

FLORIDA THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL

Francisco Jose Revuelta v. State of Florida

Revuelta v. State · No. 3D24-2203 · Decided December 31, 2025

SUMMARY

The Third District Court of Appeal of Florida affirmed the judgment in Francisco Jose Revuelta's criminal appeal. The opinion addresses appellate review of the sufficiency of the evidence and the objective standard for stand-your-ground immunity, concluding that the verdict was supported by competent, substantial evidence.

OPINION

Francisco Jose Revuelta v. State of Florida

PER CURIAM.

Third District Court of Appeal State of Florida Opinion filed December 31, 2025. Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing. _____ No. 3D24-2203 Lower Tribunal No. B24-10867 _____ Francisco Jose Revuelta, Appellant, vs. State of Florida, Appellee. An Appeal from the County Court for Miami-Dade County, Jennifer L. Hochstadt Azar, Judge. Ronald I. Strauss, Esq., P.A., and Ronald I. Strauss, for appellant. James Uthmeier, Attorney General and Katryna Santa Cruz, Assistant Attorney General, for appellee. Before MILLER, LOBREE and BOKOR, JJ. PER CURIAM. Affirmed. See *Acosta v. State*, 399 So. 3d 1118, 1124 (Fla. 3d DCA 2024) (“When the defendant in a criminal appeal challenges the sufficiency of the State’s evidence, the appellate court conducts a de novo review of the trial record to ensure that the guilty verdict is supported by competent, substantial evidence regarding each element of the charged crime.” (quoting *Garcia v. State*, 373 So. 3d 1213, 1222 (Fla. 3d DCA 2023))); *Bush v. State*, 295 So. 3d 179, 200 (Fla. 2020) (“To apply this standard to a criminal case, an appellate court must ‘view[] the evidence in the light most favorable to the State’ and, maintaining this perspective, ask whether ‘a rational trier of fact could have found the existence of the elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt.’” (quoting *Rogers v. State*, 285 So. 3d 872, 891 (Fla. 2019))); *Mobley v. State*, 132 So. 3d 1160, 1164–65 (Fla. 3d DCA 2014) (“An objective standard is applied to determine whether the immunity provided by [the stand-your-ground] provisions attach.³ That standard requires the court to determine whether, based on circumstances as they appeared to the defendant when he or she acted, a reasonable and prudent person situated in the same circumstances and knowing what the defendant knew would have used the same force as did the defendant.” (citation omitted)); *Tibbs v. State*, 397 So. 2d 1120, 1123 (Fla. 1981) (noting appellate court should “not retry a case or reweigh conflicting evidence submitted to a jury

or other trier of fact” and must affirm if “all conflicts in the evidence and all reasonable 2 inferences therefrom have been resolved in favor of the verdict on appeal” and “there is substantial, competent evidence to support the verdict and judgment”). 3

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/florida-third-district-court-of-appeal/2025/francisco-jose-revuelta-v-state-of-florida-2uyui7e8>