APPENDIX A

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PINELLAS COUNTY, FLORIDA

FREDDIE A. LAND,
Plaintiff,

V.

CASE NO.: 19-8030-CI
To be assigned
JUDGE: _____

STATE ATTORNEYS OFFICE, et al.,
Defendant(s). /

NOTICE OF INTENT TO SUE

COMES NOW, the Plaintiff, FREDDIE A. LAND, moving pro se, files this Notice of Intent to Sue the State Attorney's Office, i.e., JOSEPH A. BULONE, in and for the Sixth Judicial Circuit Court (Pinellas County) for Negligence and Personal damage. In support, Plaintiff submits the following:

JURISDICTION

This Court has original jurisdiction pursuant to the Constitution(s), and rule 9.100.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On February 19, 1997, Joseph A. Bulone, and assistant state attorney for the State Attorney's Office (at that time), in and for the Sixth Judicial Circuit Court (Pinellas County) filed an Information to commence an action (Tort) against FREDDIE A. LAND, (hereinafter Land) alleging Land had violated Florida Statute § 794.011(2). This Statute was designated as a "Capital Offense" punishable by the capital felony sentencing scheme (s.s. 775.082 and 921.141). See Fla. Stat. § 794.011(2) (1996).

JOSEPH A. BULONE invoked the Sixth Judicial Circuit Courts' jurisdiction when he charged Land with violating a capital felony by way of an Information. This is evidenced by the information filed in this case, "Capital Felony" stamped on the face of the instrument and his signature affixed thereto. While the court may have assumed that the charging document was valid JOSEPH A. BULONE knew that his action were contrary to the procedure set forth in Article I, § 15(a), to the Florida Constitution which states: "no person shall be tried for a capital crime without presentment or indictment by a grand jury..." JOSEPH A. BULONE also knew that he was exceeding his authority granted him by Article V, § 17, to the Florida Constitution.

JOSEPH A. BULONE may wish to allege, as a possible defence, that the Florida Supreme Court gave him the authority to charge Land in this manner. See Heuring v. State, 513 So.2d 122 (Fla. 1987), (We answer the certified question in the affirmative. Sexual battery is not a capital offense and therefore it may be charged by information). While the Florida Supreme Court ruled that Florida Statute § 794.011(2), was constitutionally defective, because the statute had no true felony designation or appropriate punishment under the proper felony, JOSEPH A. BULONE Knew that the legislature had not amended the statute in 1996, and the statute defined the offense as a capital felony with punishment found in the capital felony sentencing scheme (s.s. 775.082 and 921.141). JOSEPH A. BULONE could not amend this statute in "anyway", or add words to the statute. See Overstreet v. State, 629 So.2d 125 (Fla. 1983); McLaughlin v. State, 721 So.2d 1170 (Fla 1998); Hayes v. State, 750 So.2d 1, 4 (Fla. 1999).

This contract (tort proceedings) that JOSEPH A. BULONE forced Land into is "Brutum Fulmen" and is voidable on its' face, it cannot be the basis of any judicial proceeding because no lawful action can be maintained upon it. Trial by information for a violation against a capital offense is patently void. It is necessary that the judgment and sentence imposed in this case (97-03114) be annulled inasmuch as it is the only remedy at hand to cure the defect averred herein.

Regardless whether the state courts or the legislature abides by Florida's Constitution has no bearing on JOSEPH A. BULONE'S actions. He was fully aware that in 1996, Florida Statute § 794.011(2) was a capital felony punishable by the capital felony sentencing scheme (s.s. 775.082 and 921.141). See also Mills v. Moore 786 So.2d 532 (Fla. 2001). [3]. JOSEPH A. BULONE made a conscious decision to charge Land by information for allegedly violating a capital felony. He could have went to his superior and advised that he was without the authority to charge anyone with violating a capital felony. Instead, he chose to move on his own volition which placed him outside of his authority and the scope of his office and left himself vulnerable to suit. JOSEPH A. BULONE moved in bad faith exhibiting wanton and willful disregard to Land's constitutional rights and safety. JOSEPH A. BULONE has severly damaged Land both physically and mentally and has taken Land's Liberties and Freedom without Lawful authority. Suit is appropriate.

