

OCT 17 2025

COMMISSION ON ETHICS

BEFORE THE  
STATE OF FLORIDA  
COMMISSION ON ETHICS

CONFIDENTIAL

In re RANDAL ANDREWS,

Respondent.

Complaint No. 25-261

DETERMINATION OF INVESTIGATIVE JURISDICTION  
AND ORDER TO INVESTIGATE

UPON REVIEW of this complaint, I find as follows:

1. This complaint was filed by Scott Belford of Bradford County, Florida.
2. The Respondent, Randal Andrews, serves as the Zoning Director and Land Development Regulations Administrator for Bradford County, Florida.
3. The complaint alleges that Respondent used his official County email account on multiple occasions to discuss and arrange activity around his personal land sales. The complaint alleges that Respondent also signed these emails using his official title and “contact block.”<sup>1</sup> This indicates a possible violation of Section 112.313(6), Florida Statutes, and Article II, Section 8(h)(2), Florida Constitution.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The complaint mentions five specific email chains, however, one of these chains allegedly occurred in 2019 and another allegedly occurred in 2017. Pursuant to Section 112.3231, Florida Statutes, the Commission may only investigate allegations concerning conduct that occurred no more than 5 years prior to the date the complaint was filed. As this complaint was filed on September 22, 2025, the Commission may only investigate those emails that occurred on or after September 22, 2020.

<sup>2</sup> This complaint appears to be made based on Complainant's personal knowledge, as Complainant directly quoted the emails, described attachments therein, and provided specific dates of the messages. Additionally, these emails would likely be admissible under the “Admissions” hearsay exception found in Section 90.803(18), Florida Statutes.

WHEREFORE staff of the Commission on Ethics shall conduct a preliminary investigation of this complaint for a probable cause determination of whether Respondent has violated Section 112.313(6), Florida Statutes, and Article II, Section 8(h)(2), Florida Constitution, as set forth above.<sup>3</sup>

October 17, 2025

Date

Kerrie J. Stillman  
Kerrie J. Stillman  
Executive Director

KJS/aln

---

<sup>3</sup> There are multiple allegations that are insufficient to warrant an investigation. First, the complaint alleges that Respondent “took it upon himself” to grant a zoning change for a tract of property known as the “Alexander property” without an ordinance, public hearing, or posted signs. However, this allegation is legally insufficient because Complainant does not provide any information that would indicate this is not allowed, nor does Complainant provide any documentation regarding what the proper procedures are. Second, the complaint alleges that certificates of occupancy and permits were issued without proper zoning in place. However, this allegation is legally insufficient, as Complainant mentions that it is not Respondent, but rather another person (the Building Official) who is responsible for permit and certificate of occupancy issuance. Third, the complaint alleges that permit approvals and certificates of occupancy were issued without proper potable water compliance from the Department of Health. However, this allegation is also legally insufficient, as Complainant mentions that the Building Official is responsible for issuing permits and certificates of occupancy. The complaint also alleges that Respondent has not been responsive to Complainant’s inquiries and has made false and misleading statements when asked about the Alexander tract. However, these allegations are insufficient as Complainant provides no basis for his assertion that any of Respondent’s statements were false.