

DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA, THIRD DISTRICT

Douglas M. Lloyd v. State of Florida

No. 3D25-0029 · No. 3D25-0029 · Decided May 7, 2025

SUMMARY

The Florida Third District Court of Appeal dismissed Douglas M. Lloyd’s petition for writ of habeas corpus. The court concluded that the petition raised claims previously considered and rejected or otherwise procedurally barred, citing the petitioner’s history of successive collateral attacks.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	District Court of Appeal of Florida, Third District
WRITING FOR THE COURT	SCALES; LINDSEY; GORDO
JURISDICTION	Florida Third District Court of Appeal
DECIDED	May 7, 2025
DOCKET	3D25-0029
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for writ of habeas corpus invoking the court's original jurisdiction, challenging criminal convictions through successive collateral attacks.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published opinion
PARTIES	Douglas M. Lloyd v. The State of Florida

TOPICS

- habeas corpus
- successive petitions
- state post-conviction relief
- appellate procedure
- criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal procedure
- post-conviction relief
- habeas corpus
- appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the successive habeas petition should be dismissed because it raises claims previously considered and rejected or claims that are procedurally barred.

HOLDINGS

1. A successive habeas petition raising claims that have already been considered and rejected, or claims that are otherwise procedurally barred, must be dismissed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In the instant Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, Lloyd raises issues whose merits have been considered and rejected by this Court and others or are otherwise procedurally barred.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Douglas M. Lloyd has repeatedly challenged his criminal convictions through habeas and postconviction proceedings. His prior state and federal petitions and motions raised essentially the same grounds, and those claims had been considered and rejected or otherwise barred by procedural rules.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Lloyd filed successive habeas and postconviction challenges raising essentially the same grounds. This court had previously denied habeas petitions in 2005 and 2017 and affirmed denials of similar postconviction motions in 2007, 2015, 2020, and 2022; the Florida Supreme Court denied review of the 2005 ruling, and a federal court denied a later habeas petition. The court dismissed the present petition because the claims had previously been considered and rejected or were procedurally barred.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Lloyd v. McDonough, 935 So. 2d 122 (Fla. 2006)
- Lloyd v. McNeil, 08-21660-CIV, 2009 WL 2424576, at *5 (S.D. Fla. Aug. 5, 2009)
- Baker v. State, 878 So. 2d 1236 (Fla. 2004)

OPINION

Douglas M. Lloyd v. State of Florida

PER CURIAM.

Third District Court of Appeal State of Florida Opinion filed May 7, 2025. Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing. _____ No. 3D25-0029 Lower Tribunal No. F98-19062 A _____ Douglas M. Lloyd, Petitioner, vs. The State of Florida, Respondent. A Case of Original Jurisdiction – Habeas Corpus. Douglas M. Lloyd, in proper person. James Uthmeier, Attorney General, and Linda Katz, Assistant Attorney General, for respondent. Before SCALES, LINDSEY, and GORDO, JJ. PER CURIAM. Petitioner Douglas Lloyd has filed successive and repetitive collateral attacks on his criminal convictions on essentially the same grounds. This Court denied habeas petitions by this petitioner in 2005 and 2017. The Florida Supreme Court denied review of our 2005 ruling. Lloyd v. McDonough, 935

So. 2d 122 (Fla. 2006). This Court affirmed the denial of postconviction motions raising similar claims in 2007, 2015, 2020, and 2022. A federal court also denied a habeas petition by this petitioner after thorough consideration of each claim. See *Lloyd v. McNeil*, 08-21660-CIV, 2009 WL 2424576, at *5 (S.D. Fla. Aug. 5, 2009). In the instant Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, Lloyd raises issues whose merits have been considered and rejected by this Court and others or are otherwise procedurally barred. We therefore dismiss the Petition. See *Baker v. State*, 878 So. 2d 1236 (Fla. 2004). Dismissed. 2