

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

FILED
JUN 28 1990

LUCIOUS WILLIAMS,

Petitioner,

v.

CASE NO. 76,016

By: [Signature]
Deputy Clerk

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Respondent.

ON DISCRETIONARY REVIEW FROM THE
SECOND DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL, STATE OF FLORIDA

BRIEF OF RESPONDENT ON THE MERITS

ROBERT A BUTTERWORTH
ATTORNEY GENERAL

STEPHEN A. BAKER
Assistant Attorney General
Florida Bar No. 365645
2002 North Lois Avenue, Suite 700
Westwood Center
Tampa, Florida 33607-2366
(813) 272-2670

COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT

/aoh

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE NO.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS.....1

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.....2

ARGUMENT.....3

DOES A SECOND VIOLATION OF PROBATION CONSTITUTE A
VALID BASIS FOR A DEPARTURE SENTENCE BEYOND THE
ONE-CELL DEPARTURE PROVIDED IN THE SENTENCING
GUIDELINES?

CONCLUSION.....6

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....6

TABLE CITATIONS

PAGE NO.

<u>Adams v. State,</u> 490 So.2d 53 (Fla. 1986),.....	3
<u>Boldes v. State,</u> 475 So.2d 1356 (Fla. 5th DCA 1985).....	3
<u>Franklin v. State,</u> 545 So.2d 851 (Fla. 1989).....	4
<u>Lambert v. State,</u> 545 So.2d 838 (Fla. 1989).....	3
<u>Maddox v. State,</u> 553 So.2d 1380 (Fla. 5th DCA 1989).....	4
<u>Niehenke v. State,</u> 15 F.L.W. 1017 (Fla. 5th DCA April 19, 1990).....	4
<u>Riggins v. State,</u> 477 So.2d 663 (Fla. 5th DCA 1985).....	3

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

On March 26, 1987, a probation officer filed an affidavit alleging that Appellant violated probation by possessing narcotics, as evidenced by a urine test on February 17, 1987, which tested positive for cocaine. (R. 24). On August 4, 1987, the court found that Appellant had violated probation and entered an order modifying his probation. (R. 26).

On September 18, 1987, a probation officer filed an affidavit alleging that Appellant violated condition (5) by committing a burglary on August 15, 1987, and condition (8) by failing to follow a court officer's instructions to report to his probation officer on August 5, 1987. (R. 30).

On September 18, 1987, a probation revocation hearing was held before the Honorable Harry Lee Coe III, Circuit Judge. (R. 44). Probation Officer Paul Campbell testified that Appellant was placed on probation on August 29, 1986, and was instructed not to break the law. (R. 48, 49).

The trial court found Appellant guilty of violating both condition (5) and condition (8) of the probation order.

The state apparently nolle prossed the new substantive charge arising out of the violation of probation, as a negotiation arising out of the nature of the courts sentence. (R. 22).

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

Where a defendant is being sentenced solely for a violation of probation, and where those violations may be numerous, and where other reasons for departure exist beyond the allowable one-cell bump-up, a greater than one-cell departure may be given.

ARGUMENT

DOES A SECOND VIOLATION OF PROBATION
CONSTITUTE A VALID BASIS FOR A DEPARTURE
SENTENCE BEYOND THE ONE-CELL DEPARTURE
PROVIDED IN THE SENTENCING GUIDELINES?

Of critical distinction between this case and others that have been certified to this Court as being of great public importance, is that Appellant was sentenced solely for violating probation. No new substantive charges were brought up for sentencing along with the violation of probation charges. Accordingly, "double-dipping" is not an issue herein.

In Adams v. State, 490 So.2d 53 (Fla. 1986), this Court noted that Boldes v. State, 475 So.2d 1356 (Fla. 5th DCA 1985) supports the proposition that a departure greater than one cell may be had for a probation violation and that any further departure must be based upon another valid reason or reasons. Moreover, citing to Riggins v. State, 477 So.2d 663 (Fla. 5th DCA 1985), this Court further identified the currently disputed rule that multiple violations can support a departure of more than one cell.

