

Re: Letter response Heydwin v. State
2022-001277

RECEIVED

OCT 05 2022

Dear Clerk,

I respectfully request that
my Notice of Appeal and 243(c)
explanation will show that my
pleadings should be construed liberally
and not held to lawyers standards.

The reason why such a prohibition
should not be imposed on future filings
is because the Due Process Clause of
the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Const.
protects citizens against state claims
when the U.S. Supreme Court enunciates a
rule is binding upon state courts through
the Supremacy Clause. *Henry v. City of Rock
Hill*, 376 U.S. 776, 84 S. Ct. 1045. See also
Keeler v. Mauney, 500 S. Ct. 123
My claim is a 6th Amendment violation,
that should and need to be addressed by
the S.C. Supreme Court

Robert Heydman Q4B201
#330872 Perry Correctional Institution
430 OAKLAWN RD.
PELZER S.C. 29669-870499



US POSTAGETM PITNEY BOWES



ZIP 29210 \$ 000.57⁰
02 4W
0000378725 OCT. 03. 2022

RECEIVED

SEP 30 2022


PCI MAILROOM

LEGAL MAIL

The Supreme Court of South Carolina
PATRICIA A. HOWARD, CLERK of COURT
Post office BOX 11330

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA, 29211

2921131330 BOSS



1 111111 111 111 111111 11 11 111111 11 11 11 111111

THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS HAS
NOT CENSORED THIS ITEM, THEREFORE,
THE DEPARTMENT DOES NOT ASSUME
RESPONSIBILITY FOR ITS WRITTEN CONTENTS.
S.C. DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS