

FLORIDA THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL

Gregory Thomas v. State of Florida

Thomas · No. 3D24-1977 · Decided July 16, 2025

SUMMARY

The Third District Court of Appeal of Florida affirmed an order striking Gregory Thomas’s motion for clarification. The court relied on the supplemental record showing that Thomas had previously been prohibited from filing further pleadings in a self-represented capacity in the trial court.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Florida Third District Court of Appeal
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per curiam; Emas; Fernandez; Miller
JURISDICTION	Florida Third District Court of Appeal
DECIDED	July 16, 2025
DOCKET	3D24-1977
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from an order of the Miami-Dade County Circuit Court striking Thomas's motion for clarification.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published opinion
PARTIES	Gregory Thomas v. The State of Florida

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal procedure
- post-conviction relief
- appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the trial court properly struck Thomas's motion for clarification after previously prohibiting him from filing further pleadings in a self-represented capacity.

HOLDINGS

1. The order striking Thomas's motion for clarification is affirmed because the supplemental record showed that Thomas had previously been prohibited from filing further pleadings in a self-represented capacity in the trial court.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“multiple post-conviction motions” and “abus[e] [of] the judicial process by his successive attacks upon his conviction and sentence” (slip op. at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Thomas appealed after the trial court struck his motion for clarification. The supplemental record established that he had previously been barred from filing any further pleadings pro se in the trial court. The appellate court relied on that prior restriction in affirming the order striking the motion.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Thomas filed a motion for clarification in the trial court while proceeding pro se. The circuit court struck the motion, and Thomas appealed. The supplemental record showed that Thomas had previously been prohibited from filing further pleadings in a self-represented capacity in the trial court.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Mobley v. State, 976 So. 2d 1146, 1147 (Fla. 5th DCA 2008)