In Lambert v. State, 545 So.2d 838 (Fla. 1989), this Court appeared to issue the blanket rule that a departure in excess of one cell, based upon a multiplicity of probation violations, will not be allowed. However, Appellee herein urges that where other valid reasons for departure still exist, apart from the sheer number of violations, departures in excess of one cell should be

allowed. Cf. Franklin v. State, 545 So.2d 851 (Fla. 1989); and Maddox v. State, 553 So.2d 1380 (Fla. 5th DCA 1989) wherein other reasons for departure, related to the violations still cannot constitute reason to depart more than one cell.

The reasons for a rule that allows for a greater than one-cell departure, especially where the violations are numerous, can be found in Niehenke v. State, 15 F.L.W. 1017 (Fla. 5th DCA April 19, 1990), Judge Sharp, dissenting. Herein, and as noted at greater length infra, were a defendant has no particular impetus to conform his conduct to the requirements of his probation, it appears that he can commit technical violations with impunity. Such violations can and often include failure to obtain and successfully complete drug or alcohol rehabilitation, failure to stay away from prior victims or high crime areas, and failure to refrain from using controlled substances. All such violations have been proven to lead to the sort of criminal conduct that led the defendant to court in the first place. A blanket rule allowing no more than a one-cell departure, no matter how egregious or numerous the violations places the scofflaw offender on an equal footing as a defendant who, though trying to do his best, falls off the probationary wagon but once for failing to keep an appointment with the probation officer.

Appellee respectfully suggests that, where a defendant is being sentenced solely for a violation of probation, and where those violations may be numerous, where other reasons for departure exist beyond the allowable one-cell bump-up, a greater

than one-cell departure may be given. Such a rule puts those defendants who commit only one violation on an equal footing, because only one violation can only lead to a one-cell departure. However, the multiple violator can be duly compensated for his conduct, not based upon the number of his violation, but on their nature, if they support other valid reasons for departure.

Sub judice, Appellant committed two violations, but the court found many reasons for departure. (R. 34-35, 16-21). Accordingly, the certified question should be answered in the affirmative where, as here, the multiple violations given rise to many reasons for departure based upon reasons apart from the multiplicity of violations.

The arguments as laid out in this brief differ somewhat from those in the other certified question cases dealing with this issue. As noted below, the State's arguments in the other certified cases call upon this court to uphold the rule that multiple violations, in and of themselves, constitute a valid reason for a greater than one-cell departure. Appellee does not waive such an argument. However, if this Court were inclined to somewhat dampen that rule, Appellee respectfully suggests that this Court adopt the rule and reasoning as set forth by the state in the instant case.


For the sake of uniformity and clarity, Appellee incorporates herein and relies on the states brief in the case of Dennis Williams, et al, v. State, Case No. 75,919, as set out in the attached appendix.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing reasons, arguments, and authorities,
the Second District Court of Appeals decision should be affirmed.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT A. BUTTERWORTH
ATTORNEY GENERAL




STEPHEN A. BAKER
Assistant Attorney General
Florida Bar No. 365645
2002 North Lois Avenue
Westwood Center, Suite 700
Tampa, Florida 33607-2366
(813) 272-2670

OF COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the
foregoing has been furnished by U.S. mail to Megan Olson,
Assistant Public Defender, Public Defender's Office, Polk County
Courthouse, P.O. Box 9000--Drawer PD, Bartow, Florida 33830,
this 20th day of June, 1990.



OF COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

LUCIOUS WILLIAMS,

Petitioner,

v.

CASE NO. 76,016

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Respondent.

APPENDIX

Dennis Williams, Et Al, v. State, Case No. 75,919
Merits Brief of Respondent on Certified Question

Dell

**IN THE SUPREME COURT
STATE OF FLORIDA**

DENNIS WILLIAMS, et al.,

Petitioner,

vs.

Case No. 75,919

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Respondent.

