

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

RAFAEL SUAREZ,	**	
Appellant,	**	
vs.	**	CASE NO. 3D01-2034
THE STATE OF FLORIDA,	**	LOWER
Appellee.	**	TRIBUNAL NO. 92-2742

Opinion filed October 31, 2001.

An Appeal from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County, Pedro Echarte, Judge.

Rafael Suarez, in proper person.

Robert A. Butterworth, Attorney General, for appellee.

Before SCHWARTZ, C.J., and SORONDO, and RAMIREZ, JJ.

ON MOTIONS FOR REHEARING, CLARIFICATION, CERTIFICATION OR
REHEARING EN BANC

PER CURIAM.

We grant the motion for rehearing and deny the motion for clarification. 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 HAS A DUTY TO ADVISE A DEFENDANT THAT HIS PLEA IN A PENDING CASE MAY HAVE SENTENCE ENHANCING CONSEQUENCES IF THE DEFENDANT COMMITS A NEW CRIME IN THE FUTURE?