DEMAND FOR RELIEF

Land demands compensation for mental anguish and physical suffering, at $100.00 per day for every day this unlawful action has denied Land his God given right to Liberty and freedom and $100.00 a-day until his Liberty and Freedom is restored;

Land demands that the State Attorney's Office, in and for the Sixth Judicial Circuit Court (Pinellas County), move on his behalf to motion, petition, etc. the court to annul the instant judgement and sentence and restore Land's Liberties and Freedom immediately;

Land demands any further compensation this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully

Freddie A Land

FREDDIE A. LAND Pro se

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY that I placed this Notice of Intent to Sue in the hands of a South Bay Correctional & Rehabilitation facility mailroom official for mailing to: The Sixth Judicial Circuit Court, 14250 49th Street North Clearwater, FL. 33762-2800; and the State Attorney's Office, P.O. Box 5028 Clearwater, FL. 33758.
Done this 2 day of July, 2019.

Freddie A Land

FREDDIE A. LAND, R13055
South Bay Corr. & Rehab. Facility
P.O. Box 7171 South Bay, FL 33493

APPENDIX B

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PINELLAS COUNTY, FLORIDA

FREDDIE A. LAND,
Plaintiff/Petitioner,

V.

CASE NO.: 19-8030-CI
To be Assigned

JUDGE: _____

STATE ATTORNEYS OFFICE et.al.,
Defendant(s).
_____/

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
(RELIEF FROM VOID JUDGMENT)

COMES NOW the Plaintiff/Petitioner, FREDDIE A. LAND, (Hereinafter Land) moving pro se, enters before this Honorable Court seeking relief from the judgment and sentence entered in Pinellas County, Florida by Frank Quesada and W.D. Baird respectively. The judgment and sentence must be viewed as void as it is in direct conflict with the laws and Constitution of the State of Florida, and the United States Constitution.

JURISDICTION

Land invokes the jurisdiction of this Court to hear this matter pursuant to Article V, § 5(b); Article I, § 13, of the Florida Constitution; Article I, § 9 of the United States Constitution; Florida Statutes § 79.01, and Florida Rules of Civil Procedure 1.540(b)(4), that empowers this Court with the authority to address this void judgment claim. There is no other plain, speedy or adequate remedy in which to address this matter, other than the "Great Writ of Liberty."

Article I, §13, of the Florida Constitution provides that the writ of habeas corpus "shall be grantable of right . . . returnable without delay, . . ." To be entitled to the issuance of a writ of habeas corpus Land must establish that he is detained in custody and that there is probable cause to believe that his detention is without lawful authority.

Land is detained in the Department of Corrections (S.B.C.&R.F.), D.C.#O-R15055;

Land will show infra that there is probable cause to believe that his detention is without lawful authority.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On February 19, 1997, Joseph A. Bulone, and assistant state attorney at that time, filed an "Information" in the Sixth Judicial Circuit Court (Pinellas County), alleging that FREDDIE A. LAND had violated Florida Statute § 794.011(2). The statute defined the offense as a "capital felony" punishable by § 775.082 and 921.141., Florida Statute. This was a breach of a non-discretionary legal duty owed to Land by the Constitution(s).

Joseph A. Bulone charged Land with violating a capital felony, contrary to the procedure set forth in Article I, § 15(a), to the Florida Constitution which states: "no person shall be tried for a capital crime without presentment or indictment by a grand jury. . ." See also Aritcle V § 17, to the Florida Constitution. This action was unlawful and irreparably damaged Land.

Land was arrested, in error, later that day (February 19, 1997) and was subsequently released on a ten-thousand dollar bond. Jury trial was held, in error, March 2, 1999, before judge Frank Quesada. This jury trial, conducted under "Information" charging a capital felony, is void. Sentencing for this capital Felony was held March 17, 1999, before judge W.D. Baird. Appeal was filed and the Second District Court of Appeal issued a per curium affirmed May 10, 2000, and issued Mandate July 17, 2000. See 2D99-1304; Case No.: 97-03114.

