



discussion. However, Lollis argues and the State properly concedes that we must reverse her sentences for the uttering and fraudulent use charges because the trial court's oral pronouncement of sentence differs from the written sentencing documents. Specifically, the written sentencing documents do not include the qualifying conditions orally announced by the court that Lollis's prison sentences are to be suspended after three years in favor of two years' probation on the uttering and fraudulent use charges. A trial court's written sentence must conform to its oral pronouncement; when the two differ, that constitutes reversible error. See Rivera v. State, 34 So. 3d 207, 208 (Fla. 2d DCA 2010). Accordingly, we reverse this portion of Lollis's sentence and remand for the trial court to enter an amended sentence consistent with its oral pronouncement.

Affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded.

KELLY and CRENSHAW, JJ., Concur.