

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

PEDRO FERNANDEZ, :  
Petitioner, :  
vs. : Case No. 76,525  
STATE OF FLORIDA, :  
Respondent. :  
\_\_\_\_\_ :

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

BRIEF OF PETITIONER ON JURISDICTION

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

✓ DEBORAH K. BRUECKHEIMER  
ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER

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

ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONER

TOPICAL INDEX TO BRIEF

PAGE NO.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS	2
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	5
ARGUMENT	6
ISSUE	
WHETHER THE DECISION IN <u>FERNANDEZ V. STATE</u> , Case No. 87-1824 (Fla. 2d DCA July 25, 1990), CONFLICTS WITH OTHER DISTRICT COURTS OF APPEAL AND THE FLORIDA SUPREME COURT ON THE ISSUE OF ALLOWING GUIDELINE DEPARTURES ON VIOLATION OF COMMUNITY CONTROL CASES?	6
CONCLUSION	9
APPENDIX	
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	

TABLE OF CITATIONS

<u>CASES</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
<u>Adams v. State,</u> 490 So.2d 53 (Fla. 1986)	6
<u>Fernandez v. State,</u> __So.2d __, (Fla. 2d DCA, Case No. 87-01824, opinion filed July 25, 1990)	5
<u>Irizarry v. State,</u> 15 F.L.W. D1288 (Fla. 3d DCA May 8, 1990)	7
<u>Jollie v. State,</u> 405 So.2d 418 (Fla. 1981)	7
<u>Lambert v. State,</u> 545 So.2d 838 (Fla. 1989)	6, 7
<u>Maddox v. State,</u> 553 So.2d 1380 (Fla. 5th DCA 1989)	6
<u>Ree v. State,</u> 14 F.L.W. 565 (Fla. Nov. 16, 1989)	6, 7
<u>Williams, et al. v. State,</u> Case No. 75,919	5,6
<u>OTHER AUTHORITIES</u>	
§ 3.701(D)(14), Fla. Stat. (1984)	6
§ 777.04(3), Fla. Stat. (1985)	2
§ 893.13(1)(a)(1), Fla. Stat. (1985)	2
§ 893.13(1)(a)1, Fla. Stat. (1985)	2
§ 893.13(1)(a)2, Fla. Stat. (1985)	2
§ 893.13(1)(e), Fla. Stat. (1985)	2
§ 893.147(1)(a), Fla. Stat. (1985)	2

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Petitioner, PEDRO FERNANDEZ, was the Appellant in the Second District Court of Appeal and the Defendant in the trial court. Respondent, the State of Florida, was the Appellee in the Second District Court of Appeal. The appendix to this brief contains a copy of the decision rendered July 25, 1990.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

On March 10, 1986, the State for the Thirteenth Judicial Circuit in and for Hillsborough County, Florida, filed an information charging the Petitioner, PEDRO FERNANDEZ, with delivery of cocaine in violation of section 893.13(1)(e), Florida Statutes (1985), and possession of cocaine in violation of section 893.13(1)(a)2, Florida Statutes (1985), both of which allegedly occurred on September 18, 1986. On July 16, 1986, Mr. Fernandez entered pleas of guilty to both charges and was placed on three years of concurrent probation. On December 10, 1986, the State Attorney filed an information charging Mr. Fernandez with the following: two counts of delivery of cocaine in violation of section 893.13(1)(a)1, Florida Statutes (1985); two counts of possession of cocaine in violation of section 893.13(1)(e), Florida Statutes (1985); and conspiracy to deliver cocaine in violation of section 893.13(1)(a)(1), Florida Statutes (1985), and section 777.04(3), Florida Statutes (1985). The dates of these alleged offenses were November 18 and 19, 1986. On January 21, 1987, Mr. Fernandez entered nolo contendere pleas to one count to deliver, one count of possession, and one count of conspiracy to deliver. He was then placed on concurrent terms of two years of community control. At this same time Mr. Fernandez was also charged in another information with possession of cocaine in violation of section 893.13(1)(e), Florida Statutes (1985); and possession of paraphernalia in violation of section 893.147(1)(a), Florida Statutes (1985). The offenses allegedly occurred on November 20,

1986. Mr. Fernandez apparently also plead to these charges, was given time served on the paraphernalia charge, and was given two concurrent probations on the possession charges.