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

**MERITS BRIEF OF RESPONDENT ON
CERTIFIED QUESTION**

**ROBERT A. BUTTERWORTH
ATTORNEY GENERAL**

**WENDY BUFFINGTON
DELL H. EDWARDS
WILLIAM I. MUNSEY, JR.
MICHELE TAYLOR
Assistant Attorneys General
Florida Bar # 0152141
1313 Tampa Street, Suite 804
Park Trammell Building
Tampa, Florida 33602
(813) 272-2670**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CITATIONS	ii
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
CERTIFIED QUESTION	2
<p>HAS THE SUPREME COURT IN <u>REB V. STATE</u>, 14 F.L.W. 565, _____ SO.2D _____ (FLA. NOV. 16, 1989), AND <u>LAMBERT V. STATE</u>, 545 SO.2D 838 (FLA. 1989), RECEDED FROM THE HOLDING IN <u>ADAMS V. STATE</u>, 490 SO.2D 53 (FLA. 1986), IN WHICH IT FOUND THAT WHERE A DEPENDANT, 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 SECTION 3.701(D)(14), FLORIDA STATUTES (1984)?</p>	
CONCLUSION	10
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	12

TABLE OF CITATIONS

<u>CASES</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Adams v. State, 490 So.2d 53 (Fla. 1986)	3, 6, 9, 10
Addison v. State, 452 So.2d 955 (Fla. 2d DCA 1984)	5
Franklin v. State, 545 So.2d 851 (Fla. 1989)	6, 7, 10
Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238, 92 S.Ct. 2726 (1972)	4
Irizarry v. State, 15 F.L.W. 1288 (Fla. 3d DCA May 8, 1990)	9
Johnson v. State, 15 F.L.W. 515 (Fla.5th DCA February2,,1990)7, 8	7, 8
Lambert v. State, 545 So.2d 838 (Fla. 1989)	3, 6, 7, 9, 10
Meckel v. State, 556 So.2d 1240 (Fla. 5th DCA 1990)	5
Niehenke v. State, 15 F.L.W. 1017 (Fla. 5th DCA April11,1990)8, 9	8, 9
Ree v. State, _____ So.2d _____, 14 F.L.W. S565 (Fla. No. 71,424; Opinion filed November 16, 1989)(Rehearing filed November 28, 1989 and pending)	3, 9
Sanchez v. State, 541 So.2d 1140 (Fla. 1989)	5
Skeens v. State, 556 So.2d 1113 (Fla. 1990)	5
State v. Amico, 525 So.2d 515 (Fla. 4th DCA 1988)	5
Williams v. Illinois, 399 U.S. 235, 90 S.Ct. 2018 (1971)	4
Williams v. State, 559 So.2d 680 (Fla. 2d DCA 1990)	2
 <u>OTHER AUTHORITIES</u>	
Rule 3.701, Fla.R.Crim.Pr.	5
Rule 3.701(d)(14), Fla.R.Crim.Pr.	5, 7, 9

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The holding in Adams, that multiple violations of probation is a valid reason for upward departure from the sentencing guidelines has not been overruled or receded from by this Court's recent decision in Ree and Lambert.

As a matter of policy, defendants who repeatedly defy the trial court's grant of leniency should be treated more harshly than those who do not, particularly in light of the fact that multiplicity or frequency of violations of supervision is not taken into account by the guidelines.

Probation is a matter of grace. Dennis Williams' probation has been revoked. This multi-bite of the "apple" establishes unusual circumstances for the trial court to make a sentencing determination. At this point, under this Court's holdings, it is now appropriate for the imposition of the unpronounced sentence beyond the guidelines range.

CERTIFIED QUESTION

HAS THE SUPREME COURT IN REE V. STATE, 14 F.L.W. 565, _____ SO.2D _____ (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 SECTION 3.701(D)(14), FLORIDA STATUTES (1984)?

