

The State v. George Holmes, Appellant Case No. 2022-000728

ORDER MOTION
TO BE RELEASED

RECEIVED

AUG 14 2023

SC Court of Appeals

Warrant No.(s) 2018AD710200399, 2018AD710200400
Indictment No.(s) 2019GS0700039, 2019GS0700040

ORDER

The Circuit Court applied the wrong Standard of review, and under the Correct Standard of review. Please See:

Arrest Warrant No. 2018AD710200399, States "Non-violent burglary 2nd degree, CONFLICT ORDER; on February 26, 2020. Stated Defendant, George Holmes, is charged with Burglary (non-violent) 2nd degree, "Non-violent" offense. Motion by Charles W. Patrick, III, On March 25, 2020, Order Granting Defendant Motion for Bond is hereby ordered as follows: George Holmes, shall be released on his own recognizance; shall be on house arrest. Order for Competency to stand trial Evaluation Pursuant to STATE v. BLAIR. "States" George Holmes, charged with one (1) count of Burglary 2nd degree (non-violent) Please see: Summons No. 607774 Defendant's COPY incident Report #18S324616. May 18, 2022, The Trial Convicted of Burglary 2nd degree (violent) Sentence Sheet and Notice of Appeal Shows (violent).

The Circuit Court applied the wrong Standard of review and under the Correct Standard of review.

CREDIBILITY: OF B.C.S.O. Jonathan M Hewitt, 2-1-2019.

ACQUITTAL: That the evidence is insufficient to support a Conviction.

Thanks,

with kindest Regards I'm ~~George~~ Holmes

The Carolina Court of Appeals
The Supreme Court of South Carolina
Clerk of Court of Beaufort South Carolina

Mr. Colin J Hamilton, Esquire
Bar No. 104439, 14 Circuit
Assistant Public Defender
Post office Box 525
1905 Duke Street, Room 210
Beaufort, SC 29901

ORDER MOTION
OF TERMINATION **RECEIVED**

JUN 29 2022

SC Court of Appeals

The State v. George Holmes, Appellate
Appellate Case No. 2022-000728

Dear SCACR,

Big Complaint: Ineffective Assistant of Council - Creditability of
Mr. Colin J Hamilton, Esq. Bar No. 104439, Assistant Public Defender 14th Circuit...
As representing me, of my trial re Statute: SafeCracking 16-11-390, in general
Miller v. State of SC, D.C.S.C. 1970, 309 F. Supp. 1287...
Perjury and Subornation, When B.C.D.O. Affiant, Jonathan M Hewitt,
At my Preliminary hearing On 2-1-2019, he committed Perjury 16-9-10,
B.C.S.O. Jonathan M Hewitt, Committed Perjury and Subornation,
under Oath, Oath: false statement, testimony, Affidavit,
Perjury generally, Nature of Preliminary hearing 21. On 2-1-2019,
Creditability of Jonathan M Hewitt, at my trial On May 18, 2022, ...
My Arrest Warrant #2018A0110200399, States, (non violent) Burglary 2nd
degree, But the Jury trial Convicted me, burglary 2nd degree (Violent)
How?? Mr. Colin J Hamilton, Is Ineffective Assistant of Council, Also
Motion by Charles W. Patrick, III, appointed Counsel, held on
March 25, 2020, order for my bond, stated I, George Holmes,
shall be release on my own recognizance and Motion order
for Competency to stand trial Evaluation Pursuant to
STATE V. BLAIR

with kindest regards I'm ^{Thanks} George Holmes
George Holmes

~~The State v. George Holmes Appellate Case No. 2018-000728~~

Code of Laws of South Carolina 1976 Annotated
Title 16: Crimes and Offenses
Chapter 31: Offenses Against Property
Article 5: Burglary, Housebreaking, Robbery and the like

PLEASE SEE
Arrest Warrant: 2018A0710200400

Code 1976 § 16-11-390
§ 16-11-390. Safecracking.
It is unlawful for a person to use explosives, tools, or any other implement in or about a safe used for keeping money or other valuables with intent to commit larceny or any other crime.
A person who violates the provisions of this section is guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, must be imprisoned not more than thirty years.

Credits
HISTORY: 1962 Code § 16-337; 1952 Code § 16-337; 1942 Code § 1150; 1932 Code § 1150; 1911; 1904 (14) 396; 1907 (25) 580; 1955 (49) 65; 1993 Act No. 184, § 172.