Lands' detention/restraint is illegal due to a lack of jurisdiction, due process of law violations and a constitutionally defective statute. Howard v. State, 385 So.2d 739 (Fla. 3rd DCA 1980); Bradley v. State, 374 So.2d 1154 (Fla. 3rd DCA 1979). See also, Milliken v. State, 398 So.2d 508 (Fla. 5th DCA 1981). Where the "facts" are undisputed, relief must be granted as a matter of law. State v. Meyer, 430 So.2d 440, 443 (Fla. 1983). Alvarez v. State, 358 So.2d 10, 14 (Fla. 1978).

FACTS WARRANTING RELIEF

GROUND ONE

JOSEPH A. BULONE WAS WITHOUT LICIT AUTHORITY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE V, § 17, TO CHARGE A CAPITAL FELONY CONTRARY TO FLORIDA CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I § 15 (a)

There is no ambiguity in regards to our Florida Constitution. The procedure for the state in bringing suit for a capital felony against the Liberty and Freedom of an individual is clearly set forth in Article I § 15(a). It is the duty of the government to convince a Grand Jury to issue an Indictment, a "True Bill," for any citizen of this State charged with violating a "capital felony". Charging Land with violating a capital felony by way of an "Information" affected the authority of Joseph A. Bulone, and to an equal extent, the jurisdiction of judge Frank Quesada and the Sixth Judicial Circuit Court in Pinellas County, Florida to proceed to trial in this matter.

Joseph A. Bulone endowed himself with an authority that exceeded the power granted to him by the Florida Constitution, Article V, § 17, by acting contrary to Article I, § 15(a); by charging Land with a capital felony without the

grand jury. As a result of this fatal defect, the conviction, judgment and sentence must be viewed as a denial of due process of law, manifest injustice and the entire proceeding rendered void.

While it is true that the Florida Supreme Court's decisional law authorized the States' attorneys to charge this offense by Information, it did not give the States' attorneys, or their assistants, the authority to claim that the offense was a capital felony. See Heuring v. State, 513 So.2d 122 (Fla.1987), (We answer the certified question in the affirmative. Sexual battery is "not a capital offense," and therefore, it may be charged by information.). (emphasis added). Joseph A. Bulone did not have lawful authority to charge Land with violating a capital felony by way of an Information. He acted in bad faith.

Joseph A. Bulone, as an assistant state attorney, may have immunity from suit while performing his quasi-judicial functions of initiating and pursuing a criminal prosecution and presenting the States' case. He still knew that the legislative intent, in October 1996, when the alleged offense was to have occurred, was that § 794.011(2) was a capital felony punishable under the capital felony sentencing scheme (s.s. 775.082 and 921.141). He further knew that the Florida Constitution an state law divested him of the authority to charge a capital felony by way of an Information, or by an Indictment. Moreover, he knew that only the Grand Jury could issue an indictment, "a True Bill", for a violation against a capital felony. Joseph A. Bulone created this controversy when he charged Land by Information and stamped capital felony on the face of the charging document. He moved contrary to the Florida Constitution and state law and placed himself outside the scope of his office and subjected hisself to suit. Joseph A. Bulone clearly moved in bad faith with wanton and willful disregard to Land's rights and Liberty.

Joseph A. Bulone's unlawful actions have irreparably damaged Land and has caused the entire proceedings in this matter to be null and void. Rule 1.540(b) gives this Court the authority to relieve Land from this void judgment and sentence. Furthermore, there are no limitations that could prevent this claim from going forward. See State v. Burton, 314 So. 2d 136, 138 (Fla. 1975). (Orders, judgments or decrees which are product of fraud, collusion, deceit, mistake, etc. may be vacated, modified, opened or otherwise acted upon at anytime.).

