

RECEIVED

JUN 05 2013

S.C. SUPREME COURT

Larry E. Hendricks
10 Faith Lane, C-1
Winnsboro, SC 29180

Supreme Court of South Carolina
Columbia, SC

Re: Sup. Ct. App. No. 2013-000813, Hendricks v. State.

May 31, 2013

Dear Sir or Madam,

I received notice that the above matter would require a written explanation that must be backed up by facts and court precedent. I would like an opportunity to give an explanation but I am currently confined at a county detention center and can not get to my legal material to give a proper response.

I do know that a decision came down in either January or February, that I believe stands on all fours with my argument for the use of Padilla versus Kentucky, but I don't have access to its specific points at this time. As such I ask the court to allow me a further extension, so that I can have an opportunity to protect my Due Process

Rights and offer The Court a proper explanation.

I would also like to bring to The Court's attention that this matter may be remanded based on the fact that I filed a motion of recusal against Judge L. Casey Manning's involvement in this Post Conviction matter because he was The sentencing Judge. It is my understanding, based on precedent, that a sentencing judge cannot hear Post-conviction matters. If that is so, and I had a case I used in my Recusal motion filed with Richland County Clerk of Court and The attorney general, of which I received no response, then this matter should be remanded. Judge Manning signed The final order.

This case is important to me and I ask The Court to note my current limitations and allow an additional 30 days for an explanation or remand based on Judge Mannings involvement.

I appreciate your attention ~~to~~ to this matter and look forward to The Court's positive response.

Sincerely yours,
Jimmy Edward Henderson