IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Appellant,

CLIPPIC, RUPPLEME COURT By \_\_\_\_\_\_

FILED

210 J. WHITE MAY 13 1996

v.

3

1

CASE NO. 87,331

STEVEN GUTHRIE

Appellee.

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW OF DECISION OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA SECOND DISTRICT

# BRIEF OF APPELLANT ON JURISDICTION

EARL MORELAND STATE ATTORNEY

, PETER J. LOMBARD0 ASSISTANT STATE ATTORNEY Fourth Floor 2071 Ringling Blvd. Sarasota, FL 34237-7000 (941)953-7158 Florida Bar #0740829

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANT

# TOPICAL INDEX TO BRIEF

	PAGE	<u>NO</u> .
STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS		2
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT		1
ARGUMENT		4
ISSUE		3
SHOULD THIS COURT ACCEPT OF THE PRESENT APPEAL?	JURISDICTION	
CONCLUSION		5
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE		б

CASES

3

Sapp v. State,

660 so. 2d 1146 (Fla. 1st DCA 1995)

McNeil V. Wisconsin,

501 U.S. 171, 11 S.Ct. 2204, 115 L. Ed. 2d. 158(1991)

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Fla. R. App. P. 9.030(a)(2)(IV)

## SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

Based upon the issue in this case being one of great public importance and there being a conflict with the 1st DCA the Florida Supreme Court should invoke their discretionary jurisdiction.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

In the Circuit Court for Sarasota County, the State filed an information on November 17, 1994 charging Respondent, STEVEN GUTHRIE, with multiple counts of sexual activity with a child by a person in familial authority. [R11-16] Respondent filed a motion to suppress his statements to law enforcement. [R17-19] Respondent argued in the motion that he had, by signing a notification of rights form, invoked his constitution rights to remain silent and to have counsel during questioning. [R17-19, 21-23,24] Following a hearing, the trial court granted the motion. [R25,77] The state filed a timely notice of appeal. [R26] An order to stay the proceedings was issued. [R32]

On December 29, 1995, the Second District Court of Appeal affirmed the lower court ruling on Respondent's motion to suppress. The Second District certified conflict with <u>Sapp v.</u> <u>State</u>, 660 so. 2d 1146 (Fla. 1st DCA 1995). The state filed a timely notice to invoke discretionary jurisdiction on January 29, 1996.

2

٠

Should this court accept jurisdiction of the present appeal?

#### ARGUMENT

Appellant seeks the Florida Supreme Court to invoke their discretionary jurisdiction pursuant to Fla.R. Crim.P. 9.030 (a) (2) (IV).

In <u>Sapp v. State</u>, 660 20.2d. 1146 (Fla. 1st DCA 1995), <u>Sapp</u> was arrested on an unrelated charge and put in jail where he signed an "invocation of rights form" which attempted to invoke his right to counsel and right to remain silent pursuant to Amendments 5 and 6 of the U.S. Constitution. A week later <u>Sapp</u> was interrogated and gave a post-Miranda confession to other unrelated crimes.

The Court in <u>Sapp</u> cited to <u>McNeil v. Wisconsin</u>, 501 U.S. 171, 111 S.Ct. 2204, 115 L.Ed.2d. 158 (1991), said that the Fifth Amendment right to counsel explicated in <u>Miranda</u> cannot be invoked outside the context of custodial interrogation. <u>Sapp</u> at 1151.

The <u>Sapp</u> court then certified the following question to the Florida Supreme Court as a question of great public importance: "Whether an accused in custody effectively invokes his Fifth Amendment right to counsel under <u>Miranda</u> when, even though interrogation is not imminent, he signs a claim of rights form at or shortly before a first appearance hearing specifically claiming a Fifth Amendment right to counsel." Sapp at 1151.

4

In our case, <u>State v. Guthrie</u>, the Second District Court of Appeal was presented with the same "Invocation of Rights form" issued and held that the invocation of the constitutional right to counsel at first appearance on separate, unrelated charges bars uncounseled interrogation during continuous custody unless initiated by the defendant.

۰

The <u>Guthrie</u> Court said that their opinion to a certain extent conflicts with <u>Sapp</u> and certified conflict to the Florida Supreme Court.

#### CONCLUSION

Based upon that conflict and the issue being one of great public importance, the Florida Supreme Court should invoke their discretionary jurisdiction pursuant to Fla. R. Crim. P. 9.030(a)(2)(IV)

EARL MORELAND STATE ATTORNEY TWELFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

BY: FERER J LOMBARDO

Assistant State Attorney Suite 400 2071 Ringling Boulevard Sarasota, FL 34237-7000 941-953-7158 Florida Bar 0740829

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing has been furnished by mail to Florida Supreme Court, 500 S. Duval St., Tallahassee, FL 32399; Second District Court of Appeal, William Haddad, Postal Drawer 327, Lakeland Fl; and Kevin Briggs, Assistant Public Defender, P.O. Box 9000, Bartow, FL this \_\_\_\_\_\_ day of April, 1996.

PFTCR J. COMBARDO Assistant State Attorney