

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.

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 triable 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

RECEIVED

of Indictments: 2018A0710200400...

SEP 18 2023

SC Court of Appeals

6-13-2022

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 16S324616 against

George Holmes

Address: Samuel Ln Saint Helena Island, SC 29920-5411

Phone: SSN: Sex: M Race: B Height: 5 7 Weight: 240 DL State: SC DL #: DOB: 7/1984 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 12/28/18

RETURN WARRANT TO: Beaufort County General Sessions PO Box 1128 102 Ribaut Road, Rm. 208 Beaufort, SC 29901 1128

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

County/ Municipality of

Beaufort

Personally appeared before me the affiant Jonathan M Hewitt 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 Judge's Address 104 Ribaut Rd Beaufort, SC 29901-2207 Judge's Telephone (843)255-5700 Issuing Court: Magistrate Municipal Circuit

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

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

Certified - A True Copy

Jerri Ann Roseneau - Clerk of Court Beaufort County, SC - Jennifer Pettif

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

Arthur Miller and John N. Johnson, Petitioners,

v.
State of South Carolina et al. Respondents.

Civ. A. No. 70-2

Fed. 17, 1970

Attorneys and Law firms

*1938 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 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, Shelnut v. State (1965) 247 S.C. 41, 45, 145 S.E. 2d 420; cf.

United States ex rel. Sadler v. Pennsylvania (D.C. Pa. 1969) 306 F.Supp. 102106

With kindest Regards I'm
Thanks
~~George Holmes~~
George Holmes

RECEIVED

SEP 18 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RECEIVED

SEP 18 2023

SC Court of Appeals

S.C. SUPREME COURT

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's 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.~~

~~The State v. George Holmes, Appellate Case No. 2018A0710200400~~
Code of Laws of South Carolina 1976 Annotated
Title 16: Crimes and Offenses
Chapter 11: 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

Current Law

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; Cr. C. '22 § 44; Cr. C. '12 § 191; 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.

~~The State v. George Holmes, Appellate Case No. 2018A0710200400~~
Code of Laws of South Carolina 1976 Annotated
Title 16: Crimes and Offenses
Chapter 11: Offenses Against Property
Article 5: Burglary, Housebreaking, Robbery and the like
Notes Of Decisions (10) Dismiss the offense of Safecracking
In General indictment: 2018A0710200400 16-11-0390

GH It is not essential to constitute a safecracker that he 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.

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
George Holmes

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
George Holmes

GH Use of a hammer to remove a safe in 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. 145, 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.

Constitutional Issues

GH Ten year minimum sentence for safecracking with tools does not constitute cruel and unusual punishment. Stockton v. Leake (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.

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
George Holmes George Holmes

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.

Questions for Jury

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

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.~~

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED

SEP 18 2023

S.C. SUPREME COURT

Appeal from Beaufort County

Honorable Carmen T. Mullen, Circuit Court Judge

THE STATE,

RESPONDENT,

V.

GEORGE HOLMES,

APPELLANT

RECEIVED

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2022-000728

SEP 18 2023

SC Court of Appeals

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Rule 262(a)(3) and Rule 262(c)(3), SCACR, the undersigned hereby certifies a true copy of the Initial Brief of Appellant and Designation of Matter in the above referenced case has been served upon William M. Blich, Jr., Esquire, at the primary email address listed in the Attorney Information System (AIS); and on ~~George Holmes~~ at Lee Correctional Institution, 990 Wisacky Highway, Bishopville, SC 29010, this 19th day of April, 2023.

s/ Lara M. Caudy

Lara M. Caudy
Appellate Defender

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

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

LEE CLIMATE MAIL
COLUMBIA SC 290

15 SEP 2023 PM 3



US POSTAGE and PITNEY BOWES



ZIP 29010 \$ 000.87⁰
02 4W
0000373846 SEP. 15. 2023

Chief Justice Donald W Beatty
1231 Gervais Street
Columbia, SC 29217

RECEIVED

SEP 18 2023

S.C. SUPREME COURT

RECEIVED

SEP 18 2023

SC Court of Appeals

29201-920691

LEGAL MAIL ONLY