

The State of South Carolina
In The Court of Appeals

RECEIVED
MAY 22 2023
SC Court of Appeals

Appeal From the Administrative Law Court

Case: 211533/D55973 Docket # 23-ALJ-15-0001
SCDC/FDOC Contested State Agency Decision

Agency Decision Dated: 5-2-23 Final Order Received: 5-4-23

South Carolina Department of Probation,
Parole, and Pardon Services

Respondant

PO Box 207
Columbia, SC 29202
dppps.sc.gov

v.

Ronald C. Albright #211533

Appellant
(Pro Se)

PO Box 205-SB-38
Ridgeville, SC 29472

NOTICE OF APPEAL

PURSUANT TO S.C. CODE 1976 § 1-23-610; SCACR 203(b)(6); AND ALC R. 66, THE APPELLANT, RONALD ALBRIGHT, SEEKS APPELLATE REVIEW OF A DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT GRANTING A MOTION TO DISMISS AN APPEAL OF A CONTESTED CASE HEARING OF A STATE AGENCY'S DECISION. APPELLANT ALSO REQUESTS A REVIEW BY THIS COURT OF HIS CLAIMS OF DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS DEPRIVATIONS OUTLINED IN HIS 'PRE-HEARING BRIEF.'

IN SUPPORT OF APPELLANT'S CLAIMS, HE PRESENTS A BRIEF HISTORY AND CITES THE FOLLOWING POINTS FROM: THE APPELLANT'S BRIEF, THE RESPONDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS, THE ALC'S ORDER, STATE STATUTES, AND (I.C.A.O.S) RULES AS FOLLOWS: HISTORY

APPELLANT WAS ON PAROLE IN FLORIDA ON AN INTERSTATE COMPACT FOR ADULT OFFENDER SUPERVISION OR (I.C.A.O.S. HEREAFTER) TRANSFER FROM SOUTH CAROLINA. AFTER TWO YEARS, A FLORIDA PROBATION OFFICER SUBMITTED TELETYPES AND REPORTS TO S.C. ALLEGING VARIOUS VIOLATIONS NONE OF WHICH WERE FACTUAL OR VERIFIED...

Respectfully Submitted,

Ronald C. Albright

Signed-Preparer of Document

5-11-2023

Dated

cc: THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT
THE S.C. DEPT. OF P.P.P. SERVICES

... UNDER AN (ICAOS) TRANSFER, THERE IS A WELL ESTABLISHED PROCESS CALLED A "RETAKING" THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN INITIATED WHEN THESE ALLEGATIONS AROSE (ICAOS R. 5.108(A-G) § 4.109) THE AGENCY DEPARTED FROM THE PROCEDURES FOR A 'RETAKING' AS THE RESPONDANT CLAIMED TO HAVE TAKEN PLACE, (Pg. 2 LN. 8 OF RESPONDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS) THE REQUIRED STEPS THAT WERE SKIPPED OR DEVIATED FROM, DENIED PAROLEE HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS, GRANTED TO HIM BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND THE (ICAOS)'S MANDATORY LANGUAGE, AND IN SMALL PART BY S.C. STATUTES. THIS COMPACT IS BINDING TO EACH STATE AND THE COMPACT'S RULES AND PROCEDURES ARE CONSIDERED AS STATUTORY AND SUPERSEDE EITHER STATE'S STATUTES OR CUSTOMS IN THE EVENT OF A CONFLICT. (75 ALR 6TH 181 § 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, § 2a) (§34-21-1130(2-4))

APPELLANT FILED FOR A CONTESTED CASE HEARING ON 3/13/23 SEEKING THE A.L.C.'S JUDICIAL REVIEW OF NOT ONLY THE PAROLE REVOCATION, BUT ALSO THE EXTRADITION AND PROCEEDINGS THAT LED UP TO THE REVOCATION, CITING SEVERAL DEVIATIONS FROM THE (ICAOS) PROTOCOL RESULTING IN DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS. APPELLANT FILED FOR THIS REVIEW AFTER THREE DIRECT ATTEMPTS TO THE AGENCY, AS DIRECTED TO DO SO BY THE PRELIMINARY PROBABLE CAUSE HEARING ADMINISTRATOR, SHOWING A 'GOOD FAITH' EFFORT TO RESOLVE THESE ISSUES AT THE AGENCY LEVEL, DESPITE NOT HAVING RECEIVED A WRITTEN FINAL ORDER OF REVOCATION FROM THE AGENCY DESPITE REPEATED REQUESTS.

