

SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

LARRY JAMES BARBER,
PETITIONER

vs. STATE OF FLORIDA
RESPONDENT

Case No. SC 18-1739

L.T. No. 81-24230

SUPPLEMENT RESPONSE
SHOW CAUSE DECEMBER 19, 2018

COMES NOW PETITIONER AND STATES AS FOLLOWS:

1) THE PETITIONER SUBMITS HER CLAIMS FOR FOR RELIEF ARE PER SE REVERSIBLE OR FUNDAMENTAL ERRORS RESULTING IN MANIFEST INJUSTICE SUPPORTED AND DEMONSTRATED ON FACE OF RECORDS.

2) PETITIONER'S MOTIONS AND/OR PETITIONS HAVE BEEN DISMISSED, DENIED, OR AS BEING INSUFFICIENT OR SUCCESSIVE IMPOSING A BAR, FOR WHICH THE COURTS AVERS THEY HAVE NO JURISDICTION TO ENTERTAIN.

3) EVEN WHERE RELIEF FOR REVIEW UNDER THE SIGNATURE OF A MEMBER OF THE FLORIDA BAR IN GOOD STANDING JAMES A. MADDY, PUBLIC DEFENDER DENYING A BAR, IS EVIDENCE CLAIMS HAVE MERIT. (3013-2728). WHEREFORE THE PETITIONER SHOULD NOT BE BARRIED FROM SEEKING REVIEW "MAY" CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS.

1 DENIED LAW LIBRARY ACCESS TO MEET COURT IMPOSED DEADLINES AND RESEARCH, PROPER PREPARATION OF MOTIONS BY DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS.

It is hardly surprising for the law to deny review because the form of the request is improper and then when it is corrected to say that the motion is successive or repetitive. This is little more than 'gotcha school of litigation,' roundly condemned - Nelson v. State, 855 So.2d 137, 133 (Fla. 4th DCA 2003).

4) 944.279, Fla. Stat., provides that such sanction may NOT be utilized in collateral criminal proceedings. The plain meaning of the phrase "collateral criminal proceeding" used in section 944.279 refers to a type of criminal proceeding, like before this court, that is "collateral to" or somewhat separated from the "main" criminal proceeding. That is, for the very limited purposes interpreting the statutes created or amended by Chapter 96-106, a prisoner's felony conviction would be the result of the main criminal proceeding, while the prisoner's motion to correct his sentence would be "collateral" to his "main" criminal conviction, so such a proceeding (prohibition) would be a "collateral criminal proceeding"

5) In the original intent of the act was evidenced by the preamble which clearly refers only to civil actions, any "broader intent" to include criminal actions is simply not there. Hall v. State, 757 So.2d (Fla. 2000).

FEB 13 2019

FOR MAILING

Done on this 13 day of February 2019.

Respectfully,
Larry E. Barber
Larry E. Barber, Petitioner