

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: HB 4157 District Courts of Appeal

SPONSOR(S): Stargel

TIED BILLS: None **IDEN./SIM. BILLS:** None

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR or BUDGET/POLICY CHIEF
1) Civil Justice Subcommittee	15 Y, 0 N	Caridad	Bond
2) Judiciary Committee	16 Y, 0 N	Caridad	Havlicak

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

Current law provides that three judges on a district court of appeal shall consider each case and that the concurrence of a majority shall be necessary to a decision. The Florida Constitution provides that three judges on a district court shall consider each case and the concurrence of two shall be necessary to a decision. The statute restates the constitutional provision. This bill repeals the redundant statute.

This bill does not appear to have a fiscal impact on state or local governments.

This bill has an effective date of July 1, 2012.

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Section 35.13, F.S., provides that three judges on a district court of appeal shall consider each case and that the concurrence of a majority shall be necessary to a decision. Article V, s. 4(a), Fla. Const., provides that three judges on a district court shall consider each case and the concurrence of two shall be necessary to a decision. Section 35.13, F.S., restates the constitutional provision. This bill repeals the redundant statute.

B. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1 repeals s. 35.13, F.S., relating to a quorum of a district court of appeal.

Section 2 provides an effective date of July 1, 2012.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

The bill does not appear to have any impact on state revenues.

2. Expenditures:

The bill does not appear to have any impact on state expenditures.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

The bill does not appear to have any impact on local government revenues.

2. Expenditures:

The bill does not appear to have any impact on local government expenditures.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

The bill does not appear to have any direct economic impact on the private sector.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

None.

III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

The bill does not appear to require counties or municipalities to take an action requiring the expenditure of funds, reduce the authority that counties or municipalities have to raise revenue in the aggregate, nor reduce the percentage of state tax shared with counties or municipalities.

2. Other:

The Office of the State Courts Administrator states: "Repeal of section 35.13 will have no impact on consideration of cases by district courts of appeal."

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

The bill does not appear to create a need for rulemaking or rulemaking authority.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

None.

IV. AMENDMENTS/ COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES

None.