

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

CLERK, SUPREME COURT

Chief Deputy Clerk

92/

By_

94

CASE NO.

5DCA NO.

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Petitioner,

v.

ROY PHANEUF,

Respondent.

ON DISCRETIONARY REVIEW OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL, FIFTH DISTRICT

JURISDICTIONAL BRIEF OF PETITIONER

ROBERT A. BUTTERWORTH ATTORNEY GENERAL

BONNIE JEAN PARRISH ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL Fla. Bar #768870 444 Seabreeze Boulevard 5th Floor Daytona Beach, FL 32118 (904) 238-4990

COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES | • • | • • • | • | • • | • | • - | | • • | • | • | • | - | • | • | ii |
|-----------------------|-----|-------|---|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE | AND | FACTS | • | | • | ••• | • • | • | ٠ | • | • | ٠ | • | ٠ | . 1 |
| SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT . | ••• | | - | | • | ••• | • • | ••• | • | • | • | • | • | • | . 2 |
| ARGUMENT | | | • | | • | | | ••• | • | • | ٠ | • | • | • | . 3 |

POINT ON APPEAL

| | \mathbf{TH} | Ë | DE | CIS | SIO | NS | 1 | REI | LI) | ED | τ | JPC |)N | B | Y | T | ΙE | D | IS | TF | SIC C | \mathbf{T} | | | | | |
|------------|---------------|-----|----|------|-----|----|---|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|-------|--------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | IN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | 5 R1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | FAC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | |
| | SH | OUI | ЪD | EXI | ERC | IS | E | II | :s | JU | JRI | SI | DIC | TI | ÓN | Γ. | ٠ | • | ٠ | - | ٠ | • | ٠ | • | • | • | 3 |
| CONCLUSION | 1 | | | • • | • | • | • | • | ٠ | ٠ | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | | • | | • | • | • | • | • | • | 4 |
| CERTIFICAT | re (| OF | SE | ERV: | ICE | 2 | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | ٠ | • | • | • | • | 4 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES:

| <u>Jollie v. State,</u> 405 So. 2d 418 (Fla. 1981) | | | 3 |
|---|-----|-----|---|
| <u>Santoro v. State</u> , 644 So. 2d 585 (Fla. 5th DCA 1994) | 1, | 2, | 3 |
| Booth v. State, 20 Fla. L. Weekly D858 (Fla. 5th DCA April 7, 1995) | ••• | • · | 1 |
| <u>Thompson v. State</u> , 638 So. 2d 116 (Fla. 5th DCA 1994) | 1, | 2, | 3 |

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

Respondent was sentenced as a habitual offender after pleading guilty to resisting an officer with violence. Respondent signed a plea form which set forth that a hearing may be held to determine if respondent was a habitual felony offender, what the maximum sentence respondent was facing as a habitual offender and that he would not be eligible for gain time if found to be a habitual offender. The Fifth District Court of Appeal vacated the habitual offender sentence and remanded the case for resentencing. In doing so the court relied on <u>Santoro v. State</u>, 644 So. 2d 585 (Fla. 5th DCA 1994), and <u>Thompson v. State</u>, 638 So. 2d 116 (Fla. 5th DCA 1994). <u>Phaneuf v. State</u>, no. 94-1580, slip op. (Fla. 5th DCA June 9, 1995). The state timely filed a notice to invoke discretionary jurisdiction of this court.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

This court has accepted jurisdiction in <u>Santoro</u>, <u>supra</u>, and <u>Thompson</u>, <u>supra</u>, as well as several other cases, which are currently pending review by this court. The Fifth District relied on those cases in reaching its decision. This court should accept jurisdiction in this case.

ARGUMENT

POINT ON APPEAL

THE DECISIONS RELIED UPON BY THE DISTRICT COURT IN VACATING THE SENTENCE IMPOSED ARE PENDING REVIEW BEFORE THIS COURT; THERE IS PRIMA FACIE EXPRESS CONFLICT AND THIS COURT SHOULD EXERCISE ITS JURISDICTION.

A district court decision that is either pending review in or has been reversed by this court constitutes prima facie express conflict and allows this court to exercise its jurisdiction. Jollie v. State, 405 So. 2d 418, 420 (Fla. 1981). In vacating the habitual offender sentence imposed in this case, the Fifth District relied upon <u>Santoro</u>, <u>supra</u>, and <u>Thompson</u>, <u>supra</u>. Both cases are currently pending review in this court. <u>See</u> case nos. 84,758 and 83,951 respectively. This court should exercise its jurisdiction in this case. <u>Jollie</u>, <u>supra</u>.

CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments and authorities presented herein, petitioner requests this court exercise its jurisdiction in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT A. BUTTERWORTH ATTORNEY GENERAL

JEAN 'PARI

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL Fla. Bar #768870 444 Seabreeze Boulevard 5th Floor Daytona Beach, FL 32118

COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing Jurisdictional Brief of Petitioner has been furnished by delivery to Nancy Ryan, Assistant Public Defender, 112-A Orange Avenue, Daytona Beach, Florida 32114, this 1474 day of June, 1995.

Jean Pa Bonnie

Of Counsel

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

FIFTH DISTRICT

JANUARY TERM 1995

94-1456

NOT FINAL UNTIL THE TIME EXPIRES TO FILE REHEARING MOTION, AND, IF FILED, DISPOSED OF.

ROY PHANEUF,

S

v.

Appellant,

OF FLORIDA,

Appellee.

CASE NO. 94-1580

Opihion filed June 9, 1995 Appeal from the Circuit Court for Volusia County, John W. Watson, III, Judge.

James B. Gibson, Public Defender, and Brynn Newton, Assistant Public Defender, Daytona Beach, for Appellant.

Robert A. Butterworth, Attorney General, Tallahassee, and Ann M. Childs, Assistant Attorney General, Daytona Beach, for Appellee.

PER CURIAM.

We vacate the sentence imposed upon Roy Phaneuf and remand for resentencing. <u>Thompson v. State</u>, 638 So. 2d 116 (Fla. 5th DCA), <u>rev. granted</u>, <u>State v. Blackwell</u>, 649 So. 2d 234 (Fla. 1994) (Table).

If probation is imposed as a portion of the sentence, monetary conditions may not be converted to community service hours. <u>See Price v. State</u>, 620 So. 2d 1105 (Fla. 4th DCA 1993) (trial court erred in ordering defendant to perform community service in lieu of payment of costs; section 27.3455 authorizing community service in lieu of payment of costs was amended in 1986 to eliminate this alternative); <u>Parks v. State</u>, 595 So. 2d 1056 (Fla. 4th DCA 1992) (same); <u>Bush v. State</u>, 579 So. 2d 362 (Fla. 4th DCA 1991) (same); <u>Sims v. State</u>, 520 So. 2d 675 (Fla. 5th DCA 1988) (same); <u>State v. Hansley</u>, 514 So. 2d 1135 (Fla. 5th DCA 1987) (same); <u>Rowe v. State</u>, 558 So. 2d 174 (Fla. 5th DCA 1990) (state concedes court without authority to impose community service in lieu of costs under section 27.3455); <u>State v. Muoio</u>, 438 So. 2d 160 (Fla. 2d DCA 1983) (trial judge may not impose community service in lieu of mandatory fine imposed by section 316.193; all statutory references to community service work indicate such service be considered as extra sanction or additional condition of probation).

REVERSED AND REMANDED.

000000

1. Sec. 38

HARRIS, C.J., PETERSON and GRIFFIN, JJ., concur.