

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
AUTHORITIES CITED	ii
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
STATEMENT OF THE FACTS	3
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	4
ARGUMENT	
THIS COURT SHOULD RETURN TO ITS WELL-SETTLED POSITION THAT COMMENT IN A DEFENDANT'S RIGHT TO REMAIN SILENT REQUIRES REVERSAL UPON TIMELY OBJECTION THERETO.	10
THE CERTIFIED QUESTION MUST BE ANSWERED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE AND THE RULE OF <u>HOLLAND V. STATE</u> , 502 So.2d 1250 (Fla. 1987) SHOULD BE MAINTAINED.	13
THE DIRECT COMMENT ON A DEFENDANT'S EXERCISE OF HIS RIGHT TO REMAIN SILENT WAS NOT HARMLESS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT.	15
THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR SEVERANCE.	16
THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN DENYING PETITIONER A CONTINUANCE THUS DENYING HIM THE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL.	17
THE PETITIONER'S CONVICTION SHOULD BE REVERSED FOR A NEW TRIAL DUE TO THE HYPNOTIZING OF THE KEY PROSECUTION WITNESS, PRIOR TO TRIAL.	18
CONCLUSION	19
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	19

