

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SUPREME COURT

APPEAL FROM FLORENCE COUNTY
George M. McFaddin, Jr., Per Judge

C/A No. 2021-001329

TAMARQUIS ANTOUAIN WINGATE, # 3150216

APPELLANT,

v.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT.

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT
OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED
PRO SE; AND EXTENSION OF TIME

RECEIVED

JUL 29 2022

S.C. SUPREME COURT

DEAR CLERK HOWARD:

THIS IS A PRO SE CORRESPONDENCE
BY THE NAMED APPELLANT/PETITIONER, TAMARQUIS
ANTOUAIN WINGATE, REQUESTING THE COURT'S COOP-
ERATION AND ITS WILLFUL PROFESSIONALISM IN THAT

1/4 Faw

This Memorandum in Support AND ITS ATTACHED SUBSTANTIVE DOCUMENTS (LISTED IN CAPTION) BE SO FILED.

THE FOLLOWING CASE THROUGH (FORMER) APPELLATE DEFENDER HAVE RESPECTFULLY REQUESTED AND RECEIVED (3) EXTENSIONS OF TIME (3/28/2022), (4/27/22), (5/27/22) THUS FAR; INCLUDING THE FILING OF MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL, AND FOR THE COURT TO APPOINT AN OUTSIDE COUNSEL, (JUNE 16, 2022), AND WAS GRANTED, (JUNE 28, 2022), BECAUSE CONFLICT OF INTEREST CAUSES DID HOWEVER EXISTED.

HENCEFORTH, THE APPELLANT DO EXPRESS THAT THE PRO SE DOCUMENTS ARE APPROPRIATE FOR CONSIDERATION BY THIS COURT, AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED AS "HYBRID REPRESENTATION". THIS SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM AND ITS ATTACHMENTS ARE NOT NULL, AND THE FILING OF SUCH IS PROPER AND SHOULD BE ACCEPTED AND BE RULED UPON.

THE APPELLANT DID NOT KNOW OR NO COUNSEL OR COURT NOTIFIED (HIM) OF ANY REQUESTS MADE FOR WITHDRAWAL, ITS REASONS OR AN APPOINTMENT OF ANY NEW COUNSEL. IN CRITICAL COURT SITUATIONS SUCH AS THIS, MR. WINGATE SHOULD HAVE BEEN AT LEAST BROUGHT TO THIS DECISION BY ANYBODY.

2/4/22

THE APPELLANT'S FAMILY EXPLAINED THESE ACTIONS MADE WITHOUT HIS NOTICE. CLEARLY SHOWS IMPROPER COURT PROCEEDINGS PERHAPS. HOWEVER, (FORMER), APPELLATE DEFENDER SARAH E. SHIRE, DOES HAVE A JUSTIFIABLE CAUSE AND THE APPELLATE AGREES FOR (SHIRE'S) WITHDRAWAL, AND THAT SHE NOT BE OBLIGATED TO ACTIVELY FILE ANY MORE DOCUMENTS/FILINGS ON WINGATE'S BEHALF. APPELLANT DID AGREE WITH (SHIRE'S) WITHDRAWAL, BUT ONLY ON THE PART OF (HER) BEING RELIEVED FROM REPRESENTING WINGATE ON THIS CASE. WINGATE DO NOT AGREE WITH THE APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL AT ALL. NOT TO MENTIONED COUNSELOR JONATHAN D. WALLER, (FORMER-PCR), WHO TO THIS DAY HAVE NOT RESPONDED TO WINGATE'S REQUEST FOR HIS CASE FILE DATED: (4/19/22) AND WHO DID NOT FILE AN "AMENDED PCR APPLICATION" NOR A 59(e) MOTION WHEN THE PCR JUDGE DID NOT ISSUE LAWS; FACTS, AND/OR CONCLUSIONS TO ALL CLAIMS. THE APPELLANT USED TO EMPHASIZE TO THE COURT AND TO EVERYONE INVOLVED, TO CLARIFY AS CLEAR AS POSSIBLE, THAT THE DIRECT APPEAL OF WINGATE'S IN THE COURT OF APPEALS WAS "DISMISSED", NOT "AFFIRMED."

IT'S VERY DISTURBING TO CONTINUALLY TO VIEW CRITICAL ERRORS SUCH AS "THIS" IN THE RECORD AT LEAST (3) TIMES.

WHEREFORE, THE APPELLANT STATES THAT HE WAS NOT AWARE OR ANY ATTENTION OF ANY MATTER WAS BROUGHT TO HIM ABOUT THE MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL NOR THE APPOINTMENT OF COUNSELOR JONATHAN D. WALLER.

~~UNTI 7/26/2022 VIA TELEPHONE CONFERENCE~~
PLEASE BE SO KIND TO ENTERTAIN THIS MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED PRO SE, AND A MOTION FOR AN ENLARGEMENT OF TIME.

THANKS IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR TIME AND ESPECIALLY YOUR UNDERSTANDING IN THIS AND ALL OTHER MATTERS ON WINGARD'S BEHALF!

Signed this 26th Day
of July, 2022

Respectfully Submitted
Arturim Wheat
Tamarius A. Wheat
SCC# 315016 ~~Lee C. F.~~
990 Wisnoky Highway
Bishopville, S.C. 29010

cc: Atty Gen ofc (Barlow)
S.C. SUP. Court (Howard)
Angell Mabony (Waller)

4/14

RECEIVED

JUL 29 2022

S.C. SUPREME COURT