State of Florida Sixth Judicial Circuit of Florida

315 Court St. Rm 410, Clearwater, Fl. 33756
Section22@jud6.org

William H. Burgess, III   **Kelly Dolan** *kdolan@jud6.org*

Circuit Judge   **January 20, 2026,**   Judicial Assistant

Jude Burgess Family Law Practice Preferences
Judge Burgess requires ALL Section22 case inquiries to be emailed:
Section22@jud6.org

- ***Please*** **see Judge Burgess's standing AI Order requirements for all pleadings and submissions required as of today, Monday, January 20, 2026. Please complete the AI Disclosure and Certification Form per Order's instructions below.**

- **Please schedule hearings for less than one day in JAWS.**
  Unless Judge Burgess has not reviewed the case previously, if not please set for 15 min. CMC and judge will assess future hearing time.

- **Please submit all case law, exhibit(s), trial book(s) for Judge Burgess's review 5 business days prior to hearing date. Please note we do not print case law, exhibits but do not require notebooks, just organized hard copy delivery.**

- **No motion/order/notice is necessary for the Court to appear for hearings via ZOOM, but all Parties are expected to appear and conform to courtroom etiquette. Please have all party names correct on Zoom screen.**

- **Please do not submit arguments, competing order issues or ex-parte communication via email. Only Judge Burgess will address issues in relationship to hearing or case matters.**

- **Please be on time and forward hearing time cancelation from JAWS immediately.**

- **Section22 and Judge Burgess's office directives are updated via automatic email reply regularly, out of office etc.**

TECHNOLOGY: Arrange for use of technology PRIOR to the first day of trial. To do so, call the Sixth Circuit's IT Department at (727) 464-3805

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PINELLAS COUNTY, FLORIDA FAMILY
COURT DIVISION, SECTION 22

STANDING ORDER ON THE USE OF
ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LEGAL FILINGS AND
COURT SUBMISSIONS

The Court issues the following Standing Order to ensure the fair, efficient, and truthful administration of justice in matters before Section 22 of the Family Court Division. The Court recognizes that artificial intelligence (AI) tools can, if used responsibly, aid attorneys and self-represented litigants; however, misuse of such tools can result in inaccurate submissions, fabricated legal authority, unnecessary consumption of judicial resources, and disruption of proceedings.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED AND ADJUDGED as follows: I.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE.

This Standing Order applies to all attorneys appearing before the Court on behalf of clients and all self-represented litigants who submit filings, motions, briefs, memoranda, proposed orders, affidavits, or any other material in written or electronic form intended for consideration by the Court. It shall remain in effect until modified or rescinded by further Order of the Court.

This Order governs the use of generative artificial intelligence tools ("AI tools"), including but not limited to tools used for legal research, drafting, summarizing, or analyzing legal content.

The Court encourages the ethical and judicious use of AI as a supplement to, rather than a substitute for, human judgment and expertise. Litigants are reminded that AI tools may produce biased,

incomplete, or erroneous outputs, and ultimate accountability rests with the filer. Nothing in this Order prohibits the use of AI tools.

Instead, the Order establishes standards for disclosure, verification, accuracy, and personal responsibility.

This Order is issued pursuant to the Court's authority under Fla. R. Gen. Prac. & Jud. Admin. 2.515, which requires that every filing be signed and that the signature certifies the filer has read the document, has a good faith basis for its factual and legal content, and is not filing it for an improper purpose.

This Order is also issued pursuant to the Court's inherent authority to control its docket.

This Order incorporates principles reflected in section 57.105, Florida Statutes, which imposes responsibility for asserting legal and factual positions supported by existing law or a good faith argument for change, and authorizes sanctions for unsupported claims. While not identical to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, these standards similarly require diligence, candor, and accountability.

This Order does not apply to the use of AI proofreading tools that focus on accuracy and clarity without rewriting the core meaning of text, and which do not otherwise violate the provisions of this Order. Such AI tools include those used for spelling, punctuation, word choice, and sentence structure that function as a virtual editor rather than a content creator and do not expose sensitive, confidential, or proprietary information to open AI systems.

II. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Standing Order, the following definitions apply:

Section 22
Family Court Division

Standing Order on AI

Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tool: Any computer software, platform, or system that uses machine learning, large language models, or algorithmic generation to create text, images, or other content based on user prompts in order to produce text, summarize documents, conduct research, or analyze information. Examples include, but are not limited to, ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Copilot, Westlaw AI, Lexis+ AI, and similar tools.

