

>> NOW MOVE TO THE SECOND
CASE ON OUR DOCKET
WHICH IS IN RE: AMENDMENTS TO
THE FLORIDA RULES OF CRIMINAL
PROCEDURE.
>> PLEASE PROCEED.
>> GOOD MORNING JUSTICE I'M
DONALD SCAGLIONE,
CURRENT CHAIR OF THE RULES
COMMITTEE.
WE'RE HERE ON THIRD CYCLE OF
REPORT OF SUBMISSIONS MADE FROM
2008 AND 2011.
I REVIEWED THE SUBMISSIONS
BEFORE THE COURT AT THIS TIME.
MOST ARE STYLISTIC OR CLERICAL
OR SCRIVENER'S.
I BELIEVE THERE ARE ONLY TWO
ISSUES THAT ARE ADVERSARIAL.
ONE INTERNAL WITH OUR OWN
CRIMINAL RULES COMMITTEE WHERE
WE HAVE A MINORITY REPORT
PRESENTED BY ABE GLAZER, ONE OF
THE PRIOR CHAIRPERSONS OF THE
CRIMINAL RULES COMMITTEE AS TO
DISCOVERY.
OTHER ONE IS A WITHDRAWAL PLEA OF
3.170-L WHICH THIS COURT HEARD IN
ARGUMENT AS TO THE CRIMINAL
COURT STEERING COMMITTEE.
I BELIEVE WAS 2011-1699.
I WILL BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY
QUESTIONS AS TO THE OTHER
ISSUES.
YOU WILL FIND THAT WE HAVE AS A
COMMITTEE, MADE SUBMISSIONS
LIKE FOR THE APPOINTMENT
OF INDIGENTS OUT
OF JUDGE BARBER OUT OF
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY AT TIME.
WAS A COUNTY JUDGE, NOW ASCENDED
TO THE CIRCUIT BENCH.
AFTER REVIEWING COMMENTS WE
WITHDREW THAT RECOMMENDATION.
FILED A NOTICE TO APPEAR
THAT IS BASICALLY A STATUTORY
INCLUSION OF A HANDICAP ISSUE.
I CAN DIRECT YOU TO THE
ATTACHMENT OF B-12 THAT IS
THERE AS TO RULE 3.140.
IT COINCIDES WITH SUBJUDICIAL
ADMINISTRATION 2.55.
AS TO LANGUAGE AND INCLUDING ON
THE INFORMATIONS AND INDICTMENTS.
I LIKE TO PASS OVER 3.170
BECAUSE I BELIEVE THAT IS THE
ONE THAT HAS THE MOST

CONTROVERSY.

I KNOW THAT IS WHAT MY COUNSEL
IS HERE TO SPEAK ABOUT.

I WAS HERE PRESENT WHEN THE
CRIMINAL COURT STEERING
COMMITTEE AND I WAS PRESENT FOR
ANY QUESTIONS AT THAT TIME.
THAT WAS EXTENSIVELY LITIGATED
AND QUESTIONED BY THIS
HONORABLE COURT AS TO THE
WITHDRAW PLEA OF 2011-1679.
IF YOU LOOK AT 3.191

I DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO
ATTACHMENT B-36.

BASICALLY THE SCRIVNER'S AS TO
SPECIFICALLY POINTING OUT IN
THE RULE AS TO WHEN THE NOTICE
OF EXPIRATION NEED TO BE ON
THERE.

3.220 IS THE OTHER POTENTIAL
CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE, ABOUT THE
ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENAS DUCES
TECUMS.

ABE GLAZER, FORMER PAST CHAIR,
WOULD LIKE ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE
BEYOND THE LANGUAGE SUBMITTED
BY THE CRIMINAL RULES COMMITTEE
THAT STARTS RECIPROCAL
DISCOVERY.

THAT IS IN HIS ADDENDUM OF
G-1.

IF YOU LOOK AT 3.410, THAT IS
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
COMING BEFORE THE COURT.
FROM BEING BEFORE THIS COURT,
TALK ABOUT E-FILE, E-PORTAL AND
ELECTRONIC COURTS COMING IN.
THIS IS ONLY A STEPPING STONE.

I NOTICE MANY OF THESE RULES
ARE COMING THROUGH THE
THREE-YEAR CYCLE REPORT AT THIS
POINT IN TIME MAY HAVE TO BE
MODIFIED AND CHANGED BASED UPON
THE COURTS RULINGS ON THE
E-FILE, E-PORTAL DECISIONS THAT
HAVE TO COME THROUGH.