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The certified question before this Court comes from an en banc decision. Williams v. State, 559 So.2d 680 (Fla. 2d DCA 1990) (en banc). Dennis Williams was originally placed on probation for grand theft. Regretfully, in 1986 he violated probation by failing to pay costs; failure to perform community service; and, physical spouse abuse. He was found guilty by the trial court of the violations of probations; and, his probationary term was continued for three years. One year later, Dennis Williams is charged with breaking into his estranged wife's residence and with aggravated battery of Mrs. Williams.

The trial court found Dennis Williams to be in violation of his probation; revoked his probation; and, disregarded the sentencing guidelines because it was Dennis Williams' third violation.¹ The recommended range [including the one-cell increase

¹ It should be noted that of the sixteen cases consolidated in this petition, only some involve the commission of new substantive offenses during the term of probation or community control. However, the common thread which binds these cases under the

for violation of probation] is 12-30 months incarceration. The sentence is 5-years and/or 60 months incarceration.

The Second District has found that the written reasons given are incomplete. The court below has affirmed the trial court determination of the violation of probation; but, reversed and remanded for clarification of "3rd violation". In other words, the revocation is affirmed; but, there is an open question as to the reasons for departure.

The Second District is struck by this Court's holding in Ree v. State, ___ So.2d ___, 14 F.L.W. S565 (Fla. No. 71,424; Opinion filed November 16, 1989)(Rehearing filed November 28, 1989 and pending). Although Ree is not final, its projected holding suggests that when it and Lambert v. State, 545 So.2d 838 (Fla. 1989) are read in tandem, this Court has in fact receded from its holding in Adams v. State, 490 So.2d 53 (Fla. 1986) which holds that where a probationer has repeatedly violated the terms of his probation after having his probation restored, a valid reason exists to establish reasons for an upward departure beyond a one-cell bump.

II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

No area of Florida law has been subject to the litigation the "guidelines" has invited in our states courts. At bar, Ree is not yet final; but, it is the nexus of the certified question.

certified question is that all involve two or more prior violations of supervisory custody.

In Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238, 92 S.Ct. 2726 at 2775 (1972), Justice Marshall, in the invalidation of capital punishment, compared and contrasted punishment in the United States. By the 18th century crimes became less theocratic and more secular. There were fewer capital crimes in the colonies than existed in England; and, Justice Marshall suggests that there was a scarcity of labor in the Colonies. In the Furman case, Justice Brennan points out that there are four interrelated principles which enable a Court to determine whether a punishment complies with federal constitutional requirements: (1) The punishment must not be so severe as to be degrading to the dignity of human beings; (2) the government must not arbitrarily inflict a severe punishment; (3) a severe punishment must be accepted by popular sentiment; and, (4) a punishment is excessive if it is unnecessary and serves not valid legislative purpose. Under this, the most liberal view of punishment, the trial court has certainly not violated Petitioner's federal constitutional rights.

Obviously, each state has wide latitude in fixing the punishment for state crime. See, Williams v. Illinois, 399 U.S. 235, 90 S.Ct. 2018 (1971). Prior to Florida's sentencing guidelines, each state judge was vested with wide discretion in the difficult task of determining the appropriate punishment in the countless variety of situations that appear. However, uniformity is now the goal in sentencing; and, proportionality, in Florida, exists now only for capital cases.

III. CASE AT BAR

It is important to recognize that probation does not constitute a sentence. See, Addison v. State, 452 So.2d 955, 956 (Fla. 2d DCA 1984). The trial court has the discretion as to whether or not to withhold adjudication of guilt. Sanchez v. State, 541 So.2d 1140 (Fla. 1989). Probation is appropriate to impose along with community control. Skeens v. State, 556 So.2d 1113 (Fla. 1990); but, the term of probation must never exceed the maximum sentence provided by law. Meckel v. State, 556 So.2d 1240 (Fla. 5th DCA 1990).

Under Rule 3.701, Fla.R.Crim.Pr., probation is a matter falling with a category of "...a dispositive order upon conviction." So it follow that both downward and upward departures from the recommended guidelines range require valid written reason for justification.