Generative AI: Any AI tool capable of generating original text, summaries, explanations, legal analysis, or other content based on user prompts. This includes tools that provide case summaries, draft motions, suggest legal arguments, or create narratives.

Legal Filing or Court Submission: Any motion, pleading, memorandum, response, rely, brief, affidavit, exhibit, proposed order, letter, notice, or other document filed with or submitted to the Court, whether in written or electronic form, as well as any oral representation made during hearings that relies on AI-generated content.

Reasonable Inquiry: A good-faith effort consistent with an attorney's or litigant's obligations under Fla. R. Gen. Prac. & Jud. Admin. 2.515, including personally reading cited cases, verifying statutory references, confirming factual assertions, and ensuring that all representations to the Court have a factual and legal basis. Reliance on AI is not considered reasonable inquiry.

Traditional Legal Research Methods: The process of reviewing primary legal authority directly (cases, statutes, rules, constitutions), consulting secondary sources, and verifying legal propositions using reputable, non-generative sources such as Westlaw, LexisNexis, Fastcase, Caselaw Access Project, Google Scholar (case law), official statutes, or similar resources.

III. DISCLOSURE OF AI USE.

Mandatory Disclosure. Any attorney or self-represented litigant who uses an AI tool for:

- Legal research that is reflected in the text of a filing orsubmission,

- Drafting any portion of a filing or submission, or

- Summarizing legal sources or facts

must include a Disclosure of Artificial Intelligence Use at the end of the filing or submission, or in a separately filed notice for documents not traditionally including a signature block, such as exhibits. The form at Attachment 1, or a form in substantial compliance with this Order, may used for this purpose.

Required Content of Disclosure. The disclosure must:

- Identify each AI tool used by name (*e.g.*, "ChatGPT," "Lexis+ AI," "Westlaw AI," etc.),

- Briefly describe the manner in which the tool was used(*e.g.*, "Used to generate initial draft of legal argument based on provided case summaries" or "Used to research case law on child custody standards"),

- State whether the AI tool generated any text appearing
directly in the filed document, and

- Affirm that no confidential or privileged information was
inputted into the AI tool.

No-Use Statement. If no generative AI tool was used in creating the filing or submission, or in conducting related research, the filing or submission must include the following statement:

> "I certify that no generative artificial intelligence tool was used in the preparation of this filing or submission, or in conducting research for it."

Failure to disclose AI use when required shall be grounds for sanctions as outlined in Section IX.

IV. CERTIFICATION OF ACCURACY AND PERSONAL REVIEW.

Mandatory Certification. Every filing or submission must include the following certification, at the conclusion of the document or submission immediately above the signature line, signed by the attorney or self-represented litigant in substantially the following form:

> "I certify that I have personally reviewed this filing or submission, verified the accuracy of all legal authorities and factual assertions through traditional methods, and conducted a reasonable inquiry into the truth and accuracy of all statements herein."

Additional Certification When AI Is Used. When an AI tool contributes to any part of a filing or submission, the following additional certification is required:

> "I further certify that any text generated or suggested by an artificial intelligence tool has been independently reviewed, confirmed for accuracy and completeness, and corrected as necessary. I understand that reliance on an AI tool does not constitute reasonable inquiry."

For attorneys, the certification shall be signed by the attorney of record. For self-represented litigants, it shall be signed by the litigant personally. Electronic signatures are permissible pursuant to the Florida Rules of General Practice & Judicial Administration.

Effect of Signature. The Court construes the signature on any filing or submission—whether by an attorney or self-represented litigant—as certification that the signer has conducted a reasonable inquiry into the truth, accuracy, and legal validity of all statements, citations, arguments, and factual assertions contained therein.

AI Use Does Not Constitute Reasonable Inquiry. Reliance solely or primarily on an AI tool is not presumed to constitute a reasonable inquiry. The filer or submitter bears personal responsibility for ensuring the accuracy and integrity of the filing or submission, regardless of any AI assistance. No attorney or self-represented litigant may rely on an AI tool as a substitute for:

- Reading and verifying case law,

- Confirming statutory citations,

- Validating factual assertions, or

- Understanding the content of the filing.

V.   USE OF AN AI DISCLOSURE AND CERTIFICATION FORM.

The form at Attachment 1, or one that substantially complies with that form, may be used by attorneys and self-represented litigants where it is more practical to use a single form in lieu of indocument AI disclosure and certification for each filing or submission.

VI.   PROHIBITED USES OF AI TOOLS.

AI tools may not be used to:

- Generate or bolster *ad hominem* attacks, inflammatory rhetoric, or disparaging statements about any party, witness, or judicial officer;

- Fabricate legal authority, facts, or evidence;

- Prepare repetitive or voluminous filings intended to harass, delay, cause unnecessary expense, or disrupt proceedings; or

- Generate medical, psychological, or expert-like conclusions without a qualified human source.

Submissions violating these requirements may result in:

- Orders to strike filings;

- Limitations on future filings;

- Sanctions as permitted by law;

- Referral to The Florida Bar (for attorneys); or

- Contempt proceedings (for any party).

VII.   DUTY TO SUPPLEMENT OR CORRECT.

If a party discovers that their filing or submission has inadvertently included AI-generated content, the party must promptly file a Supplemental Notice identifying the inadvertently included material.

If a party discovers that their filing or submission includes inaccurate, false, fabricated, or misleading information that resulted

from AI-generated content or otherwise, the party must promptly file a Notice of Correction identifying the corrected material.

VIII.   COURT'S DISCRETION.

The Court retains inherent authority to:

- Require supplemental briefing verified without AI assistance,

- Reject or strike filings inconsistent with this Order,

- Require the filing of affidavits confirming case law authenticity,

- Limit filings by litigants who repeatedly misuse AI or file abusive or misleading documents.

IX.   SANCTIONS FOR NON-COMPLIANCE.

Violations of this Order, including its provisions concerning implied certification, may result in sanctions, including but not limited to:

- Evidentiary presumptions against the filer or submitter;

- Adverse inferences;

- Striking the non-compliant filing or submission in whole or inpart;

- Requiring the filer or submitter to submit a corrected versionwith appropriate disclosures and certifications;

- Imposing monetary fines or costs on the filer or submitter;

- Holding the filer or submitter in contempt of court;

- Referring attorneys to The Florida Bar for investigation of potential ethical violations under the Rules Regulating The Florida Bar (*e.g.*, competence, diligence, and candor toward the tribunal);

- In extreme cases, dismissing claims or defenses, or enteringdefault judgments, where the violation materially prejudices the opposing party or the administration of justice. X. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Standing Order is effective immediately and applies to all filings or submissions occurring on or after the date signed.

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers in Pinellas County, Florida, on this 20th day of January, 2026.

William H. Burgess, III

_____

Hon. William H. Burgess, III
Circuit Judge
Family Court Division, Section 22

Atch: as

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PINELLAS COUNTY, FLORIDA FAMILY
DIVISION

Attachment 1.
AI DISCLOSURE AND CERTIFICATION
(Pursuant to Standing Order Regarding the Use of Artificial Intelligence)

Case No.: _____ Division:

_____

Judge: _____

I, the undersigned, hereby disclose and certify the following regarding the document(s) listed below [list document(s) to which this disclosure applies (title and filing date if already filed)]:

_____

‒

_____

‒

_____

‒

_____

‒

_____

‒

1. Use of Artificial Intelligence.

       G No generative artificial intelligence was used to research, draft, edit, or prepare any portion of the above document(s).

       OR

       G Generative artificial intelligence was used as described below:

       AI Tool(s) Used (name and version, if known):

_____

       Description of How AI Was Used (be specific):

_____

       _ Confidential Information Statement

       I affirm that no confidential, privileged, or sealed informationfrom this case was entered into any AI tool.

2. Verification of AI-Generated Content.

       I personally reviewed and verified the accuracy of all AI-generated text, legal citations, factual statements, and legal analysis contained in the document(s) using traditional legal research methods (including, but not limited to, Westlaw, LexisNexis, Florida Statutes, official reporters, and the case record).

3. Personal Certification of Accuracy.

I certify that I have personally read the entire document(s) listedabove, that I have conducted a reasonable inquiry into the truth and accuracy of all matters contained therein, and that the document(s) contain no known misstatements of law or fact. I understand that reliance solely or primarily on an AI tool does not constitute reasonable inquiry under the Standing Order.

Date: _____   Signature: _____

Printed Name: _____

Florida Bar No. (if applicable): _____

Address: _____

                    _____

                    _____

Telephone:_____

Email: _____

Certificate of Service

I certify that a true copy of this AI Disclosure and Certification has been furnished by ᴳ e-mail ᴳ e-Portal ᴳ U.S. Mail ᴳ hand delivery on this _____ day of _____, 20___ to all parties or their counsel of record.

Date: _____   Signature: _____

Printed Name: _____