STATE OF FLORIDA

JAMES UTHMEIER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

September 26, 2025

The Hon. Monique H. Worrell
Office of the State Attorney
Ninth Judicial Circuit
415 North Orange Avenue
Orlando, Florida 32801

Re: Lewd or Lascivious Exhibition in *State of Florida v. Kevin W. Chapman*,
Case No. 2025-CF-010618-A-O;
Child Pornography in *State of Florida v. Thomas L. Dolgos*,
Case No. 2025-CF-007119-A-O; 2025-CF-011259-A-O.

Dear Madame State Attorney:

You declined to prosecute a 61-year-old man who masturbated on a park bench in front of children. Your office also dismissed a case against a man who possessed and shared dozens of videos showing the rape and sexual abuse of infants and toddlers. These dismissals lacked sufficient legal justification, exhibit gross abuses of discretion, pose serious threats to public safety, and undermine the public's confidence in the administration of justice. I write to address both cases.

State of Florida v. Kevin W. Chapman

As you are aware, on August 16, 2025, a father and his two-year-old son were at Kit Land Nelson Park, a location that features a splash pad where children play. There were multiple families with children playing in the splash pad. At least one father noticed—and pictures and videos show—a man sitting on a nearby park bench, with his right hand in his pants, looking in the direction of the children. The father stated that his two-year-old son saw the man on the park bench, who masturbated for approximately five minutes. Once the man finished, he removed his right hand from his pants and stood up. The park manager stated that when the man stood up, his shorts dropped, exposing himself. The man was arrested and identified as Kevin Chapman. Not only did your office fail to pursue pretrial detention, but it declined to charge him, claiming that the case was "not suitable for prosecution."

The purpose of bail determination, in part, is to "protect the community against unreasonable danger from the criminal defendant." § 903.046(1), Fla. Stat. Section 907.041(5)(c)5., Florida Statutes, provides that a trial court—upon motion by the state attorney—may order pretrial detention when the defendant "poses the threat of harm to the community." Your office elected not to pursue pretrial detention and instead allowed a man back on the street who masturbated

in front of small children at a children's park.

Section 800.04(7)(a), Florida Statutes, provides that a person who intentionally "masturbates," "exposes the genitals in a lewd or lascivious manner," or "commits any other sexual act that does not involve actual physical or sexual contact with the victim," while "in the presence of a victim who is less than sixteen years of age" commits lewd or lascivious exhibition.[1] The Florida Supreme Court has held "while the child need not be able to articulate or even comprehend what the offender is doing, the child must see or sense that a lewd or lascivious act is taking place for a violation to occur." *State v. Werner*, 609 So. 2d 585, 587 (Fla. 1992). The father stated that his two-year-old son was less than fifty feet from Chapman during the incident. According to the father, his child saw Chapman as Chapman was masturbating on the park bench. What's more, video and photographic evidence taken by the father shows Chapman with his hand down his pants on the bench in front of several other children who are clearly under sixteen years of age. And according to the arresting officer, the park manager confirmed these facts: he witnessed Chapman on the park bench facing the splash pad, and then observed Chapman stand up, lose his shorts, and expose himself.

There is no doubt that Chapman's actions were disgusting *and* criminal. It is your duty to prosecute him. Yet, your office never even talked to the father—except to let him know that you weren't pursuing charges. He represents an obvious danger to children, families, and all decent citizens in your circuit. I strongly encourage you to reconsider dismissing the charge against Chapman.

State of Florida v. Thomas L. Dolgos

Following an undercover operation to identify individuals sharing child pornography in Central Florida, law enforcement obtained a search warrant for the residence and all devices belonging to Defendant Thomas Dolgos. On June 4, 2025, officers executed the warrant, arrested Dolgos, and seized his devices and computers. During the execution of the warrant, Dolgos (post-Miranda) admitted to possessing content depicting naked images of children. During an on-site forensic analysis of Dolgos' laptop, investigators located at least twelve videos showing children as young as two years old being raped and sexually battered. Dolgos' search history showed the use of search terms like "babypthc," and "[Hurtcore][Baby] Baby 0yo suck penis cum in mouth toddler best." Based on a preliminary view of Dolgos' devices, it appeared he possessed thousands of images of child pornography. His devices were taken by law enforcement for additional forensic analysis.

The Office of Statewide Prosecution ("OSP") on June 10 filed a Notice of Prosecuting Authority, assuming prosecutorial authority over the case. On July 8, OSP filed a twelve-count information, charging Dolgos with enhanced Possession of Child Pornography under section 775.0847(2), Florida Statutes (second-degree felony), given the volume and horrific nature of the content.

On July 10—after OSP took control of the prosecution—an attorney from your office inexplicably dismissed all charges against Dolgos. According to the docket, Dolgos' bond was then discharged. In the interim, OSP received results from the forensic analysis. Based on the results, on August 28, OSP obtained an arrest warrant for forty-eight additional counts of enhanced Possession of Child Pornography (the recovered content featured infants and toddlers being raped and sexually abused).

[1] To be sure, other criminal statutes would also apply to the facts of this case.

Fortunately, Dolgos was apprehended days later at the Canada border and swiftly extradited back to Florida. And OSP intends to pursue the original twelve counts that were inexplicably dismissed by your office, as well as the additional forty-eight counts that were part of the August 28 arrest warrant.

The depravity of the videos Dolgos possessed is impossible to overstate. OSP will ensure justice is done. He faces the possibility of 900 years in prison.

Your office's dismissal of Dolgos' charges was an unacceptable mistake. In this instance, we're lucky that the rapid diligence of OSP and law enforcement located him and got him back to Florida. But these errors cannot happen in the future. Your office should never dismiss a case OSP is managing. Especially a case like this, involving an individual who possessed and shared dozens of videos featuring the rape and sexual abuse of infants and toddlers. At best, it suggests a lack of adequate training in your office. Please address this deficiency and ensure that it doesn't happen again.

* * *

Public safety depends upon the faithful execution of your duties. You have the duty to prosecute criminal cases on behalf of the people.[2] You neglect that duty when you "knowingly permit [criminal conduct] and prefer no charges therefor."[3] It is also incompetent to exhibit "gross ignorance of official duties or gross carelessness in the discharge of them … [or] from lack of judgment and discretion."[4] A man who masturbated on a park bench in front of—and perhaps *to*—small, innocent children should be detained and criminally prosecuted. Likewise, a man who possessed and shared dozens of videos featuring the rape and sexual abuse of infants and toddlers should be prosecuted. Your failure to do so in these cases breaches your duties as a prosecutor. In addition to neglect of duty and incompetence, it may further amount to misfeasance and malfeasance.[5]

Sincerely,

James Uthmeier
Attorney General

Cc: Ryan Newman, General Counsel
Executive Office of the Governor

[2] Fla. Const. art. 5 § 17; § 27.02(1), Fla. Stat.

[3] *State ex rel. Hardee v. Allen*, 126 Fla. 878, 172 So. 222, 224 (1937).

[4] *Israel v. Desantis*, 269 So. 3d 491, 496 (Fla. 2019) (quoting *State ex rel. Hardie v. Coleman*, 115 Fla. 119, 155 So. 119, 133 (1934)).

[5] Fla. Const. art. 4 § 7; *see also Worrell v. DeSantis*, 386 So. 3d 867, 869–71 (Fla. 2024) (affirming the Governor's suspension of Monique Worrell).