

22-6840

No. \_\_\_\_\_

ORIGINAL

FILED  
FEB 14 2023

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

DAVID OMAR CARABALLO — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF  
CORRECTIONS, ET AL... — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS OF FLORIDA, SECOND DISTRICT  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

DAVID OMAR CARABALLO #H91048/EI-126L

(Your Name)

GRACEVILLE C.F. - 5168 EZZELL RD.

(Address)

GRACEVILLE, FLORIDA 32440

(City, State, Zip Code)

850-263-5500

(Phone Number)

Provided to Graceville Correctional Facility on  
2/14 for mailing, by BP/DC

RECEIVED

FEB 22 2023

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

WHETHER THE INSTANT STATE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS  
ERRED IN DENYING PETITIONER'S POINTS OF ARGUMENT  
AS PRESENTED ON DIRECT APPEAL.

## LIST OF PARTIES

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENTS  
WILLIAM C. SHELLARD  
william.shelhart@myfloridalegal.com

## RELATED CASES

NOT APPLICABLE

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

PAGE NUMBER

CASES

(SEE APPENDIX A, #4-8 )

STATUTES AND RULES

(SEE APPENDIX A, page #9 )

OTHER

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	5
CONCLUSION.....	6

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A (SEE INDEX ON ITS COVER PAGE)

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

**OPINIONS BELOW**

For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
 is unpublished.

For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the \_\_\_\_\_ court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
 is unpublished.

## JURISDICTION

### For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was \_\_\_\_\_.

No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_\_A\_\_\_\_\_.  
The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

### For cases from state courts:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was Nov. 16, 2022.  
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_\_A\_\_\_\_\_.  
The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

FLA. STAT. § 921.0026 (D) & (F)

(D) THE DEFENDANT REQUIRES SPECIALIZED TREATMENT FOR A MENTAL DISORDER THAT IS UNRELATED TO SUBSTANCE ABUSE OR ADDICTION OR FOR A PHYSICAL DISABILITY AND THE DEFENDANT IS AMENDABLE TO TREATMENT

(F) THE VICTIM WAS THE AGGRESSOR, WILLING PARTICIPANT, AGGRESSOR OR PROVOKER OF THE INCIDENT

FLORIDA STAT. ANNOTATED 2018  
CHAPTER 776. JUSTIFIABLE USE OF FORCE  
(REFS. & ANNO'S) 776.032 IMMUNITY FROM PROSECUTION AND CIVIL ACTION FOR JUSTIFIABLE USE OF OR THREATENED USE OF FORCE

(4) IN A CRIMINAL PROSECUTION ONCE A PRIMA FACIE CLAIM OF SELF-DEFENSE, IMMUNITY FROM CRIMINAL PROSECUTION HAS BEEN RAISED BY THE DEFENDANT AT A PRE-TRIAL IMMUNITY HEARING, THE BURDEN OF PROOF BY CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE IS ON THE PARTY SEEKING TO OVERCOME THE IMMUNITY FROM CRIMINAL PROSECUTION PROVIDED IN SUBSECTION (1)

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

*(SEE APPENDIX A, pages 10-32.)*

MR. CARRBALLO'S CLAIM OF SELF-DEFENSE COMES DOWN ENTIRELY TO WHETHER MR. HASTY'S TESTIMONY PROVIDED THAT MR. CARRBALLO INTENDED TO USE LETHAL FORCE AFTER NO REASONABLE PERSON WOULD HAVE CONSIDERED LETHAL FORCE TO BE JUSTIFIED MR. CARRBALLO SEEKS REVERSAL BECAUSE (1) THE EVIDENCE AT THE "STAND YOUR GROUND" HEARING WAS INADEQUATE TO DISPROVE SELF-DEFENSE BY CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE; (2) THE AMISSION OF HASTY'S TESTIMONY WAS HIGHLY PRETUDICIAL AND CONTRARY TO MR. CARRBALLO'S RIGHT TO CONFRONT EVIDENCE WAS INSUFFICIENT TO DISPROVE SELF-DEFENSE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT; AND (4) THE TRY TESTIMONY OFFERED AGAINST HIM; (3) THE TRIAL INSTRUCTIONS WERE CONFUSING AND INCONCISELY SUPPORTED BY ANY EVIDENCE A DUTY TO RETREAT FOR REASONS THAT WERE NOT SUGGESTED THAT MR. CARRBALLO MIGHT HAVE HAD BECAUSE THE DEFENSE OF THE DOWNWARD DEPARTMENT REQUEST AMOUNTED TO FAILURE TO EXERCISE JUDICIAL DISCERNITION TO CONSIDER STATUTORY FACTORS THAT JUSTIFY A DOWNWARD DEPARTURE, AND TO IMPOSE A MORE RATIONAL SENTENCE CONSIDERING ALL OF THE RELEVANT FACTORS

AT THE LEAST, THE SENTENCE SHOULD BE REVERSED AND THE CASE REMANDED FOR RESENTENCING BECAUSE THE DEFENSE OF THE DOWNWARD DEPARTURE BECAUSE THE DEFENSE OF THE DOWNWARD DEPARTURE DISCERNITION TO CONSIDER STATUTORY FACTORS THAT JUSTIFY A DOWNWARD DEPARTURE, AND TO IMPOSE A MORE RATIONAL SENTENCE CONSIDERING ALL OF THE RELEVANT FACTORS

## CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

D. Caraballo

Date: FEBRUARY 14TH, 2023