Supreme Court of Florida

No. SC17-984

HARRY FRANKLIN PHILLIPS, Appellant,

vs.

STATE OF FLORIDA, Appellee.

[January 22, 2018]

PER CURIAM.

We have for review Harry Franklin Phillips' appeal of the circuit court's order denying Phillips' motion filed pursuant to Florida Rule of Criminal Procedure 3.851. This Court has jurisdiction. <u>See</u> art. V, § 3(b)(1), Fla. Const.

Phillips' motion sought relief pursuant to the United States Supreme Court's decision in <u>Hurst v. Florida</u>, 136 S. Ct. 616 (2016), and our decision on remand in <u>Hurst v. State</u> (<u>Hurst</u>), 202 So. 3d 40 (Fla. 2016), <u>cert. denied</u>, 137 S. Ct. 2161 (2017). This Court stayed Phillips' appeal pending the disposition of <u>Hitchcock v.</u> <u>State</u>, 226 So. 3d 216 (Fla. 2017), <u>cert. denied</u>, 138 S. Ct. 513 (2017). After this

Court decided <u>Hitchcock</u>, Phillips responded to this Court's order to show cause arguing why <u>Hitchcock</u> should not be dispositive in this case.

After reviewing Phillips' response to the order to show cause, as well as the State's arguments in reply, we conclude that Phillips is not entitled to relief. Phillips was sentenced to death following a jury's recommendation for death by a vote of seven to five. <u>Phillips v. State</u>, 705 So. 2d 1320, 1321 (Fla. 1997). Phillips' sentence of death became final in 1998. <u>Phillips v. Florida</u>, 525 U.S. 880 (1998). Thus, <u>Hurst</u> does not apply retroactively to Phillips' sentence of death. <u>See Hitchcock</u>, 226 So. 3d at 217. Accordingly, we affirm the denial of Phillips' motion.

The Court having carefully considered all arguments raised by Phillips, we caution that any rehearing motion containing reargument will be stricken. It is so ordered.

LABARGA, C.J., and QUINCE, POLSTON, and LAWSON, JJ., concur. PARIENTE, J., concurs in result with an opinion. LEWIS and CANADY, JJ., concur in result.PARIENTE, J., concurring in result.

I concur in result because I recognize that this Court's opinion in <u>Hitchcock</u> <u>v. State</u>, 226 So. 3d 216 (Fla. 2017), <u>cert. denied</u>, 138 S. Ct. 513 (2017), is now final. However, I continue to adhere to the views expressed in my dissenting opinion in Hitchcock.

An Appeal from the Circuit Court in and for Dade County, Nushin G. Sayfie, Judge - Case No. 131983CF0004350001XX Neal Dupree, Capital Collateral Regional Counsel, William Hennis, and Marta Jaszczolt, Assistant Capital Collateral Regional Counsel, Southern Region, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida,

for Appellant

Pamela Jo Bondi, Attorney General, and Melissa J. Roca, Assistant Attorney General, Miami, Florida,

for Appellee