

# **Third District Court of Appeal**

## **State of Florida**

Opinion filed March 20, 2019.  
Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing.

---

Nos. 3D18-155 & 3D18-192  
Lower Tribunal No. 17-12481

---

**Lee Howard,**  
Appellant/Cross-Appellee,

vs.

**The State of Florida,**  
Appellee/Cross-Appellant.

Appeals from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County, Michael A. Hanzman, Judge.

Carlos J. Martinez, Public Defender, and Manuel Alvarez, Assistant Public Defender, for appellant/cross appellee.

Ashley Moody, Attorney General, and Jeffrey R. Geldens, Assistant Attorney General, for appellee/cross appellant.

Before FERNANDEZ, LOGUE, and SCALES, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

The trial court properly found that there was sufficient evidence to support the conviction of petit theft. See J.P. v. State, 35 So. 3d 180, 181-82 (Fla. 3d DCA 2010) (holding that a principal was competent to testify as to the value of stolen projectors where the principal had “ordered the projectors, and [was] responsible for . . . purchasing and maintaining of all the school’s equipment and materials”). The trial court also correctly determined that there was no competent, substantial evidence to support a conviction of criminal mischief in excess of \$1,000. See A.S. v. State, 91 So. 3d 270, 271 (Fla. 4th DCA 2012) (holding that testimony regarding repair estimate for damaged vehicle should have been stricken where the actual estimates were not admitted into evidence and absent such testimony, there was no competent, substantial evidence demonstrating the element of value).

Affirmed.