# Supreme Court of Florida

\_\_\_\_\_

No. SC94042

\_\_\_\_\_

## MARIO D. ALMANZA,

Petitioner,

VS.

#### STATE OF FLORIDA,

Respondent.

[March 23, 2000]

#### PER CURIAM.

We have for review <u>Almanza v. State</u>, 716 So. 2d 351 (Fla. 3d DCA 1998), in which the Third District Court of Appeal affirmed Mario D. Almanza's violent career criminal sentence based on its prior decision in <u>Higgs v. State</u>, 695 So. 2d 872 (Fla. 3d DCA 1997). In so affirming, the <u>Almanza court certified conflict</u> with the Second District Court of Appeal's decision in <u>Thompson v. State</u>, 708 So. 2d 315 (Fla. 2d DCA 1998). We have jurisdiction. <u>See</u> Art. V, § 3(b)(4), Fla. Const. Based on our decision in <u>State v. Thompson</u>, 25 Fla. L. Weekly S1 (Fla.

Dec. 22, 1999), we quash the decision below and remand for resentencing in accordance with the valid laws in effect on July 21, 1996, the date on which Almanza committed the underlying offense in this case.<sup>1</sup> See Thompson, 25 Fla. L. Weekly at S3 (remanding for resentencing in accordance with the valid laws in effect at the time the defendant committed her offenses).

It is so ordered.

HARDING, C.J., and SHAW, ANSTEAD, PARIENTE, LEWIS and QUINCE, JJ., concur.

WELLS, J., dissents.

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

Application for Review of the Decision of the District Court of Appeal - Certified Direct Conflict of Decisions

Third District - Case No. 3D97-1834

( Dade County)

Bennet H. Brummer, Public Defender, and John E. Morrison, Assistant Public Defender, Eleventh Judicial Circuit, Miami, Florida,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> We note that Almanza has standing to raise a single subject rule challenge to chapter 95-182, Laws of Florida, even assuming the window period for raising such a challenge closed on October 1, 1996, as determined by the Fourth District Court of Appeal in Salters v. State, 731 So. 2d 826, 826 (Fla. 4th DCA), review granted, No. 95,663 (Fla. Dec. 3, 1999). Further, even though Almanza failed to raise a single subject rule challenge in the trial court, we find that such challenge may be properly addressed in this case for the first time on appeal. Cf. Heggs v. State, 25 Fla. L. Weekly S137, S138, S140 n.4 (Fla. Feb. 17, 2000); Nelson v. State, 24 Fla. L. Weekly S250, S251 (Fla. May 27, 1999), cert. denied, 120 S. Ct. 950 (2000); State v. Johnson, 616 So. 2d 1, 3-4 (Fla. 1993).

### for Petitioner

Robert A. Butterworth, Attorney General, and Fredericka Sands, Assistant Attorney General, Fort Lauderdale, Florida,

for Respondent