

To:

~~S.C. Commission of Indigent Defense~~
Division of Appellate Defense

In Re: Appointment of Appellate Counsel For Indigent Inmate

Appellate Case# 2023-001770

I Bryan Murray am currently a pro se appellant in the above referenced appeal filed in the S.C. Court of Appeals on 3-12-24. This appeal arises from a Motion to Reconsider Sentence filed 7-27-2023 in the Richland County Fifth Judicial Circuit Court and a hearing was held before the Honorable Jocelyn Newman on 10-31-2023. Record reflects i appeared pro se at the hearing. ~~I now humbly request for the appointment of appellate counsel and also request to be informed conveniently of the granting of appointment of counsel in the referenced matter.~~

Date: 3-19-2024

Respectfully Submitted

Bryan Murray
Bryan Murray #284701
A.C.I. /F2A-14
1057 Revolutionary Trail
Fairfax, s.c. 29827

CC:

~~S.C. court of appeals~~
S.C. attorney general

RECEIVED

APR 19 2024

SC Court of Appeals

The S.C. Court of Appeal observed; It is without doubt that the statutory definition for the term "no-parole" offense in section 24-13-100, i.e., "a class A, B, or C felony....." simply describes the types of offenses for which the offender is not eligible for parole but further noted; It is unreasonable to characterize an offense for which the offender is eligible for parole as a

no-parole offense pursuant to section 24-13-100, even if the maximum sentence for the offense places it within a classification encompassed by section 24-13-100. Bolin v South Carolina Dept. of Corrections 415 S.C. 276, 781 SE2d 914, 916-17 (Ct. App. 2016)

Appellant therefore, strongly objects to the denial of his state constitutional right to "A STATE CREATED LIBERTY", based on the mischaracterization of the respondent's application of a "no-parole" label on a parole eligible offense.

This court noted in Bolin, a no parole label cannot be applied to a parole eligible offense! Further, Scdc cannot deny the Appellant his earned work credits.

CONCLUSION

Appellant asserts the error of the respondent is obvious. He is not only by law entitled to his earned work credits for his release, he is also entitled to his parole eligibility. The respondent refuses to carry into effect the intent of legislation, and has favored its own interpretation over that of the courts and statutory provision(s). Appellant requests the application of all his work credits be applied to either release him from the custody of the respondent or to give him his right to parole.

This Appellant humbly prays, Thank-You

Date _____

S _____

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Bryan Murray attest that this correspondence along with proof of service has been served by way of the u.s.p.s. with sufficient postage to the following parties:

s.c. commission of indigent defense
division of appellate defense
po box 11589
cola, s.c. 29211-1589


s.c. court of appeals
jenny a. kitchings, clerk
po box 11629
cola, s.c. 29211

s.c. attorney generals office
po box 11549
cola, s.c. 29211

RECEIVED

APR 19 2024

SC Court of Appeals



RECEIVED

MAR 19 2024

MAILROOM

ACI

"THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS HAS NOT CENSORED THIS ITEM. THEREFORE, THE DEPARTMENT DOES NOT ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR ITS WRITTEN CONTENTS. ALLENDALE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION S.C. DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS "



THIS ENVELOPE IS RECYCLABLE AND MADE WITH 30% POST CONSUMER CONTENT 

© USPS 2022

Bryan Murray #284701


A.C.I. [POSTNET]

1057 Revolutionary Trail
Fairfax, S.C. 29829

2108 625181 1252

RECEIVED

APR 19 2024
SC Court of Appeals



FOREVER / USA

S.C. Court of Appeals
Jenny A. Kitchings, Clerk
P.O. Box 11629
Columbia, S.C. 29211