

State of Florida v. Larry Donell Goodman

Case No. 2007-CF-48580

August 17–18, 2026 Jury Proceedings

I. Purpose of This Summary

The August 17–18, 2026 proceedings in *State of Florida v. Larry Donell Goodman*, Case No. 2007-CF-48580, demonstrate that the court convened a jury proceeding concerning matters arising from Mr. Goodman’s prior conviction and the habitual felony offender issues associated with his case.

The transcript is particularly significant because the court and counsel expressly addressed the scope of what the jury was being asked to determine, the relationship between the 2008 conviction and the underlying offense, the offense date, the State’s burden, and the admission and use of prior-conviction evidence.

The record therefore provides a basis for examining the proceeding as an **ad-hoc jury proceeding**—that is, a jury proceeding occurring in the context of a later sentencing/resentencing matter rather than an ordinary initial criminal trial.

II. The Record Confirms That a Jury Proceeding Was Convened

At the beginning of the August 17 proceeding, the court identified the matter as:

“case number 2007-CF-48580, State versus Larry Donell Goodman.”

Mr. Goodman was sworn before the court, and the court then proceeded to address the jury instructions and the matters that would be presented to the jury.

The court specifically discussed preliminary and final jury instructions, the presentation of evidence, opening statements, closing arguments, and the jury’s consideration of the case.

The following day, the court and counsel continued addressing the proposed jury instructions and evidence, including the prior conviction and fingerprint evidence that the State intended to present.

Thus, the transcript itself documents that this was not merely a conventional sentencing hearing. A jury was being utilized in connection with the proceeding.

III. The Central Dispute: What Was the Jury Required to Find?

One of the most important portions of the record concerns the **date of the underlying offense**.

Defense counsel made what the transcript describes as a strenuous objection to the proposed “Statement of the Charge.” The defense position was that the date of the offense was an element that the jury was required to determine.

Counsel specifically argued that removing the offense date from the jury’s determination would take an issue out of the jury’s province and would relieve the State of its burden of proof.

The State took the contrary position. The prosecutor argued that Mr. Goodman had already been convicted by a jury in 2008 and that the date of the offense was therefore inherent in that prior conviction.

The judge acknowledged the uncertainty surrounding the issue and stated that she tended to agree with the State “at least at this juncture,” while recognizing that additional guidance from a higher court could alter the issue.

Defense counsel expressly maintained the objection for purposes of preserving the issue for review.

IV. The Record Shows an Explicit Concern About the Jury’s Province

The defense objection is significant because counsel did not merely disagree with wording.

Counsel expressly characterized the issue as a **jury finding** and argued that altering the instruction could improperly remove a factual determination from the jury while simultaneously relieving the State of its burden to prove the relevant fact.

The court subsequently acknowledged that the matter involved uncertainty and that the defense objection was preserved for potential review by a higher court.

This creates a clearly identifiable appellate issue concerning:

1. What factual questions were properly submitted to the jury;
2. What facts had already been established by the 2008 conviction;
3. What facts the State was required to prove in the 2026 proceeding;
4. Whether the jury was being asked to make an independent factual determination; and
5. Whether the jury instructions accurately defined the jury’s role.

V. The 2008 Conviction Was Being Used as Part of the 2026 Jury Proceeding

The State specifically relied upon Mr. Goodman's prior conviction.

The prosecutor represented that Mr. Goodman had previously been found guilty by a jury in 2008 and argued that the underlying offense date was already established through that conviction.

On August 18, the State identified documents it intended to use, including a copy of the prior conviction, an order concerning judicial notice of a fingerprint card, and the fingerprint card itself.

The court also recognized that questions could arise concerning the use of those documents and whether judicial notice alone would cause a document to become an exhibit available to the jury during deliberations.

The court distinguished judicial notice from the physical admission of an exhibit, stating that judicial notice concerns matters such as authenticity or admissibility, while an exhibit intended to go into the jury room would require admission.

VI. The Proceeding Was Structured Around a Limited Jury Function

The transcript indicates that the court was not simply conducting a conventional criminal trial from beginning to end.

The court contemplated preliminary instructions, opening statements, presentation of evidence, final instructions, and closing arguments, while simultaneously dealing with issues tied to the already-existing conviction and habitual-felony-offender findings.

