

# Third District Court of Appeal

## State of Florida

Opinion filed December 26, 2019.  
Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing.

---

No. 3D18-157  
Lower Tribunal No. 11-11535B

---

**Adolfo Perez, Jr.,**  
Appellant,

vs.

**The State of Florida,**  
Appellee.

An appeal from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County, William Thomas, Judge.

Rier Jordan P.A., Jonathan E. Jordan, and Andrew F. Rier, for appellant.

Ashley Moody, Attorney General, and Jeffrey R. Geldens and Asad Ali, Assistant Attorneys General, for appellee.

Before EMAS, C.J., and FERNANDEZ, and MILLER, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Affirmed. See Huckaba v. State, 260 So. 3d 377, 382 (Fla. 1st DCA 2018) (“A technical deficiency in a charging instrument is waived if it is not objected to before the State rests its case . . . [E]ven where the body of a charging instrument omits an essential element, such an error is a waivable technical defect, if the charging instrument references the correct statute, and the statute sets forth the required elements.”) (citations omitted); see also Partin v. State, 82 So. 3d 31, 43 (Fla. 2011) (“A trial court has discretion to provide a copy of the indictment to the jury.”); Fla. R. Crim. P. 3.400 (a)(1) (“The court may permit the jury, upon retiring for deliberation, to take to the jury room: . . . a copy of the charges against the defendant.”); Back Bay at Carillon LLC v. Quality Props. Asset Mgmt. Co., 112 So. 3d 710, 712 (Fla. 2d DCA 2013) (“[T]he record shows that the corporate representative was qualified to testify as to the value of the property.”) (citation omitted); Smith v. State, 305 So. 2d 868, 870 (Fla. 3d DCA 1975) (holding that where a bill of sale established the stolen item was purchased thirty days prior to being stolen, “the facts of [the] case fell within the exception to the rule that the purchase price of used property is not sufficient to establish value”) (citing Martin v. State, 260 So. 2d 238 (Fla. 3d DCA 1972)).