IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

FIFTH DISTRICT

FREDDIE ALEXANDER,

Appellant,

v.

CASE NO. 99-724

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Appellee.

_____/

ON APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE EIGHTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR SEMINOLE COUNTY, FLORIDA

ANSWER BRIEF OF APPELLEE

ROBERT A. BUTTERWORTH ATTORNEY GENERAL

KRISTEN L. DAVENPORT ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL Fla. Bar #909130 444 Seabreeze Blvd. Fifth Floor Daytona Beach, FL 32118 (904) 238-4990

COUNSEL FOR APPELLEE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHO	DRITIES .	•••	• •	•••	•••	• •	• •	•	•••	•	•	•	•	i	i
CERTIFICATE OF	FONT AND	TYPE	SIZ	Е.				•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	1
SUMMARY OF ARG	SUMENT	•••	•••					•		•	•	•	•	•	2
ARGUMENT:	THE PRIS DOES NOT	-			-			-							
	POWERS.		• •					•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	3
CONCLUSION .		•••	•••	•••				•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	8
CERTIFICATE OF	SERVICE	•••	•••					•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES:					
Lightbourne v. State, 438 So. 2d 380 (Fla. 1983), <u>cert. denied</u> , 465 U.S. 1051 (1984)	•	•	•		4
<u>McKendry v. State</u> , 641 So. 2d 45 (Fla. 1994)		•	•		3
<u>McKnight v. State</u> , 727 So. 2d 314 (Fla. 3d DCA), <u>rev. granted</u> , case #95,154 (Fla. Aug. 19, 1999)		•		5,6	,7
<u>Scott v. State</u> , 369 So. 2d 330 (Fla. 1979)	•	•	•	•	4
<u>Smith v. State</u> , 537 So. 2d 982 (Fla. 1989)	•	•	•		4
<u>Sowell v. State</u> , 342 So. 2d 969 (Fla. 1977)		•	•		4
<pre>Speed v. State, 732 So. 2d 17 (Fla. 5th DCA), rev. granted, case # 95,706 (Fla. Sept. 16, 1999) .</pre>	•	•	•		5
<u>State v. Cotton</u> , 728 So. 2d 251 (Fla. 2d DCA 1998), <u>rev. granted</u> , 737 So. 2d 551 (Fla. 1999)					6
<u>State v. Wise</u> , 24 Fla. L. Wkly. D657 (Fla. 4th DCA March 10), <u>rev. granted</u> , case # 95,230 (Fla. Aug. 5, 1999) .		•			5
<u>Woods v. State</u> , 24 Fla. L. Wkly. D831 (Fla. 1st DCA March 26), <u>rev. granted</u> , case #95,281 (Fla. Aug. 23, 1999)	•		•		5
<u>Young v. State</u> , 699 So. 2d 624 (Fla. 1997)	•	•	•		4
OTHER:					
Ch. 97-239, Laws of Florida	•	•	•	•••	3
§ 775.082(8), Fla. Stat. (1997)			3,	5,6	,7

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

This Court's finding that the prison release reoffender act is constitutional was correct and does not need to be revisited.

Rather than certifying conflict with other district courts, this Court should hold this appeal in abeyance pending resolution of this constitutional issue by the Florida Supreme Court.

ARGUMENT

THIS COURT'S FINDING THAT THE PRISON RELEASEE REOFFENDER ACT IS CONSTITUTIONAL WAS CORRECT AND DOES NOT NEED TO BE REVISITED.

Alexander contends that the prison releasee reoffender act is unconstitutional, as it violates the separation of powers. As Alexander acknowledges, this Court has recently held to the contrary. <u>Speed v. State</u>, 24 Fla. L. Wkly. D1017 (Fla. 5th DCA April 23, 1999). <u>See also Woods v. State</u>, 24 Fla. L. Wkly. D831 (Fla. 1st DCA March 26, 1999) (finding PRR statute constitutional); <u>McKnight v. State</u>, 727 So. 2d 314 (Fla. 3d DCA 1999) (same).

The State disagrees with Alexander's separation of powers argument. <u>Speed</u> was correctly decided by this Court and there is no reason to reconsider this recent decision.

Alexander also asks this Court to certify conflict with the decisions of other district courts construing the statute so as to give trial courts discretion in sentencing. <u>See State v. Wise</u>, 24 Fla. L. Wkly. D657 (Fla. 4th DCA March 10, 1999); <u>Cotton v. State</u>, 728 So. 2d 251 (Fla. 2d DCA 1998). Alexander seeks certification in order to preserve his right to seek further review of this issue.

Numerous cases involving the constitutionality of this statute have already been decided by the courts of appeal and are on their way to the Florida Supreme Court. There is no question that this

ii

issue will soon be decided by the Supreme Court, and its decision will obviously be binding on this Court.

Accordingly, rather than send even more cases to Tallahassee, the State submits that the interests of judicial economy, as well as fairness to this defendant, can best be served by holding this appeal in abeyance pending resolution of this issue by the Supreme Court.

CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments and authorities presented herein, appellee respectfully requests this honorable Court affirm the judgment and sentence of the trial court in all respects.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT A. BUTTERWORTH ATTORNEY GENERAL

KRISTEN L. DAVENPORT ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL Fla. Bar #909130 444 Seabreeze Boulevard Fifth Floor Daytona Beach, FL 32118 (904) 238-4990

COUNSEL FOR APPELLEE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the above Answer Brief has been furnished to Barbara C. Davis, Assistant Public Defender, by delivery to the Public Defender's Basket at the Fifth District Court of Appeal, this _____ day of June, 1999.

> Kristen L. Davenport Counsel for Appellee