

IN THE SUPREME COURT
OF FLORIDA

DEREK LANG SHINE JR.,
Petitioner,

Case No. SC18-688

DCA No. 3D15-2876

v.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
Respondent.

**PETITIONER'S APPENDIX TO
INITIAL BRIEF ON THE MERITS**

INDEX

<i>State v. Shine</i> , No. 3D15-2876, 42 Fla. L. Weekly D1832c (Fla. 3d DCA Aug. 23, 2017) (original panel opinion)	2
<i>State v. Shine</i> , No. 3D15-2876, 43 Fla. L. Weekly D224b (Fla. 3d DCA Jan. 24, 2018) (opinion on rehearing)	5
St.'s Resp. to Order to Show Cause, <i>Glover v. State</i> , SC10-254 (July 8, 2011)	8
Certificate of Service	10

Respectfully submitted,

Carlos J. Martinez
Public Defender
Eleventh Judicial Circuit
1320 NW 14th Street
Miami, Florida 33125

/s/ Jeffrey Paul DeSousa
Jeffrey Paul DeSousa
Assistant Public Defender
Florida Bar No. 110951
appellatedefender@pdmiami.com
jdesousa@pdmiami.com
(305) 545-1960

August 2, 2018

Third District Court of Appeal

State of Florida

Opinion filed August 23, 2017.
Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing.

No. 3D15-2876
Lower Tribunal No. 14-890-A-K

The State of Florida,
Appellant,

vs.

Derek Lang Shine Jr.,
Appellee.

An Appeal from the Circuit Court for Monroe County, Mark H. Jones, Judge.

Pamela Jo Bondi, Attorney General, and Robert Martinez Biswas, Assistant Attorney General, for appellant.

Carlos J. Martinez, Public Defender, and Harvey J. Sepler, Assistant Public Defender, for appellee.

Before ROTHENBERG, C.J., and SUAREZ and FERNANDEZ JJ.

SUAREZ, J.

The state of Florida appeals the downward departure sentence imposed upon Defendant Derek Lang Shine on December 22, 2015 in connection with a

probation violation.¹ Finding that the trial court failed to provide a valid legal ground for its downward departure, we reverse.

In 2015 Shine was convicted and sentenced to three years of drug offender probation, pursuant to a plea agreement with the state. Later in 2015 Shine violated his probation and the trial court revoked probation and sentenced him to 40 months of prison followed by 40 months of probation for count one and a concurrent term of 40 months prison, followed by a concurrent term of 12 months of probation for count two. The sentence imposed was a downward departure sentence to which the state objected.

The trial court's written sentencing order states that the downward departure was based on the fact that "Defendant has been granted a previous downward departure based on a valid uncoerced plea agreement . . . [and] it would be inappropriate, too harsh and contrary to the principles of graduated sanctions to

¹ The state filed two separate appeals in connection with Defendant's sentences which were imposed simultaneously and which were intended to run concurrently. In case number 15-2876 the state appeals the sentence imposed in connection with lower tribunal case number 2014-CF-890 (i. sale of cocaine within 1000 feet of a convenience business on September 4, 2014 and ii. unlawful use of a two-way communications device). In case number 15-2877 the state appeals the sentences imposed in connection with lower tribunal number 2014-CF-891 (i. sale of cocaine within 1000 feet of a convenience business on September 3, 2014 and ii. unlawful use of a two-way communications device). We hereby consolidate Third District case numbers 15-2876 and 15-2877 under case number 15-2876. We note that because both sentences were imposed at the same time and were intended to be served concurrently, there was no necessity for the filing of two separate cases and we encourage the state to appeal simultaneous sentences under a single case in the future.

now sentence the Defendant to 73.65 months imprisonment which is the lowest permissible prison sentence, absent a downward departure.”

We conclude that the trial court’s reasoning does not amount to a valid legal basis for the downward departure sentence imposed. See State v. Pita, 54 So. 3d 557 (Fla. 3d DCA 2011); State v. Salgado, 948 So. 2d 12 (Fla. 3d DCA 2006); § 921.0026 Fla. Stat. 2014.

Consequently, we reverse and remand for resentencing at which the trial court may again impose a downward departure sentence, but such must be a recognized legally permissible reason for such sentence.

Reversed and remanded.

Third District Court of Appeal

State of Florida

Opinion filed January 24, 2018.

The Opinion is not final until disposition of any further motion for rehearing and/or motion for rehearing en banc. Any previously-filed motion for rehearing en banc is deemed moot.

No. 3D15-2876

Consolidated: 3D15-2877

Lower Tribunal Nos. 14-890-A-K & 14-891-A-K

The State of Florida,

Appellant,

vs.

Derek Lang Shine Jr.,

Appellee.

Appeals from the Circuit Court for Monroe County, Mark H. Jones, Judge.

