


IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

STATE OF FLORIDA,  
Petitioner,  
vs.  
CHESTER T. BYERS,  
Respondent.

---

Case No. 74,294



DISCRETIONARY REVIEW OF DECISION OF THE  
DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA  
SECOND DISTRICT

BRIEF OF RESPONDENT ON JURISDICTION

JAMES MARION MOORMAN  
PUBLIC DEFENDER  
TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT  
FLORIDA BAR NO. 0143265

PAUL C. HELM  
**ASSISTANT** PUBLIC DEFENDER

Public Defender's Office  
Polk County Courthouse  
P. O. Box 9000--Drawer PD  
Bartow, FL 33830  
(813) 534-4200

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

TOPICAL INDEX TO BRIEF

	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS	2
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	3
ARGUMENT	4
ISSUE I	
SHOULD THIS COURT EXERCISE ITS DISCRETIONARY JURISDICTION TO REVIEW THE DECISION OF THE SECOND DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL?	4
CONCLUSION	6
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	6

TABLE OF CITATIONS

<u>CASES</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
<u>Lampkin-Asam v. District Court of Appeal,</u> 364 So.2d 469 (Fla. 1978)	5
<u>State v. Hieber,</u> Case No. 73,531.	4, 5
<u>State v. Hieber,</u> 541 So.2d 1208 (Fla. 2d DCA 1988)	5
<u>State v. Williams,</u> 463 So.2d 525 (Fla. 3d DCA 1985)	4
 <u>OTHER AUTHORITIES</u>	
Fla. R. App. P. 9.140(c)(2)	4
§ 924.07(1)(i), Fla. Stat. (1987)	4

IMINA STATEMENT

Respondent Chester T. Byers was the defendant in the trial court and the appellee in the District Court of Appeal, Second District. Petitioner, the State of Florida, was the plaintiff in the trial court and the appellant in the District Court. Petitioner is seeking review of the District Court's opinion dismissing Petitioner's appeals. The opinion is set forth in the appendix to this brief. References to the appendix are designated by "A" and the page number.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

Respondent accepts Petitioner's statement of the case and facts set forth in the Brief of Petitioner on Jurisdiction.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

Although Respondent agrees that the Second District's decision in this case conflicts with a decision of the Third District Court of Appeal, it is unnecessary for this Court to grant discretionary review. First, the Second District's decision to dismiss the State's untimely appeals in which the notices of appeal were filed more than fifteen days after the guidelines departure sentences were rendered was plainly correct. Second, the conflict will be resolved in another case in which this Court has already granted review.

ARGUMENT

ISSUE I

SHOULD THIS COURT EXERCISE ITS  
DISCRETIONARY JURISDICTION TO REVIEW  
THE DECISION OF THE SECOND DISTRICT  
COURT OF APPEAL?

Respondent agrees that the decision of the District Court of Appeal, Second District dismissing the Petitioner's untimely appeals (A1-2) conflicts with State v. Williams, 463 So.2d 525 (Fla. 3d DCA 1985). (A3-4) However, Respondent respectfully requests this Court to exercise its discretion to deny review of the Second District's decision on the ground that review is unnecessary.

Review is unnecessary in this case for two reasons: (1) The Second District's decision is correct on its face. (2) The conflict between the Second District and the Third District will be resolved by this Court in State v. Hieber, Case No. 73,531.

In this case, the Second District dismissed as untimely eight State appeals from guidelines departure sentences because the notices of appeal were filed more than fifteen days after the sentences were rendered. (A1,2) The State has the statutory right to appeal a sentence imposed outside the range recommended by the guidelines. § 924.07(1)(i), Fla. Stat. (1987). However, the State was required to file its notices of appeal within fifteen days of rendition of the orders to be reviewed, i.e. the sentences. Fla. R. App. P. 9.140(c)(2). The untimely filing of the notices of appeal was a jurisdictional defect and required the Second District

to dismiss the appeals. Lampkin-Asam v. District Court of Appeal, 364 So.2d 469, 471 (Fla. 1978).

The conflict of decisions between the Second District and the Third District more clearly appears in the Second District's decision in State v. Hieber, 541 So.2d 1208 (Fla. 2d DCA 1988).

(A5) Petitioner asserts that this Court has already accepted jurisdiction to review that decision in State v. Hieber, Case No. 73,531. Brief of Petitioner on Jurisdiction, page 2 and 3. Therefore, this Court can resolve the conflict in Hieber, and it is unnecessary to grant Petitioner's request for review in this case.

CONCLUSION

Respondent respectfully requests this Honorable Court to deny the petition for discretionary review.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy has been mailed to the Tampa Attorney General's Office on this 26th day of June, 1989.

Respectfully submitted,



JAMES MARION MOORMAN  
PUBLIC DEFENDER  
TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT  
FLORIDA BAR NUMBER 0143265

\_\_\_\_\_  
PAUL C. HELM  
Assistant Public Defender  
P. O. Box 9000 - Drawer PD  
Bartow, FL 33830  
(813) 534-4200

PCH/an