FILED SID J. WHITE JAN 21 1992 CLERK, SUPREME COURT. By\_\_\_\_\_Chief Deputy Clerk

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 79,197

4th DCA Case No. 91-1404

MERLENE WALKER,

Petitioner,

vs.

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Respondent.

## ON PETITION FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW

### BRIEF OF RESPONDENT ON JURISDICTION

**ROBERT A. BUTTERWORTH** Attorney General Tallahassee, Florida

### CAROL COBOURN ASBURY

Assistant Attorney General Florida Bar No. 393665 111 Georgia Avenue, Suite 204 West Palm Beach, Florida 33401 Telephone: (407) 837-5062

Counsel for Respondent

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

## ISSUE

THIS COURT SHOULD NOT EXERCISE ITS DISCRETIONARY JURISDICTION TO REVIEW THE DECISION OF THE FOURTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL BELOW WHICH HAS CITED AS CONTROLLING AUTHORITY SUBSEQUENT CASE WHICH CERTIFIES THE IDENTICAL ISSUE TO THIS COURT AS A QUESTION OF GREAT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE.

CONCLUSION	······	5
CERTIFICATE OF	SERVICE	5

## TABLE OF CITATIONS

# CASES

# PAGES

<u>Jollie v. State</u> , 405 So.2d 418 (Fla. 1981)	. 3
<u>State v. Brown</u> , 475 So.2d 1 Fla. 1985)	, 4
<pre>State v. Scates, 16 F.L.W. 2203 (Fla. 4th DCA August 21, 1991)</pre>	. 3

## PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Petitioner was the defendant in the Criminal Division of the Circuit Court of the Seventeeth Judicial Circuit, in and for Broward County, Florida and the appellee in the Forth District Court of Appeal. Respondent was the prosecution and the appellant below.

In the brief, the parties will be referred to as they appear before this Honorable Court.

The following symbol will be used:

R = Record on Appeal

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

The Respondent accepts the Petitioner's statement of the facts and case for the limited purpose of this jurisdictional brief.

## SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

Under the rule set out in <u>Jollie v. State</u>, 405 So.2d 418 (Fla. 1981) this Court has jurisdiction to review a per curiam opinion if it cites as controlling authority a case that is currently pending review by this Court.

The decision in the present case cites as authority another decision of the Fourth District Court of Appeal, <u>State v. Scates</u>, 16 F.L.W. 2203 (Fla. 4th DCA August 21, 1991), Supreme Court Case No. 78,533. Jurisdiction on that case has not been accepted by this Court, therefore, <u>Jollie</u> is inapplicable. Consequently, <u>Jollie</u> does not provide the authority for which this Court may accept review.

#### ARGUMENT

#### ISSUE

THIS COURT SHOULD NOT EXERCISE ITS DISCRETIONARY JURISDICTION TO REVIEW THE DECISION OF THE FOURTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL BELOW WHICH HAS CITED AS CONTROLLING AUTHORITY SUBSEQUENT CASE WHICH CERTIFIES THE IDENTICAL ISSUE TO THIS COURT AS A QUESTION OF GREAT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE.

In the instant case the Fourth District Court off Appeals declined to certify the question of law which it certified in <u>Scates v. State</u>, Case No. 78, 533. Since the Petitioner was unable to get the Fourth District Court of Appeals to certify the question, the Petitioner now seeks to invoke this Court's jurisdiction <u>based</u> on this Court's ruling in <u>Jollie v. State</u>, 405 So.2d 418 (Fla. 1981) and the <u>State v. Brown</u>, 475 So.2d 1 (Fla. 1985). In <u>Jollie</u> and <u>Brown</u> this Court ruled that jurisdiction for review could be accepted in cases which present the same question of law and are substantially the same factually as cases presently pending review in the Supreme Court even though the opinion involves a per curiam affirmance citing to an authority without further comment.

Jurisdiction was accepted in <u>Jollie</u> and <u>Brown</u> because this Court had already accepted jurisdiction in the case cited in the per curiam affirmance. However, in the instant case, this Court has not accepted jurisdiction in <u>Scates v. State</u>. Therefore, this case stands in opposition to <u>Jollie</u> and <u>Brown</u>. Since the Fourth District Court of Appeals has not certified a question of great public importance and this Court has not accepted

- 4 -

jurisdiction in <u>Scates v. State</u>, there is no basis for jurisdiction. Hence this Court lacks the constitutional authority to accept jurisdiction.

## CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, Respondent, the State of Florida, respectfully submits that this Honorable Court must summarily DENY the petition for review.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT A. BUTTERWORTH Attorney General Tallahassee, Florida CAROL COBOURN ASBURY

Assistant Attorney General Florida Bar No. 393665 111 Georgia Avenue, Suite 204 West Palm Beach, Florida 33401 (407) 837-5062

Counsel for Respondent

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing "Brief of Respondent on Jurisdiction" has been forwarded by United States Mail to: JAMES O. WALKER, ESQUIRE, Clay Building, Suite 102, 1202 East Atlantic Boulevard, Pompano Beach, Florida 33060, this <u>16th</u> day of January, 1992.

um Of Counsel

/pas