Pamela Jo Bondi, Attorney General, and Robert Martinez Biswas and Jonathan Tanoos, Assistant Attorneys General, for appellant.

Carlos J. Martinez, Public Defender, and Harvey J. Sepler and Jeffrey Paul DeSousa, Assistant Public Defenders, for appellee.

Before ROTHENBERG, C.J., and SUAREZ and FERNANDEZ JJ.

SUAREZ, J.

ON MOTION FOR REHEARING

The State of Florida moves for rehearing of this Court's August 23, 2017

opinion. We grant rehearing, withdraw our prior opinion and substitute the following opinion in its stead.

The State of Florida appeals the downward departure sentence imposed upon Defendant Derek Lang Shine on December 22, 2015 in connection with a probation violation.¹ Finding that the trial court failed to provide a valid legal ground for its downward departure, we reverse.

In 2015, Shine was convicted and sentenced to three years of drug offender probation, pursuant to a plea agreement with the State. Later in 2015, Shine violated his probation and the trial court revoked probation and sentenced him to forty (40) months of prison followed by forty (40) months of probation for count one and a concurrent term of forty (40) months prison, followed by a concurrent term of twelve (12) months of probation for count two. The sentence imposed was a downward departure sentence to which the State objected.

¹ The State filed two separate appeals in connection with Defendant's sentences which were imposed simultaneously and which were intended to run concurrently. In case number 15-2876 the State appeals the sentence imposed in connection with lower tribunal case number 2014-CF-890 (i. sale of cocaine within 1000 feet of a convenience business on September 4, 2014 and ii. unlawful use of a two-way communications device). In case number 15-2877 the State appeals the sentences imposed in connection with lower tribunal number 2014-CF-891 (i. sale of cocaine within 1000 feet of a convenience business on September 3, 2014 and ii. unlawful use of a two-way communications device). We hereby consolidate Third District case numbers 15-2876 and 15-2877 under case number 15-2876. We note that because both sentences were imposed at the same time and were intended to be served concurrently, there was no necessity for the filing of two separate cases and we encourage the State to appeal simultaneous sentences as a single case in the future.

The trial court's written sentencing order states that the downward departure was based on the fact that "Defendant has been granted a previous downward departure based on a valid uncoerced plea agreement . . . [and] it would be inappropriate, too harsh and contrary to the principles of graduated sanctions to now sentence the Defendant to 73.65 months imprisonment which is the lowest permissible prison sentence, absent a downward departure."

We conclude that the trial court's reasoning does not amount to a valid legal basis for the downward departure sentence imposed. See § 921.0026 Fla. Stat. (2014); State v. Pita, 54 So. 3d 557 (Fla. 3d DCA 2011); State v. Kasten, 775 So. 2d 992 (Fla. 3d DCA 2000); State v. Nolasco, 542 So. 2d 1052 (Fla. 3d DCA 1989). Consequently, we reverse and remand for resentencing within the sentencing guidelines.

Reversed and remanded.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

ANTHONY DESHAWN GLOVER,

Petitioner,

v.

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Respondent.

CASE NO. SC10-254

RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE


The Respondent, the State of Florida, response to this Court's order to show cause and states the following:

This Court directed the State to show cause why this Court should not accept jurisdiction in this case and remand for reconsideration in light of Jackson v. State, 36 Fla. L. Weekly S81 (Fla. Feb. 17, 2011). Although the reasons for the downward departure were different in each case, Jackson controls the issue of whether the trial court may impose a departure sentence on remand. Therefore, there does not appear to be any reason why this Court should not remand for reconsideration of Jackson.

Wherefore, the State respectfully ask this Court to remand for reconsideration of Jackson.

Respectfully submitted,

PAMELA JO BONDI
ATTORNEY GENERAL




TRISHA MEGGS PATE
Tallahassee Bureau Chief,
Criminal Appeals
Florida Bar No. 045489

Attorneys for State of Florida
Office of the Attorney General
Pl-01, the Capitol
Tallahassee, Fl 32399-1050
(850) 414-3300
(850) 922-6674 (Fax)

[AGO# L10-1-5233]

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing have been furnished by eMail to Steven Seliger on July 8, 2011.



Trisha Meggs Pate
Attorney for the State of Florida

[C:\Users\Criminal\Pleading\10105233\gloverosc.wpd --- 7/8/11,10:02 am]

APPENDIX CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing document has been furnished by email this **second** day of August 2018 to the following:

Jonathan Tanoos
Assistant Attorney General
Criminal Appeals Bureau
Office of the Attorney General
One SE Third Avenue, Suite 900
Miami, Florida 33131
crimappmia@myfloridalegal.com
jonathan.tanoos@myfloridalegal.com
Counsel for Respondent

/s/ Jeffrey Paul DeSousa
Jeffrey Paul DeSousa
Assistant Public Defender