

No. _____

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

MICHAEL DUANE ZACK, III,

Petitioner,

v.

STATE OF FLORIDA, AND SECRETARY, FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Respondents.

*On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
Supreme Court of Florida*

APPLICATION FOR STAY OF EXECUTION

***THIS IS A CAPITAL CASE
WITH AN EXECUTION SCHEDULED FOR
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2023, AT 6:00 P.M.***

Stacy R. Biggart
Fla. Bar No. 0089388
Special Assistant CCRC-North
20 SE 2nd Place, #407
Gainesville, Florida 32601
(850) 459-2226
stacybiggart@gmail.com

*Dawn B. Macready
Fla. Bar No. 0542611
Chief Assistant CCRC-North
1004 DeSoto Park Drive
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
(850) 487-0922
Dawn.Macready@ccrc-north.org
*COUNSEL OF RECORD

To the Honorable Clarence Thomas, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and Circuit Justice for the Eleventh Circuit:

The State of Florida has scheduled the execution of Petitioner Michael Duane Zack, III, for **October 3, 2023, at 6:00 p.m.** The Florida Supreme Court denied state court relief as well as Mr. Zack's request for stay on September 21, 2023. Mr. Zack respectfully requests that this Court stay his execution, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 23 and 28 U.S.C. § 2101(f), pending consideration of his concurrently filed petition for writ of certiorari.

STANDARDS FOR STAY OF EXECUTION

The standards for granting a stay of execution are well-established. *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 895 (1983). There “must be a reasonable probability that four members of the Court would consider the underlying issue sufficiently meritorious for the grant of certiorari or the notation of probable jurisdiction; there must be a significant possibility of reversal of the lower court’s decision; and there must be a likelihood that irreparable harm will result if that decision is not stayed.” *Id.* (internal quotations omitted).

PETITIONER SHOULD BE GRANTED A STAY OF EXECUTION

The questions raised in Mr. Zack's petition are sufficiently meritorious for grant of certiorari. The underlying issues present significant questions of constitutional law and are not subject to any legitimate procedural impediments.

As explained in Mr. Zack's underlying petition, the medical community now recognizes that the unique, cognitive, practical, and social impairments inherent to

Fetal Alcohol Syndrome (FAS) indistinguishable from those of Intellectual Developmental Disability (ID). This consensus has given rise to an important constitutional issue: that Mr. Zack is exempt from execution under the Eighth Amendment protections articulated in *Atkins v. Virginia*, 536 U.S. 304 (2002), and its progeny. See, e.g., *Hall v. Florida*, 572 U.S. 701 (2014), and *Moore v. Texas*, 137 S. Ct. 1039 (2017). To exclude Mr. Zack from this protected class would violate the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Mr. Zack also raises the issue that, in light of a clear, contemporary, national consensus, and with consideration of the original public meaning, the Eighth Amendment prohibits the execution of those not sentenced to death by a unanimous jury.

Should this Court grant Mr. Zack's request for a stay and grant review of the underlying petition, there is a significant possibility of the lower court's reversal. Per the guidance set forth by this Court in *Hall*, "it is proper for states to consult the medical community's opinions" to determine which individuals qualify for Eighth Amendment exemption from execution. 572 U.S. at 710. The medical community has now accepted FAS, both in etiology and symptomatology, as functionally identical with ID. And, Mr. Zack's FAS is uncontested.

With regard to Mr. Zack's right to a unanimous jury, there is an indisputable, national consensus in favor of unanimous jury death sentences. This consensus has manifested itself in sentencing and execution practices as well as statutes. This Court's own judgment has further buttressed the consensus established by the nation's citizenry and legislature. In *Ramos v. Louisiana*, this Court decided that a

unanimous jury vote is required to convict a defendant of a “serious offense” under the Sixth Amendment. 140 S. Ct. 1390 (2020).

Furthermore, Mr. Zack’s claims are not subject to any legitimate procedural impediments. The state courts have foreclosed adequate and substantive review but Eighth Amendment categorical bans cannot be nullified by any state-law waiver provision. At every opportunity since his trial, Mr. Zack has presented evidence of his prenatal alcohol exposure to the full extent allowed by then-contemporaneous scientific legal and legal standards. Evolving standards of decency have finally progressed to the tipping point that allows Mr. Zack to establish that his FAS disability affords him the same protections established in *Atkins*. To deny review would penalize Mr. Zack for being right too soon. In the same vein, Mr. Zack’s right to a unanimous jury emerges from an evolved standard of decency -- an accumulation of national consensus -- and bears no timeliness concerns.

The irreparable harm to Mr. Zack is clear. *Wainwright v. Booker*, 473 U.S. 935, 937 n.1 (1985) (Powell, J., concurring) (finding the requirement of irreparable harm as “necessarily present in capital cases”). Additionally, the Florida Supreme Court’s refusal to grant Eighth Amendment protections is not just a matter of life and death for Mr. Zack. The Eighth Amendment not only protects the individual from cruel and unusual punishment, it safeguards the public’s interest in living in a humane society. *See, e.g., Ford v. Wainwright*, 477 U.S. 399, 409-10 (1986) (Eighth Amendment restriction protects not only the individual, but “the dignity of society itself from the barbarity of exacting mindless vengeance[.]”).

Though society's standards of decency have evolved, the Florida Supreme Court will continue to foreclose relief in other similar cases by ossifying the Eighth Amendment. This creates an unacceptable risk that individuals who are diagnosed with FAS, or individuals sentenced by a non-unanimous jury, will nevertheless be denied their crucial Eighth Amendment protections.

This Court's intervention is urgently needed to prevent the imminent execution of Mr. Zack, whom the evidence undisputedly shows is deserving of the protections from the death penalty provided by the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments. Because the Florida Supreme Court refuses to apply these constitutional protections, this Court should grant a stay of execution and grant a writ of certiorari.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Zack respectfully requests that this Court grant his application for a stay of execution to address the important constitutional questions in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ STACY R. BIGGART

Stacy R. Biggart
Fla. Bar No. 0089388
Special Assistant CCRC-North
20 SE 2nd Place, #407
Gainesville, Florida 32601
(850) 459-2226
stacybiggart@gmail.com

/s/ DAWN B. MACREADY

Dawn B. Macready
Fla. Bar No. 0542611
Chief Assistant CCRC-North
1004 DeSoto Park Drive
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
(850) 487-0922
Dawn.Macready@ccrc-north.org
COUNSEL OF RECORD