APPELLANT MOVED THE A.L.C. TO EITHER ACCEPT THE REVIEW WITHOUT THE FINAL ORDER FROM THE AGENCY, OR TO ISSUE AN ORDER COMPELLING THE AGENCY TO DELIVER THE WRITTEN FINAL ORDER TO BEGIN THE TOLLING OF THE TIMELINE TO APPEAL THE REVOCATION (APPELLANT'S MOTION TO COMPEL & PETITION FOR EQUITABLE TOLLING) THE A.L.C. NOTED THAT IT WASN'T THE PROPER FORUM IN WHICH TO SEEK AN ORDER REQUIRING THE PAROLE BOARD TO ISSUE A WRITTEN ORDER, (Pg. 7 FOOTNOTE #2 OF A.L.C.'S ORDER) BUT DIDN'T SUGGEST WHICH FORUM WAS PROPER, COURT OF APPEALS PERHAPS?? IF PAROLEE ISN'T REVOKED, HE NEEDS TO BE REINSTATED ON SUPERVISION IN FLORIDA, AND IF HE IS OFFICIALLY REVOKED, HE NEEDS THE WRITTEN FINAL ORDER TO PROCEED WITH THE REVIEW OF HIS CLAIMS OF DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS.

ON 4/4/23, THE AGENCY FILED A MOTION TO DISMISS. FIRSTLY THEY STATED THAT THE PAROLEE RECEIVED THE WRITTEN FINAL ORDER OF REVOCATION ON AUG. 30 2017 AND THAT BEGAN THE TOLLING OF THE TIMELINE AND HENCE THE 30 DAYS HAVE EXPIRED TO APPEAL. PAROLEE DID NOT RECEIVE THE WRITTEN FINAL ORDER FROM THE AGENCY DESPITE REPEATEDLY REQUESTING IT, AS EVIDENCED BY THE RECORD. PAROLEE ONLY SIGNED FOR AND RECEIVED A COPY OF THE PAROLE ARREST WARRANT OBTAINED ON UNFOUNDED ALLEGATIONS ONLY, AND SWORN TO 3RD PARTY BY A S.C. PAROLE AGENT MRS. VICTORIA JAKE, ALSO IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS AND (S.C. CODE 1976 § 17-23-16a) THIS, BY NO MEANS, THE FINAL ORDER.

EQUITABLE TOLLING

THE ALC GOES ON TO STATE "CERTAINLY, NO PARTY HAS SUBMITTED A COPY OF ANY 2017 WRITTEN FINAL ORDER REVOKING PAROLE TO THIS COURT"... "IF APPELLANT'S ASSERTIONS ARE CORRECT, REGARDING RECEIPT OF SUCH AN ORDER, THEN THE TIME TO APPEAL THE 2017 REVOCATION OF PAROLE MAY NOT HAVE BEGUN TO RUN" see, e.g. SCACR RULE 59 AND IN THE ABSENCE OF A FINAL ORDER, NO APPEAL OF THE REVOCATION HAS COMMENCED." APPELLANT CONTENDS THAT THIS SHOWS CAUSE THAT A CLAIM EXISTS FOR A De Novo JUDICIAL HEARING.

THE ALC CITES §1-23-600(D) AS PROHIBITING THE COURT FROM HEARING "AN APPEAL INVOLVING THE DENIAL OF PAROLE TO A POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE INMATE BY THE DEPARTMENT." APPELLANT ISN'T AND WASN'T CHALLENGING THE SUBSEQUENT DENIALS OF PAROLE, ONLY THE REVOCATION, EXTRADITION, AND PROCEEDINGS THAT LED UP TO THAT REVOCATION. SO, THIS SECTION OF STATUTE DOESN'T APPLY TO THIS CASE.

