

FLORIDA THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL

Jonnie Ravon v. State of Florida

No. 3D25-1206 · No. No. 3D25-1206 · Decided October 22, 2025

SUMMARY

The Third District Court of Appeal of Florida affirmed the summary denial of Jonnie Ravon's Florida Rule of Criminal Procedure 3.800(a) motion to correct an illegal sentence. The court held that the claim had previously been raised, rejected, and affirmed on appeal, and that successive post-conviction proceedings raising substantially similar claims were barred.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Florida Third District Court of Appeal
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Lindsey, J.; Gordo, J.; Gooden, J.
JURISDICTION	Florida Third District Court of Appeal
DECIDED	October 22, 2025
DOCKET	No. 3D25-1206
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from the summary denial of a Florida Rule of Criminal Procedure 3.800(a) motion to correct an illegal sentence.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The appellate court reviewed the summary denial of the Rule 3.800(a) motion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published Florida Third District Court of Appeal opinion
PARTIES	Jonnie Ravon v. State of Florida

TOPICS

- post-conviction relief
- state post-conviction relief
- appellate procedure
- criminal procedure
- sentence modification

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal procedure
- post-conviction relief
- appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the circuit court properly summarily denied Ravon's Rule 3.800(a) motion when the same sentencing issue had previously been adjudicated and affirmed on appeal.
2. Whether a successive postconviction motion raising the same or nearly identical claim may be denied under the law-of-the-case doctrine and principles governing successive postconviction proceedings.

HOLDINGS

1. A defendant may not raise the same or substantially similar claim in more than one postconviction motion when the claim was previously considered, rejected on the merits, and reviewed on appeal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“[T]he law of the case doctrine prevents a litigant from relitigating the same issues previously considered and rejected on the merits and reviewed on appeal.” (slip op. at 1)

“Finding that the issue raised before the lower tribunal was squarely adjudicated by way of a previously affirmed court order, and McGee has failed to demonstrate manifest injustice capable of determination from the face of the record, we affirm.” (slip op. at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Ravon sought correction of an allegedly illegal sentence through a Rule 3.800(a) motion. The opinion states that the same issue had been raised and ruled on in an earlier order entered on August 1, 2014, which the Third District affirmed in 2015.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Ravon filed a Rule 3.800(a) motion challenging his sentence. The circuit court summarily denied the motion, and the Third District Court of Appeal affirmed because the same issue had previously been raised, rejected, and affirmed on appeal.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Ravon v. State, 159 So. 3d 945, 945 (Fla. 3d DCA 2015)
- Swain v. State, 911 So. 2d 140, 143-44 (Fla. 3d DCA 2005)
- McGee v. State, 327 So. 3d 382, 383 (Fla. 3d DCA 2021)
- Butler v. State, 95 So. 3d 294, 295 (Fla. 3d DCA 2012)
- Hepburn v. State, 934 So. 2d 515 (Fla. 3d DCA 2005)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

Third District Court of Appeal State of Florida Opinion filed October 22, 2025. Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing. _____ No. 3D25-1206 Lower Tribunal No. F98-39479C _____ Jonnie Ravon, Appellant, vs. State of Florida, Appellee. An Appeal under Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.141(b)(2) from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County, Laura Maria González-Marqués, Judge.

Jonnie Ravon, in proper person. James Uthmeier, Attorney General, and David Llanes, Assistant Attorney General, for appellee. Before LINDSEY, GORDO, and GOODEN, JJ. LINDSEY, J. Appellant, Defendant below, Jonnie Ravon, appeals the summary denial of a Rule 3.800(a) Motion to Correct Illegal Sentence. This same issue was raised and ruled on below in an order entered on August 1, 2014, and our Court affirmed that order the following year.

See *Ravon v. State*, 159 So. 3d 945, 945 (Fla. 3d DCA 2015). Because defendants are not permitted to raise similar claims in more than one motion, we are constrained to affirm. See *Swain v. State*, 911 So. 2d 140, 143-44 (Fla. 3d DCA 2005) (“[T]he law of the case doctrine prevents a litigant from relitigating the same issues previously considered and rejected on the merits and reviewed on appeal.”); *McGee v. State*, 327 So.

3d 382, 383 (Fla. 3d DCA 2021) (“Finding that the issue raised before the lower tribunal was squarely adjudicated by way of a previously affirmed court order, and McGee has failed to demonstrate manifest injustice capable of determination from the face of the record, we affirm.”).

Moreover, successive postconviction proceedings raising claims nearly identical to claims previously rejected are properly denied. See *Butler v. State*, 95 So. 3d 294, 295 (Fla. 3d DCA 2012) (citing *Hepburn v. State*, 934 So. 2d 515 (Fla. 3d DCA 2005)); *McGee*, 327 So. 3d at 383. Affirmed. 2