THE CRIMINAL RULES COMMITTEE
DID IN FACT CHANGE A COUPLE OF
SENTENCES THERE I THINK AT THE
PRACTITIONER AS A TRIAL JUDGE.

WE DON'T DO ANYTHING OUTSIDE
THE PRESENCE OF THE PARTIES.
THIS JUST CODIFIES IT.
MAKES SURE EVERYONE KNOWS IF
YOU BRING THE JURY BACK IN ALL
PARTIES NEED TO BE THERE.

THEY NEED TO BE PRESENT FOR THE
READBACK.

IF THERE IS SOMETHING BE IN
WRITING HAS TO BE SOMETHING
PLACED IN FILE AND ALL PARTIES
HAVE TO BE NOTICED AS WELL AS
OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAR AN OBJECT
TO IT.

3.590, I DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION
TO B-69.

IT TALKS ABOUT JUST THE ISSUE
OF TIMING.

3.691, DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO
B-71 WHERE IT TALKS ABOUT THE
SPECIFICALLY IT NEEDS TO BE
ADDRESSED TO THE APPELLATE
RULES, NOT REALLY TO THE
CRIMINAL RULES.

3.70.

THERE IS NO ATTACHMENTS TO THAT
BECAUSE AFTER READING THE
COMMENTS OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER
ASSOCIATION, CRIMINAL RULES
COMMITTEE MADE A DETERMINATION
THAT IT WAS BEST WE NOT MAKE
ANY CHANGES AND WE WITHDREW
THE AMENDMENTS WE HAD INITIALLY
PROPOSED.

THE 3.800 DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION
TO B-73.

IT TALKS ABOUT THE INCLUSION OF
THE SEXUAL OFFENDER, SEXUAL
PREDATOR DESIGNATION AS TO
BEING ABLE TO COME UNDER THE
300 SERIES TO ATTACK THAT.
SO THAT IS BASICALLY, THAT IS
ONE I BELIEVE MAY HAVE THE
IMPACT OF CRIMINAL COURT
STEERING COMMITTEE'S 1116.99.

>> JUST ON THAT ONE, IF IN THE
MEANTIME, THERE WOULD BE NO
HARM IN AMENDING IT, EVEN IF WE
END UP CHANGING ALL OF THE
POST-CONVICTION RULES BECAUSE
THAT MAKES CLEAR THAT IF
THERE'S AN ERRONEOUS SEXUAL
PREDATOR DESIGNATION, THAT THAT
CAN BE, RELIEF CAN BE SOUGHT
UNDER 3.800-A; IS THAT CORRECT?
>> THAT'S CORRECT.

I WOULD AGREE WITH THE JUSTICE
THAT WOULD BE MOST PRUDENT
THING TO DO AT THIS TIME.
EVERYTHING THAT IS COMING
THROUGH THE PIPELINE LINE --

>> I DON'T KNOW THAT THE
PIPELINE WILL BE COMPLETED.

THAT ONE SEEMED LIKE SOMETHING
WE COULD DO EVEN IF WE END UP
CHANGING THE WHOLE WAY THEY
POST-CONVICTION PROCESS WORKS.

>> THE 3.851 WAS SUBMITTED BY
BOB STRAIN, WHO WAS THE
PREVIOUS CHAIR OF THE CRIMINAL
RULES COMMITTEE.

IT BASICALLY TALKS ABOUT
MAINTAINING THE
CONFIDENTIALITY OF PSYCHIATRIC
REPORTS AND MENTAL HEALTH
REPORTS.

>> WE'VE ALREADY, THAT WAS A
SUBJECT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION
ON PRIVACY AND I THINK WE HAD
ALREADY REJECTED, HAVEN'T WE
ALREADY REJECTED THAT, THE
ISSUE OF, JUST BLANKET
STEALING OF MENTAL HEALTH
REPORTS?

>> YOU DID. I BELIEVE --

>> WE KNOW, THAT WAS
SOMETHING.

COMMITTEE, MAYBE THEY VOTED ON
IT HADN'T --

>> A LOT OF ISSUES COME
OUT OF THAT.

MR. STRAIN BEING CCR, DEALING
WITH DEATH PENALTY AND
POST-CONVICTION ISSUES.

