

THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA

Rondell Lyles v. State of Florida

Lyles v. State · No. 3D24-1483 · Decided March 18, 2026

SUMMARY

The Third District Court of Appeal of Florida affirmed the circuit court’s resolution of Rondell Lyles’s claim under Strickland v. Washington. The court cited Florida authority concerning the mixed standard of review for ineffective-assistance claims and the admissibility of evidence inextricably intertwined with the charged crime.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Third District Court of Appeal of Florida
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Miller; Lobree; Gooden
JURISDICTION	Florida Third District Court of Appeal
DECIDED	March 18, 2026
DOCKET	3D24-1483
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County concerning the circuit court's resolution of a Strickland claim and an evidentiary issue.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A mixed standard applies to review of a circuit court's resolution of a Strickland claim: the appellate court defers to factual findings but reviews legal conclusions de novo.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published
PARTIES	Rondell Lyles v. State of Florida

TOPICS

- post-conviction relief
- ineffective assistance
- evidence
- appellate procedure
- standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal procedure
- post-conviction relief
- evidence
- appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the circuit court properly resolved Lyles's Strickland claim.

2. Whether evidence inextricably intertwined with the charged crime is admissible under section 90.402.

HOLDINGS

1. The court affirmed the circuit court's resolution of the Strickland claim.
2. Evidence that is inextricably intertwined with the charged crime is admissible under section 90.402 when it is relevant and inseparable from the act in issue and is necessary to adequately describe the deed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“When we review a circuit court’s resolution of a Strickland claim . . . we apply a mixed standard of review because both the performance and the prejudice prongs of the Strickland test present mixed questions of law and fact. We defer to the circuit court’s factual findings, but we review de novo the circuit court’s legal conclusions.” (at 2)

“[Evidence which is inextricably intertwined with the crime charged] is admissible under section 90.402 because ‘it is a relevant and inseparable part of the act which is in issue. . . [I]t is necessary to admit the evidence to adequately describe the deed.’” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion contains no substantive factual narrative. It indicates that the appeal involved a Strickland claim and the admissibility of evidence characterized as inextricably intertwined with the charged crime.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Rondell Lyles appealed from an order of the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County. The Third District Court of Appeal affirmed per curiam.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Sochor v. State, 883 So. 2d 766, 771–72 (Fla. 2004)
- Griffin v. State, 639 So. 2d 966, 968 (Fla. 1994)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

Third District Court of Appeal State of Florida Opinion filed March 18, 2026. Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing. _____ No. 3D24-1483 Lower Tribunal No. F18-16901 _____ Rondell Lyles, Appellant, vs. State of Florida, Appellee. An Appeal from the Circuit Court for Miami-Dade County, Christine Hernandez, Judge.

Carlos J. Martinez, Public Defender, and Deborah Prager, Assistant Public Defender, for appellant. James Uthmeier, Attorney General, and David Llanes, Assistant Attorney General, for appellee. Before MILLER, LOBREE and GOODEN, JJ. PER CURIAM. Affirmed. See *Sochor v. State*, 883 So. 2d 766, 771–72 (Fla. 2004) (“When we review a circuit court’s resolution of a Strickland claim... we apply a mixed standard of review because both the performance and the prejudice prongs of the Strickland test present mixed questions of law and fact.

We defer to the circuit court’s factual findings, but we review de novo the circuit court’s legal conclusions.” (citations omitted)); *Griffin v. State*, 639 So. 2d 966, 968 (Fla. 1994) (“[Evidence which is inextricably intertwined with the crime charged] is admissible under section 90.402 because ‘it is a relevant and inseparable part of the act which is in issue....

[I]t is necessary to admit the evidence to adequately describe the deed.’” (quoting Charles W. Ehrhardt, *Florida Evidence* § 404.17 (1993 ed))). 2