At bar, there has been behavior [aggravated spouse abuse] to trigger a revocation of probation. Procedurally, the trial court has followed the teachings of State v. Amico, 525 So.2d 515 (Fla. 4th DCA 1988) by providing Dennis Williams with a new scoresheet. Under Rule 3.701(d)(14), Fla.R.Crim.Pr., the sentencing guidelines commission indicates that the sentence imposed after revocation of probation may be included with the original cell of the guidelines range or may be increased to the next highest guideline range without requiring a reason for the departure from the guidelines.

However, the guidelines themselves do not limit the sentence to a one-cell bump, nor do they prohibit departures in violation

cases if valid reasons for departure do exist.

For example, multiple violation of supervision as a valid reason for an upward sentencing departure pursuant to this Court's opinion in Adams v. State, supra, remains a valid reason for departure and has not been affected by this Court's recent holding in Lambert, supra. Lambert held that factors relating to violation of probation or community control cannot be used as grounds for departure. In so holding, Lambert addressed two issues:

- (1) When a new offense has been committed which constitutes a probation violation, must there be a conviction for this new offense before it can be used as a reason for departure on sentencing for the original offense? YES. Lambert at 841.
- (2) Even where there is a conviction for the new offense which constitutes a probation violation on the original offense, is it appropriate to use this conviction to depart in sentencing the defendant for the original offense? NO. Lambert at 841.

When the reason for departure after violation of supervision is not based on the commission of a new substantive offense or the nature of this new substantive offense, then the concerns of Lambert, necessity of conviction and double-dipping, are not implicated. Multiple violations of supervision, as approved in Adams, is such a reason.²

However, Lambert was subsequently interpreted by this Court in Franklin v. State, 545 So.2d 851 (Fla. 1989), to proscribe any

² Timing of violations, pursuant to this Court's opinion in Williams v. State, 504 So.2d 392 (Fla. 1987), is another reason to which the same analysis applies and which should remain unaffected by Lambert.

departure sentence upon a defendant being sentenced after violation of supervision other than the one-cell upward bump provided in Rule 3.701(d)(14), Fla.R.Crim.Pr. Since Franklin, Lambert has come to stand for a per se one cell bump rule in sentencing after violation of supervision. As pointed out by Judge Harris in his specially concurring opinion in Johnson v. State, 15 F.L.W. 515 (Fla. 5th DCA February 22, 1990), though Franklin, relying on Lambert, makes it clear that a departure from the guidelines should never be permitted in a violation case, Lambert is not so clear. Judge Harris continues:

In Lambert the certified question and the Court's discussion involved whether the trial court could depart from the guideline range in a community control sentence when the violation constituted a substantive crime for which the defendant had not been convicted. The court held that it would be improper to depart on the basis of criminal conduct where no conviction had occurred because of the provisions of Rule 3.701(d)11, Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure. The court also held that it would be improper to depart on the basis of criminal conduct even after conviction because of the problems of the single scoresheet and the addition of status points under legal restraint. Following the analysis, the Court stated:

Accordingly, we hold that factors related to violations of probation or community control cannot be used as grounds for departure. To the extent that this conflicts with our earlier decision in Pentaude, we recede from our decision there. Lambert, 545 So.2d at 842.

I urge that the logical interpretation of Lambert is that it recedes from Pentaude only to the extent that the trial judge may not depart in a violation case based upon new criminal conduct whether or not there has been

a conviction. There is no indication that the Lambert court ever considered the propriety of authorizing departure for noncriminal conduct violation when such authority is necessary to encourage compliance with probation or community control.

In our case the number of violations (twelve alleged), the timing of the violations (seven months after release from prison) and other factors material or relevant to defendant's character (violation of the provision not to carry a firearm while on probation for an offense involving a firearm, and refusing to participate in drug counseling) would seem appropriate for departure under Pentaude.

