

0d7

**FILED**

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

SID J. WHITE

SEP 21 1998

CASE NO. 93,719

CLERK, SUPREME COURT

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Chief Deputy Clerk

**BOOKER T. ELLIARD,**

Petitioner,

-vs-

**THE STATE OF FLORIDA,**

Respondent.

---

**ON PETITION FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW**

---

---

**BRIEF OF RESPONDENT ON THE MERITS**

---

ROBERT A. BUTTERWORTH  
Attorney General  
Tallahassee, Florida

✓ CHRISTINE E. ZHRALBAN  
Assistant Attorney General  
Florida Bar Number 0122807  
Office of the Attorney General  
Department of Legal Affairs  
444 Brickell Avenue, Suite 950  
Miami, Florida 33131  
Telephone: (305) 377-5441  
Facsimile: (305) 377-5655

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF CITATIONS . . . . . ii

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT . . . . . 1

CERTIFICATE OF FONT AND TYPE SIZE . . . . . 2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS . . . . . 3

POINT INVOLVED ON APPEAL . . . . . 4

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT . . . . . 5

ARGUMENT

    THE LOWER COURTS CORRECTLY RULED THAT CHAPTER  
    95-182 LAWS OF FLORIDA DID NOT VIOLATE THE  
    SINGLE REQUIREMENT OF FLORIDA'S CONSTITUTION.  
    . . . . . 6

CONCLUSION . . . . . 8

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE . . . . . 9

TABLE OF CITATIONS

CASES	PAGE
<u>Higgs v. State,</u> 695 So. 2d 872 (Fla. 3d DCA 1997) . . . . .	6
<u>Thompson v. State,</u> 708 So. 2d 315 (Fla. 2d DCA 1998) . . . . .	6,7
<b>OTHER AUTHORITIES</b>	
§775.084(4)(c), Fla. Stat. (1995) . . . . .	6
Chapter 95-182, Laws of Florida . . . . .	6,8

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The Petitioner, BOOKER T. ELLIARD, was the Defendant in the trial court and the Appellant in the Third District Court of Appeal (hereafter, ~~Third District~~). The State of Florida was the prosecution in the trial court and the Appellee in the Third District. In this brief, the parties will be referred to as they stood in the trial court. The symbols "R." and "T." will refer to the record on appeal and the transcripts of the proceedings, respectively. The symbols ~~S.R.~~ and ~~S.T.~~ designate the supplemental record, consisting respectively, of the trial court's order correcting Defendant's sentence and the transcript of the sentencing proceedings.

CERTIFICATE OF FONT AND TYPE SIZE

The undersigned has utilized 12 point courier in preparing this brief.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

The State accepts the Defendant's statement of the case and facts as a substantially correct and non-argumentative recitation of the relevant facts and procedural history of this case.

POINT INVOLVED ON APPEAL

WHETHER THE LOWER COURT ERRED IN RULING THAT  
CHAPTER 95-182 LAWS OF FLORIDA DID NOT VIOLATE  
THE SINGLE REQUIREMENT OF FLORIDA'S  
CONSTITUTION.

### SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

There is a natural and logical connection among sections of the Gort Act. The first part concerns sentencing for aggravated stalking and other forms of violent conduct. The second provides a remedy for the victims of this conduct when the conduct occurs in a relationship. These provisions have a cogent relationship to each other. Thus, the Gort Act does not violate the single subject provision of Florida's Constitution. Therefore, this Court should affirm the decision below.

As the issue in the instant case is the precise issue presently pending before this Court in State v. Thompson, Case No. 92,831, and since the Defendant has fully adopted the defense brief filed in this Court in Thompson for his initial brief, the State will therefore fully adopt the State's brief filed in this Court in Thompson for the State's answer brief in this case.



## ARGUMENT

THE LOWER COURT CORRECTLY RULED THAT CHAPTER  
95-182 LAWS OF FLORIDA DID NOT VIOLATE THE  
SINGLE REQUIREMENT OF FLORIDA'S CONSTITUTION.

In the instant case, the trial court sentenced the Defendant as a violent career criminal to fifteen years with a ten year minimum-mandatory sentence pursuant to the §775.084(4)(c), Fla. Stat. (1995), the "Gort Act." (R. 28-29). Now, the Defendant is arguing, as he argued in the Third District, that his violent career criminal sentence should be vacated because §775.084(4)(c), Fla. Stat. (1995) is unconstitutional on the ground that the session law that enacted it, Chapter 95-182, Laws of Florida, violated the single subject provision of the Florida Constitution. This Court should reject this claim and affirm the lower court's ruling.

As noted by the Defendant, the Third District has previously held that chapter 95-182 did not violate the single subject requirement of the Florida Constitution. Higgs v. State, 695 So. 2d 872 (Fla. 3d DCA 1997). On the other hand, the Second District has held to the contrary. Thompson v. State, 708 So. 2d 315 (Fla. 2d DCA 1998). Hence, although the Third District affirmed in the instant case on the authority of Higgs, in light of Thompson, the Third District also certified conflict with Thompson.

The issue in the instant case is the exact issue currently pending before this Court in State v. Thompson, No. 92,831. Since


the Defendant has adopted the defense brief in State v. Thompson, and in the interests of judicial economy, the State will therefore adopt the State's brief in State v. Thompson for the answer brief in this case.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, the State submits that Third District properly held that Chapter 95-182 did not violate the single subject provision of the Florida Constitution. This Court should therefore affirm.


Respectfully Submitted,

ROBERT A. BUTTERWORTH  
Attorney General  
Tallahassee, Florida

  
CHRISTINE E. ZAHRALBAN  
Assistant Attorney General  
Florida Bar Number 0122807  
Office of the Attorney General  
Department of Legal Affairs  
444 Brickell Ave., Suite 950  
Miami, Florida 33131  
(305) 377-5441  
fax 377-5655

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Brief of Respondent was mailed this 18<sup>th</sup> day of September, 1998, to Louis Campbell, Esq., Assistant Public Defender, 1320 N.W. 14th Street, Miami, Florida, 33125.

  
CHRISTINE E. ZAHRALBAN  
Assistant Attorney General