WE THOUGHT THAT WAS IMPORTANT.
WE LIKE TO KNOW HOW THE PRESS
SATURATES INFORMATION.

IF THE CASE GETS OVERTURNED,
PART OF THE PUBLIC VENUE YOU
WOULD BE AFRAID SOME OF THIS
INFORMATION WOULD SATURATE THE
PUBLIC VENUE PRIOR TO A
POSSIBLE RETRIAL.

AND I DON'T BELIEVE I
HAVE ANYTHING CRAZY

WITH A 3.170 PLEA, TALKING
ABOUT WITHDRAWAL OF PLEA.

AS I SAT THROUGH THE ARGUMENTS
FOR THE CRIMINAL COURT STEERING
COMMITTEE AND HEARD THE
REBUTTAL ARGUMENTS FROM THE
PUBLIC DEFENDERS I SEEM TO SEE
THE JUSTICES KIND OF LOCKED IN
ON THAT.

ONE THING THAT WAS BROUGHT UP TO
ME BY JUDGE EMOS THAT WAS MAKING
THE ARGUMENT, JUDGE HARKINS THAT
WAS MAKING THE ARGUMENT THAT I
DON'T BELIEVE THEY HAD THE
OPPORTUNITY TO SAY IS IT DOES

IMPACT THE TRIAL COURTS.
WE'RE SEEING IT AS TRIAL JUDGES
COME BACK NUMEROUS TIMES.
IT DOESN'T EFFECT THE ABILITY OF
WITHDRAWAL PLEA PRIOR TO
SENTENCING.
IT'S A PRIOR SECTION OF THAT.
BUT WHEN WE DO SEE THEM, THEY'RE
ACTUALLY RAISING ISSUES OF
POSTCONVICTION INEFFECTIVENESS
OF ASSISTANCE.
SO IT'S BEING DEALING WITH IT
LATER ON ON A POSTCONVICTION
ISSUE, SO IT'S BEING ADDRESSED
TWO TIMES.
IT'S THE POSITION OF THE
CRIMINAL COURTS STEERING
COMMITTEE THAT BY DELETING THIS,
DUE PROCESS AND PROTECTION FOR
THE DEFENDANT WOULD STILL BE
THERE BY BEING ABLE TO BE RAISED
THROUGH THE 3.850 INEFFECTIVE
ASSISTANCE ISSUES THAT ARE
THERE.
I'M OPEN FOR ANY TYPE OF --
>> WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE RULE
THAT SAYS YOU CAN SILENCE THE
MOTION TO WITHDRAW WITHIN 30
DAYS OF SENTENCING?
IS THAT THE -- AND SO, AND I
GUESS MY QUESTION IS, YOU KNOW,
USUALLY THE 3.850 IS SOMEWHERE
LATER DOWN THE LINE.
AND SO WHY WOULDN'T YOU WANT TO
DO IT AT AN EARLIER POINT IN
TIME?
>> I BELIEVE FROM THE ARGUMENTS
I HEARD ON 2011 1699 AND WHAT I
SEE AS A TRIAL COURT IS THE
ISSUES THAT ARE RAISED ARE
INEFFECTIVE.
THEY'RE USUALLY SUMMARILY DENIED
BECAUSE MOST OF THE TIME THEY'RE
BEING FOLLOWED BY PRO SE
LITIGANTS.
IF THERE IS ANYTHING OF FACTUAL
CONCERN THAT THE TRIAL COURTS
ARE FINDING THERE, YOU END UP
HAVING TO APPOINT COLLATERAL
COUNSEL BECAUSE THEY'RE USUALLY
ATTACKING THEIR PREVIOUS COUNSEL
THAT'S THERE.
WE'RE NOT SEEING THAT IT IS
ASSISTING THE SYSTEM OF JUSTICE
GOING THROUGH, IT'S ACTUALLY
CREATING MORE WORK.
AND I HATE TO USE THE WORD

"FINANCIAL CONCERNS" BECAUSE DUE PROCESS SHOULD NOT BALANCE INTO ANY FINANCIAL ISSUES.

RIGHTS OF THE INDEPENDENT --

>> SO I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE SAYING.

I GUESS, AND WE PROBABLY HAVE TO GO BACK TO THAT ORAL ARGUMENT BECAUSE WE, OBVIOUSLY, ENGAGED IN IT.

IS THE IDEA THAT -- ARE YOU SAYING THAT REALLY THE 30 DAYS AFTER YOU'RE NOT SEEING AS A TRIAL JUDGE THAT ANY OF THESE, LIKE, THE PLEA SHOULD BE, YOU KNOW, OVERTURNED?

I MEAN, WE'VE JUST HEARD ALL THESE SITUATIONS WHERE PUBLIC DEFENDERS DON'T HAVE THE ABILITY REALLY TO ADVISE.

THEY'VE GOT PADILLA SITUATIONS. I GUESS I'VE ALWAYS THOUGHT THE IDEA THAT IF SOMEBODY WANTED TO WITHDRAW THAT PLEA WITHIN 30 DAYS OF SENTENCING AND REALLY GO TO, AND GO TO TRIAL, THAT'S THE TIME TO DO IT.

NOW, IF THEY'RE ATTACKING GENERAL, I MEAN, BECAUSE THEY'RE ONLY DEALING WITH PLEAS.

SO ARE YOU NOT FINDING ANY OF THESE TO BE ONES WHERE YOU WOULD ACTUALLY SET ASIDE THE PLEA?

BECAUSE THAT'S REALLY WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AT.

OBVIOUSLY, IF 100% OF THEM ARE NOT SET ASIDE, THEN, AND THEN THEY JUST DO IT AGAIN

AFTERWARDS, THEN WE ARE INEFFICIENT.

>> SPEAKING FOR THE JUDGES, THEY'RE NOT FINDING MANY OF THEM BEING OVERTURNED.

I CAN TELL YOU AS A TRIAL JUDGE MAYBE 2% IN MY COURT BECAUSE THEY'RE NOT BRINGING THE ISSUES THAT ARE RELEVANT, USUALLY IT'S BUYER'S REMORSE.

THEY GO TO THE JAIL, AND THEY LISTEN TO THE INMATES THAT SAY YOU SHOULD HAVE DONE THIS, YOU SHOULD HAVE DONE THAT.

AND WE'VE ALSO SEEN NUMEROUS TIMES WHERE CASES HAVE COME BACK, AND WHEN THEY FIND OUT THEY'RE ACTUALLY FACING A LOT MORE SEVERE SANCTIONS, THEY

DON'T WANT TO WITHDRAW THEIR
PLEA.

SO THAT'S TAKEN A LOT OF TIME
AND RESOURCES --

>> BUT THEN AT THAT POINT WHY
WOULDN'T THAT BE, THEN IT WOULD
HAVE BEEN LITIGATED, SO IF THEY
BRING IT AGAIN TWO YEARS, FOUR
YEARS LATER, THEY'RE BOUND --
THEY'VE LITIGATED THE ISSUE.
WE HAVEN'T HAD A CASE ON THAT,
BUT TO ME, THAT'S THE ANSWER TO
THAT, THAT THEY CAN'T JUST RAISE
THE ISSUE THEY RAISE.

AT LEAST NOW YOU HAVE THE LAWYER
THERE WHO REMEMBERS WHAT HE OR
SHE ADVISED ON, AND IT'S DONE
THEN, NOT, YOU KNOW, TWO YEARS
AFTER THE FACT.

SO THAT'S JUST ONE OF THE --
SORT OF, AGAIN, I REALIZE I'M
NOT ON THE GROUND, SO I
APPRECIATE IT, BUT WOULDN'T THAT
BE THE SOLUTION, TO SAY THAT
THEY'RE BARRED IF THEY'VE RAISED
THOSE ISSUES AFTER THE FACT?

>> WELL, THAT'S THE STATUS OF
THE LAW, THEY'RE BARRED.

THEY COULD HAVE, SHOULD HAVE,
WOULD HAVE BROUGHT IT UP.

THE PROBLEM IS, THEY CONTINUE TO
BRING IT UP EVEN THOUGH WE MAY
HAVE LITIGATED IT.

IT STILL COMES BACK AGAIN IN
CASES THAT COME BEFORE YOU
NUMEROUS TIMES ON ISSUES THAT
WERE HANDLED ON DIRECT APPEAL OR
PREVIOUS 3.850s.

SO THE FACT THEY SAY THEY
SHOULDN'T IS NOT GOING TO STOP
THE PROCESS.

IT'S GOING TO CONTINUE TO COME
BACK THROUGH, AND I THINK THE
SUBMISSION AS BY THE CRIMINAL
RULES AS WELL AS THE CRIMINAL
STEERING COMMITTEE IS AT LEAST
THIS WILL STREAMLINE, AND WE
WILL DEAL WITH IT ONE TIME.
BECAUSE WE KNOW WE'RE GOING TO
GET IT.

ARE WE GOING TO GET IT ONCE,
TWICE, THREE TIMES?

ANY OTHER QUESTIONS?

THANK YOU ALL VERY MUCH.

>> MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT, GLEN
GIFFORD ON BEHALF OF THE FLORIDA
PUBLIC DEFENDERS ASSOCIATION.

I'M HERE ONLY TO SPEAK ON
3.170L, AND JUST BRIEFLY, THIS
WAS ARGUED IN JANUARY IN 1169,
THAT CASE IS STILL PENDING.
JUST TO BRIEFLY REITERATE OUR
POSITION, THIS RULE EFFECTUATES
THE RIGHT TO CHALLENGE THE
VOLUNTARINESS OF A PLEA AND
WHETHER A SENTENCE EXCEEDS THE
PLEA AGREEMENT ON DIRECT APPEAL.
THAT WAS RECOGNIZED IN ROBINSON.
AND IT PROVIDES A MEANS TO
PRESERVE THIS ISSUE IN THE TRIAL
COURT AT A TIME WHEN THE
DEFENDANT HAS COUNSEL BOTH IN
THE TRIAL COURT AND UP TO 30
DAYS BEFORE THE NOTICE OF APPEAL
IS FILED AND THEN ON DIRECT
APPEAL.
THE RIGHT TO DIRECT APPEAL IS
THE RIGHT TO COUNSEL.
ROBINSON RECOGNIZES THAT THESE
ISSUES CAN BE RAISED ON DIRECT
APPEAL AND AFTER THE CRIMINAL
APPEALS REFORM ACT, THEY HAVE TO
BE PRESERVED BY A MOTION IN THE
TRIAL COURT.
SO THESE MOTIONS WILL CONTINUE
TO BE FILED WHETHER THERE'S A
RULE 3.170L OR NOT ACCORDING TO
ROBINSON.
SECOND, IT'S VERY IMPORTANT THAT
THIS OPPORTUNITY EXIST AT THE
TIME WITHIN 30 DAYS AFTER THE
PLEA BECAUSE OF THE RIGHT TO
COUNSEL.
IF YOU DEFER THIS TO 3.850
PROCEEDINGS, THERE IS NO RIGHT
TO COME TO HELP PREPARE THE
MOTION.
OFTEN LITIGANTS ARE
UNREPRESENTED IN A HEARING ON
THAT.
>> WELL, WE UNDERSTAND THAT.
BUT THEIR, WHAT THE TRIAL JUDGES
ARE SAYING AND APPELLATE JUDGES
IS THAT ALL WE'RE DOING IS
CREATING ANOTHER AVENUE FOR A
ABUSE OF THE PROCESS.
NOW, YOU KNOW THAT WHEN WE
CREATED IT, IT WAS EXACTLY FOR
THAT, SO THAT WE COULD SEE THAT
AN ERROR GETS CORRECTED AT THE
EARLIEST POSSIBLE STAGE.
BUT IT'S BEEN REPRESENTED THAT
IT SOUNDS LIKE 98% OF THESE ARE
NOT FRIVOLOUS, BUT ARE JUST ALL

THEY'RE DOING IS JUST SAY, WELL,
WE WISH WE HADN'T ENTERED THAT
PLEA, AND THEY'VE ALREADY
ENTERED IT.
SO WHAT ARE YOU -- WE DON'T HAVE
ANY NUMBERS, BUT WHAT IS THE
OPPOSITE SIDE OF THAT?
>> WELL, THERE'S 98% THAT ARE
FRIVOLOUS CAN BE DEALT WITH AND
DISMISSED RATHER SUMMARILY.
THIS COURT IN SHEPHERD NARROWED
THE GROUNDS.
IF THE MOTION DOESN'T ALLEGE ANY
OF THOSE GROUNDS, THEN AT THAT
POINT IT CAN BE DISMISSED
WITHOUT FURTHER HEARING.
AND FURTHER, IF THOSE GROUNDS
ARE ALLEGED, ONLY THEN IS
CONFLICT COUNSEL APPOINTED.
SO 98% OF THESE CASES, A GOOD
PORTION OF THAT 98% IS GOING TO
BE DISMISSED WITHOUT A HEARING,
WITHOUT MUCH TROUBLE.
THAT REMAINING 2% IS VERY
IMPORTANT.
IF THE DEFENDANT GETS RELIEF AND
THEN GOES TO TRIAL, THE LAW
PRESUMES, IS IN FAVOR OF TRIAL
ON THE MERITS.
SO THAT 2% IS IMPORTANT.
MOST OF THE ABUSE OF PRACTICES,
I THINK, HAVE BEEN CURBED.
I LOOK AT SHEPHERD, AND I THINK
SHEPHERD WAS EFFECTIVE BY
NARROWING THE GROUNDS AND THEN
REQUIRING APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
IF SPECIFIC ALLEGATIONS ARE MADE
IN THE MOTION.
AGAIN, I WOULD REFER THE COURT
BACK TO OUR COMMENTS IN THE
PREVIOUS CASE AND TO THE ORAL
ARGUMENT WHERE THIS WAS
ADDRESSED IN SOME DETAILS.
IF THE COURT HAS NO FURTHER
QUESTIONS, I'LL CONCLUDE.
>> IF THE COURT DOESN'T HAVE ANY
QUESTIONS, I'LL JUST ADD ONE
ADDITIONAL ISSUE.
COUNSEL BROUGHT UP ABOUT THE
FACT ABOUT A COURSE PLEA.
WE NOW KNOW THE SUPREME COURT
HAS ISSUED SOMETHING ABOUT
LAWYERS TRYING TO ENCOURAGE
THEIR CLIENTS TO TAKE PLEAS, AND
I THINK WE'RE GOING TO RUN INTO
SOME DEFINITIONAL PROBLEMS
THERE.

JUST HOW FAR DOES DEFENSE
COUNSEL HAVE TO DO TO CONVINCE
THEIR CLIENT THAT WHAT'S IN
THEIR BEST INTERESTS?
OF COURSE, IF THEY RECOMMEND THE
PLEA TO, SAY, FIVE YEARS, THEY
GET CONVICTED AND IT'S A
FIRST-DEGREE FELONY PUNISHABLE
BY LIFE AND THEY GET LIFE, DOES
COUNSEL HAVE TO ARM TWIST THEM
TO TAKE THE CASE?
I CAN SEE THAT COMING BEFORE
THIS COURT TO GIVE US SOME
DEFINITIONAL GUIDANCE TO JUST
HOW FAR IS COUNSEL GOING TO HAVE
TO PUSH THAT.
THAT MAY HAVE TO IMPACT OUR
DECISION MAKING ON OUR MOTION
PLEA.
BUT OUTSIDE OF THAT, I'M
AVAILABLE FOR ANY FURTHER
COMMENTS.
IF NOT, THANK YOU VERY MUCH, AND
WE'LL AWAIT YOUR DECISION.
>> I HAVE JUST ONE COMMENT.
AND I APPRECIATE YOUR SERVICE.
AS THE SENIOR MEMBER OF THE
COURT, I JUST WANTED TO TAKE A
MOMENT TO SAY THAT THIS IS CHIEF
JUSTICE CANADY'S LAST ORAL
ARGUMENT AS CHIEF JUSTICE, AND
WE WILL BE TURNING THE GAVEL
OVER TO JUSTICE POLSTON.
FOR THE LAST TWO YEARS, CHIEF
JUSTICE CANADY HAS SERVED NOT
ONLY THIS COURT, BUT THE STATE
IN AN ADMIRABLE WAY, AND WE ON
THE COURT WILL MISS THAT
LEADERSHIP, BUT WE KNOW WE'LL BE
IN GOOD HANDS.
SO I WANTED TO JUST MAKE SURE WE
REFLECTED ON THAT TODAY, AND
THANK YOU.
>> CONGRATULATIONS, CHIEF.
>> WE THANK YOU --
[APPLAUSE]
THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
I APPRECIATE THAT.
THAT IS VERY KIND OF YOU.
WE APPRECIATE YOUR ARGUMENT HERE
TODAY AND YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO
OUR CONSIDERATION OF THESE
MATTERS.
COURT IS NOW ADJOURNED.
STAY TUNED.
>> ALL RISE.