

The State of South Carolina
Court of Appeals

RECEIVED

DEC 27 2024

Court of Common Pleas
S.C. SUPREME COURT
Charleston County,

Tarone D. Johnson,
Petitioner,

Rule 59(e)

vs,

Case: 2019-CP-10-2870

Danielle Dixon,
Assistant Attorney
General, State of
South Carolina.
Respondent,

appellate case no.
2022-001392

Petitioner, Tarone D. Johnson #260921, now brings this 59(e) motion before the Court's South Carolina Court of Appeals. to Compel Assistant Attorney General, Danielle Dixon to Comply with (S.C.R. Crim. P) South Carolina Rules of Criminal Procedures, states that a Petitioner's allegations must be met with a Challenge.

in the absence of findings of facts, it is improper for the P.C.R. Court to deny a defendant's motion for relief on his allegations of ineffective assistance of Trial Counsel. →

McCray vs. State, 408 S.E.2nd 241.

Any order denying a defendant's request for Post Conviction Relief would be remanded for rehearing where it failed to directly address the defendant's claims that his trial counsel was ineffective. (3/17-27-80)

The South Carolina Supreme Court ruled, that remand for a new P.C.R. hearing was necessary where the P.C.R. order failed to make findings of facts on the specific allegations raised.

Respondent, Danielle Dixon, Assistant Attorney General and Administrative Appeal Judge, Jennifer McCay expand the State of South Carolina long line of State Attorneys who violate the very laws they profess to be up-holding.

Marlow vs. State, 375 S.C. 407, holding. The Supreme Court held that issues were not preserved for appellate review in that defendant (respondent) failed to file motion asking trial court to make specific findings of facts and conclusions of law on applicant allegations.

if South Carolina Supreme Court follow through with the dismissal of Appellate Case No.

2024-001650. It is violating statute §17-27-80.

holding, "a Rule 59(e) Motion must be filed if issues are not adequately address" in the P.C.R. order. Reese, 425 S.C. 108.

Assistant Attorney General Danielle Dixon have yet to acknowledge whether Trial Attorney Harry Shaw's representation fell below the Strickland Standard.

or, whether Solicitor Peter Beck, committed perjury with the introduction of Coins into applicant Trial.

It is issues like these that applicant need preserved for the record.

P.C.R. petition 2019-CP-10-2870 had argued four allegations in particular which were

1.) Did Trial Solicitor Peter Beck injected perjury testimony into Petitioner's trial by mentioning Coins to jury?

2.) Did Trial Counsel Harry Shaw's representation fell below the Strickland Standard?

a.) was Trial judge Allen charge coercive?

b.) was Trial judge Malice charge →

Unconstitutional?

3.) Did Police violate Petitioner's (4th) and (14th) amendment right with illegal search and seizure? Rendering alleged 2nd statement inadmissable in a Court of law?

Sworn or Affirmed to and Subscribed
before me this day _____ of _____, 2012

Notary Public

My Commission Expires: _____

Tarone Johnson 260921
Kershaw Corrections
4848 Goldmine Hwy
Kershaw, SC 29069
H-B-189

2.
COLUMBIA SC 290
20 DEC 2024 PM 3 E



US POSTAGESM PITNEY BOWES
ZIP 29067 \$ 000.69⁰
02 4W
0000378441 DEC 19 2024

Patricia Howard
Clerk of Court
The Supreme Court of S.C.
P.O. Box 11330
Columbia, S.C. 29211

SCDC
DEC 14 '24
MAIL ROOM

RECEIVED

DEC 27 2024

S.C. SUPREME COURT

29211-133030

