DIS SID J. WHITE 9 1991 MAY CLERK, SUPREME COURT By-**Chief Deputy Clerk**

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. ______

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Petitioner.

vs.

FRANCISCO HERNANDEZ,

Respondent.

BRIEF OF PETITIONER ON JURISDICTION

ROBERT A. BUTTERWORTH Attorney General Tallahassee, Florida

JOAN FOWLER Senior Assistant Attorney General Chief, Criminal Law, West Palm Beach Bureau Florida Bar No. 339067

Co-Counsel for Petitioner

SARAH B. MAYER Assistant Attorney General Florida Bar No. 367893 111 Georgia Avenue, Suite 204 West Palm Beach, Florida 33401 Telephone: (407) 837-5062

Co-Counsel for Petitioner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CITATIONSii
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS2
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT
ARGUMENT

THIS COURT HAS, AND SHOULD ACCEPT, JURISDICTION TO REVIEW THE DECISION OF THE FOURTH DISTRICT IN <u>HERNANDEZ V.</u> <u>STATE</u>.

CONCLUSION.		• • • •	•••	• • •	•••	•••	• • •		••	•••	•••	• •		••	••	•	••	••	• •	•••	• •	.7
CERTIFICATE	OF	SEF	RVIC	3	• • •	•••	• • •	• • •	• •	••		• •	• • •	••	••	•	••	••	•	•••	••	. 8
APPENDIX			• • •	• • •		•••	•••		••	• • •		• •		••	••	•	••	••	• •		••	.9

PAGE

TABLE OF CITATIONS

Q.

CASES	PAGE
<u>Armstrong v. State</u> , 566 So.2d 1369, (Fla. 1990)	3,4
Bergen v. State, 552 So.2d 262 (Fla. 2nd DCA 1989)	3, 4
<pre>Hernandez v. State, 16 FLW D537 Fla. 4th DCA February 20, 1991)</pre>	1
<u>Jenkins v. State</u> , 385 So.2d 1356 Fla. 1980)	1
Lifka v. State, 530 So.2d 371 (Fla. 1st DCA 1988)	6
Mancini v. State, 312 So.2d 732, 733 (Fla. 1975)	4
Reaves v. State, 485 So.2d 829 Fla. 1986)	1
Roman v.State, 475 So.2d 1228 (Fla. 1985)	3, 4
FLORIDA STATUTES:	
F.S. §800.04(3)	6
FLORIDA RULES:	
Rule 9.030(a)(2)(A)(iv) Rule 9.120(d) and 9.220 <u>Fla.R.App.P.</u>	
OTHER AUTHORITY:	

Article V,	Section 3 of the Florida Constitution3
Article 5,	§3(b)(3) <u>Fla.</u> <u>Const</u> . (1980)4

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The State of Florida, the prosecuting authority and Appellee below in <u>Hernandez v. State</u>, 16 FLW D537 (Fla. 4th DCA February 20, 1991), Motion for Rehearing and/or Motion to Certify Question of Great Public Importance denied April 4, 1991, and the Petitioner here, will be referred to as "the State." Francisco Hernandez, the criminal defendant, Appellant below, and the Respondent here, will be referred to as "Respondent."

Pursuant to Rule 9.120(d) and 9.220 <u>Fla.R.App.P.</u> conformed copies of the decision under review and the post-decisional paperwork in the Fourth District Court of Appeal are appended to this brief to demonstrate timeliness. References to the opinion will be by "PA." No references to the record on appeal will be either necessary or appropriate. See: <u>Jenkins v. State</u>, 385 So.2d 1356 (Fla. 1980) and <u>Reaves v. State</u>, 485 So.2d 829 (Fla. 1986).

Any emphasis will be supplied by the State unless otherwise indicated.

- 1 -

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

The Fourth District Court of Appeal stated the facts as follows:

The victims, two girls, ten and eleven-years-old, were playing in a public library garden. Both girls testified that the Appellant, a gardener, exposed his penis and masturbated in front of them. They additionally testified that Hernandez lifted up one of the girls shirts and fondled her breasts. The state charged Hernandez with one count of lewd assault by fondling a child's breasts and two counts of lewd act by exposing himself and masturbating in front of the two girls. At trial, the trial court allowed two police officers and one teacher to testify as to the victim's truthfulness. Additionally, the trial court admitted testimony that another child observed Hernandez attempt fondle one of the victim's breasts the prior to Spring. Hernandez testified that the allegations were false and that he knew the girls because he frequently chased them out of the garden. (PA2).

- 2 -

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

This Court has discretionary jurisdiction pursuant to Article V, Section 3 of the Florida Constitution and Rule 9.030(a)(2)(A)(iv). The opinion of the Fourth District Court of Appeals conflicts with this Court's decision in <u>Roman v.State</u>, 475 So.2d 1228 (Fla. 1985) and <u>Armstrong v. State</u>, 566 So.2d 1369 (Fla. 1990). In that in those cases it was held that a defendant's failure to object to erroneous jury instructions, or when a defendant takes affirmative acts which result in erroneous jury instructions, he has waived or invited error; here the Fourth District held that notwithstanding Respondent's failure to object to the erroneous instructions, and his refusal of a curative instruction, the incorrect instructions warranted reversal.

The Fourth District's decision in the instant case also conflicts with the decision of the Second District in <u>Bergen v.</u> <u>State</u>, 552 So.2d 262 (Fla. 2nd DCA 1989), wherein the Court held that the defendant was properly convicted of multiple counts of performing a lewd act where he masturbated in front of 5 children, wherein the, the Fourth District held that Respondent could only be convicted of 1 count of lewd act for masturbating in front of two children.

- 3 -

ARGUMENT

POINT

THIS COURT HAS, AND SHOULD ACCEPT, JURISDICTION TO REVIEW THE DECISION OF THE FOURTH DISTRICT IN <u>HERNANDEZ V.</u> STATE.

Petitioner seeks to establish this Court's "conflict" jurisdiction in accordance with Article 5, §3(b)(3) <u>Fla. Const.</u> (1980), by arguing that the decision below conflicts with the decisions announced in <u>Roman v. State</u>, 475 So.2d 1228 (Fla. 1985), <u>Armstrong v. State</u>, 566 So.2d 1369 (Fla. 5th DCA 1990) and <u>Bergen v. State</u>, 552 So.2d 262 (Fla. 2nd DCA 1989).

Under Article V, Section 3(b)(3) of the Florida Constitution this Court may review a decision of a district court of appeal that expressly and directly conflicts with a decision of another district court of appeal or of the supreme court on the day of Thus, question law. (Emphasis added). "conflict" jurisdiction is properly invoked when: 1) the district court announces a rule of law which conflicts with a rule previously announced by the Supreme Court or by another district, or 2) the district court applies a rule of law to produce a different result in a case which involves substantially the same facts as another case. Mancini v. State, 312 So.2d 732, 733 (Fla. 1975).

Conflict jurisdiction exists in the instant case because the Fourth District Court's opinion below applies a rule of law which conflicts with a rule previously announced by this Court in <u>Romas</u> $\underline{v. State}$, and because the Fourth District's opinion below applies a rule of law to produce a different result on substantially the same facts as in Armstrong v. State, and Bergen v. State.

- 4 -

In Roman the Court held that the defendant's failure to object to the jury instructions given by the trial court waived any error on appeal, likewise below, there was no objection to the trial court's jury instructions; indeed, in this case the prosecutor called the trial court's attention to the erroneous Appellant's trial counsel iurv instructions and expressly rejected the trial court's offer to correct the instructions. This is precisely the circumstances in Armstrong, supra, where the Fifth District held that where defense counsel takes affirmative acts which result in an erroneous jury instruction, he has waived or invited error and cannot be heard to complain on appeal, notwithstanding the error being fundamental. Id. at 2372. Since the Fourth District's opinion in this case conflicts with Roman, supra and Armstrong, ¹supra by differently applying a rule of law previously announced by this Count and by applying a rule of law to produce a different result on substantially the same facts, this Court has discretionary jurisdiction to hear this case.

Conflict jurisdiction also exists in the instant case because the Fourth District's opinion applies a rule of law which conflicts with a rule previously announced by the Second District in <u>Bergen v. State</u>, <u>supra</u>. In <u>Bergen</u>, the Court affirmed the Defendant's multiple convictions for lewd act which arose from his having masturbated in front of five children, citing Judge

In <u>Armstrong</u>, the Fifth District certified the following as a question of great public importance: "Does trial counsel for a defendant waive for his client future objection to an erroneous jury instruction where he specifically requests the Court not reinstruct the jury correctly?"

Booth's partially concurring and partially dissenting opinion in Lifka v. State, 530 So.2d 371 (Fla. 1st DCA 1988), that "Section 800.04, Florida Statutes, was specifically designed to protect children under the age of sixteen". <u>Bergen</u> at 263. In the instant case, the Fourth District held that under nearly identical facts, the Respondent masturbated in front of two children, the Respondent could not be convicted by more than one count of lewd act. Clearly, as these two opinions conflict, this Court has discretionary jurisdiction to hear this case.

Further, this issue is a recurring legal problem, and this Honorable Court needs to resolve the issue so that appellate and trial courts will have a well-defined and workable rule of law to guide them. Petitioner therefore respectfully requests this Honorable Court accept jurisdiction in this case.

- 6 -

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, Petitioner, the State of Florida, respectfully submits that this Honorable Court should **GRANT** its petition for writ of certiorari review and then, following briefing on the merits, **REVERSE** the Fourth District's decision in <u>Hernandez v.</u> <u>State</u> and **REMAND** this case with directions that the judgment and sentence entered by the trial judge be **AFFIRMED**.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT A. BUTTERWORTH Attorney General Tallahassee, Florida

1) ne

JOAN FOWLER Senior Assistant Attorney General Chief, Criminal Law Florida Bar No. 339067 West Palm Beach, Florida 33401

Co-Counsel for Petitioner

SARAH B. MAYER Assistant Attorney General Florida Bar No. 367893 111 Georgia Avenue, Suite 204 West Palm Beach, Florida 33401 (407) 837-5062

Co-Counsel for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing "Brief of Petitioner on Jurisdiction" has been forwarded by United States Mail to: DOUGLAS N. DUNCAN, ESQUIRE, P.O. Box 3466, West Palm Beach, Florida 33402, this <u>6th</u> day of May, 1991.

Counsel Town

/pas