

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

ROOSEVELT RICHARDSON,

Petitioner,

v.

CASE NO. 96,764

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Respondent.

---

ON DISCRETIONARY REVIEW FROM  
THE FIFTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL

RESPONDENT'S BRIEF ON THE MERITS

ROBERT A. BUTTERWORTH  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

KELLIE A. NIELAN  
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL  
FLORIDA BAR #618550

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

COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES . . . . . ii

CERTIFICATE OF FONT AND TYPE SIZE . . . . . 1

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT . . . . . 2

ARGUMENT:

THE PRISON RELEASEE REOFFENDER ACT  
IS CONSTITUTIONAL. . . . . 3

CONCLUSION . . . . . 8

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE . . . . . 9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES:

Lightbourne v. State,  
438 So. 2d 380 (Fla. 1983),  
cert. denied, 465 U.S. 1051 (1984) . . . . . 4

McKendry v. State,  
641 So. 2d 45 (Fla. 1994) . . . . . 3

McKnight v. State,  
727 So. 2d 314 (Fla. 3d DCA),  
rev. granted, case #95,154 (Fla. Aug. 19, 1999) . . . . . 5,6,7

Scott v. State,  
369 So. 2d 330 (Fla. 1979) . . . . . 4

Smith v. State,  
537 So. 2d 982 (Fla. 1989) . . . . . 4

Sowell v. State,  
342 So. 2d 969 (Fla. 1977) . . . . . 4

Speed v. State,  
732 So. 2d 17 (Fla. 5th DCA),  
rev. granted, case # 95,706 (Fla. Sept. 16, 1999) . . . . . 5

State v. Cotton,  
728 So. 2d 251 (Fla. 2d DCA 1998),  
rev. granted, 737 So. 2d 551 (Fla. 1999) . . . . . 6

State v. Wise,  
24 Fla. L. Wkly. D657 (Fla. 4th DCA March 10),  
rev. granted, case # 95,230 (Fla. Aug. 5, 1999) . . . . . 5

Woods v. State,  
24 Fla. L. Wkly. D831 (Fla. 1st DCA March 26),  
rev. granted, case #95,281 (Fla. Aug. 23, 1999) . . . . . 5

Young v. State,  
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

CERTIFICATE OF FONT AND TYPE SIZE

The undersigned counsel certifies that this brief was typed using 12 point Courier New, a font that is not proportionately spaced.

## SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The Prison Releasee Reoffender Act is constitutional. The Act does not violate the separation of powers doctrine or due process. Setting mandatory sentences is a proper matter for the legislature, and enforcing such a statute is a proper matter for the executive. Finally, the trial court still fulfills its proper role -- deciding whether the defendant is eligible for this sentencing enhancement and imposing the sentence itself.

## ARGUMENT

### THE PRISON RELEASEE REOFFENDER ACT IS CONSTITUTIONAL.

Concerned about the early release of felony offenders and the resulting impact on Florida's residents and visitors when such offenders continue to prey upon society, the legislature determined that public safety could best be ensured by providing for lengthy mandatory sentences for those who commit new serious felonies upon their release from prison. Accordingly, the Prison Releasee Reoffender Punishment Act was enacted, effective May 30, 1997. Ch. 97-239, Laws of Florida.

Under this statute, an individual who commits certain enumerated violent felonies within three years of being released from prison must be sentenced to the statutory maximum term of imprisonment. § 775.082(8), Fla. Stat. (1997).

Richardson contends that the Prison Releasee Reoffender Act is unconstitutional, as it violates the separation of powers doctrine. According to Richardson, the legislature has improperly delegated the sentencing power of the judiciary to the executive. In other words, by invoking the mandatory penalties required by the statute, the executive has become the sentencing entity. This claim must be rejected.

First of all, it is well-established that setting penalties for crimes is a matter of substantive law within the power of the legislature. McKendry v. State, 641 So. 2d 45, 47 (Fla. 1994); Smith v. State, 537 So. 2d 982, 985 (Fla. 1989). Accordingly, arguments that mandatory sentences violate the separation of powers doctrine have been uniformly rejected by this Court. See, e.g., Lightbourne v. State, 438 So. 2d 380, 385 (Fla. 1983), cert. denied, 465 U.S. 1051 (1984); Scott v. State, 369 So. 2d 330, 331 (Fla. 1979); Sowell v. State, 342 So. 2d 969 (Fla. 1977).

Richardson's argument that the mandatory sentences for repeat offenders infringes on the power of the judiciary should likewise be rejected. The legislature acted well within its authority in setting these mandatory sentences.

