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## STATEMENT REGARDING TYPE
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## STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND EACTS

Respondent accepts Petitioner's statement of the case and facts.

## SUMMARY OF THF_ARGUMENT

Respondent acknowledges that this Court may exercise its discretionary jurisdichion to review the decision of the second District Court of Appeal in the instant case pursuant to Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure $9.030(a)(2)(a)(1)$ (1999) because the decision construes the constitutional validity of the Prison Releasee Reoffender Statute.

ISSUE
WHETHER THIS COURT HAS DISCRETIONARY JURISDICTION TO REVIEW PETITIONER'S CASE WHEN THE DISTRICT COURT'S OPINION CITED TO A PRIOR OPINION OF THE COURT EXPRESSLY DECLARING VALID THE PRISON RELEASEE REOFFENDER ACT?

Respondent acknowledges that in Grant v. State, 24 Fla. L. Weekly D2627 (Fla. 2d DCA Nov. 24, 1999), the Second District Court of Appeal expressly declared the Prison Releasee Reoffender Statute ( $\$ 775.082(8)$, Fla. Stat. (1997)) to be valid and in doing so rejected constitutional attacks on the statute based upon: (1) the single subject rule (2) violation of separation of powers (3) cruel and unusual punishment (4) vagueness (5) due process (6) equal protection and (7) ex post facto. Numerous cases are presently pending before this Court regarding the validity of this stalute based upon the constitutional grounds raised by Petitioner. This Court has already heard oral arguments regarding these issues on November 3, 1999, in the cases of Mcknight $v$. State, 727 So. 2d 314 (Fla. 3d DCA), review granted, 740 So. 2d 528 (Fla. 1999), and Cotton V. State, 728 So. 2d 251 (Fla. 2d DCA 1998), review granted, 737 So. 2d 551 (Fla. 1999).

## CONCLUSION

Respondent respectfully requests that this court grant review in the instant case.
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