

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA
FIFTH DISTRICT

NOT FINAL UNTIL TIME
EXPIRES TO FILE MOTION FOR
REHEARING AND DISPOSITION
THEREOF IF FILED

TERRY SHELDON SALADEEN,

Appellant,

v.

Case No. 5D20-584

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Appellee.

_____ /

Opinion filed March 9, 2021

Appeal from the Circuit Court
for Volusia County,
Matthew M. Foxman, Judge.

Paula C. Coffman, of Law Office of
Paula Coffman, Orlando, for
Appellant.

Ashley Moody, Attorney General,
Tallahassee, and Kaylee D. Tatman,
Assistant Attorney General, Daytona
Beach, for Appellee.

PER CURIAM.

AFFIRMED. See *Small v. State*, 179 So. 3d 421, 424 (Fla. 1st DCA 2015) (“The standard of review applied to a trial court’s finding that the hearsay statements of a child victim are reliable and come from a trustworthy source, making them admissible pursuant to section 90.803(23), [Florida Statutes,] is abuse of discretion.” (citing *Perez v. State*, 536 So. 2d 206, 210 (Fla. 1988); *Jones v. State*, 728 So. 2d 788, 790 (Fla. 1st DCA 1999))); *Rutledge v. State*, 1 So. 3d 1122, 1131 (Fla. 1st DCA 2009) (“The similarity of the prior acts to the charged crimes . . . , the closeness in time . . . , and the frequency of the prior acts lead ineluctably to the conclusion that the probative value of the . . . previous child molestation of the same victim of the charged crimes substantially outweighs the danger of unfair prejudice.” (citing *McLean v. State*, 934 So. 2d 1248, 1262 (Fla. 2006))); see also *Smith v. State*, 538 So. 2d 66, 67 (Fla. 1st DCA 1989) (“Evidence [under section 90.404(2), Florida Statutes,] that deals only with similar sex acts against the [minor] victim in the case being tried is far *less* subject to objection than evidence of similar acts against other victims.” (citing *Gibbs v. State*, 394 So. 2d 231, 232 (Fla. 1st DCA), *aff’d*, 406 So. 2d 1113 (Fla. 1981))).

LAMBERT, TRAVER and NARDELLA, JJ., concur.