



entitles him to relief. However, because the case law cited by Sanchez does not reflect a new statement of the law, we affirm the trial court's denial of his rule 3.850 motion.

Furthermore, any ineffective assistance of trial counsel claim that Sanchez might have raised in a 3.850 motion under Nahm v. State, 760 So. 2d 253 (Fla. 2d DCA 2000), is now time-barred, unless he can demonstrate his entitlement to a belated 3.850 motion pursuant to Medrano v. State, 748 So. 2d 986 (Fla. 1999).

Affirmed.

BLUE, C.J., and STRINGER, J., Concur.