The statute also sets forth a procedure whereby the executive initiates the sentence enhancement process. Contrary to Richardson's argument, this procedure does not mean that the executive has usurped the power of the judiciary, and it does not make the prosecutor the sentencing entity, as Richardson asserts. While the executive *initiates* the process, it is the court which decides whether the defendant qualifies under the statute, and it is the court which imposes the sentence itself. Cf. Young v. State, 699 So. 2d 624, 625-27 (Fla. 1997) (state attorney has sole authority to initiate habitual offender proceedings).



Richardson argues that the sentencing procedure here is infirm because there is no requirement of a jury finding of the underlying basis for the mandatory sentence. To the contrary, the statute does in fact require such a finding -- the jury must find the defendant has committed a qualifying felony on a certain date. The trial court then applies this finding to the provisions of the statute -- examining, for example, whether the defendant had been released from prison within three years of the date the jury found the crime had been committed.

The Prison Releasee Reoffender Act gives the State Attorney no greater power than that traditionally exercised in the charging decision, and it in no way infringes upon the sentencing power of the judiciary -- which still has to evaluate whether the State has proven that the defendant qualifies for sentencing under the statute and still has to impose the sentence itself. McKnight v. State, 727 So. 2d 314 (Fla. 3d DCA), rev. granted, case #95,154 (Fla. Aug. 19, 1999).

This Court should adopt the well-reasoned decision of the district court in McKnight, and Richardson's separation of powers argument should be rejected. See also Woods v. State, 24 Fla. L. Wkly. D831 (Fla. 1st DCA March 26) (agreeing with McKnight, rejecting separation of powers challenge to PRR statute), rev. granted, case #95,281 (Fla. Aug. 23, 1999); Speed v. State, 732 So.

2d 17 (Fla. 5th DCA) (same), rev. granted, case # 95,706 (Fla. Sept. 16, 1999).

Richardson alternatively contends that the statute may be saved by giving the trial court the discretion to apply the statutory exceptions to mandatory sentencing. § 775.082(8)(d), Fla. Stat. (1997). This is the position adopted by the Second and Fourth District Courts of Appeal. See State v. Wise, 24 Fla. L. Wkly. D657 (Fla. 4th DCA March 10), rev. granted, case # 95,230 (Fla. Aug. 5, 1999); State v. Cotton, 728 So. 2d 251 (Fla. 2d DCA 1998), rev. granted, 737 So. 2d 551 (Fla. 1999) (case # 94,996).

The State submits that these decisions ignore the clear statutory language, as well as the legislative history of the statute, and should therefore not be followed by this Court.

The statute provides that "[u]pon proof ... that a defendant is a prison releasee reoffender as defined in this section, such defendant is not eligible for sentencing under the sentencing guidelines and *must* be sentenced as follows..." § 775.082(8)(a)(2), Fla. Stat. (1997) (emphasis added). This language clearly provides that sentencing is mandatory, not discretionary.

The legislative history supports such a finding as well. The court in McKnight thoroughly examined the relevant legislative reports, quoting extensively from staff analysis reports as well as

impact statements. These statements clearly reveal that the statute was designed to leave no room for discretion where the State has met its burden of proving that the defendant qualifies for PRR sentencing. 727 So. 2d at 316.

The McKnight court further noted that allowing the statutory exceptions to be applied by the trial court would lead to absurd results. For example, the trial court would be in no position to conclude that prison releasee reoffender sanctions should not be applied because "the testimony of a material witness cannot be obtained" or "other extenuating circumstances ... preclude the just prosecution of the offender." § 775.082(8)(d), Fla. Stat. These statutory exceptions -- including the victim's preference exception -- obviously apply to the decision of the prosecuting attorney, not the trial court.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the trial court's role is clearly mandatory. Id. at 317.

This Court should reject Richardson's argument that the trial court is not required to follow the clear statutory mandate. The district court's decision affirming Richardson's sentence as a

---

<sup>1</sup>The exceptions provide reasons for the prosecuting attorney to decline to apply the statutory mandate. Of course, the prosecutor is not *required* to forgo PRR sentencing any time one of these exceptions apply. Rather, such a decision is left to his or her discretion.

prison releasee reoffender should be approved, and the certified question should be answered in the negative.

CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments and authorities presented herein, respondent respectfully requests that this Court approve the decision of the district court and answer the certified question in the negative.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT A. BUTTERWORTH  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

---

KELLIE A. NIELAN  
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL  
Fla. Bar #618550

---

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

COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the above Respondent's Brief has been furnished by hand delivery to Nancy Ryan, Assistant Public Defender, 112 Orange Avenue, Suite A, Daytona Beach, Florida 32114, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of December, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kristen L. Davenport  
Assistant Attorney General