

Third District Court of Appeal

State of Florida

Opinion filed May 20, 2026.
Not final until disposition of timely filed motion for rehearing.

No. 3D26-0690
Lower Tribunal No. F06-9999

Ramon Antonio Osorio,
Petitioner,

vs.

State of Florida,
Respondent.

A Case of Original Jurisdiction – Mandamus.

Ramon Antonio Osorio, in proper person.

James Uthmeier, Attorney General, and Richard Polin, Assistant Attorney General, for respondent.

Before SCALES, C.J., and MILLER and GOODEN, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Ramon Antonio Osorio petitions this Court for a writ of mandamus and seeks to compel the trial court to comply with our prior mandate in Osorio v. State, 34 So. 3d 98 (Fla. 3d DCA 2010). Finding no merit, we deny the petition. See Huffman v. State, 813 So. 2d 10, 11 (Fla. 2000) (“In order to be entitled to a writ of mandamus the petitioner must have a clear legal right to the requested relief, the respondent must have an indisputable legal duty to perform the requested action, and the petitioner must have no other adequate remedy available.”); Widner v. State, 429 So. 3d 678, 678 (Fla. 3d DCA 2026) (“And so there is no action for us to compel.”); Lee v. State, 425 So. 3d 701, 701 (Fla. 3d DCA 2025) (“Yet our records demonstrate that the trial court has fully complied with our mandate. . . . Since the trial court fully complied with our mandate, there is no action for us to compel.”); Cade v. State, 427 So. 3d 90, 90 (Fla. 3d DCA 2025) (“But the trial court entered a written order denying the motion in July 2025. Since the trial court did so, there is no action for us to compel.”).

Petition denied.