GROUND TWO

TRIAL BY INFORMATION CHARGING A CAPITAL FELONY WOULD RENDER ANY JUDGMENT VOID

In 1997, when Joseph A. Bulone filed his Information Florida Statute § 794.011(2), was, and still is, a capital felony. Based upon the plain language used in the statute, it is clearly a capital felony. This is evident by the legislature's continued "capital felony" designation of the offense and by the offense being conjoined with the capital felony sentencing scheme within the statute. (See Florida Statutes § 775.082 and § 921.141., Mills v. Moore, 786 So. 2d 532, 538 (Fla. 2001)).

Land's trial conducted under information charging a capital felony is void. The adjudication and sentence must be vacated as a consequence of this plain error. Trial by information for a capital felony is "Brutum Fulmen". When Joseph A. Bulone charged Land by Information with violating a capital felony he acted in a manner which breached his authority, moved contrary to the Florida Constitution, Article I § 15(a), violated Legislative intent and the founding principles of law in the Constitution of the United States, Amendment V, rendering the entire process void from its inception.

By creating a brutum fulmen contract that is actually voidable on its face, it cannot be the basis of any judicial proceeding because no lawful action can be maintained upon it. Trial by information for a capital felony is patently void. It is necessary that the sentence and judgment be annulled inasmuch as it is the only remedy at hand to cure the defect affirmed herein.

GROUND THREE

JOSEPH A. BULONE KNOWINGLY CHARGED FREDDIE A. LAND WITH AN UNADMINISTRABLE STATUTE THAT IS CONSTITUTIONALLY DEFECTIVE RENDERING VOID THE SENTENCE AND JUDGMENT IN THIS MATTER

JOSEPH A. BULONE was aware that for an offense to be designated capital, death must be a possible punishment. The Florida Supreme Court defined a capital offense. "A capital case is a case in which a person is tried for a capital crime. A capital crime is one for which the punishment of death is inflicted." See Adams v. State, 56 Fla. 1, 14 (1908). The United States Supreme Court held the same. See Fitzpatrick v. United States, 178 U.S. 304, 44 L.Ed. 1078, 20 S.Ct. Rep. 944 (1900). Mr. Justice Brown speaking for the Court said: "The test is not the punishment which is imposed, but that which may be imposed under the statute." See also Rakes v. United States, 212 U.S. 55, 53 L.Ed 401, 29 S.Ct. 244 (1909). And, Mills v. Moore, supra.

The legislature enacted section 794.011(2), defined the Statute as a capital offense, and prescribed punishment in the capital felony sentencing scheme, S.S. 775.082 and 921.141. Fla. Stats. See Senate floor debate: May 23, 1974, S.B. 959. The major flaw with this bill was that the United States Supreme

Court in 1972 ruled that: "it is unconstitutional to punish the criminal offense of sexual battery by death." See Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238 (1972). Therefore, § 794.011(2) Fla. Stat., could never have become a capital offense because the United States Supreme Court had already ruled that death for the offense of sexual battery was unconstitutional thus, § 794.011(2) Fla. Stat. was a constitutionally defective statute from its' inception and is unadministrable. The legislature moved in bad faith when creating this statute.

In 1981, the Florida Supreme Court held that "the sentence of death is grossly disproportionate and excessive punishment for the crime of sexual battery and is therefore forbidden." Buford v. State, 403 So.2d 943 (Fla. 1981); Coker v. Georgia, 433 U.S. 584 (1977). Again, the legislature moved in bad faith for failing to amend this statute.

When a portion of a statute is declared invalid the remaining portions thereof "which are severable" ordinarily should be recognized as valid, and it is the duty of the court to preserve their validity whether or not a severability clause was included." Severability is a judicial doctrine recognizing the obligation of the judiciary to uphold the constitutionality of legislative enactments where it is possible to strike only the unconstitutional portions." See Ray v. Mortham, 742 So.2d 1276, 1280 (Fla. 1999).

It is not possible to sever the sentence of death from § 794.011(2), and the statute remain a capital offense. The Florida Supreme Court held in Donaldson v. Sack, 265 So.2d 499 (Fla. 1972), citing Fitzpatrick supra, (eliminating the sentence of death may not destroy the entire statute, but it most certainly would no longer be a capital felony.). In fact, in 1982, the Florida Supreme Court held in Rowe v. State, 417 So.2d 981 (Fla. 1982), "murder in the first-degree is the only existing capital offense in the State of Florida."