Due to the filing and convictions of the November 1986 charges, an affidavit of violation of probation was filed in the September 1986 case. On May 27, 1987, affidavits of violation of community control were filed in the other two cases. On May 28, 1987, the trial court conducted a violation of probation/community control hearing. At that hearing Mr. Fernandez admitted to the allegation of having violated his probation on September 1986 charges and testimony established his having violated his community control. After hearing the evidence, the trial court revoked Mr. Fernandez's community control and probation.

On the same date the court sentenced Mr. Fernandez as follows: for the September 1986 charges he received 30 months imprisonment each with credit for 55 days, said sentences to run concurrent with each other but consecutive to the November charges; for the November 18 charges he received 3 1/2 years imprisonment with credit for 64 days time served, said sentences to run concurrent with each other but consecutive to the September 1986 charges and the November 19, 1986, charge; and for the November 19, 1986, charge he received 3 1/2 years of imprisonment with credit for 64 days served, said sentence to run consecutive to the September 1986 and November 18, 1986, charges. This came to a total of 9 1/2 years imprisonment. The guidelines recommended community control or 12 to 30 months, and the one-cell bump up for

a violation of probation/community control would have allowed for 2 1/2 to 3 1/2 years imprisonment.

On June 8, 1987, Mr. Fernandez filed a motion to correct sentence based on the upward departure from the guidelines without reasons. This motion was denied on June 15, 1987. Mr. Fernandez timely filed his notice of appeal on all three cases on June 18, 1987; and on July 25, 1990, the Second District Court of Appeal held that the consecutive sentences were a departure from the guidelines. The court, however, remanded the case with the understanding that the trial court could depart if it supplied valid written reasons.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

By allowing the trial court to depart from a guideline sentence on a violation of probation and community control case, the Second District Court of Appeal is conflicting with this Court and other district courts of appeal. This Court and other district courts of appeal have held that the guideline sentence with a one-cell bump up is all that is allowed once a defendant has been violated.

ARGUMENT

ISSUE

WHETHER THE DECISION IN FERNANDEZ V. STATE, Case No. 87-1824 (Fla. 2d DCA July 25, 1990), CONFLICTS WITH OTHER DISTRICT COURTS OF APPEAL AND THE FLORIDA SUPREME COURT ON THE ISSUE OF ALLOWING GUIDELINE DEPARTURES ON VIOLATION OF COMMUNITY CONTROL CASES?

From the facts of this case it is readily apparent that the Second District Court of Appeal is allowing trial courts to depart from guideline sentences -- if written reasons are given -- on violation of probation and community control cases. It is doing so under the justification that several violations are a reason for a departure. In several cases the Second District Court of Appeal certified this practice to this Court with the following question:

Has the Supreme Court in Ree v. State,<sup>1</sup> 14 F.L.W. 565 (Fla. Nov. 16, 1989), and Lambert v. State, 545 So.2d 838 (Fla. 1989), receded from the holding in Adams v. State, 490 So.2d 53 (Fla. 1986), in which it found that where a defendant previously placed on probation, has repeatedly violated the terms of his probation after having had his probation restored, that a trial court may use the multiple violations of probation as a valid reason to support a departure sentence beyond the one cell bump for violation of probation under § 3.701(D)-(14), Fla. Stat. (1984)?

This question was certified in 16 cases and is presently pending before this Court in Williams, et al., v. State, Case No. 75,919.

---

<sup>1</sup> The new citation for Ree based on a motion for rehearing is 15 F.L.W. D395 (Fla. July 19, 1990).

