

# The South Carolina Court of Appeals

The State, Respondent,

v.

Jorico D. Tyler, Appellant.


Appellate Case No. 2024-000366

---

## ORDER

---

Appellant has failed to provide a sufficient explanation as required by Rule 203(d)(1)(B)(iv) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR).<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, this matter is dismissed, and the remittitur will be sent as required by Rule 221(b), SCACR.



---

FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:

Robert Douglas Mellard, Esquire

Robert Michael Dudek, Esquire

Theodore Nichols Lupton, Esquire

---

<sup>1</sup> Appellant's allegations regarding the alleged ineffectiveness of his plea counsel would be more appropriately set forth in an application for post-conviction relief. See S.C. Code Ann. § 17-27-10 et seq.; *Al-Shabazz v. State*, 338 S.C. 354, 363, 527 S.E.2d 742, 747 (2000) ("In a direct appeal, the focus generally is upon the propriety of rulings made by the circuit court in response to a party's motions or objections. In PCR, the focus usually is upon alleged errors made by trial or plea counsel.").

Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire  
Mark Reynolds Farthing, Esquire  
Jorico Tyler, #00368868

**FILED**  
**May 06 2024**