THE NEXT SECTION OF THE ALC'S ORDER IS CONFUSING AND APPELLANT UNDERSTANDS AS CONTRADICTORY, STATING: "IT AGREES WITH THE DEPARTMENT THAT, EVEN IF THE 2017 PAROLE REVOCATION HAD BEEN "PROPERLY APPEALED" TO THE COURT IT WOULD LACK JURISDICTION TO ENTERTAIN ANY SUBSTANTIVE REVIEW OF THE REVOCATION ORDER(?) THIS STATEMENT SEEMS TO BE ERRED AS THE REVOCATION ORDER WAS ONLY A SMALL PART OF THE REVIEW SOUGHT, AND, APPELLANT COULD NOT HAVE "PROPERLY APPEALED" AS THE COURT NOTED, WITHOUT THE ISSUANCE OF THE FINAL ORDER. EVEN MORE CONFUSING IS (FOOTNOTE #1 pg. 6 OF THE ALC'S ORDER) STATING THAT THE COURT DOES HAVE JURISDICTION TO REVIEW "THE METHOD AND PROCEDURE EMPLOYED BY THE PAROLE BOARD TO REACHING ITS DECISION AND, "THE COURT MUST HEAR THOSE MATTERS." THE METHOD AND PROCEDURAL CLAIMS ARE EXACTLY WHAT THE APPELLANT IS SEEKING REVIEW OF. THE AGENCY DEPARTED FROM THE STATUTORY PROCEDURES OF THE (ICAOs) IN REACHING ITS DECISION AND THEREBY VIOLATED PAROLEE'S DUE PROCESS RIGHTS, AN SHOULD BE REVIEWED.

APPELLANT CONTENDS ALC ERRED IN ITS DETERMINATION THAT IT "CAN NOT CONDUCT ANY REVIEW WITHOUT A COPY OF THE PAROLE BOARD'S ORDER." DOESN'T THIS IN EFFECT GIVE THE PAROLE BOARD THE POWER TO BLOCK AN APPEAL SIMPLY BY NOT ISSUING AN ORDER? ALC STATED "IT NEED NOT RESOLVE THIS CONFLICT BECAUSE IN EITHER SCENARIO, DISMISSAL WOULD BE APPROPRIATE." AN AGENCY'S FINAL ORDER, DENIED OR UNREASONABLY DELAYED CAN BE BOTH REVIEWED AND REMEDIED BY THE COURT UNDER 5 U.S.C.A § 706(C) "SCOPE OF REVIEW"; GONZALEZ V. CUCCINELLI 985 F.3d. 357

APPELLANT ALSO DISAGREES WITH THE ALC'S NOTION THAT, "IN EITHER SCENARIO, DISMISSAL WOULD BE APPROPRIATE." BECAUSE IN APPELLANT'S SCENARIO, THAT ACTUALLY TOOK PLACE, HE DID NOT RECEIVE THE FINAL ORDER AND THIS "DENIAL OR UNREASONABLE DELAY" WOULD SHOW CAUSE FOR A CLAIM FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THE ISSUES, (CONTINUED)

...(REVIEW OF THE ISSUES), EITHER WITHOUT THE FINAL ORDER, OR THE ISSUANCE OF AN ORDER BY THE COURT COMPELLING THE AGENCY TO PRODUCE THE FINAL ORDER. NEVERTHELESS, APPELLANT CONTENDS THAT DISMISSAL WASNT APPROPRIATE FOR SCENARIO # 2, OR APPELLANT'S CLAIMS.

