



The Supreme Court of South Carolina

PATRICIA A. HOWARD
CLERK OF COURT

BRENDA F. SHEALY
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11330
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1080
FAX: (803) 734-1499

TO: David Antonio Little, Jr.

FROM: Patricia A. Howard, Clerk

DATE: June 1, 2023

RECEIVED
JUN 01 2023
SC Court of Appeals

This Court has received your recent correspondence:

- Since you are represented by counsel in this matter(s), no action will be taken on your *pro se* filing. *Miller v. State*, 388 S.C. 347, 697 S.E.2d 527 (2010); *Jones v. State*, 348 S.C. 13, 558 S.E.2d 517 (2002); *State v. Stuckey*, 333 S.C. 56, 508 S.E.2d 564 (1998); *Foster v. State*, 298 S.C. 306, 379 S.E.2d 907 (1989).
- Since you are represented by counsel in this matter(s), we are forwarding a copy of your letter to counsel.

cc: Wanda H. Carter, Esquire (with copy of correspondence)
The Honorable Jenny Kitchings (with copy of correspondence)

RECEIVED

MAY 31 2023

DAVID ANTONIO LITTLE, JR.,
PLAINTIFF,

v.

THE STATE OF SOUTH
CAROLINA
DEFENDANT,

IN THE SUPREME COURT
SOUTH CAROLINA DISTRICT

S.C. SUPREME COURT

CASE NO(S). 2021A1310100124;
2021A1310100258, 2021A1310100125,
AND 2021-000990

RECEIVED

WRIT OF MANDAMUS JUN 01 2023
SC Court of Appeals

ARGUMENTS

[2002 WL 31898316, SELL V. U.S.] [SCHMERBER, 384 U.S. AT 711]
THE TRIAL JUDGE ERRED IN FINDING THE APPELLANT COMPETENT
TO STAND TRIAL FOLLOWING A PRETRIAL BLAIR HEARING THAT WAS POORLY
CONDUCTED DUE TO THE COUNSEL TONYA COPELAND - LITTLE'S INEFFECTIVE
REPRESENTATION FROM THE MOMENT COUNSEL AGREED TO TAKE ON MR.
LITTLES CASELOAD. MR. LITTLE HAS CLEARLY BEEN PREJUDICED BY THE
STATE'S REPRESENTORS INCLUDING JUSTICE ROGER M. YOUNG, SOLICITOR
KERNARD REDMOND, AND COUNSEL TONYA COPELAND - LITTLE. VIOLATIONS
MADE BY THE STATE CONSIST OF THE APPELLANT'S 1ST, 4TH, 5TH, 6TH,
8TH, AND 14TH AMENDMENTS UNDER THE BILL OF RIGHTS. MR. LITTLE
HAS BEEN DISCRIMINATED AGAINST, LIED ON, AND BIASSED BY THE
STATES DEFENSE AND THE FOLLOWING PROVES SUCH ALLEGATIONS:

ARREST

MR. LITTLE WAS UNLAWFULLY AND ILLEGALLY ARRESTED BY OFFICERS OF THE CHERAW
POLICE DEPARTMENT ON CHARGES OF POSSESSION OF MARIJUANA. IN THE OFFICERS REPORTS
IT STATES THAT MR. LITTLE WAS BEING DISORDERLY IN A STORE IN THE CHERAW AREA, IN
WHICH MR. LITTLE WAS NEVER CHARGED FOR DISORDERLY CONDUCT, BUT FOR POSSESSION OF
MARIJUANA THAT WAS FOUND, "SUPPOSEDLY," IN MR. LITTLES VEHICLE BY AN ILLEGAL SEARCH
OF MR. LITTLES PROPERTY IN WHICH HE WAS NOT OCCUPYING OR NEAR AT THE TIME OF THE
SEARCH. [PALACIO V. STATE, 333 S.C. 506, 514, 511 S.E. 2D 62, 66 (1999)] BEFORE
OFFICERS HAD EVEN PLACED CUFFS ON MR. LITTLE THEY HAD ALREADY TOOK IT UPON THEM-
SELVES TO SEARCH HIS VEHICLE THAT HE WAS STANDING AT LEAST 15-20 FEET AWAY FROM.
MR. LITTLE WAS NEVER READ HIS RIGHTS AT THE TIME AND WAS NEVER INFORMED THAT
HE WAS UNDER ARREST OR INFORMED OF WHAT REASON. [ADAMS, 397 S.C. AT 488-89, 725
S.E. 2D AT 527], [MARYLAND V. DYSON, 527 U.S. 465, 119 S.C.T. 2013, 144 L.ED. 2D 442
(1999)] OFFICERS DID NOT HAVE A PROBABLE CAUSE TO SEARCH THE VEHICLE OF MR.
LITTLE AND DID NOT HAVE A WARRANT TO JUSTIFY THEIR SEARCH. [STATE V. BAILEY, 276
S.C. 32, 274 S.E. 2D 913 (1981)], [STATE V. COX, 290 S.C. 489, 351 S.E. 2D 570
(1986)] OFFICER CANNOT JUSTIFY WHY THEY FAILED TO FIRST READ MR. LITTLE HIS
RIGHTS AND ARREST HIM BEFORE THEY BEGAN THE SEARCH OF HIS VEHICLE.
[STATE V. FORRESTER, 343 S.C. 637, 541 S.E. 2D 837 (2001)] [CHIMEL, 395 U.S., 752, 89]
UPON THE PROCESSING AND BOOKING OF MR. LITTLE AT THE CHERAW POLICE DEPARTMENT
OFFICERS VIOLATED MR. LITTLES DUE PROCESS BY STILL NOT INFORMING HIM OF WHY HE WAS
ARRESTED, AS WELL AS FAILING TO ALLOW MR LITTLE A PHONE CALL AND THE RIGHT TO
SIGN THE INVENTORY SHEET OF THE PROPERTY THAT WAS TAKEN FROM HIM. [JONES V. CITY
OF COLUMBIA, 301 S.C. 62, 389 S.E. 2D 662 (1990)], [WORTMAN V. SPARTANBURG, 310 S.C.
1, 425 S.E. 2D 18 (1992)] OFFICERS FAILED TO FOLLOW FORMAL ARREST PROCEDURES.
[868 N.W. 2D AT 530], [DILWORTH V. ADAMS, 841 F.3D 246], [STATE V. GASKINS]
[ARIZONA V. GANT]

[BELL V. WOLFISH, 441 U.S. 520] [LEE V. WINSTON, 717 F.2D 883 (CA 4 1983)]
LATER THE SAME DAY MR. LITTLE WAS TRANSPORTED TO THE CHESTERFIELD COUNTY
DETENTION CENTER WHERE AGAIN HIS PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS WAS VIOLATED BY
JAILERS DUE TO IMPROPERLY BOOKING MR. LITTLE. MERE SPECULATION AND ASSUMP-
TIONS MADE BY JAILERS LEAD THEM TO PLACING MR. LITTLE IN A RESTRAINT
CHAIR FOR MORE THAN (72) HOURS WITHOUT FOOD OR WATER. ACTIONS OF THE JAILERS
WERE NEGLIGENT AND UNJUSTIFIABLE. EVEN IF MR. LITTLE WAS SUICIDAL OR
MENTALLY ILL, LEAVING HIM IN A RESTRAINT CHAIR FOR MORE THAN (72) HOURS CANNOT
BE JUSTIFIED. IT ONLY PROVES WANTON, INTENTIONAL, AND MAUCIOUSNESS ON
THE PART OF JAILERS WHO SOUGHT TO INJURE AND IMPAIR MR. LITTLE PHYSICALLY AND
PSYCHOLOGICALLY. [BASS V. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPT. OF SOCIAL SERVICES, 414 S.C. 558]
[FORD, 276 S.C. AT 162, 276 S.E.2D AT 118] CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS OF THE
CHESTERFIELD COUNTY JAIL DISREGARDED JAIL PROTOCOL AND LAWS PROTECTED
UNDER THE CONSTITUTION. OFFICERS WHO WERE AWARE OF THE CONDITION THAT
MR. LITTLE WAS IN FAILED TO ACT WHILE HAVING KNOWLEDGE OF THE WRONGFUL
ACTS BEING COMMITTED. MR. LITTLE ALLEGES THAT THE ACTS WERE DONE AS
COERCIVE FORCE. [PALMER V. SANDERSON, 9 F.3D 1433 (1993)] THE REASONABLE-
NESS OF THESE ACTS MUST BE JUDGE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF A REASONABLE
PERSON WITH THE 20/20 VISION OF HINDSIGHT. [§ 44-22-150] [WILLIAMS, 77 F.3D AT
764], [MCCARTHR, SUPRA, AT 33, 1121 S.C.T. 946], [CUPP V. MURPHY, 412 U.S. 291]
WHILE MR. LITTLE REMAINED IN THE RESTRAINT CHAIR, NO NURSE FROM THE JAIL
ATTEMPTED TO SPEAK WITH MR. LITTLE BEFORE SIGNING OFF ON DOCUMENTS TO
APPROVE MR. LITTLE'S TRANSPORT TO MLEOD HEALTH CHERAW, PROVING NEGLIGENT
AND WANTON IN THEIR ACTIONS WITH DISREGARD TO MR. LITTLE'S CONDITIONS DESPITE
PRESUPPOSITIONAL IDEAS THAT MR. LITTLE WAS SUFFERING FROM MENTAL
PSYCHOSIS. THE NURSES WHO SIGNED OFF ON THE DOCUMENTS APPROVING THE
EVALUATION AS WELL AS OFFICERS OF THE JAIL WERE DELIBERATELY INDIFFERENT
TO MR. LITTLE'S CONDITION AND PLACED THE PSYCHE OF MR. LITTLE IN DANGER.
MR. LITTLE WAS TRANSPORTED TO MLEOD HEALTH CHERAW; AND WHILE PROFUSELY
PROCLAIMING THAT HE DID NOT CONSENT TO ANY MEDICAL TREATMENT, HE WAS HELD
DOWN AGAINST HIS WILL AND FORCED ANTI PSYCHOTIC INJECTIONS TO HIS BUTTCKS
AND HAD SOMETHING FORCED INTO THE TIP OF HIS PENIS, PROVING BOTH FORCED
DRUGS AND FORCED TAKING OF DNA. [SCHMERBER V. CALIFORNIA, 384 U.S. 757,
767-70; 86 S.C.T. 1826, 16 L. ED. 2D 908 (1966)] [308 S.C. 192, 195, 417 S.E. 2D
572, 574 (1992)] EVERY WARRANT OBTAINED BY MR. LITTLE THROUGH RULE 5
EVIDENCE IS "SUSPICIOUS" WHEN YOU EXAMINE THE DOCUMENTS AND THEY FAIL
TO STATE FOR WHAT REASON THE DNA IS NEEDED AS EVIDENCE. FAILING TO
PRODUCE A CLEAR INDICATION THAT RELEVANT MATERIAL EVIDENCE WILL BE
FOUND AND THE METHOD USED TO SECURE THE EVIDENCE WAS UNSAFE ON MR.
LITTLE'S BEHALF BECAUSE HE WAS FORCED MIND ALTERING DRUGS WHEN ACTORS
OF THE STATE COULDVE JUST ASKED; BUT DIDNT AND BY FAILING TO DO SO
VIOLATED MR. LITTLE'S 4TH AND 14TH AMENDMENT. [BOYD V. UNITED STATES]
[TERRY, SUPRA, AT 12, 38 S.C.T. 1862] [367 S.C. AT 53-54, 625 S.E. 2D AT 223]
AFTER BEING HELD IN THIS CONDITION AND TAKEN TO A HOSPITAL AND FORCED
DRUGS, THE NEXT DAY INVESTIGATORS CAME TO READ MR. LITTLE HIS MIRANDA
WARNING FOR THE FIRST TIME SINCE HIS ARREST. THE INVESTIGATOR DANIEL
SCOTT HAS FALSIFIED DOCUMENTS AND MADE FALSE STATEMENTS SAYING THAT
MR. LITTLE CONFESSED TO THE CRIME; BUT HAS FAILED TO PRODUCE ANY VIDEO OR
AUDIO OF THE CONFESSION IN RULE 5 DISCOVERY. INVESTIGATOR DANIEL SCOTT
HAS ALSO DOCTORED THE MIRANDA DOCUMENT TO SHOW THE DATE AS 2/15/21,
BUT CAMERAS FROM THE JAIL WILL PROVE THAT MR. LITTLE NEVER SAW
DANIEL SCOTT ON 2/15/21, BUT ONLY AFTER HE WAS DRUGGED DID DANIEL SCOTT
REMOVE MR. LITTLE FROM THE JAIL ON 2/17/21. [MIRANDA V. ARIZONA, 384 U.S.
436], [MINCEY V. ARIZONA] [BROWN V. MISSISSIPPI], [TOWNSEND V. SAIN, 372
U.S. 293, 83 S.C.T. 745, 9 L. ED. 2D 770], [UNITED STATES V. MONIA, 317 U.S. 424]
[478 F.SUPP. AT 1383 N. 58] [SELL V. U.S., 539 U.S. 166] [425 MD. 550, 42 A.3D
549]

[STATE V. CHISHOLM, 395 S.C. 259, 266-68, 717 S.E. 2D 614, 617-18 (CT. APP. 2011)]
AT THE BEGINNING STAGE OF MR. LITTLE'S ARREST HE WAS DEMORALIZED AND
BASICALLY RAPED BY MUNICIPAL ACTORS IN A WAY THAT CANNOT BE JUSTIFIED. THESE
ACTORS HAVE INTENTIONALLY AND ILLEGALLY VIOLATED RIGHTS OF MR. LITTLE.
THEY HAVE FORCEFULLY ENTERED INTO HIS SANCTA BY FORCING MIND ALTERING
DRUGS INTO HIS SYSTEM SEEKING TO GAIN A COERCED CONFESSION AND TO
MENTALLY IMPAIR HIM. ANY AND ALL ACTS OF VIOLENCE THAT MR. LITTLE EXHIBITED
AFTER FEBRUARY 16, 2021 IS DUE TO THE STATE'S INFRINGEMENTS ON HIS RIGHTS
AND MORALITY AS A HUMAN BEING. [FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT, AGAINST "THE
DEMANDS OF AN ORGANIZED SOCIETY." 457 U.S. AT 320, 102 S. CT. AT 2460]

[457 U.S. AT 315-16, 102 S. CT. AT 2458] CRIMINALS ALSO WEAR BADGES AND
BANG GRAVELS IN THE COURTROOM. FOR THE SERVANTS OF THIS FOURTH CIRCUIT TO
ACT AS IF WHAT HAS BEEN DONE TO MR. LITTLE WAS LAW OR MORALLY RIGHTEOUS
THEN I CAN ONLY ASK GOD ALMIGHTY TO FORBID THE EVILS HAPPENING IN THIS
WICKED COUNTRY. [WATSON V. CITY OF MEMPHIS, 373 U.S. 526, 83 S. CT. 1314]

[2002 WL 31898316, SELL V. U.S.] [HARPER, 494 U.S. AT 229]
FORCIBLE MEDICATION WITH ANTI-PSYCHOTIC DRUGS IMPLICATES INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS
TO FREEDOM FROM PHYSICAL INVASION AND FREEDOM OF THOUGHT AS WELL AS
THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY PROTECTED BY THE CONSTITUTION AND THE COMMON LAW.
[HARVEY V. STRICKLAND, 350 S.C. 303, 566 S.E. 2D 529]

THE RIGHT TO BE FREE OF UNDESIRED PHYSICAL TOUCHING TRACES ITS ORIGINS
TO ENGLISH COMMON LAW OF THE MIDDLE THIRTEENTH CENTURY, F.W. MAITLAND,
THE FORMS OF ACTION AT COMMON LAW 40, 43, 53 (1985 ED.), AND TODAY IS
REFLECTED IN THE TORT OF BATTERY WHICH PROTECTS THE INDIVIDUAL AGAINST
EVEN THE SLIGHTEST UNCONSENTED TOUCHING. W. KEETON, D. DOBBS; R.
KEETON, D. OWEN, PROSSER AND KEETON ON THE LAW OF TORTS § 9 P. 39
(5TH ED. 1984). THE RIGHT TO BE FREE OF UNWANTED PHYSICAL CONTACT AND ITS
ANCIENT COMMON LAW ORIGINS HAS BEEN RECOGNIZED BY THE SUPREME
COURT.

NO RIGHT IS HELD MORE SACRED; OR IS MORE CAREFULLY GUARDED, BY THE
COMMON LAW, THAN THE RIGHT OF EVERY INDIVIDUAL TO POSSESSION AND CONTROL
OF HIS OWN PERSON, FREE FROM ALL RESTRAINT OR INTERFERENCE OF OTHERS,
UNLESS BY CLEAR AND UNQUESTIONABLE AUTHORITY OF LAW.
[1989 WL 1127142, WASHINGTON V. HARPER]

[STATE V. BUTLER, 230 S.C.]

THE AFOREMENTIONED LEADS US TO THE ASSAULT / RESISTING ARREST CHARGES
THAT MR. LITTLE RECEIVED 10 YEARS FOR WHICH IS BIZARRE WHEN A EUROPEAN
WOMAN ONLY SERVED 10 MONTHS FOR KILLING A BLACK KID AND THEN LIED AND
SAID SHE THOUGHT THE GUN SHE USED TO KILL HIM WAS HER TASER ...
A TASER DOES NOT EVEN WEIGH THE SAME. [HEARNS, 961 S.C. 2D AT 218]
AS FAR AS THE ASSAULT / RESISTING ARREST, THE OFFICER FAILED TO INFORM
THAT I WAS UNDER ARREST OR THAT I SHOULD PUT MY HANDS BEHIND MY BACK.
HE JUST PROCEEDED TO PUSH ME BECAUSE, BY HIM BEING A EUROPEAN AND,
BY HIM HAVING A BADGE HE THOUGHT HE WAS ABOVE THE LAW AND WHAT'S
BEING DONE AT THIS PRESENT TIME AND WHAT HAS BEEN DONE IN THE
PAST GIVES THESE EUROPEANS THE AUDACITY TO "THINK" THEY CAN DO AS THEY
PLEASE AND GET AWAY WITH IT, AND MOST DO BECAUSE OF THIS ROTTEN
SYSTEM. (ROM 12:19-21) [ID, AT 39, 71 S. CT. AT 789]

[U.S. V. WHITE, 606 F. 3D 144] (MAGNA CARTA, CLAUSE
39) DUE PROCESS OF LAW - HANNIS TAYLOR (24 YL 353)
(TRIAL VIDEO WAS ALTERED BY THOSE DEVILS)

LEGAL MAIL
MAIL ROOM

WARRANTS

THE WARRANTS IN MR. LITTLE'S CASE APPEAR TO BE FORGED AND FALSIFIED IN A FURTIVE WAY BY OFFICERS OF THE CHESTERFIELD COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE. IT HAS ALREADY BEEN STATED THAT OFFICERS OF THE CHERAW POLICE DEPARTMENT HAD ALREADY ILLEGALLY AND UNLAWFULLY SEARCHED MR. LITTLE'S VEHICLE, THEREFORE ANY ALLEGED DRUGS OF EVIDENCE FOUND IS SUBJECT TO SUPPRESSION. [JACKSON V. DENNO] THE WARRANTS ISSUED ARE DEFECTIVE DUE TO THE FACT THAT THEY WERE SIGNED TWO DAYS AFTER THE ARREST, AND APPEAR TO BE COPIED AND PASTED [STATE V. WILSON, 345 S.C. 1, 545 S.E. 2D 827, 829 (2001)] [STATE V. DAVIS, 364 S.C. 364, 409, 613 S.E. 2D 760, 784 (CT. APP. 2005)] THE VIOLATIONS CANNOT BE SEEN AS HARMLESS ERROR. THE SAME WARRANTS WERE USED TO FORCE DNA FROM MR. LITTLE BEFORE HE WAS ISSUED A COPY OF THE WARRANT OR GIVEN A JUDICIAL HEARING BEFORE ANY MAGISTRATE JUDGE ON THE MATTER OF HIS CONSENT TO GIVE DNA. THE OFFICERS ACTED IN BAD FAITH WHEN THEY TRANSPORTED MR. LITTLE TO A HOSPITAL AND FORCED DRUGS INTO HIS SYSTEM TO OBTAIN DNA, IF THAT WAS EVEN THE PURPOSE BEHIND THE ORDEAL. [STATE V. SACHS, 264 S.C. 541, 216 S.E. 2D 501 (1975)] [DAVIS V. DOE, 285 S.C. 538, 331 S.E. 2D 352 (1985)] MR. LITTLE'S 4TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS WERE VIOLATED UPON HIS UNLAWFUL AND ILLEGAL ARREST MADE BY THE CHERAW POLICE DEPARTMENT. [UNITED STATES V. SALVUCCL, 448 U.S. 83, 100 S. CT. 2547, 65 L. ED. 2D 619 (1980)] AS WELL AS DUE PROCESS. [58 AM. JUR. 2D, OATH AND AFFIRMATION, SECTION 3]

PRETRIAL TRANSFER TO FDC

MR. LITTLE ALLEGES THAT HE WAS TRANSFERRED ON MARCH 22, 2021 FROM CCDC TO FLORENCE COUNTY DETENTION CENTER DUE TO RETALIATION BEHIND THE INCIDENT THAT TOOK PLACE ON MARCH 9, 2021, BY TRANSFERRING MR. LITTLE WITHOUT A DISCIPLINARY HEARING OR WITHOUT A INCIDENT REPORT, OFFICERS VIOLATED HIS DUE PROCESS. NOT ONLY WAS MR. LITTLE SENT TO FDC TO BE PLACED IN MAX SECT., BUT UPON HIS ARRIVAL HE WAS ONCE AGAIN FORCED DRUGS AGAINST HIS WILL WHILE BEING IN A RESTRAINT CHAIR. MR. LITTLE WAS MADE TO FACE EXTREME HARDSHIP WHILE AT FDC, ALL AT THE HANDS OF A CORRUPT SHERIFF, JAMES DIXON, IN RETALIATIONS FOR THE INCIDENT FROM MARCH 9, 2021. JAMES DIXON WAS SOON TO BE UP FOR REELECTION SO THIS WAS UNDENIABLY DONE TO PLEASE HIS EUROPEAN SUPPORTERS AND FELLOW SERVANT EMPLOYEES. [ROBLES V. PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY] IT IS NO SECRET AS TO WHAT IS GOING ON AND WHAT HAS BEEN GOING ON IN THIS COUNTRY. PEOPLE JUST CHOOSE TO IGNORE THE TRUTH!! [SCOTT V. VANDIVER, 476 F. 2D 238] THE MAUCIOUS AND SADISTIC PUNISHMENTS IMPOSED ON MR. LITTLE CANNOT BE EXPLAINED OR JUSTIFIED IN LITIGATION SENSE OR ONE OF MORALITY. [BELL V. WOLFISH] [LEER V. MURPHY, 844 F. 2D AT 1033-34] [GRAHAM V. CONNOR] THEY HAD ONLY PLANNED TO PSYCHOLOGICALLY IMPAIR MR. LITTLE AND NO REASONABLE PERSON CAN DENY THIS FACT. [BROOKS V. PEMBROKE CITY JAIL, 722 F. SUPP. 1294, 1299-1300 (E.D.N.C. 1989)] [18 U.S.C. § 1512] [RILEY V. DORTON, 93 F. 3D 113] [SCINTO, 841 F. 3D AT 225], [SANDIN V. CONNER, 515 U.S. 472] [445 U.S. AT 494] [WOLFF V. McDONNELL, 418 U.S. 539, 94 S. CT. 2963, 41 L. ED. 2D 935 (1974)] [1989 WL 1127142]

LEGAL MAIL
MAIL ROOM

THE PUNISHMENTS SUFFERED WHILE AT FCDC WERE EXTREMELY SERIOUS AND MADE THE DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS EVEN MORE SEVERE CAUSING MORE INJURY, PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPAIRMENT, AND MENTAL ANGUISH TO MR. LITTLE.

[GRAY V. CREANER, 465 F.2D 179, 185 (3RD CIR. 1972)] DUE TO THE INFLICTIONS OF PAIN THAT MR. LITTLE HAS ENDURED FROM BOTH THE CHESTERFIELD COUNTY DETENTION CENTER AS WELL AS FLORENCE COUNTY DETENTION CENTER, HAS SHOCKED MR. LITTLE'S CONSCIENCE IRREPARABLY AND IT HAS ALL BEEN DONE INTENTIONALLY IN BAD FAITH. [ROCHIN V. CALIFORNIA, 342 U.S. 1165]

[BROWN V. STATE OF MISSISSIPPI, 297 U.S. 278, 285-286, 56 S. CT. 461, 464-465, 80 L. ED. 622] [DANIS V. MILLS, 194 U.S. 451, 457, 24 S. CT. 692, 695, 48

L. ED. 1067] [WOLF V. PEOPLE OF STATE OF COLORADO, 338 U.S. 25, 69 S. CT.

1359, 93 L. ED. 1782] [UNITED STATES V. WASHINGTON, 431 U.S. 181, 188, 97 S. CT.

1814, 52 L. ED. 2D 238 (1977)] [STATE V. SPEARS, 429 S. C. 422]

[WOLFF V. McDONNELL, 418 U.S. AT 558] [LARGE V. SUPERIOR COURT OF COUNTY OF MARICOPA, 714 P.2D 399 (ARIZ. 1986)] [TURNER V. SAFFLEY, 482 U.S. AT 89]

ONCE MR. LITTLE WAS TRANSFERRED BACK TO CHESTERFIELD COUNTY DETENTION CENTER AFTER HAVING SUFFERED THE EXTREME POLICE BRUTALITIES AND TORMENTS HE WAS UNSOUND IN MIND. FROM BEING SPRAYED CONSTANTLY WITH CHEMICAL MUNITION TO BEING FORCED ANTI-PSYCHOTIC DRUGS. THE INTENTIONS OF STATE ACTORS WERE CLEAR... THEY SOUGHT TO PUNISH MR. LITTLE THROUGH COMPELLSION AND BRUTE FORCE. [SELL V. U.S. 539 U.S. 1166, 123 S. CT. 2174] [VITEK V. JONES]

[GRISSOM V. ROBERTS, NO. 09-3128, 2009 WL 2601260 AT 6 (D. KAN. AUG. 24, 2009)] [BAILEY, 736 F.2D AT 969]

MR. LITTLE WAS MACE MOST OF THE TIME JUST FOR BEATING ON THE CELL DOOR OR FOR SIMPLY TALKING BACK TO OFFICERS AT FCDC.

[SOTO, 744 F.2D AT 1261] AFTER BEING BACK AT CCDC MR. LITTLE WAS RETALIATED AGAINST EVEN MORE. [MILLER V. LEATHERS, 913 F.2D 1085]

FOR 5-6 WEEKS MR. LITTLE WAS MADE TO STAY IN A CELL WITH NO SHOWER, RECREATION, TOILET TISSUE OR ANY MEANS TO FLUSH HIS TOILET. MR. LITTLE AT SOME POINT HAD TO DESTROY THE MATTRESS TO USE THE COTTON INSIDE AS TISSUE. ONCE DOING SO MR. LITTLE'S MATTRESS WAS TAKEN FOR ALMOST A WEEK MAKING HIM HAVE TO SLEEP ON THE STEEL BUNK OR EITHER THE FLOOR OF HIS CELL. MR. LITTLE REMAINED UNDER THESE CONDITIONS UP UNTIL THE DAY OF HIS TRIAL WHERE HE WAS POORLY REPRESENTED AND PREJUDICED BY STATE APPOINTED COUNSEL TONYA COPELAND - LITTLE. COUNSEL TONYA COPELAND - LITTLE FAILED TO EVEN VISIT MR. LITTLE TO CONFER A DEFENSE FOR HER CLIENT, TO ASK IF HE DESIRED TO TAKE THE CASE TO TRIAL, AND FAILED TO INFORM HIM OF TRIAL.

[MCKNIGHT V. STATE, 378 S. C. 33, 46, 661 S. E. 2D 354, 360 (2008)]

[STRICKLAND V. WASHINGTON, 466 U.S. 668, 687, 104 S. CT. 2052, 80 L. ED. 2D 674 (1984)]

COUNSEL'S PERFORMANCE WAS DEFICIENT AND WAS INTENTIONAL DUE TO DISCRIMINATION. BEFORE THE TRIAL HAD EVEN STARTED MR. LITTLE INFORMED THE JUDGE THAT COUNSEL WAS INEFFECTIVE, BUT WAS ONLY IGNORED. IN A RISE ARTICULATED AND CALCULATED BY MUNICIPAL OFFICERS, AS WELL AS THE JUDGE, MR. LITTLE WAS WRONGFULLY CONVICTED WHILE NOT EVEN BEING FULLY COMPETENT DUE TO PRIOR BRUTALITIES CAUSED BY CORRUPTED STATE ACTORS. MR. LITTLE WAS ALSO DISCRIMINATED AGAINST BY DR. MATTHEW GASKINS DURING A MENTAL EVALUATION THAT MR. LITTLE HAD NOT BEEN GIVEN NOTICE OF, WHERE HE WAS QUESTIONED AND HIS ATTORNEY WAS NOT PRESENT. THE SAME DR. GASKINS COMMITTED PERJURY DURING HIS TESTIMONY AND MR. LITTLE'S ATTORNEY FAILED TO OBJECT TO THE LIES MATTHEW GASKINS TOLD OR TO MAKE ANY OTHER OBJECTIONS TO THE VIOLATIONS OF MR. LITTLE'S DUE PROCESS.

[PATE V. ROBINSON, 383 U.S. 375, 86 S. CT. 836]

LEGAL MAIL
MAIL ROOM

TRIAL TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD

1.) PG. 7 (16-24)

CLEARLY MR. LITTLE WAS NOT INFORMED OF HIS TRIAL THAT WAS MORE OF A MOCKED TRIAL WHERE MR. LITTLE WAS PREJUDICED BY THE COURT AND IT PROVES THAT HE HAD BEEN ASKING TO GO TO TRIAL FOR HIS ORIGINAL CHARGES, BUT IN A STEALTHY RUSE BY STATE ACTORS, WAS FORCED INTO A TRIAL THAT HE WAS NOT MADE AWARE OF UNTIL (72) HOURS BEFORE-HAND AND ALSO WHERE COUNSEL FAILED TO VISIT HIM AT THE JAIL TO INFORM OR CONFER WITH HIM ABOUT A DEFENSE. PROVING HER POOR REPRESENTATION, FEIGNED INCOMPETENCE, AND PLOT TO CONSPIRE AGAINST MR. LITTLE WITH THE STATE AND PROSECUTOR. WHEN IT WAS TIME FOR MR. LITTLE TO TESTIFY, THE COURT REMOVED THE

2.) PG. 6 (LS-7)

MY QUESTION IS: WHY DIDNT THE STATE GIVE ME THE SPEEDY TRIAL FOR THE MURDER CHARGE I WAS ORIGINALLY ARRESTED FOR WHEN I HAD BEEN REQUESTING A SPEEDY TRIAL BEFORE THE RESISTING / ASSAULT CHARGES? IT IS CLEAR THAT THE STATE ACTORS ARE AWARE THAT THEY HAVE VIOLATED MR. LITTLE FROM THE VERY START, BUT DUE TO THE FACT THEY RUSHED ME TO TRIAL FOR SOME TRUMPED UP CHARGES, STACKING THEM AGAINST ME WHEN I ONLY HIT (2) OF THOSE OFFICERS AND NOT (3). IT IS CLEAR WHAT THE STATE HAS DONE.

3.) PG. 41-66 (12-15) PG. 42-43 (20-25) (1-8) PG. 63 (17-21)

DR. MATTHEW GASKINS SWEARS TO TELL THE TRUTH, BUT HE TOO VIOLATED MR. LITTLE'S RIGHT TO HAVE COUNSEL PRESENT AT THE TIME OF HIS "EVALUATION" WHICH HE CLEARLY STATES WAS NOT COMPLETE DUE TO HIS OWN PERSONAL FEELINGS OF DISCRIMINATION, WANTON CARE, AND BIASED OPINIONS. MR GASKINS ALSO COMMITS PERJURY BY FALSELY TESTIFYING THAT THE INTERVIEW LASTED OVER AN HOUR WHEN IN ALL ACTUALITY WAS ONLY (20-30) MINUTES AT MOST AND WAS VIDEO RECORDED. COUNSEL TONYA COPELAND - LITTLE AND DR. MATTHEW GASKINS WERE AWARE THAT DR. MATTHEW GASKINS BEGAN THE EVALUATION WITHOUT COUNSEL PRESENT, BUT COUNSEL FAILED TO MAKE ANY OBJECTIONS ON THE MATTER. PROVING THAT THESE DEVILS PLANNED, KNOWINGLY, TO CONSPIRE TO GET A CONVICTION. IT IS CLEAR THAT MR. LITTLE WAS BAMBOOZLED AND MOCKED BY THE STATE, AND EVEN THE COURT STENOGRAPHER CONSPIRED TO CONSTRIE THE WORDS OF MR. LITTLE AND TRIED HARD TO CORRECT HER ERRORS, BUT MR. LITTLE IS A RACIST...? PG. 69 (CLEARLY THE JUDGE KNEW I WAS INCOMPETENT BUT ERRORED IN HIS JUDGEMENT.) (INTENTIONALLY)

4.) PG. 179 (15-19)

CLEARLY THIS IS PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT AND A VIOLATION OF RULE 3.8. SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF A PROSECUTOR (F) AND IF THE PROSECUTOR DID NOT PREJUDICE MR. LITTLE ANYWHERE ELSE IN THIS EXAGGERATED AND EMBELLISHED TRANSCRIPT, THEN HE DID SO HERE. THE PROSECUTOR ALSO HAS PROVED THAT MARC WEISS COMMITTED PERJURY BY LYING SAYING THAT MR. LITTLE HIT HIM, BUT HE ACTUALLY INJURED HIMSELF BY RUNNING INTO A WALL DUE TO HIS OWN COWARDICE.

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

NO EXPLANATIONS CAN BE GIVEN TO ABSOLVE THE STATE ACTORS WHO HAS CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON MR. LITTLE'S RIGHTS TO CAUSE THE PAIN, SUFFERING, AND MENTAL ANGUISH IN WHICH MR. LITTLE HAS SUFFERED AND STILL SUFFERS. THESE SNEAKY UNDERHANDED PEOPLE SHOULD BE TRIED AND CONVICTED, BUT I DOUBT THAT WILL HAPPEN BECAUSE THEY ARE PROTECTED BY THIS GOVERNMENT. THE UNITED STATES IS NOTHING MORE THAN A COMMERCIAL FOR-PROFIT COMPANY. THE MAIN OBJECTIVE OF THIS GOVERNMENT IS TO CONTROL A DEAF, DUMB, AND BLIND PEOPLE. FOR THE RECORD, OFFICER MCQUEEN WAS A SCAPEGOAT AND DID NOTHING WRONG DUE TO THE FACT THAT PRIOR TO THE INCIDENT ON 3/9/2021 MR. LITTLE WAS NOT BEING MADE TO WEAR RESTRAINTS.

AFTER BEING FORCED MINDALTERING DRUGS ON TWO (2) OCCASIONS; FORCED TO REMAIN IN A RESTRAINT CHAIR FOR MORE THAN (72) HOURS; CONSTANTLY MACEED BY OFFICERS AT FLORENCE COUNTY DETENTION CENTER AND SUBJECTED TO POLICE BRUTALITIES; FORCED TO REMAIN IN A CELL WITHOUT A SHOWER, PHONE ACCESS, AND HAVING TO REMAIN IN THESE CONDITIONS FOR OVER A MONTH, BEING FORCED TO SLEEP ON A STEEL BUNK OR THE FLOOR BECAUSE BARBAROUS OFFICERS TAKE YOUR MATTRESS FOR ALMOST A WEEK, ANY SAIN PERSON, AFTER EXPERIENCING THIS TYPE OF DEPRIVATION WOULD BE INCOMPETENT TO STAND TRIAL. [STATE V. NANCE, 320 S.C. 501, 466 S.E. 2D 349] SEE [NANCE V. FREDERICK, 358 S.C. 480, 5916 S.E. 2D 162]

THE CRUEL, UNUSUAL, AND OPPRESSIVE INFLICTIONS OF PAIN AND SUFFERING THAT MR. LITTLE HAS FACED SINCE HIS ARREST GOES TO SHOW THAT THE POLICY ENFORCERS AND GOVERNMENT SERVANTS IN THIS COUNTRY ARE VIKRENT AND THEY JUDGE NOT BY LAW, BUT BASED OFF OF CALLOUSNESS AND BIAS TENDENCY WHICH IS NOT LAW. BUT, IT DOES NOT TAKE WHAT IVE EXPERIENCED FOR PEOPLE TO KNOW THAT THEIR GOVERNMENT IS CORRUPTED TO THE CORE... HISTORY PROVES THAT!!! THE CONSTITUTION AND DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE PROVES THAT, AND THAT IS WHY THESE ROMAN, PAGAN, HYBRID EUROPEANS DIE FIGHTING, TRYING TO PROTECT THE UNITED STATES OF AMERIKKA CORPORATION AND ITS IDOLATROUS PAPER FIAT "MONEY" WHICH IS RIDICULE AND MOCKERY TO THE ABORIGINAL INDIGENOUS "NATIVE" PEOPLE WHO WERE IN THIS LAND FIRST. THEY HAVE INDEED DOOMED THEMSELVES BECAUSE THEY REFUSE TO FOLLOW GOD ALMIGHTIES LAW. WOE TO THEM AND ANY PEOPLE WHO BLINDLY FOLLOW THEM.

LEGAL MAIL
MAIL ROOM

UNAPOLOGETICALLY I SPEAK THE TRUTH AND I DO NOT FEAR THE BACKLASH OR CONSEQUENCES THAT MAY FOLLOW MY EXERCISE OF FREE SPEECH. I WOULD RATHER DIE ON MY FEET THAN LIVE ON MY KNEES LIKE MOST OF THE COWARDLY PEOPLE ARE DOING IN THIS COUNTRY. GOD ALMIGHTY HAS MADE ME A NATURALIZED PERSON SO I DO NOT SEEK TO BE NATURALIZED AND DEFINITELY DO NOT PLEDGE MY ALLEGIANCE TO THIS INHUMANE AMERIKKAN FLAG OR THE PEOPLE IN THIS LAND OF DISBELIEF. ALL I ASK IS THAT YOU GIVE ME MY LIBERTY AND MY JUSTICE. IF YOU DECIDE YOU WANT TO CONSPIRE TO KILL ME, I ASK THAT YOU SHOOT ME NOT IN MY BACK. IT IS SAD THAT ONE MUST EVEN ASK FOR LIBERTY AND JUSTICE ccc

(THOMAS JEFFERSON, VIRGINIA STATUTE FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM (1785)).

FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS DO I HEREBY SEEK THE REVERSE AND REMAND OF THIS CASE AND ALSO THE DISMISSAL OF ANY SAID PENDING CASES WITHOUT BEING DISCRIMINATED AGAINST, RETALIATED AGAINST, OR PREJUDGED BY THIS "JUSTICE" SYSTEM THAT HAS ALWAYS BEEN ROGUE. MR. LITTLE PRAYS FOR A RETRIAL NOW THAT HE HAS GAIN HIS COMPETENCY SO THAT HE CAN EXPOSE THE CORRUPTED CONSPIRATORS IN THE NAME OF ALLAH. [282 F.3D AT 563, N.3] HOW MUCH LONGER WILL THIS STATE OPPRESS ME ccc

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

MAY 18, 2023


WITHOUT PREJUDICE



DAVID ANTONIO LITTLE, JR.,
#385407
386 REDEMPTION WAY
MCCORMICK, SC 29399

"THE DEVIL CAME TO STEAL, KILL, AND PIT ONE GROUP OF PEOPLE AGAINST ANOTHER", THE WORD RACISM WAS CREATED BY EUROPEANS AND HIS -STORY IS VERY UNMISTAKABLE ccc

RECEIVED

MAY 31 2023

S.C. SUPREME COURT

**LEGAL MAIL
MAIL ROOM**

IN THE SUPREME COURT
SOUTH CAROLINA DISTRICT

RECEIVED

MAY 31 2023

S.C. SUPREME COURT

CASE NO. 2021A1310100124, 2021A1310100258,
2021A1310100125 AND 2021-000990

DAVID ANTONIO LITTLE, JR.,

PLAINTIFF,

v.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

DEFENDANT,

RECEIVED

JUN 01 2023

SC Court of Appeals

PROOF OF SERVICE

THE PLAINTIFF, DAVID ANTONIO LITTLE, JR., DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT HE HAS FILED A WRIT OF MANDAMUS FOR THE ABOVE-MENTIONED CASES.

RESPECTFULLY,

MAY, 24 2023



David Little, Jr.
DAVID ANTONIO LITTLE, JR.,
#385407
MCCORMICK CORRECTIONAL
INSTITUTE
386 REDEMPTION WAY
MCCORMICK, SC 29899

**LEGAL MAIL
MAIL ROOM**