Notes of Decisions (10)
Code 1976 § 16-11-390, SC ST § 16-11-390
Current through 2019 Act No. 90, subject to technical revisions by the Code Commissioner as authorized by law before official publication.
End of Document
© 2019 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

RECEIVED
AUG 14 2023
SC Court of Appeals

Mr. George Holmes did not commit the offense of safecracking
Dismiss
Indictment: 2018A0710200400 16-11-6398

GH It is not essential to constitute safecracking that the offender shall be successful in his attempt to break open the safe. Miller v. State of S. C. (D.C.S.C. 1970) 309 F.Supp. 1287.
George Holmes
GH "safetampering" falls within the crime defined as "safecracking" in this section [Code 1962 § 16-337]. Miller v. State of S. C. (D.C.S.C. 1970) 309 F.Supp. 1287. Burglary 2
GH Defendant's possession, following larceny of safe, of property of the nature stolen, with his admission to others that he had obtained them from the safe in subject, were sufficient to sustain his conviction of the offense of safecracking. State v. Blue (S.C. 1975) 264 S.C. 468, 215 S.E.2d 905. Burglary 45
GH Use of a hammer to remove a safe (one county, although it was not opened until carried into a second county, constituted a violation of this section [Code 1962 § 16-337], such as to give a court of the first county jurisdiction over the case. Shelnut v. State (S.C. 1965) 247 S.C. 41, 145 S.E.2d 420.

GH The subject of the act from which this section [Code 1962 § 16-337] is taken was expressed in the title thereof. State v. O'Day (S.C. 1906) 74 S.C. 448, 54 S.E. 607.

GH Constitutional Issues
Ten year minimum sentence for safecracking with tools does not constitute cruel and unusual punishment. Stockton v. Leeke (S.C. 1977) 269 S.C. 459, 237 S.E.2d 896.

GH This section [Code 1962 § 16-337] is not unconstitutional by reason of the fact that life imprisonment is directed upon conviction if the jury does not recommend mercy, and not less than ten years' imprisonment is directed when the jury does recommend mercy. State v. Haulcomb (S.C. 1973) 260 S.C. 260, 195 S.E.2d 601, appeal dismissed 94 S.Ct. 229, 414 U.S. 886, 38 L.Ed.2d 134. Larceny 2
George Holmes George Holmes

GH The contention that this section [Code 1962 § 16-337] is not sufficiently definite to place a person of common intelligence on notice as to what is prohibited is clearly without merit. The offense is designated in bold-faced letters - "SAFECRACKING." State v. Haulcomb (S.C. 1973) 260 S.C. 260, 195 S.E.2d 601, appeal dismissed 94 S.Ct. 229, 414 U.S. 886, 38 L.Ed.2d 134. Larceny 2

GH Indictment 2018A0710200400 I'm Not Guilty GH
Where an indictment on its face specifically sets forth the charge of safecracking as the fourth count, its plain language is not to be ignored merely because on the outside of the indictment the several counts are tabulated in a different order. Crady v. State (S.C. 1966) 248 S.C. 522, 151 S.E.2d 670.

GH Questions for Jury
George Holmes
In a prosecution for armed robbery and safecracking, the court improperly denied defendant's motion for directed verdict.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2

STATEMENT OF FACTS 3

ARGUMENT

1.

~~The trial judge erred~~ by denying Appellant’s motion for a directed verdict for the offense of second degree burglary where Appellant allegedly entered a standalone structure housing an automated teller machine (ATM), which is not a “building” as intended by the legislature for purposes of S.C. Code Ann. § 16-11-312(B)(3)..... 5

2.

~~The trial judge erred~~ by denying Appellant’s motion for a directed verdict for the offense of safecracking where the state alleged Appellant attempted to pry open an automated teller machine (ATM) since an ATM does not constitute “a safe used for keeping money or other valuables” as intended by the legislature for purposes of S.C. Code Ann. § 16-11-390. 9

3.

~~The trial judge erred~~ by denying Appellant’s motion to relieve counsel and proceed *pro se* without conducting the proper inquiry pursuant to ~~Faretta v. California, 422 U.S. 806 (1975)~~ in violation of Appellant’s federal and state constitutional rights 12

CONCLUSION 17

25. However, Appellant was "not satisfied." He asserted, "It's not looking right at all." Tr. 126, ll. 5-7.

The judge then inquired whether Appellant was under the influence of any drugs or alcohol. Appellant responded, "No, ma'am" and again stated that he was "~~not satisfied with his [counsel's] service.~~" The following colloquy then took place:

THE COURT: Sir, if you want him to be relieved, I can entertain that. But we're still going forward with the trial and you would have to represent yourself.

~~MR. HOLMES: I'll represent myself. Mental health and all - let's represent myself. And tell the Lord Jesus, I'll represent myself. I don't want his service. I'll represent myself.~~

MR. HAMILTON [Defense Counsel]: It would be against the advice of --

THE COURT: Counsel, obviously. Mr. Holmes, we need to go forward. We're in the middle of your trial, sir. You have not been to law school. You don't know the rules of evidence and you will do better having the assistance of counsel.

~~MR. HOLMES: God is all - I don't want his service.~~ This is not going right.

MR. HAMILTON: I'd like to reserve the right that Mr. Holmes can re-raise this motion at a time in the future if he so chooses.

THE COURT: That's fine. That's fine. Okay. Let's bring the jury in.

Tr. 126, l. 12 – 127, l. 8 (emphasis added).

The jury then entered the courtroom and testimony resumed. Tr. 127, ll. 9-12. ~~The judge never entertained Appellant's motion to relieve counsel and represent himself nor did she conduct a Faretta colloquy.~~

Standard of Review

"Whether a defendant has knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily waived his right to counsel is a mixed question of law and fact which appellate courts review de novo." State v. Samuel, 422 S.C. 596, 602, 813 S.E.2d 487, 490 (2018) (citing United States v. Lopez-Osuna,

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing argument, this Court should direct a verdict of acquittal for the offenses of second degree burglary and safecracking. In the alternative, Appellant respectfully requests this Court reverse his convictions and remand for a new trial.

Respectfully submitted,

~~/s/ Lara M. Caudy~~
~~Lara M. Caudy~~
~~Appellate Defender~~

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

~~This 19th day of April 2023.~~

3-24-2019

APPEAL

RE: Motion to dismiss indictment: 2018A0710200400; because of Denial of Speedy trial; Lack of Prosecution; Failure to bring indictment in next term; Tape recording of February 1 2019 of my Preliminary hearing at Beaufort Magistrate

APPEAL 6-13-2022 G.H.

Jeffery Stephens

TO: ~~Courtney Gibbes~~ - Public defender - Lauren Heath Carroway; Judges of General Sessions, Mullen, Buckner, Goldsmith, John Cooper Clerk of Court & SC Commission of indigent defense... The SC Commission of Lawyers Conduct & Chief Justice Issac M. Stone III, Solicitor, 14th Judicial Circuit

Complaint: On February 1 2019, At my Preliminary hearing Beaufort Magistrate

The Presiding Judge was Mark Francis Fitzgibbons on February 1 2019. Ofc Jonathan M Hewitt - B.C.S.O Proof of witness alleged lies by stating that the safe was crack open. I'd like to introduced the tape into evidence of specific facts, why ofc Jonathan M Hewitt testimony is not sufficient or isn't trialable or appropriate to support any convictions of indictment: 2018A0710200400 The evidence of the tape recording of the witness statement I Demand for Speedy trial or dismissal of Indictments: 2018A0710200400...

6-13-2022

^{-N-}
2018A0710200399...

Thanks

With kind regards for your time I'm

George Holmes
George Holmes

RECEIVED

JUN 16 2022
S.C. SUPREME COURT

RECEIVED

JUN 16 2022
SC Court of Appeals

The State v. George Holmes, Appellate Case No. 2022-000728

ARREST WARRANT

2018A0710200400

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

County/ Municipality of

Beaufort

THE STATE 18S324618
against

George Holmes

Address:

Phone: SSN:
 Sex: M Race: B Height: 5 7 Weight: 240
 DL State: SC DL #:
 DOB: Agency ORI #: SC0070000
 Prosecuting Agency: Beaufort County Sheriff's Office
 Prosecuting Officer: Jonathan M Hewitt - S00393
 Offense: Burglary / Safecracking

Offense Code: 0141
 Code/Ordinance Sec: 16-11-0390

This warrant is CERTIFIED FOR SERVICE in the
 County/ Municipality of
 The accused
 is to be arrested and brought before me to be
 dealt with according to the law.

(L.S.)

Signature of Judge

Date:

RETURN

A copy of this arrest warrant was delivered to
 defendant
 on 12/28/2018

Signature of Constable/Law Enforcement Officer

RETURN WARRANT TO:

Beaufort County General Sessions
 PO Box 1128
 102 Ribaut Road, Rm. 208
 Beaufort, SC 299011128

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

County/ Municipality of

Beaufort

Personally appeared before me the affiant Jonathan M Hewitt who
 being duly sworn deposes and says that defendant George Holmes
 did within this county and state on or about 12/28/2018 violate the criminal laws of the
 State of South Carolina (or ordinance of County/ Municipality of Beaufort)
 in the following particulars:

DESCRIPTION OF OFFENSE: Burglary / Safecracking

I further state that there is probable cause to believe that the defendant named above did commit
 the crime set forth and that probable cause is based on the following facts:

That on December 28th, 2018, at approximately 0128 hours, the defendant, one George Holmes did knowingly, willingly and
 unlawfully violate the laws of the State of South Carolina in that he did commit the offense of Safecracking. The defendant
 unlawfully broke into the Navy Federal Credit Union ATM. Upon gaining entry attempted to force entry into the ATM box to steal
 the currency located within. The incident was captured on surveillance footage, Holmes was positively identified and a BCSO
 Tracking Team was recalled and tracked to the location he was found. This incident did occur at 102 Sea Island Parkway, Beaufort,
 Beaufort County, South Carolina and within the jurisdiction of the Beaufort County Sheriff's Office. The Affiant and others are
 witness to the same.

Signature of Affiant

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

County/ Municipality of

Beaufort

Affiant's Address 2001 Duke St
 Beaufort, SC 29902-

Affiant's Telephone

ARREST WARRANT

TO ANY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER OF THIS STATE OR MUNICIPALITY OR ANY CONSTABLE OF THIS COUNTY:

It appearing from the above affidavit that there are reasonable grounds to believe that

on or about 12/28/2018 defendant George Holmes
 did violate the criminal laws of the State of South Carolina (or ordinance of
 County/ Municipality of Beaufort) as set forth below.

DESCRIPTION OF OFFENSE: Burglary / Safecracking

Having found probable cause and the above affiant having sworn before me, you are empowered and directed to arrest the said defendant and bring him or
 her before me forthwith to be dealt with according to law. A copy of this Arrest Warrant shall be delivered to the defendant at the time of its execution, or as
 soon thereafter as is practicable
 Sworn to and subscribed before me

on 12/28/2018

Signature of Issuing Judge
 (L.S.)

Mark Francis Fitzgibbons
 Judge Code: 7060

Judge's Address 104 Ribaut Rd
 Beaufort, SC 29901-2207

Judge's Telephone (843)255-5700

Issuing Court: Magistrate Municipal Circuit

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

3 Statutes: Intent
 0 Statutes: Plain language; Plain ordinary
 Common, or literal meaning
 1 Statutes: In general, factors considered

Certified - A True Copy

Jeri Ann Rosejeau - Clerk of Court
 Beaufort County, SC - Jennifer Peters

Form Approved by
 S.C. Attorney General
 April 21, 2003
 SOCA 318

ORIGINAL

AFFIDAVIT

United States District Court, D. South Carolina, Columbia Division.

Arthur Miller and John M. Johnson, Petitioners,

v.
State of South Carolina et al. Respondents.

Civ. A. No. 70-2,

Fed. 17, 1970

Attorneys and Law Firms

*1288 Daniel R. McLeod, Atty. Gen., Emmett H. Clair, Asst. Atty. Gen., Columbia, S.C.

OPINION and ORDER

⑤ Such reason apparently was never conveyed to appointed counsel, who would undoubtedly have been relieved to have been released from representation; nor did the petitioner explain how he expected to pay such counsel. There is perhaps an implication in the record that in not raising the plea that, since the petitioners had not actually succeeded in opening the safe involved in their prosecution, they could not be guilty of 'safecracking', only of, to use the words of one of the petitioners, 'safetampering'. However, it has been authoritatively held, in the construction of the South Carolina 'Safecracking' Statute, 'It is not essential to constitute a safe cracking~~er~~ that he shall be successful in his attempt to break open the safe.'

State v. O'Day (1906) 74 S.C. 448, 450, 54 S.E. 607, 608

See, also, Shelmut v. State (1965) 247 S.C. 41, 45, 145 S.E. 2d 420; c.f.,

United States ex rel. Sadler v. Pennsylvania (D.C. Pa. 1969) 306 F. Supp. 102, 106

With kindest regards I'm
Thanks
 George Holmes
 George Holmes

George Holmes #289114
Lee CI/F-7-85
990 Wisack Highway
Bishopville, SC 29010

RECEIVED

AUG 14 2023

SC Court of Appeals



US POSTAGE™ PITNEY BOWES

ZIP 29210 \$ 000.87⁰
02 4W
0000378725 AUG. 10. 2023.

RECEIVED

AUG 14 2023

S.C. SUPREME COURT

~~George Holmes~~
~~Lee CI/F-7-85~~
~~990 Wisack Highway~~
~~Bishopville, SC 29010~~

The Supreme Court of South Carolina
Patricia A Howard, Clerk of Court
Post office Box 11330
Columbia, SC 29211

3500 1330182123

LEGAL MAIL ONLY