

FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA

Quinton Marcus Reddick v. State of Florida

No. 1D2024-0612 (Fla. 1st DCA May 20, 2026) · No. 1D2024-0612 · Decided May 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The First District Court of Appeal of Florida, on rehearing, affirmed Quinton Marcus Reddick’s fifteen-year prison sentence for violating probation. The court rejected his arguments concerning suppression of evidence, an alleged error in the violation-of-probation affidavit, and prosecution costs, holding that the evidence supported the probation violations and that no due process violation occurred.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	First District Court of Appeal of Florida
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Robert E. Roberts; Ray; Kelsey
JURISDICTION	First District Court of Appeal of Florida
DECIDED	May 20, 2026
DOCKET	1D2024-0612
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Reddick appealed an Alachua County Circuit Court judgment finding him guilty of violating probation and sentencing him to fifteen years in prison. The appeal followed a prior appeal in which the district court reversed an order suppressing evidence related to the underlying criminal charges. On rehearing, the district court substituted this opinion for its prior opinion and affirmed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The opinion does not expressly identify a standard-of-review formulation. It reviewed the claimed due-process defect in the violation-of-probation affidavit and the mootness and legal-costs issues on appeal.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published opinion; precedential value subject to the opinion's stated finality notice.
PARTIES	Quinton Marcus Reddick v. State of Florida

TOPICS

probation

appellate procedure

mootness

suppression of evidence

criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal procedure

probation

appellate procedure

evidence

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Reddick's suppression arguments concerning evidence underlying the probation-violation charges remained justiciable after the district court reversed the suppression order in the related criminal case.
2. Whether an apparent scrivener's error in the amended violation-of-probation affidavit deprived Reddick of due process or prevented a finding that he violated special condition 29.
3. Whether the evidence supported a finding that Reddick violated special condition 29 and the standard condition requiring him to live without violating any law.
4. Whether the assessment of prosecution costs was permissible under current law.

HOLDINGS

1. Reddick's first two suppression arguments were moot because the district court had already reversed the suppression order in the related criminal case.
2. The apparent unintentional error in the amended violation-of-probation affidavit did not establish a due-process violation because the evidence supported the alleged violation, the parties understood the issue, and Reddick received full due process regarding the violations of the standard condition.
3. The probation violation was adequately supported by the evidence of a violation of special condition 29 and by the nine alleged violations of the standard condition requiring Reddick to live without violating any law.
4. Reddick's challenge to the prosecution costs failed under current Florida law.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“a VOP affidavit need only allege the basic facts and “need not be set forth with the specificity required in criminal indictments and informations”” (at 2)

“We grant rehearing in part and substitute the following opinion for the original one.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Reddick was placed on seven years of probation after a 2018 conviction, with conditions prohibiting violations of law and limiting internet access for romantic or sexual pleasure. In 2020, he was arrested and charged with offenses involving child pornography, and the State also alleged violations of the probation conditions. At the violation hearing, the State relied on one video, which Reddick conceded through counsel was child pornography; the circuit court found a probation violation and sentenced him to fifteen years in prison.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

In 2018, Reddick was convicted of traveling to meet a child for unlawful sexual activity and placed on probation. After his 2020 arrest on child-pornography charges, the State charged him with violating probation. Following an evidentiary hearing, the circuit court rejected his suppression and probation-affidavit arguments, found a violation, and imposed a fifteen-year prison sentence. The First District granted rehearing in part, substituted its opinion, and affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- State v. Reddick, 415 So. 3d 1185 (Fla. 1st DCA 2025)
- Hines v. State, 358 So. 2d 183, 185 (Fla. 1978)
- Parks v. State, 411 So. 3d 414 (Fla. 2025)

OPINION

Quinton Marcus Reddick v. State of Florida

PER CURIAM.

FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL

STATE OF FLORIDA

_____ No. 1D2024-0612 _____

QUINTON MARCUS REDDICK,

Appellant, v.

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Appellee. _____ On appeal from the Circuit Court for Alachua County. James M. Colaw, Judge. May 20, 2026

ON MOTION FOR REHEARING

We previously rendered our opinion affirming Appellant’s judgment and sentence. Appellant moved for rehearing, arguing among other things that the opinion’s references to his being on “sex-offender probation” were inaccurate. We grant rehearing in part and substitute the following opinion for the original one. Any other relief requested in the motion is denied. *** Appellant challenges his judgment and sentence of fifteen years in prison for violating his probation. We affirm. In 2018, an Alachua County jury found Reddick guilty of traveling to meet a child for unlawful sexual activity, a violation of section 847.0135(4)(a), Florida Statutes (2017). The judgment declared Reddick a sexual offender as defined in sections 943.0435, 944.606, and 944.607, Florida Statutes. The trial court sentenced Reddick to seven years of probation, subject to standard conditions including “you will live without violating any law.” The judgment required Reddick to undergo “psycho-sexual evaluation, follow rec[ommendation] for treatment.” The judgment also imposed special condition 29, that Reddick “can’t access computer or internet for

romantic/sexual pleasure.” Reddick transferred his probation to Leon County. In 2020, Reddick was arrested in Tallahassee for transmission of child pornography, and charged for that crime as well as seven counts of possession of child pornography and one count of possession with intent to promote child pornography. On appeal from an order suppressing evidence obtained in support of those charges, we reversed. See *State v. Reddick*, 415 So. 3d 1185 (Fla. 1st DCA 2025), rev. denied, 2025 WL 2399541 (Fla. Aug. 19, 2025). Based on those new charges, the State also charged Reddick with violating two conditions of his probation. Reddick moved to suppress the evidence that generated the new charges, mirroring his arguments in the Tallahassee case. He also argued that he could not be found guilty of violating special condition 29 of his probation as alleged in his original VOP affidavit, prohibiting accessing the internet for romantic or sexual pleasure—which the trial judge hand-wrote into his earlier judgment. He relied on an apparent scrivener’s error in the amended VOP affidavit, in which a successor probation officer indicated a violation of special condition 29 but used language from special condition 30, requiring a professional assessment and safety plan prior to accessing the internet. The Alachua County court conducted an evidentiary hearing. To avoid re-victimizing the minors depicted in Reddick’s child sex- abuse materials, the State proceeded with the VOP using only one of the videos, which Reddick, through counsel, conceded was child pornography. The court rejected Reddick’s arguments, found him 2 guilty of violating his probation, and sentenced him to fifteen years in prison. Reddick raises four issues on appeal, none of which has any merit. We reversed on the suppression issues in his earlier appeal, rendering moot his first two arguments. See *Reddick*, 415 So. 3d at 1192–95. His argument about the VOP affidavit fails also. In context, he cannot show a due process violation in what was apparently an unintentional mistake. The evidence supported a violation of special condition 29 and the record reflects both parties understood what was at issue. See *Hines v. State*, 358 So. 2d 183, 185 (Fla. 1978) (explaining a VOP affidavit need only allege the basic facts and “need not be set forth with the specificity required in criminal indictments and informations”). More importantly, the same VOP affidavit also relied on Reddick’s nine violations of the standard condition of living without violating the law, as to which Reddick clearly received full due process. His final argument about costs of prosecution fails under current law. See *Parks v. State*, 411 So. 3d 414 (Fla. 2025). AFFIRMED. ROBERTS, RAY, and KELSEY, JJ., concur.

_____ Not final until disposition of any timely and authorized motion under Fla. R. App. P. 9.330 or 9.331. _____ Jessica J. Yeary, Public Defender; Megan Lynne Long and David Alan Henson, Assistant Public Defenders, Tallahassee, for Appellant. James Uthmeier, Attorney General; and Robert Charles Lee, Assistant Attorney General, Tallahassee, for Appellee. 3