

DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA, THIRD DISTRICT

Moises Abraham Jaime v. State of Florida

No. 3D23-2020 · No. No. 3D23-2020 · Decided July 23, 2025

SUMMARY

The Florida Third District Court of Appeal affirmed Moises Abraham Jaime’s criminal conviction. The court held that the evidence was sufficient to support the conviction and to overcome the motion for judgment of acquittal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	District Court of Appeal of Florida, Third District
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Emas; Miller; Bokor
JURISDICTION	Florida Third District Court of Appeal
DECIDED	July 23, 2025
DOCKET	No. 3D23-2020
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from a criminal judgment of conviction entered by the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County, including the denial of a motion for judgment of acquittal.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Whether the evidence, viewed in the light most favorable to the State, was sufficient for a rational trier of fact to find the elements of the charged crime beyond a reasonable doubt; the standard applies even when the State's evidence is purely circumstantial.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published opinion
PARTIES	Moises Abraham Jaime v. The State of Florida

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- standard of review
- evidence
- criminal procedure
- reasonable doubt

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal law
- appellate practice
- evidence

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the evidence was legally sufficient to sustain Jaime's conviction and to overcome his motion for judgment of acquittal.
2. Whether the sufficiency-of-the-evidence standard changes when the State's proof is purely circumstantial.

HOLDINGS

1. A conviction may be sustained when, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the State, a rational trier of fact could find the elements of the charged crime beyond a reasonable doubt; the court affirmed the judgment.
2. The same standard of appellate review applies regardless of whether the State presented purely circumstantial evidence of guilt.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“There is sufficient evidence to sustain a conviction if, after viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the State, a rational trier of fact could find the existence of the elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt.” (at 2)

“This standard of appellate review applies regardless of whether, at trial, the State presented only purely circumstantial evidence of guilt as to the charge crime.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion provides no detailed account of the underlying offense or trial evidence. It reflects that Jaime challenged the sufficiency of the evidence supporting his conviction and that the appeal involved the denial of a motion for judgment of acquittal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Jaime appealed from the Miami-Dade County circuit court. The Third District Court of Appeal affirmed in a per curiam decision, relying on Florida precedent concerning sufficiency of the evidence and review of a motion for judgment of acquittal.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Johnston v. State, 863 So. 2d 271, 283 (Fla. 2003)
- Garcia v. State, 373 So. 3d 1213, 1222 (Fla. 3d DCA), review denied, No. SC2023-0668, 2023 WL 6389749 (Fla. Sept. 29, 2023)
- State v. Shearod, 992 So. 2d 900, 904 (Fla. 2d DCA 2008)
- Scott v. State, 330 So. 3d 562, 563 (Fla. 4th DCA 2021)

- Godbolt v. State, 319 So. 3d 773, 777 (Fla. 1st DCA 2021)

OPINION

Moises Abraham Jaime v. the State of Florida

PER CURIAM.

Third District Court of Appeal State of Florida Opinion filed July 23, 2025. Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing. _____ No. 3D23-2020 Lower Tribunal No. F22-9421 _____ Moises Abraham Jaime, Appellant, vs. The State of Florida, Appellee. An Appeal from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County, Carmen Cabarga, Judge. Carlos J. Martinez, Public Defender, and Amy Weber, Assistant Public Defender, for appellant. James Uthmeier, Attorney General, and Ivy R. Ginsberg, Assistant Attorney General, for appellee. Before EMAS, MILLER, and BOKOR, JJ. PER CURIAM. Affirmed. See Johnston v. State, 863 So. 2d 271, 283 (Fla. 2003) (“There is sufficient evidence to sustain a conviction if, after viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the State, a rational trier of fact could find the existence of the elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt.”); Garcia v. State, 373 So. 3d 1213, 1222 (Fla. 3d DCA) (“This standard of appellate review applies regardless of whether, at trial, the State presented only purely circumstantial evidence of guilt as to the charge crime.”), review denied, No. SC2023-0668, 2023 WL 6389749 (Fla. Sept. 29, 2023); State v. Shearod, 992 So. 2d 900, 904 (Fla. 2d DCA 2008) (“The State met its threshold burden of producing evidence on every element of the crime charged, overcoming the motion for judgment of acquittal and permitting the questions of credibility to be resolved by the jury.”); Scott v. State, 330 So. 3d 562, 563 (Fla. 4th DCA 2021) (holding there was competent, substantial evidence to “overcome appellant’s motion for judgment of acquittal” because the “State put the evidence together like pieces of a puzzle, not by a stacking of inferences”); Godbolt v. State, 319 So. 3d 773, 777 (Fla. 1st DCA 2021) (“Because the victim did not totally repudiate her pretrial statements—which the trial court determined carried the requisite safeguards of reliability for admission as substantive evidence—we cannot say that the evidence was insufficient to show that a crime was committed at all.”). 2