

FLORIDA THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL

Javares Maurice Kendrick v. State of Florida

Kendrick · No. 3D25-1811 · Decided December 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The Third District Court of Appeal of Florida denied Javares Maurice Kendrick’s petition for writ of prohibition in an original criminal proceeding. The court cited the substantial deference afforded to a trial court’s determination that a mistrial was a manifest necessity, particularly when based on potential jury prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Florida Third District Court of Appeal
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per Curiam; Fernandez; Gordo; Bokor
JURISDICTION	Florida Third District Court of Appeal
DECIDED	December 10, 2025
DOCKET	3D25-1811
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for writ of prohibition invoking the court's original jurisdiction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A trial court's determination that a mistrial was a manifest necessity receives great deference, particularly when the asserted grounds involve jury prejudice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published
PARTIES	Javares Maurice Kendrick v. State of Florida

TOPICS

- criminal procedure
- appellate procedure
- double jeopardy
- standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal procedure
- appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court's determination that a mistrial was a manifest necessity warranted extraordinary appellate intervention through a writ of prohibition.

HOLDINGS

1. A trial court's determination that a mistrial was a manifest necessity is entitled to great deference, especially when the grounds for the mistrial relate to jury prejudice; the petition for writ of prohibition was therefore denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“that mistrial was a manifest necessity deserves great deference,” (2)

“The interest in orderly, impartial procedure would be impaired if he were deterred from exercising that power by a concern that any time a reviewing court disagreed with his assessment of the trial situation a retrial would automatically be barred.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion concerns a trial court determination that a mistrial was justified by manifest necessity, apparently in connection with potential jury prejudice. The opinion does not describe the underlying events in further detail.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Kendrick petitioned the Third District Court of Appeal for a writ of prohibition concerning a trial court's determination that a mistrial was required by manifest necessity. The district court denied the petition.

DISPOSITION

writ_denied

CASES CITED

- Quinones v. State, 766 So. 2d 1165, 1172 n.9 (Fla. 3d DCA 2000)
- Clark v. State, 756 So. 2d 244, 246 (Fla. 5th DCA 2000)
- Arizona v. Washington, 434 U.S. 497, 513 (1978)

OPINION

Javares Maurice Kendrick v. State of Florida

PER CURIAM.

Third District Court of Appeal State of Florida Opinion filed December 10, 2025. Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing. _____ No. 3D25-1811 Lower Tribunal No. AFHMUJE _____ Javares Maurice Kendrick, Petitioner, vs. State of Florida, Respondent. A Case of Original Jurisdiction – Prohibition. Carlos J. Martinez, Public Defender, and Maria E. Lauredo, Chief Assistant Public Defender, for petitioner. James Uthmeier,

Attorney General, and Daniel Colmenares, Assistant Attorney General, for respondent. Before FERNANDEZ, GORDO and BOKOR, JJ. PER CURIAM. Denied. See *Quinones v. State*, 766 So. 2d 1165, 1172 n.9 (Fla. 3d DCA 2000) (explaining that a trial court’s determination “that mistrial was a manifest necessity deserves great deference,” especially when “the grounds for the mistrial relate to jury prejudice, for the trial judge is in a peculiarly good position to observe the jurors, the witnesses and the attorneys in order to evaluate the extent of the prejudice” (quoting *Clark v. State*, 756 So. 2d 244, 246 (Fla. 5th DCA 2000))); see also *Arizona v. Washington*, 434 U.S. 497, 513 (1978) (“[T]he trial judge must have the power to declare a mistrial in appropriate cases. The interest in orderly, impartial procedure would be impaired if he were deterred from exercising that power by a concern that any time a reviewing court disagreed with his assessment of the trial situation a retrial would automatically be barred.”). 2