

THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA

Derrick Grantley v. The State of Florida

No. 3D24-0910 · No. 3D24-0910 · Decided July 30, 2025

SUMMARY

The Third District Court of Appeal of Florida affirmed the circuit court’s ruling in Derrick Grantley’s appeal. The court cited authorities addressing abusive, repetitive, or frivolous pro se post-conviction filings and the prohibition of further pro se filings.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Third District Court of Appeal of Florida
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Fernandez; Lindsey; Miller
JURISDICTION	Third District Court of Appeal of Florida
DECIDED	July 30, 2025
DOCKET	3D24-0910
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County in a post-conviction criminal matter.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	Derrick Grantley v. The State of Florida

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal procedure
- post-conviction relief
- appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the circuit court's ruling in Grantley's post-conviction proceedings should be affirmed in light of his repeated pro se challenges to his judgments and sentence.

HOLDINGS

1. The court affirmed the circuit court's ruling, relying on established Florida precedent that repeated, abusive, or frivolous pro se challenges to a defendant's judgments or sentence may constitute an abuse of the judicial or post-conviction process and justify barring further pro se filings.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“After repeated denials of multiple, successive filings, there comes a point where ‘enough is enough.’” (at 2)

“We do not take the action of barring a defendant from further pro se pleadings lightly. However, [e]nough is enough.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion concerns Grantley's repeated pro se filings challenging his judgments and sentence. The court relied on precedent addressing abusive, repetitive, malicious, or frivolous post-conviction filings and restrictions on further pro se pleadings.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Grantley appealed the circuit court's ruling in lower tribunal cases F98-3144B and F98-5013. The Third District affirmed, citing Florida decisions permitting restrictions on repetitive, abusive, or frivolous pro se post-conviction filings.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. State, 915 So. 2d 682, 684 (Fla. 3d DCA 2005)
- Isley v. State, 652 So. 2d 409, 410-11 (Fla. 5th DCA 1995)
- Horvatt v. State, 325 So. 3d 91, 92-93 (Fla. 5th DCA 2019)
- Wimberly v. State, 50 So. 3d 785, 786-88 (Fla. 4th DCA 2010)
- Proctor v. State, 869 So. 2d 752, 753 (Fla. 5th DCA 2004)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

Third District Court of Appeal State of Florida Opinion filed July 30, 2025. Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing. _____ No. 3D24-0910 Lower Tribunal Nos. F98-3144B & F98-5013 _____ Derrick Grantley, Appellant, vs. The State of Florida, Appellee. An Appeal from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County, Milton Hirsch, Judge.

Derrick Grantley, in proper person. James Uthmeier, Attorney General, and Yolande M. Samerson, Assistant Attorney General, for appellee. Before FERNANDEZ, LINDSEY, and MILLER, JJ. PER CURIAM. Affirmed. See *Johnson v. State*, 915 So. 2d 682, 684 (Fla. 3d DCA 2005) (“After repeated denials of multiple, successive filings, there comes a point where ‘enough is enough.’ Based upon careful review of defendant’s filings in this court, we conclude that defendant has reached that point.”) (quoting *Isley v. State*, 652 So.

2d 409, 410–11 (Fla. 5th DCA 1995)) (citation omitted); *Horvatt v. State*, 325 So. 3d 91, 92–93 (Fla. 5th DCA 2019) (barring the defendant from further pro se filings after finding “apparent abuse of the legal process by... abusive, repetitive, malicious, or frivolous pro se filings attacking his sentence”); *Wimberly v. State*, 50 So. 3d 785, 786–88 (Fla. 4th DCA 2010) (finding an “abuse of the post-conviction process” and “prohibiting further pro se filings” following “a campaign of filing motions for post-conviction relief” and one belated appeal even though not all claims were “identical”); *Proctor v. State*, 869 So.

2d 752, 753 (Fla. 5th DCA 2004) (“We do not take the action of barring a defendant from further pro se pleadings lightly. However, [e]nough is enough. Finding no merit in [the defendant]’s numerous filings, we must hold that his successive challenges to his judgments and sentence constitute an abuse of the judicial system.”) (quotation marks and citation omitted).