In 1997, when Joseph A. Bulone filed his Information against Land and stamped capital felony on the face of the charging document he acted in bad faith and with malicious intent towards Land. There is Know-way he could have believed his actions were lawful. Joseph A. Bulone Knew §794.011(2) was constitutionally defective and unadministrable rendering the entire process void.

GROUND FOUR

FLORIDA STATUTE §794.011(2) IS CONSTITUTIONALLY DEFECTIVE AND UNADMINISTRABLE RENDERING THE CONVICTION, JUDGMENT AND SENTENCE IN THIS CASE VOID FROM IT'S INCEPTION

In October 1996, when this offense (accusation) was alleged to have occurred Florida Statute §794.011(2) was designated a capital felony and was punishable under the capital felony sentencing scheme (s.s. 775.082 and 921.141). As previously stated this statute (S.B. 959) was constitutionally defective and unadministrable from its' inception. While the Florida Constitution grants the legislature the power to define crimes and prescribe punishment, See Article III, that branch of government cannot move against United States Supreme Court law. See Furman v. Georgia, supra. As such, §794.011(2) could never be disignated a capital felony punishable under the capital felony sentencing scheme.

In 1981, when the Florida Supreme Court also ruled that the sentence of death for sexual battery was unconstitutional, (Buford v. State, supra) the statute lost its' capital felony designation. As previously stated, it is not possible to severe the sentence of death from the statute and §794.011(2) remain a capital felony. "Eliminating the sentence of death may not destroy the entire statute, but it most certainly would no longer be a capital felony." Donaldson v. Sack, supra; "Murder

in the first-degree is the only existing capital offense in the State of Florida." Rowe v. State, supra; "Sexual battery is not a capital offense." Heuring v. State, supra.

It is undisputed that Florida Statute §794.011(2) could never have become a capital felony with the possible punishment of death. It is further undisputed that the legislature failed in its' duty in creating this statute and failed in its' duty in 1981, by not amending the statute.[1] Instead, they allowed the statute to continue on with no true/real felony designation or lawful punishment. This allowed the State courts to bypass the Constitution(s), duly enacted laws and the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure when arresting, trying and sentencing an individual accused of this offense. Article II §3 to the Florida Constitution forbids the legislature to delegate its' constitutionally assigned powers to another branch. See also, State v. Atlantic Coastline Railroad Co., 56 Fla. 617, 636-37, 47 So. 969, 976 (1908). Hayes v. State, 750 So. 2d 1, 4 (Fla. 1999) (we are not at liberty to add words to statutes that were not placed there by the legislature).

In 1996, § 794.011(2) was a capital felony according to the legislature. In fact, to this very day the legislature still designates this offense as a capital felony in its' statutes. Logic dictates, based upon the plain language used in the statute, that the legislatures' intent is still to punish a person convicted of §794.011(2) as provided in the capital felony sentencing scheme. Application of the capital felony sentencing scheme, in conjunction with §794.011(2) is contrary to the fundamental rudiments of law because the offense is not by definition a capital felony, due to the sentence of death being ruled unconstitutional, and is not

[1] See letter, sent to senator Darryl Ervin Rousen May 30, 2019, attached.

recognized by the courts as a capital felony for the purpose of charging, trying and sentencing and individual charged with violating the offense.

Based on the foregoing, §794.011(2) cannot be a capital felony, cannot be conjoined with the capital felony sentencing scheme and is therefore constitutionally defective and an unadministrable statute. See Alvarez v. State, 358 So.2d 10, 14 (Fla. 1978). Moreover, if the net effect of this statute is simply to provide an indefinite term of imprisonment, then this statute is at odds with Article I § 17 of the Florida Constitution. This writ is proper, Ex parte Messer, 99 So. 330, 332 [1] (Fla. 1924).