The State's proposed instruction itself expressly referenced the fact that Mr. Goodman had been found guilty on March 21, 2008, of home-invasion robbery in Case No. 2007-CF-48580, while also identifying the underlying offense date.

That structure is important because it demonstrates that the 2026 jury proceeding was occurring against the background of an already-existing conviction rather than functioning as a completely new prosecution.

VII. Continuous Objection Was Preserved

The transcript further reflects that defense counsel sought to preserve objections throughout the proceeding.

Before the jury was brought in, defense counsel stated:

“defense offers continuous objection”

concerning the issue being submitted to the jury.

The defense subsequently renewed its objection to the State’s proposed language concerning the previously established offense date.

Accordingly, the record contains multiple indications that the defense was attempting to preserve the disputed jury-instruction and jury-function issues rather than acquiescing in the court’s approach.

VIII. The Jury Instructions Were a Material Part of the Proceeding

The court and counsel devoted substantial attention to the jury instructions.

The court reviewed the instructions page-by-page and asked counsel whether there were objections.

The court later explained that the preliminary instructions would be given before opening statements and that the final instructions would be reviewed before closing arguments.

The court also stated that jurors would not receive written copies of the instructions until deliberations because the court did not want them distracted from the evidence and arguments.

The file’s analysis accordingly identifies jury instructions, the offense date, evidentiary issues, and the jury’s role as the principal legal issues reflected in the August 17–18 record.

IX. Significance to an Ad-Hoc Jury Argument

The transcript provides several facts that can be used to characterize the proceeding as an **ad-hoc jury proceeding arising within Mr. Goodman’s post-conviction/resentencing history**:

A. The underlying conviction already existed.

The State repeatedly relied upon the 2008 jury conviction rather than treating the 2026 proceeding as a prosecution of a new offense.

B. The jury was nevertheless being asked to perform a defined factual function.

The dispute over the offense date demonstrates that the parties and court were actively determining what factual matter belonged before the jury.

C. The State was preparing prior-conviction evidence.

The State identified the prior conviction and fingerprint documentation as materials it intended to use during the proceeding.

D. The court was exercising ordinary trial-management functions.

The record contains jury instructions, preliminary instructions, opening statements, evidence, closing arguments, exhibits, objections, and deliberation-related procedures.

E. The defense preserved objections to the scope of the jury's factual role.

Defense counsel repeatedly objected to the proposed treatment of the offense date and expressly sought to preserve the issue for higher-court review.

X. Issues the Record Potentially Preserves for Further Review

Based solely on the uploaded transcript, the August 17–18 record appears to preserve questions concerning:

1. **The precise purpose of the 2026 jury proceeding;**
2. **The factual issues properly submitted to the jury;**
3. **Whether the offense date was properly treated as already established rather than submitted for a new jury determination;**
4. **The extent to which the State remained responsible for proving facts relevant to the proceeding;**
5. **The distinction between the 2008 conviction and the factual determinations being made in 2026;**
6. **The proper use of judicial notice concerning prior conviction and fingerprint records;**
7. **Whether documents judicially noticed were properly admitted as exhibits for jury consideration; and**
8. **Whether the jury instructions accurately defined the limited function assigned to the jury.**

The transcript itself does not resolve these legal questions. Instead, it documents the parties' competing positions and the court's rulings and preserves the defense objections.

XI. Conclusion

The August 17–18, 2026 transcript establishes that the court convened a jury proceeding in *State of Florida v. Larry Donell Goodman*, Case No. 2007-CF-48580, involving issues arising from Mr. Goodman’s prior 2008 conviction and habitual-felony-offender proceedings.

The record is particularly important because the parties disputed the precise factual role of the jury. Defense counsel argued that the offense date was a matter for the jury and that removing it from the jury’s consideration could improperly affect the State’s burden of proof. The State argued that the prior conviction had already established the relevant facts. The court tentatively accepted the State’s position while expressly acknowledging uncertainty and preserving the defense objection for higher-court review.

Consequently, the August 17–18 proceedings provide a concrete record from which to examine the **nature, scope, and legal authority of the ad-hoc jury proceeding**, including what factual findings the jury was authorized to make and what facts the State was required to establish.