

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

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
OF FLORIDA
SECOND DISTRICT

| | | |
|-------------------|---|--------------------|
| JAMES A. LEDFORD, |) | |
| |) | |
| Appellant, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | Case No. 2D05-2972 |
| |) | |
| STATE OF FLORIDA, |) | |
| |) | |
| Appellee. |) | |
| |) | |
| _____ |) | |

Opinion filed September 23, 2005.

Appeal pursuant to Fla. R. App. P.
9.141(b)(2) from the Circuit Court for
Polk County; Randall G. McDonald,
Judge.

PER CURIAM.

Affirmed. See Bolender v. State, 658 So. 2d 82 (Fla. 1995);
Alexander v. State, 830 So. 2d 899 (Fla. 2d DCA 2002); Brown v. State, 827 So.
2d 1054 (Fla. 2d DCA 2002); McGee v. State, 684 So. 2d 241 (Fla. 2d DCA
1996).

As this court did in Alexander, we certify the same question of great public importance:

ARE ALLEGATIONS OF AFFIRMATIVE MISADVICE BY TRIAL COUNSEL ABOUT THE SENTENCE ENHANCING CONSEQUENCES OF A DEFENDANT'S PLEA FOR FUTURE CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR IN AN OTHERWISE FACIALLY SUFFICIENT MOTION COGNIZABLE AS AN INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL CLAIM?

Affirmed; question certified.

CASANUEVA, SALCINES, and SILBERMAN, JJ., Concur.