The appropriate correction would be for the legislature to amend the statute so that it is consistent with the current status of the law, by designating the proper felony level to §794.011(2), and by prescribing punishment under the appropriate felony sentencing scheme thereby eliminating the issue of vagueness and the violations against the Due Process Clause. Without such legislation the impending constitutional defect remains uncured. It is not the duty of the state courts to rewrite this statute in any form. See Overstreet v. State, 629 So.2d 125 (Fla. 1983); McLaughlin v. State, 721 So.2d 1170 (Fla. 1998).

The United States Supreme Court held in 1972, that death for sexual battery was "unconstitutional" therefore §794.011(2) could not have become a capital felony. The Florida Supreme Court ruled in 1981, that death for sexual battery was "unconstitutional" so again §794.011(2) could not be a capital felony. In fact, the Florida Supreme Court stated in 1981, that murder in the first-degree is the "only existing capital felony" in the State of Florida. The Florida Supreme reiterated in 1987, that §794.011(2) was not a capital offense. In State v. Smith, 547 So.2d 613 (Fla. 1989), Judge Barketts stated that the legislature cannot specifically override a supreme court ruling. There is only one type of capital

felony in the State of Florida, see Fla. Stat. § 775.081, and § 794.011(2) is not that type period. See also Betancourt v. State, 804 So. 2d 313 (Fla. 2001).

There is no-way lawfully that Joseph A. Bulone, or the State Attorney's office, could have charged Land with violating a capital felony by information (or by indictment without the grand jury). Furtherstill, they could not charge Land with violating a capital felony that does not exist. This unconstitutional and unlawful action perpetrated under color of law has severly damaged Land both physically and mentally. Land's God given right to Liberty and Freedom must be restored.

RELIEF REQUIRED

Land demands that the judgment and sentence in this case be annulled and Land's Liberties and Freedom be restored immediately;

Any and all relief Land is constitutionally and justly entitled to.

Respectfully

Freddie A. Land

FREDDIE A. LAND, Pro se

NOTARY CERTIFICATE

STATE OF FLORIDA)
)
COUNTY OF PINELLAS)

Before me, the undersigned authority, this day personally appeared FREDDIE A. LAND, who first being duly sworn, says that he is the Plaintiff/Petitioner in the above-styled cause, that he has read the foregoing petition and that all matters herein are true and correct.

SWORN and SUBSCRIBED TO before me this 3 day of July, 2019.

GABRIELA [illegible]
Commission # GG 107947
Expires May 24, 2021
Bonded Thru Troy Fain Insurance 800-385-7019

Seal

Notary Public / State of Florida

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY that I Placed this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus in the hands of a South Bay Correctional & Rehabilitation facility mailroom official for mailing to: The Sixth Judicial Circuit Court, Ken Burke, Clerk of Court, 14250 49th Street N. Clearwater, FL. 33762-2800; and one true copy to be served upon the Defendant at: The State Attorney's Office P.O. Box 5028 Clearwater, FL. 33758.
Done this 2 day of July, 2019.

Freddie A. Land

FREDDIE A. LAND, R15055
South Bay Corr. & Rehab facility
P.O. Box 7171 South Bay, FL 33493

APPENDIX C

Arrest

Date of Arrest	02/26/1997	
Charge	001	
Arresting Agency ORI	FL0520000	
Arresting Agency Name	Pinellas County Sheriffs Office	
Agency Case Number	108639	
AON Description	Sex Asslt	
Statute	Level	Degree
	Felony	Unknown
Offense Literal	BATT	
Charge Count	1	
Judicial Charge	001-1	
Arrest Charge Status	Charge Resulted From Arrest	
Judicial Agency ORI	FL052015J	
Judicial Agency Name	Pinellas County Clerk of Court	
Uniform Case Number	521997CF003114AXXXNO	
Sequence Number	1	

Prosecution

Prosecution Charge Status	Initiated by Prosecutor	
PON Description	Sex Asslt	
Offense Literal	SEXUAL BATTERY CHILD UNDER 12	
Statute	Level	Degree
794.011.2a	Felony	Capital
Statute Description	By 18 Yoa Older Sex Battery Vict Under 12 Yoa	
Charge Count	1	
Counsel Type	Private Attorney	
Final Action Taken	Filed	
Final Decision Date	02/19/1997	

