Supreme Court of Florida

No. SC17-919

THOMAS LEE GUDINAS, Appellant,

vs.

STATE OF FLORIDA, Appellee.

[January 30, 2018]

PER CURIAM.

We have for review Thomas Lee Gudinas's appeal of the circuit court's order denying Gudinas's motion filed pursuant to Florida Rule of Criminal Procedure 3.851. This Court has jurisdiction. <u>See</u> art. V, § 3(b)(1), Fla. Const.

Gudinas's motion sought relief pursuant to the United States Supreme Court's decision in <u>Hurst v. Florida</u>, 136 S. Ct. 616 (2016), and our decision on remand in <u>Hurst v. State</u> (<u>Hurst</u>), 202 So. 3d 40 (Fla. 2016), <u>cert. denied</u>, 137 S. Ct. 2161 (2017). This Court stayed Gudinas's appeal pending the disposition of <u>Hitchcock v. State</u>, 226 So. 3d 216 (Fla. 2017), <u>cert. denied</u>, 138 S. Ct. 513 (2017). After this Court decided <u>Hitchcock</u>, Gudinas responded to this Court's order to show cause arguing why <u>Hitchcock</u> should not be dispositive in this case.

After reviewing Gudinas's response to the order to show cause, as well as the State's arguments in reply, we conclude that Gudinas is not entitled to relief. Gudinas was sentenced to death following a jury's recommendation for death by a vote of ten to two. <u>Gudinas v. State</u>, 693 So. 2d 953, 959 (Fla. 1997). His sentence of death became final in 1997. <u>Gudinas v. Florida</u>, 522 U.S. 936 (1997). Thus, <u>Hurst</u> does not apply retroactively to Gudinas's sentence of death. <u>See Hitchcock</u>, 226 So. 3d at 217. Accordingly, we affirm the denial of Gudinas's motion.

The Court having carefully considered all arguments raised by Gudinas, we caution that any rehearing motion containing reargument will be stricken. It is so ordered.

LABARGA, C.J., and QUINCE, POLSTON, and LAWSON, JJ., concur. PARIENTE, J., concurs in result with an opinion. LEWIS and CANADY, JJ., concur in result.

PARIENTE, J., concurring in result.

I concur in result because I recognize that this Court's opinion in <u>Hitchcock</u> <u>v. State</u>, 226 So. 3d 216 (Fla. 2017), <u>cert. denied</u>, 138 S. Ct. 513 (2017), is now final. However, I continue to adhere to the views expressed in my dissenting opinion in Hitchcock. An Appeal from the Circuit Court in and for Orange County, A. James Craner, Judge - Case No. 481994CF007132000AOX

James Vincent Viggiano, Jr., Capital Collateral Regional Counsel, and Ali A. Shakoor, Assistant Capital Collateral Regional Counsel, Middle Region, Temple Terrace, Florida,

for Appellant

Pamela Jo Bondi, Attorney General, Tallahassee, Florida, and Doris Meacham, Assistant Attorney General, Daytona Beach, Florida,

for Appellee