APPELLANT CONTENDS THAT THE ALC HAS JURISDICTION TO HEAR THIS CASE UNDER § 1-23-380(F) BECAUSE OF THE RESPONDANT'S "UNWARRANTED EXERCISE OF DISCRETION" IN INFERRING THAT THE FIRST TWO WORDS OF § 24-21-680 "UPON FAILURE", WERE SATISFIED BY A 3RD PARTY SUMMARY OF THE FL. PAROLE OFFICER'S UNFOUNDED ALLEGATIONS. THE 1ST TWO WORDS OF 24-21-680 PREDICATE THE REMAINDER OF THIS SECTION OF THE STATUTE AND IS AN OPENING COMPONENT OF THE STATUTE TO BE MET TO SUPPOSEDLY GRANT THE OMNIPOTENT STATUS THE RESPONDANT CLAIMS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW OF THIS STATUTE (RESPONDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS Pg. 2 LN. 14) THAT "NO COURT HAS JURISDICTION TO REVIEW A PAROLE REVOCATION." (!) APPELLANT CLAIMS THE AGENCY IS DEPRIVING HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW OF 24-21-680, AND WHEN THE LOSS OF A LIBERTY INTEREST IS AT STAKE, DUE PROCESS IS WARRANTED TO DIFFERENTIATE ALLEGATIONS FROM FACTS (ICAOS R. 5.108 A-G) AND; APPELLANT CONTENDS THAT ALL DECISIONS ARE REVIEWABLE.

APPELLANT OPPOSES THE ALC'S CONTENTION THAT IT CAN NOT APPLY § 1-23-380(5)(A-F) IN ITS SCOPE OR REVIEW. THIS STATUTE OUTLINES THE PROCESS FOR REVIEW OF AN AGENCY'S DECISION WHERE ALL OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES HAVE BEEN EXHAUSTED. WHILE 1-23-380 STATES THE COURT MAY NOT SUBSTITUTE IT'S JUDGEMENT FOR THE JUDGEMENT OF THE AGENCY "AS TO THE WEIGHT OF THE EVIDENCE ON QUESTIONS OF FACT." IT CAN HOWEVER, REVERSE OR MODIFY THE AGENCY DECISION IF SUBSTANTIAL RIGHTS HAVE BEEN PREJUDICED BY USE OF UNWARRANTED EXERCISE OF DISCRETION OR MADE ON UNLAWFUL PROCEDURE OR IN VIOLATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL OR STATUTORY PROVISIONS. NEARLY ALL OF THE POINTS IN THIS STATUTE APPLY TO THIS CASE AND ARE RAISED AND EXPLAINED IN DETAIL IN APPELLANT'S PRE-HEARING BRIEF, AND GIVE THE COURT THE AUTHORITY TO REVIEW, REVERSE, OR MODIFY THE DECISION.

THE ALC SHOULD HAVE ALSO BEEN ABLE TO REVIEW, SET ASIDE, OR AMMEND THIS AGENCY ACTION UNDER 1-23-380(5)(C) AS "MADE ON UNLAWFUL PROCEDURE" BECAUSE THE LAWFUL PROCEDURE IN THIS CASE WAS TO FOLLOW THE (ICAOS) PROTOCOLS. ALL OF THE AGENCY'S DEVIATIONS FROM (ICAOS) LED TO A LOSS OF A LIBERTY INTEREST WITHOUT THE DUE PROCESS AFFORDED BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND THE MANDATORY LANGUAGE OF THE (ICAOS) COMPACT.

(APPELLANT CLAIMS ALL POINTS OF 1-23-380(5)(A-F) ARE EVIDENCED IN THIS CASE, NOT JUST 'UNWARRANTED DISCRETION' AND 'UNLAWFUL PROCEDURE' AND ARE DETAILED IN HIS BRIEF.)

IRRELEVANT MATTER

THE REITERATION OF THE SUBSEQUENT DENIALS OF PAROLE AND THE REASONS FOR THEM, BY THE AGENCY IN THEIR MOTION, ARE IRRELEVANT TO THIS CASE AS THEY ARE NOT BEING CHALLENGED* AND THE "PILING ON" OF ANY SUBSEQUENT ROUTINE DENIALS OF PAROLE OR REASONS FOR THEM DO NOT ERASE OR COVER OVER THE ACTUAL REVOCATION AND PROCEEDINGS THAT LED UP TO IT, BEING CHALLENGED, AND THEY ONLY SERVE TO COMPLICATE THE ISSUES AT HAND. (* WITH EXCEPTION TO THE PAROLE BOARD USING "FAILURE TO SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE A COMMUNITY SUPERVISION PROGRAM" AS A REASON FOR DENIAL OF PAROLE AT HIS LAST HEARING. BUT OTHER THAN THIS, APPELLANT IS NOT SEEKING REVIEW OF THE DENIALS.) ONLY THE REVOCATION AND EXTRADITION.

OUTSTANDING MOTIONS & ISSUES

APPELLANT SUBMITS THE REMAINING RELEVANT OUTSTANDING MOTIONS AND ISSUES OUTLINED IN HIS INITIAL 'PRE-HEARING' BRIEF TO THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS FOR REVIEW AND RESOLUTION, BASED ON THE ALC'S FOOTNOTE #2 IN ITS ORDER STATING THE REMAINING MOTIONS ARE NOW MOOT DUE TO ITS RESOLUTION OF THIS MATTER. THESE MOTIONS AND ISSUES WERE PART OF A COLLECTIVE AND THE CALLING ONE A "PRIOR ISSUE" AND DISPOSITIVE AND LEAVING THE OTHERS OUTSTANDING, PUTS THEM, OR THEIR EFFECTS, AT RISK OF BECOMING "CAPABLE OF REPETITION YET EVADING REVIEW" OR BEING LOST ALTOGETHER. APPELLANT IS TRYING TO PRESERVE THESE ISSUES UNTIL THEY ARE RULED UPON AND BROUGHT BEFORE THE APPROPRIATE COURT. ALC STATED THAT IT WASN'T THE PROPER FORUM FOR ONE OF THE MOTIONS, BUT DIDN'T SUGGEST WHAT WAS, OR ANYTHING ELSE ABOUT THE OTHER OUTSTANDING MOTIONS.

RELIEF REQUESTED

IF IT PLEASES THE COURT, AND IF AT ALL POSSIBLE, THE APPELLANT REQUESTS FROM THIS COURT:

- 1) TO APPOINT COUNSEL REPRESENTATION, AS THIS IS A COMPLEX CASE BETWEEN 2 DIFFERENT SOVEREIGN STATES, AND A COMPACT WITH FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION AND APPELLANT IS A LAYMAN;
- 2) A COMPLETE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF APPELLANT'S CONSTITUTIONAL AND DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATIONS OUTLINED IN HIS "PRE-HEARING BRIEF" AND MOTIONS;
- 3) TO APPLY THE DOCTRINE OF EQUITABLE TOLLING IN THIS CASE, AS SOUGHT IN HIS PETITION FOR SUCH;
- 4) ISSUE AN ORDER TO SET ASIDE, UNDER 5 U.S.C.A. § 706 (2) (a-f), THE AGENCY'S ACTIONS AND REINSTATE THE PAROLEE'S SUPERVISION IN FLORIDA AND;
- 5) CLEAR THE RECORD OF, OR DESIGNATE THE GRANDTHEFT CHARGE FROM FLORIDA AS ADJUDICATED AND DISMISSED (PER THE FL. STATES ATTORNEYS NOTICE AND REQUEST), TO PREVENT S.C.D.P.P.S. FROM FURTHER DOUBLE JEOPARDY OR USE OF THIS FALSE CHARGE AGAINST THE PAROLEE.

MOTION ENCLOSED

MOTIONS REFRAMED FOR S.C. COURT OF APPEALS AND, PRE-HEARING BRIEF ENCLOSED

SEE PETITION ENCLOSED

ART. 12 § 24-21-1130(a-4)

THIS IS ALSO BARRED BY:

S.C. CODE 1976 § 44-53-410; STAUDLEE V. HAY 403 F. SUPP. AT 1247

VENUE

FROM EVERYTHING THAT THE APPELLANT HAS RESEARCHED, READ, OR FOUND, A HABEUS CORPUS BROUGHT IN THE 4TH CIRCUIT OR SUPREME COURT IS THE MOST SUCCESSFUL AND THE PROPER VENUE TO BRING AND GET RELIEF ON CONSTITUTIONAL AND DUE PROCESS CLAIMS AS THE STATE COURTS TEND TO RULE ON THE SIDE OF THE STATE AGENCIES, AND GENERALLY DON'T LIKE TO UPSET CUSTOMARY STATE AGENCY PRACTICES OR PUBLISH OPINIONS ON CERTAIN NICHES OF STATUTE OR LAW THAT MAY NOT HAVE BEEN SPECIFICALLY ADDRESSED BEFORE IN THEIR STATE, AND THIS IS UNDERSTANDABLE. THE (ICAO'S) HAS BEEN IN SOME OTHER STATES LONGER AND THEREFORE MORE ESTABLISHED AND FAMILIAR, AS TO ITS SUPRESEDING OF STATE STATUTES, FOR UNIFORMITY.

BUT, A HABEUS OR RELATED REMEDIES REQUIRE THAT ALL ADMINISTRATIVE AND STATE REMEDIES BE EXHAUSTED BEFOREHAND. I STATE THE FOLLOWING WITH THE UTMOST RESPECT, BUT TO ME, AN IGNORANT LAYMAN, IT SEEMS A GREAT WASTE OF VALUABLE TIME AND RESOURCES TO HAVE TO GO THROUGH SEVERAL DIFFERENT VENUES IF THE ULTIMATE RELIEF SOUGHT IS CONSTITUTIONAL IN NATURE AND LIES WITH THE DISTRICT OR SUPREME COURTS.

APOLOGIES IF I'M MISTAKEN IN MY UNDERSTANDING OF THE DIFFERENT ROLES OF EACH LEVEL OF THE COURTS AND WHAT THEY CAN AND CAN'T RULE ON, I'VE JUST SEEN WAY MORE ADHERENCE TO CONSTITUTIONAL STATUTES IN THE 4TH CIRCUIT THAN THE STATE COURTS. NEVERTHELESS, AS REQUIRED, APPELLANT IS SUBMITTING HIS CASE FOR REVIEW IN THIS COURT AND PRAYS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED.

CONCLUSION

BOTH THE APPELLANT AND THE RECORD HAVE SHOWN CAUSE THAT A CLAIM EXISTS TO SUPPORT A COMPREHENSIVE JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THIS CASE ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS CLAIMED IN APPELLANT'S PRE-HEARING BRIEF, THAT SHOULD LEAD TO A 'SETTING ASIDE' OF THE AGENCY ACTION AND THE REINSTATEMENT OF PAROLEE'S SUPERVISION IN FLORIDA. APPELLANT ALSO CONTENDS THAT A REMAND OF THIS CASE BACK TO THE SAME AGENCY THAT RENDERED THIS DECISION (S.C.D.P.P.S) CAN NOT POSSIBLY RESULT IN A FAIR AND UNBIASED RESOLUTION OF THE ISSUES AND PRAYS THIS COURT ISSUE ORDERS AND RECOMMENDATIONS NECESSARY AS IT SEES FIT TO REMEDY THESE CLAIMS AND ENSURES THAT THEY ARE ADHERED TO.

CC: THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT;
THE S.C. DEPT. OF P.P.P. SERVICES;
FILES

RESPECTFULLY
SUBMITTED

RONALD C. ALBRIGHT - (PRO-SE)

NOTICE OF APPEAL 5 - 11 - 2023

RECEIVED

MAY 22 2023

**The State of South Carolina
In The Court of Appeals**

SC Court of Appeals

Appeal From the Administrative Law Court

Case: 211533/D55973 Docket # 23-ALT-15-0001
SCDC/FDOC Contested State Agency Decision

A.L.C. Decision Dated: 5-2-23 Final Order Received: 5-4-23

**South Carolina Department of Probation,
Parole, and Pardon Services**

Respondant

PO Box 207
Columbia, SC 29202
dppps.sc.gov

v.

Ronald C. Albright #211533

**Appellant
(Pro Se)**

PO Box 205-SB-38
Ridgeville, SC 29472

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

THE UNDERSIGNED, RONALD ALBRIGHT, CERTIFIES THAT HE CAUSED TO BE MAILED TO THE BELOW NAMED RESPONDANTS, COPIES OF:

- 1.) NOTICE OF APPEAL
- 2.) REQUEST FOR RECORD ON APPEAL, etc. COMPLETE RECORD/TRANSCRIPTS
- 3.) MOTION FOR DESIGNATION OF MATTER TO BE INCLUDED ON RECORD
- 4.) MOTION TO PROCEED WITHOUT COSTS OR FEES (IN FORMA PAUPERIS)
- 5.) MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
- 6.) PETITION FOR EQUITABLE TOLLING
- 7.) CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
- 8.) LETTER TO S.C.D.P.P.S. REQUESTING TRANSCRIPTS AND DOCUMENTS.
- 9.) MOTION TO COMPEL ISSUANCE OF FINAL ORDER OF PAROLE REVOCATION.

BY PLACING THEM IN THE LIEBER CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONAL MAIL ROOM ADDRESSED AS FOLLOWS:
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT - 1205 PENDLETON ST. SUITE 224, COLUMBIA, SC 29201
S.C.D.P.P.S - LEGAL DEPT. - P.O. BOX 207 - COLUMBIA, SC 29202

Respectfully Submitted,

Ronald C. Albright

Signed-Preparer of Document

5-11-2023

Dated

"RATIO EST RADIUS DIVINI LUMINIS - VERITAS NIHIL VERETUR, NISI ABSCONDI"

RONALD C. ALBRIGHT - #211533
L.C.I. - SB-58 - P.O. Box-205
RIDGEVILLE, S.C. 29472
11TH of MAY, 2023

RECEIVED

S.C. COURT OF APPEALS

CLERK OF COURT

P.O. Box 11629

COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211

MAY 22 2023

SC Court of Appeals
(DOCKET No. 23-ALJ-15-0001)

RE: ALBRIGHT V. THE S.C. DEPT. OF P.P.P. SERVICES

HON. CLERK OF COURT

PLEASE FIND ENCLOSED FOR FILING FOR THE ABOVE CAPTIONED CASE ONE OF EACH:

- 1.) NOTICE OF APPEAL
- 2.) REQUEST FOR RECORD ON APPEAL, ^{Recd.} ETC. COMPLETE RECORD/TRANSCR.
- 3.) MOTION FOR DESIGNATION OF MATTER TO BE INCLUDED IN R.O.A.
- 4.) MOTION TO PROCEED WITHOUT COSTS OR FEES (IN FORMA PAUPERIS)
- 5.) MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
- 6.) PETITION FOR EQUITABLE TOLLING
- 7.) CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
- 8.) MOTION TO COMPEL ISSUANCE OF FINAL ORDER OF PAROLE REVOCATION

COULD YOU BE SO KIND AS TO SEND ME BACK A DATE-STAMPED COPY OF THE ABOVE FILINGS IN THE ENCLOSED SASE.

PLEASE EXCUSE ANY TECHNICAL OR CLERICAL MISTAKES IN FORMAT AS APPELLANT IS A LAYMAN AND FILING PRO-SE. THANK YOU FOR YOUR VALUABLE TIME IN THIS MATTER.

INCLUDED IS A COPY OF A LETTER TO THE SCOPPPS REQUESTING TRANSCRIPTS AND DOCUMENTS. I'M AWARE THIS ISN'T A "FILING" BUT I'M SUBMITTING IT TO THE CLERK FOR DOCUMENTATION OF THE REQUEST TO THIS AGENCY. THANK YOU

- 9.) LETTER TO S.C.D.P.P.P.S. REQUESTING TRANSCRIPTS AND DOCUMENTS. (ATTACHED TO MOTION FOR DESIGNATION OF MATTER TO BE INCLUDED #3 ABOVE)

- 10.) ORDER FROM ALC GRANTING RESPONDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS

RESPECTFULLY
SUBMITTED,

Ronald C. Albright
RONALD C. ALBRIGHT

cc: S.C. COURT OF APPEALS,
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT,
THE S.C. DEPT. OF P.P.P. SERVICES,
FILES.

(1) of 1

RONALD ALBRIGHT #211533
L.C.I. - SB 88 - P.O. Box 205
RIDGEVILLE, SA 29472

US POSTAGE
0000720725 MAY 16 2023
\$ 002.94⁰⁰

RECEIVED

MAY 22 2023
SC Court of Appeals

S.C. COURT OF APPEALS
P.O. BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SA 29211

RECEIVED

MAY 11 2023
MAIL ROOM
LIBER G

INTERDEPARTMENTAL
LEGAL MAIL (5-11-2023)

