### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 73,806

THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Petitioner,

APR 6 1989

Deputy Clerk

ROBERTO L. BETANCOUELERK, SUPPENE COURT

 ${\tt Respondent.}$ 

ON APPLICATION FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW

BRIEF OF RESPONDENT ON JURISDICTION

BENNETT H. BRUMMER
Public Defender
Eleventh Judicial Circuit
of Florida
1351 N.W. 12th Street
Miami, Florida 33125
(305) 545-3078

HENRY H. HARNAGE Assistant Public Defender Florida Bar No. 140835

Counsel for Respondent

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION,
STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS 2
QUESTION PRESENTED,
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT,
ARGUMENT,4
WHETHER THE DISTRICT COURT DECISION REQUIRING THE TRIAL COURT, UPON REMAND, TO RESENTENCE WITHIN THE GUIDELINES, EXPRESSLY AND DIRECTLY CONFLICTS WITH TWO OTHER DISTRICT COURT DECISIONS CONCERNING WHETHER THE TRIAL COURT MAY NOW, UPON REMAND FOR RESENTENCING, DEPART FROM THE GUIDELINES?
CONCLUSION, , , , , , , , , ,
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE,6

## TABLE OF CITATIONS

CASES	PAGES
DYER v. STATE 534 So.2d 843 (Fla. 5th DCA 1988)	. 4
WALDRON v. STATE 529 So.2d 772 (Fla. 2d DCA 1988)	. 4
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
FLORIDA RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE	
Rule 9.030(a)(2)(A)(vi)	4

#### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 73,806

THE STATE OF FLORIDA,

Petitioner,

-vs-

ROBERTO L. BETANCOURT,
Respondent.

### ON APPLICATION FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW

#### ODU

The respondent, Roberto L. Betancourt, was the defendant in the trial court and the appellant in the Third District Court of Appeal. The petitioner, the State of Florida, was the plaintiff in the trial court and the appellee in the Third District Court of Appeal. In this brief, the parties will be referred to as they stand in this court. The symbol "A" will be used to refer to portions of the appendix attached hereto. All emphasis is supplied unless the contrary is indicated.

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

Respondent accepts the petitioner's Statement of the Case and Facts.

### OUESTION PRESENTED

WHETHER THE DISTRICT COURT DECISION REQUIRING THE TRIAL COURT, UPON REMAND, TO RESENTENCE WITHIN THE GUIDELINES, EXPRESSLY AND DIRECTLY CONFLICTS WITH TWO OTHER DISTRICT COURT DECISIONS CONCERNING WHETHER THE TRIAL COURT MAY NOW, UPON REMAND FOR RESENTENCING, DEPART FROM THE GUIDELINES?

# SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Respondent concedes that discretionary jurisdiction appears to exist as to the limited question of law concerning what the trial court may do at resentencing.

### ARGUMENT

WHETHER THE DISTRICT COURT DECISION REQUIRING THE TRIAL COURT, UPON REMAND, TO RESENTENCE WITHIN THE GUIDELINES, EXPRESSLY AND DIRECTLY CONFLICTS WITH TWO OTHER DISTRICT COURT DECISIONS CONCERNING WHETHER THE TRIAL COURT MAY NOW, UPON REMAND FOR RESENTENCING, DEPART FROM THE GUIDELINES?

The petitioner suggests that the decision under review [Appendix to this Respondent's Brief and hereafter referred to as the **Betancourt** decision] expressly and directly conflicts with the decision of the Second District in <u>Waldron v. State</u>, 529 So.2d 772 (Fla. 2d DCA 1988) and of the Fifth District in <u>Dyer v. State</u>, 534 So.2d 843 (Fla. 5th DCA 1988).

Because the **Betancourt** decision acknowledges that its rule (as to what may occur upon resentencing) conflicts with two other district court decisions, it would appear that this Court has jurisdiction. Cf. Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure 9.030(a) (2)(A)(vi) and 9.120(d) ("When jurisdiction is invoked pursuant to Rule 9.030(a)(2)(A)(v) or (a)(2)(A)(vi) (certifications by the district courts to the Supreme Court), no briefs on jurisdiction shall be filed.").

### CONCLUSION

Based on the cases and authorities cited herein, the respondent respectfully concedes that this honorable Court may decline to accept, or accept, or postpone its decision on discretionary jurisdiction in this cause.

Respectfully submitted,

BENNETT H. BRUMMER
Public Defender
Eleventh Judicial Circuit
of Florida
1351 N.W. 12th Street
Miami, Florida 33125

(305) 545-3078

BY: HARNAGE

Assistant Public Defender Florida Bar No. 140835

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the fore-going was delivered by mail to the Office of the Attorney General, Suite N-921, 401 N.W. 2nd Avenue, Miami, Florida 33128, this day of April, 1989.

HENRY H. HARNAGE

Assistant Public Defender