

FLORIDA THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL

Juan Bridon v. The State of Florida

No. 3D24-0390 · No. 3D24-0390 · Decided April 9, 2025

SUMMARY

The Third District Court of Appeal of Florida affirmed Juan Bridon's conviction in an appeal from the Miami-Dade County Court. The court held that the motion for judgment of acquittal issue was preserved and cited authority concerning criminal intent requirements for public welfare offenses and mala prohibita crimes.

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

Third District Court of Appeal State of Florida Opinion filed April 9, 2025. Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing. No. 3D24-0390 Lower Tribunal No. B23-15795 Juan Bridon, Appellant, vs. The State of Florida, Appellee. An Appeal from the County Court for Miami-Dade County, Cristina Rivera Correa, Judge. Carlos J. Martinez, Public Defender, and Maria Lauredo, Chief Assistant Public Defender, for appellant.

James Uthmeier, Attorney General, and Daniel Colmenares, Assistant Attorney General, for appellee. Before EMAS, FERNANDEZ and MILLER, JJ. PER CURIAM. Affirmed. See *Morris v. State*, 721 So. 2d 725, 726-27 (Fla. 1998) (finding that a motion for judgment of acquittal can be made at the close of the State's evidence, and in order to preserve the issue for appeal, the defendant is not required to renew the motion after the defendant has presented evidence); *Morissette v. United States*, 342 U.S. 246, 255-56 (1952) (stating that a certain class of "public welfare offenses" do not require intent); *State v. Gruen*, 586 So.

2d 1280, 1281 (Fla. 3d DCA 1991) ("[C]rimes proscribing conduct not prohibited at common law or crimes 'mala prohibita', which usually result from neglect, do not require any criminal intent."). 2