

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.

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

