

NOT FINAL UNTIL TIME EXPIRES TO FILE REHEARING
MOTION AND, IF FILED, DETERMINED

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
OF FLORIDA
SECOND DISTRICT

DANIEL SAVOURY,)	
)	
Appellant,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 2D02-73
)	
STATE OF FLORIDA,)	
)	
Appellee.)	
_____)	

Opinion filed October 18, 2002.

Appeal pursuant to Fla. R. App. P.
9.141(b)(2) from the Circuit Court
for Pinellas County; Richard A. Luce,
Judge.

PER CURIAM.

Daniel Savoury challenges the trial court's order summarily denying his motion filed pursuant to Florida Rule of Criminal Procedure 3.850. We affirm.

In his motion, Savoury alleged that his plea was involuntary because defense counsel affirmatively misadvised him regarding the future sentencing-enhancing effects of the plea in regard to an as yet uncommitted crime. In Stansel v.

State, 27 Fla. L. Weekly D1947 (Fla. 2d DCA Aug. 28, 2002), we held that this claim is not cognizable in a rule 3.850 motion. We certify the same question that we certified in Stansel. We affirm, without discussion, any other issues raised by Savoury in his motion.

ALTENBERND, WHATLEY, and NORTHCUTT, JJ., Concur.