

2-19-23

RECEIVED

FEB 23 2023

MS. CARTER,

SC Court of Appeals

I DO NOT BELIEVE IN WASTING ANYONES TIME OR BEATING AROUND THE BUSH, ESPECIALLY WHEN IT INVOLVES MY FREEDOM SO I WILL BE VERY FRANK. PLEASE DO NOT BE OFFENDED BECAUSE THAT'S FAR FROM MY INTENTIONS.

YOUR ARGUMENT IS THAT I WAS NOT COMPETENT AT TRIAL AND I COMPLETELY UNDERSTAND THAT, BUT I BELIEVE THAT MORE THAN THAT SHOULDVE BEEN ARGUED REGARDLESS OF THE FACT THAT, BEING COURT APPOINTED, YOU'RE ONLY ENTITLED TO ARGUE ONE ERROR.

I FEEL THAT THE FACT THAT I WAS FORCED ANTIPSYCHOTIC INJECTIONS ON TWO DIFFERENT OCCASIONS AND WAS NOT AFFORDED THE RIGHT TO A JUDICIAL HEARING OR JUDGE ORDER SHOULDVE BEEN THE MAIN ARGUMENT OF MY DIRECT APPEAL. IF I WAS COMPETENT THEN WHY DID THE STATE FORCE ANTIPSYCHOTIC MEDICAL INJECTIONS ON ME IS WHAT, COUNSEL TONYA COPELAND-LITTLE SHOULDVE ARGUED AT MY TRIAL, BUT DIDNT.

SHE ALSO DID NOT ARGUE THE FACT THAT DR. MATTHEW GASKINS BEGAN HIS INTERVIEW WITH ME WHILE SHE WAS NOT PRESENT AND ALSO THE FACT THAT HE COMMITTED PERJURY BY STATING THAT HE INTERVIEWED ME FOR MORE THAN AN HOUR WHEN SHE KNEW THAT WASNT CORRECT AND THAT THERE WAS CAMERA/VIDEO RECORDING THAT WOULD PROVE THAT HE LIED.

AS FAR AS IM CONCERNED, MS TONYA COPELAND-LITTLE CONSPIRED WITH THE STATE TO GUARANTEE AN EASY CONVICTION. YOU TOO WORK FOR THE GOVERNMENT SO I QUESTION YOUR ACTIONS AS WELL. THIS WHOLE SYSTEM IS ABOUT MONEY AND CONTROL. I KNOW WITHOUT A SHADOW OF DOUBT IF ID HAD A PAID ATTORNEY I WOULD NOT BE WHERE I AM AND DUE TO THE FACTS OF MY SITUATION I WOULD NOT HAVE ANY PENDING CHARGES. THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA HAS DELIBERATELY VIOLATED MY FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT DUE PROCESS ALONG WITH MY FIRST, FOURTH, FIFTH, SIXTH AND EIGHTH AMENDMENTS.

"GIVE ME LIBERTY OR GIVE ME DEATH"  
- PATRICK HENRY

RESPECTFULLY,  
*Law Oil*

FREEDOM TO THINK IS ABSOLUTE OF ITS OWN NATURE; "THE MOST TYRANNICAL GOVERNMENT IS POWERLESS TO CONTROL THE INWARD WORKINGS OF THE MIND." [JONES V. OPELIKA] [STANLEY V. GEORGIA] [U.S. V. CHARTERS]

COMPETENT PERSONS [AS LITTLE WAS JUDICIALLY DECLARED TO BE] DEFENDING AGAINST CRIMINAL CHARGES SHOULD NOT, IN ANY SYSTEM OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, BE COMPELLED AGAINST THEIR WILL TO TAKE INTO THEIR BRAIN, DRUGS WHICH RADICALLY ALTER THEIR THINKING, EMOTION AND BEHAVIOR. [STATE V. MARYOTT]

THE COURT OF APPEALS RULING "MUST" BE REVERSED BECAUSE THE FORCED ADMINISTRATION OF MIND-ALTERING PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS IS AN IRREVERSIBLE INTRUSION INTO AN INDIVIDUALS FREEDOM OF THOUGHT, LIBERTY INTERESTS, PRIVACY INTERESTS, AND BODILY INTEGRITY. [SELL V. U.S.] [WASHINGTON V. HARPER] [KULAS V. VALDEZ]

DUE PROCESS GUARANTEES THAT THE COURTS SHALL BE OPEN TO EVERY PERSON WITH A REMEDY FOR INJURY TO HIS PERSON, PROPERTY OR REPUTATION, WITH THE OPPORTUNITY FOR SUCH REMEDY BEING GRANTED AT A MEANINGFUL TIME AND IN A MEANINGFUL MANNER.

WHERE RIGHTS SECURED BY THE CONSTITUTION ARE INVOLVED, THERE CAN BE NO RULE MAKING OR LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD ABROGATE THEM. [MIRANDA V. ARIZONA]

PEOPLE - ARE SUPREME, NOT THE STATE. [WARING V. MAYOR OF SAVANNAH]  
THE STATE CANNOT DIMINISH RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE [HERTADO V. CALIFORNIA]

FORCED ADMINISTRATION OF ANTIPSYCHOTIC MEDICATION IMPAIRED RIGGINS' CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED TRIAL RIGHTS. [RIGGINS V. NEVADA]

WHEN THE STATE COMMANDS MEDICATION DURING THE PRE-TRIAL AND TRIAL PHASES OF THE CASE FOR THE AVOWED PURPOSE OF CHANGING THE DEFENDANT'S BEHAVIOR, THE CONCERNS ARE MUCH THE SAME AS IF IT WERE ALLEGED THAT THE PROSECUTION HAD MANIPULATED MATERIAL EVIDENCE.

[BRADY V. MARYLAND]

DAVID A. LITTLE JR. #385407  
MCCORMICK CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION  
386 REDEMPTION WAY  
MCCORMICK, SC 29899

AUGUSTA GA 309

21 FEB 2023 PM 2:1

RECEIVED

FEB 23 2023

SC Court of Appeals

CLERK OF COURT  
SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS  
P.O. BOX 11629  
COLUMBIA, SC 29211



SCDC  
FEB 21 2023  
MAIL ROOM

2921131629

