

SIXTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA

Angel Daniel Caraballo v. State of Florida

Caraballo · No. 6D2024-0099 · Decided May 1, 2026

SUMMARY

The Sixth District Court of Appeal of Florida held that Angel Daniel Caraballo's life sentences on counts one and two were illegal because they did not state his parole eligibility. The court reversed the denial of his Florida Rule of Criminal Procedure 3.800(a) motion and remanded for ministerial corrections stating that he is eligible for parole after completing the 25-year mandatory minimum term.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Sixth District Court of Appeal of Florida
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per Curiam; Wozniak, J.; White, J.; Gannam, J.
JURISDICTION	Sixth District Court of Appeal of Florida
DECIDED	May 1, 2026
DOCKET	6D2024-0099
DISPOSITION	reversed_and_remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal under Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.141(b)(2) from an order of the Circuit Court for Osceola County denying a Florida Rule of Criminal Procedure 3.800(a) motion to correct illegal sentences.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published opinion; not final pending expiration or disposition of any timely motion for rehearing.
PARTIES	Angel Daniel Caraballo v. State of Florida

TOPICS

sentencing

sentence modification

post-conviction relief

criminal procedure

appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal procedure

post-conviction relief

sentencing

appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Caraballo's life sentences on counts one and two were illegal because they failed to state his eligibility for parole after completion of the twenty-five-year mandatory minimum term.

HOLDINGS

1. The life sentences on counts one and two were illegal to the extent they failed to state that Caraballo is eligible for parole after completing the twenty-five-year mandatory minimum term.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Therefore, we reverse the trial court’s order denying Caraballo’s motion and remand for the trial court to amend both the life sentence on count one and the life sentence on count two to state that Caraballo is eligible for parole after completing the 25-year mandatory minimum term.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Caraballo was serving life sentences on counts one and two, each subject to a twenty-five-year mandatory minimum term. The sentencing documents did not state that he was eligible for parole after completing that mandatory minimum term.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Caraballo moved under rule 3.800(a), arguing that his life sentences on counts one and two were illegal because they did not reflect his parole eligibility. The circuit court denied the motion. On appeal, the State conceded error, and the Sixth District Court of Appeal reversed and remanded with instructions to correct both sentences.

DISPOSITION

reversed_and_remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The trial court must amend the life sentence on count one and the life sentence on count two to state that Caraballo is eligible for parole after completing the twenty-five-year mandatory minimum term. Caraballo's presence is not required for these ministerial corrections.