation.

VI. REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION

The complainant respectfully requests that the Florida Judicial Qualifications Commission open a formal investigation into Judge Randall H. Rowe III's conduct.

Specifically, the complainant asks the Commission to investigate:

1. the factual and legal basis presented to Judge Rowe before he signed the December 27, 2022, organized scheme to defraud warrant;
2. whether Judge Rowe reviewed the underlying business records and public-safety materials connected to Community Outreach;
3. whether the timing of the warrant was coincidental or connected to the complainant's discovery and reporting of alleged Clerk's Office fraud;
4. whether any improper communications, ex parte information, or external influence contributed to the issuance of the warrant;
5. whether Judge Rowe had any communications with law enforcement, prosecutors, court personnel, or other judges concerning the complainant outside ordinary court procedures;
6. the basis for requiring Ishmael Acevedo to sign a restraining order against the complainant;
7. whether the restraining order was lawful, necessary, and ethically appropriate;
8. whether Judge Rowe's conduct created an appearance of impropriety;
9. whether Judge Rowe's actions undermined public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary; and
10. whether Judge Rowe violated any provision of the Florida Code of Judicial Conduct.

The complainant further requests that the Commission review the publicly available documentation located at **VolusiaTruth.com**, including the court-record documentation, Community Outreach materials, Internal Affairs complaints, federal filings, and related records.

VII. CONCLUSION

The complainant understands that the Judicial Qualifications Commission is not an appellate court and cannot correct every legal wrong that may have occurred in the underlying proceedings.

However, this complaint concerns something different: whether Judge Randall H. Rowe III's actions, when viewed in context, complied with the ethical duties required of a Florida judge.

The complainant respectfully submits that the December 27, 2022 warrant, the timing of that warrant, the nature of the company involved, the complainant's prior discovery of alleged court-record fraud, the arrest outside the FBI field office, the March 2023 Acevedo restraining order, and the subsequent death of Mr. Acevedo collectively raise serious questions that warrant independent review.

The complainant does not ask the Commission to accept every allegation without investigation. To the contrary, the complainant asks the Commission to conduct an independent investigation, review the records, obtain any necessary transcripts or certified documents, and determine whether Judge Rowe's conduct complied with the Florida Code of Judicial Conduct.

Respectfully Submitted,

Adam J. Macker

Adam J. Macker

386-898-4700

adam@volusiatruth.com