

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
OF FLORIDA
THIRD DISTRICT
JULY TERM, A.D. 2001

JOSE GONZALEZ,	**	
Appellant,	**	
vs.	**	CASE NO. 3D01-1605
THE STATE OF FLORIDA,	**	LOWER
Appellee.	**	TRIBUNAL NO. 85-578

Opinion filed October 3, 2001.

An Appeal under Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.141(b)(2) from the Circuit Court for Monroe County, Richard G. Payne, Judge.

Jose Gonzalez, in proper person.

Robert A. Butterworth, Attorney General, for appellee.

Before LEVY and SHEVIN, JJ., and NESBITT, Senior Judge.

PER CURIAM.

ON MOTIONS FOR REHEARING AND CLARIFICATION

We deny the motions for rehearing and clarification; however, as in Major v. State, 790 So. 2d 550 (Fla. 3d DCA 2001), we certify that we have passed on the following question of great public importance:

WHETHER THE TRIAL COURT OR COUNSEL HAVE A DUTY TO ADVISE A DEFENDANT THAT HIS PLEA IN A PENDING CASE MAY HAVE SENTENCE ENHANCING CONSEQUENCES IF THE DEFENDANT

COMMITTS A NEW CRIME IN THE FUTURE?

Motions denied; and question certified.¹

¹ See Bismark v. State, 2001 WL 1041747 (Fla. 2d DCA Sept. 12, 2001)(requesting that the Florida Supreme Court accept jurisdiction for immediate resolution of this issue).