## Supreme Court of Florida

ORIGINAL

No. 80,908

STATE OF FLORIDA, Petitioner,

vs.

ICELVIN SMITH, Respondent.

[April 8, 19931

SHAW, J.

We have for review <u>Smith v. State</u>, 608 So. 2d 567 (Fla. 1st DCA 1992), wherein the court certified a question of great public importance. We have jurisdiction. Art. V, § 3(b)(4), Fla. Const. We have since answered the question in <u>State v. Rucker</u>, 18 Fla. L. Weekly S93 (Fla. Feb. 4, 1993). We quash <u>Smith</u> and remand for proceedings consistent with <u>Rucker</u>.

It is so ordered.

BARKETT, C.J., and OVERTON, McDONALD, GRIMES, KOGAN and HARDING, JJ., concur.

NOT FINAL UNTIL TIME EXPIRES TO FILE REHEARING MOTION AND, IF FILED, DETERMINED.

Application for Review of  $th\,e$  Decision of the District Court of Appeal - Certified Great Public Importance

First District - Case No. 91-3620

(Hamilton County)

Robert A. Butterworth, Attorney General; and James W. Rogers, Bureau Chief - Criminal Appeals, and Joe S. Garwood, Assistant Attorney General, Tallahassee, Florida,

for Petitioner

Nancy A. Daniels, Public Defender and P. Douglas Brinkmeyer, Assistant Public Defender, Second Judicial Circuit, Tallahassee, Florida,

for Respondent