The Second District Court of Appeal did not mention Williams in Mr. Fernandez's opinion. The Second District Court of Appeal merely cited to case law that allows a trial court to depart from the guidelines upon remand for resentencing if it did not realize it was not departing when it initially imposed the sentence. That point of law is not the issue here. The issue is that the Second District Court of Appeal is allowing for departures on violation of probation or community control cases. This policy has been rejected by this Court in Ree, supra, and Lambert, supra. It has also been rejected by two other district courts of appeal in Maddox v. State, 553 So.2d 1380 (Fla. 5th DCA 1989); and Irizarry v. State, 15 F.L.W. D1288 (Fla. 3d DCA May 8, 1990). The Fifth and Third District Courts of Appeal held that multiple violations of probation were no longer valid reasons for a guidelines departure. This Court's holding on the subject as set forth in Ree and Lambert is that "any departure sentence for probation violation is impermissible if it exceeds the one-cell increase permitted by the sentencing guidelines." Lambert, 545 So.2d at 842; Ree, 15 F.L.W. at S396.

Because of the conflict with the Second District Court of Appeal's practice of allowing departures on violation cases and this Court and other District Court of Appeal's holdings that prohibit such a practice, and because this issue is already before this Court in Williams, et al., this Court should accept jurisdiction over Mr. Fernandez's case. See, Jollie v. State, 405 So.2d 418 (Fla. 1981).

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing reasons, arguments, and authorities, Petitioner has demonstrated that conflict does exist with the instant decision and this Court and other district courts of appeal so as to invoke discretionary review.

APPENDIX

PAGE NO.

1. Decision of the Second District Court  
of Appeal in Fernandez v. State, \_\_So.2d\_\_  
(Fla. 2d DCA, Case No. 87-01824, opinion  
filed July 25, 1990.

A1

NOT FINAL UNTIL TIME EXPIRES TO FILE REHEARING  
MOTION AND, IF FILED, DETERMINED.

f

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL  
OF FLORIDA  
SECOND DISTRICT

PEDRO FERNANDEZ,  
Appellant,  
v.  
STATE OF FLORIDA,  
Appellee.

CASE NO. 87-01824

Opinion filed July 25, 1990.

Appeal from the Circuit  
Court for Hillsborough County;  
Robert H. Bonanno, Acting Circuit  
Judge.

James Marion Moorman,  
Public Defender, and  
Deborah K. Brueckheimer,  
Assistant Public Defender,  
Bartow, for Appellant.

Robert A. Butterworth,  
Attorney General, Tallahassee,  
and Joseph R. Bryant,  
Assistant Attorney General,  
Tampa, for Appellee.

HALL, Judge.

The appellant Pedro Fernandez challenges the sentences  
he received after he was found to have violated conditions of  
probation and community control in three cases in which he was  
convicted of various drug offenses. We agree with the appellant

A1

that the imposition of consecutive sentences in all three cases resulted in a total sentence that exceeded the recommended guidelines range and the permissible one cell bump. Because the trial court provided no written reasons in support of this departure sentence we must remand for resentencing. Since the trial court did not consider the sentence he imposed to be a departure from the guidelines, he may again depart if he supplies valid, written reasons therefor. Waldron v. State, 529 So.2d 772 (Fla. 2d DCA 1988), approved in State v. Betancourt, 552 So.2d 1107 (Fla. 1989); State v. Vanhorn, 15 F.L.W. S327 (Fla. May 31, 1990).

Accordingly, we affirm the appellant's conviction but reverse the appellant's sentence and remand for resentencing with directions consistent herewith.


SCHEB, A.C.J., and PATTERSON, J., Concur.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy has been mailed to Robert Butterworth, Suite 700, 2002 N. Lois Ave., Tampa, FL 33607, (813) 873-4730, on this 31<sup>st</sup> day of August, 1990.

Respectfully submitted,

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

  
DEBORAH K. BRUECKHEIMER  
Assistant Public Defender  
P. O. Box 9000 - Drawer PD  
Bartow, FL 33830  
(813) 534-4200

DKB/ddv