## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

Petitioner,

vs.

JEFFREY JEROME MILTON,

Respondent.

CASE NO. 66,393

SID J. WHITE
FEB 21 1985
CLERK, SUPREME COURT

Chief Deputy Clerk

RESPONDENT'S BRIEF ON THE MERITS

JAMES B. GIBSON
PUBLIC DEFENDER
SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

JAMES R. WULCHAK CHIEF, APPELLATE DIVISION ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER 1012 South Ridgewood Avenue Daytona Beach, FL 32014-6183 (904) 252-3367

ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE NO
TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
TABLE OF CITATIONS	ii
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
ARGUMENT	
THE SENTENCING GUIDELINES ARE APPLICABLE, IF AFFIRMATIVELY ELECTED BY THE DEFENDANT, TO PROBATION REVOCATIONS WHERE THE SENTENCING OCCURS AFTER OCTOBER 1, 1983, EVEN THOUGH THE ORIGINAL ORDER PLACING THE DEFENDANT ON PROBATION WAS PRIOR TO THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE GUIDELINES.	2
CONCLUSION	5
CEDTIFICATE OF SERVICE	5

## TABLE OF CITATIONS

CASES CITED:	PAGE NO.
Boyett v. State 452 So.2d 958 (Fla. 2d DCA 1984)	2,3,4
Bracey v. State 356 So.2d 72 (Fla. 1st DCA 1978)	3
Duggar v. State 446 So.2d 222 (Fla. 1st dCA 1984)	2,3
In re Rules of Criminal Procedure (Sentencing Guidelines) 439 So.2d 848 (Fla. 1983)	2
Milton v. State 9 FLW 2333 (Fla. 5th DCA 11/8/84)	2
Rutlin v. State 455 So.2d 1347 (Fla. 5th DCA 1984)	2
Villery v. Florida Parole and Probation Commission 396 So.2d 1107 (Fla. 1981)	3
OTHER AUTHORITIES:	
Section 921.001(4)(a), Florida Statutes (1983) Section 948.09(3), Florida Statutes (1983)	2,3 3,4
Rule 3.701, Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure	3

#### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

STATE OF FLORIDA,	)		
Petitioner,	)		
	)		
vs.	)	CASE NO.	66,393
JEFFREY JEROME MILTON,	)		
Respondent.	)		

## RESPONDENT'S BRIEF ON THE MERITS

## SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Sentencing in this case did not occur when the defendant was originally placed on probation, since a probation order is not a sentence. Therefore, sentencing following a probation revocation is not a "resentencing". The sentencing in the instant case took place after the effective date of the sentencing guidelines, although the crime occurred prior thereto. The defendant elected the sentencing guidelines. The guidelines apply.

#### ARGUMENT

THE SENTENCING GUIDELINES
ARE APPLICABLE, IF AFFIRMATIVELY ELECTED BY THE DEFENDANT, TO PROBATION REVOCATIONS
WHERE THE SENTENCING OCCURS
AFTER OCTOBER 1, 1983, EVEN
THOUGH THE ORIGINAL ORDER
PLACING THE DEFENDANT ON
PROBATION WAS PRIOR TO THE
EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE
GUIDELINES.

The legislature specifically mandated that the sentencing guidelines are applicable if affirmatively elected by the defendant to sentences imposed after October 1, 1983, for crimes occurring prior thereto. § 921.001(4)(a), Fla.Stat. (1983). See also In re Rules of Criminal Procedure (Sentencing Guidelines), 439 So.2d 848, 849 (Fla. 1983).

The state, however, asserts that the defendant is not entitled to be sentenced under the guidelines since he was "sentenced" when he was originally placed on probation and is therefor not entitled to the election provided by the rule since the new proceeding is merely a "resentencing". The district courts have rejected this assertion. Milton v.

State, 9 FLW 2333 (Fla. 5th DCA November 8, 1984); Rutlin v.

State, 455 So.2d 1347 (Fla. 5th DCA 1984); Boyett v. State,
452 So.2d 958 (Fla. 2d DCA 1984); Duggar v. State, 446 So.2d
222 (Fla. 1st DCA 1984).

Placing the defendant on probation is not a sentence. Section 948.01(3), Florida Statutes (1983), provides that in placing a defendant on probation the court shall "withhold the imposition of sentence." Therefore, a defendant who is placed on probation has not been sentenced and is not sentenced until such time as he may violate probation and have it revoked. Boyett v. State, supra at 959; Duggar v. State, supra at 223. See also Villery v. Florida Parole and Probation Commission, 396 So.2d 1107, 1110 (Fla. 1981); and Bracey v. State, 356 So.2d 72 (Fla. 1st DCA 1978), holding that an order of probation is not a sentence.

Although Section 948.06(1), Florida Statutes (1983), provides that upon revocation of probation the court may "impose any sentence which it might have originally imposed before placing the probationer or offender on probation," this statute has been limited by the legislature in enacting the quidelines. The legislative intent was clearly expressed in Section 921.001(4)(a), providing for sentencing pursuant to the guidelines for all felonies, except capital and life felonies, where sentencing is after the effective date and the defendant has elected to be sentenced thereunder. sentencing of persons on probation was not excluded from the See also ambit of the statute. Boyett, supra at 959. Committee Note (c) to Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure 3.701, which explicitly requires that sentences imposed in probation revocations be in accordance with the guidelines.

In rejecting the state's argument concerning Section 948.01(3), the Second District held:

There had to be a cutoff date after which the guidelines would be applied. This comprehensive legislation [§ 921.001, Fla.Stat.] which so drastically affects sentencing in Florida necessarily overrides any inconsistency which may remain in section 948.06(1). Since appellant was sentenced after October 1, 1983, he was entitled to be sentenced under the guidelines.

## Boyett v. State, supra at 960.

The defendant here was sentenced after October 1, 1983. He elected to be sentenced pursuant to the guidelines. The trial court erred in refusing to utilize the guidelines in imposing the defendant's sentence.

The decision of the District Court of Appeal,

Fifth District, correctly vacated the sentence and remanded

for sentencing in accordance with the guidelines. This Court

should answer the certified question in the affirmative and

affirm the decision of the district court.

#### CONCLUSION

BASED UPON the cases, authorities, and policies cited herein, the respondent requests that this Honorable Court answer the certified question in the affirmative and affirm the decision of the District Court of Appeal, Fifth District.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES B. GIBSON
PUBLIC DEFENDER
SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

JAMES R. WULCHAK

CHIEF, APPELLATE DIVISION
ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER
1012 South Ridgewood Avenue
Daytona Beach, FL 32014-6183
(904) 252-3367

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished by mail to: The Honorable Jim Smith, Attorney General, 125 N. Ridgewood Avenue, Daytona Beach, FL 32014 and Mr. Jeffrey J. Milton, Inmate No. 749153, P. O. Box 699, Sneads, FL 32460 on this 19th day of February, \$\dar{2}985\$.

AMES R. WULCHAK

√HIEF, APPELLATE DIVISION ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER