

MICHAEL PALKA # 355525
K. R+E. F-3-258
4344 BROAD RIVER RD
COLUMBIA S.C. 29210

DATE. 6-25-13

S.C. COURT OF APPEALS
P.O. BOX 121629
COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211

WARRANT NOS:
M757387 - M757388

RE: NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPEAL,

RECEIVED

JUL 08 2013

SC Court of Appeals

DEAR APPEAL COURT.

AS YOU SEE, I DID NOT BENEFIT FROM MY GUILTY PLEA. SO MY PLEA CAN NOT BE KNOWINGLY OR VOLUNTARY MADE. UNDER UNITED STATES V MCGLOCKLIN 8F.3D 1037-1047 [6TH CIR 1993] A GUILTY PLEA IS INVOLUNTARY, WHERE THE DEFENDANT LACKS KNOWLEDGE OF AN ELEMENT OF THE OFFENSE OR DOES NOT UNDERSTAND THE NATURE OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO BENEFIT FROM HIS PLEA. THIS MAKES HIS COUNSEL ENEFFECTIVE IN THIS CASE AT BAR. COUNSEL SHOULD HAVE OBJECTED TO THE MAX PLEA ON THIS CASE. "WHY" BECAUSE DEFENDANT DID NOT BENEFIT FROM HIS PLEA. IF COUNSEL HAD OBJECTED TO SENTENCE, IT COULD HAVE BEEN RAISED ON DIRECT APPEAL, BUT BECAUSE OF COUNSEL'S ABANDONMENT OF HIS CLIENT. DEFENDANT REQUEST THIS HONORABLE COURT TO RAISE THIS ISSUE, UNDER.

PAGE 1. OF 2.

BoYKIN v ALABAMA 395 U.S. 238.242 [1969] THIS COURT
MUST CONSIDER ALL OF THE RELEVANT CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING
THE GUILTY PLEA TO DETERMINE ITS INVOLUNTARINESS, AND TO SHOW
THAT COUNSEL RICHARD H. WARDER ABANDONED HIS CLIENT IN THE
COURT ROOM.

FOR THESE REASONS I REQUEST THAT COUNSEL BE APPOINTED IN
MY BEHALF, AND THE APPEAL TO GO ON THREW THE COURT SYSTEM,

THANKING YOU IN ADVANCE

I REMAIN

Mike Palta

Michael Palta

PAGE 2 OF 2,

RECEIVED

JUL 08 2013

SC COURT OF APPEALS