

THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA

Isiah Rashad Moore v. State of Florida

No. 3D25-0237 · No. No. 3D25-0237 · Decided June 24, 2026

SUMMARY

The Florida Third District Court of Appeal affirmed Isiah Rashad Moore’s judgment and conviction for armed carjacking and possession of a firearm by a convicted felon. The court held that the challenged testimony regarding general criminal behavior was relevant, that any unfair-prejudice objection was unpreserved, and that the testimony did not constitute fundamental error. The court also affirmed without further elaboration the rulings concerning cross-examination of the victim and the requested good-faith-belief instruction.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Third District Court of Appeal of Florida
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Lindsey, J.; Lobree, J.; Gooden, J.
JURISDICTION	Florida Third District Court of Appeal
DECIDED	June 24, 2026
DOCKET	No. 3D25-0237
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Moore appealed his judgment and convictions for armed carjacking and possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, including the resulting mandatory life sentence imposed after a prison release reoffender proceeding.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Evidentiary rulings are reviewed for abuse of discretion. Whether an error is fundamental is a question of law reviewed de novo. Unpreserved unfair-prejudice claims are reviewed for fundamental error.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published
PARTIES	Isiah Rashad Moore v. State of Florida

TOPICS

- relevance
- evidence
- preservation of error
- standard of review
- criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal law

criminal procedure

evidence

appellate practice

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court erred by overruling Moore's relevance objection to testimony comparing his conduct with the conduct of other people who stole vehicles without altering the license plate.
2. Whether admission of the challenged testimony constituted fundamental error because its prejudicial effect allegedly invited the jury to infer guilt from general criminal behavior.
3. Whether the trial court erred by limiting cross-examination of the victim concerning the victim's probationary status.
4. Whether the trial court erred by denying Moore's requested instruction on the good-faith-belief defense.

HOLDINGS

1. Testimony comparing Moore's conduct with the conduct of other vehicle thieves could be relevant because it tended to address the defense theory that a guilty carjacker would not drive a stolen vehicle with an unaltered license plate. The defense's opening statement opened the door to the testimony, and the relevance objection was properly overruled.
2. Any unfair-prejudice objection was not preserved because Moore objected only on relevance grounds. Reviewing for fundamental error, the court found none because the testimony was admitted to counter the defense theory and the State presented substantial additional evidence of guilt.
3. The trial court's ruling denying the challenged cross-examination was affirmed without further elaboration.
4. The denial of the requested good-faith-belief defense instruction was affirmed without further elaboration.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"In this connection, testimony regarding general criminal behavior comparing similar acts to the charged offense can be relevant because it tends to prove guilt." (at 5)

"When such testimony is excluded, it's excluded on grounds of prejudice, not relevance." (at 5)

"As an evidentiary principle, the concept of 'opening the door' allows the admission of otherwise inadmissible testimony to 'qualify, explain, or limit' testimony or evidence previously admitted." (at 6)

"Given the totality of the State's evidence to establish guilt, we can find no fundamental error." (at 7)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On November 15, 2023, a man armed with a gun approached Muller Tercier, demanded his car keys, and took Tercier's vehicle with the assistance of a second armed man. Approximately thirty-two hours later, Trooper Hernandez located the vehicle through its license plate and a BOLO and stopped it while Moore was driving. Tercier later identified Moore as the perpetrator from a photo lineup and in court. Moore was convicted of armed

carjacking, and the jury found the offense qualified for prison release reoffender treatment, resulting in a mandatory life sentence.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Moore was charged with armed carjacking and possession of a firearm by a convicted felon. He was found guilty of armed carjacking, and a subsequent proceeding determined that the offense was committed within three years of his release from county detention, resulting in a mandatory life sentence. He appealed, arguing that the trial court improperly admitted testimony concerning general criminal behavior, restricted cross-examination concerning the victim's probationary status, and denied a requested good-faith-belief instruction. The Third District affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Morris v. State, 233 So. 3d 438, 446 (Fla. 2018)
- State v. Smith, 241 So. 3d 53, 55 (Fla. 2018)
- Burton v. State, 237 So. 3d 1138, 1141-43 (Fla. 3d DCA 2018)
- Hayes v. State, 276 So. 3d 950, 953 (Fla. 3d DCA 2019)
- J.B. v. State, 705 So. 2d 1376, 1378 (Fla. 1998)
- Rodriguez v. State, 753 So. 2d 29, 42 (Fla. 2000)
- Tompkins v. State, 502 So. 2d 415, 419 (Fla. 1986)
- Lowder v. State, 589 So. 2d 933, 935 (Fla. 3d DCA 1991)