Johnson v. State, 15 F.L.W. at 516. See also Judge Sharp's dissent in Niehenke v. State, 15 F.L.W. 1017 (Fla. 5th DCA April 19, 1990):

Despite the language in Franklin and Lambert, (citations omitted), which appears to flatly prohibit a trial judge from using a defendant's violation of probation as a reason to impose a departure sentence (beyond the allowed one cell bump-up), I think the facts of this case are distinguishable. In Lambert, the defendants had violated their probations (respectively) by committing new criminal substantive offenses, and the trial judges imposed departure sentences because the probation violation was substantive and egregious, although the defendant had not then been convicted of the new criminal conduct.

Here we have the problem of the multiple probation violator for whom there is no longer any consequence or remedy for further probation violations. Niehenke had already served all of the time permitted under the sentencing guidelines (including the one-cell bump-up). His multiple probation violations were based on "technical" reasons: supervision, and failure to pay a fine. No later substantive criminal offense are involved here, and thus no possibility of double dipping.

As the trial judge put it at the sentencing hearing:

And that if the Court of Appeals wants to tell me that I can't do this (impose a departure sentence beyond the one cell increase), then I will ask the probation department not bother with coming back with violations of probation for people who have served a maximum they can serve under the guidelines, because we have been told that we can't do anything to them then. They're free spirits at that point, and can do whatever they please. Complete immunity. Because that would be the effect of the ruling otherwise.

Although violation of probation is not an independent offense punishable at law in Florida surely neither the Florida Supreme Court nor the legislature, by adopting the guidelines, intended to abolish it as a practical matter. Yet if multiple probation violators are confined to the one-cell bump-up, that is precisely what has happened. The trial courts will have lost any power to enforce conditions of probation. This is an area drastically in need of clarification.

Niehenke at 1017, 1018.

Finally, see also, Irizarry v. State, 15 F.L.W. 1288 (Fla. 3d DCA May 8, 1990), where the Third District noted that, in theory, Adams is distinguishable from the situation addressed by Lambert and Ree. The court noted that in Adams the reasons for departure involved earlier probation violations unrelated to those under consideration at sentencing. The double counting problem addressed in Lambert and Ree does not appear to exist in Adams. In view of the fact that Rule 3.701(d)(14) textually permits departure, and in view of the facts of the cases just cited, there is a theoretical basis on which Adams may have continuing validity.

CONCLUSION

In summation, pursuant to this Court's opinion in Adams, multiple violations of supervision should continue to be a valid reason for departure of greater than the one cell bump provided for in the Rules of Criminal Procedure. The concerns addressed in Lambert, necessity of conviction and double-dipping, are not implicated when a court departs based on a defendant's multiple prior violations of supervision or when the instant violation is technical and not substantive.

The scoresheet does not allow the inclusion of the number or timing of violations of probation or community control. If Lambert is construed to apply a per se rule of one cell bump, the trial court's discretion in imposing an appropriate sentence will be unduly restricted. The rule announced in Franklin is nowhere to be found in Lambert upon which it relies.

WHEREFORE, based on the above reasons and authorities, the State asks this Court to answer the certified question in the negative.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT A. BUTTERWORTH
ATTORNEY GENERAL

for Michelle Taylor
WENDY BUFFINGTON
Assistant Attorney General
Florida Bar # 0779921
1313 Tampa Street, Suite 804
Park Trammell Building
Tampa, Florida 33602
(813) 272-2670

Dell H. Edwards

DELL H. EDWARDS
Assistant Attorney General
Florida Bar # 745110

William I. Munsey, Jr.

WILLIAM I. MUNSEY, JR.
Assistant Attorney General
Florida Bar # 0152141

Michele Taylor

MICHELE TAYLOR
Assistant Attorney General
Florida Bar # 0616648

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished by U.S. Mail to MEGAN OLSON, ESQ., Assistant Public Defender, P.O. Box 9000 - Drawer PD, Bartow, Florida 33830 this 21st day of June, 1990.

William I. Munsey, Jr.

WILLIAM I. MUNSEY, JR.
OF COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT