

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Supreme Court

RECEIVED

Apr 08 2024

APPEAL FROM SPARTANBURG COUNTY  
Court of Common Pleas  
Hon. G. D. Morgan, Circuit Court Judge

S.C. SUPREME COURT

Case No. 2023-001011

Stepheno Alston. . . . . Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

The State of South Carolina. . . . . Respondent-Appellee.

AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION TO PROCEED AS PRO-SE

I, Stepheno Alston, being first duly sworn, state:

1. I am the Petitioner-Appellant in the above-entitled action, proceeding as pro-se, moves this Court to terminate the representation of my appointed counsel, Kathrine H. Hudgins, Appellant Defender, who is to be relieved of any further obligations in perfecting my Petition for Writ of Certiorari, for as I choose to proceed as pro-se.
2. This affidavit is made in support of Petitioner-Appellant’s motion to proceed as Pro-se, made pursuant to *State v. Brewer* 328 S.C. 117, 492 S.E.2d 97 (S.C., 1997) (citing *Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806, 95 S.Ct. 2525 (1975), for an Order granting Petitioner-Appellant’s Motion to Proceed as Pro-se.
3. The waiver of my right to counsel is made knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily.
4. Petitioner-Appellant is fully aware of the dangers and disadvantages of proceeding as pro-se.
5. Kathrine H. Hudgins, Esq., has failed to make reasonable efforts to raise two meritorious issues that Petitioner-Appellant has raised during his PCR hearing, insomuch as, her failure to do so, hinders Petitioner-Appellant appeal of the PCR Court’s Order of Dismissal.
6. Petitioner-Appellant wants to represent himself and to proceed as Pro-se for his Petition for Writ of Certiorari.
7. This motion is not made for delay and is being made in good faith.

