

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 79,162

RAFAEL JOSE PUERTAS,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE STATE OF FLORIDA,

Respondent,

ON APPLICATION FOR DISCRETIONARY JURISDICTION

BRIEF OF RESPONDENT ON JURISDICTION

ROBERT A. BUTTERWORTH Attorney General Tallahassee, Florida

JOAN L. GREENBERG Florida Bar #0510599 Assistant Attorney General Department of Legal Affairs 401 N.W. 2nd Avenue P.O. Box 013241 Miami, Florida 33101 (305) 377-5441

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION1
QUESTION PRESENTED2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS3
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT4
ARGUMENT5
THE DECISION OF THE THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL IS IN CONFLICT WITH A DECISION OF ANOTHER COURT OF APPEAL, ALLOWING THIS COURT TO EXERCISE ITS JURISDICTION5
CONCLUSION6
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE6

TABLE OF CITATIONS

PAG	E
Jollie v. State, 405 So.2d 418 (Fla. 1981)5	
Kopko v. State, 577 So.2d 956 (Fla. 5th DCA 1991)5	
State v. Lofton, 534 So.2d 1148 (Fla. 1988)5	
State v. Pardo, 582 So.2d 1225 (Fla. 3d DCA 1991)	
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
Art. V, §3 (b)(3), Fla. Const	
Fla.R.App.P. 9.030 (a)(2)(A)(iv) 5	

INTRODUCTION

This is an application for discretionary review of a decision of the District Court of Appeal of Florida, Third District. The symbol "A" designates the appendix to the brief.

QUESTION PRESENTED

WHETHER THE DECISION OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL IS IN DIRECT AND EXPRESS CONFLICT WITH A DECISION OF ANOTHER DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OR OF THIS COURT.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

The defendant was convicted after a jury trial of sexual battery on a person under twelve years of age. The Third District Court of Appeal affirmed his conviction and sentence in a per curiam decision without written opinion on December 24, 1991. (A. 1). As authority for its decision, the district court cited State v. Pardo, 582 So.2d 1225 (Fla. 3d DCA 1991). (A. 2-5). Pardo is pending review in this Court as Case Number 78,318.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

Because in the instant case the case cited as authority for the same principle of law is presently pending review in this Court pursuant to its discretionary conflict jurisdiction, this Court has jurisdiction to review the instant case.

ARGUMENT

THE DECISION OF THE THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL IS IN CONFLICT WITH A DECISION OF ANOTHER COURT OF APPEAL, ALLOWING THIS COURT TO EXERCISE ITS JURISDICTION.

This Court has discretionary jurisdiction to review decisions of district courts of appeal that expressly and directly conflict with a decision of another district court of appeal on the same question of law. Art. V, § 3 (b)(3), Fla. Const.; Fla.R.App.P. 9.030 (a)(2)(A)(iv). A district court's per curiam decision without opinion citing as controlling authority a decision that is pending in this Court constitutes express conflict. State v. Lofton, 534 So.2d 1148 (Fla. 1988); Jollie v. State, 405 So.2d 418 (Fla. 1981).

The Third District's opinion in the instant case in its entirety reads as follows:

PER CURIAM
Affirmed on the authority of State
v. Pardo, 582 So.2d 1225 (Fla. 3d DCA
1991).

Pardo certified express and direct conflict with Kopko v. State, 577 So.2d 956 (Fla. 5th DCA 1991), and is presently pending review in this Court as Case Number 78,318 on the same issue of law. This being so, the State concedes that this Court has jurisdiction to review the instant case. Art. V, §3 (b)(3), Fla. Const.; Jollie, 405 So.2d 418.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the State concedes jurisdiction in the instant case.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT A. BUTTERWORTH Attorney General

JOAN L. GREENBERG

Florida Bar #0510599

Assistant Attorney General Department of Legal Affairs

401 N. W. 2nd Avenue, Suite N921

P.O. Box 013241

Miami, Florida 33101

(305) 377-5441

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

JOAN L. GREENBERG

Assistant Attorney General

/bfr