Court

Court Charge Status	Same	
CON Description	Sex Asslt	
Offense Literal	SEXUAL BATTERY CHILD UNDER 12	
Statute	Level	Degree

794.011.2a	Felony	Capital

Statute Description	By 18 Yoa Older Sex Battery Vict Under 12 Yoa
Charge Count	1
Trial Type	Jury
Final Plea	Not Guilty
Final Action Taken	Guilty/Convicted
Final Decision Date	03/17/1999

Sentence

Sentence Type	N/A - Not Applicable
Sentence Imposed Date	03/17/1999
Sentence Sequence Number	0
Minimum Confinement	999 years 99 months 99 days
Maximum Confinement	999 years 99 months 98 days
Confinement Type	State Prison Facility
Credit Time Served	180 days
Court Fine ($)	2.00
Court Cost ($)	403.00
Restitution ($)	0.00
Sentence Provision(s)	Sentenced Under Sentencing Guidelines

REGISTRATION

OBTS	0012244023
Date of Registration	09/07/1999
Registering Agency ORI	FL0370100
Registering Agency Name	Florida Department of Law Enforcement Headquarters
Charge	001
AON Description	Sex Predator Registration
Registration Literal	SEX BATT BY ADULT CHILD UNDER 12
Registration Type	Sex Predator

This is a multi-source offender record.

This record contains Florida information only. When explanation of a charge or disposition is needed, communicate directly with the agency that contributed the record information.

The use of this record is controlled by Federal regulations. It is provided fo

APPENDIX D

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

ELBERT PARR TUTTLE COURT OF APPEALS BUILDING
56 Forsyth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

David J. Smith
Clerk of Court

For rules and forms visit
www.ca11.uscourts.gov

April 27, 2022

Freddie A. Land
R15055
Sumter C.I. K1105L
9544 County Road 476B
Bushnell, FL 33513

This notice is to acknowledge receipt of your document(s) on April 21, 2022 **.**

Your document(s) will be handled as described below:

☐ This Court's records indicate that you have no open case pending in this Court. No action will be taken on your document(s).

☐ This Court is a federal court of limited jurisdiction. This Court has authority to act only on cases created under the statutes enacted by Congress. In general, only cases which have been first filed, and finally decided, in a United States District Court or Bankruptcy Court within this Circuit (Alabama, Florida, and Georgia), the United States Tax Court, and certain federal agencies may be appealed to this Court. This Court does not have authority to act in appeals from state and county courts. No action will be taken on your document(s).

☐ Your document(s) appear(s) to have been intended for a different court. No action will be taken on your document(s).

☐ You requested a specific form. The Court does not offer a form related to your request. No action will be taken on your document(s).

☐ Your request for an extension of time to file a notice of appeal will be submitted to the district court. No action will be taken in this Court on your document(s).

☐ Except as noted above, this Court does not act on requests for an extension of time submitted without an existing case or appeal. No action will be taken on your document(s).

☐ The Clerk's Office is unable to discern the purpose of your document(s) and/or your document(s) do(es) not appear to have been intended for this Court. Please provide clarification; otherwise, no action will be taken on your document(s).

☐ An appeal from a district court to a court of appeals may be taken only by filing a notice of appeal with the district court within the time allowed by FRAP 4. *See* FRAP 3. You mistakenly filed a notice of appeal with this Court. (Please note, that under 11th Cir. R. 22-1(a), this Court will construe a party's filing of an application for a certificate of appealability, or other document indicating an intent to appeal, as the filing of a notice of appeal.) Under FRAP 4(d), the notice of appeal will be sent to the district court.

☐ The Clerk's Office is unable to discern whether your document(s) may be or may serve as a notice of appeal. Out of an abundance of caution, your document(s) will be sent to the district court under FRAP 4(d) to be processed as the district court deems appropriate. No action will be taken in this Court on your document(s).

☒ An application for a writ of habeas corpus must be made to the appropriate district court. Under FRAP 22(a), the application will be transferred to the district court.

☐ The Clerk's Office is unable to provide you with legal advice. No action will be taken on your document(s).

☐ Other: