

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